

How to accommodate two types of resultatives: A lexical-constructional account

Seizi IWATA  
Osaka City University

Resultatives are one of the phenomena that have been challenging to projectionist approaches in the generative tradition (Pinker 1989, Levin & Rapoport 1988, Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995, among others). Thus, the phrasal syntax of *He laughed himself silly* cannot possibly be projected from the verb *laugh*.

Against this background, it is quite natural that Goldberg's (1995) constructional approach to argument structure has attracted considerable attention. Thus Goldberg explains away resultatives by attributing the observed syntax and semantics to a construction, rather than to the verb.

What should not be overlooked, however, is the fact that the success of Goldberg's (1995) constructional account comes from the following two points: First, Goldberg's emphasis on the non-compositional character of constructions; second, the instances of resultatives cited are non-compositional.

It turns out that neither of these two points is self-evident. As for the first, Goldberg concedes that constructions can be compositional in her subsequent work (Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004, Goldberg 2006). As for the second, it is now common knowledge among Japanese scholars that resultatives divide into two types, and that in one type the notion of state change is inherent in the verb meaning (e.g. *The lake froze solid*, *He painted the wall red*).

In this talk, I will show how the two types of resultatives are to be accommodated in a constructional account. The first type, illustrated by sentences like *The lake froze solid*, should not be handled by means of an argument structure construction. The second type, exemplified by sentences like *He wiped the table clean*, are to be handled in terms of an argument structure construction, but in a way rather different from Goldberg's theory. The proposed alternative account, called a lexical-constructional account (Iwata 2008), is characterized by its rather radically usage-based view of constructions, as well as its emphasis on the need for a detailed examination of verb meanings.