

原 著

Ichiro hit his way to the record! —The Semantics of the *Way* Construction—

Shu-ichi Kawasaki

Way構文の意味論

川 崎 修 一

抄 録

英語には、Way構文(またはone's /X's way構文)と呼ばれる構文の存在が認められている。この構文に関しては、非対格性仮説(Unaccusative Hypothesis)に論拠を置く統語論的分析をはじめ、過去四半世紀以上に渡り様々な枠組みから考察がなされており、特に意味論的観点から示唆に富む有力な分析が提案されてきた。本研究では、主要な先行研究の中から特に有力であると考えられる概念意味論(Conceptual Semantics)、構文文法(Construction Grammar)、機能的構文論(Functional Syntax)の分析を概観した上でそれぞれの問題点を指摘し、Way構文に課される制約に関する新たな意味論的提案を提示する。さらに、大規模コーパスをはじめ様々な言語資料からの用例に基づき、本稿で提案する分析がより包括的に言語事実を捉えることを検証する。*

Key Words: construction, intransitivity, functional constraint, semantic constraint, syntax-semantics interface

I. INTRODUCTION

The last several decades have witnessed a variety of proposals concerning the semantic characteristics of the "*Way* construction": Jackendoff (1990, 1992), Goldberg (1995, 1997), Kuno and Takami (2004), etc. These three analyses are all consonant, to a varying degree, with the idea that there are some semantic constraints strictly imposed on the construction. However, all the semantic require-

* This work is supported by Research Grant 2006 from the Japanese Red Cross College of Nursing. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 35th Conference of the Japan Society of English Usage and Style held at Chuo University in June 2006. I am indebted to two anonymous reviewers, whose comments and suggestions helped me clarify the argumentation and correct errors that would have otherwise been left unnoticed. I am solely responsible for the errors that may remain.

受理：2007年1月4日

ments suggested in their accounts have much to be revised in their own terms. Drawing heavily upon a hotchpotch of the examples from diverse fields of inquiry, the present study is predominantly an attempt 1) to re-examine in depth the validity of the ideas presented in the precedent literature and 2) to suggest alternative semantic constraints which license the construction, on the basis of the data culled from all possible resources ranging from international corpora, such as British National Corpus (BNC) and the Collins Wordbanks *Online* (CWO) to dictionaries, books, and conversational discourse.

The *Way* construction can be roughly schematized in the following (cf. Goldberg, 1995: 199): [SUBJ_i [V [POSS_i *way*] OBL]] (where V is a non-stative verb and OBL codes a directional adverbial phrase) and illustrative examples are listed in (1):

- (1) a. Babe Ruth *homered his way* into the hearts of America. (Jackendoff, 1990: 212)
- b. Beatles *sang their way* around the world. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 67)
- c. Madonna *danced her way* to fame and fortune. (BNC)
- d. *Eat your way* to a healthier heart! (CWO)
- e. Sam *joked his way* into the meeting. (Goldberg, 1997: 155)
- f. Jack Sparrow *bluffed his way* out of the tricky situation.
- g. The jazz pianist *ad-libbed his way* through the long solo part.
- h. The huge locomotive *snorted and belched its way* across the plain. (BNC)
- i. ...of 'In Living Color,' the white kids either *fake their way* through the conversation or change... (CWO)
- j. The blind drunk violinist *hiccupped his way* out of the bar.
- k. The students at the Japanese Red Cross College of Nursing have been *singing their way* to better English these several years.
- l. Ichiro *hit his way* to the record!

This article is organized as follows: section II provides a brief overview of the leading analyses proposed so far, and it is argued that these studies fail to make clear some of the requirements that the construction must meet in order to be acceptably used. Then in section III I will propose an alternative semantic constraint imposed on the construction. In conclusion, I will evaluate the validity of the analysis developed in section III and implications of my argument for the interface between syntax and semantics.

II. LEADING ANALYSESE REVISITED

A. Jackendoff (1990, 1992)

Within the framework of Conceptual Semantics, Jackendoff (1990, 1992) discusses the *Way* construction with particular reference to its conceptual (i.e. semantic) structure. In his discussion, Jackendoff suggests syntactic requirement of intransitivity and semantic one of 'inherently a process verb' (e.g., *eat, whistle, roll*) or 'a repeatable bounded event' (e.g., *homer, belch, moan, joke*) in the choice of verbs compatible with the construction (Jackendoff, 1992: 136):

- (2) a. Babe Ruth *homered his way* into the hearts of America. (= 1a)
- b. *Babe Ruth *hit home runs his way* into the hearts of America.

