TOWARDS A CONSTRUCTIONIST, USAGE-BASED REAPPRAISAL OF INTERPERSONAL MANIPULATION: EVIDENCE FROM SECONDARY PREDICATION IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH[1]

Francisco Gonzálvez García
Universidad de Almería

ABSTRACT

This paper argues for a constructionist analysis à la Goldberg (*Constructions*, *Work*, "Nature") of the most distinctive semantico-pragmatic hallmarks of secondary predication after verbs of causation, volition and preference in English and Spanish. Specifically, it is demonstrated that the commonalities and idiosyncratic particulars of these configurations can be felicitously captured taking into account: (i) the degree of felicity of the control exerted by the main clause subject (the Agonist) and the entity/person in the object slot (the Antagonist), broadly construed, as well as the (ii) the dynamic interaction of the semantico-pragmatic properties of the entity/person in the object slot with those of the object-related predicative phrase (XPCOMP).

KEY WORDS: Usage-based, constructionist, secondary predication, manipulation, force dynamics.

RESUMEN

Este artículo defiende un análisis construccionista, basado en datos reales extraídos de corpora, de los rasgos semántico-pragmáticos más destacados de la predicación secundaria con verbos causativos, de volición y de preferencia en inglés y español. Se afirma que las regularidades e idiosincrasias de estas configuraciones pueden explicarse satisfactoriamente prestando especial atención a: (i) el grado de efectividad del control ejercido por el sujeto de la cláusula principal (Agonista) y la entidad/persona codificada en el objeto directo (Antagonista), concebido en sentido lato, y a (ii) la interacción dinámica de las propiedades semántico-pragmáticas de la entidad/persona designada por el objeto directo y las de la frase predicativa orientada hacia el objeto (XPCOMP).

PALABRAS CLAVE: uso lingüístico, construccionista, predicación secundaria, manipulación, dinámica de fuerza.

1. INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of this paper is to argue the case for a bottom-up, corpus driven, usage-based constructionist analysis à la Goldberg (*Constructions*, *Work*,

"Nature") of the most distinctive semantico-pragmatic hallmarks of secondary predication (Aarts; Demonte and Masullo; inter alios) after verbs of causation (e.g. "order," "ordenar" 'order'), volition (e.g. "want," "querer," 'want') and preference (e.g. "prefer," "preferir" 'prefer') in English and Spanish, as in (1)-(2) below.[2] Most of the data used throughout in this paper comes by and large from the original edition of the *British National Corpus* (BNC henceforth). To a lesser extent, English data has been reproduced here from other corpora, such as the *Great Britain Component of the International Corpus of English* (ICE-GB henceforth), the *Brown Corpus* (of Edited American English) and the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English (LOB henceforth). As for Spanish, the corpus data has been extracted from the *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual* (CREA henceforth).

(1) (a) We want him **back there** or we want him **dead** (Brown, N07:189)
     (b) I like it **crunchy**! (BNC, KP6 65)

(2) (a) *Quer-emos   a   Ángel   **libre***
         want-PRS.1PL   OBJ   Angel   free
         (CREA, 1985, El País, 02/02/1985: 3.000 personas marcharon en silencio contra el secuestro del industrial)
         'We want Angel free'
     (b) [*Daniel*] [...] *me   prefier-e   **musti-a,***
             Daniel   1SG.ACC   prefer-PRS.3SG   sad-F.SG
         acobard-ad-a, enferm-a
         dishearten-PTCP-F.SG sick-F.SG
         (CREA, 1996, Fernando G. Delgado, La mirada del otro, Novela)
         "Daniel prefers me sad, disheartened, sick"

At a higher degree of delicacy, this paper aims to shed some light on the commonalities and idiosyncratic particulars among the configurations in (1)-(2) and those after verbs of cognition and calling/saying, as exemplified in (3)-(4) below respectively:

(3) (a) I consider her a model of feminine beauty and virtue (BNC H8A 441)
     (b) They called me a Frankenstein [...] (BNC CH0 1835)

[2] From now on, interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses will be supplied for the Spanish examples following the Leipzig Glossing Rules (see <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/LGR04.09.21.pdf>). The following additional abbreviation will be used in this paper: CONDITIONAL (conditional or potential verb tense).

(4)   (a) [...] *[E]ncuentr-o maravillos-a-s susintervencion-es, son*
            find-PRS.1SGwonderful-F-PLPOSS.2SGintervention-PL be.PRS.3PL
       extraordinari-a-s
       extraordinary-F-PL
       (CREA, 1983, Carlos Fisas, Historias de la Historia)
       '[...] I find your interventions wonderful, they are extraordinary'
       (b) *Y   en África   me   llam-an   el   huracán*
       And in Africa   1SG.ACC   call-PRS.3PL   DEF.M.SG   hurricane
       saharaui
       Saharawi
          (CREA, 1990, Oral, Sara y Punto, 04/11/90, Tve-2)
          'And in Africa they call me the Saharawi hurricane'

Configurations of the type in (1)-(4) above have been argued to be instances of a family of object-related depictives in English and Spanish (Gonzálvez-García, "Family"). While a number of interesting robust generalizations can be detected among all four configurations, this paper is also concerned with otherwise puzzling acceptability differences with verbs of causation/volition/preference of the type illustrated in (5)-(6) below:

(5)   (a) I want him **dead**
       (b) *I want him **a dead man**
       (c) You are a dead man

(6)   (a) *Quer-emos a Ángel **libre***
       want-PRS.1PL   OBJ   Angel   free
       'We want Ángel free'
       (b) **Quer-emos*   a   Ángel   **un**   **hombre**   **libre***
       want-PRS.1PL   OBJ   Angel   INDF.M.SG   man   free
       *'We want Angel a free man'
       (c) *Ángel   es   un   hombre   libre*
       Angel   be.PRS.3SG   INDF.M.SG   man   free

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 outlines the methodological preliminaries underlying the selection and filtering of the data on which this paper is based, especially in relation to the usage-based model invoked here. Section 3 offers a selected cursory review of some relevant proposals made in both the formalist and functionalist camp regarding the configurations under scrutiny here and goes on to conclude that a constructionist, usage-based account of the type invoked in Cognitive Construction Grammar (Goldberg, *Work*, "Nature") can successfully accommodate, at least from the standpoint of encoding, the restrictions impinging on the element in the object slot and the object-related obligatory predicative phrase (XPCOMP henceforth). Section 4 presents an overview of the constructionist analysis of depictive secondary predication (or, alternatively, the *subjective-transitive* construction) in English and Spanish. Section 5 presents a microscopic view of the 'manipulative' and 'generic' instances of the *subjective-transitive* construction. Evidence is provided for the fact that the semantico-pragmatic hallmarks of the configurations in (1)-(2) above

can only be captured at a constructionist level, rather than by looking at the XPCOMP alone. Specifically, it is argued that the interpretive latitude of these configurations can be felicitously captured under a constructionist account, with special focus on: (i) the degree of felicity of the control exerted by the main clause subject (the Agonist) and the entity/person in the object slot (the Antagonist), broadly construed, as well as (ii) the dynamic, though nonetheless motivated, interaction of the semantico-pragmatic properties of the entity/person in the object slot with those of the XPCOMP. Section 6 summarizes the main findings in relation to earlier discussion and proposes some avenues for future research to maximize the explanatory adequacy of a constructionist analysis of the type entertained here.

2. SOME METHODOLOGICAL PRELIMINARIES

The term "secondary predication" is used here in a theory-neutral fashion to refer to a type of object-related predicative phrase displaying a high degree of syntactico-semantic obligatoriness, as shown among other things by the fact that its omission invariably yields a (more or less) dramatic meaning change or an ungrammatical result. Thus, consider (7a)-(7b):

(7)   (a) I want him **dead** -/-> I want him
      (b) *Daniel me*   *prefier-e*   ***musti-a*** *-/->* *Daniel*   *me*
          Daniel 1SG.ACC   prefer-PRS.3SG   sad-F.SG   Daniel   1SG.ACC
      prefier-e
      prefer-PRS.3SG
      "Daniel prefers me sad" -/-> "Daniel prefers me"

Moreover, the XPCOMPs reproduced in bold in (1)-(2) and (7) belong to the depictive subtype (or, more exactly, a depictive attribute in Halliday's terminology), since they characterize the NP in the object slot in relation to the process denoted by the verb, "but as a concomitant, not a result, of the process" (Halliday 63).

