This collective volume originated in a workshop—*Deconstructing Constructions*—held at the University of La Rioja and organized by the Functional Grammars Research Group in 2006. Consequently, it reflects the research interests of the Group, and particularly those of Javier Martín Arista and Christopher S. Butler, who have devoted more than half a lifetime to the analysis of functionalism and of the benefits of quantitative methodology respectively. The book also epitomizes the current interaction among different schools of linguistics, particularly between the functionalist and cognitivist domains, where linguistic solipsism is gradually giving way to mutual influencing.

The dialogue that is proposed here is enhanced by the incorporation of linguistic typology, discourse, corpus-based and contrastive approaches of various kinds, but it is nevertheless the impact of Adele Goldberg’s *Constructions* (1996, 2005) on the linguistics scene that shapes the contributions included. Constructionist approaches in general and the notion of construction in particular always find their way to the surface in this volume, modifying earlier cognitivist proposals and maximizing functionalist models, although they are also sometimes alluded to in critical terms.

Part I, ‘Theoretical Issues’, comprises four contributions of diverse linguistic background. It starts with Daniel García Velasco’s ‘Innovative Coinage. Its Place in the Grammar’ (3-23), which focuses on the usage-based conception of language. This paper utilizes a theory of discourse that profiles the crucial role of context. Velasco focuses his attention on the study of proper nouns in verbal contexts—eponyms—and proposes Functional Discourse Grammar (henceforward FDG) as a model ideally suited for the analysis of lexical creation.

Verbal eponyms of the type *He’s Beckhamed it* fall under the category of contextuals, are characterized by showing not sense but reference, and may be variously interpreted out of context and from one context to another. García Velasco points at the similarities shared by eponym conversion and coercion, but also makes clear that eponyms do not comply with the override principle because they are meaningless referential constructs. He proposes an FDG account based on the integration of the grammatical, conceptual and contextual components. It is in the listener’s conceptual component that the interpretation finally takes place according to Clark and Gerrig’s sequence of hierarchical constraints:
identity of the eponym, acts by the eponym, relevant act and the type of act referred to. In sum, García Velasco not only underscores the inability of Construction Grammar (henceforward CxG) to tackle the issue of verbal eponyms, but also develops to the full the discourse dimension of a theory that, despite its communicative import from the very beginning, had been primarily restricted to the formalized analysis of argument structure during the Dikkenian period.

In ‘The Construction of Macro-events. A Typological Perspective’ (25-62), Johan Pedersen takes Leonard Talmy’s cognitive semantics typology of macro-events to firmer, CxG ground. Pedersen convincingly argues that the famous distinction between satellite-framed (Germanic) and verb-framed (Romance) languages as regards the expression of motion is noticeably weakened when further extended to state change, aspect, co-activity and resultatives. He argues that the figure-ground alignment that allegedly lies at the core of macro-event structure is inadequate because of a lack of potential alternations which are vaguely assumed to show up in other language types. Instead, Pedersen proposes regarding the cited macro-events as deeply entrenched, usage-based constructions found in the grammar. These specify information structure in pairs of Main and Supportive Information that in turn crystalize into constructions of different degrees of specificity: schematic and lexical.

Accordingly, his reanalysis of motion, resultative and perception macro-events portrays a combination of schematic Main Information Constructions and lexical Supportive Information Constructions in satellite-framed Germanic languages like English and Danish while verb-framed Romance languages seem to opt for a reverse lexical mic-schematic sic. As regards aspect, the proposed analysis —schematic mic/lexical sic for the two languages cited above— differs radically from Talmy’s proposal. By means of a computerized version of H.C. Andersen’s short story The Snowman in Danish, English, German, Spanish, French and Italian, he then portrays a relatively complex picture with macro-event alternations in each of the languages involved. He rounds off his contribution by suggesting further typological validation in this respect.

