CARMEN NOVO URRACA[*]
Universidad de La Rioja

Butler, C. and Arista, J.M., eds. 2009. *Deconstructing Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp: 306.

This book consists of an introduction by the editors and nine chapters, which are divided into three sections, dealing, respectively, with theoretical issues, the Lexical Constructional Model and specific constructions.[1] References are provided by chapter and three indexes (by topic, name and language) close the book.

The first section opens with Daniel García Velasco's paper, entitled "Innovative coinage. Its place in the grammar". This article deals with a particular case of innovative lexical creation, namely the use of proper nouns with verbal function. García Velasco holds the view that verbal eponyms are expressions whose interpretation is strongly dependent on the context in which they are used. Then, the author discusses how these facts can be incorporated into Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995, 2006) and Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008). After discarding the possibility of treating verbal eponyms in terms of coercion, García Velasco draws the conclusion that Functional Discourse Grammar, which, along with the semantic-syntactic and phonological components, distinguishes a conceptual and a contextual component, offers an architecture that can carry out the analysis undertaken. In a paper entitled "The construction of macro-events. A typological perspective", Johan Pedersen discusses Talmy's (1985, 1987, 1991, 2000) typology of macro-events from the point of view of Construction Grammar. Thus, Talmy´s distinction in lexicalization between satellite-framed and verb-framed languages is applied to the contrastive analysis of a short story by Hans Christian Andersen in six parallel versions (the original Danish version, as well as the translations into English, German, Spanish, Italian and French). Pedersen considers that Talmy´s typology is restricted to lexicalization, thus requiring an enlargement that includes lexical and schematic constructional levels of analysis. The author proposes a framework of analysis in which the typological patterns are interpreted as an information structure phenomenon. Such framework can accommodate data that do not conform to the basic patterns and identify patterns still not distinguished in

Talmy´s typology. The paper by Beatriz Martínez Fernández, entitled "Constructions, co-composition and merge", discusses instances of *break* verbs with argument-adjuncts of motion which do not meet the requirements for being considered a construction in Goldberg´s (1995, 2006) Construction Grammar but resemble the syntax of Goldberg´s caused-motion construction. As Martínez Fernández puts it, these structures acquire the semantics of motion while keeping the semantics of change of state, thus the term *merge structures*. The author resorts to Pustejovsky's (1995) Generative Lexicon because it focuses on creative uses of language in general and polysemy in particular, and, moreover, can explain co-composition and merge. Martínez Fernandez also raises the question of how to account for merge structures in the framework of Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997; Van Valin 2005) and reaches the conclusion that the choice between a merge or a co-compositional reading will be determined by lexical representation. The paper by Javier Martín Arista, which is entitled "A typology of morphological constructions", is a contribution to the development of the theory of morphology of Role and Reference Grammar that develops a number of questions of the Layered Structure of the Word (Martín Arista 2008, 2010, 2011a, 2011b) and applies them to English and the Australian language Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara. With the general aim of defining morphological processes by means of criteria different from class membership, a distinction is made between constructions and constructional schemas. Morphological constructions, which are typologically relevant, are defined on the grounds of the distribution of markedness, that is, whether the Nucleus or other word constituents display the morphologically relevant features. Constructional schemas, which constitute language-specific instantiations of constructions and can combine with one another, can be broken down into the following types: recursive/non-recursive, analytic/synthetic and continuous/discontinuous. The conclusion is drawn that derivation (including compounding and affixation) can be endocentric or exocentric, whereas inflection is endocentric. Inflection and derivation can be analytic and synthetic as well as continuous and discontinuous. Finally, derivation is typically recursive while inflection is non recursive.

