

## **How to document and implement constructional meanings in a constructicon: a frame-based approach**

Alexander Ziem (Heinrich-Heine University Düsseldorf, Germany), [ziem@hhu.de](mailto:ziem@hhu.de)

In recent years, several constructicon projects started to build digital resources for constructions peculiar to their respective target language, including relations holding among them (for an overview cf. Lyngfelt et al. 2018). Unsurprisingly, developing constructicons, i.e. repositories of constructions, turned out to be a very challenging endeavour, not only in terms of the enormous workload (which constructions are out there and which should be prioritized?) but also with regard to methodological and technical issues (how should the constructions identified be analyzed and implemented, and what kind of digital platform is appropriate for doing so?). One important methodological issue relates to the analysis and representation of constructional meanings. While all projects employ a similar constructicographic apparatus (for an overview cf. Boas et al. 2020), they differ to a large extent as to how meanings are identified, investigated and documented. Some constructicons, such as the Brazilian Portuguese and the German one, use semantic frames (Fillmore/Baker 2010) for analyzing and representing constructional meanings, whereas, for example, the Russian constructicon refrains mostly for practical reasons from using frames and determines constructional meanings on the basis of the configurations of their elements; constructions are semantically tagged in the database accordingly (Janda et al. 2020). Understanding constructicons primarily as semantic resources whose structure is driven by the meanings of both lexical and grammatical constructions and the semantic relations between them, this talk aims at elaborating and evaluating the potential of a Berkeley FrameNet-related approach to constructional meanings. Based on annotated instances of various construction families but with a specific focus on the semantic domain of quantification, it discusses methodological challenges and ways to approach them from a practical constructicographic perspective. In particular, the focus is on the following issues. (1) What criteria must be met for a lexical frame to be considered semantically adequate for capturing constructional meanings? And, more specifically, what's the impact of mappings (and mismatches) between elements of a construction and the elements of the frame evoked? (2) In case there is no appropriate lexical frame accounting for a constructional meaning, is it appropriate, or even required, to develop new frames that potentially only account for grammatical meanings? To what extent can frames account for the variety of meanings in the lexicon-grammar continuum? (4) How to account for and implement different levels of semantic abstraction ranging from meanings of single constructions to clusters and families of constructions? (5) What are the limits of a frame-based approach to constructional meanings? For instance, may frames also account for rather idiomatic meanings? The talk concludes by emphasizing the advantages of using frames for representing constructional meanings. It is argued that integrating a FrameNet-like resource in a constructicon opens new constructicographic perspectives. FrameNet is considered an important mainstay of a constructicon.

## References

Boas, Hans C., Lyngfelt, Benjamin, and Tiago Timponi Torrent. 2019. Framing Constructicography. In *Lexicographica* 35.1, 41-95.

Fillmore, Charles J., and Collin Baker (2010): A Frames Approach to Semantic Analysis. In: Heine, Bernd and Narrog, Heiko (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*. Oxford u.a.: Oxford University Press, 313-339.

Lyngfelt, Ben et al. (eds.) (2018): *Constructicography: Constructicon development across languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Endresen, Anna, and Laura A. Janda. 2020. Taking Construction Grammar One Step Further: Families, Clusters, and Networks of Evaluative Constructions in Russian. In: Mike Putnam, Matthew Carlson, Antonio Fábregas, Eva Wittenberg (eds.): *Defining Construction: Insights into the Emergence and Generation of Linguistic Representations* (special issue of *Frontiers in Psychology* 11), 1-22.