- (3) a. Mickey Mantle *fanned his way* into the Hall of Fame.
 b. *Mickey mantle *struck out his way* into the Hall of Fame.

In (2) *hit home runs* is the closest paraphrase of *homer*, and in (3) *strike out* is approximately synonymous with *fan* in the relevant sense. This means that the verb must not only be intransitive but have a null complement. With regard to the semantic constraints, observe the following examples (Jackendoff, 1992: 162):

- (4) a. We *ate our way* across the U.S.
 b. Sue *whistled her way* through the tunnel.
 c. The barrel *rolled its way* up the alley.
 d. Bill *belched his way* out of the restaurant.
 e. Sam *joked his way* into the meeting. (= (1e))

Jackendoff argues that the acceptability of (4) is due to the semantic characteristics of the verbs: inherently processes (cf. 4a, b, c) and repeated bounded events (cf. 4d, e). On the other hand, he attributes the unacceptability of (5) to the fact that *open* and *break* are non-repeatable events and that *sleep*, *fall*, *blush* do not express a process or repetition of a bounded action but 'a prolonged state' (it is quite unclear whether these verbs are, in his idea, a 'process' or not; in other cases he refers to it as 'homogeneous process'), and hence unacceptable (cf. p1):

- (5) a. *The window *opened/broke its way* into the room.
 b. *Bill *slept /fell/ blushed his way* to New York.

To put it briefly, he claims that even though the verb expresses a process, verbs of homogeneous process are not compatible with the *Way* construction; it must describe repetition of a bounded event / action (cf. Kuno and Takami, 2004: 96).

However, this analysis fails to account for a substantial number of examples. Consider the following examples in (6):

- (6) a. The wounded fugitive *limped his way* through the crowd.
 b. The thieves then *wended their way* through the dark back street to the docks. (BNC)
 c. ...and saw Norman Huber *inch his way* out of the cockpit. (CWO)
 d. When the milling crowd had *snaked its way* through each house, they all departed in a flurry of silks and satins, slamming coach doors, and the shouts of the footmen to the coachmen. (BNC)
 e. Leah *meandered her way* through her fans.
 f. After the gun fight against mob dogs, Donnie Brasco, seriously wounded and nearly unconscious, *wandered his way* to a safe place.
 g. To reach that tip of land you have to *thread your way* through a maze of crowded alleyways. (BNC)

The meanings of the verbs used in all these sentences are not categorized into a bounded event/ac-

tion, (or inherently a process in any sense). What becomes clear from these examples is that the verbs used express inherently a 'motion/movement' or 'change of location', not a repeated bounded event. Contrary to his analysis, these sentences are all perfectly well-formed (for other counter arguments against Jackendoff's analysis, see Kuno and Takami (2004: 96)). Consider further other examples in (7) that contradict his account:

- (7) a. The Great Central Railway, from Marylebone to Manchester via Sheffield, opened in 1900, the last great trunk railway construction, *limped its way* through the century to be finally chopped up into pieces and closed down in 1969. (BNC)
- b. The bus will *wend its way* around the country this summer. (ibid.)
- c. A darker shadow *inched its way* along one of the walls of the Drum. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 77)
- d. The delirious atmosphere hushed slightly as their column of official jeeps *snaked its way* down into the Rante. (BNC)
- e. Many cycleways *meander their way* through picturesque parks. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 77)
- f. The river *wandered its way* through the meadows.
- g. Nearby a river, narrow but cut deep, *threaded its way* between rocks. (BNC)

The verbs do not express a bounded event, in the same way as those in (6) and all examples in (7) are well-formed. It is clear from (6) and (7) that Jackendoff's semantic analysis is not descriptively adequate and leaves unsolved the semantic constraints to be placed on the construction.

