Two interesting contributions published in the last few years on English resultative constructions in the cognitive/constructional linguistic camp are Iwata (2006) and Iwata (2008). Building on previous research such as Washio (1997) and Rapoport (1999), he discusses cases where the resultative phrase is an AP and distinguishes between argument structure resultative constructions (e.g. The kettle boiled dry, The joggers ran the pavement thin), ASCs, and adjunct resultative constructions (e.g. The door swung open, He slid the door shut), non-ASCs. Unlike ASCs, in non-ASCs the resultative AP functions as a specifier in a construction which entails a final state (e.g. The river froze → The river froze solid). Iwata contends that this difference accounts for the diverging behaviour of the two types of resultative construction, including the fact that non-ASCs do not seem to obey Goldberg’s (1995) Unique Path Constraint, which prevents two different paths (concrete and/or abstract) from occurring in the same clause (e.g. ASC *He kicked him black and blue down the stairs vs. non-ASC He spread the butter thick on(to) the bread). Iwata (2006) also claims that Broccias’s (2003) analysis fails to capture such differences and relies on incorrect generalizations/constraints.

In this presentation, I will first contend that appealing as Iwata’s approach may seem to be, on closer inspection it turns out to be problematic, both conceptually and empirically. I will then re-evaluate and update my (2003) approach to resultatives (or, rather, change constructions) showing it to be capable of capturing a wider range of data than Iwata’s. In particular, I will argue that a deeper understanding of resultative (or change) constructions can be arrived at if one realises that single (change) events may be conceptualised as having multiple facets (see also Matsumoto 2006) that are tightly linked together (see e.g. Broccias 2008) and can be focused on by means of “resultative” phrases.