In line with the usage-based stance taken in the cognitively-influenced Goldbergian strand of Construction Grammar (CxG henceforth), the methodo-logical focus here is on the use of authentic data extracted from corpora routinely supplemented with data gained from introspection by native speakers (Goldberg, *Work*, "Nature"; Boas, *Constructional*; Bybee; Bybee and Eddington; inter alios). Thus, searches were conducted in the spoken component of the original version of the BNC. Additional examples from the ICE-GB and the LOB and Brown corpora have been supplied where necessary so as to make the sampling representative of British and American English. In the case of Spanish, searches were conducted in the CREA in all text categories and modes in both corpora within the variety of Castilian Spanish.[3] This restriction was imposed for practical reasons, viz. to guar-

---

   [3] See the *Real Academia Española* website in the bibliographical section.

antee a quantitative parity in the raw amount of data extracted. Thus, in the case of English, our searches yielded a total of 567 tokens, while in Spanish a number of 224 instances were attested. In order to ensure maximum precision and recall Gries, Hampe and Schönefeld (13), the raw tokens were manually coded, and only those featuring instances of secondary predication of the type illustrated in (3)-(4) were computed for analysis (see Tables 1-3). Examples from other sources have also been used, most notably, from the literature on the topic (see especially section 4) as well as lyrics (as in example (36)), but have not been computed for statistical analysis. In agreement with the premises of the bottom-up usage-based approach invoked here, invented examples have been kept to a minimum.

At this stage, a brief digression is in order regarding the extraction of the examples reproduced in (37) below. Given that the data component of the original edition of the BNC was insufficient to make finer-grained claims regarding the productivity of this configuration, searches were conducted in the case of this configuration in the entire corpus.

Moreover, all the examples reproduced in this paper, whether taken from the English corpora mentioned above or CREA, were previously rated as (a) acceptable, (b) marginally acceptable or (c) unacceptable by a group of 30 educated British and American native speakers aged between 20 and 50 and by a group of Spanish university students aged between 21 and 22 at the University of Almería, Spain, respectively.

It should be emphasized that, in this paper, the term "usage-based" is taken to imply the acceptance of a number of premises (Gonzálvez-García and Butler 82-83), the most relevant being, for our concerns here, the following: (i) redundant generalizations concerning (highly) frequent item-specific patterns/expressions are allowed, even if these are fully compositional, and (ii) extensive use should be made of data from naturally occurring data in the investigation of language use.

Moreover, a brief justification is in order regarding the contrastive nature of this paper and the choice of English and Spanish as the languages under scrutiny in particular. With respect to the former issue, a contrastive analysis is quite appealing for the elaboration of pedagogical grammars or teaching materials. Thus, I concur with Taylor's observation that "[A] pedagogical grammar will need to be inherently contrastive, focusing on what is idiosyncratic in the target language vis-à-vis the learner's native language" (52). Although the configurations illustrated in (1)-(2) above have been analyzed in some detail in English (see the references in section 3 below; Aarts and Aarts) and Spanish (Demonte and Masullo; Gonzálvez-García, "Reconstructing"; inter alios), to the best of our knowledge, no systematic contrastive analysis of these configurations based on naturally-occurring data has been undertaken thus far. Moreover, the configurations in (1)-(2) above can be argued to exhibit a number of prima facie perplexing semantico-pragmatic restrictions which are of paramount importance for constructionist approaches in general and the Goldbergian strand in particular (Goldberg, *Constructions* 223-224; *Work* 38). Last but not least, the constructionist analysis presented here, I would contend, lends further credence to the viability of Contrastive CxG (Boas, *Constructional*, "frame-semantic"), especially for the elaboration of contrastive (e.g. Eng-

lish-Spanish) dictionaries and endorses its invaluable potential for pedagogical grammars, given that there is considerable empirical evidence that language learners make use of constructions (Gries and Wulff; Langacker, *Relevance*; Taylor; Valenzuela and Rojo; inter alios).

3. WHY DO WE NEED A CONSTRUCTIONIST *REAPPRAISAL* OF INTERPERSONAL MANIPULATION?

This section is concerned with a necessarily brief discussion of a number of proposals made in the formalist and functionalist camp regarding the selection of the XPCOMP. For ease of exposition, I will restrict my discussion to configurations of the type exemplified in (1)-(2) above.[4]

3.1. Stowell's (*Origins*, "subjects") local theory of subcategorization

Within the Chomskyan framework of Principles and Parameters (Chomsky), Stowell (*Origins*, "Subjects") argues for a purely categorical account of the selection of the XPCOMP in secondary predication (or "small clauses" in his terminology). According to Stowell, "consider" and "expect" may not select PPs and APs, respectively, as XPCOMPs in this construction. In support of this claim, Stowell provides the following examples:

> (8) (a) I consider him **honest**
> (b) *I consider that sailor **off my ship** by midnight
>
> (9) (a) I expect that sailor **off my ship by midnight**
> (b) *I expect him **honest**
> (Stowell, *Origins* 259) [bold emphasis added to the original]

In the case of "expect," counterexamples to Stowell's formulation can be found in the light of naturally-occurring data (or data provided by informants). Thus consider (10):

> (10) (a) People here expect further city raids **aimed at them with inevitable civilian casualties** (ICE-GB, S2B-005-95)
> (b) I'm going out to buy a packet of cigarettes and by the time I get back, I expect my meal **well-cooked** (Example created by Neil McLaren and approved by native informants)

---

[4] See González-García, "Modality," for further details.

3.2. Kitagawa's semantic approach to predicate selection

Still within a Government and Binding-oriented framework, Kitagawa (111-112) argues against Stowell that the above-noted restrictions on predicate selection cannot be aptly explained in purely categorial (i.e. syntactic) terms. Rather, Kitagawa claims that the restrictions in question are semantic in nature. In his own words: "[c]*onsider* selects a complement expressing 'state of affairs' but not a complement expressing 'change of state'." *Expect*, on the other hand, has exactly the opposite selectional properties. In other words, the complement to *expect* expresses that something will change into (or turn out to be in such and such state)" (Kitagawa 212). In support of this claim, he provides the grammaticality contrasts reproduced in (11)-(12) below:

(11) (a) * The doctor considers that patient **dead** tomorrow
     (b) Unfortunately, our pilot considers that island **off the route**

(12) (a) *I expect that island **off the route**[5]
     (b) I expect that man **dead** by tomorrow
                    (Kitagawa 212) [bold emphasis added to the original]

It is interesting to note that Kitagawa observes that a sentence like (12b) above is typical of "mafia talk." However, no attempt is made to account for how such a feature can be related to the semantic distinction between a current and a changeable state of affairs, respectively.

3.3. Pollard and sag's account of syntactic subcategorization and semantic selection

Pollard and Sag's account of the configurations under discussion here differs from those of Stowell and Kitagawa in arguing for the need to achieve a compromise between a purely structural account, on the one hand, and a purely semantic one, on the other (105). In addition, Pollard and Sag invoke a much more dynamic view of the issue in so far as they acknowledge that the acceptability of a given configuration depends to a large extent on whether it can be felicitously contextualized or not (see footnote 5). However, these authors are hard-pressed to acknowledge that there are limitations as to what contextualization can do to amel-

---

⁵ In this respect, it must be noted that Pollard and Sag (103) rightly note that the sentence in question becomes acceptable in the following context: "Suppose, for instance, that the manager of a cruise ship company suddenly discovers a coup d'état is about to take place on an island that is currently on the route of the company's premier cruise ship." In this context, these authors claim, "she might then with complete felicity say to her assistant: *I expect that island off the route by tomorrow*" (emphasis in original).

iorate a putatively unacceptable result. Thus, for instance, the sentences reproduced in (13) below invariably yield an unacceptable result regardless of the particular context in which they are uttered.

(13) (a) * We expect Kim **a doctor** (by the end of the year)
      (b) * We expect that island **a safe place** (after the revolution)
      (c) * We expect him **a dead man** (by tomorrow)
            Pollard and Sag 104) [bold emphasis added to the original]

Regarding the non-acceptability of examples like the ones in (13) above, Pollard and Sag venture the following working hypothesis: "Perhaps the unacceptability of *I expect Kim a success* is due to the same kind of semantic factors that affect *I expect that island off the route*. To make good on this explanation, one would need to develop a precise account of how the denotations of predicative NPs are systematically different from those of other predicative expressions, and how this semantic difference renders predicative NPs inconsistent with the semantics of *expect*." (Pollard and Sag 104) —Emphasis in original. I will have more to say about the far-reaching implications of this programmatic claim in the final part of this section.

