Constructional idioms of 'insanity' in English and Spanish: A corpus-based study

Gloria Corpas Pastor

University of Malaga, Spain

University of Wolverhampton, UK

Abstract

This paper presents a corpus-based study of constructions in English and Spanish, with a special emphasis on equivalent semantic-functional counterparts, and potential mismatches. Although usage/corpus-based Construction Grammar (CxG) has attracted much attention in recent years, most studies have dealt exclusively with monolingual constructions. In this paper we will focus on two constructions that represent conventional ways to express 'insanity' in both languages. The analysis will cover grammatical, semantic and informative aspects in order to establish a multi-linguistic prototype of the constructions. To that end, data from several giga-token corpora of contemporary spoken English and Spanish (parallel and comparable) have been selected. This study advances the explanatory potential of constructional idioms for the study of idiomaticity, variability and cross-language analysis. In addition, relevant findings on the dialectal distribution of certain idiom features across both languages and their national varieties are also reported.

Keywords: Construction Grammar; Phraseology; corpus; insanity idiom; constructional idiom

1. Introduction

Construction Grammar has prompted a profound transformation in the way idiomaticity is understood and viewed. Language is now conceived as an idiomatic continuum of which 'constructions' are the building blocks (general phrasal patterns and idioms). In this paper we will take an observational stance toward a corpus-based analysis of 'insanity' constructions in English and Spanish. Within a constructionist approach to idiomaticity, special emphasis will be laid on equivalent semantic-functional counterparts, and potential mismatches. This is the first study, to the best of our knowledge, investigating 'insanity' constructions in English and Spanish that uses both parallel and comparable corpora, and takes diatopic variation into account. This paper is also one of the first contributions that advances the notion of constructional idiom as a powerful tool for cross-linguistic comparison, contrastive analysis and linguistic aspects of translation. Our research follows the path of related work on schematic phraseological units (or phrasemes) by Dobrovol'skij

(2011, 2015, 2020, etc.; Baranov and Dobrovol'skij 2013, Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen 2018), one of the most preeminent scholars within the European Society of Phraseology (EUROPHRAS).[1]

This paper is structured as follows. First, basic constructionist notions and related work are introduced in Section 2. Objectives and hypothesis are provided in Section 3. Section 4 covers methodological issues, including a description of the constructions and the corpora selected for this study. Then, corpus-based descriptions will be provided with a view to ascertaining any differential construal nature, either general or language specific (Section 5). Section 6 discusses the key findings and finally, Section 7 summarises the conclusions drawn from this study.

2. Theoretical framework

Construction Grammar (CxG) views language as an idiomatic continuum of which constructions are the building blocks. Constructions are usage-based conventionalised pairings of form and meaning (symbolic units) which are linked to each other and constitute complex networks. These symbolic units emerge through repeated experience with actual instances (*constructs* or *exemplars*) and their generalisations (*constructions*). According to Goldberg (2006. p. 5):

> Any linguistic pattern is recognised as a construction as long as some aspect of its form or function is not strictly predictable from its component parts or from other constructions recognised to exist. In addition, patterns are stored as constructions even if they are fully predictable as long as they occur with sufficient frequency.

Within CxG idiomaticity is no longer relegated as a collection of language 'irregularities'. Thus, semantically opaque expressions (idioms) may share certain aspects of regular syntactic structure with fully productive expressions (Fillmore, Kay & O'Connor, 1988), whereas transparent syntactic structures may involve all sorts of unpredictable constraints that cannot be simply derived from the syntax alone (Kay & Fillmore, 1989). These two observations turn idioms into constructions of their own, and places them on a par with other types of syntactic, lexical or morphological units of traditional linguistic analysis.

Despite the potential of CxG for the study of 'idioms', most analyses have covered schematic constructions (e.g. the passive construction, the double accusative construction, the *all*-cleft construction, etc.), mainly for English, but for other languages as well. It would suffice to note that most volumes within the reknown John Benjamins series "Constructional Approaches to Language"[2] consist of monolingual case studies of particular constructions. Only recently has research been directed at exploring (partially) substantive constructions (e.g., *hold* one's *horses*, *the sooner the better*, V NP_{crime}, etc.), again mostly from a monolingual perspective. For instance, the special issue of the *Journal of Social Sciences*, edited by M. I. González-Rey (2015), includes only two papers covering intra- or interlinguistic features: Molina Plaza's (2015) analysis of light verb constructions with *get* and *take* in English and Spanish and Author's (2015a) corpus-based construal account of a register-based collocational construction across domains (general and specialised medical domains) and languages (English and Spanish). Other recent cross-linguistic studies are

---

[1] EUROPHRAS was founded in Bielefeld (Germany) in January 1999 (http://www.europhras.org). Their members have always been very active as regards publications and conference organisation. They also publish the impact factor journal *Yearbook of Phraseology* (https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/yop).