The section devoted to the Lexical Constructional Model (Ruiz de Mendoza and Mairal Usón 2008) begins with Christopher Butler's paper "The Lexical Constructional Model. Genesis, strengths and challenges". Butler briefly reviews some recent work on relationships across a spectrum of functionalist, cognitivist and constructionist approaches to language. Then, the author discusses the model in terms of the influence of earlier approaches and the continuation of previous work. Thus, the model is considered against the wider context of Functional Grammar (Dik 1997a, 1997b), Coseriu's Lexematics, Role and Reference Grammar, the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (Goddard and Wierzbicka 1994, 2002), Meaning-Text Theory (Mel'čuk 1996, 2006), Construction Grammar and the cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy. Butler underlines the strengths of the model and, to conclude, identifies a number of challenges for future research. The chapter by Ricardo Mairal Usón and Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, entitled "Levels of description and

explanation in meaning construction", lays the foundations of the Lexical Constructional Model, which the authors consider descriptively adequate for the explanation of meaning construction at all levels of linguistic description, from semantics and morphosyntax to pragmatics and discourse. As put forward in this article, the Lexical Constructional Model distinguishes four linguistic levels. Level 1 is the argument structure module and consists of elements with syntactically relevant semantic interpretation. The other levels are idiomatic, in such a way that each of them is either subsumed into a higher-level constructional configuration or triggers a relevant conceptual structure that yields an implicit meaning derivation. Levels 2 and 3 deal with cognitively entrenched meaning implications resulting from, respectively, low-level and high-level inferential schemas, while level 4 takes issue with discursive phenomena like cohesion and coherence, as well as their influence on meaning construction. The authors devote a significant part of the chapter to the interaction between lexical and constructional configurations at the different levels, which is regulated by a number of internal and external constraints.

The part on specific constructions begins with Francisco González García´s paper, whose title is "Measuring out reflexivity in secondary predication in English and Spanish. Evidence from cognition verbs". The article concentrates on secondary predications with *find/encontrar* and a reflexive pronoun with object function in English and Spanish. The author identifies two related constructions, namely, the reflexive subjective-transitive construction and the self-descriptive subjective-transitive construction. The reflexive subjective-transitive construction produces an agentive construal on the event/state of affairs in question, while the self-descriptive subjective-transitive construction imposes a non-agentive construal. At the same time, the reflexive subjective-transitive construction resembles a two-participant event while instances of the self-descriptive subjective-transitive construction are equivalent to one-participant events. Corpus-based evidence gathered by the author indicates that although English and Spanish share a number of morphological and syntactic features, the inventory of morphosyntactic realizations of the noun phrase is not fully symmetrical, which is consistent with the language-specific nature of argument structure. Francisco Cortés Rodríguez, in a chapter entitled "The inchoative construction. Semantic representation and unification constraints", carries out an analysis of English inchoative structures within the Lexical Constructional Model. In this framework, lexical-constructional subsumption abides by the semantic compatibility between predicates and constructions. In this respect, two types of restrictions apply in the analysis of inchoative constructions. In the first place, an external constraint affects the unification of causative predicates and inchoative structures. In the second place, unification is subject to internal constraints on the semantic structure of predicates. Cortés Rodríguez reaches the conclusion that the analysis of these constrains stresses the explanatory power of the Lexical Constructional Model for meaning construction. The third part of the book closes with the contribution by Pilar Guerrero Medina, entitled "Semantic and pragmatic constraints on the English *get*-passive". Guerrero Medina holds that a lexically-based approach to the English *get*-passive is inadequate because a number

of pragmatic and contextual factors are crucial to ascertain its acceptability. The author analyses corpus data and concentrates on how the semantics of the English *get*-passive interacts with the semantic properties of verbs of five types that partake in the construction: affect, giving, motion, corporeal and annoying verbs. The author draws the conclusion that the English *get*-passive constitutes a family of constructions, comprising the causative *get*-passive and the spontaneous *get*-passive.

The editors have made a well motivated and balanced choice that gives us a very good read. It is not usual to find such a variety of topics, languages and approaches covered so coherently in a volume. Neither is it frequent to find authors who lay out extensive amounts of data in such a respectful and careful way.

