

Cognate Object Constructions in English: A Construction Grammar Approach*

Ken-ichi Kitahara

1. Introduction

In this paper, I investigate constructions exemplified by the following:

- (1) a. Sam smiled a silly smile.
b. Sam danced a merry dance.

In (1a, b), the object nouns, *smile* and *dance*, are formally the same as the main verbs. Such objects are called *cognate objects*.¹ Constructions involving cognate objects are called *cognate object constructions*.

As we shall see later, not all cognate object constructions show the same syntactic behavior. An interesting question is why they show different syntactic behaviors. In order to answer this question, I claim that so-called cognate object constructions are divided into two independent constructions and that their syntactic behaviors are reduced to the property of each construction. Throughout the discussion, I demonstrate that a construction grammar approach can provide a comprehensive account of cognate object constructions in English.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews a functional analysis of cognate object constructions in Takami and Kuno (2002) and points out some serious problems with their analysis. Section 3 shows that cognate object constructions consist of two types of the pairing of form and meaning. Furthermore, I argue that a construction grammar approach can capture the idiosyncrasy of each construction properly. Section 4 examines how cognate object constructions specify the properties of their components. Section 5 is the concluding remarks.

* I am greatly indebted to the following people for their constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper: Yukio Hirose, Nobuhiro Kaga, Masaharu Shimada, and Naoaki Wada. My special thanks also go to Hiroyuki Iwasaki, Masaru Kanetani, Suguru Mikami, and Nobukatsu Yoshida. I would like to thank Oliver Hayden and Robert Snelling for acting as my informants. Needless to say, any remaining errors are mine.

¹ In English, there are examples in which cognate objects are not formally the same as their verbs. Observe the following examples:

- (i) a. John died a gruesome death. (Jones (1988:89))
b. Peter Piper sang a song of sixpence. (Massam (1990:183))

The object nouns in (i), *death* and *song*, are not formally the same as the verbs, *die* and *sing*. However, these objects are etymologically related to the verbs, like those in (1). In this paper, such objects are also dealt with as cognate objects.

2. Takami and Kuno (2002) and Their Problems

In this section, I briefly review a functional analysis by Takami and Kuno (2002). In order to answer the question of why cognate object constructions show different syntactic behaviors, Takami and Kuno (2002) argue that the verbs taking cognate objects should be classified into intransitive or transitive. According to their discussion, the cognate object construction is the construction in which an intransitive verb takes a cognate object. On the other hand, the construction in which a transitive verb takes a cognate object is dealt with as the transitive construction. In short, the property of the main verb determines whether the sentence belongs to the cognate object construction. There are some useful criteria for this classification: Passivization, substitution, and modification. Consider the following examples:

- (2) a. *A silly smile was smiled by Sam.
 b. A merry dance was danced by Sam.
 (Jones (1988:91))
- (3) a. Mona smiled a tantalizing smile. *Rose smiled *it*, too.
 (Horita (1996:243))
 b. Mary danced an exotic dance. She danced *it* to show us her experiences in Asian countries.
 (Takami and Kuno (2002:149))
- (4) a. *She smiled a smile. (Horita (1996:243))
 b. She danced a dance. (Horita (1996:222))

In (2)-(4), the cognate object of the verb *smile* cannot be passivized, substituted by the pronoun *it*, and accepted without modifying phrases, in contrast with the cognate object of the verb *dance*. Thus, the verb *smile* is classified as intransitive and the verb *dance* as transitive. Likewise, from three criteria above, Takami and Kuno propose that the verbs *laugh* and *die* are intransitive, while the verbs *live* and *scream* are transitive. That is, the constructions where the verbs *smile*, *laugh*, and *die* occur belong to the cognate object construction and those where the verbs *dance*, *live*, and *scream* occur belong to the transitive construction.

However, Takami and Kuno's proposal has some serious problems. Firstly, there are some examples in which the cognate object of the transitive construction cannot be passivized. Consider sentences (5) and (6):

- (5) a. Harry lived an uneventful life.
 b. *An uneventful life was lived by Harry.
 (Jones (1988:91))
- (6) a. John screamed a terrifying scream.

- b. *A terrifying scream was screamed by John.