3.4. Borkin's syntactico-semantic approach

In her discussion of verbs of volition and expectation, Borkin (53) contends that examples of the type reproduced in (14a)-(14b) below are likely to be used to convey an order, in contrast to their non-finite counterparts with "to be," which would convey a wish and a future prediction, respectively:

(14) (a) I **want** this man **dead** by noon
      (b) I **expect** this man **dead** by noon
            (Borkin 53) [bold emphasis added to the original]

To our mind, a problem with Borkin's account is that the above generalization is somewhat less than accurate when grammar is inspected at higher level of resolution. Thus, it is true that not all predicates encoding volition/causation, etc. convey a sharp order in the secondary predication environment (or with "to be" deleted, in her terminology). Thus, for instance, this is not true for verbs of volition, wish or preference (e.g. "wish," "like," "prefer," etc.), where there is either a softening of the imperative colouring or almost no imperative force at all, at least from a conventional point of view. Thus, consider (15) below:

(15) (a) I like my meat **well done**
      (b) I prefer my tea **cold**
         (Examples created by Neil McLaren and approved by native informants,
                                 bold emphasis added to the original)

The implications of this criticism will become more evident in the remainder of this paper. I will contend that the configurations exemplified in (14) and

(15) can be considered two different, though nonetheless connected, sub-constructions within the family of object-related depictives in English and Spanish, namely, the *manipulative subjective-transitive* construction and the *generic subjective-transitive* construction, respectively.

3.5. HUDSON *ET AL.* ON THE DEGREE OF SEMANTIC MOTIVATION OF SYNTAX

In the context of the discussion of the degree of semantic motivation of syntax presumably invoked by practitioners of the different strands of CxG, Hudson *et al.* use the minimal pair reproduced in (16) below as evidence that "want," unlike "wish," may select an "ed"-participle as XPCOMP.

(16) I **want/*wish** the fire **lit**
　　　　　　　　(Hudson *et al.* 443) [bold emphasis added to the original]

More interestingly for our purposes here, they draw the following conclusion from the observation of acceptability contrasts of the type exemplified in (16) above:

> The general conclusion that we draw is that syntax has some degree of autonomy in relation to semantics, although in the vast majority of cases the two are in step. The minority of mismatches are sufficient to show that we are capable of learning purely syntactic facts, unaided by semantics (or even in spite of semantics), and of storing these facts in competence. (Hudson et al. 445)

However, in the light of naturally-occurring data, it is simply somewhat inaccurate on descriptive grounds to claim that "wish" cannot be followed by a passive participle. Thus consider (17):

(17) (a) What was the matter they wished **discussed**?
　　　　　　　　　　(Van Ek 179) [bold emphasis added to the original]
　　　(b) Alianor wished the words **unspoken as soon as uttered** (BNC CCD 2406)

Regarding the conclusions at which Hudson *et al.* arrive regarding the fact that CxG (Langacker, "Universals" 465) claims that grammar is wholly semantically-motivated, it must be emphasized that this holds true for Cognitive Grammar, but certainly not for the entire family of CxG(s). Thus, for instance, Goldberg (*Constructions*) acknowledges that grammar involves a number of idiosyncratic facts which must therefore be learned. In much the same vein, Tomasello (xii) rightly points out that "the functional approach does not mean that all structures in language are determined by function in the sense that they are iconically related to their meanings, as many generative grammarians misconstrue the claim (e.g. Newmeyer 1991)."

From the brief critical examination of a number of semantic and structural proposals regarding the selection of the XPCOMP in secondary predication outlined in the preceding pages, a number of observations can be seen to emerge that

need to concern us here: (i) the acceptability or non-acceptability of a given configuration can be argued to be sensitive to (social, physical, and linguistic) contextual factors, and (ii) the distribution and semantico-pragmatic import of the configurations in (1)-(4) above cannot be aptly accounted for on both descriptive and explanatory grounds in terms of the semantic and/or structural properties of the XPCOMP alone. Rather, the interpretation of these configurations can be best captured at a constructional level, that is, by looking at the dynamic, though nonetheless motivated, interaction of the meaning and form properties of the overall constructional meaning, on the one hand, with those of the integrating components of the construction on the other. This is the question to which we turn in the next section.

4. A CONSTRUCTIONIST ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY PREDICATION: THE *SUBJECTIVE-TRANSITIVE* CONSTRUCTION AS A FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTIONS

Secondary predication (NP V NP XPCOMP) configurations are analyzed as instances of the *subjective-transitive* construction, whose general skeletal meaning can be glossed as follows (Gonzálvez-García, "Reconstructing," "Passives," "Saved," "Family"):

X (NP$_1$) EXPRESSES A HIGH DEGREE OF DIRECT, PERSONAL COMMITMENT TOWARDS Y (NP$_2$ XPCOMP)

Before proceeding further, a number of important clarifications need to be made. The first one concerns the sense in which the term "construction" is used in this paper. According to Goldberg (*Work*, 3), constructions are taken to be "conventionalized pairings of form and function," with no idiosyncrasy requirement attached (Goldberg, "Nature" 205). Thus, in agreement with the usage-based model, (highly) frequent configurations will be considered in this paper to be constructions even if these are fully compositional and can thus be predicted from a corresponding higher-level construction at a given level of specificity (Goldberg, *Work* 214-215; Bybee and Eddington 328).

The second one has to do with the sense in which the term "subjective" should be understood in this paper.[6] In the case of interpersonal manipulation, one facet of subjectivity needs to concern us here, namely, what De Smet and Verstraete (387) refer to as "interpersonal subjectivity," that is, "the enactment of speaker's position with regard to its content," and, more exactly, its relation to force dynamics (Talmy).

---

[6] See GONZÁLVEZ-GARCÍA, "Reconstructing," "Passives," "Saved," and Family" for a discussion of the implications of subjectivity for this construction.

Third, when the labels "secondary predication," or, alternatively, "*subjective-transitive* construction," are invoked in this paper, these should not be taken to detract from Croft's (*Radical*, "Lexical") observation that much of argument structure is construction-specific and language-specific. The labels are shorthand for expository convenience. Our position in this respect is in agreement with Goldberg (*Work*, 226), who opts for retaining "the more traditional emphasis on trying to capture and motivate generalizations, imperfect though we recognize them to be." With this general scenario in mind, the *subjective-transitive* construction can be seen, at a higher level of delicacy, as a family involving at least four sub-constructions, which are the result of the modulation of the lexical semantics of the matrix verb with the overall constructional meaning. These are, in actual fact, the basis of what Croft ("Lexical," 56-59) calls "verb-class-specific constructions," or Boas (*Constructional*, "Determining"), "mini-constructions," that is, form-meaning pairings representing an individual sense of a verb. Consider (18) below:

(18) a. [[Sbj Consider/Considerar.verb Obj XPcomp]] [personal, direct, fully-committed evaluation]
b. [[Sbj Call/llamar.verb Obj XPcomp]] [personal, direct, fully-committed verbalization]
c. [[Sbj Want/Querer.verb Obj XPcomp]] [strong, direct/indirect, target-oriented manipulation]
d. [[Sbj Like/Gustar.verb Obj XPcomp]] [direct, personal, general preference]

Due to space constraints, this paper will be exclusively concerned with instances of the (18c) and (18c) sub-constructions above, namely, referred to in sections 4.1-4.2 under the labels of the *manipulative subjective-transitive* and *generic subjective-transitive* constructions, respectively.