B. Goldberg (1995, 1997)

From the viewpoint of Construction Grammar as they call it, Goldberg (1995, 1997) examines the *Way* construction and argues that it implies a motion, either literal or metaphorical, and its interpretation is divided into two semantically distinct types: 'a means of a motion' (6a-c) and "some other co-extensive action of manner" (6d, e), as shown in (8):

- (8) a. Nevertheless, he somehow *bribed his way* out of hospital to shoot down an impudent intruder strafing his base. (BNC)
(= He got out of hospital through bribery.)
- b. Some medical students *bought their way* into the private university.
(= Some medical students entered the private university through bribery.)
- c. Brand *elbowed his way* to the centre of the group.
(= Brand got to the center of the group by elbowing people out of his way.)
- d. Mary *danced her way* to the counter.
(= Mary went to the counter (while) dancing.)
- e. John *shouted his way* down the street.
(= John went down the street (while) shouting.)

She then claims that specifically in the case of means interpretation, the construction always entails

that the subject referent moves despite external difficulty or in some indirect way; manner interpretation, on the other hand, only entails that the subject referent moves along a path.

However, it is quite difficult to judge whether the construction should be interpreted as means or manner, depending on the context in which it is used. The distinction between the means and manner interpretations is not necessarily clear; there are examples that can be interpreted either way. Consider the examples in (9), (10), and (11):

- (9) Sam *joked his way* into the meeting. (= (1a))

- (10) a. Madonna *danced her way* to fame and fortune. (= 1c)
b. Ballerina Muffy will *dance her way* right into your heart. (CWO)
c. *Dancing her way* from success to success, she shot to stardom. (CWO)
d. Mary *danced her way* through the park. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 68)
e. ...as she *danced her way* from the juke box to her place behind him. (CWO)

- (11) a. Sally *drank her way* through a case of vodka. (Goldberg, 1995: 204)
b. *Sip your way* around the nearby Muscadet vineyards. (BNC)

As for (9) and (10a), it is unclear whether it should be interpreted as the means or manner interpretation. On the other hand, (10b) and (10c) clearly have the means interpretation, while (10d) and (10e) manner interpretation. However, examples in (11) cannot be classified into means or manner; they might express just a manner of action.

Goldberg further proposes four semantic requirements as follows:

- (12) a. The verb necessarily designates a repeated action (cf. Jackendoff's 'repetition of a bounded event / action')
- b. The motion must be self-propelled.
- c. The motion must be directed - it cannot be aimless. (Goldberg, 1995: 212)
- d. The subject referent moves despite external difficulty or in some indirect way.

She argues that (12a) applies to both the means and manner interpretation, whereas (12b, c, d) only apply to the means interpretation. Observe the following examples in (13):

- (13) a. Firing wildly, John *shot his way* through the crowd. (Goldberg, 1995: 21)
- b. *With a single bullet, John *shot his way* through the crowd. (ibid.)

Goldberg claims that constraint (12a) can account for the grammatical difference of (13a) and (13b); sentence (13a) entails a series of shooting occurring, whereas sentence (13b) a single shooting.

Aside from the validity of (12b-d) for the moment, however, (12a) is far from descriptive precision and is seriously flawed (for Kuno and Takami's counter argument against Goldberg, see Kuno and Takami, 2004: 101). For instance, there are many cases, as in (6), (7) where verbs do not necessarily designate repeated action and in some cases like (1f, g) and (8a, b, d), it is unclear whether repetition is necessarily involved or not. Regarding this issue, consider further the sentences given below:

- (14) a. MX *walked his way* to the front of the crowd. (CWO).
 b. The baby *wormed her way* out of the bed to reach for a nursing bottle.
- (15) a. The river *wandered its way* through the meadows. (=7f)
 b. Nearby a river, narrow but cut deep, *threaded its way* between rocks. (=7g)
 c. Sam *joked his way* into the meeting. (= 1e)
 d. *Sleep your way* to the top! (Passage from an airline ad)
 e. Mary *danced her way* to the counter. (= (8e))

The verbs in (14) express a manner of motion and it is unclear that the event that the sentence describes includes repetition of walking and worming. (What is it like for walking(s)/worming(s) to be repeated at all?). Furthermore, in the contexts in which the sentences in (15) are used, it is quite unnatural that wandering, threading, joking, sleeping, and dancing be repeated.

As has been demonstrated above, Goldberg's constructional approach to the *Way* construction cannot serve as a descriptive device for capturing the essence of the construction.