(Moltmann (1989:300-301))

Although Takami and Kuno classify the verbs *live* and *scream* as transitive, the cognate objects of these verbs cannot be passivized, as shown in (5b) and (6b).

Secondly, the cognate object of the transitive construction shows different behaviors with respect to substitution. Consider the following:

- (7) a. Mary danced a traditional dance, and *it* was noticeable.
 b.?*Mary danced a staggering/nervous dance, and *it* was noticeable.

(Horita (1996:240))

The cognate object of the transitive verb *dance* in (7a) can be substituted by the pronoun *it*, while cannot in (7b).

Thirdly, the cognate object of the intransitive verb can be accepted without modification. Consider the following:

- (8) As he knew it must be another bibliophile he said nothing but smiled a smile.

(Omuro (2004:146))

In (8), the cognate object of the intransitive verb *smile* is acceptable without modification, unlike (4a).²

Fourthly, the constructions classified as the cognate object construction can show the same syntactic behaviors as the transitive construction. Consider the following examples:

- (9) a. She smiled Marilyn Monroe's smile (in "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes").
 b. Marilyn Monroe's smile was smiled by Mary.
 c. Mary smiled Marilyn Monroe's smile. Nancy smiled *it*, too.

(Kitahara (2005:17))

In (9b, c), the cognate object of the intransitive verb *smile* can be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*, unlike (2a) and (3a).

As is observed above, Takami and Kuno's analysis does not sufficiently account for the different syntactic behaviors of cognate object constructions. They reduced the syntactic behaviors of cognate object constructions to the transitivity of

² In English, unmodified cognate objects can function as intensifying adverbs. Observe the following examples:

- (i) a. Joseph dreamed a dream. (Hashimoto (1998:128))
 b. He walked a walk and talked a talk well beyond his years. (Omuro (2004:145))

According to Hashimoto (1998), each cognate object in (i) can be paraphrased into an intensifying adverb as *surely* or *certainly*. Such cognate objects cannot be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*. Thus, the existence or nonexistence of modification may not be a useful criterion for determining whether the verb is transitive or not.

the verbs. However, we have seen that such approach cannot explain the examples in (5)-(9). Moreover, they left unsolved whether the construction where a transitive verb takes a cognate object can be treated like other transitive constructions, i.e. transitive constructions which do not take cognate objects. In the following sections, I will address these issues from the perspective of construction grammar.

3. Correspondences between Form and Meaning in Cognate Object Constructions

In construction grammar (cf. Goldberg (1995)), a construction is viewed as the pairing of a specification of form with a specification of meaning. From this perspective, I claim that so-called cognate object constructions should be divided into two independent constructions, based on the semantic properties of cognate objects, not the transitivity of the verbs. As we shall see in the following subsections, cognate objects function as either predicate appositives or referential objects. I will refer to the constructions with the former type of cognate objects as the predicative cognate object construction (henceforth, the predicative COC) and those with the latter type as the referential cognate object construction (the referential COC). In this section, I examine the correspondence between form and meaning of each cognate object construction.

3.1. The Semantic Function of the Predicative COC

In this subsection, I investigate the semantic function of the predicative COC in detail. According to Inui (1949), the cognate object of the predicative COC functions as a predicate appositive, i.e. a predicate nominal in apposition with the subject and the verb (cf. Curme (1947)). Such a cognate object specifies the manner of the action denoted by the verb.

This claim is supported by the following facts. Firstly, the cognate object of the predicative COC is an optional element in apposition with the subject and the verb. In fact, it can be separated by a comma or connected with a hyphen. Observe the following examples:

- (10) a. He smiled, a nervous smile. (Kasai (1980:12))
 b. Mary slept – a very sound sleep.
 c. He lay still in the mud and waited to die, not having even seen the enemy – a dirty, unheroic death.

(Kashino (1993:49))

This behavior is almost equivalent to that of an afterthought (cf. Bolinger (1977)).

Secondly, the cognate object of the predicative COC can be paraphrased into

a manner adverbial (cf. Yasui (1982), Omuro (1990-91), and Nakau (1994)). Consider the following examples:

- (11) a. Ann slept a sound sleep. (Nakau (1994:318))
 b. Mary smiled a beautiful smile. (Matsumoto (1996:199))
 c. The girls danced a nervous dance. (Horita (1996:239))

In (11), each cognate object specifies the manner of the action denoted by the verb, and therefore can be paraphrased into the manner adverb which expresses the same meaning, as in (12) ³:

- (12) a. Ann slept soundly. (Nakau (1994:318))
 b. Mary smiled beautifully. (Matsumoto (1996:199))
 c. The girls danced nervously.

