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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Outline of Study

This thesis discusses what I call ‘Converbal Motion Constructions’ in English from the theoretical approach of Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995; 2006, Boas 2003, Stefanowitsch and Gries 2003, Iwata 2008, among others). Examples of these constructions are given in (1).

(1) a. She \textit{went flying} up the garden! \hfill (BNC-KCX)

b. It \textit{came crashing} through the window. \hfill (BNC-G07)

(The Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction)

(2) a. I hope to \textit{go shopping} tomorrow. \hfill (BNC-HH8)

b. Every day they \textit{came looking for} me. \hfill (BNC-EVS)

(The Converbal Purposive Motion Construction)

(3) a. He \textit{sent} the clerk \textit{hurrying} into the back room. \hfill (BNC-CDN)

b. My boyfriend Fisher Stevens will have to \textit{drag} me \textit{kicking and screaming} out of the house. \hfill (BNC-CH5)
The examples in (1)-(3) are drawn from the *British National Corpus* (hereafter, the *BNC*). Each sentence in (1) and (2) involves an intransitive motion verb and an -*ing* form verb, whereas examples in (3) involve a caused motion verb and an -*ing* form verb, with a noun phrase intervening between them. The Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is discussed by Goldberg (2006). The Converbal Purposive Motion Construction has been analyzed by Visser (1973), Silva (1975), Bolinger (1983), Wierzbicka (1988), Dixon (2005), Schlüter (2005), Swan (2005), and Salkie (2010). The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction has been paid little attention and treated only by Goldberg (2006: 51).

A ‘converb’ is defined by Haspelmath (1995: 3) as a non-finite form verb functioning subordinately. Since each -*ing* form verb in (1)-(3) is a converb by this definition, I regard these constructions as Converbal Motion Constructions.

Converbal Constructions, distributed in European and Altaic languages, have been discussed mainly in the field of typology and they have been compared with Serial Verb Constructions. For these reasons, the notion of ‘converb’ is not well known among theoretical linguists except for typologists even though Converbal Constructions are found in familiar languages. In this thesis, I focus on constructions denoting motion events among various Converbal Constructions in English. There are many previous studies on constructions associated with motion events and motion verbs (Talmy 1985; 1991; 2000a; 2000b, Levin 1993, Goldberg 1995; 2006, among others), and it is possible

---

1The letters in parentheses indicate a sub-corpus from which a sentence is drawn.
2The *BNC* is a balanced, 100 million word collection of samples of spoken and written language from a variety of sources. It is designed to represent current British English.
3Goldberg (2006: 50-52) calls the construction in (1) and (3) ‘English Serial Verb Construction’ but I do not use this term because Serial Verb Constructions usually refer to constructions found in East Asian languages, West African languages, and so on.
to compare the Converbal Motion Constructions with what has been done in the literature.

1.2 General Claims

The sentences in (1)-(3) look like instances of bi-clausal constructions, such as the Free Participial Construction and the Absolute Participial Construction, in that an inflecting verb co-occurs with an -ing form verb. The Free Participial Construction is a bi-clausal construction that involves an implicit subject (i.e., PRO) in its subordinate participial clause. The Absolute Participial Construction is a bi-clausal construction that involves an overt subject in its subordinate participial clause. Examples of the two constructions are given (4).

(4) a. **Inflating** her lungs, Mary **screamed.** (The Free Participial Construction)

   b. The coach **being crowded**, Fred **had to stand.**

   (The Absolute Participial Construction)

   (Kortmann 1991: 5)

However, I will argue that all of the examples in (1)-(3) are different from those of participial constructions in that they are mono-clausal. I will present evidence to demonstrate that these constructions are not bi-clausal in the following chapters. In addition, I will suggest the two verbs in both the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction and the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction above constitute a single complex predicate. If an inflecting verb and an -ing form verb function as a single predicate, each construction turns out to represent a single event.
I claim that form and meaning are closely paired with each other, and meanings of constructions reflect how tightly grammatical elements are combined. That is, there must be characteristic interactions between a main verb and an -ing form verb in each construction since the constructions are mono-clausal and the two verbs in each construction are closely related to each other. In order to demonstrate such relationships, about 5,000 examples, drawn from the BNC, are statistically analyzed. By using corpus data, I will show the prototypical meaning/function of each construction.

1.3 Theoretical Stances

In this thesis, I adopt the basic assumptions of Construction Grammar. This theory regards constructions to be the basic units, and such basic units are pairings of form and meaning. Constructions include small units like affixes (e.g., -ed / ‘past’) as well as larger grammatical constructions (e.g., the Ditransitive Construction: Subj V Obj1 Obj2 / ‘X CAUSE Y to RECEIVE Z’). However, I focus only on grammatical constructions.

I adopt mainly Goldberg’s (1995; 2006) Construction Grammar in which verbs are basically monosemous. Her approach is contrasted with the projectionists’ approach (e.g., Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995) in terms of the semantics of verbs. Unlike Goldberg, they regard verbs to be polysemous. Moreover, Goldberg’s Construction Grammar can be contrasted with Jackendoff’s (1990) approach. Although Jackendoff recognizes constructions as basic units in a language system, he considers verbs to be polysemous. I will clarify the differences between Goldberg’s Construction Grammar and other approaches (e.g., Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995, Jackendoff 1990).

---

4Construction Grammar, spelled with initial capital letters, is used as an inclusive term. When I refer to a particular Construction Grammar, I use other terms such as Goldberg’s Construction Grammar and a Unification-based Construction Grammar.
Construction Grammars vary from one scholar to another. For example, Boas (2003) recognizes verbal polysemy in a positive manner, and his Construction Grammar is sharply different from Goldberg’s approach in terms of the semantics of verbs. Thus, I will discuss other constructional approaches by Boas (2003) and Iwata (2008) by contrasting them with Goldberg’s Construction Grammar.

1.4 Methodology

As the title of this thesis shows, I utilize the frequencies in my corpus data to illustrate prototypical meanings of constructions. Corpus-based or corpus-driven approaches to Cognitive Linguistics have been gaining force since the start of the twenty-first century. Langacker (1990) proposed the Usage-based Model and this model has been verified by corpus-oriented studies.

Corpus-based studies tend to disregard the grammatical structures and meanings. For example, the two expressions, John fell down the stairs and John fell in love, may be regarded as the same type of expression in that fell is followed by a prepositional phrase in both expressions. In the field of theoretical linguistics, especially Cognitive Linguistics, the latter is said to be different from the former. The latter expresses the change of state of the subject referent while the former does not. However, a KWIC concordance display cannot distinguish the latter from the former.

In response to this shortcoming in corpus linguistics, I employ Collostructional Analysis (Stefanowitsch and Gries 2003), which assumes constructions as basic grammatical units and investigates which words or phrases are attracted or repelled by a construction. However, except for the ICE-GB corpus, there are few corpora fully an-
analyzed grammatically. Collostructional Analysis needs all examples of a construction appearing in a corpus. Thus, we need to sort out useful sentences from unnecessary ones by examining them one by one. It takes much time to sort them out. However, this process is essential in uncovering the nature of each construction. Collostructional Analysis is based on a statistical analysis (i.e., Fisher exact test), so that frequency data is statistically analyzed to present more creditable evidence in the later chapters.

The (statistically analyzed) frequency information is important to show the prototypical meaning/function of a construction. We can describe how one construction differs functionally from another, only by utilizing such statistic data. Frequency data seems to be just numerical information, not associated with meaning/function, but it provides useful clues as to constructional ‘niche’ (see also Taylor 2004: 58).

1.5 Brief Summary of Chapters

The organization of this thesis is as follows. Chapter 2 describes the theoretical frameworks of Construction Grammars and the corpus-based approaches. Many constructionists propose their own theories but there are commonalities among them. Their similarities and differences should be clarified. I will also introduce the Usage-based Model, which has been verified by corpus-oriented studies. Chapter 3 will mainly focus on Converbal Constructions in various languages. These constructions have not been given much attention so far, but an investigation into these constructions would contribute to the theoretical development of Construction Grammar. These constructions involve two kinds of closely related verbs. The tightness of linkage between two verbs varies from one construction to another. Chapter 4 will give many instances of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, drawn from the BNC. I will discuss
syntactic and semantic properties of the construction, considering a large amount of
corpus data. Since this construction resembles the Intransitive Motion Construction as
indicated by its name, I will compare the two constructions and consider why more
than one similar construction exists in English. Chapter 5 will examine the Converbal
Purposive Motion Construction. This construction is similar to the construction dealt
with in Chapter 4 but different in several points. The Converbal Purposive Motion
Construction is a good construction for discussing an important issue among not only
constructionists but also projectionists, who assume syntactic configurations are de-
termined by verbal meanings. The argument structure of this construction lacks a
Path argument even though a deictic motion verb is involved. Chapter 6 will discuss
the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction and compare this construction with the
Caused-Motion Construction. The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is similar
to the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction in that an -ing form verb expresses
manner of motion or accompanying action of a subject/object referent. Chapter 7 will
discuss all constructions examined from Chapter 4 to Chapter 6 from a theoretical
perspective. The iconic characteristics of the three constructions will be discussed. In
addition, I will discuss the contributions frequency information provides. Chapter 8
will provide conclusions, reviewing previous chapters.
Chapter 2

Theoretical Backgrounds

2.1 Introduction

As I stated in Chapter 1, a brief introduction to the theoretical frameworks for dealing with English Converbal Motion Constructions in this thesis will be given in this chapter. The main theory introduced here is Construction Grammar (e.g., Fillmore et al. 1988, Kay and Fillmore 1999, Goldberg 1995; 2006, Croft 2001, Boas 2003, Stefanowitsch and Gries 2003, among others). Although there are, of course, several commonalities among them, Construction Grammars vary from one scholar to another (see also Croft and Cruse 2004). Among Construction Grammars, I support mainly Goldberg’s (1995; 2006) Construction Grammar. Her Construction Grammar is different from that proposed by Boas (2003) since Goldberg considers verbal information should be minimal but Boas does not.

In addition to Construction Grammar, other approaches by Levin (1985), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) and Jackendoff (1990)

---

1In this thesis, I will not discuss Embodied Construction Grammar (Bergen and Chang 2005) and Fluid Construction Grammar (Steel 2011) since they are beyond the scope of the present study.
will be compared with Goldberg’s Construction Grammar in detail in the following sections. The approaches by Levin (1985) and Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) are sharply different from Goldberg’s (1995) Construction Grammar with respect to the verbal meaning. In other words, projectionists such as Levin and Rappaport Hovav recognize verbal polysemy in a positive manner and they assume that verbal meanings determine syntactic configurations. On the other hand, Goldberg considers verbal meanings to be minimal and assumes that not only verbs but also constructions can determine argument structures. The approach by Jackendoff (1990; 1997) is also contrasted with Goldberg’s Construction Grammar. Jackendoff considers verbs to be polysemous as Levin and Rappaport Hovav do. However, unlike Levin and Rappaport Hovav, he recognizes constructions as basic grammatical units, and his approach resembles Goldberg’s one in this point.


The organization of this chapter is as follows. In 2.2, I will introduce Goldberg’s Construction Grammar, and contrast her approach with the Construction Grammar proposed by Boas (2003) and a Unification-based Construction Grammar (e.g., Kay and Fillmore 1999). Unlike Goldberg’s Construction Grammar, there is much information in the background in a Unification-based Construction Grammar. In 2.3, I will review literature associated with decompositional semantics (e.g., Levin 1985, Jackendoff 1990,
Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998), compared with Goldberg’s Construction Grammar. In 2.4, usage-based models, especially corpus-based approaches to constructions, will be considered.

2.2 Construction Grammar

This section introduces three kinds of Construction Grammars. First, I will outline Goldberg’s Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995; 2006). Second, I will overview another kind of Construction Grammar proposed by Boas (2003), and contrast his approach with Goldberg’s Construction Grammar. Third, I will compare a Unification-based Construction Grammar (e.g., Kay and Fillmore 1999) to Goldberg’s approach.

2.2.1 Goldberg’s Construction Grammar

Goldberg uses decompositional approaches to represent the semantics of constructions and the meanings are paired with abstract forms, as illustrated in (5)-(7).²

(5) a. X CAUSES Y to RECEIVE Z
   b. Subj V Obj Obj₂
   c. Pat faxed Bill the letter. (The Ditransitive Construction)

(6) a. X CAUSES Y to MOVE Z
   b. Subj V Obj Obl
   c. Pat sneezed the napkin o ff the table. (The Caused-Motion Construction)

(7) a. X MOVES Y

²Goldberg inflects some functions, such as CAUSES. However, conceptual functions are not English words or lexemes such as cause and move but concepts to represent meanings of words, phrases, sentences, and so on. Thus, conceptual functions should not be inflected.
b. Subj V Obl

c. The fly buzzed into the room. (The Intransitive Motion Construction)

(Goldberg 1995: 3)

Although argument structure had been regarded to be one of the formal properties of a verb only (e.g., Grimshaw 1990), Goldberg (1995) applied the notion of argument structure to constructions as well. In other words, not only verbs but also constructions have argument structures.

She generally does not appeal to verbal polysemy and suggests that constructions determine how many and what kinds of arguments are realized. In order to account for this mechanism, she introduces two kinds of arguments: participant roles and argument roles. Participant roles are arguments provided by verbs and they are distinguished from the roles associated with constructions, which are called argument roles. Participant roles are unique to verbs and these roles are associated with frame-specific ones (e.g., sneezer), whereas argument roles are very general ones (e.g., Agent). The verb sneeze, for example, usually takes only an argument Agent, as in (8a), and cannot be used as a transitive: sneeze cannot be followed only by an NP as shown in (8b). However it can occur in the Caused-Motion Construction, in which sneeze is followed by an NP and a PP as in (8c).

(8) a. She sneezed.

b. *She sneezed the tissue.

c. She sneezed the tissue off the table.

She proposes the Theme argument, the tissue, is not an argument of sneeze because (8b) is not acceptable. It is not only verbs but also constructions that determine how
many arguments are required. Thus, it is valid that the Theme argument in (8b) is not an argument of the verb but that of the construction. This process in which the participant role of sneeze fuses with the argument roles of the Caused-Motion Construction is illustrated, as shown in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1: The Caused-Motion Construction + sneeze](Goldberg 1995: 52)

In the case of the Caused-Motion Construction, there are three kinds of argument roles, cause, goal and theme.\(^3\) The cause role of the Caused-Motion Construction can fuse with the sneezer role because the sneezer role can be construed as an instance of the cause role (Goldberg 1995: 50).

Whether or not a participant role is profiled is lexically determined. She exemplified the difference of meaning between rob and steal by the examples in (9) and (10).

\[(9) \quad \text{Jesse robbed the rich (of all their money).} \]

\[(10) \quad \text{Jesse stole money (from the rich).} \quad \text{(Goldberg 1995: 45)}\]

In the case of rob, the participant roles, thief (i.e., Jesse) and target (i.e., the rich), are profiled. The other participant role, goods (i.e., all their money), is not profiled and can be deleted, as shown in (9). On the other hand, in the case of steal, thief (i.e., Jesse) and

\(^3\)The roles represented in boldface are profiled roles.
goods (i.e., money) are profiled and target (i.e., the rich) is not. Thus, the non-profiled participant role, target, can be omitted, as shown in (10).

Goldberg argues for the principles determining the relation between participant roles and argument roles. When a verb combines with a construction, the participant roles of the verb are fused with the argument roles of the construction. Which participant roles are fused with which argument roles is determined by two principles. One is ‘the semantic coherence principle’ and the other is ‘the correspondence principle.’

The former principle says that when a participant role is an instance of an argument role, it can fuse with the argument role. The latter principle says profiled participant roles obligatorily fuse with the profiled argument roles of a construction. That is, in the case of Figure 2.1, the profiled participant role, sneezer, obligatorily fuses with the profiled argument role, cause, of the Caused-Motion Construction. The participant role, sneezer, is regarded as an instance of the argument role, cause, and both sneezer and cause are profiled. Since the verb sneeze does not have the other two participant roles, the construction provides the goal and theme arguments. Argument roles that are not obligatorily fused with the participant roles of a verb are indicated by dashed lines. In the case of the Caused-Motion Construction, the goal and theme arguments are indicated by dashed lines. Each construction specifies which argument roles obligatorily fuse with which participant roles by solid lines.

In Converbal Motion Constructions involving two verbs, one is a main verb and the other is a converb (i.e., an -ing form verb). We cannot predict which verbs can be licensed without schematic constructions, and I will show the necessity of argument structure constructions in later chapters.
That is a thumbnail sketch of Goldberg’s Construction Grammar. The problems in
her theory are discussed by Boas (2003, 2008), and I will discuss the problem in the
next subsection.

2.2.2 Construction Grammar proposed by Boas (2003)

assumes that the information of verbs is minimal and the syntactic information can
be added by constructions, whereas Boas argues for a fine-grained analysis of the
meaning of verbs, including not only semantic but also syntactic properties.

According to Boas (2003: 105), it is necessary to maximize the properties of lexical
items to explain why some verbs (e.g., talk) can be found in the Resultative Construction
but others (e.g., whisper, grumble and grouched) cannot. That is, we cannot predict the
distribution of verbs in (11a)-(11e).

(11)  a. He talked himself blue in the face.

    b. *He spoke himself blue in the face.

    c. *He whispered himself blue in the face.

    d. *He grumbled himself blue in the face.

    e. *He grousched himself blue in the face. (Boas 2003: 105)

Although talk, speak, whisper, grumble and grouch are verbs belonging to the same verb
class, except for talk, none of them are used in the Resultative Construction.

Furthermore, Goldberg cannot explain why some verbs belonging to the same
semantic class (i.e., verbs of ingestion) can take postverbal complements and others
cannot, as shown in (12)-(14).
In this thesis, we explore how such abstract constructions are set up in Chapter 4 and 6. In order to get argument structure constructions, first, we build verb-specific or verb-class specific constructions from concrete examples. Then, argument structure constructions are formed through them. A usage-based model (Langacker 1990; 2000) should be adopted to examine this process in which argument structure constructions are formed. Croft (2001) as well as Boas (2003) take a usage-based view of language, and they assume argument structure constructions are formed by abstracting each language use. I agree with the discussion by Boas (2003) above, but cannot agree with the proposal by him below.

Boas (2003) argues for the existence of mini-constructions. Mini-constructions include very specific meaning and information. For instance, the verb *talk* has a single argument in a basic usage but it takes optionally a reflexive object (i.e., ‘fake object,’ as shown in (11a)) and the result phrase (e.g., *blue in the face*) describing the object referent. All the idiosyncratic information is included in the meaning of the verb *talk* in the resultative use. Of course, Boas claims this meaning is different from another meaning of *talk* in another use. That is, Boas (2003, 2008) argues for multiple meanings of verbs and suggests all information of a verb in all usage should be listed in the lexical entry.
It should be noted that maximized lexical entries of verbs suggested by Boas (2003) can be contrasted with the projectionist approaches discussed in 2.3. Boas assumes *hit has at least two meanings: one is the sport sense in (15a) and (15b) and the other is the physical impact sense in (16a).

(15)  
   a. Joe hit the ball.  
   b. Joe hit the ball across the field.

(16)  
   a. Joe hit the table.  
   b. *Joe hit the table across the field.

Levin (1985) and Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) also assume the difference of the meanings of verbs is reflected in argument realization (see also Nemoto 1998; 2005). Then, does Boas (2003) agree with the projectionist approaches? The answer to this question is ‘no’ because Boas does not posit semantic shift of a verb in terms of lexical rules. The meanings of verbs are changed due to the kinds of evoked frames.

2.2.3 A Unification-based Construction Grammar

As to valence, the information of predicates should be minimal in a Unification-based Construction Grammar suggested by Fillmore and Kay (in prep.), Kay and Fillmore (1999), and Fried and Östman (2004). This approach to verbal meanings is similar to that of Goldberg. However, there is much information in the background, and the valence of a verb may be added when the verb is fused with a linking construction such as the Affected Object Construction in a Unification-based Construction Grammar. For example, six Frame Elements are assumed for *walk: Walker, Distance, Ground, Point of departure, Destination and Companion. The sixth Frame Element, Companion, can be licensed when *walk is used in the Affected Object Construction given below.
One of the background elements (i.e., you, a Frame Element of Companion) is realized as an object as shown in (17). Since Goldberg assumes that arguments are added by constructions, she considers the number of valence of a verb to be minimal. She does not assume any frame element. In both Goldberg’s Construction Grammar and a Unification-based Construction Grammar, verbal meanings are considered to be minimal (cf. Boas 2003).

2.3 Decompositional Semantic Approaches

Jackendoff (1990; 1997), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), and Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) assume that verbal meanings determine syntactic configurations and adopt decompositional semantic approaches. Thus, their approaches are different from Goldberg’s Construction Grammar.

While Jackendoff (1990; 1997) recognizes constructions, larger than words, as basic units composing grammatical systems and also as part of the lexicon, Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) reject constructions. They attempt to account for the syntactic behavior of verbs from their meanings.

However, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) recognize Event Templates, similar to constructions, but they consider verbs to be polysemous. That is, some researchers recognize the importance of constructions in language systems while others do not.

---

As is well known decompositional approaches have their roots in generative semantics (e.g., Lakoff 1971, cf. Katz and Fodor 1963), but I do not introduce generative semantics here.
2.3.1 Semantic Shifts through Lexical Rules

Levin (1985) attempted to describe properties shared among lexical items of the same class by examining a particular verb *slide*. In particular, she claimed that arguments of semantically similar verbs syntactically realize in the same way. To cite a case, *slide* can be used both transitively and intransitively, as shown in (18).

(18) a. Sarah slid the cup across the table from her place to Laura’s place.
   b. The cup slid across the table from her place to Laura’s place.

(Levin 1985: 5)

Although both of these sentences describe the movement of a certain object (i.e., a cup) along a trajectory, these sentences differ in meaning. The sentence in (18a) indicates the cause of movement of the cup and that in (18b) does not, and *slide* in its transitive use requires two arguments, Agent and Theme, while *slide* in the intransitive use takes only one argument, Theme.