C. Kuno and Takami (2004)

Kuno and Takami examine the *Way* construction from the viewpoint of Functional Syntax and propose four functional (i.e. semantic) constraints that the construction must obey:

- (16) The Functional / Semantic Constraint on the *Way* Construction: The *way* construction is acceptable to the extent that
- i. it involves a (nontrivial) physical, temporal, or psychological distance;
 - ii. the subject referent gradually moves through the whole span of that distance.
 - iii. in an unusual manner; and
 - iv. the verb describes that manner of movement.

The functional constraint as it appears can better capture some of the examples that Jackendoff and Goldberg left unsolved. Observe the following sentences:

- (17) a. ^{?*T}Tomorrow, ladies and gentlemen, Evel Knievel will *jump his way* over this ditch. (this ditch = the Grand Canyon) (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 96)
 b. John *parachuted his way* across the finish line.
 c. Sam *lied his way* out of the jam. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 96)
 d. Bob *finagled his way* onto the team. (ibid)
 e. The smuggler *joked his way* through customs. (ibid)

Concerning (12a), they argue that (17a) and (17b) describe a single act, but the sentences are acceptable "or nearly so for many speakers" (however, the speaker whom I have consulted with has found (17a) unacceptable). Furthermore, it might be the case, they insist, that Sam in (17c) told a single lie; in (17d) an event of Bob's finagling took place just once; and in (17e) the smuggler told a single joke. They then further suggest that a repeated bounded action is not a necessary condition for the acceptability of

the construction.

Kuno and Takami argue instead that what counts here is whether the action covers the whole span of the specified distance (cf. (16 ii)). They further argue for their functional constraints in reference to the examples given below (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 86):

- (18) a. *Joe *walked his way* to the store.
b. *Bill *walked / ran his way* down the hallway.
- (19) a. Gandhi *walked his way* across the country to win democracy for his people.
b. The priest *walked his way* across the country to protest nuclear arms.
c. The novice skier *walked her way* down the ski slope.

Their argument runs as follows: in (18) while the Functional Constraint (16i) is observed, there is nothing that indicates that they moved in an unusual manner; walking or running to the store or down the hallway is neither unusual nor unexpected in daily life. Hence they do not meet the requirement (16iii), and the unacceptability results. By contrast, (19a, b, c) are perfectly acceptable despite the fact that the same verb *walk* is used. In (19a, b), however, Gandhi and the priest literally walk across the country to win democracy for his people and to protest nuclear arms, respectively; and therefore they are interpreted as having gradually moved in their own unusual manner, and not in a way in which people ordinarily move across the country (e.g., by taking buses, trains, or planes). Therefore, these sentences satisfy the Functional Constraint (16) and the acceptability results. (19c) also indicates that the novice skier walked slowly and carefully down the ski slope, and this manner of movement is different from other people's manner of movement down the ski slope (i.e., skiing). Therefore, the skier is interpreted as having gradually moved down the ski slope in an unusual manner, and the acceptability results, satisfying the Functional Constraint.

The functional constraint by Kuno and Takami seems to be the most tenable among the leading analyses and can capture some of the characteristics of the *Way* construction ((16i, iv) seem to be mostly acceptable). However, their analysis still falls short of complete descriptive adequacy and leaves many examples unaccounted for: (16ii, iii), in particular, are found to be problematic. Consider the sentences below ((20a, b, c, f, Kuno and Takami, 2004):

- (20) a. The avalanche *rolled its way* into the valley.
b. Then to everyone's amazement, the arrow *whizzed its way* directly to the bull's eye.
c. Rainwater *trickles its way* to the underground pool.
d. The ping-pong ball *bounced its way* into the corridor.
e. The patient *sipped her way* through the glass of lemonade.
f. Blood dripped its way from his head to his shoulder, and from there to the ground.

Regarding their 'unusualness' constraint, there are many examples that cannot be accounted for by their analysis. First, in no sense is it unusual for the avalanche to roll into the valley in (20a). The same argument holds for all other examples in (20): in (20b) it is not unusual for an arrow to get to the bull's eye by whizzing; in (20c) it is easily imaginable for rainwater to trickle to an underground pool; in (20d) a ping-pong ball usually bounces when it moves; in (20e) a patient cannot usually drink

something in the same way that healthy people do and sipping is not at all an unusual manner when a patient drinks a glass of lemonade; in (20f) it is usually the case that blood drips when it comes down from one's head to the shoulder.