Thus, the cognate object of the predicative COC, like manner adverbials, represents the manner of the action denoted by the verb.

Thirdly, the predicative COC can be an answer to the question that asks how the action is done. Observe the followings:

- (13) A: How did Miss Maple smile?
 B: She smiled a deprecating smile. (Omuro (1990-91:75))

- (14) A: How did the girls dance?
 B: The girls danced a nervous dance. (Horita (1996:239))

As shown in (13) and (14), the predicative COC is acceptable as an answer to the question with *how*. These examples also support the claim that the cognate object of the predicative COC represents the manner of the action denoted by the verb.

Fourthly, the cognate object of the predicative COC must be indefinite. Consider the following example:

- (15) *John screamed *this* scream/*every* scream we heard today. (Moltmann (1989:301))

Moltmann observes that in (15), cognate objects cannot occur with strong determiners when they function as predicate appositives. This is consistent with the fact that predicate nominals exhibit the indefiniteness effect (cf. Kearns (1988)). Interestingly, when a cognate object is not indefinite, it cannot be paraphrased into a manner adverbial, as exemplified in (16):

- (16) a. Sam danced *{the/every}* beautiful dance.

³ In section 3.3, we will consider the difference between the predicative COC and the intransitive construction with a manner adverbial.

(≠ Sam danced beautifully.)

- b. Sam smiled *{the/every}* beautiful smile.

(≠ Sam smiled beautifully.)

As shown in (16a, b), *{the/every}* *beautiful* *{dance/smile}* cannot be paraphrased into the manner adverb, *beautifully*. Thus, they cannot function as predicative appositives. Sentences (16a, b) do not belong to the predicative COC. Therefore, cognate object constructions are recognized as the predicative COC only if their cognate objects exhibit the indefiniteness effect, i.e. their cognate objects function as predicate appositives.

In sum, the cognate object of the predicative COC functions as a predicate appositive and specifies the manner of the action denoted by the verb. Thus, the predicative COC is similar to the intransitive construction with a manner adverbial.

3.2. *The Semantic Function of the Referential COC*

In this subsection, I turn to the semantic function of the referential COC. The cognate object of the referential COC functions as a referential object (cf. Massam (1990), Macfarland (1995)) and represents a particular, recognizable type independent of the action denoted by the verb.

This claim is supported by the following facts. Firstly, the cognate object of the referential COC can be passivized. Consider the following example:

- (17) The blood-curdling scream that they had all heard in countless horror movies was screamed by one of the campers.

(Langacker (1991:363))

In (17), the cognate object can undergo passivization, like a direct object. According to Langacker (1991), the scream referred to in (17) transcends the specific event denoted by the verb and represents a particular, recognizable type of scream whose existence is therefore independent of any single instantiation. Thus, the cognate object of the referential COC behaves as a direct object, and it represents a particular, recognizable type.

Secondly, the cognate object of the referential COC can be substituted by the pronoun *it*. Observe the following:

- (18) a. John sang a beautiful song. He sang *it* to cheer her up.
 b. He lived a happy trouble-free life. He could live *it* because his wife took care of all the difficulties. (Takami and Kuno (2002:149))
 c. Mary screamed a blood-curdling scream and she screamed *it* practically in my ear. (Takami and Kuno (2002:153))

In (18), each cognate object represents a particular, recognizable type and can be substituted by the pronoun *it*. Thus, we can say that the cognate object of the

referential COC has a specific reference.

Thirdly, the referential COC can be an answer to the question that asks what is affected by the action. Observe the examples in (19) and (20):

(19) A: What did he sing?

B: He sang a beautiful song.

(Omuro (1990-91:75))

(20) A: What (sort of dance) did the girls dance?

B: They danced a traditional dance.

(Horita (1996:239))

As shown in (19) and (20), the referential COC is acceptable as an answer to the question with *what*. Thus, the cognate object of the referential COC is considered to function as a referential object.