[2] https://benjamins.com/catalog/cal.

Horvarth and Siloni (2017), on the distribution of phrasal and clausal idioms across diatheses in English and Hebrew; Author (2015b, 2017, 2018) on the distribution of idiomatic and collocational constructions across different varieties of the same language (translated versus non-translated, diatopic varieties); and Mellado Blanco's (2019) analysis of antiphrasis-based constructional idioms in German and Spanish.

Within constructions, in this paper we will focus on "partially lexically-filled phrasal patterns" (Goldberg, 2006, p. 215) or "constructional idioms":

> Constructional idioms are syntactic constructions with a (partially or fully) noncompositional meaning contributed by the construction, in which—unlike idioms in the traditional sense— only a subset (possibly empty) of the terminal elements is fixed. (Booij, 2002, p. 320)

> [..] constructional idioms, that is, patterns (of varying degrees of productivity and schematicity) for the formation of expressions, but whose syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and even phonological properties cannot be derived from general principles, whether universal or language-specific. (Taylor, 2015, p. 464).

The notion of "constructional idiom" has a powerful explanatory potential for the study of idiomaticity and productivity with corpora. This core concept also represents a possible response to classical research questions, such as the overall frequency of idiom variation, the language specificity, the search techniques employed to locate instances of non-canonical forms and creative variation, the differing notions of idiom, collocation, constructions, patterns…, and other problems which have been recurrently identified in the literature since Moon's (1998) seminal work.[3]

Following Goldberg (2006, p. 78ff), it can be argued that a constructional idiom (C_1) is a special case of another, more abstract construction (C_2), i.e., a more fully specified version of that construction. In other words, these special cases can be treated as partially lexically filled instances of a given construction. For instance, the constructional idiom (*as) mad as a* Y (C_1) would be a special case of the comparison construction [X BE *as* ADJ *as* Y][4]. As such, the *mad as a* Y construction would be dominated by this second, more schematic construction, via an instance link. And vice versa, *mad as a Y* would dominate the second construction by a subpart link (i.e., C_1 is a proper subpart of C_2 and exists independently). This entails that instances of this particular construction and the more schematic construction mutually motivate each other, and that the instance (C_1) inherits the syntax and semantics associated with the superordinate construction (C_2). And the same would apply to other embedded constructions in a recursive fashion.

3. Hypothesis and objectives

This study is designed to assess a two-part hypothesis: (a) phraseological units (traditional idioms) are not simple irregularities, but constructions; and (b) corpus-driven CxG provides a comprehensive theoretical framework for the study of Phraseology.

To this end, we have established the following objectives:

---

[3] Due to space limitations, only some relevant studies will be mentioned at this point. For a comprehensive overview of previous related work, see Philip (2008), Wulff (2008), Corver et al. (2019) and Glass (2019). For corpus-based cross-linguistic studies, see Colson (2008), Ishida (2008), Cignoni, Coffey and Moon (2012), Ebeling and Ebeling (2013), Ebeling (2018) and Fellbaum (2019), among others.

[4] The very limited number of slot fillers for the construction *(as) mad as a Y* makes this construction a special case, that can also be called a "stereotyped comparison", as in *(as) easy as pie*, *(as) dead as a doornail, (as) poor as a church mouse,* etc. The notion of "stereotyped comparison" has been used, among others, by Corpas Pastor (1996), Burger (1998) and Fiedler (2007).

(1) to study two types of idioms of insanity (comparison and resultative constructions) in English and Spanish.

(2) to design and implement a robust corpus-based methodology for monolingual and cross-lingual analyses

(3) to establish formal, semantic, and pragmatic features of the symbolic units in both languages, taking into account any dialectal differences.

(4) to observe the construal nature of cross-lingual correspondences and describe their behaviour in translation.