Individually, all contributions present interesting and original material. Overall, the book fully attains its aim of contributing to the convergence of functional and constructional analyses. Indeed, functionally oriented articles, like García Velasco´s, Martínez Fernández´s, Martín Arista´s, Cortés Rodríguez´s and Guerrero Medina´s, incorporate insights and proposals from constructional (mainly Golbergian) models, while constructionally oriented contributions, such as those by Mairal Usón and Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez and Gonzálvez García, adopt some functionalist perspectives.

All chapters reflect a wide theoretical background as well as critical synthesis and application to particular problems. In this respect, the rigorous corpus analysis on which a good number of articles are based, the comparative analysis in two or more languages and the attention paid to some relatively unknown languages are remarkable. Although the range of languages analysed throughout the book is remarkable, the style of the book is clear and accessible, thanks to its exemplification with glossing and figures and the reader-friendly way of citing data.

Considering the remarks above, the book is not intended for undergraduate students, but could be used by postgraduate students with some theoretical background, and is ideal for those already familiar with constructional or functional linguistic models who wish to find extensions or new applications of these frameworks.

To conclude, I have no doubt that this book, which presents the basic tenets of the Lexical Constructional Model and the Layered Structure of the Word as well as some initial applications of these frameworks, deserves consideration and will receive attention by linguists for years to come. I would certainly encourage anyone interested in functional and constructional models of language to get a copy of *Deconstructing Constructions*.

Notes

* Correspondence to: Carmen Novo Urraca. Departamento de Filologías Modernas. Universidad de La Rioja. C/San José de Calasanz, 33. 26004. Logroño. La Rioja. E-mail: carmen.novo@unirioja.es.

REFERENCES

Dik, S. 1997a (1989). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*. Ed. K. Hengeveld. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dik, S. 1997b. *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part 2: Complex and Derived Constructions*. Ed. K. Hengeveld. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Goddard, C. and A. Wierzbicka. 1994. "Introducing lexical primitives". *Semantic and Lexical Universals. Theory and Empirical Findings*. Eds., C. Goddard and A. Wierzbicka. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 31-54.

Goddard, C. and A. Wierzbicka. 2002. "Semantic primes and Universal Grammar". *Meaning and Universal Grammar. Theory and Empirical Findings* (Volume I). Eds., C. Goddard and A. Wierzbicka. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 41-85.

Goldberg, A. 1995. *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Goldberg, A. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hengeveld, K. and J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A Typologically-based Theory of Language Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martín Arista, J. 2008. "Unification and separation in a functional theory of morphology". *Investigations of the Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Ed. R. Van Valin. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 119-145.

Martín Arista, J. 2010. "Lexical negation in Old English". *NOWELE-North-Western European Language Evolution* 60/61: 89-108.

Martín Arista, J. 2011a. "Projections and constructions in Functional Morphology: The case of Old English *HRĒOW*". *Language and Linguistics* 12 (2): 393-424.

Martín Arista, J. 2011b. "Adjective formation and lexical layers in Old English". *English Studies* 92 (3): 323-344.

Mel'čuk, I. 1996. "Lexical functions: a tool for the description of lexical relations in the lexicon". *Lexical Functions in Lexicography and Natural Language Processing*. Ed., L. Wanner. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 37-102.

Mel'čuk, I. 2006. *Aspects of the Theory of Morphology*. Ed. D. Beck. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pustejovsky, J. 1995. *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Ruiz de Mendoza, F. and R. Mairal Usón. 2008. "Levels of description and constraining of factors in meaning construction: an introduction to the Lexical Constructional Model". *Folia Linguistica* 42 (2): 355-400.

Talmy, L. 1985. "Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms". *Language typology and syntactic description*, *Vol. 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*. Ed., T. Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 57–149.

Talmy, L. 1987. *Lexicalization Patterns: Typologies and Universals* [Berkeley Cognitive Science Report 47]. Berkeley CA: University of California.

Talmy, L. 1991. "Path to realization: a typology of event conflation". Eds., L. Sutton, C. Johnson and R. Shields. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 480-519.

Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Van Valin, R. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, R. and R. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.