Fourthly, the cognate object of the referential COC does not exhibit the indefiniteness effect. Consider the following:

(21) a. Tom sneezed *every* sneeze that we heard that day.

b. Zack screamed *many* screams before quieted him down.

(Massam (1990:169))

In (21a, b), the speakers count up the number of time the subjects sneezed or screamed, respectively. That is, each cognate object has a specific reference as a particular, recognizable type, and therefore it can occur with a strong determiner. Hence, sentences (21a, b) belong to the referential COC.

In sum, the cognate object of the referential COC functions as a referential object, i.e, it refers to a type separate from the action denoted by the verb. Therefore, the referential COC is similar to transitive constructions (cf. Goldberg (1995) and Taylor (2003)).

3.3. *The Idiosyncrasies of the Predicative COC and the Referential COC*

In this subsection, I consider the idiosyncrasies of the predicative COC and the Referential COC.

In the predicative COC, the cognate object functions as a predicate appositive in ‘object’ slot. We can say that the predicative COC is idiosyncratic in that a noun phrase located in ‘object’ slot functions as an adverbial.⁴ In addition, the semantic

⁴ It is not unusual that noun phrases function as adverbials in English. Consider the examples in (i):

(i) a. I will see you *tomorrow/next week/the day after tomorrow/the next day*.

b. You should never abandon your job *this way*.

(Haegeman and Guéron (1999:41))

In (i), italicized noun phrases function as adverbials. These noun phrases can be widely used in various constructions. However, only in the predicative COC, the cognate object can function as

function of the predicative COC is not predictable from the form [NP V NP]. Thus, the predicative COC is more idiosyncratic than other constructions which have the form [NP V NP], i.e. transitive constructions.

We need to consider whether the predicative COC is entirely equivalent to the intransitive construction with a manner adverb. Jones (1988) contends that the difference between cognate objects and manner adverbials is merely a stylistic matter. However, we must recognize that there are functional differences between cognate objects and manner adverbials. According to Omuro (1990-91), sentence (22a) cannot be paraphrased into (22b):

(22) a. She smiled a warm happy smile.

b. *She smiled warmly happily. (Omuro (1990-91:68))

As shown in (22b), verbs cannot be modified by more than one manner adverb, without using the coordinate conjunction. Thus, we need to say, "She smiled warmly and happily," instead of (22b). On the other hand, if we utter the sentence like (22a), we can express the manner of the action without using the coordinate conjunction. In this sense, the predicative COC is functionally less restricted than the corresponding intransitive construction.

Moreover, the predicative COC can express the manner of the action denoted by the verb more richly than the intransitive construction with a manner adverb. Observe the following examples:

(23) a. He laughed a laugh that shook the timbers of even that solidly built old house.

b. Mona sneezed a 20 decibel sneeze, which is a rare thing to hear. (Massam (1990:168))

As shown in (23), cognate objects can be modified by the relative clause. Needless to say, manner adverbs cannot. In the predicative COC, the manner of the action can be modified more vividly by using various types of modifiers together.

To sum up, the predicative COC, I claim, is more idiosyncratic than transitive constructions and is functionally less restricted than the corresponding intransitive construction.

Let us turn to the idiosyncrasy of the referential COC. In the referential COC, the cognate object located in 'object' slot functions as an object which has a specific reference. In this point, the referential COC is similar to transitive constructions.

an adverbial. In this sense, the cognate object of this construction is more idiosyncratic than constructions like (ia, b).

However, we see a big difference between the referential COC and transitive constructions. In revealing this difference, a historical analysis of cognate objects is useful.

According to Osaki (2000), cognate objects were pleonastically inserted as alliterative filler words in late OE poetry. That is, cognate objects were originally optional elements. It is because of alliteration that they came into existence. I consider that the prosodic function of alliteration is one of the essential properties of so-called cognate object constructions. In fact, my informants feel both the predicative COC and the referential COC clumsy and unnatural, because of their prosodic features. Furthermore, as many linguists have pointed out (e.g. Kurata (1986)), cognate object constructions are used in very limited contexts, e.g. religious prose, nursery rhyme, and literary works which is written in rhyme. Thus, I propose that the referential COC is more idiosyncratic than transitive constructions in that the prosodic function of the former is distinct and not predictable from that of the latter.