Second, as Levin (1993: 40) points out, such verbs as are used in (21) below appear to have an intransitive variation that almost paraphrases the use of the verb followed by *X's way* (i.e. the two variations are truth-conditionally equivalent). That is, the *Way* construction does not necessarily express 'an unusual manner' of a subject referent (put differently, these verbs have some specific/unique manner of motion sense linguistically encoded). If their unusualness requirement is valid, then an event where someone is going through the crowd by pushing should be regarded as an unusual situation; on the contrary, this situation is not unusual in reality. The same holds for all examples in (21):

- (21) a. They *pushed their way* through the crowd. (Levin, 1993: 40)
(They pushed through the crowd.)
- b. The wounded fugitive *limped his way* through the crowd. (cf. (6a))
(The wounded fugitive limped through the crowd.)
- c. The river *meanders its way* into the town
(The river meanders into the town.)
- d. The glamorous singer *threaded her way* through her outrageous fans and out of the concert hall.
(The glamorous singer threaded through her outrageous fans and out of the concert hall.)
- e. The irate sumo wrestler *elbowed/forced his way* through the paparazzi.
(The irate sumo wrestler elbowed/forced through the paparazzi.)
- f. The student *inched her way* towards the teacher who was infuriated at her mischievous behavior during the lecture.
(The student inched towards the teacher who was infuriated at her mischievous behavior.)
- g. The excited mistress *hopped her way* down the street to see her beloved mob member who was just released from jail after an interval of ten years.
(The excited mistress hopped down the street to see her beloved mobster who was just released from jail after an interval of ten years.)
- h. He can't *worm his way* out of this difficult situation.
(He can't worm out of this difficult situation.)
- i. Her hand *snaked its way* down his pajamas to feel his hardness...
(Her hand snaked down his pajamas to feel his hardness... (BNC))

Third, there are many other examples that flatly contradict the unusualness requirement that Kuno and Takami proposed, in the same way as those in (20) and (21). Consider the sentences in (22):

- (22) a. MX *walked his way* to the front of the crowd. (CWO) (cf. (19a, b))
- b. We showed how you could *walk your way* to fitness in just four weeks. (CWO)
- c. The students of the Japanese Red Cross College of Nursing are *writing their way* to better English.
- d. *Walk your way* to a healthier lawn. (CWO) (cf. (19a, b))
- e. I had got used to the pace over there which was so slow you could almost *walk your way*

- into scoring positions. (BNC)
- f. ...he *jumped his way* across the shallows from log to log,... (CWO)
 - g. The climbers *clawed their way* to the top of the very steep cliff.
 - h. To reach that tip of land you have to *thread your way* through a maze of crowded alleyways. (= 6g)
 - i. Jack Sparrow *bluffed his way* out of the tricky situation. (=1f)
 - j. The jazz pianist *ad-libbed his way* through the long solo part. (=1g)

It is quite likely that going through a crowd by walking happens daily, and all the other cases in (22) describe natural manners of movement in such circumstances. Contrary to their analysis, all these examples are acceptable. Accordingly, it can safely be said that the unusualness constraint depends highly on an arbitrary judgment and is not acceptable as a diagnosis for the grammaticality of the construction.

Furthermore, as for their 'gradualness' condition (cf. (16ii)), those examples listed in (23) do not fall under the scope of their analysis. Observe the following sentences:

- (23) a. Sam *lied his way* out of the jam. (= (17c))
 b. Bob *finagled his way* onto the team. (= (17d))
 c. The smuggler *joked his way* through customs. (= (17e))
 d. Nevertheless, he somehow *bribed his way* out of hospital to shoot down an impudent intruder strafing his base. (= (8a))

It is highly unclear whether as they argue, lying, finagling and joking continue through the whole span of that distance (cf. (16ii)). In any way, it is highly unlikely that the subject referents in (23) gradually moves, either psychologically or whatsoever, through the whole span of an event.

As I have demonstrated so far, the functional analysis proposed in Kuno and Takami (2004), as in Jackendoff and Goldberg, has left many matters unclear. In what follows, I will suggest an alternative analysis from a semantic point of view.

III. AN ALTERNATIVE SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

In the last section, it was demonstrated that all semantic (functional) analyses proposed so far fall short of precision and have much to be revised. In this chapter I will suggest an alternative semantic analysis that can fully capture the requirements that the *Way* construction must meet, which is as follows:

- (24) The Semantic Constraint on the *Way* Construction
 The *Way* construction is acceptable to the extent that it:
- i. expresses a manner of movement or action for a period of time
 - ii. implies a resultant state, and
 - iii. involves interval(s) or non-straightforward movement during the event.