Within the framework of GB theory, the causative *slide* in (18a) assigns the Theme (i.e., an internal argument) directly and the Agent (i.e., an external argument) indirectly. According to Burzio’s generalization (Burzio 1981), verbs assigning a theta-role to their subject can assign a Case to their object.\(^5\) As a Case is also assigned under government, the object is assigned a theta-role directly and the subject is assigned a theta-role indirectly.

Levin (1985) makes an alternative proposal that the level of lexical representation determines semantic classes of verbs. Other verbs describing change of location such as *float*, *roll*, *bounce*, and *move* are also used transitively and intransitively. All of these

\(^5\)This capitalized ‘Case,’ an abstract case, should be distinguished from a ‘case’ referring to the name of a noun or a pronoun.
verbs in their transitive uses have an Agent argument and a Theme, and all of these verbs in their intransitive uses have only a Theme argument. That is, verbs in the same semantic class share the same argument structure and the Agent argument realizes as a subject and the Theme argument as an object. The fact that the same verb *slide* is used in both causative and non-causative uses is not accidental. Levin assumes one of the pair in these two kinds of the uses of a verb is derived from the other. There are some pieces of evidence suggesting that the non-causative *slide* relates to the causative *slide*. She shows the same characteristics between these two uses. First, the causative *slide* and the non-causative *slide* have a Theme argument. Second, both of them take directional phrases. Third, *slide* allows alternation in some sentences but not in others. Fourth, when *slide* occurs in the Ditransitive Construction, it obligatorily takes a Recipient argument that denotes an entity capable of ownership, even though *slide* in the other construction does not necessarily, as shown in (19).

(19)  
  a. Jill slid Susan the present.  
  b. *Jill slid the door the present.  

(20) a. Jill slid the present to Susan.  
  b. Jill slid the present to the door.  

(Levin 1985: 35)

The facts about dative alternation suggest that the verb, *slide*, can be used not only as a verb of change of location but also as a verb of change of possession. Thus, following the evidence, she claims that the meaning of change of location is different from that of change of possession, one of which is derived from the other.

Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) argue for the nature of multiple meanings of verbs. They are interested in the meaning of verbs relevant to syntactic behavior. According to their assumption, the lexical meaning representation of the verb *slide*
found in (19a) is different from that of *slide* in (20a). They capture this semantic relationship in terms of ‘semantic shift,’ achieved via a ‘lexical rule.’ Due to lexical rules, multiple meaning does not have to be listed in the lexical entry of each verb. That is, only the basic meaning of a verb is listed in the lexical entry and the other meanings are derived through the lexical rules.

As I have noted briefly above, there are constructionists such as (Boas 2003) positive about recognizing multiple meanings of a verb. However, what Levin and Rappaport Hovav proposed is clearly different from what is assumed by Boas (2003). While Levin and Rappaport Hovav argue that only the basic meanings should be included as information of verbs, Boas takes a maximal semantic approach to verbal polysemy. That is, he assumes all information relevant to a verb should be contained as the frame of the verb. Differences in opinion among constructionists about verbal polysemy has been already discussed in 2.2.

### 2.3.2 Lexical Semantic Templates

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) posit event structure templates, roughly equivalent to the meaning part of constructions, and template augmentations instead of lexical rules. In this subsection, I overview the approach proposed by Rappaport Hovav and Levin and contrast it with Goldberg’s Construction Grammar. These templates are defined in terms of Aktionsart, given below.

(21) a. [ x ACT <MANNER> (y)]  
    (activity)

    b. [ x <STATE> ]  
    (state)

    c. [ BECOME [ x <STATE> ] ]  
    (achievement)

    d. [ [ x ACT <MANNER>] CAUSE [ BECOME [ y <STATE> ] ] ]

20
Each constant such as ACT and CAUSE encodes the verb’s core meanings (i.e., lexical aspect or Aktionsart) and determines the number of minimal arguments of verbs. For example, *sweep* may be realized in several syntactic patterns as shown in (22).

(22) a. Phil swept the floor.  
    b. Phil swept the floor clean.  

In (22a), *sweep* takes only a subject and an object, on the other hand, it takes a result phrase *clean* in addition to a subject and an object in (22b). From these facts, they claim *sweep* has multiple meanings. The event structure in (22a) is that of activity, represented in (21a), while, in the case of (22b), the event structure is accomplishment, represented in (21d). Then, which is a more basic meaning, activity or accomplishment? According to Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998), the meaning of *sweep*, which occurs in the event structure of accomplishment, is derived via Template Augmentation. The lexically specified representation of (22a) and (22b) are shown in (23a) and (23b).

(23) a. [ x ACT <Sweep> (y)]  
    b. [[ x ACT <$sweep$>] CAUSE [ BECOME [ y <$STATE$>]]]

The event structure template in (21d) is associated with the resultative construction. That is, event structure templates, suggested by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998), are roughly equivalent to the meaning part of constructions in Construction Grammar. However, they make an assumption in favor of multiple meanings for verbs and
semantic derivation via Template Augmentation. In the framework of Construction Grammar, any derivational device is not admitted.

2.3.3 Lexical Conceptual Structures and Constructions

Jackendoff (1983, 1990, 1997) takes decompositional semantic approaches to represent the meanings of words, phrases, and sentences. He considers verbs to be polysemous, but unlike Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), he recognizes constructions. Thus, his approach is different from Goldberg’s Construction Grammar with respect to the meanings of verbs. In the following, I overview the approach proposed by Jackendoff to contrast it with Goldberg’s Construction Grammar. I do not introduce the whole of his theory here, but I would like to discuss i) verbal polysemy, ii) constructional approach, and iii) conceptual functions related to motion events. The reason I introduce Jackendoff’s approach to motion events is that I will discuss constructions associated with motion events in Chapters 4, 5, and 6.

For example, Jackendoff (1990: 65-66, 80-81) picks up the verb dress. The verb is used as both transitive and intransitive, as shown in (24), respectively.


b. Bill dressed. (Jackendoff 1990: 65)

When dress is used as transitive, it means ‘put clothes on someone’ and, when used as intransitive, it means ‘put clothes on myself.’ Jackendoff assumes two different lexical entries for transitive and intransitive dress. According to him, such alternation is due to the difference between the meaning of transitive dress and intransitive dress. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) and Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) derive one meaning from the more basic meaning of a verb and attempt to simplify a lexical entry for each
verb. On the other hand, Jackendoff assumes multiple lexical entries for a verb.

In the framework of Construction Grammar, such kinds of alternations are not attributed to the meaning of each verb. Some constructionists consider it to be implausible that the meaning of the transitive *dress* is changed when the direct object is omitted. Indeed, Goldberg (1995: 22-23) argues the transitive use and the intransitive use of a verb share the same stem in most languages, and the meaning of *dress* in (24a) should not be distinguished from that of *dress* in (24b).

Jackendoff recognizes constructions even though he argues for verbal polysemy. For instance, toward not only idioms but also the *way* construction and the resultative construction, he takes a constructional approach. That is, he is sure that not all phenomena are accounted for by the properties of verbs. For example, an adverb can be inserted after the verb in (25a), whereas an adverb cannot be inserted after the verb in the *way* construction in (25b).

(25) a. Bill belched noisily all the way out of the restaurant.

       b. *Bill belched noisily his way out of the restaurant.

       (Jackendoff 1990: 212)

This suggests that the constituent structure of the *way* construction is different from that of the other construction. This difference between (25a) and (25b) is not contributed by the verbal meaning. From this fact, Jackendoff recognizes constructions as basic grammatical units.

Although Goldberg (1995; 2006) does not adopt a conceptual meaning for each verb, Jackendoff (1990) does. In the following, I overview Jackendoff’s analysis of verbs expressing motion events to contrast his approach to Goldberg’s.

Conceptual structure, a semantic representation, is based on a decompositional
approach to the semantics of words, phrases, and sentences. In this theory, spatial motion verbs are decomposed in terms of conceptual functions such as GO, MOVE, ORIENT, EXT, CAUSE and so on. Although, of course, there are other conceptual functions in his theory, I will not introduce all of the conceptual functions since some of them are not concerned with the phenomena in this thesis.

In the case of manner of motion verbs, Jackendoff posits two conceptual functions (Jackendoff 1990: 88-89, 223-225). One is a GO-function and the other is a MOVE-function. The GO-function takes a Thing and a Path argument, and the MOVE-function takes a Thing argument. These conceptual functions are represented, as shown in (26).

(26) a. \[
\text{EVENT GO} ([\text{Thing }], [\text{Path }])
\]

b. \[
\text{EVENT MOVE} ([\text{Thing }])
\]

Jackendoff claims that the MOVE-function is necessary to analyze the following sentences appropriately because wiggle and dance express manner of motion or accompanying action, but they do not express locomotions.

(27) a. Willy wiggled out of the hole.

b. Debbie danced into the room. (Jackendoff 1990: 89)

The subjects, Willy and Debbie, are arguments of both the GO-function and the MOVE-function but the path expressions, out of the hole and into the room, are those of the GO-function alone. That is, the sentence in (27a) is represented by using conceptual functions as shown in (28).

(28) \[
\text{GO} ([\text{Thing } \alpha], [\text{Path }])
\]

\[
\text{MOVE} ([\text{Thing } \alpha])
\]
The conceptual functions in (28) show that the subject argument of the GO-function is identical with that of the MOVE-function. Locomotion is denoted by the GO-function and the accompanying action expressed by \textit{wiggle} in (27a) is denoted by the MOVE-function. (see also Jackendoff 1990: 224).

Moreover, Jackendoff (1990: 89) provides evidence from typological studies to distinguish the MOVE-function from the GO-function given below.

(29) a. \textit{La botella floto a la cueva.}  
    \textit{the bottle floated to the cave}  
    \textit{The bottle floated into the cave'}  
    (Spanish: Jackendoff 1990: 89)

    b. \textit{La botella entró a la cueva flotando.}  
    \textit{the bottle moved-in to the cave floating}  
    \textit{The bottle floated into the cave'}  
    (Spanish: Talmy 1985: 69)

(30) a. ?Jon-wa eki-e hashitta.  
    John-TOP station-to ran  
    \textit{John ran to the station'}  

    John-TOP station-to running-went.  
    \textit{John went running to the station'}  
    (Japanese: Yoneyama 1986: 1-2)

In (29a), \textit{floto} (‘floated’) expresses manner of motion and it cannot co-occur with a path expression \textit{a} (‘to’). On the other hand, in (29b), \textit{entró} (‘entered’) expresses locomotion to a place and it can co-occur with the path expression (i.e., \textit{a la cueva}) in Spanish. In (30a), \textit{hashitta} (‘ran’) expresses a manner of motion and it cannot co-occur with a path expression (i.e., \textit{eki-e}). On the other hand, in (30b), the complex predicate, composed of a manner of motion verb \textit{hashiru} and a deictic motion verb \textit{iku}, can co-occur with a path expression. In short, \textit{floto} (‘floated’) and \textit{hashitta} (‘ran’) have only the MOVE-function while \textit{entro} (‘entered’) and the complex predicate \textit{hashitte-itta} involve the GO-function, so that they can take path expressions, as shown in (29b) and (30b).
That is, a MOVE-function does not have an argument representing a path expression but a GO-function does. However, in English, some action verbs such as *wiggle* and *dance* can take an argument for a path expression, as shown in (27a) and (27b). These facts lead him to claim that multi-functional structures are necessary, and he suggests that, also in the case of the *way* construction given in (31a) and (31b), multi-functional conceptual structures are needed.

(31)  

a. Bill belched his way out of the restaurant.  
b. Harry moaned his way down the road.  

(Jackendoff 1990: 211)

That is, he proposes that *belch* and *moan*, action verbs, have not only the MOVE-function but also the GO-function in the *way* construction. In other words, the meanings of *belch* and *moan* in the *way* construction are different from those of these verbs in other constructions that do not represent a locomotion.

Goldberg’s (1995) analysis is different from Jackendoff’s. According to her, the meaning of a verb is based on the frame of each verb and verbs express manner of motion, accompanying action, and so on. That is, locomotion is expressed by constructions (e.g., the Intransitive Motion Construction and the *Way* Construction). Thus, she does not distinguish the GO-function from the MOVE-function. I will adopt Goldberg’s analysis in Chapters 4 and 6.

Projectionists (e.g., Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995) and Jackendoff (1983, 1990, 1997) assume multiple meanings of verbs, and all of them adopt decompositional semantic approaches. However, not all researchers of lexical semantics adopt such a kind of approach. Indeed, most linguists in the area of Cognitive Linguistics take a different approach to lexical semantics (e.g., Fillmore 1977; 1982; 1985, Fillmore and Atkins 2000, Langacker 1987; 1991).
2.4 Usage-based Models and Construction Grammar

Now we turn to the relation between Usage-based models and Construction Grammar. Usage-based models are supported by most works in the framework of Construction Grammar and my analysis in later chapters is based on these models. Furthermore, the validity of statistical approaches to usage-based models (e.g., Stefanowitsch and Gries 2003, Gries 2012, cf. Bybee 2010) are considered in this section.

2.4.1 A Usage-based Model in Language Studies

Usage-based models assume linguistic structures (or grammar) are strongly based on language uses. That is, language uses produced by a speaker are based on the abstract grammar of a language and the grammar is formed through daily experiences of language uses. Langacker’s usage-based model is based on Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987; 1991) so his usage-based model shares some concepts with Cognitive Grammar. For this reason, his model is built on the assumption that language is highly redundant and has bottom-up properties. Highly frequent collocations become fixed units and become cognitively routinized or ‘entrenched,’ to use Langacker’s term. Since a lot of constructional approaches utilize corpora, they match with usage-based models nicely.

Cognitive linguistics, especially usage-based approaches, met corpus linguistics,
which provide objective evidence for analysis (Boas 2007). However, this trend is not universally accepted by all cognitive linguists. Indeed, some cognitive linguists such as Talmy (2000a; 2000b) do not show corpus data or other empirical evidence because the meanings of words are somewhat subjective so that they claim introspection is the best way to know what the meaning of language is. Not all linguists advocating a usage-based model show frequency data drawn from a corpus. Some linguists who take a usage-based view of language do not use corpus frequency (e.g., Iwata 2008). This is because, there can be expressions that are possible but that do not exist in corpora. Thus, it should be noted that not all usage-based models are corpus-based approaches (Iwata 2008: 6-8).

Today, corpus-based cognitive linguistics is not unusual at all and a lot of studies within the framework of cognitive semantics have been published using corpus (e.g., Glynn and Fischer 2010). These quantitative methods in cognitive semantics are called ‘corpus-based’ approaches, distinguished from ‘corpus-driven’ approaches. Corpus-based approaches assume linguistic theories and examine the validity of them, whereas corpus-driven approaches are not based on linguistic theories. This distinction between corpus-based and corpus-driven language studies was introduced by Tognini-Bonell (2001). In the field of cognitive linguistics, especially cognitive semantics, quantitative data and methodologies are playing an increasingly important role. However, there are problems, with over-reliance on language data drawn from corpora and statistically analyzed data, and methodological issues including reliance on speech tags and concordance, which enables us to search data easily (Newman 2010). Moreover, there is a problem choosing methodologies (e.g., Collostructional Analysis, proposed by Stefanowitsch and Gries (2003)). Which statistical methodology is the
best to investigate the nature of language? Although Collostructional Analysis is one of the best ways among statistical methodologies (see 2.4.2), this point is criticized by Bybee (2010: Chapter 5, see also Johnson 1999, Killgarriff 2005). That is, we must investigate whether or not the frequency of words and phrases really corresponds to the degree of entrenchment as Langacker (1990; 2000) claims. In the next subsection, corpus-based approaches are discussed in detail.

### 2.4.2 Corpus-based Approaches

As stated above, cognitive linguistics have applied corpus-based methodologies, distinguished from corpus-driven methodologies (e.g., Sinclair 1991), to investigate the nature of language, especially meaning of language. In the course of Construction Grammar, the study by Stefanowitsch and Gries (2003) is one of the most influential ones. They have introduced the notion of collostructional strength to investigate how a collexeme is more attracted to a given construction than would usually be assumed.⁹ This subsection discusses Collostructional Analysis and introduces some critiques against their approach.

Before discussion of Collostructional Analysis, it should be emphasized that raw frequency had played a very important role in the field of corpus-based approaches before. However, since the appearance of a variety of statistical methods in the field of linguistics, raw frequencies have not been reliable evidence to examine the nature of language. Collostructional analysis, calculated in a more strict way, is one of such methodologies based on statistics. Four frequencies are necessary to investigate the collostructional strengths of verbs occurring in a construction, as shown in Table 2.1.

---

⁹The term ‘collostruction’ is coined by Stefanowitsch and Gries, composing two terms, ‘construction’ and ‘collocation.’
Here, we use the Chi-square test (like the Fisher exact test) to calculate collostructional strengths of collexemes occurring in a given construction.\textsuperscript{10} In order to calculate collostructional strength of a collexeme for a given construction, we need four frequencies: the frequency of the collexeme in the construction ($w$), the frequency of the collexeme in all other constructions ($x$), the frequency of the construction with lexemes other than the collexeme ($y$) and the frequency of all other constructions with lexemes other than the collexeme ($z$). We can get the figures in $w$, $w+y$ and $w+x$ directly from the corpus, and we can get the total number of constructions in $w+x+y+z$ by counting the total number of verbs in the BNC ($= 10,206,300$, counted by Stefanowitsch and Gries (2003: 219)).\textsuperscript{11} We can get all the other remaining figures (i.e., $x$, $y$, $z$, $x+y$, $y+z$) by subtraction.

Stefanowitsch and Gries (2003: 218-220) consider an example where the collexeme is \textit{accident} and the construction is [N waiting to happen] to show how collostructional strength of a given collexeme in a construction is calculated. The result is shown in Table 2.2.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Construction $c$ & Other constructions & Row totals \\
\hline
Word $v$ & $w$ & $x$ & $w+x$ \\
Other words & $y$ & $z$ & $y+z$ \\
Column totals & $w+y$ & $x+y$ & $w+x+y+z$ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Collostructional Approach}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{10}The term ‘collexeme’ is a word occurring in a given construction.
\textsuperscript{11}According to Stefanowitsch and Gries (2003), the number of construction is regarded as the number of uses of verbs.
Table 2.2: Crosstabulation of *accident* and the [N *waiting to happen*] construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[N <em>waiting to happen</em>]</th>
<th>¬ [N <em>waiting to happen</em>]</th>
<th>Row totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8,606</td>
<td>8,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¬ accident</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10,197,659</td>
<td>10,197,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10,206,265</td>
<td>10,206,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stefanowitsch and Gries 2003: 219: slightly modified)

The [N *waiting to happen*] construction occurs only 35 times in the BNC, whereas all the other constructions occur 10,206,265 times in the same corpus. Despite the low frequency of the [N *waiting to happen*] construction, the collexeme *accident* occurs 14 times in the construction. If *accident* occurred randomly in various kinds of constructions, it would occur only 0.03 times (=expected value) in the [N *waiting to happen*] construction, and lexemes other than *accident* would occur 34.97 times in the same construction. However, the figures in Table 2.2 differ widely from each expected value in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Expected Values of Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[N <em>waiting to happen</em>]</th>
<th>¬ [N <em>waiting to happen</em>]</th>
<th>Row totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>8,619.97</td>
<td>8,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¬ accident</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>10,197,644.03</td>
<td>10,197,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10,206,265</td>
<td>10,206,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The squared residual error between a measured value and an expected value in each cell is divided by each expected value. Then we can get the Chi-squared value by adding each resulting value calculated above. The chi-squared value (=6143.629) is the collostructional strength of the collexeme *accident* in the [N *waiting to happen*]
construction. The higher the collostructional strength is, the more a collexeme is associated with a given construction.

According to Bybee (2010: 98), the figure in z is problematic because it is impossible to guess the exact number of all uses of verbs in constructions in a corpus such as the BNC. Bybee sees this as a problem of Collostructional Analysis, and claims that Collostructional Analysis does not include semantic factors. Moreover she gives confirmed evidence that this analysis does not reflect our knowledge of language (see also Bybee and Eddington 2006, cf. Gries 2012). Bybee (2010: 100) concludes that “simple frequency analysis with semantic similarity produces the best results.”

Corpus-based approaches aim to reveal the nature of language by using frequency data drawn from corpora and/or statistically processed data. According to Gries (2012: 487), “different corpus sizes yield similar results, and a more systematic test supports that.” However, we should avoid over-reliance on corpus data. Bybee (2010) suggests that introspection should be involved in corpus studies. In this thesis, I aim to approach to the semantic aspects of Converbal Motion Constructions in English by utilizing corpus data, and I examine how Collostructional Analysis is useful in language studies by analyzing two constructions in Chapter 4 and 6.

---

12Fisher exact test is slightly different from the Chi-squared test. Moreover, in fact, Stefanowitsch and Gries use a p value to indicate the collostructional strength of each verb. I use Chi-squared test and chi-squared value for ease of explanation, here.
Chapter 3

Converbal Constructions

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to give a survey of Converbal Constructions in general, in preparation for discussion of English Converbal Constructions in Chapters 4 through 6. The term ‘converb’ was first introduced by Nedjalkov and Nedjalkov (1987) to describe a certain verb in Altaic languages. Then Haspelmath (1995) applied the notion of converb to European languages. In many works, it is suggested that Converbal Constructions seem to be similar to Serial Verb Constructions, which appear in the languages of West Africa, South-east Asia, Oceania, New-Guinea, and the Caribbean (Bisang 1995, Croft 2012, among others). I will give a broad overview of Converbal Constructions comparing them with Serial Verb Constructions and put together what is discussed in previous studies.

The outline of this chapter is as follows. First, I will give the definition of Converbal Constructions. Although Serial Verb Constructions, similar to Converbal Constructions, are generally regarded as mono-clausal constructions (Durie 1997), Converbal Constructions are not necessarily mono-clausal (Kortmann 1995). Thus, I will define
what Converbal Constructions are, and overview the variety of Serial Verb Constructions and Converbal Constructions in languages in 3.2. Since Haspelmath (1995) introduced the notion of converb into various languages, many researchers have described Converbal Constructions in many languages. I will note their descriptions. I argue that some Converbal Constructions are mono-clausal in this thesis. In some of the mono-clausal Converbal Constructions, two verbs constitute a complex predicate. I will discuss this point in 3.3. I will overview several interpretations of the English converbal form in 3.4. Furthermore, I will discuss the relation between mono-clausality and the range of variety of interpretation the English converbal form marks.

