

**On the Form and Meaning of Cognate Object Constructions in English:  
A Construction Grammar Approach**

Ken-ichi Kitahara

The aim of this thesis is to provide a comprehensive account of various syntactic behaviors observed in cognate object constructions (henceforth, COCs).

As is well known, not all COCs show the same syntactic behavior (cf. Pereltsvaig (1999)). Observe the following:

- (1) a. \*A silly smile was smiled by Sam. (Jones (1988:91))  
 b. A good life was lived by Susan. (Rice (1987:210))

As shown in (1a, b), COs show different behaviors with respect to passivization. Thus, the COs which cannot undergo passivization are treated as adjunct COs, while those which can be passivized are treated as argument COs.

In order to explain why there are adjunct COs and argument COs, Takami and Kuno (2002) propose that the verbs taking COs are divided into intransitive or transitive. According to their proposal, the verb *smile* in (1a) is intransitive, and therefore its CO cannot be passivized. On the other hand, the verb *dance* in (1b) is transitive and the passivization of its CO is acceptable.

However, Takami and Kuno's proposal does not sufficiently account for different syntactic behaviors of COs. In contrast with (1a), there are some examples where the CO of the verb *smile* can be passivized, as shown in (2):

- (2) Marilyn Monroe's smile was smiled by Mary.  
 (Kitahara, Kodaira, and Tamura (2005:137))

Although Takami and Kuno classify the verb *smile* as intransitive, *Marilyn Monroe's smile* in (2) can be passivized, like a direct object. Furthermore, the CO of the verb *live* cannot always be passivized. Observe the following:

- (3) \*An uneventful life was lived by Harry. (Jones (1988:91))

In (3), the CO of the verb *live* cannot undergo passivization, unlike (1b). We need to explain why the COs of the same verb show different syntactic behaviors.

In order to solve this problem, I propose that so-called COCs are divided into two independent constructions. For convenience, I refer to the COCs which have adjunct COs as TYPE I and those which have argument COs as TYPE II. First, let us examine the correspondence of form and meaning in TYPE I. The CO of this type expresses the manner of the action denoted by the verb. This claim is supported by the following:

- (4) a. Mary smiled a beautiful smile. (= Mary smiled beautifully.)  
 (Matsumoto (1996:199))

- b. A: How did Miss Maple smile?  
B: She smiled a deprecating smile.

(Omuro (1990-91:75))

In (4a), TYPE I can be paraphrased into the intransitive construction with a manner adverb. In fact, as in (4b), it can be accepted as an answer to the question with *how*. Thus, TYPE I is similar to the intransitive construction with a manner adverb.

Next, we turn to TYPE II. The CO of this type has a specific reference and functions as a referential object. Consider the following:

- (5) a. Mary danced an exotic dance. She danced *it* to show us her experiences in Asian countries. (Takami and Kuno (2002:149))  
b. A: What (sort of dance) did the girls dance?  
B: They danced a traditional dance.

(Horita (1996:239))

The CO of TYPE II, as shown in (5a), can be substituted by the pronoun *it*. (5b) supports this observation. B's utterance involving the CO which has a specific reference belongs to TYPE II, and therefore can be an answer to the question with *what*. Thus, TYPE II is similar to the transitive construction. From the above facts, it is clear that there are two types of the pairing of form and meaning in COCs.

To assume that COCs are divided into two independent constructions is a key to the answer to the question why the COs of the same verb show different syntactic behaviors. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1999), the form and meaning of a construction are contributed by the construction itself, not just by the verb. From this perspective, I claim that each COC specifies the property of the verb therein. Following this claim, the construction in (2) belongs to TYPE II, while that in (3) belongs to TYPE I. In fact, *Marilyn Monroe's smile* in (2) can be substituted by the pronoun *it*, as shown in (6):

- (6) Mary smiled Marilyn Monroe's smile. Nancy smiled *it*, too.  
(Kitahara, Kodaira, and Tamura (2005:138))

Note further that *an uneventful life* in (3) can be paraphrased into a manner adverb, as in (7):

- (7) Harry lived an uneventful life. (= Harry lived uneventfully.)

From the above discussions, I claim that the property of the verb should be determined by the specification of each COC. That is, the syntactic behaviors of a CO are reduced to the specification of each COC, not to that of the verb.

Consequently, there are two types of constructions, TYPE I and TYPE II, in COCs. Each COC specifies the property of the verb. This analysis provides a comprehensive account of various syntactic behaviors in COCs.