The contributions of Beatriz Martínez Fernández and Javier Martín Arista benefit from the more central role that the functionalist Role and Reference Grammar (henceforward RRG) has accorded to constructions in the latest version of this theory (Van Valin 2005). In ‘Constructions, Co-composition and Merge’ (63-84), Martínez Fernández foregrounds the limitations in the scope of the concept of construction à la Goldberg: a meaning-form pairing in which the semantics of the constituent group cannot be interpreted as just the sum of its parts. She argues convincingly in favour of the existence of some cases that are excluded from CxG because these merge structures, as she calls them, retain part of their verbal semantic input. This is so with the caused-motion construction when containing break verbs of pure change of state: the resulting merge acquires the semantics of motion but at the same time retains the semantics of change of state.

Martínez Fernández adjusts the RRG syntax-to-semantics and semantics-to-syntax linking algorithm to Pustejovsky’s theory of the Generative Lexicon (1995). The four levels
of representation proposed — Argument Structure, Qualia Structure, Event Structure and Lexical Inheritance Structure — may be linked by co-composition, a device that makes a verb and a prepositional phrase co-occurring in the syntax combine their representations to move away from state into active accomplishment in event structure terms. She proves that Pustejovsky’s formalized account of co-composition through formal and agentive Qualia may also be used to explain merge. She draws her discussion to a close by suggesting that other directional prepositions for path and origin may also participate in similar merges. In an ingenious and elegant manner, Martínez Fernández implements the formalized RRG analysis and at the same time opens up a new direction for future research.

Javier Martín Arista’s compelling contribution, ‘A Typology of Morphological Constructions’ (85-114), develops a theory of morphology in the RRG domain. His proposal is in accordance with the incorporation of constructional schemas into the latest version of RRG theory and the reinterpretation of the RRG semantics-to-syntax syntax-to-semantics linking algorithm and its constituents in language-specific constructivist terms. In line with the Layered Structure of the Clause (henforward LSC), he develops the Layered Structure of the Word (LSW), which is made up of a modified set of semantic-syntactic domains arranged bottom-to-top: Nucleus, Core, Word and Complex Word. Each layer shows its own semantic operators. The difference between a Simplex and a Complex Word lies, he argues, in the absence or presence of lexical constituents along with the Nucleus and the related derivational and inflectional operators. In the Complex Word, the type of constituent projection devised here sets up a continuum between compounding and derivation; the operator projection, in turn, allows for the unification of inflection and derivation. This is, in our opinion, where the value of this formalized proposal lies, setting it apart from other contributions in similar functionalist terms.

Martín Arista’s projectionist analysis also tackles the account of the position of (Complex) Word constituents in constructivist terms. Language-specific morphological templates are made the basis of the author’s own typology of Constructional Schemas: continuous and discontinuous, synthetic and analytic and recursive and non-recursive. These schemas can combine mutually and instantiate the two major types of morphological constructions of language-generic nature advanced in this work: endocentric and exocentric constructions. Markedness accounts for the differences between these. This allows Martín Arista’s functionalist proposal to dispense with the traditional and unsatisfactory class membership distinction between derivation and compounding on free/bound form grounds. He finally proceeds in section four to validate his RRG constructionist proposal by studying the morphology of Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara, an Australian aboriginal language. In sum, Martín Arista’s paper not only develops a fully fledged RRG theory of morphology of highly constructivist import, but also paves the way for its typological validation.

Part II is devoted to The Lexical Constructional Model (henceforward LCM). Two contributions are found here: one on the genesis of the model, the other on its description. To these, and for the sake of consistency, we have added a third from Part III that is actually a case study.
In ‘The Lexical Constructional Model. Genesis, Strengths and Challenges’ (117-51), Christopher S. Butler develops a thorough-searching study of the genesis of the LCM and of the cluster of mutually compatible linguistic theories gathered around it and situated in functional-cognitive space. He traces the history of this model back to Martín Mingorance’s Functional-Lexematic Model (henceforward FLM). This late 1980s and early 1990s theory enriched the FG analysis of predicate frames by incorporating a parallel semantic architecture in terms of lexical fields which later became prototype domains mutually interconnected by means of a semantic macronet (Faber and Mairal Usón 1999). Subsequently, this theory embraced the typologically tested benefits of RRG. Predicate frames were thus replaced by lexical templates (LTS) and language-specific stepwise lexical decomposition gave way to a RRG-based abstract metalanguage. By means of the Lexical Template Modeling Process, Levin’s lexical alternations were also incorporated. The new version also included the study of word formation and a new ontological dimension revolving around Wierzbicka’s semantic primes and Melčuk’s lexical functions.