3.2 The Definition of Converbal Constructions

Haspelmath (1995: 3) defines ‘converb’ as follows: “[a] converb is defined here as a nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination.” Now, the term converb is coming into widespread use to refer to a verb found in many constructions in various languages. However, in previous times, it had been used to refer to verbs in Altaic languages (Nedjalkov and Nedjalkov 1987). In this thesis, I identify the -ing form verbs in English as converbs.

The subject of a converb may or may not be coreferential with the subject of the main verb. If the subject of a converb is coreferential with the subject of the main verb, it must be implicit, but if the subject of a converb is not, it may be explicit, as shown in (32).

(32)  
a. A tall man came after, hurrying to catch them. (BNC-CJA)

b. Dan walked from the room, his head reeling. (BNC-FAB)
In (32a), the subject of *hurrying* is coreferential with that of *came*, and the subject (i.e., *a tall man*) of *hurrying* is implicit. On the other hand, in (32b), the subject of *reeling* is not coreferential with that of *walked*, and the subject of *reeling* is explicit.

### 3.2.1 Criteria for Identification of Subordination

Converbal Constructions are distinguished from coordinate constructions. Haspelmath supposes five criteria for converbs (i.e., i) clause-internal word order, ii) variable position, iii) possibility of backwards pronominal anaphora, iv) semantic restrictiveness and v) possibility of extraction), some of which all converbs must fulfill and none of which coordinate constructions fulfill.

We pay attention to the last criteria, distinguishing subordinate structures from coordinate structures. Haspelmath says that wh-movement from the main clause of subordinate structures is allowed presenting (33) as evidence, and this property is not seen in coordinate structures in the examples in (34) as Ross (1967) discussed (cf. Lakoff 1986).

(33)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{After he sold his car, Alexis bought a bicycle.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{What did Alexis buy after he sold his car?} \\
\text{c. } & \text{What did Alexis buy, having sold his car?} \quad \text{(Haspelmath 1995: 17)}
\end{align*}

(34)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Alexis sold his car and bought a bicycle.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{*What did Alexis sell his car and buy?} \quad \text{(Haspelmath 1995: 17)}
\end{align*}

In the examples of (34), two phrases *sold his car* and *bought a bicycle* are coordinated, and the two clauses are linked by a coordinate conjunction, *and*. As Ross (1967) pointed out, extraction from one clause of coordination structures is not allowed (i.e.,}
Although wh-movement from the main clause of subordinate structures is allowed, wh-movement from the subordinate one of subordinate structures is not allowed, as shown in (35).

(35) *Who did John come back [before I had a chance to talk to t ]?  

(Huang 1982: 497)

Haspelmath seems unconcerned about from which clause a grammatical element is extracted. That is, in (33), he extracts a bicycle from a main clause, and makes a conclusion that extraction is allowed in only subordinate structure constructions. However, if his car is extracted from a subordinate clause, the resulting sentences are not accepted, as shown in (36).

(36) a. Alexis bought a bicycle after he sold his car.  

b. *What; did Alexis buy a bicycle after he sold t.  

c. *What; did Alexis buy a bicycle having sold t.

This constraint is known as Adjunct Island Constraint (Huang 1982). For these reasons, whether a grammatical element is extracted or not is not recognized as a criterion of a subordinate structure.

3.2.2 Converbal Constructions and Serial Verb Constructions

Although not only Converbal Constructions but also Serial Verb Constructions are discussed in the literature, few linguists have compared these similar but different constructions. Serial Verb Constructions are observed in regions such as West Africa (e.g., Baker 1989), East Asia (e.g., Li and Thompson 1981) and Oceania (e.g., Crowley
On the other hand, Converbal Constructions are observed in Europe (e.g., Kortmann 1995) and Asia (e.g., Bisang 1998). Aikhenvald and Dixon (2006) provide an overview of the Serial Verb Constructions, and Haspelmath and König (1995) of Converbal Constructions.

Bisang (1995; 1998) and Croft (2012) focus on the differences and similarities of these two kinds of constructions. In the rest of this subsection, I will overview their observations on differences and similarities between Serial Verb Constructions and Converbal Constructions.

First, all verbs in the Serial Verb Constructions are equal status. In (37a), neither mú (‘take’) nor wá are marked for grammatical features. In (37b), both na-muali and nau-mai are marked for 1SG:REAL. On the other hand, only a main verb inflects and a converb does not in Converbal Constructions, as illustrated by each example of (38).

(37) a. Mo mú iwè wá ilé
   1SG take book come home
   ‘I brought a book home.’

   (Serial Verb Construction: Yoruba: Bangbòse 1974: 1)

b. na-muali nau-mai eni lei'ai
   1SG:REAL-walk 1SG:REAL-come sp' bush
   ‘I walked from the bush.’

   (Serial Verb Construction: Paamese: Crowley 2002: 71)

(38) a. Uta o utat-te iki-mashita.
    song acc sing-conv go-pst:hon
    ‘[He] went along singing’


b. presjakox ulitsata na begom
    across.pf:cut:aor.1sg street:the on running
    ‘I crossed the street running’

    (Converbal Construction: Bulgarian: Croft et al. 2010: 216)
Second, Aikhenvald (2006: 1) argues Serial Verbs function as a single predicate and a Serial Verb Construction is conceptualized as a single event. On the other hand, there are bi-clausal Converbal Constructions, as are the case in (32). That is, some Converbal Constructions are conceptualized as two events.

Third, there are also differences in semantic relation between Serial Verb Constructions and Converbal Constructions. For example, ‘condition’ and ‘concession’ are expressed only by Converbal Constructions (Croft 2012: 347).

### 3.3 Converbal Constructions as Complex Predicates

As I noted, unlike Serial Verb Constructions, Converbal Constructions can be either mono-clausal or bi-clausal. Moreover, as in Serial Verb Constructions (Andrews and Manning 1999: Chapter 4), more than one verb constitutes a complex predicate in a mono-clausal Converbal Construction.

Complex predicates are defined by Alsina, Bresnan and Sells (1997: 1) as predicates composed of more than one word or morpheme. Converbal Constructions involve more than one predicate. There is, at least, one head (i.e., an inflecting verb) and another grammatical element (i.e., an \(-ing\) form verb). This morphosyntactic property of Converbal Constructions does not contradict the definition of complex predicates. In the rest of this section, I will show that Converbal Constructions treated in Chapter 4 and Chapter 6 can be analyzed as involving complex predicates. The significance of regarding Converbal Constructions as complex predicate constructions is important in the rest of this thesis.
3.3.1 Intransitive Complex Predicates

As is the case for Serial Verb Constructions (see (37b) in Paamese), Converbal Constructions represent intransitive motion events as shown in (39).

(39) Eight of the men came running out of the trees (…). (BNC-HR7)

The sentence in (39) is mono-clausal (see Chapter 4). However, as an inflecting verb and an -ing form verb do not constitute a complex predicate in bi-clausal Converbal Constructions, the two verbs in the example in (39) may not constitute a complex predicate.

In addition, in the English example in (39), both the Agent argument and the Path argument can be considered as arguments of either verb. That is, eight of the men can be the argument of either verb and out of the trees can also be that of either verb. In other words, the two verbs play a role as a predicate. This is evidence to show that two verbs in a mono-clausal Converbal Construction constitute a complex predicate. I will discuss this point in detail in Chapter 4.

3.3.2 Transitive Complex Predicates

As we have already seen, caused-motion verbs appear in Serial Verb Constructions found in West Africa (see (37a) in Yoruba). In the case of Serial Verb Constructions, Baker (1989) pointed out that objects are shared by two verbs. In the case of Converbal Constructions in English, a Path argument is not always shared by both verbs, as shown in the contrast in (40).\(^1\)

---

\(^1\)I cannot find this type of construction in languages other than English.
(40)  a. He **sent** the clerk **hurrying** into the back room to get a dark grey suit (⋯).  
        (BNC-CDN).

        b. Bill **took** him **kicking** into the room.  
        (Goldberg 2006: 51)

In (40a), the Path argument (i.e., *into the back room*) can be regarded as the argument of both verbs, whereas, in (40b), the Path argument (i.e., *into the room*) cannot be the argument of *kicking*. Why is this type of construction allowed in English Converbal Constructions? A complex predicate construction allows such expressions. I will discuss this point in Chapter 6.

3.4 Several Interpretations of the Converbal Form in English

In Converbal Constructions in English, a converbal form (i.e., -ing form) marks a wide variety of interpretations (Kortmann 1991). The default interpretation for the Free Participial Construction is the expression of simultaneity (Haiman 1985: 228) or ‘temporal concomitance’ in Talmy’s (1978: 505) term. However, the corpus analysis by Kortmann (1991) reveals that the converbal form is interpreted as ‘anteriority,’ ‘posteriority,’ ‘manner,’ ‘accompanying circumstance,’ and others.² Examples of each interpretation, drawn from the corpus, are given below.

(41)  a. **Catching** sight of her, he slowly raised his right hand (⋯).

        b. **Lifting** the telephone, she asked for room 1410.  
        (Kortmann 1991: 144)  
        (‘anteriority’)

(42)  a. Reassuringly, the car’s motor started at a touch, **purring** smoothly as the result of an overhaul (⋯).

²Kortmann (1991: 168) pointed out the term ‘accompanying circumstance’ is used as a cover term for a variety of semantic relations (e.g., Quirk *et al.* 1985: 1124), and I use a term ‘accompanying action’ for this in my own analysis.
b. Booker T. wheeled each trolley in and, (⋯), spread the contents on a large flat tray, ranking the mess back and forth like a gardener preparing topsoil.

(Kortmann 1991: 151)

(‘posteriority’)

(43) a. They walked little Quilley between them, carefully trimming their agile pace to his own faltering tread.

b. Then came the girl (⋯), plodding along the pedestrian pathway.

(Kortmann 1911: 166)

(‘manner’)

(44) a. Next morning I woke at my usual hour, feeling like a bottle of champagne.

b. The door opened and Skullion came in, holding his bowler hat in one hand.

(Kortmann 1991: 170)

(‘accompanying action’)

3.5 Prototype of Each Converbal Construction

As I have seen in several constructions in various languages, Converbal Constructions vary widely, and converbal forms mark various interpretations such as ‘anteriority’ and ‘posteriority.’ However, an -ing form is interpreted only as ‘manner of motion,’ ‘accompanying action,’ and ‘purpose’ in mono-clausal Converbal Constructions in English. Then, what restricts the interpretation that a converbal form marks?

If there is an iconic relation between grammatical form and meaning, the interaction between a main verb and an -ing form verb in a clause is more significant than that between a main clause and a subordinate clause. Kortmann (1991) and Stump (1985) show the prototypical relation between main clauses and subordinate clauses. How
about mono-clausal Converbal Constructions? If a main verb and a convorb are in a single clause, the prototypical relation between the two verbs should be examined. I will discuss this point in Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

3.6 Summary

Unlike Serial Verb Constructions, Converbal Constructions are found in European and Asian languages. Scholars have not discussed the differences between mono-clausal constructions and bi-clausal ones except for Talmy (1985; 2000b). The construction discussed in the later chapters are mono-clausal, and thus, they have a great chance of having special combinations between two verbs. The following chapters will investigate the interactions between the two verbs, and account for why such special interactions can be observed.
Chapter 4

The Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction

4.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the properties of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction in English given in (45).

(45) a. My son went running to Irene’s house to see what was the matter.  
    (BNC-HH3)

b. He ran screaming down through the orchard missing collision with the trees (⋯).  
   (BNC-A61)

c. So if these neutrons came smashing into your body, they could break up any of chemicals that are very important for your life, for your body chemistry.  
   (BNC-GW0)

1This chapter is built on Morishita (2011a).
The construction has a formal characteristic: a verb precedes a non-finite (-ing) form verb. The inflecting verb (e.g., go, come, and run) is a motion verb and the -ing form verb is a manner of motion verb (e.g., running), denoting a manner of motion while the subject referent is moving, or an action verb (e.g., screaming), denoting an accompanying action during motion. There is another construction representing the locomotion of a subject referent, and it is called the Intransitive Motion Construction. Examples of the Intransitive Motion Construction are given in (46).

(46)  
   a. He went upstairs to his shattered bedroom to fetch it for Harry. (BNC-EFW)  
   b. She ran upstairs, busily chewing toast (BNC-JY0)  
   c. Edward left Windsor Castle and got into a large black car. (BNC-GV9)

The event represented by the Intransitive Motion Construction is simpler than the event represented by the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction because there is a single predicate in each example in (46), whereas there are two predicates in each example in (45). In this chapter, I suggest that the two verbs in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction constitute a single complex predicate.

Moreover, it should be noted that the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction differs from the Free Participle Construction (Kortmann 1991; 1995) illustrated in (47) in the light of syntactic structure and semantic/functional properties, and is associated with a constraint not imposed on the Free Participle Construction.

(47)  
   a. But as we were coming out of the doorway, running across there (⋯). (BNC-B24)  
   b. After we got home, she ran into the street, screaming. (BNC-CEN)
The organization of this chapter is as follows. Section 2 demonstrates how this construction is different from the Free Participial Construction, and clarifies the syntactic and constituent structure of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. Section 3 examines the semantic/functional properties of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. In order to look closer at the semantic/functional aspects of this construction, 1,130 examples drawn from the BNC are statistically analyzed and are compared with the data from randomly sampled examples of the Intransitive Motion Construction. Section 4 presents a constructional analysis aimed at providing a proper description of the variation in meaning and syntactic behavior of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction.

4.2 Syntactic Properties

First of all, it should be noted that the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is mono-clausal and differs from the Free Participial Construction, although at first glance the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction looks very similar to the bi-clausal construction.

Goldberg (2006: 50-52) also considers this construction to be different from the Free Participial Construction, since the -ing form verbs in subordinate clauses can take a complement, but those of the examples of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction cannot, as shown in (48)-(49).

(48)  
   a. Bill went down the street [PRO whistling a tune].
   b. Bill took off toward the cops [PRO screaming at the thief].

   (Goldberg 2006: 51, slightly modified)

(49)  
   a. *Bill went whistling a tune down the street.
b. *Bill took off screaming at the thief toward the cops.  
(Goldberg 2006: 51)

From the differences shown in (48) and (49), I conclude that the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is not restructured from the Free Participial Construction.

In other languages, similar constructions are regarded as the result of restructuring from bi-clausal constructions. For instance, Talmy (2000b: 224) cites an example of Spanish given in (50).²

(50) a. La botella salió flotando de la cueva.
    the bottle exited floating from the cave
    ‘The bottle exited floating from the cave’

b. La botella salió de la cueva flotando.
    the bottle exited from the cave, floating
    ‘The bottle exited from the cave, floating’  
    (Spanish: Talmy 2000: 224)

He argues that the example illustrated in (50a) is not a complete single clause because the non-finite form verb, flotando can also be found in a subordinate clause, as shown in (50b). That is, he regards the example of (50a) as the result of restructuring from the example of (50b). It seems to be problematic to consider non-finite form verbs as a cue of a bi-clausal construction because not all non-finite form verbs behave the same way. A close examination of the syntactic and constituent structure of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction follows and appears to contradict Talmy’s suggestion.

4.2.1 Is the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction Mono-clausal?

There are many examples of the mono-clausal construction that can be paraphrased by the Free Participial Construction. However some examples of the mono-clausal

---

²Talmy notes that the Participial Motion Construction and the Purposive Motion Construction in Japanese (see Matsumoto 1991) are mono-clausal and are not the result of restructuring.
construction cannot be paraphrased. The examples in (51) seem to be paraphrased by the Free Participial Construction.

(51)  a. Louis came bounding down the stairs  
      (BNC-F9C)

      b. If these neutrons come smashing into your body, they will break up any of chemicals  
      (BNC-FMR)

(52)  a. Bounding down the stairs, Louis came.  

      b. Smashing into your body, these neutrons came

Then, are the examples illustrated in (51) a construction restructured or derived from the Free Participial Construction illustrated in (52)? In fact, the example of (51b) seems to be bi-clausal because the path expression into seems not to be an argument of the main verb came but that of the -ing form verb smashing, as shown in (53).

(53)  a. These neutrons smashed into your body and broke up.

      b. #These neutrons came into your body and broke up.     (intended meaning)

When something bumps against a somewhat hard object, it can break up. Although the examples of (53) seem to be evidence demonstrating that the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is the Free Participial construction, other syntactic evidence shows this is not true.

4.2.2 Constituent Structure

For the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, at least three kinds of constituent structures can be posited.

First, three constituent structures corresponding to the sentence illustrated in (54) are shown in (55)-(57).
(54) Bill went screaming down the street yesterday.

(55)

```
(55) VP
    V'                   Adv
    V                  V'
    went              screaming
    PP                 down the hill
    yesterday
```

In (55), the main verb *went*, the *-ing* form verb *screaming*, and the prepositional phrase *down the hill* go together and make a V' constituent.

(56)

```
(56) VP
    V'                   Adv
    V                  V'
    went              V
    screaming           PP
    PP                 down the hill
    PP                 yesterday
```

In (56), a V' constituent is composed of the *-ing* form verb *screaming* and the prepositional phrase *down the hill*. In addition, this V' constituent makes a new constituent, labeled V', with the main verb *went*.

(57)

```
(57) VP
    V'                   Adv
    V                  V'
    went              PP
    screaming         PP
    PP                 down the hill
    PP                 yesterday
```

In (57), the main verb *went* and the *-ing* form verb *screaming* make a constituent, labeled V' for now, and then this V' constituent and the prepositional phrase *down the hill* make a large V' constituent.
All of the three kinds of constituent structures are plausible, but in fact one is correct and the others are not. In the following, the validity of each structure is checked by syntactic tests.

4.2.2.1 Tripartite Structure

A trifurcate constituent structure is suggested by Goldberg (2006: 50-52). She pointed out one thing for the constituent structure of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction from the evidence given in (58).

(58)  

a. Down the hill Bill went screaming.  
b. ??Screaming down the hill Bill went.  

(Goldberg 2006: 52)

She denied the constituent structure shown in (56) since the prepositional phrase down the hill can be fronted, but the -ing form verb and the prepositional phrase cannot be fronted together, as shown in (58b). That is, the -ing form verb (i.e., screaming) does not make a constituent with the prepositional phrase (i.e., down the hill). Furthermore, the examples illustrated in (58) give evidence that a prepositional phrase is not an argument of an -ing form verb in this construction.

She assumed only two constituent structures as to the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. One is the structure in (55) and the other is shown in (56). She argued for the structure in (55) by denying the structure in (56).

However, the evidence given in (58) is not enough to demonstrate the trifurcate constituent structure to be true because an adverb can intervene between an -ing form verb and prepositional phrase, as shown in (59), in contrast to (60).

(59)  

a. Bill went screaming loudly down the hill.  
b. Bill went running quickly down the hill.
(60)  a. *Bill went loudly screaming down the hill.

        b. *Bill went out screaming down the hill.

    As is well known, an adverb can only intervene between constituents. As the sentences illustrated in (60) show, neither an adverb nor a particle can occur between the main verb and the -ing form verb. The sentences in (59) seem to demonstrate that the -ing form verb does not make a constituent with the prepositional phrase (see 4.2.2.2), and those in (60) imply that the main verb and the -ing form verb make a constituent. For these reasons, this tripartite structure must be rejected. Thus, the sentences in (59) do not support the structure suggested by Goldberg.

4.2.2.2  Main Verb Independent Structure

The evidence shown in (59) seems to demonstrate that the structure shown in (56) is not plausible, but there is other evidence to show that the structure in (56) is plausible.

    If the structure in which a main verb is independent of a constituent composed of an -ing form verb and a prepositional phrase is plausible, the prepositional phrase is the argument of the -ing form verb. Nevertheless, as Goldberg notes about the sentences in (58), screaming cannot take an argument denoting a Path. The evidence Goldberg offers seems to reject the structure in (56). However, crashing can take a complement denoting a Path and this path expression is not the argument of a main verb, as shown in (61).³

(61)  a. She went crashing into him.

³In some examples of the Converbal Motion Constructions in which crash occurs as an -ing form verb, the -ing form verb cannot be deleted although Ando (2005: 236) notes that the -ing form verb in this construction is deletable. This fact is observed by Salkie (2010: 177-178) but he does not analyze it theoretically. I will discuss this phenomenon more deeply within the framework of Construction Grammar in a later section.
b. She crashed into him.

c. #She went into him. (intended meaning)

The constituent structure of this type of sentence may be the structure illustrated in (56). That is, crashing and into him are fronted together, as shown in (62).

(62) Crashing into him, she went.

In order to examine the constituent structure of the sentence in (61a), the do so test, adverb insertion, and fronting are applied. The do so test is formulated in relation to proverbialization facts. Although Jackendoff (1977: 58) notes the phrase do so can be replaced by V’, Radford (1988: 234) observes the phrase do so can be replaced not only by V’, but also by VP. Consider the following contrasts.

(63) a. John will [v' buy the book on Tuesday], and Paul will do so as well.

b. John will [v buy the book] on Tuesday, and Paul will do so on Thursday.

(64) a. John will [v put the book on the table], and Paul will do so as well.

b. *John will [put the book] on the table, and Paul will do so on the chair.

(Radford 1988: 234)

In (63), the phrase do so can replace either the VP, buy the book on Tuesday, or V’, buy the book. In (64), however, the phrase do so can only replace the V’, put the book on the table. These suggest that no argument can be outside do so and that the phrase do so can replace either V’ or VP with all arguments included within do so.

The results of the do so test for the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction are shown below.

(65) a. Mary [went crashing into Jack] on Monday and Jane did so on Tuesday, too.
b. *Mary went [crashing into Jack] on Monday and Jane went doing so on Tuesday, too.

The sentence in (65a) suggests that the string *went crashing into Jack* is V'. That is, in this construction, a prepositional phrase is an argument. Furthermore, the sentence illustrated in (65b) suggests that the -ing form verb *crashing* and the prepositional phrase *into Jack* do not make a V' constituent even though *into Jack* appears to be an argument of *crashing* as described in (61).\(^4\)

The evidence shown here demonstrates that the main verb independent structure in (56) is not plausible, and that the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is mono-clausal.