4.1. The *manipulative subjective-transitive* construction

This (sub-)construction is attested with verbs of causation and volition, such as e.g. "want," "require," "need," in English, and "querer" ('want'), "necesitar" ('need'), etc. in Spanish. This sense conveys an intended, target-oriented, direct/indirect, categorical (i.e. strong) manipulation of the state of affairs/event encoded in the NP XPCOMP string. Thus, consider (19a)-(19b) below:

(19) (a) [...] I want him back here (BNC, KP5 1933) (#but I will understand if he decides not to return here) -/-> I want him to be back here (but I will understand if he decides not to return here)

(b) *Nosotros*	*lo*	*quer-emos*	*todo*	*at-ado*	*y*	*bien*	*at-ado*
1PL	3SG.ACC	want-PRS.1PL	all	tie-PTCP	and	well	tie-PTCP
(#*pero*	*no pas-a*	*nada*	*si*	*al*	*final algo*		
But	NEG	nothing	if	to.	end something		
	happen-PRS.3SG			DEF.M.SG			

no	*qued-a*	*bien at-ado*	*del*	*todo) -/->*
NEG	stay-PRS.3SG	well tie-PTCP	of.DEF.M.SG	everything

Nosotros	*queremos*	*que*	*todo*	*qued-e*	*bien*
1PL	want-PRS. PL	COMP[that]	everything	stay-PRS.SUBJV.3SG	well
at-ado	*(#pero entendemos*		*que*	*pued-a*	
tie-PTCP	but understand-PRS.1PL		COMP[that]	can-PRS.SUBJV.3SG	
hab-er	*algun-o-s*	*fallo-s*	*de*	*última hora)*	
exist-INF	some-M-PL	mistake-PL	of	last hour	

(CREA, El mundo, 17/10/1994: Comienza la huelga de hambre de la plataforma del 0,7%)

'We want everything tied and well tied (#but it is OK if something is not tied at all in the end') -/-> 'We want everything to be tied and well tied (but we understand that something may eventually go wrong in the last minute)'

4.2. The *generic subjective-transitive* construction

This (sub-)construction obtains with verbs of liking and preference, such as e.g. "wish," "like," "prefer" in English, and "gustar" ("like"), "desear" ("wish"), "preferir" ("prefer"), in Spanish. Configurations of this kind convey the expression of a general preference on the part of the subject/speaker in direct terms. In other words, they express how exactly somebody prefers something or somebody. No directive force is necessarily implied here —at least from a conventional standpoint— although these configurations can be conversationally interpreted as such given an adequate supporting context. Thus, for instance, the sentence reproduced in (20) below can, on a particular occasion, be uttered by, for example, dissatisfied customers as a hint to the waiter that s/he should serve them food and wine more in line with their personal preference.

(20)	[...] *El*	*vino*	*nos*	*gust-a*	*blanco*	*y*
	DEF.M.SG	wine	1PL.DAT	like-PRS.3SG	white	and
	en	*su*	*punto, [y]*	*la*	*carne*	*poco hech-a*
	in	3SG.POSS	point	and DEF.F.SG	meat	little do.PTCP-F.SG

(CREA, Javier Pérez de Silva, Pedro Jiménez Hervás, La televisión contada con sencillez)

'We like the wine white and cool and the meat rare'

An important corollary emerging from a close inspection of the acceptability differences reproduced in (19) —or (20) for the matter— is that the secondary predication encodings impose a different construal from that of their non-finite counterparts in English or their finite counterparts in Spanish. This difference of construal has been aptly characterized by Givón in terms of "strong manipulation" and "weak manipulation," respectively.

In the remainder of this paper, I will take a closer look at the last two types of sub-constructions with a view to demonstrating that a Goldbergian-type of con-

struction can adequately capture, at least from the point of view of encoding, the main restrictions impinging on the entity/person in the object slot and the XPCOMP.

5. A MICROSCOPIC VIEW OF "MANIPULATIVE" AND "GENERIC" INSTANCES OF THE *SUBJECTIVE-TRANSITIVE* CONSTRUCTION

As was already advanced in the preliminary characterization of the *subjective-transitive* construction outlined in the previous section, the notion of force dynamics, as put forward in Talmy is of pivotal importance to understand the semantico-pragmatic import of these configurations. This is so, among other reasons because force dynamics "pertains to the linguistic representation of force interactions and causal relations occurring between certain entities within the structured situation" (Talmy 12). It must be emphasized that although force dynamics is originally envisaged by Talmy as falling within the realm of physical force in general and in particular as a generalization over causatives (Talmy 409-470), as noted by De Mulder (295), the schematic system of force dynamics has also been applied through metaphorical transfers to the domains of internal psychological relationships and social relations. In what follows, I will be basically concerned with the implications of force dynamics in the social domain and, more precisely, in the psychophysical and interpersonal domains.[7]

5.1. THE SEMANTICO-PRAGMATIC PROFILE OF THE XPCOMP

A robust generalization emerging from the otherwise acceptability differences exemplified in (21)-(23) below runs as follows: the more controllable by the subject/speaker the property/state of affairs/condition encoded in the XPCOMP, the more felicitous the state of affairs/event to be encoded will be in this configuration. Thus, consider:

(21) (a) She wanted me*(to be) a medical doctor (ICE-GB Corpus, S1B-071-20)
      (b)*Ella me   quier-e   médico   quier-e   que
      She 1SG.ACC   want-PRS.3SG   doctor   want-PRS.3SG   COMP[that]
      sea   médico
      be.PRS.SUBJV.1SG   doctor
      * 'She wants me a medical doctor' / 'She wants me to be a medical doctor'

---

⁷ For further information on the formalization of the entire family of object-related depictives in English and Spanish within a Goldbergian framework, the reader is referred to GONZÁLVEZ-GARCÍA, "Family."

(22) (a) I want you *(to be) able to justify your marks (BNC JND)
  (b) *_Te_   _quier-o_   _capaz_   _de_ _justific-ar_ _tus_   _nota-s_/
     2SG.ACC want-PRS.1SG capable of justify-INF 2PL.POSS mark-PL
  Quiero   _que_   _sea-s_   _capaz_   _de_ _justificar_
  want-PRS.1SG COMP[THAT] be.PRS.SUBJV-2SG capable of justify-INF
  tus   _nota-s_
  2PL.POSS mark-PL
  *'I want you able to justify your marks'/ 'I want you to be able to justify your marks'

Thus, while one may want to express a wish that one's son become a doctor, hence the felicity of the combination with a non-finite clause and a finite clause in English and Spanish, respectively, one cannot felicitously manipulate someone into being a doctor.[8] The same rationale applies to the state of affairs "being able to justify one's marks," as in (22) above. Further compelling evidence for this claim stems from the Spanish minimal pair reproduced in (23) below:

(23) (a) *_María quier-e_   _el_   _resultado_ **_fals-o_**
      María want-PRS.3SG   DEF.M.SG   result   false-M.SG
                            (Bosque 205) [bold emphasis added to the original]
      * 'María wants the result false'
  (b) _María quier-e_   _el_   _resultado_ **_falsific-ad-o_**
      María want-PRS.3SG   DEF.M.SG   result   falsify-PTCP-M.SG
      'María wants the result falsified'

An important provisional generalization emerging from the data analyzed so far is that 'true' NPs (i.e. those which are not functionally equivalent to APs or AdvPs) are systematically unacceptable as XPCOMPs in English, while characterizing NPs are marginally acceptable with some verbs in Spanish. This restriction can be motivated semantically as follows: properties, conditions, states and locations, as encoded in APs, PPs, AdvPs, *-ed* participles and gerunds, fit in nicely with the strong manipulation flavour of the construction. By contrast, those NPs truth-functionally encoding an entity/person rather than a state, clash with the constructional semantics of the construction, given that one cannot manipulate an entity or person into an entity/person. This restriction is not only applicable to the family of depictives, but to resultatives as well. Thus consider the acceptability differences reproduced in (24) below:[9]

––––––––––

[8] It should be emphasized that when society comes into the picture, in addition to the Agonist and the Antagonist, society can be in turn Agonist or Antagonist (e.g. depending on the dad's or son's point of view). For a more thorough discussion of the issue, the reader is referred to Johnson, inter alios.
    [9] For a comprehensive discussion of the salient properties of resultatives from a constructionist standpoint, the reader is referred to Boas (Constructional, "Determining"), Goldberg and Jackendoff, and Iawata, inter alios.

