

**EXPLAIN ME THIS: CREATIVITY, COMPETITION AND THE PARTIAL PRODUCTIVITY OF CONSTRUCTIONS.** Adele E. Goldberg. To appear, Princeton University Press.

[adele@princeton.edu](mailto:adele@princeton.edu)

**1. Introduction: CENCE ME principles**

- 1.1. The puzzle
- 1.2. The roadmap
- 1.3. The CENCE ME principles
- 1.4. Speakers balance the need to be Expressive and Efficient while obeying the Normative conventions of their speech community.

**2. Word Meanings**

- 2.1. Words evoke semantically rich, structured, partially-abstracted senses
- 2.2. Implicit memory for how words are used is vast
- 2.3. We regularly employ old words for new uses: common words evoke a cluster of conventional, related senses.
- 2.4. Creativity: New representations are added to express new meanings
- 2.5. Competition: Word meanings are constrained by competition in context from other words
- 2.6. Speakers avoid overgeneralizations by learning and gaining fluency with more appropriate labels for intended meanings
- 2.7. Summary

**3: Constructions as invitations to form categories**

- 3.1. Meaning (semantics)
  - 3.1.1 Experimental evidence for constructional meaning
  - 3.1.2 Relationships among argument structure constructions
  - 3.1.3 Semantic compatibility between verb and construction is gradient
- 3.2. Form (syntax)
- 3.3. Sound patterns (phonology)
- 3.4. Discourse context (Information Structure)
- 3.5. Social Context
- 3.6. Variation across dialects
- 3.7. Variation across languages
- 3.8. Constructions can be combined (recursively)
- 3.9. Summary

**4: Creativity: coverage is key**

- 4.1. Knowledge and memory
- 4.2. Memory for language
- 4.3. Verbs in argument structure constructions
- 4.4. Why NPs tend to be form open slots in argument structure constructions
- 4.5. Familiar ways to express particular meanings are more accessible and preferred (entrenchment)
- 4.6. Creativity: generating new representations to express new meanings
- 4.7. Coverage: clustering of partially abstract exemplars in high dimensional conceptual space
- 4.8. Modeling COVERAGE
- 4.9. Summary

**5. Competition in context: statistical preemption**

- 5.1. Statistical preemption in the case of morphology and meaning

**EXPLAIN ME THIS: CREATIVITY, COMPETITION AND THE PARTIAL PRODUCTIVITY OF CONSTRUCTIONS.** Adele E. Goldberg. To appear, Princeton University Press.

[adele@princeton.edu](mailto:adele@princeton.edu)

5.2. We prefer expressions that we recognize from our own speech community

5.3. Explain me this

5.4. How to calculate the probabilities

5.5 Recasts

5.6. A secondary factor: Confidence (of statistical preemption)

5.7. Mechanism: competition-driven learning

5.8. What coverage adds to statistical preemption

5.9. Summary

**6. Age effects**

6.1. Younger children are less likely to recognize the SIMILARITIES needed for generalization

6.2. Younger children are less likely to recognize relevant DIFFERENCES needed to reproduce a complex system

6.3. Early abstractions

6.4. Why adult (L2) learners struggle to overcome overgeneralizations

**7. The roads not taken**

7.1. Is compatibility between verb and construction enough?

7.2. Is positing invisible features or underlying structure explanatory?

7.3. Do we only use formulations we have witnessed (conservatism via entrenchment)?

7.4. Are the “Tolerance” and “Sufficiency” numbers explanatory? (Yang 2016)?

7.5. Productivity and Reuse in Language (O’Donnell 2015)

7.6. A critique of preemption (“blocking”) by Embick & Marantz (2008)

7.7. Do children witness enough data?

7.8. Summary

**8. Where we are and what lies ahead**