In order to examine whether this semantic constraint functions well, observe first the examples that

Kuno and Takami's functional constraint fails to clearly account for ((25a, b, c)=(19), (25e)=(20d), (25e)=(6b), (25e, f, g, h, i)=(23)):

- (25) a. Gandhi *walked his way* across the country to win democracy for his people.
 b. The priest *walked his way* across the country to protest nuclear arms.
 c. The novice skier *walked her way* down the ski slope.
 d. The patient *sipped her way* through the glass of lemonade.
 e. The wounded fugitive *limped his way* through the crowd. (cf. (6a))
 f. Sam *lied his way* out of the jam.
 g. Bob *finagled his way* onto the team.
 h. The smuggler *joked his way* through customs.
 i. Nevertheless, he somehow *bribed his way* out of hospital to shoot down an impudent intruder strafing his base.

In these sentences, the verbs express a manner of movement and the event implies an intended resultant state or purpose, which satisfy (i) and (ii). In (25a, b, c) it is quite natural to understand that these events involve intervals between each walking, because it is impossible to walk across the country and for a novice skier to walk down the ski slope without having any intervals or in a straightforward manner, thereby satisfying (iii) and acceptability results. In (20d) repeated sippings are thought to have occurred with intervals in drinking a glass of lemonade and therefore this sentence is acceptable. In (25e) it might usually be the case that a wounded fugitive in the leg limps through the crowd and the event necessarily involves limping with intervals until he gets through the crowd (note that (16i, iv) seem to correctly describe the event that the *Way* construction expresses, but it is reasonably derivable from (24i, ii)).

Below is the schematic representation of the events described in examples (25a, b, c):

- (26) MANNER OF MOVEMENT 'walk' in (25a, b)
 WALK >>>>> WALK >>>>> WALK >>>>> across the country to ~
 [INTER] [INTER] [INTER] [RESULTANT STATE]
- (27) MANNER OF MOVEMENT 'walk' in (25c)
 a. WALK >>>>> WALK >>>>> WALK >>>>> DOWN THE SKI ~
 [INTER] [INTER] [INTER] [RESULTANT STATE]
 (>>>>> signifies an interval)
 b. ==== ===== WALK ==== ===== DOWN THE SKI ~
 ==== ====
 [NON-STRAIGHTFORWRD] [RESULTANT STATE]
 (====signifies a non-straightforward path along which each walking proceeds)

Note that (27a, b) show that sentences that contain inherently a manner of movement verb have binary interpretability: the 'interval' interpretation or 'non-straightforward' interpretation, depending on the context in which it is used.

Next, observe the schematized representation of (25d, e) in (28) and (25f, g, h, i) in (29), respec-

- e. ?Since Bob received his mail order wings, he has *flown his way* to San Francisco many times. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 74)

(33) Movement Intervals or Movement Non-straightforward (2 possibilities)

- a. The barrel *rolled its way* up the alley. (= (4c))
- b. The thieves then *wended their way* through the dark back street to the docks. (= (6b))
- c. Alice Slade *inched her way* apologetically into the room. (= (6c))
- d. Leah *meandered her way* through her fans. (= (6e))
- e. After the gun fight against mob dogs, Donnie Brasco, seriously wounded and nearly unconscious, *wandered his way* to a safe place. (= (6f))
- f. To reach that tip of land you have to *thread your way* through a maze of crowded alleyways. (= (6g))
- g. The ping-pong ball *bounced its way* into the corridor. (= 20d))
- h. They *pushed their way* through the crowd. (= (21a))

(34) Action Intervals

- a. Babe Ruth *homered his way* into the hearts of America. (= (1a))
- b. Madonna *danced her way* to fame and fortune. (= (1c))
- c. *Eat your way* to a healthier heart! (= (1d))
- d. The blind drunk violinist *hiccupped his way* out of the bar. (= (1j))
- e. The students of the Japanese Red Cross College of Nursing have been *singing their way* to better English these several years. (= (1k))
- f. Bill *belched/yelled his way* out of the restaurant.
- g. Lisa *swam her way* to three gold medals. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 89)
- h. The jazz pianist *ad-libbed his way* through the long solo part. (= (1g))

(35) Action Intervals or Action Single Interval (2 possibilities)

