

Why *Go* Doesn't Have Two Past Participles

JOSEPH HILFERTY

Departament de Filologia Anglesa i Alernanya

Facultat de Filologia

Universitat de Barcelona

Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585

08007 Barcelona

Spain

E-mail: hilferty@lingua.fil.ub.es

ABSTRACT

The present paper argues that traditionalist-inspired claims (e.g., Swan 1980) alleging that the past participle been (to) is in allomorphic alternation with gone (to) are unsubstantiated by the facts. First, it is shown that gone to and been to are semantically distinct. Then, it is postulated that the preposition to is polysemous in the domain of space and that this polysemy accounts for its ability to collocate with been. Finally, it is suggested that, unlike gone to, been to belongs to an idiomatic grammatical construction, which helps to explain the differences in distribution between the two expressions. Taken as a whole, these arguments strongly indicate that been (to) is categorized as an instance of be and not as an allomorph of go.

KEY WORDS: *Been to*, *gone to*, grammatical constructions, construction **grammar**, prepositional polysemy.

RESUMEN

Cienos autores inscritos en una línea tradicionalista (p. ej., Swan 1980) alegan que el inglés **been** (to) es un participio de pasado en alternancia con *gone* (to); el presente artículo arguye, sin embargo, que una **examinación** detallada de los datos lingüísticos resta credibilidad a tal posibilidad. En primer lugar, se demuestra que *gone to* y **been to** son **semánticamente** distintos. En segundo lugar, se postula que la preposición **to** es polisémica en el dominio del espacio y es justamente esta **polisemia** la que permite la combinación **been + to**. Finalmente, se sugiere que, a diferencia de *gone to*, **been to** constituye una construcción **gramatical** idiomática, lo que ayuda a **explicar** las diferencias de **distribución** que **existen** entre las dos expresiones en cuestión. Considerados en su **globalidad**, **estos** argumentos indican que **been** (to) se **categoriza** en realidad como una forma de *be* y no como un **alomorfo** de *go*.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Been to*, *gone to*, construcciones gramaticales, **gramática** de construcciones, polisemia preposicional.

I. THE IMPLICIT ARGUMENT

Every once in a while one hears from traditionalist-inspired grammarians that *go* has two past participles (see, e.g., Swan 1980, §101). Though no explicit arguments are offered to substantiate this claim, the basis for it probably rests on grammaticality judgments such as those in (1) and (2).

- (1) a. Henry Hinkleweenie often goes to Arizona.
 b. Henry Hinkleweenie went to Arizona last year.
 c. Henry Hinkleweenie has gone to Arizona only a few times since he got married.
- (2) a. * Henry Hinkleweenie is to Arizona all the time.
 b. * Henry Hinkleweenie was to Arizona last month.
 c. Henry Hinkleweenie has been to Arizona once in the past ten years.

Given the distribution of the data set,¹ the argument would, speciously, take the following form:

Primo: in contrast to *go*, *be* is defective when it collocates with spatial *to*;

Secundo: speakers should agree that *been to* and *gone to* are synonymous, since

Tertio: *to* + PLACE implies movement —ergo, *been* does also;

THEREFORE:

Quarto: *been* is an alternate past participle of the verb *go*.

I believe that this account of the facts is flawed on several counts, not the least of which have to do with such fundamental questions as synonymy, polysemy, and **grammatical** constructions. I take up these matters each in turn and show that *been* is not an alternate past participle belonging to *go*.

II. SYNONYMY

The first flaw in the above argument relates to the implication that *gone to* and *been to* are synonymous with one another. This means, in other words, that sentences such as those in (3) should be **semantically** identical.

- (3) a. Ren and Stimpy have gone to Nepal several times.
 b. Ren and Stimpy have been to Nepal several times.

Despite these initial appearances, it is well known that *gone to* and *been to* do not convey quite the same meaning. This is borne out by the differences in interpretation regarding examples such as (4):

- (4) a. Ren and Stimpy have gone to the office.
 b. Ren and Stimpy have been to the office.

Let us start with sentence (4a). This sentence has at least two plausible default interpretations. One interpretation is, roughly, that Ren and Stimpy **have** departed from wherever they were and are now on their way to the office. Another possibility is that they **have** reached the office and *they are still there*. This differs from the interpretation of (4b), which is that they **have** gone to the office, but *they are no longer there*. This point is perhaps more clearly illustrated in (5).