### 4.2.2.3 Complex Predicate Structure

Next I will talk about the complex predicate structure. In the structure in (57), the main verb *went* and *screaming* make a constituent V'. However, this constituent is apparently smaller than V' because *do so* cannot replace it, as shown in (66).

\[(66)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. John [v went screaming down the stairs] and Mary did so, too.} \\
\text{b. *John [went screaming] down the stairs and Mary did so up the stairs, too.}
\end{align*}\]

Thus, we need a new category, larger than V and smaller than V'.\(^5\)

Here, the constituent structure in which the main verb and the -ing form verb make a constituent and sentences suggesting such a structure are reviewed.

---

\(^4\)If we make a pause between *went* and *crashing* in the sentence in (65b), the resulting sentence may be accepted since the sentence can be interpreted as an example of the Free Participial construction. That is, the contrast in the sentences illustrated in (65) seems to be evidence rejecting the structure in (56) but if the string *crashing into Jack* is considered to be a subordinate clause, the result of the *do so* test can be changed.

\(^5\)Since the two verbs *went screaming* are morphologically two words, I avoid applying V to them.
(67)

(68)

a. *Bill went **loudly** screaming down the hill.

b. *Bill went **out** screaming down the hill.

I adopt $V'$ in my analysis. The newly created label is larger than $V^0$ but smaller than $V'$ (cf. Kageyama 1993, Booij 1990). The constituent structure applying the $V'$ is drawn below.

(69)

Here the $V'$ is a label for a complex predicate, composed of an inflecting verb and a non-finite form verb. The fact that a non-finite form verb such as *whistling* cannot take an argument (e.g., *a tune*) shows that the $V'$ is a complex predicate. That is, the argument structure of *went screaming* is different from that of *scream*.

I will give further evidence to support this suggestion that a main verb and an -ing form verb go together, and function as a complex predicate in this construction based on quantitative corpus data drawn from the *BNC* in the next section.
4.3 Corpus Studies

In this section, I will investigate the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction by utilizing corpus data. Furthermore, I will compare this construction with the Intransitive Motion Construction, and conclude that one construction is functionally different from the other. In order to collect examples of the two constructions, I conducted searches of all data matching the following syntactic schemata.

(70) a. Subj Verb (Motion Verb) Obl (The Intransitive Motion Construction)
    b. Subj Verb (Motion Verb) V-ing Obl (The Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction)

The corpus data shown below include statistically analyzed values as well as raw frequencies.

4.3.1 The Intransitive Motion Construction

Before looking at the corpus data of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, I will take a closer look at the Intransitive Motion Construction in light of the frequencies of the verbs appearing in it. There are 1,539 examples of this construction in the BNC.7

First of all, let us look at the examples of the Intransitive Motion Construction.

(71) a. Gazzer went into Bella’s room. (BNC-ACB)
    b. (…) he had come out of the darkness and was full of hope and plans. (BNC-ASC)

---

6 In the corpus investigation, all verbs listed as ‘verbs of motion’ (Levin 1993: 263-270) and ones listed in Matsumoto (1997: 130-140) are referred to.
7 As in the case of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, all verbs of motion listed in Levin (1993: 263-270) and Matsumoto (1997: 130-140) are considered. However, in this case, since the number of examples in the BNC is too large to survey, only 1% of all data are randomly sampled and considered.
a. As he strode towards the door, Ashley regarded him with cold eyes.  

b. A watery mist drifted along the corridors of the castle.

(73)  
a. She lowered her head and entered the Stygian darkness.  
b. When I reached the spot, I breathed in the herb’s mint/ammonia vapours and stared over the landscape.

I randomly sampled 1% (1,539 examples) of this construction from the BNC, and analyzed this construction. In 4.3.1.1, I will focus on the verbs and path expressions of this construction.

4.3.1.1 Verbs and Path Expressions in the Intransitive Motion Construction

In the Intransitive Motion Construction, many types of verbs occur. They are divided into three kinds based on semantic criteria: deictic motion verbs (e.g., go and come), manner of motion verbs (e.g., run and stagger) and path verbs (e.g., leave and reach). Deictic motion verbs are seen in (71), manner of motion verbs are in (72) and path verbs are in (73). There are 114 types of verbs in the 1,539 examples of the Intransitive Motion Construction, and deictic motion verbs occur 735 times (47.76%) and this is the most dominant type. As for deictic motion verbs, go occurs 424 times and come occurs 311 times. That is, go occurs more frequently than come in this construction. Manner of motion verbs occur 394 times (25.60%). Path verbs occur 284 times (18.45%).

Path, Talmy’s term, is also divided into three kinds: Source (e.g., from and out of), Via (e.g., across and towards) and Goal (e.g., to and into). Goal is found 638 times, Via 466 times and Source 261 times in this construction. In Table 4.1, path expressions

8There are some verbs that should not be grouped into these three kinds of verbs. For example, travel and move do not represent manner of motion. In this thesis, I classified these verbs as ‘Other.’
occurring more than 15 times in this construction are sorted into three kinds: **Source**, **Via** and **Goal**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>away</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>up</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>across</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>round</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>along</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>towards</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 261</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 466</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this construction, path expressions representing **Goal** (e.g., *to* and *into*) occur statistically more significantly than path expressions representing **Via** ($\chi^2=44.4698; df=1; p<.0001$). That is, this construction is **Goal**-oriented. The results are consistent with what Ikegami (1987) proposed. I will show that **Goal** is not dominant in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction in 4.3.2.

Next, let us look at the relation between verbs and path expressions in the Intransitive Motion Construction. Only the highest-frequency 10 intransitive motion verbs and their Path types in this construction are listed in Table 4.2.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\)Cases in which a path expression does not occur are classified into the x column.
As shown in Table 4.2, go, come, return, and arrive tend to be followed by path expressions representing Goal, while run is likely to be followed by path expressions representing Via. That is, some kinds of verbs prefer Via to Goal, and other kinds of verbs prefer Goal to Via. Go, come, return, and arrive do not represent manner of motion, whereas run is a manner of motion verb.

In order to generalize the relation between verb types and Path types, I summarized all verbs occurring in this construction in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>59 (13.9%)</td>
<td>128 (30.2%)</td>
<td>237 (55.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>85 (27.3%)</td>
<td>93 (29.9%)</td>
<td>133 (42.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave</td>
<td>4 (5.6%)</td>
<td>10 (14.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>56 (78.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move</td>
<td>8 (13.6%)</td>
<td>26 (44.1%)</td>
<td>25 (42.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reach</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>43 (91.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrive</td>
<td>5 (12.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>34 (87.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>run</td>
<td>6 (14.3%)</td>
<td>17 (48.6%)</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climb</td>
<td>4 (12.1%)</td>
<td>7 (21.2%)</td>
<td>13 (39.4%)</td>
<td>9 (27.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.9%)</td>
<td>23 (74.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.3, deictic motion verbs (e.g., go and come) prefer Goal to Via, whereas manner of motion verbs such as run and stagger prefer Via to Goal. Although
the reason the Intransitive Motion Construction is Goal-oriented may be that deictic motion verbs occur very frequently in this construction, this construction as a whole is Goal-oriented.

4.3.2 The Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction

Next, let us look at the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. I collected all examples of this construction in the BNC. There are 1,130 instances of this construction in the corpus, and all of these examples are analyzed.

4.3.2.1 Main Verbs and Path Expressions

In this subsection, I focus on main verbs and path expressions in this construction. There are only 13 types of main verbs: two types of deictic motion verbs; nine types of manner of motion verbs; and two types of other verbs. Deictic motion verbs (e.g., go and come) occur 1,071 times (94.8%) and these are the most dominant, whereas manner of motion verbs (e.g., run and fly) occur only 53 times (4.7%), and drop and move occur three times, respectively.10 As to Path, Goal is found 347 times, Via 582 times, and Source 261 times in this construction. The results of the corpus investigation of this construction are shown in Table 4.4 and Table 4.5.11

10The verbs drop and move do not represent manner of motion. Thus, they are classified as 'Other.'
11In Table 4.4, only path expressions occurring more than 15 times in this construction are listed.
As shown in Table 4.4, *down* occurs most frequently in this construction, path expressions representing *Via* occur statistically more significantly than path expressions representing *Goal* \((\chi^2=100.0798; \ df=1; \ p<.0001)\). In other words, *Via* is the most dominant in this construction. That is, this construction is 'Via-oriented', though the Intransitive Motion Construction is ‘Goal-oriented’ (see 4.3.1.1).

Moreover, the relation between main verbs and path expressions in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is shown in Table 4.5.
As shown in Table 4.5, *come* occurs more frequently than *go* in this construction (cf. 4.3.1.1). Moreover, deictic motion verbs (i.e., *go* and *come*) prefer Via to Goal (cf. 4.3.1.1). I will discuss this point in detail in 4.3.3.

### 4.3.2.2 Collostructional Analysis of Main Verbs

In this subsection, I examine how strongly this construction prefers *come* to *go* statistically. I apply Collostructional Analysis to the main verbs occurring in this construction. As I mentioned in Chapter 2, Collostructional Analysis is a method to measure the interaction of a verb and a construction associated with it.

The results of Collostructional Analysis of the main verbs in this construction are given in Table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs (n)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>come</em> (844)</td>
<td>156 (18.5%)</td>
<td>431 (51.1%)</td>
<td>257 (30.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>go</em> (227)</td>
<td>31 (13.7%)</td>
<td>129 (56.8%)</td>
<td>67 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>run</em> (37)</td>
<td>9 (24.3%)</td>
<td>16 (43.2%)</td>
<td>12 (32.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fly</em> (6)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>drop</em> (3)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>move</em> (3)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stride</em> (2)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stagger</em> (2)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>march</em> (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rush</em> (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>roll</em> (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>shamble</em> (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>slide</em> (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>walk</em> (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td>201 (17.8%)</td>
<td>582 (51.5%)</td>
<td>347 (30.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6: Collostructional Strength of Inflecting Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>come</em> (844)</td>
<td>Infinite</td>
<td><em>drop</em> (3)</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>go</em> (227)</td>
<td>140.061</td>
<td><em>march</em> (1)</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>run</em> (37)</td>
<td>23.375</td>
<td><em>slide</em> (1)</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fly</em> (6)</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td><em>rush</em> (3)</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stagger</em> (2)</td>
<td>2.926</td>
<td><em>roll</em> (1)</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stride</em> (1)</td>
<td>2.179</td>
<td><em>move</em> (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>shamble</em> (2)</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td><em>walk</em> (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that *come* is very strongly associated with the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. On the other hand, *go* is not so strongly associated with this construction. From these results, I conclude this construction is indubitably *come*-oriented.

### 4.3.2.3 -Ing Form Verbs in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction

Unlike the Intransitive Motion Construction, the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction involves an -ing form verb. The high-frequency -ing form verbs are listed in (74).


As shown in (74), manner of motion verbs such as *running* and *rushing* tend to occur frequently, but action verbs such as *screaming* can be seen in this construction.

---

12The ‘Infinite’ means a word associates with a construction so strongly that we cannot calculate the value. For your information, I use the negative logarithm to the base of ten of the exact p-value, following Gries, Hampe, and Schönfeld (2005: 648).
4.3.2.4 Collostructional Analysis of -ing Form Verbs

Next, I apply Collostructional Analysis to -ing form verbs occurring in this construction. Since the data is very large, I cannot show all results of this analysis. Thus, I show only a part of the data in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Collostructional Strength of -ing Form Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>running (121)</td>
<td>128.492</td>
<td>walking (18)</td>
<td>28.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rushing (62)</td>
<td>115.540</td>
<td>bounding (17)</td>
<td>27.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flying (47)</td>
<td>82.268</td>
<td>bursting (15)</td>
<td>25.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crashing (44)</td>
<td>61.663</td>
<td>riding (14)</td>
<td>24.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurtling (24)</td>
<td>60.901</td>
<td>roaring (14)</td>
<td>24.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tumbling (24)</td>
<td>48.874</td>
<td>trotting (14)</td>
<td>24.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurrying (23)</td>
<td>37.294</td>
<td>pouring (13)</td>
<td>22.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>screaming (22)</td>
<td>36.307</td>
<td>storming (13)</td>
<td>21.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charging (17)</td>
<td>36.126</td>
<td>galloping (12)</td>
<td>18.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>striding (20)</td>
<td>32.959</td>
<td>barging (11)</td>
<td>17.881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that running, rushing, crashing, and flying are strongly attracted to this construction. The reason running and rushing are attracted to this construction is that they represent physically energetic actions. Examples in which attracted -ing form verbs occur, are given in (75).

(75) a. She came running down the stairs. (BNC-HGV)

b. And Manyara came rushing out of the temple. (BNC-F72)

a. She might even fall into the telescope lens and go crashing down upon herself. (BNC-H8S)

b. The bullet goes flying over my head and lands in the field behind me. (BNC-B0P)
Most verbs in Table 4.7 are manner of motion verbs representing physically energetic action. However, the collostructional strength of *screaming*, an action verb, is high. This is because it represents perceptually salient action.

**4.3.2.5 The Interaction between Main Verbs and -ing Form Verbs**

Next, let us look at the interaction between main verbs and -ing form verbs in this construction. Is there a characteristic relation between main verbs and -ing form verbs in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction? Either a deictic motion verb (e.g., *go*) or a manner of motion verb (e.g., *stagger*) occurs as an inflection verb, and either a manner of motion verb (e.g., *running*) or an action verb (e.g., *screaming*) occurs as a non-finite form verb. That is, there are four combination patterns regarding the co-occurring relation between the two verbs as in (76).\(^{13}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(76)} & \quad \bullet \text{ A Deictic Motion Verb} \quad \times \quad \text{A Manner of Motion Verb} \\
& \quad \bullet \text{ A Deictic Motion Verb} \quad \times \quad \text{An Action Verb} \\
& \quad \bullet \text{ A Manner of Motion Verb} \quad \times \quad \text{A Manner of Motion Verb} \\
& \quad \bullet \text{ A Manner of Motion Verb} \quad \times \quad \text{An Action Verb}
\end{align*}
\]

Indeed, all of these four patterns are found in the 1,124 examples drawn from the BNC, but the frequency of instances of each pattern is skewed. The results from classifying 1,124 examples into four patterns are given in Table 4.8.

---

\(^{13}\)As I have already noted, *drop* (3) and *move* (3) are excluded
Table 4.8: Tendency as to the Combination of Main Verbs and -ing Form Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manner of Motion Verbs</th>
<th>Action Verbs</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deictic Motion Verbs</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner of Motion Verbs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 179.649; \text{df}=1; p<.0001$ (Yates’s Correction)

The upper left cell, in which deictic motion verbs occur as main verbs and manner of motion verbs as -ing form verbs, is most productive. On the other hand, the lower left cell, in which both verbs are manner of motion verbs, is non-productive. The other two cells in the right row, in which -ing form verbs are action verbs, are intermediately productive. Examples of each cell in Table 4.8 are given in (77).

(77)  

a. A huge dog came running towards me.  

(bNC-H9U)  

(A Deictic Motion Verb x A Manner of Motion Verb)

b. She went humming upstairs to clean the bathroom.  

(BNC-ASE)  

(A Deictic Motion Verb x An Action Verb)

c. The woman ran zigzagging into a cleft on the opposite side of the gulley.  

(BNC-F9X)  

(A Manner of Motion Verb x A Manner of Motion Verb)

d. A mother ran screaming from the building.  

(BNC-CH2)  

(A Manner of Motion Verb x An Action Verb)

When a deictic motion verb occurs as a main verb, a manner of motion verb is likely to co-occur to represent a manner of motion. On the other hand, when a manner of motion verb occurs as a main verb, an action verb is likely to co-occur to represent an accompanying action. A manner of motion verb rarely co-occurs with another manner
of motion verb. This is because we cannot, for example, run during walking.

4.3.2.6 Summary of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction

We have looked at the results of a corpus investigation of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. The big picture of this construction shows that *come*, a marked deictic motion verb, occurs as a main verb more frequently than *go*. That is, it came into clear view that this construction is not ‘*GOAL*-oriented.’ In addition, we found *-ing form* verbs expressing physically energetic or perceptually salient actions such as *running* and *screaming* are likely to occur in this construction.

4.3.3 Comparing Path Expressions in the Two Constructions

In this subsection, I compare path expressions in the two constructions based on the data I have shown so far. First, I show how different the distribution of frequencies associated with path expressions is. Table 4.9 shows an overview.

Table 4.9: Distribution of Path Expressions in Two Intransitive Motion Constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Intransitive Motion Construction</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2=85.224; \text{df}=2; p<.0001 \]

Table 4.9 shows that path expressions representing *GOAL* tend to occur more often in the Intransitive Motion Construction, whereas path expressions representing *Via* are more likely to occur in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction.

In order to show the correlation between verbal types and Path types, Cluster Analysis, a multivariable statistical method, is applied. Cluster Analysis is a method
of grouping a set of objects graphically. For example, Gries and Stefanowitsch (2005) use this method of grouping verbs occurring in the Ditransitive Construction.

My analysis was restricted to manner of motion verbs occurring more than five times and two deictic motion verbs in the Intransitive Motion Construction and *go* and *come* in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. These 25 verbs are the treated as cases and three path types are treated as variables in this analysis. The data is summarized in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>run</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jump</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slip</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rush</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stumble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crawl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dash</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>march</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go-ing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come-ing</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Distribution of Path Expressions of Verbs (Raw Frequencies)

In order to apply Cluster Analysis, I converted variables in Table 4.10 to standardized form (z-scores). The standardized data is summarized in Table 4.11.

---

14Cases in which path expressions do not occur are excluded.
Table 4.11: Distribution of Path Expressions of Verbs (z-scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>run</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>0.9684</td>
<td>-1.0289</td>
<td>stride</td>
<td>-1.0911</td>
<td>0.8729</td>
<td>0.2182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climb</td>
<td>-0.8729</td>
<td>-0.2182</td>
<td>1.0911</td>
<td>swing</td>
<td>-0.7044</td>
<td>1.1446</td>
<td>-0.4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fly</td>
<td>-0.7835</td>
<td>-0.3428</td>
<td>1.1263</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td>-0.8006</td>
<td>-0.3203</td>
<td>1.1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive</td>
<td>-1.0507</td>
<td>0.9401</td>
<td>0.1106</td>
<td>slide</td>
<td>-0.5774</td>
<td>1.1547</td>
<td>-0.5774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jump</td>
<td>0.3203</td>
<td>0.8006</td>
<td>-1.1209</td>
<td>crawl</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wander</td>
<td>-0.2182</td>
<td>1.0911</td>
<td>-0.8729</td>
<td>dash</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurry</td>
<td>-1.0596</td>
<td>0.9272</td>
<td>0.1325</td>
<td>flee</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
<td>-1.1547</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slip</td>
<td>0.8006</td>
<td>0.3203</td>
<td>-1.1209</td>
<td>march</td>
<td>0.2182</td>
<td>0.8729</td>
<td>-1.0911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rush</td>
<td>-1.1547</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>-0.9174</td>
<td>-0.1486</td>
<td>1.0660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stumble</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>-0.7259</td>
<td>-0.4148</td>
<td>1.1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drift</td>
<td>-0.5774</td>
<td>1.1547</td>
<td>-0.5774</td>
<td>go -ing</td>
<td>-0.9011</td>
<td>1.0759</td>
<td>-0.1748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leap</td>
<td>-1.1547</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
<td>come -ing</td>
<td>-0.9010</td>
<td>1.0759</td>
<td>-0.1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sail</td>
<td>1.0911</td>
<td>-0.2182</td>
<td>-0.8729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of Cluster Analysis is shown in Figure 4.1. The similarity between cases is measured by Euclidean distance, and the linkage method used here is complete linkage.
In Cluster Analysis, similar cases (i.e., verbs) are grouped together in an earlier stage. For example, in Figure 4.1, go and come in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction (i.e., go-ing and come-ing) are grouped in a very early stage, and then they are grouped in another cluster composed of stumble and crawl.

The most interesting point in Figure 4.1 is that deictic motion verbs (i.e., go and come) in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction belong to a cluster composed
of many kinds of manner of motion verbs. On the other hand, *go* and *come* in the Intransitive Motion Construction belong to another cluster composed of *flee, climb, come, fly,* and *walk.*

From Figure 4.1, I conclude that *go* and *come* in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction tend to co-occur with path expressions representing V\textsubscript{IA}. This is because, as I have noted in 4.3.1.1, manner of motion verbs in the Intransitive Motion Construction are likely to be followed by path expressions representing V\textsubscript{IA}. In fact there is no significant difference between deictic motion verbs in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction and manner of motion verbs in the Intransitive Motion Verbs in regard to Path types, as shown in Table 4.11.\textsuperscript{15}

Table 4.12: Deictic Motion Verbs in CIMC and Manner of Motion Verbs in IMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>V\textsubscript{IA}</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deictic Motion Verbs in CIMC</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner of Motion Verbs in IMC</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2=3.932; \text{df}=2; p=.140 \]

Considering these facts as to the relation between verbs and path expressions, I can explain why path expressions representing V\textsubscript{IA} are likely to occur in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction (see 4.3.2.1). Manner of motion verbs in the Intransitive Motion Construction tend to be followed by path expressions representing V\textsubscript{IA}, whereas deictic motion verbs (i.e., *go* and *come*) tend to be followed by those representing Goal or Source (see 4.3.1.1). However, *go* and *come* occurring in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction are likely to be followed by particles or prepositional phrases representing V\textsubscript{IA}. This is because -\textit{ing} form verbs representing a manner of

\textsuperscript{15}The CIMC stands for the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, and the IMC stands for the Intransitive Motion Construction.
motion or an accompanying action follow these verbs, and these complex predicates function like manner of motion verbs. In short, when a manner of motion verb is used, the process of motion is focused, whereas when a speaker pays attention to the result of motion, a deictic motion verb tends to be used.

4.3.4 Summary of Corpus Study

In this section, I have shown various kinds of data associated with two kinds of intransitive motion constructions, and analyzed the data statistically. As a result, the characteristics of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction have been revealed.