(24) (a) John beat him **black and blue**
(b) John kicked him **into the street**
(c) *They tied him **a prisoner**
   (Guéron and Hoekstra 100) [bold emphasis added to the original]
(d) He painted the walls **a pale shade of blue** -> He painted the walls **light blue**

While it is indeed crucial to take into account the inherent semantico-pragmatic properties of the XPCOMP, it is my contention that in order to account for the restrictions on the type of XPCOMP that can felicitously occur in this construction, one needs to take into consideration the dynamic interaction of the meaning and form properties of the XPCOMP (and the other construction's constituents) on the one hand, and the overall constructional meaning on the other. By way of illustration, consider the examples reproduced in (25)-(28) below:

(25) I like them **paperbacks** they're not too big is it? (BNC KB2 1582)

(26) [...] do you want it **colour** mate or **black and white**? (BNC KC6 1046)

(27) [Al]   *Archiduque   Felipe   le   gust-an   la-s*
    DAT.DEF.M.SG Archduke   Felipe   3SG.DAT   like-PRS.3PL DEF.F-PL
    *infanta-s,   **honest-a-s,   trabajador-a-s   de su   pueblo***
    infanta-PL   honest-F-PL   hard.working-F-PL of 3SG.POSS people
    y   madre-s   sumis-a-s y   amantísim-a-s
    and   mother-PL   obedient-F-PL   and excellent.lover-F-PL
    (CREA, 1982, Manuel Martínez Mendiero, Juana del amor hermoso)
    'The Archduke Felipe likes his infantas honest, devoted to their people, obedient mothers and excellent lovers'

(28) [...]   *la   novela conviert-e   el   último exilio de Goytisolo*
    DEF.F.SG   novel   turn-PRS.3SG DEF.M.SG last   exile of Goytisolo
    en   un-a   reivindicación de Onan,   o de   Kessel Schwartz, que
    into   INDF-F.SG vindication of Onan   or of Kessel Schwartz REL
    *lo   quier-e **un   esperpento anal***
    3SG.ACC   want-PRS.3SG   INDF.M.SG   absurdity anal
    'The novel turns the last exile of Goytisolo into a vindication by Onan or by Kessel Schwartz, who wants it to be an anal absurdity'
    (CREA, 1977, El País, 16/09/1977: Juan sin tierra)

The examples reproduced above appear to contradict, prima facie, the claim substantiated in the previous pages that NPs are systematically barred in the XPCOMP position in the configurations under scrutiny here. However, a number of interesting considerations emerge in the light of the examples reproduced in (25)-(28) above. In the case of the English examples, the XPCOMPs are NPs from a formal point of view, but they function on semantico-pragmatic grounds like adjectives. In fact, it seems that the speaker uttering "paperbacks" in (25) is using it as meaning something like "small, handy." Example (25) is even more evident because "colour" is coordinated with APs such as "black and white." Thus, in the case

of (25)-(26) above, despite their formal appearance, the XPCOMPs function as APs and encode properties which can be controlled by the main clause subject/speaker, who can felicitously decide which format of book to purchase or whether s/he wants his photos colour or black and white.

The Spanish examples add a further twist to the picture presented so far, since they must be interpreted against a specific socio-cultural background which is in the final event responsible for determining the felicity of the selection of the XPCOMP. Thus, (27) makes reference to the time of reign of Felipe II, and at this time kings had the authority to determine the way their daughters should be raised and educated. It is important to note that the properties encoded in the XPCOMP here are construed by the subject/speaker as stage-level properties rather than inherent, permanent properties. In other words, the sentence conveys the way the king wants his daughter raised and educated. Example (28), by contrast, features an XPCOMP conveying a permanent rather than transient or stage-level property. However, it is the socio-cultural context that makes it possible for this sentence to be acceptable. Authors are in authority to give vent to their creative impulse and turn their work into a particular by-product, in this case, as the subject/speaker defines it, "an anal absurdity" (see also example (39f) below for a similar case). By contrast, parents cannot, under normal circumstances, in the present-day scenario, turn their sons and daughters into doctors, teachers, etc. (cf. example (21) above).

However, it must be emphasized that taking the socio-cultural dimension of force dynamics seriously calls for a broad construal of lexical semantics in which there is room for a wide range of factors. To return to the by now familiar example of parents and children, consider, by way of illustration, the acceptability contrasts reproduced in (29)-(31) below:

(29) *Tod-o-s lo-s padre-s que sient-en la carencia de*
all-M-PL DEF-M.PL parent-M.PL REL feel-PRS.3SG DEF.F lack of
un hij-o y decid-en adopt-ar uno lo
INDF.M.SG son-M.SG and decide-PRS.3PL adopt-INF one 3SG.ACC
quier-en recién nacid-o, san-o, guap-o y
want-PRS.3PL recent.born-PTCP.M.SG healthy-M.SG cute-M.SG and
onrosad-o
rosy- M.SG
"All those parents who feel the lack of a son and decide to adopt one, want him newly born, healthy, cute and with rosy cheeks"
(CREA, 1988, Informe Semanal, 11/06/88, TVE 1)

(30) *#Queremos a nuestro hij-o extrovertid-o, suspicaz, médico*
want-PRS.1PL OBJ 1PL.POSS son-M open-M perspicuous-M doctor
"We want our son *(to be) open, perspicuous a doctor"

(31 *Queremos a nuestro hij-o libre de enfermedad-es genética-s*
want-PRS.1PL OBJ 1PL.POSS son-M free from disease-PL genetic-PL
"We want our son free from any genetic disease"

Let us suppose the case of a couple who want to have children. If we are talking about biological children, then a sentence like (30) is hardly felicitous since, there is no way in which, under normal circumstances, parents can establish a priori the properties or characteristics that the child should actually have. A radically different picture emerges if the property at stake is, for instance, whether the child should be free from any genetic disease. In those countries such as the United States of America or the United Kingdom, where the manipulation of embryos is deemed legal for therapeutic purposes, a sentence like (31) could then be considered felicitous. Finally, if we are talking about an adopted child rather than a biological child, then parents have more freedom to decide, at least in principle, the characteristics of the child they would like to adopt. This is why a sentence like (29) would thus be acceptable given the adoption kind of supporting context. This is indeed a very complex issue, but I hope that this brief discussion can be seen to point to the need of adopting a constructional, rather than local, view of these constructions in which the semantico-pragmatic facets of sentences are understood to be sensitive to a broad range of socio-cultural factors.

An additional important semantico-pragmatic hallmark of configurations of this kind which cannot be properly understood without invoking a socio-cultural perspective has to do with the fact that the property/state encoded in the XPCOMP must have some positive or negative import for the manipulator. In other words, the XPCOMP must be goal-directed.

(32) Bosses/#Students/#Teachers want employees weak

(33) My mother/#The mayor of the city/#George Bush does not want our house in a mess

As the examples above show, a situation in which employees are weak is likely to be more advantageous for bosses than for students or teachers, among other reasons because there are in principle no socio-economic relations between the parties in question. By the same token, one's mother, especially in European countries such as Spain or Italy, is more likely to be concerned about keeping one's house clean and tidy than governmental authorities from the same country or even less from other countries.

To round off this section, I hope to have argued the case for the need to look beyond the inherent meaning and/or form properties of the XPCOMP alone and adopt a constructionist perspective which acknowledges the existence of a dynamic interplay between the inherent meaning and form properties of the construction's constituents, on the one hand, and the constructional meaning, on the other. In the course of the exposition, force dynamics has been shown to be a crucial factor, whether understood from a psychophysical perspective (cf. examples (1)-(2) above), or, more crucially, from a socio-cultural one (cf. examples (29)-(32) above).

A robust generalization emerging from the examination of the semantico-pragmatic profile of the entity/person yielding a felicitous result in the object slot in this environment can be stated as follows: The more definite the entity/person to be encoded in the object slot, the more felicitous it will be in the *subjective-transitive* construction, in keeping with its "target" status. This explains, for instance, why expletives and dummy elements are systematically not acceptable in English in this construction:

(34)   We want #there/???somebody/EVERYBODY/him back

(35)   I don't want there *(to be) any question of you being late (BNC G0N 713)

Moreover, English, unlike Spanish, allows the entity/person in the object slot (the controllee) to be inclusive of the entity/person in the subject slot (the controller) in this environment:

(36) (a)   I want us together again (Janet Jackson, lyric)
      (b)   *Nos   quier-o   juntos   de   nuevo
            1PL.ACC   want-PRS.1SG   together   of   new
            'I want us together again'
      (c)   Quiero   que   est-emos   juntos   de   nuevo
            want-PRS.1SG COMP[that]   be-PRS.SUBJV.1PL together of   new
            'I want us to be together again'

5.3. FREQUENCY MATTERS

However, under the usage-based approach invoked here, frequency is considered to be of paramount importance in a number of interesting respects.[10] First, highly frequent expressions will be treated as constructions, even if they are fully compositional. In this respect, two important qualifications need to be made abundantly clear. In the case of Spanish, the examination of the data collected from the corpora and other sources (e.g. examples in the literature) has not allowed us to posit an inventory of frequent combinations in the two sub-constructions under scrutiny here. A different picture emerges in the case of English, where there is some empirical evidence that the "money back" sequence is particularly frequent with "want" and, to a lesser extent, with other verbs of causation and volition such as "ask," "expect," "claim," "demand," and even more polite combinations of the type "would like."