- (5) a. Ren and Stimpy **have** gone to Italy for the month.
 b. * Ren and Stimpy **have been** to Italy for the month

Example (5b) is unacceptable **because** the semantics of *been to* clashes with that of *for the month*. This clash is due to the fact that *been to* implies specifically that Ren and Stimpy are no longer in Italy, whereas *for the month* suggests that they currently are. (To put it in less impressionistic terms, it is impossible to "be and then no longer be" at the same place during the same time span.) By contrast, in example (5a), the semantic structure of the two relevant constituents does not clash. On the present account, *gone to* is in perfect consonance with *for the month*, since they both indicate that Ren and Stimpy are currently in Italy.

This still invites the question of why sentences such as (3a) and (3b) seem to be very close semantically? Such sentences resemble each other **because** they convey basically the same **conceptual content** (in the sense of Langacker 1987, 1990, 1991). They contrast subtly with one another, however, in the way they portray this conceptual content. In this connection, consider the variations of sentences (3) proposed in (6):

- (6) a. Ren and Stimpy **have** gone to the Clinton White House a few times.
 b. Ren and Stimpy **have been** to the Clinton White House a few times.

What makes the meanings of examples (6a) and (6b) so similar is the fact that the adverbial *a few times* denotes that the actions were "recurrent." In essence, then, both sentences describe arrivals at (as well as **departures** from) the White House. This, I believe, is the basis for the apparent synonymy of these examples.

While sentences such as (6a) and (6b) are semantically quite comparable, they are not exactly identical. It is true that they both represent the same event; however, they do so by **perspectivizing** different facets of the situation. For example, in (6a) *gone to* highlights the goal-oriented **trajectory** of Ren and Stimpy, which ends up at the White House. In sentence (6b), on the other hand, *been to* emphasizes the **presence** of Ren and Stimpy at a place located at the endpoint of the **trajectory**.² That is, though a prior **trajectory** is implicit in the semantic structure of *been to*, the expression does not profile a **trajectory per se**. Therefore, even though the same circumstances are being described in both cases, the two sentences carry slightly different nuances of construal. I will explore this observation **further** in the following section.

III. POLYSEMY

Another flawed aspect of the two-participle **argument** has to do with the meaning of the preposition *to*. Though *to* has yet to be given a full description, most accounts of this

preposition do not even entertain the possibility that, in the domain of space, it might not be monosemous. In this section I will show that spatial *to* is actually polysemous. This overlooked detail has significant consequences for **distinguishing *been*** to from *gone to*.

In its prototypical sense, the preposition *to* **highlights** the goal portion of an **entire** trajectory (cf. Hilferty 1993, Taylor 1993). This can be **seen** by considering the following **example**:

- (7) Ray Cokes went to a London pub.

In this sentence, *to a London pub* designates the goal section of **some** larger unspecified trajectory. (**Common** sense dictates that Ray Cokes had to start his trajectory from somewhere). However, when *to* collocates with ***been*** in what I shall call the ***been to-construction***, then, it **does** not convey exactly the same meaning as in (7). Rather than highlighting the approach towards the goal, it instead focuses on the very endpoint of the trajectory. This remark merits **some** clarification.

Endpoint-focus phenomena **have been** well documented for English path prepositions (e.g., Bennett 1975, Lakoff 1987, Taylor 1993, *inter alia*). **Consider** the contrast in examples (8)-(10). In each of the (a) sentences, the subject effects **some** sort of movement along a path.

- (8) a. Ray Cokes walked over the hill.
b. Ray Cokes lives over the hill.
- (9) a. Ray Cokes ran across the street.
b. Ray Cokes lives across the street.
- (10) a. Ray Cokes **skipped** past the supermarket.
b. Ray Cokes lives past the supermarket.

In the (b) sentences, on the other hand, no such movement is expressed; in these cases, the subject is merely located on the other **side** of the place indicated by the prepositional object. Such data **provides some** independent motivation for assigning an endpoint-focus sense to *to*. If **I am correct**, this static reading of *to* **does** not really underscore the movement toward the endpoint of the goal trajectory. On the contrary, in the context of the ***been to-construction*** I would contend that *to* focuses on the endpoint itself.

While Deane (1993) specifically **denies** the possibility that spatial *to* might **have** an endpoint-focus sense, the ***been to-construction*** seems to suggest otherwise. This said, however, I should **hasten** to add it **is** obvious that *to* cannot combine with **all** sorts of “**motionless**” verbs. In fact, this use of *to* is not very productive at all:

- (11) a. Bill walked to the store.
b. * Bill works to the store.
c. * Bill lives to **the** store.