Notice here that the referential COC has the same prosodic function of alliteration as the predicative COC. According to Taylor (2003:198), for some constructions, the formal characterization needs to include prosodic information. The same holds true for cognate object constructions. In light of the prosodic function of alliteration, the referential COC should be treated as a type of cognate object constructions, not as that of transitive constructions.

From the above discussion, I claim that the referential COC has the same idiosyncratic prosodic function as the predicative COC and belongs to so-called cognate object constructions.

3.4. Summary

In sum, so-called cognate object constructions are divided into two independent constructions: The predicative COC and the referential COC. It is clear that each cognate object construction is more idiosyncratic than other constructions. In the next section, we will solve some problems with the proposal by Takami and Kuno (2002) from the perspective of construction grammar.

4. The Relation between Verbs and Cognate Object Constructions

In this section, we reveal the relation between verbs and cognate object constructions, in order to solve the problems raised in section 2. In construction grammar, it is assumed that grammatical constructions have their own conceptual

content and specify the properties of the verbs used therein.⁵ That is, in construction grammar, the form and meaning of a grammatical construction are contributed by the construction itself, not just by the verb. A construction specifies the properties of its components, even of the verb.

With this in mind, I answer the question of why the same verb shows different syntactic behaviors in cognate object constructions, as shown in (5)-(9). In English, cognate object constructions are divided into the predicative COC and the referential COC. Each construction specifies how verbs are combined with it in its own way. Hence, the properties of the verbs should be determined by the specification of each cognate object construction.

In the following subsections, I will investigate how each cognate object construction specifies the properties of the verbs used therein.

4.1. *The Relation between Verbs and the Predicative COC*

Although Takami and Kuno mention that the cognate object of the transitive verb can be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*, it does not always hold true. Observe the following:

- (24) a. Sam danced a merry dance. (= Sam danced merrily.)
 b. *A merry dance was danced by Sam. (cf. (2b))
 c. Sam danced a merry dance. *Sam danced *it* because he was sad.

In (24b, c), the cognate object of the verb *dance* cannot be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*. Notice that the cognate object functions as a predicate appositive which represents the manner of the action denoted by the verb. Of more note is that the unacceptability of (24b) is totally different from that of (2b). The different judgment to the same sentence is attributable to the specification of each cognate object construction. More specifically, sentence (2b) is an example of the referential COC, while sentence (24b) is that of the predicative COC.

To see the validity of the analysis here, observe the examples in (5b) and (6b), repeated as (25) and (26):

- (25) *An uneventful life was lived by Harry. (= (5b))

⁵ For instance, consider the following example:

(i) Harry sneezed the tissue off the desk. (Lakoff and Johnson (1999:502))
Sneeze is basically an intransitive verb, as in "Harry sneezed." According to Lakoff and Johnson (1999:502), the meaning of the verb *sneeze* is to forcefully and suddenly expel air through the nose. Thus, this verb by itself does not take a direct object or a directional adverb. However, when this verb is placed in such construction, as shown in (i), it can take an immediately following direct object and directional adverb. This is not predictable from the meaning of the verb *sneeze*. Therefore, Lakoff and Johnson assume that the form and meaning of a construction are reduced not to the verb, but to the construction itself.

(26) *A terrifying scream was screamed by John. (= (6b))

In (25) and (26), the verbs *live* and *scream* occur in the predicative COC. The cognate objects, *an uneventful life* and *a terrifying scream*, can be paraphrased into the manner adverbials, *uneventfully* and *terrifyingly*, respectively. Hence, sentences (25) and (26) are unacceptable.

Next, let us consider the example where the cognate object of the transitive verb can be substituted by the pronoun *it*. Observe sentence (7a), repeated as (27):

(27) Mary danced a traditional dance, and *it* was noticeable. (= (7a))

In (27), the cognate object of the verb *dance* is substituted by the pronoun *it*. However, it does not always hold true. Consider the following sentence:

(28) In this welcome ceremony held for the visiting American President, some children from the kindergarten nearby danced a traditional dance between two very long speeches. (Horita (1996:239))

Sentence (28) can be interpreted as follows: It is a tradition that children from the kindergarten nearby dance in the welcome ceremony.⁶ Then, what kind of dance the children perform is irrelevant to this context. That is, the cognate object, *a traditional dance* can be paraphrased into the adverbial phrase, *traditionally*. In this interpretation, sentence (28) is recognized as the predicative COC. In fact, the cognate object in (28) cannot be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*, as shown in (29). Observe the following:

- (29) a. *A traditional dance was danced by some children from the kindergarten between two very long speeches.
 b. Some children from the kindergarten danced a traditional dance between two very long speeches. *They danced *it* in this welcome ceremony.