---

[10] See further Bybee and Hopper; Bybee; Bybee and Eddington; inter alios.

(37) (a) I want my money back: that's all (BNC FP7 1115)
(b) Take it back to the shop that you bought it from and ask for your money back (BNC C8N 1142)
(c) I'm expecting thirty quid back (LOB L10:31)
(d) Yes, we would like our money back (BNC H9Y 1035)

Our search of the string "money back" in the entire BNC yielded 333 tokens. 20 of these tokens were instances of secondary predication with "want" as main verb. Interestingly enough, 11 of these 20 tokens were found with an "I" subject. Given the low frequency of the construction in general, a fact probably due to politeness factors, the conclusion can be warranted that "X WANT(S) ONE'S MONEY BACK" qualifies as a construction in English in its own right within the *manipulative subjective-transitive* construction.

In what follows, an inventory of representative examples of each morphosyntactic realization of the XPCOMP in the constructions under examination here in English and Spanish is provided in (38) and (39) below:

(38) (a) Oh put that back on Aaron Put that back on Aaron cos I might need that to send it back He's always taking labels off I need that **back** on there Put it back on You gonna stick it back for me? (BNC KD1) **2(AdvP)**
(b) [...] I don't want him **upset** in the morning cos I wanna go out and have a nice even kneel then (BNC KBG 515) (**AP**)
(c) Ah this is no good, I want this job **done** erm in four hours (BNC FY9 629) (**Ed-Participle**)
(d) [...] We really want all the bad things **at the bottom**, don't we? (BNC KBW 9806) (**PP**)
(e) I didn't want that lady **thinking** you were untidy (BNC KD0 1007) (-*ING* **Participle**)
(f) I like them **paperbacks** they're not too big is it? (BNC KB2 1582) (**NP**)

(39) (a) *El   PNV habl-a   de derrota militar, pero quier-e   a*
DEF.M.SG PNV talk-PRS.3SG of defeat military but want-PRS.3SG OBJ
*Batasuna **en la política*** [...]
Batasuna in DEF.F.SG politics
(CREA, 2004, ABC, 03/11/2004: Nacional) (**PP**)
'The Basque Nationalist Party (PNV) talks of military defeat, but wants Batasuna into politics'
(b) *Te   necesit-o   **a mi   lado***
2SG.ACC need-PRS.1SG   to 1SG.POSS side
'I need you by my side'
(CREA, 1987, José María Gironella, Los hombres lloran solos) (**AdvP**)
(c) [...] *Ellos nos   quiere-n   **hermos-a-s y   alegres** y*
3PL 1PL.ACC   want-PRS.3PL pretty-F-PL and   jolly-PL and
nos   llama-n   frívol-a-s
1PL.ACC   call-PRS.3PL   frivolous-F-PL
'They (men) want us pretty and jolly and they call us frivolous'
(CREA, 2002, Carmen Alborch. Malas. Rivalidad y complicidad entre mujeres) (**AP**)

(d) *Quer-emos   pan,   quer-emos   vino,   quer-emos   a   Fraga*
want-PRS.1PL bread   want-PRS.1PL wine   want-PRS.1PL OBJ   Fraga
colg-ado de un pino!
hang-PTCP of INDF pine.tree
(CREA, 1977, Triunfo, 18/07/1977: "No quiero arrepentirme después de lo que pudo haber sido y no fue") (**Past Participle**)
'We want bread, we want wine, we want Fraga hanging from a pine tree!'

(e) *A   mí   me   gust-an   los hombre-s   bien*
to   1SG.DAT 1SG.DAT   like-PRS.3PL   DEF.M.PL   man-PL well
*afeit-ado-s y **marc-ando paquete*** [...]
shave- PTCP.M.PL and mark-GER bulge
(CREA, Juan Marsé, 2000, Rabos de lagartija, Novela) (**Gerund**)
'I like men well-shaved and showing a bulge'

(f) *No   es,   pues,   la   actitud   barroca   la   que*
NEG   be-PRS.3SG therefore DEF.F.SG   attitude   baroque DEF.F.SG REL
puebl-a   la-s   página-s   de   est-a   narración   que
populate-PRS.3SG DEF-F.PL page-PL   of   PROX-F.SG narration   REL
*se   quier-e   **farsa**,* [...]
PASS   want-PRS.3SG   farce
(CREA, 1996, El Mundo, 20/04/1996: Crítica de libro. "La libertad," de Ignacio Vidal-Folch) (**NP**)
'It is not, therefore, the baroque attitude that populates the pages of this narration that is meant to be a farce'

The distributional facts in general and their frequency of occurrence in relation to the morphosyntactic realization of the XPCOMP with each of the verbs in the two (sub-)constructions are captured in Table 1, for English, and Tables 2-3, for Spanish:

TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF VERBS OF VOLITION, LIKING AND PREFERENCE IN THE SECONDARY PREDICATION ENVIRONMENT IN THE BNC (BASED ON DATA FROM SPOKEN ENGLISH ONLY)							
VERB	ACTIVE VOICE						TOTAL
	AP	PP	AdvP	-Ed Part.	Gerund	NP	
WANT	33 (6.79%)	64 (11.26%)	135 (27.77%)	181 (37.24%)	72 (14.81%)	1 (0.20%)	486 (85.71%)
LIKE	13 (43.33%)	5 (16.66%)	2 (6.66%)	6 (20%)	2 (6.66%)	2 (6.66%)	30 (5.29%)
WISH	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
PREFER	—	2 (66.66%)	1 (3.33%)	—	—	—	3 (5.29%)
NEED	3 (6.25%)	13 (27.08%)	21 (43.75%)	6 (12.5%)	5 (12.5%)	—	48 (8.46%)
TOTAL	49 (8.46%)	84 (100%)	158 (100%)	193 (100%)	79 (100%)	4 (100%)	567 (100%)

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF VERBS OF VOLITION, LIKING AND PREFERENCE IN THE ACTIVE VOICE IN THE CREA.							
VERB	ACTIVE VOICE						
	AP	PP	AdvP	EdP	Gerund	NP	Total
QUERER 'want'	19 (21.9%)	24 (29.2%)	18 (21.9%)	9 (10.9%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (33.3%)	72 (34.6%)
GUSTAR 'like'	31 (43.05%)	10 (13.8%)	4 (5.5%)	24 (33.3%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (66.6%)	73 (35%)
DESEAR 'wish'	3 (37.5%)	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)	—	—	—	7 (3.3%)
NECESITAR 'need'	3 (10.7%)	5 (17.8%)	16 (57.1%)	—	1 (3.5%)	—	25 (12%)
PREFERIR 'prefer'	35 (64.8%)	8 (14.8%)	2 (3.7%)	6 (11.1%)			51 (24.5%)
TOTAL	91 (100%)	50 (100%)	41 (100%)	39 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	208 (100%)

TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF VERBS OF VOLITION, LIKING AND PREFERENCE IN THE PASSIVE VOICE IN THE CREA							
VERB	ACTIVE VOICE						
	AP	PP	AdvP	EdP	Gerund	NP	Total
QUERER 'want'	11 (84.61%)	—	—	—	—	1 (50%)	12 (60%)
GUSTAR 'like'	—	—	—	—	—	—	0
DESEAR 'wish'	—	—	—	1 (25%)	—	—	1 (5%)
NECESITAR 'need'	1 (7.69%)	2 (100%)	—	—	—	—	3 (15%)
PREFERIR 'prefer'	1 (7.69%)	—	—	2 (75%)	—	1 (50%)	4 (20%)
TOTAL	13 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	20 (100%)

Despite the fact that, leaving aside the "X WANT(S) ONE'S MONEY BACK" construction in English, no particularly frequent combinations have been attested in our data, the statistical data presented above can be provisionally summarized and illustrated from an impressionistic way in a four-fold continuum, as in (I)-(IV), ranking from most to least frequent:

(I) SOMEBODY WANTS SOMETHING IN A GIVEN STATE/CONDITION

(40) (a) I want it **bright** (BNC KDB 1728)
      (b) [...] *quier-o   un   sombrero de paja, lo   quier-o*
             want-PRS.1SG INDF.M.SG hat   of straw ACC.3SG want-PRS.1SG
      buen-o   y   bonit-o
      good-M.SG   and   beautiful-M.SG
      (CREA, 1993, Lorenzo Díaz, La radio en España (1923-1993), Medios de
      Comunicación, Alianza Editorial, S. A. (Madrid), 1993)
      'I'd like a straw hat, I'd like a good and nice one'

(II) SOMEBODY WANTS SOMETHING SOMEWHERE

(41) (a) I want it **in its place** (BNC 434)
      (b) *El   posible   cambio   del   mercadillo   no*
             DEF.M.SG possible   change   of.DEF.M.SG street.market   NEG
      gust-a   a   tod-o-s   los   afect-ad-o-s.
      like-PRS.3SG OBJ   all-M-PL   DEF.M.PL   affect-PTCP-M-PL
      Industriales   del   Nevero y   vecin-o-s
      Industriales   of.DEF.M.SG Nevero[NAME] and   neighbour-M-PL
      *de   San   Fernando   no   lo   quier-en **tan   cerca***
      of   San   Fernando[NAME] NEG ACC.3SG want-PRS.3PL so   near
      (CREA, 2004, Prensa, El Periódico Extremadura, 06/05/2004: Traslado de
      la venta ambulante de los domingos. España. Negocios. Editorial
      Extremadura, S. A. (Cáceres). 2004)
      'The likely change of emplacement of the street market does not please those
      affected. Industriales del Nevero and the neighbours of San Fernando do not
      want it in the vicinity'

(III) SOMEBODY WANTS SOMEBODY IN A GIVEN STATE/CONDITION

(42) (a) I want him **dead, dead, DEAD!** (BNC HTU 695)
      (b) *Te   quier-o   **preocupad-o,**   porque sólo así ser-ás*
             2SG.ACC   want-PRS.1SG worry-PTCP-M.SG   because only so be-FUT.2SG
      vencedor
      winner
      (CREA, 1986, Terenci Moix, No digas que fue un sueño, España, Novela,
      Planeta, Barcelona, 1993)
      'I want you concerned about it, because only then will you be the winner'

(IV) SOMEBODY WANTS SOMEBODY SOMEWHERE

(43) (a) I want you **out of this house!** (BNC FPK 252)
      (b) *Te   quier-o   **fuera de   mi   vida***
             2SG.ACC   want-PRS.1SG out   of   POSS.1SG life
      'I want you out of my life'

6. CLOSING REMARKS AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, I hope to have argued the case for a bottom-up, corpus-based, constructionist account of instances of secondary predication involving verbs of causation, volition, wish and preference in English and Spanish. The overarching claim substantiated in the preceding pages supports the superiority, on both descriptive and explanatory level, of a constructionist, rather than local, account of the semantico-pragmatic hallmarks of these configurations as well as a number of otherwise puzzling restrictions impinging on the entity/person in the object slot and the XPCOMP. Specifically, force dynamics, whether in the psychophysical or in the socio-cultural realms, has been argued to play a crucial role in determining the degree of felicity of the configurations under scrutiny here.

However, the proposal presented here has been quite modest: the generalizations emerging from the preceding pages have been drawn on data from decoding. However, as pointed out by Boas ("Determining," "Resolving"), encoding is as important as decoding. In the case of the constructions under examination here, experimental evidence of all sorts (e.g. sentence completion tasks, reading experiments, etc.) is necessary to further refine the sketchy picture of the constructions which has been provided here.

Another important avenue for future research concerns exploring the discourse-functional properties of these constructions from an interpersonal level. For ease of exposition, most of the examples reproduced in this paper do not go beyond the domain of the single sentence. However, it was suggested earlier that interpersonal factors in general and politeness in particular may be a crucial determinant of the distribution and semantico-pragmatic import of these configurations. Thus, although the instances of the manipulative *subjective-transitive* construction convey a sharp order (or "strong manipulation" in Givón's terminology), a number of alternative and more polite strategies exist in the secondary predication in English and Spanish. Thus, consider (44) and (45) below:

(44) I am 82, and would like to see this argument **settled** before I pitch stumps on the Green Field (BNC CU1 64)

(45) [...] *me   gust-aría   ver-lo   **propuest-o**   **también***
      DAT.1SG like-COND.3SG see.INF-ACC.3SG propose.PTCP-M.SG too
***para   la   Región   del   Biobío,** que represent-o en*
for   DEF.F.SG region   of.DEF.M.SG   Biobío, REL represent-PRS.1SG in
el   *Senado*
DEF.M.SG Senate
'I'd like to see this proposed for the region of Biobío, too, which I represent in the Senate'
(CREA, Chile, Oral, Sesión 30, en martes 16 de Enero 1996, 09.FORMALI DAD=alta, AUDIENCIA=interlocutor, CANAL=cara a cara, Senado de Chile (http://www.senado.cl))

At a higher level of delicacy, it might be interesting to explore the interactions of these configurations with, for example, negation and voice. Thus, for instance, the data extracted from the corpora in English and Spanish reveals that "want" and "querer" ('want') are very often found with negative polarity. Moreover, Spanish "querer" ('want') allows for passive configurations, unlike its English counterpart. Even more crucially, it would be illuminating to come to grips with the main illocutionary forces conventionally or conversationally associated with these configurations.[11]

Throughout this paper, our emphasis on force dynamics has been on the socio-cultural realms and, to a lesser extent, on the psychophysical realm. However, as suggested in Gonzálvez-García ("Family"), the constructionist account provided here can be maximized by examining the relations among constructions. A case in point is the caused-motion construction. Thus, consider (46)-(47) below:

(46)　(a) [...] She so thought/*believed herself **into the mind of the murderer and victim**, that she communed with spirits (BNC G1W 1423, material in italics added)

(47　*Luis* [...] *hizo*　　　　　*tod-a*　*un-a*　　*apología de la-s*　*virtud-es*
　　　Luis　　do.INDFPRET.3SG all-F.SG INDF-F.SG apology of DEF.F.PL virtue-PL
　　　del　　　*periodismo de élite,*　*del*　　　*que*　*se*
　　　of.DEF.M.SG journalism of elite　of.DEF.M.SG REL　REFL.3SG
　　　cre-ía / [# *pens-aba*]　　　　　　*en　la indiscutible*
　　　believe-IMPPRET.3SG/think-IMPPRET.3SG in　DEF.F.SG　unquestionable
　　　vanguardia
　　　avant.garde
　　　(CREA, 1991, Javier García Sánchez, La historia más triste, España, Novela, Anagrama (Barcelona), 1991, material in square brackets added)
　　　'Luis made a full-blown defence of the virtues of an elite journalism, of which he considered himself to be beyond any question in the avant garde'

In this respect, it may be worthwile exploring why the caused-motion construction is only felicitous with "think" but not with other verbs of cognition selecting similar complementation strategies. In the case of Spanish, although the caused-motion construction appears to be highly restricted with verbs of cognition, one may still find unacceptability contrasts of the type illustrated in (47) above.

Perhaps in order to shed some light on the otherwise puzzling acceptability differences exemplified in (46)-(47), one might need to reconsider the issue of the division of labour between lexical semantics and constructional semantics. This issue is especially relevant in the context of the present volume. Thus, for instance, Boas (*Constructional*, "Determining," "Resolving") contends that the Goldbergian-type of construction may be sufficient to explain decoding facts but not encoding

---

[11]　See Ruiz de Mendoza and Baicchi, and references therein.

facts. In this respect, he suggests building into the model the notion of mini-constructions, which supply the detailed semantic, pragmatic and syntactic information required to, say, predict which exemplars may or may not fuse with a given construction. Much in line with Boas' proposal to assign a more crucial role to verbal semantics in the production and interpretation of constructions is the Lexical Constructional Model (LCM henceforth), the most detailed version of which can be found in Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez and Mairal Usón ("Levels"). This model is explicitly advertised as bridging the gap between a "moderate functional model" such as Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin) and the non-monotonic, cognitively-influenced Goldbergian strand of CxG (Goldberg, *Constructions*, *Work*, "Nature"). In this connection, it is worth emphasizing that the LCM, unlike CxG and RRG, places added emphasis on the lexicon, hierarchically organized into semantic classes, to provide robust generalizations regarding the fusion of verbs with constructions. To what extent the proposals made by Boas and the LCM can maximize the explanatory power of Goldbergian-type constructions only time and, in particular, outside evidence (e.g., in the form of corpus studies, computer modelling or psychological experiments) will tell.