- a. Jack Sparrow *bluffed his way* out of the tricky situation. (= (1f))
- b. He could *bribe his way* from here to Timbuktu if he wanted ... (CWO)
- c. Bob *finagled his way* onto the team. (= (25g))
- d. Sam *lied his way* out of the jam. (= (25f))
- e. The smuggler *joked his way* through customs. (= (25h))

Finally, to confirm the validity of this semantic analysis, I will show how it can account for unacceptable examples in the following (Kuno and Takami, 2004):

- (36) a. *The apple *fell its way* to the ground.
 b. *She *dove her way* into the fire.
 c. *Joe *walked his way* to the store. (cf. (27) and (28))
 d. *The oil *rose its way* to the surface of the water.
 e. *The tanker *sank its way* to the bottom of the sea.
 f. *John *flew his way* to San Francisco. (cf. (32j))
 g. *The metal parts *rusted their way* to failure. (Kuno and Takami, 2004: 102)

- h. *The water *evaporated its way* into the air. (ibid)
- i. ?*He *swam his way* from one end of the pool to the other. (cf. (33g))

My semantic analysis can explain why all these sentences are judged to be ill-formed: In (36a-f) the verbs *fall*, *dive*, *walk*, *rise*, *fly* and *sink* are categorized as a manner of motion verb, and therefore they must meet either the Movement Intervals or Movement Non-straightforward requirement. However, they do not and unacceptability results. In the case of (36g), the verb *rust* is strictly a change of state verb, but can be treated as an action verb in the sense that it does not imply movement or change of location. Accordingly it must be interpreted either as Action Intervals or Action Single Interval, but it does not: rusting occurs without any interval once something starts to rust, or there cannot be a single interval between the end of rusting and the resultant state. Therefore, it is correctly predicted to be unacceptable: the same holds for (36h). In (36i) *swim* is classified into a manner of movement verb, and must hence be interpreted as either Movement Intervals or Movement Non-straightforward. However, in general (i.e. except for under very specific circumstances) we do not swim with intervals or in a non-straightforward way from one end of the pool to the other in normal context and as a result, this sentence is, to a large extent, unacceptable.

To sum up, in this section I have proposed an alternative semantic constraint that is thought to be imposed on the *Way* construction, and also demonstrated that my analysis can better account for the examples that Kuno and Takami's functional constraint fails to explain. Moreover, it has become clear that a corollary of my semantic constraint is that the *Way* construction must be interpreted in one of four ways, as in (30) and (31).

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have re-examined three leading semantic analyses of the *Way* construction and demonstrated that they are not acceptable: Section II.A. has shown that contrary to Jackendoff's proposal, there are many examples that do not express a repeatable bounded event. In section II.B. , I have disproved Goldberg's analysis to the effect that the distinction between the means and manner interpretations is not clear and the constraints based on this dichotomy cannot be accepted. Section II.C. exemplified that the functional constraint by Kuno and Takami, though acceptable in some way, also has much to be revised, especially in terms of 'unusualness' condition and 'gradualness' condition. In Section III, I have proposed an alternative semantic constraint on the *Way* construction:

(37) The Semantic Constraint on the *Way* Construction

The *Way* construction is acceptable to the extent that it:

- i. expresses a manner of movement or action for a period of time
- ii. implies a resultant state, and
- iii. involves interval(s) or non-straightforward movement during the event.

I have also suggested that the *Way* construction has four-way interpretability derivable from the above constraint, depending on the verbs that each sentence contains:

Levin, B. and T. Rapoport (1988) "Lexical Subordination," *CLS* 24, 275-289.

Marantz, A. (1992) "The Way Construction and the Semantics of Direct Arguments in English: A Reply to Jackendoff," in T. Stowell and E. Wehrli (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 26: Syntax and the Lexicon*, 179-188. New York: Academic Press.

Perlmutter, D. (1978) "Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis," *BLS*, 4, 157-189.

Stowell, T and E. Wehri (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 26: Syntax and the Lexicon*, 155-178. New York: Academic Press.

Corpora

British National Corpus (<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>)

Collins Wordbanks *Online* (<http://www.collins.co.uk/Corpus/CorpusSearch.aspx>)

Dictionaries

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 4th edition.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 3rd edition.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 7th edition.

Web Dictionary

One Look Dictionary Search (www.onelook.com/)