Despite its limited productivity, the use of *to* described for the ***been to-construction*** is by no means arbitrary. It **is** motivated by the obvious fact that *to be* in a location you must **have**

previously gone there. The restricted distribution of endpoint-focus points to the need for special treatment of *been* to. I take the matter up in the next section.

In any event, there **does** exist additional **evidence** supporting the analysis advanced **here**. For one thing, in a conventional construction such as to the *left/right* of X, the preposition to is perfectly felicitous as the marker of a static relationship.

- (12) a. In this picture, Chelsea is standing to the left of Hilary.
b. **Bill's** picture is to the right of Hilary's picture.

For another, there are examples such as those in (13), indicating 'attachment' (cf. Lindkvist 1950, §638 ff):

- (13) a. The gum was stuck to the bottom of the table (by **Bill**).
b. The gum was stuck to the bottom of the table (and there was no way to get it off).

Such uses **allow** for passive-voice and stative interpretations (examples (13a) and (13b), respectively). On the passive interpretation, the gum is conceived as going roughly from an OFF-relationship to an ON-relationship with regard to the table. On the stative interpretation, change of place is not explicitly denoted, but entailed. Taken together, examples such as (12) and (13b) **provide** good motivation for positing a static endpoint-focus use of to.

The import of ascribing an endpoint-focus sense to to is that *been* maintains its stative meaning in the *been* to-construction. This is a plausible solution, since it is consonant with native-speaker intuitions: gone stresses 'going,' whereas *been* stresses 'being.' On the basis of meaning, then, it is difficult to make the case that *been* (to) is an alternate participle of *go*.³ Now let us turn to a final argument against the stance that *go* has two past participles.

IV. GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS

The third point on which the two-participle position **fails** has to do with the nature of grammatical constructions. There exists a trend in current linguistic theory that seeks to explain language in terms of simultaneous syntax and semantics and which are aptly described as construction-based **frameworks**.⁴ Such an approach to language describes the regularities (and "irregularities") of linguistic structure as sets of form-meaning pairings. This view affords a fundamental insight for idiomatic expressions that are less **than fully** productive. **Learned** and stored in memory as semantico-grammatical "chunks," such expressions are deemed to be special **grammatical** constructions, whose overall structure is noncompositional. The idiomatic **patterns** of a language are therefore **seen** as possessing Gestalt qualities, in that they are not the sum of their component parts.

A case in point is of course the *been* to-construction, which clearly is not the **mere** sum of *been* + *to*. We **have** already described the idiosyncratic semantics of the construction in the two previous sections, so there is no need to **belabor** the matter **here**. Instead, I will offer a very rough picture of what the syntax of the construction looks like. At the highest level of generalization, this construction probably takes the form of:

- (14) [[have_{aux.}] [[been] [[to] [PLACE_{NP}]]]]

While the representation used in (14) is a simplified rendering of the *been* to-construction, it is sufficient for present purposes. What it is meant to convey is a verb phrase headed by auxiliary *have*, which **takes *been* +** to as its obligatory complement.⁵ Of special importance here is the fact that not all the "slots" have a lexically filled terminal node. This is the case of the constituent marked [PLACE_{NP}], which licenses any noun phrase whose semantics is that of a place. So, like most other constructions, the *been* to-construction is a cross between lexical, syntactic, and semantic information.

Now, the upshot of (14) is that the *been* to-construction obeys the rules of "perfect" constructions, i.e., it can only be productively in the perfect tenses (e.g., the present perfect and the past perfect), as in (15):

- (15) a. Present perfect: Henry Hinkleweenie has never **been** to Berserkeley.
 b. Past perfect: Henry Hinkleweenie **told** me that he had **been** to **Hell** once but he really didn't like it.

Gone (to), on the other hand, belongs to spatial go. This is significant because it suggests that go (*to*) should display full productivity, namely that it should be able to be used without any problem in all active-voice tenses. This is in fact corroborated by the grammaticality judgments in (1). Thus, the differing distributions of go and be in examples (1) and (2), respectively, are fully explainable via the constructions that they belong to.

As further proof for the proposal presented herein, consider the case of elided questions, such as the following:

- (16) a. Gone to the office yet?
 b. Go to the office yet?
- (17) a. **Been** to the office yet?
 b. * Be to the office yet?

