Radical Constructionism
   Arnold M. Zwicky, Stanford University

1. some morphological background: stems and their associated inflectional categories
1.1. Arnoff on Latin verb stems: root, "present stem", "perfect stem", "third stem" (third stem
   so-called because of its multifunctionality)
1.2. Harris on Spanish adjective stems: root (Stem 0) /klar/, fem stem (Stem 1) /klara/, masc
   stem (Stem 2) /klaro/ [not his labels] - but Stems 1 and 2 have other functions too (-*mente*
   adverbs built on Stem 1, Stem 2 converted directly into an adverb)
1.3. Hua verb stems (Haiman): apparently phonologically defined:

Stem Z: basic stem	i	u	o
Stem X: front stem	i	i	e
Stem Y: back stem	u	u	o
Stem W: low stem	i	a	a

   apparent uses:
      Stem Z: (sg) imper
      Stem X: 3rd sg
      Stem Y: 1st
      Stem W: finite default (2nd, or 3rd du/pl)
      BUT: du/pl imperatives use Stem X
 finite scheme, with "mood" suffixes: **X/Y/W** as above;
 scheme for imperatives and V1 in some compound constructions (progressive, future,
   same-subject medials): **X** in non-1st non-sg, **Z** elsewhere (1st or du/pl);
 scheme for some other compound constructions (subjunctive, jussive): **X** everywhere
2.1. multifunctionality of the stems (wrt person and number), and in fact of the schemes (wrt
   other categories):
   morphological rules (describing morphological constructions) stipulate one of
      these schemes; the schemes, and the stem types that figure in them, are associated with
   inflectional categories (and hence, ultimately have meaning) only by virtue of the
      constructions they occur in
2.2. connection between stem types and meaning: via inflectional categories
      sometimes the association of stem type and inflcat is direct;
      sometimes a stem type is associated mostly (in terms of token frequency) with one
         inflcat, though it has other uses as well, and vice versa;
      sometimes a stem type has no clear "primary associate" in the world of inflcats
   multifunctionality is the general case;
 label stem types arbitrarily, not with inflcat names;
 stems are mere morphological stuff
2.3. but what about psychological associations between stem type and inflcat?
      a kind of knowledge
      cf. knowledge of (relative) frequencies of lexemes
      cf. knowledge of contexts of use for lexemes, alternative inflectional forms, etc.
3. the pattern of Hua stem choice - where both "meaning" (in the morphological case, inflcats)
      and "form" (stem choice) are associated with whole constructions, not directly to one
      another - is repeated wholesale in syntax, in the distribution of inflcats (including those
      involving marker words)

3.1. English "verb forms" of Type:M/U/P/N (all "non-finite")
        elementary (one-word) types:
                U "(unmarked/bare) infinitive", "base (form)": *be, jump*
                P "past participle", "*-en* form": *been, jumped*
                N "present participle", "gerund participle", "*-ing* form": *being, jumping*
        complex types (involving a "marker/grammatical/function word"/"non-lexical item"/...)
                M "marked infinitive": *to be, to jump*
3.2. Type:P modestly multifunctional: in perfect (*I have seen Vienna*), passive (*I was seen in Vienna by dozens of linguists*), adjectivals (*The door was fully closed*)
  Type:N wildly multifunctional (Pullum & Zwicky 1991): several nominal uses (*I was surprised at their finishing so soon*; *I was surprised at them finishing so soon*), some adjectival uses (*Anyone having a hat on will be prosecuted*), several adverbial uses (*Let's go fishing*; *Being aliens, we had to take precautions*), many verbal uses (*I am singing our national anthem*; *Stop singing like that!*; *Kim having a hat on!; This shirt needs washing by a professional*)
  Type:U middling multifunctional: in imperatives (*Be quiet!*), complement of modals (*I'll be quiet*), complement of infinitival TO in Type:M (*I want to be free*), complement of perception verbs (*I saw them eat the whole thing*), complement of causative verbs (*I made them eat the whole thing*)
  Type:M wildly multifunctional (Zwicky 1982): in nominal clauses (*For them to eat sushi would be a surprise*), purpose adverbials (*To open, press here*), relative clauses (*the book for you to read*), many sorts of verb complements (*I started to sing*; *I forced them to sing*; *I want to be free*; *I believe them to be spies*), etc.
4. how are meanings associated with inflcats?
4.1. lexicalist analysis:
        meanings are associated with the inflcats directly, in the individual words of expressions, which then contribute their meanings to the expressions in which they occur;
        semantics for constructions might be limited to a few operations (function application, function composition, unification, etc.);
        requires positing numerous homophonous inflcats (including marker words), at least for the inflcats of Vs
4.2. lexicalist/constructionalist combo:
        inflcats have primary/basic/default meanings associated with them (or are ambiguous in a small number of ways, i.e. have two or more primary meanings);
        words contribute these meanings to constructions in which they occur, unless these meanings conflict with those associated with a construction, in which case they are overridden;
        requires some decision as to primary meaning(s)
4.3. radical constructionist alternative:
        the meanings and the inflcats are both associated with particular constructions, not directly to one another;
        the inflcats themselves are just (meaningless) syntactic stuff, usable in many different constructions;
        no decision needed as to which meanings are primary;
        rather than numerous homophonous inflcats, we posit numerous constructions, which we have reason to do anyway;
        as for the inflcats, we might as well label them arbitrarily