First, this construction is very strongly attracted to *come* rather than *go*. Second, high-frequency non-finite form verbs occurring in this construction represent physically energetic and perceptually salient actions. Third, this construction is V1A-oriented, in contradiction to the nature of language.

4.4 Theoretical Discussion

In this section, I discuss these properties of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction from the perspective of Construction Grammar. First of all, I define the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction as a pair of form and meaning as shown in (78).

(78)  

a. Subj V V-ing Obl

b. X GO Y with/ by V-ing

As I have noted in Chapter 1, each construction occupies a ‘niche’ in the grammatical system of a language. In other words, a construction is necessarily different from
another construction functionally/semantically. Then, what kind of ’niche’ does the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction occupy? In this section, I answer this question theoretically.

4.4.1 Functional Explanation

The reason why the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction exists is that it occupies a constructional ’niche’ in the grammatical system in English. First, the most prototypical examples of this construction are given in (79).

(79)  

a. Emma **came running** towards her (⋯).  

   (BNC-HWE)  

b. He **came rushing** across the garden (⋯).  

   (BNC-ADS)  

c. It **came crashing** through the window.  

   (BNC-G07)

In the examples in (79), a marked deictic motion verb (i.e., *come*) is followed by -ing form verbs, representing a physically energetic manner of motion. In addition, a path expression representing V1A follows a non-finite form verb. The Intransitive Motion Construction expresses the same events in (79) as the sentences in (80)-(81) illustrate.

(80)  

a. Emma **ran** towards her.  

b. He **rushed** across the garden.  

c. It **crashed** through the window.

(81)  

a. Emma **came** towards her.  

b. He **came** across the garden.  

c. It **came** through the window.

Each sentence in (80) involves only a manner of motion verb, and thus information associated with deixis is not involved. Each sentence in (81) involves only a deictic
motion verb, and thus information associated with manner of motion is not involved. On the other hand, the examples given in (82) are not prototypical examples of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction in that the main verb is *go* and the path expression is *to*. These non-prototypical examples can be replaced by simpler examples shown in (82)-(83) without the loss of significant meaning.

(82)  
   a. My son **went running** to Irene’s house to see what was the matter.  
       (BNC-HH3)  
   b. When he had leisure he **went bicycling** to Lincolnshire village churches.  
       (BNC-A68)  

(83)  
   a. My son **ran** to Irene’s house to see what was the matter.  
   b. When he had leisure he **bicycled** to Lincolnshire village churches.

Moreover, this construction has another grammatical character. Look at the examples in (84), where action verbs such as *muttering* and *crying* follow a deictic motion verb or a manner of motion verb.

(84)  
   a. The old woman shouldered her bag again, giving him a baleful look, and **went muttering** away.  
       (BNC-FUB)  
   b. Looking up, he saw me, and at once jumped up and **ran crying** in terror into the bushes!  
       (BNC-HGS)  

These examples cannot be replaced by simplex predicate constructions, as shown below.

(85)  
   a. *The old woman shouldered her bag again, and **muttered** away.  
   b. *He saw me, and at once jumped and **cried** in terror into the bushes.
This is the reason why an action verb as an -ing form verb follows a motion verb in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction.\textsuperscript{16} In other words, when we need to refer to an accompanying action, we cannot help using this construction.

For these reasons, the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction functions differently from the Intransitive Motion Construction, and occupies a ’niche’ in the English grammatical system. These results do not conflict with suggestions by Goldberg (1995: 67). Goldberg argues that one construction is different from another semantically/functionally. That is, this construction plays a different role from the Intransitive Motion Construction even though it is not as productive as the unmarked construction.

4.4.2 Four Subconstructions

As discussed in Chapter 2, Goldberg (1995) assumes constructions, pairs of meaning and form, are independent of verbs. However, as I discussed in Chapter 2, I pay attention to each component of a complex predicate. In the following, I assume four kinds of subconstructions of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction.

4.4.2.1 Subject V MotionV-ing Real Path

First look at the most prototypical and productive subconstruction, where an -ing form verb is a manner of motion verb. Examples of this subconstruction are given below.

(86) \begin{enumerate}
\item Colley the Mason \textbf{came blundering} through the crowds (⋯). \quad (BNC-HTN)
\item The dumpy woman \textbf{went bustling} into a large stone flagged kitchen (⋯)
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{16}Some sound emission verbs such as \textit{whistle} are used in the Intransitive Motion Construction.
The Path argument, through the crowds and into a large stone flagged kitchen, are relevant to either a main verb or a non-finite form verb since both of the two verbs can take a Path argument.

4.4.2.2 Subject V ActionV-ing Real Path

Secondly, look at the subconstruction in which an -ing form verb is an action verb. Examples of this subconstruction are given in (87).

(87)  a. Hysterically light with fear, I ran sobbing to my room. (BNC-FU7)

b. She turned to look at the registrar as he strode smiling into the room (⋯) (BNC-JY0)

In this subconstruction, an action verb such as sob or smile does not require a Path argument when used in the Intransitive Motion Construction. Thus, to my room and into the room are not relevant to the -ing form verbs. In other words, the directional phrase following an -ing form verb is relevant to a main verb such as run and stride.

4.4.2.3 Subject V crash-typeV-ing pseudo Path

The third subconstruction is a little tricky because the prepositional phrase does not in fact represent Path, and I call such a prepositional phrase ‘pseudo Path.’ Examples of this subconstruction are given below.

(88) She prayed for Oliver to come crashing into the flat (⋯). (BNC-GV2)

In the example in (88), the subject referent does not come into the flat. That is, the preposition, into, represents just a Goal of motion, and the sentence in (89) is acceptable.

(89) Oliver came crashing into the flat, but he didn’t come into the flat.
This fact means that this pseudo Path argument is not relevant to a main verb (i.e., come). It is relevant to an -ing form verb (i.e., crashing).

### 4.4.2.4 Subject go sprawling location Path

The last subconstruction is very specific because both the main verb and the -ing form verb are fixed to go and sprawling, and a prepositional phrase represents ‘location Path.’ There are only two examples of this subconstruction in the BNC, and the examples are given in (90).

(90) a. (…) as yet another pilgrim went sprawling on the wet peat. (BNC-CHH)

   b. (…) she lost her balance and went sprawling on the floor. (BNC-H8F)

The complex predicate, go sprawling, represents ‘fall over’, and such a meaning is derived from go, sprawl and a prepositional phrase. After a subject referent went sprawling on the floor, he/she will sprawl on the floor. Thus, the prepositional phrase in (90) is relevant not to go but to sprawling, but it is not the argument of sprawling. The prepositional phrases on the wet peat and on the floor seem to represent Location. However, these prepositional phrases are interpreted as Path in this subconstruction. That is, the meaning of this subconstruction can be reduced to each component constituting the complex predicate go sprawling and a prepositional phrase.

### 4.4.3 Goldberg’s Approach to the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction

Now, I apply Goldberg’s Construction Grammar to the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. This construction is represented as follows.
This construction has two argument roles: Theme and Path. The Theme argument fuses with the participant roles of both verbs. In the example in (91), Both the Theme argument and the Path argument of this construction are fused with the participant roles of both come and running.

(91) He came running back from the grave (\ldots). (BNC-K8S)

The composite fused structure of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction with come and running is represented as follows.
Figure 4.3: Composite fused structure of the CIMC (come and running)

However, the Path argument role does not necessarily fuse with the participant roles of both verbs. In (92), the Path argument fuses with only a participant role of the inflecting verb since the action verb (i.e., sob) cannot take a Path argument in the Intransitive Motion Construction.

(92) Hysterically light with fear, I ran sobbing to my room. (BNC-FU7)

The composite fused structure of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction with run and sobbing is represented as follows.

Figure 4.4: Composite fused structure of the CIMC (run and sobbing)

In the examples in (93), the Path argument fuses with only the participant roles of
the -ing form verbs.\footnote{When an -ing form verb is\textit{ sprawling}, a prepositional phrase is not the argument of the verb. Nevertheless, since such a prepositional phrase is relevant to \textit{ sprawling} in this construction, \textit{ sprawl} is the argument.}

(93) a. She prayed for Oliver to\textbf{ come crashing} into the flat (\ldots) \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} (BNC-GV2)

b. (\ldots) she lost her balance and\textbf{ went sprawling} on the floor. \hspace{1cm} (BNC-H8F)

The composite fused structure of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction with \textit{go} and \textit{ sprawling} is represented as follows.\footnote{Figure 4.5: Composite fused structure of the CIMC (\textit{go} and \textit{ sprawling})}

In this pattern in Figure 4.5, the sprawl.loc is fused with the(PATH) argument associated with this construction. As the result of fusion, the sprawl.loc is interpreted as a PATH. If it were not for the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction as an argument structure construction, such expressions as (93) would not be created.

4.4.4 A Network of Subconstructions of the CIMC

So far, we have looked at the four subconstructions of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. Figure 4.6 shows how these subconstructions are combined (see also Langacker 1987; 1991).
The most productive subconstruction is the Subj V MotionV-ing Real PATH subconstruction, in which a prepositional phrase is necessarily relevant to either a main verb or a non-finite form verb. The reason why this subconstruction is most productive is that an -ing form verb is a manner of motion verb. Comparing manner of motion with accompanying action, manner of motion has a deeper relationship with this construction because this construction represents motion events. Manner of motion (e.g., running and staggering) is an act, relevant to the locomotion of a subject referent, whereas accompanying action (e.g., whistling and smiling) is an act, not directly relevant to locomotion. For this reason, the Subj V ActionV-ing Real PATH subconstruction is less productive than the Subj MotionV-ing Real PATH subconstruction.

It should be noted that a common grammatical character is shared by the Subj V MotionV-ing Real PATH subconstruction and the Subj V ActionV-ing Real PATH subconstruction. Obliques in both subconstructions are PATH arguments. According to this common feature, a schematic construction, Subj V V-ing Real PATH, is formed. Of 1,130 regarded as a verb that has two participant roles in this thesis.\footnote{The participant role, sprawl.loc, represents a LOCATION associated with sprawl.}
examples, most cases are subsumed by this schematic construction. However, the Subj V crash-typeV-ing Pseudo Pатх subconstruction is not subsumed by the schematic construction because the Oblique in the subconstruction is not a pure Pатх argument, as shown in (94).

\[(94)\] She prayed for Oliver to come crashing into the flat \(\cdots\). \(=\) (88)

Thus, this subconstruction is formed as an extensional construction from a schematic construction, Subj V V-ing Real Pатх.

In addition, a schematic construction, the Subj V V-ing Pатх, and the Subj V crash-typeV-ing Pseudo Pатх subconstruction share a commonality. That is, the obliques in both constructions are physical Pатх. According to this commonality, a schematic construction, the Subj V V-ing physical Pатх, is formed.

Furthermore, the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction subsumes another subconstruction, the Subj go sprawling Location Pатх subconstruction. In this construction, obliques such as on the wet peat and on the floor are Pатх arguments of neither main verbs nor -ing form verbs, as shown in (95)=(90).

\[(95)\] a. \((\cdots)\) as yet another pilgrim went sprawling on the wet peat. \(\text{(BNC-CHH)}\)

b. \((\cdots)\) she lost her balance and went sprawling on the floor. \(\text{(BNC-H8F)}\)

This network is based on the Usage-based Model attributed to Langacker (1990; 2000), where a schematic construction is formed by abstracting commonalities from more concrete expressions. After a schematic unit is formed, we create innovative expressions from the schema. All of the 1,130 examples of this construction contribute to form a highly schematic unit, and they are instances of the schematic constructions as well.
4.4.5 Predictability of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction

As I noted in 4.3, a corpus investigation has revealed the nature of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. For example, *come* occurs more frequently than *go*, and *come* tends to co-occur with *running* and *rushing*. These facts cannot be predicted from only the meaning of *come* or *running*. However, we can explain why this construction has such preferences in other terms: this corpus study shows that one construction is different from another construction functionally and/or semantically.

How about some rhetorical expressions of this construction? An example of such an expression is given in (96).

(96) Someone’s going to **go flying** if you don’t pick up these toys.  

(OALD$^{6\text{th}}$)

As Ando (2005: 237) points out, such an expression as (96) is, to some extent, idiosyncratic. This is because the complex predicate *go flying* can mean ‘tumbling to one’s knees.’ Such a meaning is observable in the example of the Subj *go sprawling* subconstruction, as well. In these expressions, a somewhat dynamic meaning, ‘falling down’ or ‘tumbling to one’s knees,’ emerges. Or perhaps, such a dynamic meaning is attributed to the prototypical meaning of this construction (see 4.3).

As I have already discussed syntactically, this construction is mono-clausal even though two verbs occur in a single clause. In addition, in terms of constituent structure, the two verbs constitute a single complex predicate. This complex predicate behaves like a single predicate, and a dynamic meaning emerges.
4.4.6 Summary of Theoretical Discussion

The Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is apparently a marked construction since it involves two verbs, and at first glance, this construction seems to be unnecessary in that most motion events can be expressed by the Intransitive Motion Construction. However, a closer look at each grammatical element through a corpus investigation demonstrates how this construction is different from the Intransitive Motion Construction.

In addition, in order to notice such differences between the two intransitive motion constructions, it is necessary to recognize argument structure constructions. It is not until we look at the whole of a construction that we can shed light on a ‘niche’ a construction occupies. Moreover, networks of subconstructions are very important to understand the meaning of each expression. If we deny the most schematic constructions, we may not understand why the idiomatic expressions such as go sprawling and go flying get so dynamic a meaning.

4.5 Summary

I first examined the constituent structure of this construction, and collected all examples of this construction in the BNC. As a result, important facts are revealed. i) An inflection verb and a non-finite form verb constitute a complex predicate. From the resulting data, I found grammatical features unique to this construction: come-orientation and Via-orientation. In order to account for the skewed corpus data, I compared this construction with the Intransitive Motion Construction. The results of the comparison show that one construction is different from the other semantically/functionally. That
is, the Intransitive Motion Construction is go-oriented and Goal-oriented, unlike the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. Moreover, I discussed the grammatical features of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction from the perspective of Construction Grammar and the Usage-based Model, and showed the relation between its subconstructions.

A closer look at the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction contributes not only to detailed descriptions of the construction but also to the theory of Construction Grammar. Such detailed descriptions of the construction through a corpus investigation suggest each construction occupies a ‘niche’ in a language system, and the Usage-based Model proposed by Langacker (1990; 2000) is involved in the emergence of innovative expressions.

There is another construction, in which go and come is followed by an -ing form verb, but this construction is different from the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction in several points. I will examine such a construction in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

The Converbal Purposive Motion Construction

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses another construction in which a deictic motion verb is followed by a non-finite (-ing) form verb, given in (97) and (98).¹

(97)  
1. We **went shopping** in Brighton. (BNC-FB9)
2. We used to **go swimming** there a lot. (BNC-KC4)

(98)  
3. He always **came looking for** her. (BNC-BP1)
4. Once, Ken **came knocking** at her door. (BNC-J0W)

An -ing form verb such as **shopping** and **looking for**, following a deictic motion verb (i.e., go and come), represents the purpose of moving somewhere. Thus, I name this construction the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction.² I assume that this construction has two subconstructions. One is a subconstruction in which an -ing form

---

¹This chapter is built on Morishita (2011b; 2013b).
²In this construction, the term 'converb' is used in a broader sense than usual.
verb represents a recreational activity. The other is a subconstruction in which an -ing form verb represents a searching or visiting activity. In the former subconstruction, for example in (97a), the subject referents shopped after they had arrived at Brighton. On the other hand, in the latter subconstruction, for example in (98a), the subject referent is looking for a person while he is moving.

The semantic relation that the -ing form verb has to the main verb in this construction is different from that seen in the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, in which the -ing form verb represents a manner of motion or an accompanying action, as dealt with in the last chapter. We cannot predict why the -ing form has the semantic relation of 'purpose' to the main verb in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction.

This construction is discussed by Visser (1973), Silva (1975), Bolinger (1983), Wierzbicka (1988), Dixon (2005), Schlüter (2005), Swan (2005), and Salkie (2010). In 5.3.1, I will look at the constraint Salkie (2010) proposed. In 5.4, I will discuss the meaning of deictic motion verbs in this construction, and consider what Visser (1973), Dixon (2005), and Schlüter (2005) proposed. In 5.5.1, I will see what Silva (1975) and Swan (2005) pointed out. In 5.5.3, I will refer to Bolinger’s (1983) proposal.

The most salient point of this construction is that a particle or a prepositional phrase representing a Path cannot follow an -ing form verb, as shown in (99) and (100), at least for most speakers.3 4

(99) a. *We went shopping to Brighton.

3 Of course, when the -ing form verb swimming in (99b) is interpreted as a verb representing not a purpose but a manner of motion, the sentence is taken to be grammatical. Moreover, when we say We went shopping in the evening to the mall, a Path argument can occur (personal communication: Nishihara Toshiaki). This expression may not be an example of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, but I cannot explain why such an expression can be allowed.

4 The sentences in (99) and (100) can be accepted by speakers of some dialects, but these sentences are treated as ungrammatical in most previous studies (e.g., Swan 2005). Thus, I discuss this construction, following Swan (2005).
b. *We used to go swimming to the shore.

(100)  

a. *He came looking for her to the town.

b. *Ken came knocking to her door.

This ungrammatical character distinguishes this construction from the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction.

Generative Grammar has accounted for the number and kind of complements a verb takes in terms of subcategorization in a lexical entry as in (101).

(101)  

a. go: V, [PP]

b. come: V, [PP]

Subcategorization frames in (101) indicate that both go and come take a prepositional phrase as an argument, and these subcategorization frames are satisfied in the sentences in (102).\(^5\)

(102)  

a. Mary went to the shopping mall.

b. John came to the room.

In the sentences in (102), as you can see, both went and came take a prepositional phrase, to the shopping mall or to the room, representing a path expression.

I examine the reason why go and come in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction do not take a prepositional phrase as an argument. This might be because the meanings of go and come in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction are different from those of go and come in the Intransitive Motion Construction shown in (102). In

\(^5\) In fact, both go and come may occur without prepositional phrases in sentences. That is, these verbs may or may not co-occur with prepositional phrases. However, in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, it is a necessity that any prepositional phrase representing a path expression does not follow an -ing form verb.
fact, Visser (1973), Dixon (2005), and Schlüter (2005) claim that the meanings of go and come had bleached (see 5.4.1). That is, the inability of go and come to take a directional argument might be due to the meanings of these verbs.

I argue that the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction is mono-clausal. Moreover, there are two constraints on this construction: the subject in this construction is limited to a human being or a higher animal, and the -ing form verb must be atelic. I will present not only syntactic evidence to show the mono-clausality of this construction but also semantic evidence to show the constraints on the subject and telicity of this construction.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. Section 2 will examine the syntactic structure of this construction. Section 3 will theoretically discuss constraints on the subject and telicity of this construction. Section 4 will discuss the meanings of the deictic motion verbs (i.e., go and come), and the argument structures of these verbs based on two kinds of semantic tests suggested by Quine (1960), McCawley (1967), and others. Section 5 will show the results of a corpus investigation of this construction. More than 1,600 instances were drawn from the BNC, and they were statistically analyzed to give a solid examination of this construction, and Section 6 will conclude my discussion.

5.2 Syntactic Properties

Before examining the syntactic structure of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, I compare this construction with the Free Participial Construction. The deictic motion verb in the main clause of the Free Participial Construction takes a directional argument. Moreover, there are few examples in which the -ing form in a subordinate clause of the Free Participial Construction represents 'purpose' of going or coming
somewhere.\footnote{In fact, according to Kortmann (1995: 216-217), only a few (2.3\%) \textit{-ing} forms of the Free Participial Construction can represent a purpose. Most \textit{-ing} forms in the Free Participial Construction represent ‘accompanying action’ (15.4\%), ‘simultaneity’ (14.4\%), ‘exemplification/specification’ (13.5\%), ‘cause’ (12.9\%), ‘anteriority’ (8.6\%), and ‘result’ (7.4\%).}

In examples of the Free Participial Construction, a clause headed by an \textit{-ing} form verb is obviously a subordinated clause. In other words, the Free Participial Construction is apparently bi-clausal. In the next subsection, I will show that the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction is not bi-clausal.

5.2.1 Constituent Structure

First, we consider which words are grouped together in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction to show how \textit{come} and \textit{go} are related to an \textit{-ing} form verb. The results of the \textit{do so} replacement are shown below.

(103) a. We \textbf{[vp went shopping in Brighton]} and they \textbf{did so}, too.

b. We \textbf{[v went shopping]} in Brighton and they \textbf{did so} in Eastbourne, too.

c. *We \textbf{[went] shopping in Brighton} and they \textbf{did so} hiking in Eastbourne, too.

d. *We went \textbf{[shopping]} in Brighton and they went \textbf{doing so} in Eastbourne, too.

The results shown in (103c) and (103d) mean that both \textit{went} and \textit{shopping} must be within V’ because no phrase within V’ can appear outside \textit{do so}. In addition, the result of (103b) shows that \textit{went} and \textit{shopping} make a V’ constituent. Furthermore, (103b) shows that a prepositional phrase such as \textit{in Brighton} is out of V’ and thus it is not an argument.

In order to take a closer look at constituent structure, I present other evidence. If a phrase makes a constituent with another, these two cannot be separated by an adverb. 
In fact an adverb such as *slowly* or *hastily* cannot be put between a main verb and an
-ing form verb, as shown in (104).

(104)  a. *We went *slowly* hiking in Eastbourne.
    b. *We went *hastily* shopping in Brighton.

The results of the adverb insertion shown in (104) give evidence demonstrating that a
deictic motion verb and an -ing from verb make up a constituent.

Evidence shown in this subsection suggests that this construction is mono-clausal.

In the next section, I will discuss constraints on this mono-clausal construction.

5.3 Constraints on the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction

There are some constraints on the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction described
in the literature. However, scholars have not discussed why such constraints are
imposed on this construction. In this section, I will give a reason for the constraints.

5.3.1 A human subject constraint

First, consider the constraint on the subject of the Converbal Purposive Motion Con-
struction shown in (105).

(105)  a. *John went swimming in the river.
    b. *The fish went swimming in the river.

