Constructional networks: More on the as-predicative

Beate Hampe
University of Erfurt

Starting out from previous corpus work on the *as*-predicative (Gries, Hampe & Schönefeld 2005, 2010), this contribution adds another layer of analysis to the merged corpus data from the ICE-GB and the BNC sampler presented in Gries, Hampe & Schönefeld (2010).

Though the authors observe in their 2005 publication that "the range of structural configurations exceeds the range specified ... for complex-transitive structures with complements lacking the particle *as*", their analysis does not focus on the considerable formal flexibility of the complement itself, which follows the comparative particle *as* and can appear in the form of a NP, AjP, PP or even non-finite clause (ex a.-d., cf. ibid.):

   a.   She *described* herself *as* [$_{NP}$ the last surviving example of the Victorian professional aunt].
   b.   She *regards* her clients' business *as* [$_{AjP}$ confidential].
   c.   Prince Charles *regards* both what exists and what has been projected *as* [$_{PP}$ entirely at odds with the historical character of the surroundings].
   d.   We *see* the hard ecu *as* [$_{S}$ being extremely useful in the fight against inflation].

This contribution will complete the preceding analyses by checking whether the main uses of the *as*-predicative are systematically related to the various formal realizations of the *as*-phrases. To this end, the methods of *collostruction analysis* (e.g. Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003) will be applied in the same way as done in Hampe (2011a). The question is relevant, because previous work on the other complex-transitive argument structures (Hampe 2011a,b) has presented evidence that the formal distinctions between the various object-related complements (as PP, AjP and NP) correspond to a number of basic semantic distinctions to do with the movement, manipulation, categorization and naming of objects by agents – and thus also to a number of constructional distinctions, viz. that between the Caused-Motion Construction (CMC), the Resultative Construction (RC), the Denominative Construction (DC) and the Attributive Construction (AC), whose central senses are defined by the semantics of their leading generic collexemes, the generic verbs *put*, *make*, *find* (metaph) and *call*, respectively.

As the central senses of the *as*-predicative (as defined by its leading collexeme groups *regard/see* (metaph.)/*know, describe/define* and *treat/use*) overlap with and go beyond those of the AC and the DC, and as the sets of verbs attracted to the respective constructions (with and without *as*) also overlap, the analysis presented will be shown to have implications for the discussion of constructional alternations as well as the discussion of the simultaneous motivation of syntactic constructions by their components and by related constructions.

Key words: complex-transitive argument structures, *as*-predicative, construction networks, collostruction analysis, constructional alternation

References
Gries, S. T., B. Hampe, et al. (2005). "Converging evidence: Bringing together experimental and corpus data on the associations of verbs and constructions." *Cognitive Linguistics* **16**(4): 635-676.
Gries, S. T., B. Hampe, et al. (2010). Converging Evidence II: More on the association between verbs and constructions. *Empirical and Experimental Methods in Cognitive/Functional Research*. S. Rice and J. Newman. Stanford, CA, CSLI Publications**:** 59-72.
Hampe, B. (2011a). "Discovering constructions by means of collostruction analysis: The English Denominative Construction." *Cognitive Linguistics* **22**(2): 211-245.
Hampe, B. (2011b). Metaphor, constructional ambiguity and the causative resultatives. *Windows to the Mind*. S. Handl and H.-J. Schmid. Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter**:** 185-215.
Stefanowitsch, A. and S. T. Gries (2003). "Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* **8**(2): 209-243.