The present account predicts the ungrammaticality of (17b), because there seems to be no stable be to-construction to sanction it. On the other hand, the grammaticality of the corresponding go to-sequence in (16b) is assured (in American English), since it needs no licensing by a special construction. Thus, the "defective" distribution of *been* to falls out directly from the constructional restrictions it is subject to.

Now, the foregoing remarks should not be taken as saying that gone (*to*) does not participate in the present- and past-perfect constructions. Of course it does. What I do mean to say is that be is only able to collocate productively with spatial to through the *been* to-construction (which, no doubt, is a very specific variant of the perfect constructions). These observations suggest strongly that there is no need to posit an ad-hoc allomorphic relationship claiming that *been* is an alternate past participle of go.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Contrary to what is sometimes asserted, *go* does not have two past participles, but only one: *gone*. The sequence *been to*, far from being an alternant of *gone (to)*, belongs instead to a specific grammatical construction, which is endowed with its own particular syntax and semantics. This, I contend, is the basis for its "defective" distribution. As is often the case with grammatical constructions, *been to* is not the literal sum of its parts and therefore cannot profitably be analyzed as such. Only by analyzing *been to* as an idiomatic construction with its own semantico-syntactic constraints can one come to a natural and realistic account that accords with native-speaker intuitions. Bearing this in mind, it seems clear that the past participles *been* and *gone* do not constitute a case of allomorphy. Instead they are, just as common sense would predict, the past participles of *be* and *go*, respectively.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Al Muth, Paco Ruiz de Mendoza, and an anonymous reviewer for their many helpful suggestions. I would also like to thank Chet Creider, Dick Hudson, and And Rosta for providing some grammaticality judgments, as well as Carsten Breul for fortuitously bringing examples (16) and (17) to my attention. It goes without saying, however, that all shortcomings and errors are strictly my own.

NOTES

1. While (2a) and (2b) are clearly unacceptable, Lindkvist (1950, §616) states that it is possible to encounter *be to* + PLACE in tenses other than the present and the past perfect. In fact, he adduces an attested example in which a simple form of *be* is (apparently) used with the spatial preposition *to*:

- (i) Ferdy, having the common love of a free show, was one of the first *to* the rails; he had a good place in the front row. (taken from Lindkvist 1950: 312: the italics are Lindkvist's)

Observe, however, that *to the rails* actually forms a constituent with (*one of*) *the first* and therefore cannot truly be considered an instance of *be to*. This is shown by (ii), where the prepositional phrase must be integrated as part of the noun phrase.

- (ii) a. * One of the first was Ferdy to the rails.
b. One of the first to the rails was Ferdy.

Lindkvist's point is nevertheless well taken. For instance, it seems to me that, given the right context, most native speakers of American English would not "bat an eyelash" if they were to hear a sentence such as (iii) in the stream of discourse.

- (iii) ? It was getting really late and we were only to Santa Fe.

In the context of explaining a trip whose final destination was supposed to be somewhere beyond the capital of New Mexico, sentence (iii) would probably not sound very odd. However, there must be some clear contextual or situational cue indicating that the object of *to* is merely a subdestination: otherwise, such uses are unacceptable. This accounts for the infelicity of (iv):

- (iv) * We were to Santa Fe and we stayed there.

At present, I have embarrassingly little to say about the matter (though see note 5), other than to note that sentences such as (iii) pose an additional difficulty for any analysis that claims that *been (to)* is a form of *go*.

2. As we have seen, *been to* also carries the conventional implicature that the grammatical subject is no longer at the site indicated by the prepositional object. In the case of (6b), this connotation is spelled out more explicitly by the reiterative adverbial of frequency *a few times*.

3. It should be noted that I am not **claiming** that it is impossible for a verb to **have** two past participles, each with different meanings. As is well **known**, in American English *ger* has two past participles: *got* and *gorren*.

- (v) a. **Have** you got enough money?
 b. I'm **sorry**; I've **really** got to go now.
- (vi) a. **Have** you gotten my letter in the mail yet?
 b. **You** mean you **still** haven't gotten there yet?

Though no doubt there is a certain amount of variation, the "pseudo-past participle" *got* is generally used to express possession and obligation (e.g., examples (v)), whereas the true past participle *gorren* usually expresses meanings akin to receiving, **arriving**, and other values associated with *ger* (e.g., examples (vi)). Given the **similarity** of phonological forms, counting *gor* and *gorren* as past participles of *get* is quite natural. *Been* and *gone*, on the other hand, bear little phonological resemblance to one another; suppletion notwithstanding, such a putative allomorphic relationship would **have little claim** to naturalness.