Salkie (2010) claims that only humans can be subjects and other animals like fish cannot
in this construction. On the other hand, both *go* and *swim* can take a non-human subject
in the Intransitive Motion Construction, as shown in the examples of (106)-(107).7

---

7A similar constraint is imposed on a construction called the Light Verb Construction, as shown in (iii).
(106) a. John went to the shore.
    b. The fish went to the shore.

(107) a. John swam to the shore.
    b. The fish swam to the shore.

However, I found some examples in which an animal is the subject of this construction, as shown in (108).

(108) a. The bear used to go hunting (\textit{...}). \hfill (BNC-G1A)
    b. When bees go food-collecting in the tropics (\textit{...}). \hfill (BNC-EFF)

The examples in (108) show that Salkie’s (2010) proposal is not correct. Since the events represented by this construction are somewhat complex, the subject referent has to plan ahead to going somewhere. Fish cannot plan ahead to swim, but higher animals (or insects) such as bears can plan ahead to hunt. Of course, the subject referents in most examples of this construction are humans.

5.3.2 Atelicity

Another constraint on the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction is associated with telicity (Vendler 1967). In this section, I argue that the telicity of this construction is identical with that of the verb phrase headed by an -\textit{ing} form verb, which occurs as the -\textit{ing} form verb in this construction.

Telicity is a time scale property of a verb or a verb phrase. If a verb phrase is telic, an action or event represented by the verb phrase must be complete. On the other hand, if a verb phrase is atelic, an action or event represented by the verb phrase is incomplete.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(iii)] a. *The stone had a roll down the grassy bank.
\item[(iii)] b. The stone rolled down the grassy bank. \hfill (Dixon 2005: 347)
\end{itemize}

This constraint is likewise not derived from the property of the main verb, \textit{roll}.
hand, if a verb phrase is atelic, an action or event represented by the verb phrase is incomplete.

Examples of telic and atelic events are given in (109)-(110).

(109)  
   a. John went to the station \textit{in} thirty minutes.  
   b. *John went to the station \textit{for} thirty minutes.

(110)  
   a. *Mary shopped at the supermarket \textit{in} thirty minutes.  
   b. Mary shopped at the supermarket \textit{for} thirty minutes.

Whether a verb phrase is telic or not can be tested by adding \textit{in} \textit{H} minutes or \textit{for} \textit{H} minutes to sentences. Telic sentences can add \textit{in} \textit{H} minutes; on the other hand, in atelic sentences \textit{for} \textit{H} minutes can be added.

I applied this test to the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, and the resulting sentences are shown in (111).

(111)  
   a. They went shopping \textit{for} three hours.  
   b. *They went shopping \textit{in} three hours.

The resulting sentences in (111) show that the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction represents an atelic event. The atelic property of this construction can be drawn from the verb phrase, which occurs as the -\textit{ing} form verb in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, as shown in (112).\footnote{Wierzbicka (1988) and Langacker (1991: 24) pointed out that the Light Verb Construction is also atelic. This atelic property of the Light Verb Construction reflects the telicity of the main verb phrase, as shown in (iv).}

(112)  
   a. We swam to the shore \textit{in} ten minutes.

\footnote{(iv)  
   a. *John had a walk in ten minutes.  
   b. John [\textit{VP walked to the post office}] in ten minutes.  
   c. *John [\textit{VP walked in ten minutes}].}
b. We swam for ten minutes.

c. We went swimming for ten minutes.

In the sentence in (112a), *swam* is followed by a directional argument *to the shore*, and the sentence is telic. When *swim* is not followed by a *Goal* argument, the verb phrase is atelic, as shown in (112b). In the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, the *-ing* form verb is not followed by a directional argument, and thus this construction is atelic (see also Wierzbicka 1988: 97).

As I have already stated in 5.1, the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction cannot take a directional argument like *to the store*. This inability to take a directional argument is related with the atelicity of this construction. When a verb phrase, where a motion verb is followed by a directional argument, especially one representing a *Goal* in Talmy’s term, must be telic.

5.3.3 Summary of Constraints

I have discussed two grammatical characteristics of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction in this section. i) Only human beings or higher animals can be the subject of this construction since the subject referent has to plan ahead to move somewhere. Lower animals cannot plan ahead. ii) This construction is atelic, and this atelicity is drawn from the verb phrase, which occurs as the *-ing* form verb in this construction.

---

9Wierzbicka (1988: 326) notes that a directional prepositional phrase also does not occur in the Light Verb Construction as shown in (v).

(v) *John had a walk to the post office to post a letter.*

(Wierzbicka 1988: 326)
5.4 The Meanings of Go and Come

In this section, I examine whether or not the meanings of go and come in the Purposive Motion Construction are different from those of go and come in the Intransitive Motion Construction.

5.4.1 Bleaching of the Meanings of Deictic Motion Verbs

In some previous studies, it is suggested that the deictic motion verbs in the Purposive Motion Construction had been semantically bleaching (Visser 1973). For example, Schlüter (2005: 228) observes that the inflecting verb is not phonologically stressed but a non-finite form verb is stressed in this construction. Moreover, Dixon (2005: 55) notes go and come in this construction behave like a secondary verb.10 If their suggestions are correct, the meanings of deictic motion verbs in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction are different from those of deictic motion verbs in the Intransitive Motion Construction. To my mind, this does not ring true. In 5.4.3 and 5.4.4, I will examine whether deictic motion verbs are polysemous or not by using two kinds of semantic tests.

5.4.2 Polysemy or Vagueness

There have been many studies on the meaning of a word and many scholars have been concerned about whether a word is polysemous or vague, and several kinds of tests have been proposed (Quine 1960, Zwicky and Sadok 1975, Kempson 1977, An inflecting verb is more likely to be a syntactic head than a non-finite form verb in English. This is an interesting point, but this gap between syntactic headness and phonological and semantic headness does not concern us in this thesis.

10
In the case of polysemy, a given phonological form is associated with two or more meanings and they are related to but distinct from each other. On the other hand, in the case of vagueness, a given phonological form is associated with an abstract single meaning and has non-distinguished subcases. However, it is not easy to distinguish polysemy from vagueness. That is, it is difficult to confirm whether a sense of a word is related to another of the same word (Geeraerts 1993, Tuggy 1993, see also Lyons 1977: 550).

Of course, some tests to distinguish polysemy from vagueness are able to make the distinction. In this section, I use two kinds of tests, the logical test and the identity test, in order to examine whether or not one meaning of a word is different from that of another. In other words, whether or not a word is polysemous will be confirmed by these two tests, and I will suggest that the Constructionist approach does well in the cases of *go* and *come* in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction and the Intransitive Motion Construction. That is, the meanings of deictic motion verbs (e.g., *go* and *come*) in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction are identical with those in the Intransitive Motion Construction.

### 5.4.3 The Logical Test

Quine (1960) proposed a test examining whether a word is polysemous or not. If a sentence *p and but not q* with respect to a word is true, the word is polysemous. This

---

11 Some linguists use another term 'ambiguous.' In the case of ambiguity, a given phonological word is associated with more than one distinct meaning. The most typical example of ambiguity is homonyms like *bank* (i.e., 'river edge' and 'financial institution') in that the two meanings of *bank* are not related to each other. Ambiguity may not be clearly distinguished from polysemy. Since homonyms do not concern us here, I do not use the term ambiguous.

12 Although Lakoff (1970) and Kempson (1977) proposed a test called the linguistic test, this test cannot be applied to the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction because a deictic motion verb and an -ing form verb make a V' constituent replacing *do so.*
The noun *dog* has at least two separate meanings. One is ‘a carnivorous animal’ and the other is ‘a male dog.’ Thus, when the *dog* referred to in (113a) represents a bitch, the sentence is true. On the other hand, a noun *lion* does not have two or more meanings, given that the sentence in (113b) is not true. The noun *lion* does not distinguish ‘a male lion’ from ‘a female lion.’

The application of the logical test to the two kinds of usages of deictic motion verbs (e.g., *go* and *come*) results in the sentences shown in (114).

(114) *Mary went* shopping at the mall but she didn’t *go* to the mall.

The resulting sentence in (114) shows that the meaning of *go* in the Intransitive Motion Construction cannot be separated from that of *go* in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction.

The result in (114) demonstrates that the meaning of *go* in the Intransitive Motion Construction is identical with that of *go* in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction. In the next section, I do another test called the identity test proposed by McCawley (1968).

### 5.4.4 The Identity Test

A test proposed by McCawley (1968) demonstrates one meaning of a word is identical with another meaning. If the meaning of a word is identical with another, one of them
can be deleted in a sentence. The following sentence is an example of the identity test.

(115)  John is as sad as the book he read yesterday.  
       (McCawley 1968: 126)

In (115), the meaning of the adjective sad describing John is identical with that of sad indicating the property of the book.

The sentence in (116) demonstrates that the meaning of go in the Intransitive Motion Construction is identical with that of go in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction.

(116)  I went shopping in Toronto and then ____ to a Haunted Halloween.

(http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wXedkYApYms)

The results of not only the logical test but also the identity test show that the meanings of deictic motion verbs in the Intransitive Motion Construction are identical with those of deictic motion verbs in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction. However, the syntactic configuration of go and come in one construction is different from that of go and come in the other. That is, deictic motion verbs in the Intransitive Motion Construction take a directional argument while those in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction do not as I have already discussed in 5.1.

This means that syntactic behavior does not always reflect a verbal meaning. The constructionist approach suggested by Kay and Fillmore (1999) and Goldberg (1995; 2006) does well. For example, Goldberg (1995: 10-12) argues that the meaning of the verb kick in the sentence John kicked the ball is the same as that of kick in John kicked at the ball. I will turn to the facts demonstrated in this section, and discuss them in relation to -ing form verbs in 5.6.
5.5 Corpus Studies

There are 1,614 examples of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction in the BNC. Of these examples, only go (out) and come (out) can be used as inflecting verbs, and go occurs more frequently than come. This distribution of frequency of the construction is different from that of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction discussed in Chapter 4; unlike the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction is go-oriented.

In this section, I focus mainly on -ing form verbs occurring in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction. In the literature, it is noted that specific kinds of -ing form verbs can occur in this construction, like recreational verbs and searching verbs (Silva 1975; Swan 2005). However, my corpus investigation leads us to a different conclusion. Moreover, this investigation and the result of a multivariable analysis found another important tendency that some -ing form verbs are likely to co-occur with go while others are likely to co-occur with come.

5.5.1 Overview of Corpus Investigation

An overview of the corpus investigation into -ing form verbs occurring in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction is given in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1: Results of Corpus Investigation into -ing Form Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>go or go out</th>
<th>frequencies</th>
<th>come or come out</th>
<th>frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shopping</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>looking for</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swimming</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>knocking</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking for</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>visiting</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishing</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>calling</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunting</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>shopping</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skiing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>dancing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dancing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sailing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>begging</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 shows that go and go out tend to co-occur with -ing form verbs representing recreational activities such as shopping, swimming and fishing. On the other hand, come and come out do not behave in the same way: they tend to co-occur with -ing form verbs representing searching and visiting activities such as looking for and knocking. In addition, come and come out often co-occur with -ing form verbs representing activities not associated with recreational or searching activities. For example, begging does not represent recreational or searching activities at all. The example in which begging occurs is given below.

(117) One day a very poor man came begging at his door. (BNC-ABV)

This fact that -ing form verbs representing non-recreational activities are not ruled out is contradictory to what is written in the literature (Silva 1975: 348-350, Swan 2005: 202).  

Except for visiting and a few -ing form verbs, as Silva (1975: 346-347) pointed out, an -ing form verb in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction cannot take an object.

---

13 As Silva (1975: 348) pointed out, compound verbs such as hill-walking, witch-hunting and pupil-teaching occur in this construction. Some examples in which these compounds occur are found in the BNC, as well. Some of them (e.g., pupil-teaching) are not related to recreational activities.
as shown in (118)-(119).

(118)  a. Jake said he’d be sailing catamarans tonight.  
       b. Sue is hunting bear.  

(Silva 1975: 347)

(119)  a. *Jake said he’d go sailing catamarans tonight.  
       b. *Sue’s gone hunting bear.  

(Silva 1975: ibid.)

However, I found an example in which hunting takes an object as shown in (120).

(120)  Do I want to go hunting Easter eggs?  

(BNC-KRP)

As long as an event represented by an -ing form verb and its object is interpreted to be atelic, taking an object of an -ing form verb does not violate the constraint discussed in (5.3.2). For this reason, some -ing form verbs can take an object in this construction.

In the following subsections, I will look at the relation between a deictic motion verb and a non-finite form verb by utilizing a statistical method.

5.5.2 Relation between a Deictic Motion Verb and an -ing Form Verb

As I have already noted, go and come occur with different sets of -ing form verbs. This correlation between deictic motion verbs and -ing form verbs can be seen in Table 5.2. This is just a list of high-frequency -ing form verbs, so I take a closer look at the associations of the two verbs (i.e., an inflecting verb and an -ing form verb) by using a multivariable analysis, called Cluster Analysis.

The analysis was restricted to the 21 most frequent -ing form verbs, which occur more than 10 times in this construction. The 21 -ing form verbs are treated as cases and the four main verb types are treated as variables in this analysis. The data is
summarized in Table 5.2.\textsuperscript{14}

Table 5.2: Raw Frequency and z-scored Data of High-Frequency Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Raw Frequency</th>
<th>z-score for go</th>
<th>z-score for go out</th>
<th>z-score for come</th>
<th>z-score for come out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>295 (1.499)</td>
<td>14 (-0.451)</td>
<td>7 (-0.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.548)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go out</td>
<td>84 (1.126)</td>
<td>11 (-0.711)</td>
<td>61 (-0.547)</td>
<td>1 (-0.963)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping</td>
<td>134 (1.500)</td>
<td>1 (-0.490)</td>
<td>0 (-0.505)</td>
<td>0 (-0.505)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking for</td>
<td>81 (1.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.516)</td>
<td>2 (-0.467)</td>
<td>0 (-0.516)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishing</td>
<td>46 (1.486)</td>
<td>7 (-0.311)</td>
<td>2 (-0.541)</td>
<td>2 (-0.634)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping</td>
<td>39 (1.490)</td>
<td>3 (-0.479)</td>
<td>5 (-0.369)</td>
<td>0 (-0.643)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skiing</td>
<td>43 (1.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.515)</td>
<td>1 (-0.469)</td>
<td>0 (-0.515)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visiting</td>
<td>23 (1.296)</td>
<td>1 (-0.741)</td>
<td>12 (0.278)</td>
<td>0 (-0.833)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knocking</td>
<td>4 (-0.311)</td>
<td>0 (-0.588)</td>
<td>30 (1.487)</td>
<td>0 (-0.588)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking</td>
<td>23 (1.478)</td>
<td>4 (-0.250)</td>
<td>0 (-0.614)</td>
<td>0 (-0.614)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sailing</td>
<td>26 (1.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camping</td>
<td>22 (1.499)</td>
<td>0 (-0.530)</td>
<td>1 (-0.438)</td>
<td>0 (-0.530)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riding</td>
<td>13 (1.276)</td>
<td>7 (0.319)</td>
<td>0 (-0.797)</td>
<td>0 (-0.797)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drinking</td>
<td>10 (1.046)</td>
<td>8 (0.665)</td>
<td>0 (-0.856)</td>
<td>0 (-0.856)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking</td>
<td>9 (1.178)</td>
<td>2 (-0.558)</td>
<td>6 (0.434)</td>
<td>0 (-1.054)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racing</td>
<td>15 (1.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climbing</td>
<td>13 (1.496)</td>
<td>1 (0.394)</td>
<td>0 (-0.551)</td>
<td>0 (-0.551)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jogging</td>
<td>11 (1.480)</td>
<td>1 (-0.493)</td>
<td>0 (-0.296)</td>
<td>0 (-0.691)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calling</td>
<td>11 (1.480)</td>
<td>1 (-0.493)</td>
<td>0 (-0.296)</td>
<td>0 (-0.691)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeking</td>
<td>5 (1.015)</td>
<td>2 (-0.338)</td>
<td>4 (-0.564)</td>
<td>0 (-1.240)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wandering</td>
<td>11 (1.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td>0 (-0.500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of Clustered Analysis based on the data in Table 5.2 is given in Figure 5.1. The similarity between cases is measured by Euclidean distance, and the linkage method used here is complete linkage.

\textsuperscript{14}The figures in parentheses are standardized (z-scored) values.
As shown in Figure 5.1, *seeking*, *visiting*, *looking for* and *looking* are grouped together in a relatively early stage. Moreover, *climbing*, *hunting*, *walking*, *dancing*, *jogging*, *camping*, *fishing*, *skiing*, *shopping*, *swimming*, *wandering*, *sailing* and *racing* are also clustered together in a relatively early stage. The -ing form verbs belonging to the former cluster are likely to follow *come*. On the other hand, the -ing form verbs belonging to the latter tend to follow *go* or *go out*.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15}As Figure 5.1 shows, *knocking* and *calling* are not grouped with other *come*-oriented verbs. This is because *knocking* and *calling* are associated with *come* more strongly than other *come*-oriented verbs.
As I have noted in 5.1, the sentences in which visiting and looking for follow come may be instances of a subconstruction of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction. The result of Cluster Analysis supports this suggestion. That is, when a main verb is go or go out, -ing form verbs representing recreational activities are likely to occur. On the other hand, when the main verb is come, -ing form verbs associated with searching activities tend to occur.

5.5.2.1 The Reason Go Occurs More Frequently than Come

In this construction, go occurs 1,346 times and come occurs 268 times. That is, go occurs much more frequently than come. In fact, the collostructional strength of go is infinite, whereas that of come is 191.11. So it is no wonder that go is more productive than come in this construction, and we will look at the reasons later on.

In this construction, the prototypical activities, represented by -ing form verbs, are recreational activities such as shopping and swimming. In order to do such recreational activities, we have to move to a place such as a shopping mall or the sea. Since speakers are not at such a place in most cases, go occurs much more frequently than come. That is, the go-oriented character of this construction is associated with the prototypical meaning of this construction. This correlation between deixis and kinds of activities has already been graphically shown in Figure 5.1.

5.5.3 Frame Semantics and the Productivity of Each -ing Form Verb

We now turn to the individual verbs of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction to discuss why there is such a skew in the results of the corpus investigation.
5.5.3.1 On running and jogging

The productivity of -ing form verbs occurring in this construction varies. For example, running occurs only five times while jogging occurs 11 times in this construction. I examined how frequently running and jogging as verbs appear in the BNC, and the result shows that running appears 34,637 times and jogging only 318 times: the collostructional strength of running is just zero, whereas that of jogging is 21.995. These results show that the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction prefers jogging to running. How is this possible?

The reason why this construction is more likely to co-occur with jog than run is that the schematic meaning of the construction is more coincident with the meaning of jog than that of run. As Taylor (1996) states, the meaning of jog implies a pleasurable activity but that of run does not. According to The Oxford Dictionary of English, run is defined as ‘move at a speed faster than walk, never having both or all the feet on the ground at the same time’ and jog is defined as ‘run at a steady gentle pace, especially on a regular basis as a form of physical exercise’ (emphasis added). The difference of meanings between run and jog is not relevant in their syntactic behavior (cf. Jackendoff 1983), but the difference in frequencies of both verbs reflects the difference of meanings of both verbs.

As noted in the literature, the most typical meaning of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction is associated with recreational activities such as shopping and swimming, and it is no wonder that the schematic meaning of the construction is more coincident with the meaning of jogging than that of running.
On shoplifting and begging

Now, let us look at verbs representing non-recreational activities such as shoplifting and begging in this construction. The encyclopedic or frame semantic knowledge of a word (e.g., Fillmore 1982) is highly relevant to the productivity of -ing form verbs occurring in this construction (see also 5.5.3.1). If this suggestion is correct, -ing form verbs representing non-recreational and non-searching activities must be non-productive, but this is not true. For example, both shoplifting and begging are to some extent productive. The former occurs eight times and the latter occurs 13 times, but they seem to represent non-recreational activities; examples of these verbs occurring in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction are given below.16

(121)  a. (⋯) The Smiths, as always, led by manic vegetarian Morrissey, were inciting the nation’s kids to go shoplifting. (BNC-ART)

   b. One day a very poor man came begging at his door. (BNC-ABV)

According to Silva (1975: 348-349) and Swan (2005: 202), such non recreational activities do not fit with the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction. However, Bolinger (1983) argued that verbs representing nonrecreational activities can be used in this construction, as shown in (122).

(122)  a. The English were getting restive because King Richard had gone crusading again.

   b. Let’s go canvassing this morning. I think we can pick up some more signatures. (Bolinger 1983: 154)

---

16 The expression go begging has two meanings. One is ‘going somewhere to get something’ and the other is the idiomatic meaning, ‘unwanted or unused by anybody.’ An example of the latter meaning is shown in (vi).

(vi) WELL-PAID Euro jobs are going begging.  (BNC-CH2)
Bolinger (1983: 155) explains why such verbs can be used in this construction, noting “what is fun for you may be work for me” and this is correct. That is, -ing form verbs in this construction are relatively non-restricted; if the subject referent feels enjoyment, various kinds of verbs can occur in the slot, but they do not represent prototypical recreational activities.

5.5.4 Summary of Corpus Studies

In 5.5, I presented the properties of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction and also discussed some characteristic -ing form verbs occurring in this construction. Some appear very often and others do not, and the reasons for this are accounted for. Some are likely to co-occur with go or go out and others with come or come out. There are many -ing form verbs representing activities not associated with recreational or searching activities in this construction. In the next section, I bring together some properties described in the previous sections, and discuss them within the framework of Construction Grammar.

5.6 Theoretical Discussion on the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction

In this section, I suggest that the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction should be regarded as a construction or a pair made up of form and meaning.
5.6.1 The Converbal Purposive Motion Construction as a Construction

One of the characteristic mechanisms of Construction Grammar is that it is based on constraints. That is, form constrains its meaning. The form and meaning of the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction are formalized, as shown in (123).