From the above discussions, in the predicative COC, the verbs do not take objects, and they are syntactically and semantically intransitive. Thus, the verb used in the predicative COC should represent a self-contained activity with the manner which the cognate object expresses.

4.2. *The Relation between Verbs and the Referential COC*

Now, we consider how the referential COC specifies the properties of the verbs therein. Such verbs as *smile*, *laugh*, and *die* are not compatible with the referential COC. Observe the following examples:

(30) a. Sam smiled a beautiful smile.

⁶ Horita brings up in footnote sentence (28), which was suggested by an anonymous reviewer. The interpretation of (28) is based on this reviewer's suggestion.

- b. *A beautiful smile was smiled by Sam. (cf. (2a))
 c. Sam smiled a beautiful smile. *Sam smiled *it* because he was happy.
- (31) a. *A sad laugh was laughed by Mary at the meeting. (Takami and Kuno (2002:136))
 b. He laughed a hearty laugh. *He laughed *it* because he was truly amused by her joke. (Takami and Kuno (2002:148))
- (32) a. Ken died a hero's death.
 b. *A hero's death was died by Ken.
 c. Ken died a hero's death. *Ken died *it* because he was brave.

As shown in (30)-(32), the cognate objects of the verbs *smile*, *laugh*, and *die* cannot be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*. Why are these verbs incompatible with the referential COC?

In answering this question, the perspective of construction grammar is useful. In construction grammar, it is assumed that verbs involve frame-semantic meanings. Goldberg (1995) mentions that verb meanings must include reference to a background frame rich with world and cultural knowledge. From this viewpoint, we can explain why the verbs *smile*, *laugh*, and *die* are incompatible with the referential COC. Comparing *dance*, *live*, and *scream* with *smile*, *laugh*, and *die*, we notice that the former describes willed or volitional acts, whereas the latter describes involuntary bodily processes. Intuitively, we cannot imitate or replicate someone's involuntary bodily process. For instance, it is difficult to imagine that one imitates or replicates someone's smile. In contrast, it is easy to imagine that one imitates or replicates someone's dance. Therefore, the verbs describing involuntary bodily processes are not compatible with the referential COC in which the cognate object expresses a particular, recognizable type.

However, there are some examples in which the verbs *smile*, *laugh*, and *die* appear in the referential COC. Consider the following:

- (33) a. She smiled Marilyn Monroe's smile (in "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes").
 b. Marilyn Monroe's smile was smiled by Mary.
 c. Mary smiled Marilyn Monroe's smile. Nancy smiled *it*, too. (= (14))
- (34) Everyone looks back on their childhood and no one can say it was all bad or all good because it's both and that's what makes it a happy childhood. *Laughs are laughed*, and some cheeks blush, but the memoirs of our youth is what has molded us into what we are

- today. (Takami and Kuno (2002:166))
- (35) a. He died the death of a Christian.
 b. ?The death of a Christian was died by Harry.

(Hamada (1997:104))

Takami and Kuno argue that the cognate objects of the verbs *smile*, *laugh*, and *die* cannot be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*. However, as is observed in (33)-(35), these constructions show the same behavior as transitive constructions. We need to explain under what condition these verbs can appear in the referential COC.

Here, I focus attention on the modification parts of cognate objects. Omuro (1990-91) points out that the semantic core of a cognate object construction is its modification part. He brings up the following facts as evidence. Firstly, the negation negates the manner of the action denoted by the verb, not the action itself. Consider the following examples:

- (36) a. *Jack did not smile a beautiful smile, but he did not smile.
 b. Jack did not smile a beautiful smile, but he smiled.
 c. *Bob did not dance a beautiful dance, but he did not dance.
 d. Bob did not dance a beautiful dance, but he did dance.