4. See, especially, Fillmore and Kay's Construction Grammar framework (e.g., Bmgman 1988, 1996. Fillmore 1985, 1986, 1988, 1996, Fillmore & Atkins 1992, Fillmore & Kay *in progress*, Fillmore et al. 1988, Goldberg 1994, 1995, 1996, Kay 1984, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1997, Koenig 1993, 1995, Michaelis 1994. Michaelis & Lambrecht 1994, 1996a, 1996b, Valenzuela 1996). See, also, Lakoff's Cognitive Semantics approach (e.g., Lakoff 1987, Goldberg 1992) and Langacker's Cognitive Grammar (e.g., Langacker 1987, 1990, 1991, Achard 1993). For further arguments in favor of **construction-based grammars**, see Bates & Goodman *in press* and Jackendoff (1995, 1997: ch. 7).

5. Unfortunately, this **formulation does** not explain example (iii) in note 1. A complete account would **ultimately have** to explain the possibility of such a use in discourse (for American English at least, though apparently not for British English). As a **first** approximation to the problem, I would speculate that **examples** such as (iii) **only exist** as extrapolations (i.e., as **extensions** rather than **instantiations**) from the schema proposed in (14). These extrapolations would probably be analogical in character and based on other verb-phrase patterns (perhaps on that of *go to*). This would account, at least in part, for the very **slight** oddness of such utterances, since the grammatical construction they would presuppose would **have** to be assembled "on the fly" and therefore would lack cognitive entrenchment (see Langacker 1987, 1990, 1991 for the notion of entrenchment).

Another aspect of this construction that **deserves** mentioning is the fact that it **does not** account for examples in which the preposition *to* **does not** appear.

- (vii) a. She hasn't **been** to Logroño; she's **been** somewhere **else**.
 b. **Where have** you **been** all this time?
 c. To tell you the truth, I've never **been** there.
 d. I've **been** home twice today.

It is important to note that this same phenomenon happens with other verbs (though in **varying** degrees, to be **sure**). A smattering of examples can be found in (viii):

- (viii) a. She hasn't **gone** to Logroño; she's **gone** somewhere **else**.
 b. Where are you going?
 c. No. I've never driven there before.
 d. I've already **run** home twice today.

In any event, the preposition *to* **cannot** be omitted from the *been to*-construction without allowing for an ungrammatical sequence such as:

- (ix) * I've **been** San Francisco.

My tentative **proposal** for the *been to*-construction would be to say that the preposition *to* can be **overridden** by certain lexical items such as *where*, *somewhere*, *some* place, *there*, *home*, etc. This **amounts to listing** exceptions and I **will not** endeavor to work the **matter** out any **further**.