(123) a. Subj \textit{humans/higher animals} go/come V-ing

b. X GO in order to ACT\textit{atelic}

The form and meaning pair illustrated in (123) imposes constraints on the subject and the verb. As I have noted in 5.3.1, the subject in this construction must be a human being or a higher animal such as a bear. Furthermore, part of the meaning of this construction (i.e., in order to ACT) is subordinated. It is commonplace that non-finite form verbs play subordinate roles (Haspelmath 1995: 3), and also in this construction, -\textit{ing} form verbs provide a subordinative meaning. The constraints on the subject and telicity of the -\textit{ing} form verb are specific to this construction, and the constraint on telicity of -\textit{ing} form verbs cannot be predictable from each grammatical element in this construction.

5.6.2 Syntactic Configuration Is not Always Determined by Verbs

It has been generally agreed that predicates, especially verbs, play central roles in clauses. In fact, Boas (2003) places emphasis on the meanings of verbs in his work (cf Levin 1985, Pinker 1989). Although his suggestion may be correct in some cases, I have found that syntactic configuration is not always determined by verbal meanings.

In 5.4, I presented independent evidence to demonstrate that the meanings of \textit{go} and \textit{come} in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction are identical with those of
go and come in the Intransitive Motion Construction by presenting results of the logical test and the identity test.

As many constructionists have noted in the literature, Construction Grammar has multiple orientations. For example, Boas (2003) suggested that verbs have multiple meanings. It is necessary to examine his argument with independent evidence demonstrating the correctness of this assumption. I argued that deictic motion verbs occurring in several syntactic configurations do not necessarily have multiple meanings.

5.7 Conclusions

The Converbal Purposive Motion Construction has been described in the literature, but such descriptions did not account for why a subject referent is restricted to a human being and why a prepositional phrase is not a Path argument. I tackled these problems theoretically, and have explained why these constraints are imposed on this construction.

First, I showed the constituent structure of this construction, and proposed that this construction is mono-clausal. In addition, since only human beings or higher animals can plan ahead to do recreational or searching activities, this construction imposes a constraint on its subject. Moreover, I demonstrated that go and come do not have multiple meanings although they occur in multiple syntactic configurations, applying the logical test and the identity test.

I have treated, at first glance, very similar constructions, where an inflecting verb is followed by an -ing form verb in Chapters 4 and 5. I will examine a causative construction in the next chapter. The causative construction involves an -ing form verb but the -ing form verb does not immediately follow an inflecting causative verb, and
an object intervenes between them.
Chapter 6

The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss a construction introduced by Goldberg (2006: 51), shown in (124) and (125).

(124)  
  a. Bill took him kicking into the room.  
  b. Bill brought him kicking and screaming into the room.  

(Goldberg 2006: 51)

(125)  
  a. He sent the clerk hurrying into the back room to get a dark grey suit.  

(BNC-CDN)  
  b. A series of small explosions one morning brought Alec running out to the top of the step.  

(BNC-B1X)  
  c. A day’s yacht charter took us threading through the islands.  

(BNC-BPJ)

1This chapter is built on Morishita (2013a).
d. My boyfriend Fisher Stevens will have to **drag** me **kicking and screaming** out of the house.  

This construction has a formal characteristic: an inflecting verb is followed by an object, an *-ing* form verb, and then a particle or a prepositional phrase. I name this construction the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. Since this construction has been paid little attention, there are few previous studies.

In general, one predicate represents a single event. The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction involves two predicates: one predicate is an inflecting verb and the other is an *-ing* form verb. I will show the cases where two predicates in this construction constitute a single complex predicate and that the complex predicate represents a single event.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. Section 2 will discuss whether the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is mono-clausal or not, by comparing this construction with the Free Participial Construction and the Absolute Participial Construction, which are apparently bi-clausal. In addition, I will examine the constituent structure of this construction, applying some syntactic tests. In Section 3, I will show the results of a corpus investigation. The corpus data of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction will be compared with that of the Caused-Motion Construction. Section 4 will discuss the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction from the perspective of Construction Grammar. I will conclude in Section 5.
6.2 Syntactic Properties

The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is similar to the Free Participial Construction and the Absolute Participial Construction in that both of them involve two kinds of verbs: one is an inflecting verb and the other is a non-finite form verb. The two Participial Constructions are bi-clausal, and the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction may appear to be bi-clausal also. However, I will show that the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is mono-clausal. Let us examine how the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is different from the others.

6.2.1 A Comparison between the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction and the Free Participial Construction

In order to examine whether or not the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is the same as the Free Participial Construction, some examples of both the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction and the Free Participial Construction are given in (126) and (127).

(126)  a. The feeling sent the adrenalin rushing to her cheeks. (BNC-GCG)

b. He was dragged kicking and screaming to a van parked nearby. (BNC-CH2)

(The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction)

(127)  a. The Queen has sent a message to Pakistan, welcoming its formal return to the Commonwealth. (BNC-AIG)

b. A huge hand grabbed Zen’s shoulder and dragged him outside, shoving him up against the side of the car. (BNC-HTT)
The most remarkable point of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is that the object of a causative motion verb (e.g., *send* and *drag*) is identical with the logical subject of an *-ing* form verb (e.g., *rushing* and *kicking and screaming*). For example, in (126a), the object of *sent* is *the adrenalin* and the logical subject of *rushing* is also *the adrenalin*.

On the other hand, in the cases of the Free Participial Construction, the object of a causative motion verb is not identical with the subject of an *-ing* form verb. For example, in (127a), the object of *sent* is *a message to Pakistan* but the subject of *welcoming* is a PRO (=*The Queen*). From the facts, I conclude that the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is different from the Free Participial Construction.

6.2.2 A Comparison between the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction and the Absolute Participial Construction

Now, I will show how the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction differs from the Absolute Participial Construction. In the case of the Absolute Participial Construction, the subject of a superordinate clause must be different from the explicit subject of a subordinate clause. Examples of the Absolute Participial Construction are given in (128).

(128) a. Dan *walked* from the room, his head *reeling*. (BNC-FAB)

b. (…) the woman *was* on him like a tigress (…), her hand *chopping* down viciously at his chest. (BNC-GUG)

In the sentence in (128a), the subject of *walked* is *Dan* and that of *reeling* is *his head*, and in the sentence in (128b), the subject of *was* is *the woman* and that of *chopping* is *her hand*. 
In the case of the Absolute Participial Construction, there is no argument shared by both verbs, whereas there is an argument shared by the main verb and the -ing form verb in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. In cases where the object of the main verb is identical with the subject of the -ing form verb, an additional argument is needed in the Absolute Participial Construction, as shown in (129).

(129)  

a. He sent the clerk into the room, she hurrying to get a dark grey suit.  
b. My boyfriend Fisher Stevens will have to drag me out of the house, I kicking and screaming.

Thus, the absence of a shared argument between two kinds of verbs differentiates the Absolute Participial Construction from the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction.

6.2.3 Constituent Structure

As I have discussed above, the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is different from the two kinds of participial constructions. However, I have not shown that the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is mono-clausal yet. Moreover, the constituent structure of this construction has been overlooked. Thus, I will now examine the mono-clausality and constituent structure of this construction.

6.2.3.1 Mono-clausality of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction

Now I discuss the mono-clausality of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. Evidence demonstrating whether a sentence is mono-clausal or not comes from reflexivization. Reflexives (i.e., forms ending in -self/-selves) require a clausemate antecedent, as shown in (130).
(130)  a. John killed himself.
    b. *John killed him.
    c. *John killed himself

If the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is mono-clausal, a reflexive must be bound within the same clause. Relevant sentences are given in (131).

(131)  a. John sent a boomerang crashing against himself.
    b. *John sent a boomerang crashing against him.

The sentences in (131) show that the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is mono-clausal because John is coindexed with himself in (131a).

6.2.3.2  Do so Test

The do so test examines which grammatical elements make up the V’ or the VP. Elements that can be replaced by do so make a constituent, the V’ or the VP. The results of this test are given in (132).

(132)  a. He [sent the clerk hurrying into the back room] and she did so, too.
    b. He [sent the clerk hurrying] into the back room and she did so into the front room, too.
    c. *He [sent the clerk] hurrying into the back room and she did so running into the front room, too.
    d. *He sent the clerk [hurrying into the back room] yesterday and she will send another clerk doing so tomorrow, too.

The sentences in (132a) and (132b) show that the strings sent the clerk hurrying into the back room make a constituent, the V’. The prepositional phrase into the back room is an
argument because an argument cannot occur out of do so. However, at this stage, the internal structure of the V’ has not yet been clarified. Thus, in the following analysis, fronting will be applied to this construction.

6.2.3.3 Fronting

It has been shown that a directional phrase goes together with a motion verb, and the results of the do so test demonstrate that a prepositional phrase or a particle is an argument. A directional phrase of this construction may seem to be the arguments of an -ing form verb since most -ing form verbs occurring in this construction are manner of motion verbs such as scurrying or rushing. However, some non-finite form verbs occurring in this construction are action verbs, and such verbs cannot take a directional phrase. I will examine which grammatical element takes the directional phrase in this construction as an argument by a syntactic test here.

Fronting has been used in Chapter 4. Thus I do not discuss details of this test here. I merely show an original sentence and resulting sentences below.

(133) a. A sudden rain shower sent the drivers scurrying to the pits.

b. *Scurrying to the pits a sudden rain shower sent the drivers.

c. To the pits a sudden rain shower sent the drivers scurrying.

The sentences in (133b) and (133c) show that the strings scurrying to the pits is not a constituent. If the prepositional phrase to the pits were an argument of scurrying, the sentence in (133b) would be accepted, but it is not. Only a directional phrase to the pits can be fronted. Such evidence shows that an -ing form verb and a directional phrase do not make a constituent together even though a prepositional phrase may seem to be the argument of a non-finite form verb.
The constituent structure of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is shown in (134).²

(134)

The tree illustrated in (134) shows that a directional phrase like *into the back room* is not the argument of a single verb but an argument of the whole of a complex predicate *sent ... hurrying* given that the prepositional phrase is the sister of *sent:* *hurrying*. The complex predicate is labeled as *V?* as in the case of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction.

### 6.2.4 Argument Structure of the Complex Predicate

Next let us look at the argument structure of the complex predicate composed of an inflecting verb and an *-ing* form verb. In the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, an action verb as well as a manner of motion verb occurs as an *-ing* form verb, as shown in (135).

(135) a. Just as Angel was about to leap on her, Luke picked up and carried her *yelling* into the house. (BNC-CA0)

b. It is the noise of a foul and loathsome beast which emerges from the tunnel and drags him *screaming* into the darkness. (BNC-F9C)

²The *V?* indicates a grammatical element, larger than *V⁰* but smaller than *V* as defined in Chapter 4.
The action verbs (i.e., *yelling* and *screaming*) cannot take a directional argument, as shown in (136), and this fact affords collateral evidence that a prepositional phrase is the argument of a complex predicate.

(136) a. *She yelled into the house.

(This sentence is intended to mean ’she went into the house, yelling’)

b. *He screamed into the darkness.

(This sentence is intended to mean ’he went into the darkness, screaming’)

In addition, an *-ing* form verb in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction cannot take an argument, as shown in the contrast between (137a) and (137b).

(137) a. She screamed *insults* at him.

b. *Luke carried her screaming *insults* at himself into the house.

This contrast in (137) shows that the argument structure of *scream* changes when it becomes a part of a complex predicate.

If this construction were bi-clausal and an *-ing* form verb headed an independent VP, the *-ing* form verb would take an argument, as is possible with the Free Participial Construction in (138).

(138) Luke carried her into the house, she screaming *insults* at him.

From the evidence, I argue that the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is mono-clausal and that an inflecting causative motion verb and a non-finite form verb go together and make a V’ constituent. In the next section, I will show examples of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction found in the corpus data drawn from the BNC.
6.3 Corpus Results

There are only 303 examples of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction in the BNC, and in order to make a comparison of this construction and the Caused-Motion Construction, I selected 397 examples of the Caused-Motion Construction from the same corpus. Examples of the former construction are drawn from the corpus in full detail, but those of the latter are a randomly sampled 1% of the whole from the corpus. In this section, I analyze the 700 examples statistically, and show the differences between the two constructions.

6.3.1 The Caused-Motion Construction

Before looking at the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, I examine 397 examples of the Caused-Motion Construction randomly sampled from the BNC. In the case of this construction, there is only one verb slot and a wide-ranging variety of verbs occur there. I will take a closer look at the verbal types and Path types of this construction. The examples of the Caused-Motion Construction are given in (139).

(139)  a. I’ll take it out of the oven!  (BNC-CEB)

    b. Andy, can you bring my bible downstairs?  (BNC-KBW)

    c. FRANK Sinatra sent flowers to the funeral of Sixties pop star Paul Ryan yesterday.  (BNC-CBF)

    d. He stooped and took off his shoes and kicked them aside.  (BNC-APM)

---

31% of all uses of causative motion verbs listed in Levin (1993: 132-137) are extracted from the whole of the BNC.
6.3.1.1 Verbs and Path Expressions in the Caused-Motion Construction

In this subsection, I focus on verbs and their path expressions in this construction. Only high-frequency causative motion verbs and their Path types in this construction are listed in Table 6.1, and high-frequency path expressions, occurring more than five times in this construction, are listed in Table 6.2.

Table 6.1: High-Frequency Causative Motion Verbs and Their Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs (n)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>take (121)</td>
<td>42 (34.7%)</td>
<td>14 (11.6%)</td>
<td>65 (53.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring (43)</td>
<td>9 (20.9%)</td>
<td>10 (23.3%)</td>
<td>24 (55.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send (42)</td>
<td>5 (11.9%)</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
<td>35 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>push (26)</td>
<td>6 (23.1%)</td>
<td>8 (30.8%)</td>
<td>12 (46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pull (25)</td>
<td>8 (32.0%)</td>
<td>7 (28.0%)</td>
<td>10 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carry (20)</td>
<td>7 (35.0%)</td>
<td>4 (20.0%)</td>
<td>9 (45.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer (15)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move (14)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>3 (21.4%)</td>
<td>7 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive (10)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Path Expressions in the Caused-Motion Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>away</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>home</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 113       Total 66       Total 218

In this construction take occurs most frequently, and bring follows it (cf. 6.3.2). These high-productive verbs are mainly used as ‘continuous causation’ verbs in Talmy’s (2000a: Chapter 8) term (see also Shibatani 1976), and sentences in (139a) and (139b)
are representative examples containing such verbs. That is, continuous causation verbs such as take, bring, and carry are comparatively productive in this construction. Of 397 examples of the Caused-Motion Construction, there are 285 examples in which the causation represented by verbs is continuous causation (71.8%).

Looking at the particles and prepositions listed in Table 6.2, path expressions representing Goal seem to occur dominantly in this construction (cf. 6.3.2). In addition to causative type, the dominant Path type of the Caused-Motion Construction is also different from that of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. In the next Section, I will look at the results of the corpus investigation of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction.

6.3.2 The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction

In order to compare the Caused-Motion Construction with the other caused-motion construction, this subsection shows the corpus data of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction.

6.3.2.1 Main Verbs and Path Expressions

There are a wide variety of -ing form verbs that occur in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. However there are only eight kinds of main verbs: two kinds of deictic causative verb (i.e., take and bring), and six kinds of causative motion verbs (e.g., send and drag). As to Path, Goal is found 125 times, Via 144 times and Source 34 times in this construction (cf. 6.3.1). All main verbs and their path expressions in this construction are listed in Table 6.3.4

4The particle against does not represent Path in Talmay’s term, and I term this particle ‘pseudo-path.’ I will discuss this point in a later section.
Table 6.3: Main Verbs and Path Types in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs (n)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>send (250)</td>
<td>24 (9.6%)</td>
<td>128 (51.2%)</td>
<td>98 (39.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring (35)</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>10 (28.6%)</td>
<td>19 (54.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drag (9)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take (4)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carry (2)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haul (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kick (1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6.3, unlike the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, where go and come occur at a high-frequency, deictic causative verbs such as bring and take do not occur at a high-frequency. On the other hand, send occurs at a high-frequency in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction.

Path expressions such as to and across are divided into three groups, Source, Via, and Goal. These path expressions are listed in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4: Path Expressions in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>across</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>against</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>back</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>towards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>backwards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | ...   | ...                  | ...   | ...                   | ...
| Total 34                |       | Total 144            |       | Total 125             |       |
As pointed out in Chapter 4, there is a linguistic dissymmetry between Source and Goal cross-linguistically, and it is said that languages have a Goal-oriented property. However, Table 6.4 shows the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is Via-oriented. This characteristic grammatical property of this construction is compared with that of the Caused-Motion Construction in 6.4.

### 6.3.2.2 Collostructional Analysis of Main Verbs

In the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, the most high-frequency inflecting verb is *send*. Nevertheless, this result may be a reflection of token frequency of verbs in the corpus. That is, *if send* appears much more than other verbs such as *take* and *bring* in the corpus, the result may be skewed. In order to solve this problem, Collostructional Analysis (see Chapter 2) is applied.

The results of the Collostructional Analysis are shown in Table 6.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>send</em> (250)</td>
<td>Infinite</td>
<td><em>kick</em> (1)</td>
<td>1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bring</em> (35)</td>
<td>38.733</td>
<td><em>carry</em> (2)</td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>drag</em> (9)</td>
<td>15.366</td>
<td><em>drive</em> (1)</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>haul</em> (1)</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td><em>take</em> (4)</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.5 shows, *send* is the most prototypical causative verb occurring in this construction. Unlike the Caused-Motion Construction, onset causation verbs are the most dominant in this construction (cf. 6.3.1). The most striking fact is that *take*, occurring most frequently in the Caused-Motion Construction, occurs only four times in this construction and its collostructional strength is very low (i.e., 0.084) among other causative motion verbs. In addition, in this construction, *bring* as well as *send* are
used as onset causation verbs in most cases, as shown in (140).

(140)  a. A series of small explosions one morning **brought** Alec running out to the
top of the steps.  

    (BNC-B1X)

    b. My screams of terror awoke my parents and **brought** them rushing in panic
to my room.  

    (BNC-A6C)

Before preceding to the next subsection, it should be noted that this construction
much prefers onset causation to continuous causation. Of the 303 examples in the
Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, there are 276 examples (91.1%) in which
causation represented by verbs is ‘onset causation’ in Talmy’s (2000a: Chapter 8) term
(cf. 6.3.1). This is the most prominent semantic/functional difference between these
two constructions. This fact is closely compared with the Caused-Motion Construction
in 6.4.

6.3.2.3 Collostructional Strength of -ing Form Verbs

Next we look at the -ing form verbs of this construction. Type frequency of inflecting
verbs occurring in this construction is relatively low, whereas that of -ing form verbs
is very high. As in the case of inflecting verbs, the typicality of -ing form verbs needs
to be checked by Collostructional Analysis as well, and the result of that analysis is
shown in Table 6.6.
Table 6.6: Collostructional Strength of -ing Form Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
<th>Collexeme (n)</th>
<th>Collo. Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crashing (38)</td>
<td>91.139</td>
<td>screaming (8)</td>
<td>13.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scurrying (19)</td>
<td>56.463</td>
<td>kicking and screaming (4)</td>
<td>13.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprawling (13)</td>
<td>36.326</td>
<td>hurling (5)</td>
<td>12.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flying (21)</td>
<td>32.408</td>
<td>spinning (5)</td>
<td>12.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tumbling (10)</td>
<td>22.705</td>
<td>arcing (5)</td>
<td>8.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rushing (12)</td>
<td>21.274</td>
<td>fleeing (3)</td>
<td>7.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billowing (3)</td>
<td>16.418</td>
<td>whirling (3)</td>
<td>6.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reeling (6)</td>
<td>14.413</td>
<td>bouncing (2)</td>
<td>6.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurrying (8)</td>
<td>13.996</td>
<td>rolling (5)</td>
<td>6.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6 shows that crashing is the prototypical -ing form verb occurring in this construction. Most verbs, except for arcing, listed in Table 6.6 represent physically energetic and perceptually salient actions (see also Chapter 4). Examples including screaming and screaming and kicking are given below.

(141) a. TV GIRL Yvette Fielding was dragged screaming behind a horse when a stunt backfired. (BNC-CH2)

b. They proceeded to apprehend Willis and a fellow partygoer and dragged them screaming and kicking to the squad car. (BNC-CDG)

The reason why the collostructional strengths of screaming and kicking and screaming are high is that they are verbs representing perceptually salient actions. Of course, yelling represents a perceptually salient actions as well as screaming and kicking and screaming, but the collostructional strength of yelling is not high. This is because drag…kicking and screaming is a ‘cliché’, whereas drag…yelling is not (see also Boas 2003: Chapter 5).
6.3.2.4 The Interaction between Main Verbs and -ing Form Verbs

Is there any tendency of correlation between the two verbs in this construction? In the case of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, when an inflecting verb is a deictic motion verb, a manner of motion verb is likely to co-occur. How about in the case of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction? The result is shown in Table 6.7.

Table 6.7: The Interaction between Main Verbs and -ing Form Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manner of Motion Verbs</th>
<th>Action Verbs</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deictic Causative Verbs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Deictic Causative Verbs</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2=0.043; \text{df}=1; p=0.835$ (Yates’s Correction)

As shown in Table 6.7, there is no significant difference between deictic causative verbs and non-deictic causative verbs in this construction, and this is one difference between this construction and the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction.

However, we should focus on the most high-frequency verb, send. The reason this verb is so productive in this construction hints at the solution to the problem of the interaction between inflecting and non-finite form verbs. Among causative motion verbs, sent is the most canonical onset causation verb, whereas take and bring are representative continuous causation verbs in Talmey’s (2000a: Chapter 8) terms. Focusing on this difference in the types of causation, we can understand the nature of this construction. Table 6.8 shows the interaction of the two verbs.
Table 6.8: The Interaction between Main Verbs and -ing Form Verbs (Version 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manner of Motion Verbs</th>
<th>Action Verbs</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onset Causation Verbs</strong></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Causation Verbs</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²=67.077; df=1; p<.0001 (Yates’s Correction)

As Table 6.8 shows, when a causative verb denotes onset causation, manner of motion verbs are likely to co-occur. Why does a main verb affect the selection of the -ing form verb? When a main verb denotes continuous causation, an object referent cannot move by itself freely. That is, when a main verb is a continuous causative verb, it is hardly likely that an -ing form verb represents the manner of motion of an object referent. This physical constraint leads to the reduced co-occurring of a continuous causation verb and a manner of motion verb. However, when an inflecting verb is a onset causation verb, an object referent can move by itself freely, and thus manner of motion verbs are likely to co-occur with onset causation verbs.