The final stage in this process involved the postulation of the LCM itself, which is appropriately defined by Butler as the bringing together of CxG and Metaphor/Metonymy theory. Butler concludes his excellent contribution by summarizing the strengths of the LCM and pinpointing its future challenges. It is interesting to observe (http://www.lexicom.es/drupal/publications) how, through the years, the LCM has substantially gained solidity in all the four levels of analysis proposed and complied with most of the criteria of adequacy propounded for functional theories here.

In ‘Levels of Description and Explanation in Meaning Construction’ (153-98), Ricardo Mairal Usón and Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez provide a detailed account of the four levels of description in the LCM and of their interrelation by means of two alternating mechanisms: subsumption and cueing.

In Level 1, the core-grammar module, the authors develop an inventory of argument constructions but move theoretically away from CxG in the representational format selected, which incorporates the cited RRG abstract semantic metalanguage. Their proposal frames LTS into Lexical Constructional Templates (LCTS) in this module. In turn, Levels 2, 3 and 4 incorporate the pragmatics and discourse dimension. The non-argumental constructions of Level 2 are implicational, while Level 3 covers high-level illocutionary constructions and frames verbal predicates in the world of social norm and acceptable behavior. Finally, Level 4 discourse constructions express the ways in which the speaker connects his propositions.

Mairal Usón and Ruiz de Mendoza treat cueing and subsumption in section seven. Cued inferencing is economical in essence and works at all levels. They present examples for sense completers, modal or phasal aspect constructions or even minor clauses relating to Level 1. We find metonymy operating in the examples provided in Levels 2 and 3 for traditional implicatures and illocutionary force, and, in higher levels of implicated meaning, the authors postulate complex cognitive constructs like the Cost-Benefit Idealized Cognitive Model. The second process, subsumption, is defined as a mechanism that makes it possible...
for lower levels of semantic structure to form part of higher levels of syntactically oriented structure. It is mediated by internal and external constraints. The first operate at Level 1 and facilitate/block the merging of lexical items and their corresponding templates into LCTs. External constraints relate to shifts in the category ascription of a verbal item when this becomes part of a construction. This contribution thus offers the description of a model that can turn the fuzziness of CxG coercion effects into a systematic account of the process of subsumption and that, by incorporating the discourse dimension of language, gains theoretical strength. In sum, the LCM may be said to keep the best of the functionalist approach to argument structure whilst, at the same time, it undergoes a more decidedly cognitivist turn at all levels of linguistic analysis.

In ‘The Inchoative Construction. Semantic Representation and Unification Constraints’ (247-70), Francisco J. Cortés Rodríguez performs an analysis of the inchoative construction in line with the internal and external constraints in the process of subsumption. He also effects the integration of Pustejovsky’s qualia structure into the semantic module for LTS in the LCM and reassesses the role of RRG logical structures since they fail in capturing the semantic, non-aspectual nuances of predicates. The format also looks different, with semantically enriched RRG logical structures anticipating qualia structure.

Cortés Rodríguez starts by providing an overview of the semantics of inchoative structures, where a telic event that is modified by the lexical function cause is said to express change of state or position with or without a locative adverbial, and later focuses on coercion and on the constraints on event and argument structure. Among the first, result state and telicity block pure state and activity verbs respectively. Telic causality is at the basis of inchoatives. This explains the causative/inchoative alternation, which is grounded in a Process for action metonymy. The Unification between causative verbs and the inchoative template is effected through coercional subevent selection. Among the argument constraints involved, he points at the central role of effectors and postulates the agent-causer blocking constraint —improving Levin’s proposal— and the cause expletivization constraint, by which inchoatives participating in the causative/inchoative alternation retain part of their causative value. In sum, Cortés Rodríguez restructures the format for LTS and provides a comprehensive analysis of the insertion/blocking of various verb classes into/from the inchoative construction that depicts what is, in my opinion, a decidedly alternational turn in the LCM.