WORKS CITED

- Achard, M. (1993) "Causative Structures in French: Word Order Following *Faire*, *Laisser*, and *Forcer*". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 19, 1-12.
- Bates, E. & J.C. Goodman (*in press*) "On the Inseparability of Grammar and the Lexicon: Evidence from Acquisition, Aphasia, and Real-Time Processing". *Language and Cognitive Processes*.
- Brugman, C.M. (1988) "The Syntax and Semantics of *Have* and its Complements". Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Brugman, C.M. (1996) "Inalienability and the Interpretation of Modified Noun Phrases", in Shibatani & Thompson (eds.) (1996), 1-27.
- Bennett, D.C. (1975) *Spatial and Temporal Uses of English Prepositions: An Essay in Stratificational Semantics*. London: Longman.
- Deane, P.D. (1993) "At, By, To and Past: An Essay in Multimodal Image Theory", *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 19, 112-124
- Fillmore, C.J. (1985) "Syntactic Intrusions and the Notion of Grammatical Construction", *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 11, 73-86.
- Fillmore, C.J. (1986) "Varieties of Conditional Sentences", in F. Marshall (ed.) *Proceedings of the Third Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*. Pittsburgh, The University of Pittsburgh: 163-182.
- Fillmore, C.J. (1988) "The Mechanisms of Construction Grammar". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14, 35-55.
- Fillmore, C.J. (1989) "Grammatical Construction Theory and the Familiar Dichotomies", in R. Dietrich & C.F. Graumann (eds.) *Language Processing in Social Context*. Amsterdam, Elsevier Science Publishers B.V. (North Holland): 17-38.
- Fillmore, C.J. (1996) "The Pragmatics of Constructions", in D.I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis & J. Guo (eds.) *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language: Essays in Honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp*. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: 53-69.
- Fillmore, C.J. & B.T. Atkins (1992) "Toward a Frame-Based Lexicon: The Semantics of *Risk* and Its Neighbors", in Lehrer & Feder Kittay (eds.) (1992), 75-102.
- Fillmore, C.J. & P. Kay (*in progress*) *Construction Grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Fillmore, C.J., P. Kay & M.C. O'Connor (1988) "Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions: The Case of *Let Alone*". *Language* 64(3), 501-538.
- Goldberg, A.E. (1992) "The Inherent Semantics of Argument Structure: The Case of the English Ditransitive Construction". *Cognitive Linguistics* 3(1), 37-74.
- Goldberg, A.E. (1994) "Another Look at Some Learnability Paradoxes". *Child Language Research Forum* 25, 60-75.
- Goldberg, A.E. (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, A.E. (1996) "Making One's Way Through the Data", in Shibatani & Thompson (eds.) (1996), 29-43.
- Hilfeny, J. (1993) "Through as a Means to Metaphor". Paper presented at the Third International Cognitive Linguistics Association Conference, Leuven, Belgium, July 18-23, 1993 (to appear in the Conference Proceedings published by Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin).
- Jackendoff, R. (1995) "The Boundaries of the Lexicon", in M. Everaert, E.-J. van der Linden, A. Schenk & R. Schreuder (eds.) *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: 133-166
- Jackendoff, R. (1997) *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Kay, P. (1984) "The Kind of/Sort of Construction". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10, 157-171.
- Kay, P. (1989) "Contextual Operators: *Respective, Respectively, and Vice Versa*". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 15, 181-192.
- Kay, P. (1990) "Even". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13(1), 59-111.
- Kay, P. (1991) "Constructional *Modus Tollens* and Level of Conventionality". *Chicago Linguistic Society* 27(2), 105-124.
- Kay, P. (1992) "At Least", in Lehrer & Feder Kittay (eds.) (1992), 309-331.
- Kay, P. (1994) "Anaphoric Binding in Construction Grammar". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20. 283-299.
- Kay, P. (1997) *Words and the Grammar of Context*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Koenig, J.-P. (1993) "Linking Constructions vs. Linking Rules: Evidence from French". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 19, 217-231.
- Koenig, J.-P. (1995) "Mapping Constructions as Word Templates: Evidence from French", in C.S. Burgess, K. Dziwirek & D. Gerds (eds.) *Grammatical Relations: Theoretical Approaches to Empirical Questions*. Stanford, CA. CSLI Publications: 249-270.
- Lakoff, G. (1987) *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R.W. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. I, *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R.W. (1990) *Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, R.W. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. II, *Descriptive Application*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lehrer, A. & E. Feder Kittay (eds.) (1992) *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Lindkvist, K.-G. (1950) *Studies on the Local Sense of the Prepositions In, At, On, and To in Modern English*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup (reproduced by Kraus Reprint, Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1968).
- Michaelis, L.A. (1994) "A Case of Constructional Polysemy in Latin". *Studies in Language* 18(1), 45-70.
- Michaelis, L.A. & K. Lambrecht (1994) "On Nominal Extraposition: A Constructional Analysis". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20, 362-373.
- Michaelis, L.A. & K. Lambrecht (1996a) "The Exclamative Sentence Type in English", in A.E. Goldberg (ed.) *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*. Stanford, CA, CSLI Publications: 375-389.
- Michaelis, L.A. & K. Lambrecht (1996b) "Toward a Construction-Based Theory of Language Function: The Case of Nominal Extraposition". *Language* 72(2), 215-247.
- Shibatani, M. & S.A. Thompson (eds.) (1996) *Grammatical Constructions; Their Form and Meaning*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Swan, M. (1980) *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (1st ed.).

- Taylor, J.R. (1993) "Prepositions: Patterns of Polysemization and Strategies of Disambiguation", in C. Zelinsky-Wibbelt (ed.) *The Semantics of Prepositions: From Mental Processing to Natural Language Processing*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter: 151-175.
- Valenzuela Manzanares, J. (1996) "Esquemas cognitivos y construcciones gramaticales en el verbo inglés: estudio de un corpus de biología molecular". Ph.D. dissertation. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.