(Iwakura (1976:60))

As indicated in (36a, c), the negation cannot negate the activity of smiling. On the other hand, it can negate the manner in which the activity of smiling is done, as shown in (36b, d).

Secondly, speakers put stress on the modification part of a cognate object construction. Consider the following examples:

- (37) a. John smiled a SAD smile.
 b. John died an UNNATURAL death.

(Omuro (1990-91:70))

Small capitals indicate that cognate object constructions are pronounced with stress on the modifiers of their cognate objects. From the above facts, he contends that the semantic cores of cognate object constructions are their modification parts.

Based on Omuro's analysis, I assume that verbs appear in the referential COC if their cognate objects can represent a particular, recognizable type by virtue of modification. Then, the actions denoted by the verbs are interpreted as the imitations or replications of the types which the cognate objects describe. In this context, it is easy to image that one imitates or replicates someone's involuntary bodily process purposely. For instance, in (33a), the cognate object is interpreted as a particular, recognizable type by virtue of the name of the American famous

actress. Thus, the activity of smiling can be interpreted as the imitation or replication of Marilyn Monroe's smile. Sentence (33a) means that she imitated the smile which Marilyn Monroe smiled in "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes." Hence, as shown in (33b, c), the cognate object of sentence (33a) can be passivized and substituted by the pronoun *it*.

In addition, when the cognate object of the referential COC does not have modifying phrases, it represents a particular, recognizable type by virtue of the plural form. Reconsider sentence (34). The cognate object, *laugh*, is followed by a plural suffix. In this context, the speaker counts up the number of times the subject laughed. Then, the activity of laughing can be interpreted as the repetition of laugh. As a result, each laugh is counted as a particular, recognizable type. Thus, *laughs* can undergo passivization.

Notice further that the information of the modification part is context-dependent. When we interpret a cognate object as a particular, recognizable type, we use the contextual information invoked by its modification part. For instance, take the following sentences as examples:

- (38) a. The old man laughed one of those short Pict laughs – like a fox barking on a frosty night.
 b. One of those short Pict laughs was laughed by the old man.

(Hamada (1997:104))

If one does not know what short Pict laugh is like, he or she may not accept (38b) as grammatical. The same holds true for (35). In general, the meaning of the verb *die* is considered as an involuntary bodily process. Thus, if the verb *die* occurs in a cognate object construction, the sentence tends to be interpreted as the predicative COC. If one does not know what the death of a Christian is like, he or she may interpret *the death of a Christian* as *in a Christian way*. However, if *the death of a Christian* is interpreted as a particular, recognizable type, the verb *die* represents the imitation or replication of the type which the cognate object describes. In this context, sentence (35a) is recognized as the referential COC. Hence, sentence (35b) is acceptable. To know whether a cognate object construction belongs to the referential COC, we need to consider the contextual information. In other words, in the analysis of cognate object constructions, we should consider information on the situation or context in which they are used.

From the above discussions, even the verbs *smile*, *laugh*, and *die* occur in the referential COC if their cognate objects can represent particular, recognizable types by virtue of modification, plural suffix, and contextual information. More specifically, the verb used in the referential COC should represent the imitation or

repetition of the type which cognate object expresses.

4.3. Summary

In this section, I described the relation between verbs and cognate object constructions. Throughout our discussion, it has been clear how each cognate object construction specifies the properties of the verbs therein. From this viewpoint, we solved Takami and Kuno's problems raised in section 2.

5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, I have argued that so-called cognate object constructions are divided into two types of cognate object constructions: The predicative COC and the referential COC. I have also argued that each construction specifies the properties of the verbs therein (cf. Goldberg (1995)). The proposed analysis, I believe, provides a comprehensive account of cognate object constructions in English.

