

The Constructionalization of Implicit Theme Resultative Constructions as a 'Snowclone' in English

Yasuhiro Tsushima
Fuji Women's University
tsushima@fujijoshi.ac.jp

Keywords: Implicit Theme Resultative Construction (ITRC), construction, constructionalization, constructional change, snowclone

The main purpose of this paper is to clarify the constructionalization of **Implicit Theme Resultative Constructions**, which the author's studies (2010, to appear, *inter alia*) call the sentences below.

(1)a. Persil washes whiter. (BNC) / b. Concentrated washing powders wash whiter. (Aarts 1995: 85)

c. Our new washing machine washes cleaner. (Author 2010: 1) / d. This brush paints darker. (Aarts 1995: 86)
Aarts (1995) firstly points out the existence of this type of sentences. A series of the author's studies (2010, to appear, etc.) suggests that ITRCs has a resultative secondary predicate to mean the 'result' of their syntactically implicit themes, and further that they carry the meaning of the 'property' of their subject entities. The studies also claim that they have their similar syntactic and semantic characteristics to Middle Constructions, which hold their property meaning, and to Resultative Constructions, which represent their resultative meaning. The studies define ITRCs as a blended (or, bridge) construction. Therefore, ITRCs have their own form (i.e., "NP₁ V ϕ Resultative Phrase") and meaning (i.e., "X (in virtue of Property) ENABLES Y TO BECOME Z") and form their own constructional network.

The previous studies with reference to ITRCs refer to Aarts' (1995, 1997) syntactic and semantic approaches, and Goldberg's (2001, 2005) pragmatic ones, and a series of the author's Cognitive Linguistic ones. Since none of the previous studies clarify the process of the constructionalization of ITRCs, this paper attempts to resolve it in the framework of Traugott and Trousdale (2013, 2014) and Traugott (2014). First of all, the paper points out that ITRCs are a kind of the so-called '**snowclones**', which are compatible with the **lexical constructionalization**. Pullum (2003) defines a snowclone as "a multi-use, customizable, instantly recognizable, time-worn, quoted or misquoted phrase or sentence that can be used in an entirely open array of different jokey variants by lazy journalists and writers." Traugott and Trousdale's works suggest that snowclones have at least four stages in the process of constructionalization: "(a) A pre-formula stage in which variations on an expression occur, all understood literally, and requiring no special knowledge; (b) A catchy fixed formula is used (with similar meaning) often drawing on a proverb, title, or quotation; (c) The fixed expression may be quickly extended with the development of open slots or playful allusion to it, e.g. via puns or other variations of it; (d) Snowcloning, a second fixing as variants become (relatively) routinized as formulas with open slots in them" (Traugott 2014: 15).

At present rough sketch of the constructionalization of ITRCs as follows. First, sentences like 'Persil washes whiter' in (1a) are literally understood. Second, a fixed formula such as 'INSTR wash/es ϕ whiter' instantiated in (1b) is constructed, based on Middle Constructions, Resultative Constructions, and other idiomatic expressions. Third, a pattern like 'INSTR wash/es ϕ AP-er' having partial open slots is extended and instantiated such as in (1c). The second and third stages refer to the partial phases of **pre-constructional changes**. Forth, the fixed expressions in the third stage are relatively routinized as a **snowclone**, and more schematized pattern 'INSTR V ϕ AP (or PP)' is reasonably extended and fixed with the form-meaning pairing, which sanctions sentence (1d). This is the **constructionalization** of ITRCs. After the constructionalization, ITRCs are likely to have some **post-constructional changes**, in which the constructions can be further extended (i.e., a super-schematic pattern and its full instantiation).

This paper would conclude that the constructionalization motivates ITRCs with the form-meaning pairing.

<Selected References>

- Aarts, Bas. 1995. "Secondary predicates in English." In: Bas Aarts and Charles F. Meyer (eds.) *The verb in contemporary English*. 75-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2003. "PHRASES FOR LAZY WRITERS IN KIT FORM." *Language Log*, October 27.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2014. "Toward a constructional framework for research on language change." *Cognitive Linguistic Studies*. Volume 1, Issue 1. 3-21.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2014. "Contentful constructionalization." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*. Volume 4, Issue 2. 256-283.
- Tsushima Yasuhiro. 2010. *A Cognitive Linguistic Study of Implicit Theme Resultative Constructions and Their Related Constructions*. Doctoral Dissertation, Hokkaido University.
- Tsushima Yasuhiro. to appear. "The Cognitive Network of Implicit Theme Resultative Constructions."