5.1. cf. Croft (sec. 11.4.3 of Cruse & Croft (in press)):
 "Radical Construction Grammar... takes the constructions as the basic or primitive elements of
   syntactic representation and defines categories in terms of the constructions they occur
   in."
  Croft is discussing syntactic functions (intransitive, transitive, ditransitive V) here, but the
   approach applies equally well to inflcats
5.2. semantics associated with syntactic entities (functions, major categories, subcategories,
  inflcats) then follows from the semantics of the constructions
5.3. autobiographical note: Jakobsonian-universalist position on inflcats - a fixed (though large
  and internally structured) inventory of inflcats, with associated meanings, for all languages
  (very much like the inventory of distinctive features) [Zwicky (1978) and elsewhere]
5.4.   denial of universalism for inflcats [cf. Pullum (1985)];
        but a universalist (cognitive, or naive-metaphysical) approach to the meanings associated
          with constructions [Croft (in press)];
        a middle course between the anti-universalism of much post-Bloomfieldian American
          structuralist syntax and the strong universalism of much European structuralist and
          much generativist [post-"structuralist" structuralist] syntax
5.5.   matching of inflcats in different languages (via their meanings): only rough and ready;
        this is like the matching of lexemes in different languages (via their meanings);
        the same observation holds for the matching of inflcats in different historical stages of the
          "same" language;
        consequently. using a small set of standard labels for inflcats in typological and historical
          studies just muddles things
6. but what about psychological associations between inflcats and certain meanings? (cf. 2.3)
        in some cases there certainly seems to be a strong connection between them:
          Type:R "present tense" (*am/is/are, jump/jumps*) closely, though scarcely invariably,
            connected to present time, Type:T "past tense" (*was/were, jumped*) to past time,
          Type:C "counterfactual" (*were, jumped*) to counterfactual mood;
        knowledge about language, not necessarily an association in the grammar:
           most occurrences of R forms refer to present time, and/because
           R is the preferred ("unmarked") way of referring to present time
7. the case of Type:U (already hugely multifunctional) used for "present subjunctive":
                I insist/require/demand that he be appointed.
7.1. putative generalization: non-finite clauses have non-nominative [non-Type:A] subjects
        (acccusative [Type:O] or prepositionally-marked):
                Him eating sushi!   I hate for him to eat sushi.
7.2. contradiction, since these clauses have Type:A subjects;
           either the verb form is of a new finite type (with exactly the same phonology as U),
           or not every occurrence of U is non-finite (non-finiteness is only the default for U)
7.3. try the second resolution: U is just a formal category; U is used mostly in non-finite clauses,
        but it is also called for in one finite clause
7.4. what does "finite clause" mean then?
        it's a clause construction stipulating Type:A subject
7.5. the "present subjunctive" construction then inherits these conditions (as do the "present"
  and "past" and "counterfactual" constructions)
8.1. hopelessness of labels like "finite" and "subjunctive" - at best, suggestive; but not adequate
  for cross-language comparison, or the study of syntactic change, or of course for semantics
8.2. the names of the constructions, like the names of the inflcats, are merely suggestive;

the constructions might as well be given numbers, or other ad hoc proper names

9.1. analogy of these inflcats of V to case selection for N: indirect object Dat, direct object Dat, subject Dat, locational Dat, ethical Dat, Dat as object of various Ps, etc.

(case by agreement)
"semantic" case (locational, ethical Dat)
case associated with syntactic functions (indirect object Dat}
case associated with a particular construction (Abl absolute)
case governed by a particular head, or class of heads
 (direct object Dat, Dat object of P)

9.2. most approaches take the last set as the paradigm examples, seeking a governing element in all situations; but we could just as easily take "constructional case" as the paradigm; then apparent government is just the cooccurrence of a subcategory stipulation for the head in a construction (reference to the class of lexemes eligible to be head) and a case stipulation on one of the dependents

9.3. case associated with synactic functions generally is just the case stipulated by the default construction involving that function

9.4. "semantic" case easily seen as constructional case as well

9.5. one welcome consequence of this analysis is that it's no longer necessary to decide which type of case we're looking at (often a difficult task)

9.6. the cases could then be arbitrarily named, with numbers or letters (the traditional names [sometimes] pick out their default, or most common, uses); they are associated with syntactic functions and, ultimately, with meanings, not directly but by virtue of the constructions they are used in

REFERENCES

Aronoff, Mark. 1994. Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
Croft, William. In press. Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective. Oxford Univ. Press.
Cruse, D. Alan & William Croft. In press. Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge Univ. Press.
Haiman, John. 1980. Hua: A Papuan language of the Eastern Highlands of New Guinea. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Harris, James W. 1991. The exponence of gender in Spanish. LingI 22.1.27-62.
- 1992. The form classes of Spanish substantives. Yearbook of Morphology 1991.65-88.
Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1985. How complex could an agreement system be? ESCOL 1.79-103.
- & Arnold M. Zwicky. 1991. Condition duplication, paradigm homonymy, and transconstructional constraints. BLS 17.252-66.
Roberts, Paul. 1962. English Sentences. NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.
Zwicky, Arnold M. 1978. Markedness in morphology. Die Sprache 24.2.22-37.
- 1982. Stranded *to* and phonological phrasing in English. Linguistics 20.3-57.
- 1994. Dealing out meaning: Fundamentals of syntactic constructions. BLS 20.611-25.