### 6.4 Discussion on the Results of the Corpus Investigation

As Goldberg (1995: 67) discussed, there are no synonymous constructions: construction are different from each other semantically and/or functionally. If this is true, the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction should be different from the Caused-Motion Construction in regard to semantics and/or functions.
In 6.3.1 and 6.3.2, we have reviewed and looked closely at the causative type and path expressions of two causative constructions. This section compares one construction with the other construction.

6.4.1 Onset Causation or Continuous Causation

As noted before, in most examples of the Caused-Motion Construction, the causation type involved is continuous causation, whereas, in the examples of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, onset causations can be seen. Why are there such differences? The difference is due to the number of verbs and kinds of verbs involved.

In the case of the Caused-Motion Construction, there is only a single verb, indicating the means of causation. Examples of this construction are given in (142).

(142)  a. Grace quickly rowed the boat out to sea again. (BNC-FPP)

    b. (…) devouring month-old copies of The Times which had been airmailed
to Australia (…) (BNC-CHG)

Causative motion verbs specify the means of causation. For example, in (142a), the verb row specifies the means of causation, and it means ‘propelling a boat with oars.’ In (142b), the verb airmail specifies the means of causation and its meaning is ‘sending something, especially mail, by airplane.’ Using these verbs in the Caused-Motion Construction, we can specify the means of causation.

On the other hand, in the case of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, there are two verbs, constituting a single complex predicate. One represents the means of causation, and the other represents manner of motion or accompanying action of an object referent. Unlike the Caused-Motion Construction, this construction can focus on an action by an object referent. This suggestion is clearly valid in view
of corpus evidence shown in 6.3.2.3. Most high-frequency -ing form verbs in this construction represent physically energetic and perceptually salient actions. Table 6.6 in 6.3.2.3 shows that the physically energetic manner of motion represented by crashing and scurrying, or perceptually salient accompanying action expressed by kicking and screaming and screaming fit this construction.

What it comes down to is that the Caused-Motion Construction pays attention to the action to a subject referent, and the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction pays attention to an action by an object referent. Usually, object referents in causative motion events do not behave in a special way and speakers need not pay attention to their actions. For these reasons, the Caused-Motion Construction is more frequently used than the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. However, when an object referent moves in a distinctive way, speakers cannot help paying attention to his/her/its action or movement, and they use the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction to represent such causative events.

6.4.2 Goal, Source, or Via

Next, we consider path expressions. As the corpus investigation shows, prepositional phrases or particles representing Goal occur most often in the Caused-Motion Construction, whereas, prepositional phrases or particles representing Via occur most often in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. These differences between the two constructions are statistically significant, as shown in Table 6.9.
Table 6.9: Difference Distribution of Path Expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Caused-Motion Construction</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 109.070; \text{df} = 2; p < .0001 \]

This difference as to Path between the two constructions is not attributed to the causative verbs. For example, the verb *send* is of a relatively high-frequency in both of the constructions: it occurs 42 times in the Caused-Motion Construction and 250 times in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. In the case of the Caused-Motion Construction, *send* co-occurs with path expressions representing *Goal* 35 times (83.3%), whereas in the case of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, it co-occurs with *Goal* expressions 72 times (28.8%).

Moreover, this difference as to Path between the two constructions is not due to -ing form verbs in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. For example, the verb *fly* occurs in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction as an -ing form as well as in the Intransitive Motion Construction as an inflecting verb, as shown in (143).

(143) a. He was shaking from the shock of the recoil of the gun, which had sent him *flying* backwards. \(\text{(BNC-ABX)}\)

b. He plans to *fly* to Canada on Wednesday to bring her home. \(\text{(BNC-AHX)}\)

In (143a), *flying* represents a manner of motion by the object referent. On the other hand, *fly* in (143b) represents the means to go somewhere by airplane. Types of path expressions co-occurring with *flying* in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction are

---

5 Especially causative motion verbs such as *transport* and *transfer*, which are usually company services, generally co-occur only with path expressions representing *Goal* or *Source.*
different from those co-occurring with *fly* in the Intransitive Motion Construction, as shown in Table 6.10.\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Expressions</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Path Expressions</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>across</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>to</em></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>away</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>from</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>into</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>over</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>through</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>down</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everywhere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>in</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>off</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>onto</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>towards</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of *flying* in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, path expressions corresponding to *VIA* such as *across*, *backwards*, and *through* are most likely to co-occur with it. However, in the case of *fly* in the Intransitive Motion Construction, path expressions corresponding to *GOAL* such as *to* are most dominant. From the facts, we can conclude that the *VIA*-oriented grammatical character of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is not due to -*ing* form verbs as well. In short, the *VIA*-oriented feature of this construction is reduced to neither the properties of causative verbs nor to those of verbs occurring in the -*ing* form either.

---

\(^6\)CCMC stands for the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, and IMC stands for the Intransitive Motion Construction
6.4.3 Attention to Processes

As I have already discussed, the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction focuses on an object referent, and pays attention to an action by this object referent. In general, events are Goal-oriented, but the results of events represented by this construction are not the focus. In order to focus on actions by an object referent, onset causation is preferred rather than continuous causation. This construction as a whole is designed to represent such processes.

6.5 Theoretical Discussion

In this section, I discuss the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction within the framework of Construction Grammar. First of all, I define the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction as a pair of form and meaning as shown in (144).

(144) a. Subj V Obj V-ing Obl

b. X CAUSE Y: to GO Z with/by V-ing

This construction is a mono-clausal construction as I have already demonstrated. In addition, the two verbs in this construction interact with each other. When the type of causation is onset causation, manner of motion verbs such as flying and scurrying tend to occur. When verbs represent continuous causation, in contrast, action verbs such as screaming are likely to occur. Furthermore, a corpus investigation showed that this construction has the property of being V1A-oriented. By virtue of these grammatical characteristics, this construction can occupy a ‘niche’ in causative constructions in English.
In the following, I will discuss this construction from the perspective of Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995; 2006, Kay 2005) and the Usage-Based Model (Langacker 1990; 2000).

6.5.1 Three Subconstructions

As the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction has several subconstructions (see Chapter 4), the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction has three subconstructions as well. Recognizing three kinds of subconstructions is motivated by the argument structure of the verbs involved.

In some examples of this construction, Path arguments are related to two verbs. In other cases, Path arguments are related to causative verbs. In still other cases Path arguments are, without a doubt, related to -ing form verbs. I classify all of the examples of this construction into these three sub-groups.

6.5.1.1 Subject V Object Motion V-ing Real Path

In this subconstruction, a manner of motion verb follows an object. Examples of this subconstruction are given in (145).

(145) a. Much to his horror he was (…) sent flying through the corridors by a roomful of water. (BNC-AMB)

b. (…) a single slip could send them plummeting down the mountainside. (BNC-A15)

In the examples in (145), the Path arguments, through the corridors and down the mountainside, are related to both inflecting verbs and -ing form verbs.
6.5.1.2 Subject V Object Action V-ing Real Path

In the examples in the second subconstruction, Path arguments are apparently related to causative verbs only, as show in (146).

(146) a. She was carried screaming from the siege house, where she lives with her parents. (BNC-K4W)

b. He was dragged kicking and screaming to a van parked nearby. (BNC-CH2)

In the examples of this subconstruction, an -ing form verb cannot take a Path argument, as shown in (147).

(147) a. *She screamed from the siege house, where she lives with her parents.

b. *He kicked and screamed to a van parked nearby.

This shows that a path expression is related only to an inflecting verb. A complex predicate inherits this Path argument. Most examples of this subconstruction involve a continuous causation verb.

6.5.1.3 Subject V Object crash-type V-ing Pseudo Path

In addition, some Path arguments are, without doubt, related to -ing form verbs, as shown in (148).

(148) a. (…) the impact hurled her forward again and sent her crashing against the steering column with enough force to knock the breath from her. (BNC-G0P)

b. First I pulled the great ladder away from the tower, sending it crashing back into the trees. (BNC-HGS)

In these examples, the prepositional phrases, against the steering column and back into the trees, are not related to causative verbs but related to crashing, as shown in (149).
(149)  a. She crashed against the steering column.
    b. The car crashed back into the trees.

Furthermore, in some examples of this subconstruction, crashing cannot be deleted. Such an example is given in (150).\(^7\)

(150)  a. Donna sent the Volvo **crashing** into the Audi again, then shifted up through the gears and drove off.  
        \[(\text{BNC-G0P})\]
    b. #Donna sent the Volvo ____ into the Audi.  
        \[(\text{intended meaning})\]

6.5.2 Goldberg’s Approach to the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction

Now, I apply Goldberg’s Construction Grammar to the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. This construction is represented as follows.

![Figure 6.1: The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction](image)

Unlike the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction (see Chapter 4), this construction has three argument roles, **Causer**, **Theme**, and **Path**. In this construction, the

\(^7\)Sometimes crashing can be deleted without largely altering the meaning of the sentence.
(i) One by one, the concrete weighted drums were winched up and then sent **crashing** into the sea.  
    \[(\text{BNC-AN9})\]
(ii) One by one, the concrete weighted drums were winched up and then sent ____ into the sea.
Causer argument is fused with the participant role of an inflecting verb only. The Theme argument fuses with the participant role of both verbs. In some cases, the Path argument is fused with the participant role of either verb or both verbs. In the example in (151), the participant roles of both send and whirling fuse with argument roles associated with this construction: Path and Theme arguments are related to whirling as well as send.

(151) He (...) sent his axe whirling across the room. (BNC-HA3)

In the composite fused structure of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, one of the participant roles of send is fused with the Causer argument. In addition, the other participant roles of send and whirling are fused with the Path and Theme arguments. The composite fused structure with send and whirling is represented as follows.

![Figure 6.2: The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction (send and whirling)](image)

However, the Path argument does not necessarily fuse with a participant role or both participant roles of both verbs. In (152), the Path argument does not fuse with a participant role of the action verb (i.e., yelling).

(152) (...) Luke picked her up and carried her yelling into the house. (BNC-CA0)
The composite fused structure of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction with *carry* and *yelling* is represented as follows.

![Figure 6.3: The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction (carry and yelling)](image)

In some cases, the **Path** argument fuses with only a participant role of *-ing* form verbs, as shown in (153).

(153) (⋯) an underwater earthquake *sent* 50ft tidal waves *crashing* into the coast of Nicaragua. (BNC-CH2)

The composite fused structure of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, where the participant roles of *sent* and *crashing* are fused with the argument roles of this construction, is represented as follows.
In the composite fused structure shown in Figure 6.4, the Path argument must be fused with a participant role of crashing. This participant role of crashing is necessarily Goal.

6.5.3 Networks of Subconstructions in a Usage-based Model

In the Usage-Based Model, all examples are considered as instances of schemata. When we find that one instance and another instance have something in common, we build a schema. Then, we create innovative expressions through the schema. Now, we will look at how schemata are created in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction.

First, the most productive subconstruction is made as a schema. Instances of this subconstruction, -ing form verbs, are manner of motion verbs such as flying and rushing. Thus, the Subj V Obj MotionV-ing Real Path subconstruction is formed. Very productive schemata form an innovative schema as their extension. The Subj V Obj ActionV-ing Real Path subconstruction is an extension from the Subj V Obj MotionV-ing Real Path subconstruction.

This newly created subconstruction has elements in common. In the path expressions with the Subj V Obj MotionV-ing Real Path subconstruction, the verbs following
objects are in -ing form. Thus, a new schema, the Subj V Obj V-ing Motion Path, is created. This subconstruction subsumes the two subconstructions, the Subj V Obj MotionV-ing Real Path subconstruction and the Subj V Obj ActionV-ing Real Path subconstruction. From the Subj V Obj V-ing Motion Path subconstruction, the Subj V Obj crash-typeV-ing Pseudo Path subconstruction is created as an extension. By these steps, all three subconstructions are created, and finally, the most schematic construction is created, subsuming all of the subconstructions and all examples of this construction. This can be seen in Figure 6.5.

![Figure 6.5: Subconstructions of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction](image)

This analysis within the framework of the Usage-Based Model concerns information about the frequency of each expression. The most productive subconstruction, of course, the prototype of this construction, is the Subj V Obj MotionV-ing Motion Path subconstruction.

### 6.5.4 Summary of Theoretical Discussion

The Converbal Caused-Motion Construction is a special construction in that it has two verbs even though it is mono-clausal. Prepositional phrases are considered to be related to main verbs in most examples. However, in some examples, where the -ing form verb
is crashing, prepositional phrases are not related to causative motion verbs but related to crashing. How is this expression possible? This was answered using the Usage-based Model. Our ability to form schemata and make innovative expressions as extensions of such schemata enables us to create expressions. Moreover, I investigated how the highest placed schema is formed. In Goldberg’s Construction Grammar, only the highest level constructions are emphasized, but middle-level schematic constructions (i.e., verb-class constructions) are also important (Iwata 2008).

6.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have examined syntactic and semantic aspects of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. This construction is the causative version of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, treated in Chapter 4.

Unlike the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, deixis is unimportant in the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction. However, many high-frequency -ing form verbs representing physically energetic and perceptually salient actions are found in both constructions. That is, there are not only differences but also similarities between these constructions. The next chapter will discuss the three constructions dealt with in Chapters 4, 5, and 6.
Chapter 7

General Discussion

7.1 Introduction

In the previous three chapters, I have argued that Converbal Motion Constructions in English are mono-clausal even though two verbs are involved. In addition, the corpus investigation and statistical analysis have shown the correlation patterns between verbs in each construction. In this chapter, I discuss three issues related to these constructions: i) iconicity in grammar, ii) the niches of constructions and iii) the importance of corpus data in Construction Grammar.

7.2 Iconicity in Grammar

As Kortmann (1991; 1995) and Stump (1985) pointed out, the interpretation of -ing form varies widely (see Chapter 2). The interpretation of -ing form in the Free Participial Construction is greatly varied. In contrast, in the case of the Converbal Motion Constructions discussed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, the interpretation of the -ing form is

\footnote{This chapter is based on Morishita (2012a; 2012b).}
limited to 'manner of motion' as in (154a, 156a), 'accompanying action' as in (154b, 156b), or 'purpose' as in (155a, 155b).

(154) a. James came running up the stairs as she came out of the office. (BNC-FRS)

   b. Kylie ran sobbing out of the studios (⋯). (BNC-ADR)

(155) a. We must go swimming together one day. (BNC-CFJ)

   b. I went shopping and filled an entire cupboard with the sprays and powders (⋯). (BNC-A0R)

(156) a. All the windows in my carriage shattered, and sent glass flying across the people inside. (BNC-K55)

   b. They proceeded to apprehend Willis and a fellow partygoer and dragged them screaming and kicking to the squad car. (BNC-CDG)

This limitation of interpretation is correlated with the differences in the constituent structures of bi-clausal constructions and mono-clausal constructions. As I have already noted, the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, and the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction are mono-clausal even though they involve two verbs. That is, the verbs in the Converbal Motion Constructions in (154) - (156) are integrated into single clauses. In contrast, the Free Participial Construction is undoubtedly bi-clausal. The Free Participial Construction, which has a wide variety of interpretations, involves two kinds of verbs, but they are loosely integrated.

The interpretations 'manner of motion,' 'accompanying action,' and 'purpose' are associated with simultaneity in a broader sense. In the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, the action represented by a manner of motion verb or an action
verb continues while a subject referent is moving. In the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction, the action represented by a manner of motion verb or an action verb continues while an object referent is moving. Moreover, in the Converbal Purposive Motion Construction, a subject referent moves to somewhere to accomplish the purpose represented by an -ing form verb, and the subject referent keeps the purpose in mind during motion.

The integrity of the two verbs in the Converbal Motion Constructions is reflected in the limitation of interpretation, and the simultaneity in a broader sense. These facts support the iconicity of grammar (e.g., Haiman 1985).

7.3 Each Construction Occupies Its Own Niche

Taylor (2004: 58) argues that a linguistic unit occupies a ‘niche.’ As one word in a language is different from another word semantically/functionally, one construction functions differently from another. That is, there are no synonymous constructions (Goldberg 1995: 67, see also Matsumoto 2010). In this section, I show that the prototypical meaning/function of one construction is different from that of another, reviewing corpus evidence.

In previous chapters, I drew 1,539 examples of the Intransitive Motion Construction, 1,130 examples of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction, 397 examples of the Caused-Motion Construction, and 303 examples of the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction from the BNC.

As I noted in Chapter 4, the prototypical function of the Intransitive Motion Construction is different from that of the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction. This difference is clearly shown by the corpus data. In the former construction go (424) oc-
curs more frequently than *come* (311). In contrast, *come* (844) occurs more frequently than *go* (227) in the latter construction. In other words, the Intransitive Motion Construction is *go*-oriented, whereas the Converbal Intransitive Motion Construction is *come*-oriented. That is, these two constructions are contrasted in terms of deixis.

As I have noted in Chapter 6, the Caused-Motion Construction is also contrasted with the Converbal Caused-Motion Construction in term of causative type. The former construction prefers continuous causation (71.8%) to onset causation (28.2%), whereas the latter construction prefers onset causation (91.1%) to continuous causation (8.9%).

Moreover, while both the Intransitive Motion Construction and the Caused-Motion Construction are *GoAL*-oriented as a whole, both the Converbal Motion Constructions dealt with in Chapters 4 and 6 are *Via*-oriented. These facts strongly show that each construction occupies its own niche.

### 7.4 Corpus Data in Construction Grammar

Many linguists in the field of Construction Grammar have utilized corpus data, and most previous studies by them examine which words are prototypical in a given construction (e.g., Stefanowitsch and Gries 2003). These studies aim to describe each construction in detail by presenting several statistically analyzed data as well as raw frequencies of words occurring in constructions. These studies are certainly important to Construction Grammar, and I have described three constructions in detail by showing corpus data in this thesis.

The data drawn from corpora are numerical, and thus, we can compare the distribution of frequency of a word or words in a given construction with that in another construction. Especially, these numerical data are helpful to compare two similar con-
structions in meaning and/or function. In fact, I compared two kinds of Intransitive Motion Constructions in Chapter 4, and two kinds of Caused-Motion Constructions in Chapter 6.

The theoretical generalizations proposed by Goldberg and Taylor are important, but such theoretical hypotheses need to be examined by some empirical methods. Corpus investigation is one of such empirical methods.
Chapter 8

Concluding Remarks

8.1 Introduction

This dissection has adopted a constructional approach to Converbal Motion Constructions in English based on large corpus data. These constructions have been described in few previous studies. However, through the foregoing chapters, my corpus-based statistical descriptions of these constructions not only give exhaustive and reliable data to the field of theoretical linguistics but also contribute to the theory of Construction Grammar. In what follows, I will summarize the major findings of my study.

The organization of this final chapter is as follows. Section 1 will briefly recapitulate the essential points in the previous chapters. Section 2 will indicate what remains to be seen in the future since the scope of this thesis is limited to constructions involving -ing form verbs.
8.2 Converbal Constructions Revisited

Converbal Constructions have mainly attracted the attention of typologists since Haspelmath (1995) introduced the notion of ‘converb’ into theoretical linguistics. The non-finite form verbs functioning subordinately are seen in many languages, and the notion of ‘converbs’ has tempted linguists of European languages to describe phenomena in terms of ‘converb’ (e.g., Kortmann 1995). The researchers focused on bi-clausal constructions such as the Free Participial Construction and the Absolute Participial Construction. This may be because mono-clausal constructions that involve converbs are regarded as reduced versions of bi-clausal constructions through reconstructing. Nevertheless, in fact, some Converbal Constructions are syntactically mono-clausal as I demonstrated in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Moreover, in mono-clausal Converbal Constructions in English, a complex predicate composed of an inflecting verb and an -ing form verb functions as a single predicate, and it takes a single path argument.

These observations suggest not all Converbal Constructions are bi-clausal. Mono-clausal Converbal Constructions should not be regarded as reduced versions from bi-clausal ones. This difference between mono-clausal constructions and bi-clausal ones is reflected in the range of variety of interpretations. That is, the range of interpretations of -ing forms are very limited in mono-clausal Converbal Constructions.

In addition, the corpus investigation illustrated the prototypical meaning/function of each construction. In the theory of Construction Grammar, there should not be more than one semantically and/or functionally same construction (The Principle of No Synonymy: Goldberg 1995: 67). Corpus investigation is very useful to examine the prototypical meaning/function of a construction because verbs occurring frequently in a construction reflect their prototypical meanings.
Many functional and/or cognitive linguists have faith in an assumption that the grammatical structure in languages is functionally motivated. What I have done so far in this thesis contributes to this issue. That is, grammatical structure motivates meaning and/or function.

8.3 What Remains to Be Seen

In my thesis, I focus on limited constructions, in which a motion verb or a causative motion verb co-occurs with an *-ing* form verb. However, there are constructions where a motion verb is followed by another verb. Examples of such constructions are given in (157) and (158).

(157)  
   a. You should **come** and **see** them.  
   b. I should **go** and **get** the other box and then you’ve got all the other bits and pieces as well.

(158)  
   a. **Come buy** wine and milk without money and without cost.  
   b. Come on, I’m hungry, let’s **go get** some lunch and then we’ll find an estate agent.

The expressions in (157) involve a conjunction between a deictic motion verb (i.e., *come* and *go*) and a transitive verb (i.e., *see* and *get*). On the other hand, in (158), two verbs are juxtaposed without a conjunction.

It should be noted that the second verbs in (157) and (158) seem to be transitive and take an object. In the Converbal Motion Constructions dealt with in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, most *-ing* form verbs cannot take an object. If each construction occupies its niche, these constructions in (157) and (158) must be different from the constructions discussed
in previous chapters. If this is true, how are these constructions different from other similar constructions? In addition, I should demonstrate that the construction in (158) is not a reduced version of the construction in (157), as well. Moreover, the productivity of the verbs in the constructions should be examined with a corpus investigation.
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