WORKS CITED

AARTS, Bas. "Secondary Predicates in English." *The Verb in Contemporary English. Theory and Description*. Ed. Bas Aarts and Charles F. Meyer. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 75-101.

ARTS, Jan and Flor AARTS. "*Find* and *Want*: A Corpus-based Study in Verb Complementation." *The Verb in Contemporary English: Theory and Description*. Ed. Bas Aarts and Charles F. Meyer. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 159-182.

BOAS, Hans. C. *A Constructional Approach to Resultatives*. Stanford: CSLI, 2003.

——. "Determining the Productivity of Resultative Constructions: A Reply to Goldberg & Jackendoff." *Language* 81 (2005): 448-464.

——. "A Frame-semantic Approach to Identifying Syntactically Relevant Elements of Meaning." *Contrastive Studies and Valency: Studies in Honor of Hans Ulrich Boas*. Ed. Petra C. Steiner, Hans C. Boas and Stefan Schierholz. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2006. 119-149.

——. "Resolving Form-Meaning Discrepancies in Construction Grammar." *Constructional Reorganization*. Ed. Leino Jaakko. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. 11-36.

BORKIN, Ann. "*To Be* or Not *to Be*." *Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 9 (1973): 44-56.

BOSQUE, Ignacio, ed. *Indicativo y subjuntivo*. Madrid: Taurus, 1990.

BYBEE, Joan. "From Usage to Grammar: The Mind's Response to Repetition." *Language* 82.4 (2006): 711-733.

BYBEE, Joan and David EDDINGTON. "A Usage-Based Approach to Spanish Verbs of 'Becoming'." *Language* 82.2 (2006): 323-355.

BYBEE, Joan and Paul. J. HOPPER, eds. *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.

CHOMSKY, Noam. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1981.

CROFT, William. "Lexical Rules vs. Constructions: A False Dichotomy." *Motivation in Language: Studies in Honour of Günter Radden*. Ed. Hubert Cuyckens, Thomas Berg, René Dirven and Klaus-Uwe Panther. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. 49-68.

——.*Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.

DEMONTE, Violeta and Pascual José MASULLO. "La predicación: los complementos predicativos." *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española. Vol. 2: las construcciones sintácticas fundamentales. Relaciones temporales, aspectuales y modales*. Ed.. Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1999. 2461-2523.

DE MULDER, Walter. "Force Dynamics." *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Ed. Dirk Geeraerts and Herbert Cuyckens. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. 294-317.

DE SMET, Hendrik and Jean-Christophe VERSTRAETE. "Coming to Terms with Subjectivity." *Cognitive Linguistics* 17.3 (2006): 365-392.

GIVÓN, T. "The Binding Hierarchy and the Typology of Complements." *Studies in Language* 4 (1980): 333-377.

GOLDBERG, Adele. E. *Constructions: A Construction Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.

——. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. New York: Oxford UP. 2006.

——. "The Nature of Generalization in Language." *Cognitive Linguistics*. (Forthcoming)

GOLDBERG, Adele. E. and Ray JACKENDOFF "The Resultative as a Family of Constructions." *Language* 80 (2004): 532-568.

GONZÁLVEZ-GARCÍA, Francisco. "The Family of Object-related Depictives in English and Spanish: Towards a Usage-based, Constructionist Analysis." *Language Sciences* (2008). March 18 2008. <http://www.science-direct.com>.

——. "A Modality View of Predicate Selection in Small Clauses." *Texas Linguistic Forum* 38 (1997): 111-119.

——. "Passives without Actives: Evidence from Verbless Complement Clauses in English and Spanish." *Constructions* 1-5 (2006). Accessed February 5 2007. <http://www.constructions-online.de/articles/specvol1>.

——. "Reconstructing Object Complements in English and Spanish." *Gramática de construcciones: contrastes entre el inglés y el español*. Ed. Montserrat Martínez Vázquez. Huelva: Grupo de Gramática Contrastiva, 2003. 17-58.

——. "'Saved by the Reflexive': Evidence from Coercion via Reflexives in Verbless Complement Clauses in English and Spanish." *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 5 (2007): 193-238.

GONZÁLVEZ-GARCÍA, Francisco and Christopher S. BUTLER. "Mapping Functional-cognitive Space." *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 4 (2006): 39-96.

GRIES, Stefan Th. and Stefanie WULFF. "Do Foreign Language Learners Also Have Constructions? Evidence from Priming, Sorting, and Corpora." *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 3 (2005): 182-200.

GRIES, Stefan Th., Beate HAMPE and Doris SCHÖNEFELD. "Converging Evidence II: More on the Association of Verbs and Constructions." *Experimental and Empirical Methods in the Study of Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language*. Ed. John Newman and Sally Rice. Stanford: CSLI, 2005. 1-15.

GUÉRON, J. and T. HOEKSTRA, "The Temporal Interpretation of Predication." *Small Clauses*, *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 28. Ed. Anna Cardinaletti, and Maria Teresa Guasti. New York: Academic, 1995. 77-107.

HALLIDAY, Michael A.K. "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English." *Journal of Linguistics* 3 (1967): 37-81.

HUDSON, Richard, Andrew ROSTA, Jasper HOLMES, and Nikolas GISBORNE. "Synonyms and Syntax." *Journal of Linguistics* 32 (1996): 439-446.

IAWATA, Seizi. "Argument Resultatives and Adjunct Resultatives in a Lexical Constructional Account: The Case of Resultatives with Adjectival Result Phrases." *Language Sciences* 28 (2006): 449-496.

International Corpus of English (ICE). June 25, 2006. <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/ice>.

JOHNSON, Mark. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987.

KITAGAWA, Yoshihisa. "Small but Clausal." *Proceedings of the 21st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 1985. 210-220.

LANGACKER, Ronald W. "The Relevance of Cognitive Grammar for Language Pedagogy." *Cognitive Approaches to Pedagogical Grammar: Volume in Honour of René Dirven*. Ed. Sabine De Knop and Teun De Rycker. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 2008. 7-35.

——. "Universals of Construal." *Berkeley Linguistics Society* (*BLS*) 19 (1993): 447-463.

POLLARD, Carl and Ivan A. SAG. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: U of Chicago P / CSLI, 1994.

Real Academia Española: Banco de datos (CREA) online. *Corpus de referencia del español actual*. February-July 2006. <http://www.rae.es>.

RUIZ DE MENDOZA IBÁÑEZ, Francisco José and Annalisa BAICCHI. "Illocutionary Constructions: Cognitive Motivation and Linguistic Realization." *Series A: General and Theoretical Papers* 668. Essen: LAUD, 2006.

RUIZ DE MENDOZA IBÁÑEZ, Francisco José and Ricardo MAIRAL USÓN. "Levels of Description and Constraining Factors in Meaning Construction: An Introduction to the Lexical Constructional Model." *Folia Linguistica*. [Forthcoming].

TALMY, Leonard. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge: MIT P, 2000.

TOMASELLO, Michael. "Introduction: A Cognitive-Functional Perspective on Language Structure." *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*. Vol. 1. Ed. Michael Tomasello. Mahwah: Erlbaum, 1998. vii-xxiii.

STOWELL, Timothy. *Origins of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge: MIT P, 1981.

——. "Subjects across Categories." *The Linguistic Review* 2 (1983): 285-312.

TAYLOR, J.R. "Some Pedagogical Implications of Cognitive Linguistics." *Cognitive Approaches to Pedagogical Grammar: Volume in Honour of René Dirven*. Ed. Sabine De Knop and Teun De Rycker. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. 36-64.

VALENZUELA, Javier. and Ana ROJO. "What Can Language Learners Tell Us About Constructions? *Cognitive Approaches to Pedagogical Grammar: Volume in Honour of René Dirven*. Ed. Sabine De Knop and Teun De Rycker. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. 197-229.

VAN EK, Jan A. *Four Complementary Structures of Predication in Contemporary British English: An Inventory*. Groningen: Wolters, 1966.

VAN VALIN, Robert D. Jr. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.