Part III, studies of specific constructions, integrates the corpus-based and contrastive dimensions into this volume. In ‘Measuring out Reflexivity in Secondary Predication in English and Spanish. Evidence from Cognition Verbs’ (201-45), Francisco Gonzálvez García offers an insightful corpus-based account of the reflexive evaluative subjective transitive and the self-descriptive subjective-transitive constructions in English and Spanish from a CxG perspective that captures the differences between these and also frames them in the transitive reflexive-intransitive/middle continuum.

Gonzálvez García focuses on constructional configurations such as I find myself incredulous/Me encuentro muy atractivo and James found himself a virtual prisoner /me
encontré en el paro, with find/encontrar followed by a reflexive pronoun and an obligatory object-related complement. After an overview of the higher-level reflexive construction, he proceeds to analyze the reflexive-subjective transitive construction, which also displays the semantic nuance of self-judgement/perception and shows restrictions involving a human subject and a complement holding an evaluative relation with the reflexive. The author then turns to the self-descriptive subjective-transitive construction, which shows a non-agentive, non-volitional human main clause subject, an unexpected and probably negative state of affairs/process/action, a stage-level predicate and a reflexive complement with informational salience. He then proceeds to contrast his corpus-based findings in both languages. In spite of the inherent language-specificity involved, he also detects some collocational affinities as regards the realization of the reflexive complement. He concludes by framing the construction in the reflexivity continuum and proposing further lines of research. In sum, it is in the contrastive turn that CxG takes here and in Gonzálvez’s capacity for making the best possible use of corpora that we considerer the value of this contribution to lie.

Pilar Guerrero Medina’s ‘Semantic and Pragmatic Constraints on the English Get-passive’ (271-94) is a corpus-based analysis of five verbal classes which effects a shift in the lexical approach to get-passives towards their understanding in CxG terms. After reviewing five semantico-pragmatic features traditionally associated with this structure, she points out that these are neither fully satisfactory nor equally relevant for the get –ed construction, except for those expressing partial agentivity and resultative state. She then proceeds to make her own selection of verb classes: affect, giving, motion (send and steal), corporeal (eat and dine) and annoying (Dixon 2005). These verb classes are then traced in the get –ed construction in the BNC, the results obtained rating agentless giving highest (58.92%) and corporeal lowest (2.32%). She posits two major subconstructions: the causative and spontaneous get-passives. The first is found with affect, corporeal and annoying verbs, profiles the responsible Patient role and is predominantly agentless. It also shows the y is caused to receive z from x and y is caused to have/not to have z subtypes for giving and motion respectively. The spontaneous subconstruction or y becomes z shows a nonvolitional patient and a “cut” effector, appears with change of state stretch and break verbs and may be thought of as inchoative. She completes her contribution by listing the properties of these two subconstructions in detail. Guerrero Medina’s sound methodology thus proves the inadequacies of most of the earlier proposals and opens up a new path in the analysis of get –ed structures in CxG terms.

The volume as a whole is coherently organized, moving from several proposals for combining theories to the more corpus-based, quantitative studies of the final section in a neat and principled way. As has already been suggested, Cortés Rodríguez’s paper might have been better suited for Part II. Indeed, one would have also liked to see more contributions from the theoretical domains of FDG and from the Belgian type of Systemic Functional Grammar that fuses with cognitivist/constructionist ideas and is referred to
in the introduction. However, this would have caused this book to be unnecessarily long for a volume that effectively synthesizes —or, in the editors’ words, deconstructs— the common avenues of functionalism and constructivism.
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