REFERENCES

- Bolinger, Dwight (1977) *Meaning and Form*, Longman, London.
- Curme, George O (1947) *Principles and Practice of English Grammar*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Goldberg, Adele (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Haegeman, Liliane and Jacqueline Guéron (1999) *English Grammar: A Generative Perspective*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Hamada, Hidehito (1997) "Hi-tenkeiteki na Mokutekigo no Imikoozoo ni tsuite (On the semantic structure of atypical objects)," *Sapporo Daigaku Gaikokugo Gakubu Kiyoo* (The Bulletin of the Faculty of Foreign Studies of Sapporo University) 31-1, 83-108.
- Hashimoto, Isao (1998) *Seisho no Eigo to Heburai Gohoo* (Biblical English and Hebrew Usage), Eichosha, Tokyo.
- Horita, Yuko (1996) "English Cognate Object Constructions and Their Transitivity," *English Linguistics* 13, 221-247.
- Inui, Ryoichi (1949) "Iwayuru COGNATE OBJECTS ni tsuite: Sono Kinoo to Kokugo e no Eikyoo (On So-called Cognate Objects: Their Functions and Influences on Our National Language)," *Eibungaku Kenkyuu* (Studies in English Literature) 26-2, 261-76.
- Iwakura, Kunihiro (1976) "Doozoku Mokutekigo to Yootai no Fukushi to Hitei (Cognate Objects, Manner Adverbs, and Negation)," *Eigo Kyooiku* (English Education) 6, 60-63.
- Jones, Michael A. (1988) "Cognate Objects and the Case-Filter," *Journal of Linguistics* 24, 89-110.
- Kasai, Seizo (1980) "'to dream a strange dream' no Koozoo: Doozoku Mokutekigo Saikoo (On the Structure of 'to dream a strange dream' : Rethinking Cognate Objects)," *Hokkaido Daigaku*

- Bungakubu Kiyoo* (The Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters of Hokkaido University) 28-1, 7-24.
- Kashino, Kenji (1993) *Imiron kara Mita Gohoo* (Usage from the Perspective of Semantics), Kenkyuusha, Tokyo.
- Kearns, Kate (1988) "Light Verbs in English," ms., MIT.
- Kitahara, Ken-ichi (2005) *On the Form and Meaning of Cognate Object Constructions in English: A Construction Grammar Approach*, unpublished MA thesis, University of Tsukuba.
- Kurata, Toru (1986) *Eibunpoo Rongyoo* (Works on English Grammar), Shinozaki Shorin, Tokyo.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1999) *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, Basic Books, New York.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* Vol. II: *Descriptive Application*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Macfarland, Talke (1995) *Cognate Objects and the Argument/Adjunct Distinction in English*, Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University.
- Massam, Diane (1990) "Cognate Objects as Thematic Objects," *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 35, 161-190.
- Matsumoto, Masumi (1996) "The Syntax and Semantics of the Cognate Object Construction," *English Linguistics* 13, 199-220.
- Moltmann, Frederika (1989) "Nominal and Clausal Event Predicates," *CLS* 25, 300-314.
- Nakau, Minoru (1994) *Ninchi Imiron no Genri* (Principles of Cognitive Semantics), Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Omuro, Takeshi (1990-91) "Doozoku Mokutekigo Koobun no Tokusei (The Idiosyncrasies of the Cognate Object Construction), *Eigo Kyoouiku* (English Education), 11, 74-77; 12, 78-80; 1, 68-72.
- Omuro, Takeshi (2004) "Kihonkei to Henshu no Dootei ni Azukaru Daikibo Koopasu: Doozoku Mokutekigo wo Rei ni (The Large Corpus Related to the Identification of the Basic Form and Variants of Constructions: The Case of the Cognate Object Construction)," *Eigo Koopasu Kenkyuu* (Studies of English Corpus) 11, 137-151.
- Osaki, Hisao (2000) "The Influence of Alliteration on the Development of the Cognate Object in Old English," *Studies in Language and Culture* 26, 79-89, Osaka University.
- Rice, Sally (1987) *Toward a Cognitive Model of Transitivity*, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- Taylor, John R. (2003) *Linguistic Categorization*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Takami, Ken-ichi and Susumu Kuno (2002) "Doozoku Mokutekigo Koobun to Hi-nookakusei (The Cognate Object Construction and Unergativity)" *Nichi-eigo no Jidooshi Koobun* (Intransitive Constructions in Japanese and English), 133-177, Kenkyuusha, Tokyo.
- Yasui, Izumi (1982) "Doozoku Mokutekigo no Kinoo ni tsuite (On the Function of Cognate Objects)," *Language and Information*, 79-91, University of Tsukuba.

Doctoral Program in Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Tsukuba
e-mail: kitaken@zb4.so-net.ne.jp