4. Data and methodology

As Boas (2010, p.12) has rightly pointed out, "there is indeed a broad variety of methodologies employed for cross-linguistic constructional analyses". The different approaches are all similar in structure: they depart from a specific constructional phenomenon in English in order to explore the way this same phenomenon is realised in the other language(s). To this end, relevant constructional properties are subjected to cross-linguistic analysis, and those that do not lend themselves well to an effective comparison are considered to be language-specific.

Since constructions pair different aspects of form (phonology, morphology, syntax) and meaning (semantics, pragmatics), they are particularly suitable for cross-linguistic analyses because they enable researchers to obtain deeper insight on all of their different (and partially idiosyncratic) distributional properties across languages simultaneously. In this paper, we will adopt a contrastive approach that is based on two assumptions: (a) the semantic description of a construction should be regarded as the primary basis for comparisons of constructions across languages (Boas, 2010); (b) large amounts of textual data are needed in order to provide a full-fledged account of constructions (cf. Gries, 2013, Yoon and Gries, 2016). The meaning pole (including discourse-pragmatic and functional factors) will be the first step towards a "tertium comparationis" that can be employed for comparing and contrasting the formal properties of constructional counterparts in the other language, whereas the form pole would be only secondary. Our methodology will combine Ishida's (2008) corpus-based approach for contrastive analysis of idioms with similar meanings in different languages and the step-by-step cross-linguistic constructional generalisation (from meaning to form) advanced by Boas (2010).

4.1. Choice of constructions

There are many preferred ways to convey madness and insanity in English and Spanish. Some examples are *be away with the fairies*, *go bananas*, *go crackers*, *have bats in the belfry*, *have you gone out of your mind?*, *as mad as a hatter*, *mad as a March hare*, etc. in English, and their Spanish counterparts *estar como un cencerro*, *estar como una cabra*, *estar loco de atar*, *faltarle a alguien un tornillo, írsele a alguien la pinza* or *írsele a alguien la olla.* All these idioms are all roughly equivalent to 'be or go crazy'. Most of them are entered as individual idioms in dictionaries with (partially) synonymous meanings.

In this paper we will narrow down the analysis to two main constructional phenomena that seem to lie at conventional ways of expressing insanity. Spanning various patterns, these units exhibit different degrees of complexity and schematisation. As stated in Section 2, constructional idioms are partially lexically filled instances (special cases) of another construction (more general and schematic). In this paper we analyse insanity idioms with *mad/loco* as special cases of two different constructions: (a) the Comparison construction and (b) the Resultative construction. These types of constructional idioms of insanity exhibit

similar semantic and pragmatic values in analogous situations, which provides an appropriate tertium comparationis for contrastive analysis.

We will adopt a contrastive, cross-language perspective based on the analysis of large corpora. Corpus analysis is of special relevance to constructional approaches. Each construction is coupled with its own degree of entrenchment, which is highly correlated to frequency (and can, therefore, change according to usage and exposure to data). As stated by Stefanowitsch and Flach (2017, p.108), "the entrenchment of a unit depends on its usage intensity in language use (as sampled in linguistic corpora)". For Wulff (2013, p. 279), schematic idioms are of particular interest, because they show a "multi-dimensional continuum" of formally and semantically irregular and cognitively entrenched expressions. The notions of *entrenchment* and *conventionality* were introduced by Langacker (1987) and have received different interpretations. For Croft and Cruse (2004), Bybee (2013) and Goldberg (2013), token frequency determines the degree of entrenchment. But for others (Hay and Baayen 2005, Barðdal 2008; 2011, Baayen 2011, Booij 2013), it is type frequency that correlates with the degree of entrenchment.

Following Hoffmann (2017), an informal description of the form and meaning parts of these types of conventional pairings is provided for both languages. The arbitrary nature of the two poles (form/meaning) are represented by a bidirectional arrow. Non-compositional meaning aspects are given in curly brackets. Constructions will be characterised cross-linguistically in terms of morphosyntactic patterns, slot fillers, and usage preferences and restrictions.

4.2. Corpora used in the present study

Idioms tend to be very low-frequency items, and yet they are cognitively entrenched.[5] This is in line with Wulff (2013): if a construction is cognitively entrenched, it is not necessarily frequent in a corpus, even a huge one. For instance, in the enTenTen15, the lemma *mad* appears 167,014 times (with a normalised frequency of 9.10 per million) and *hatter* has a raw frequency of 7,768 (0.42 normalised frequency), while (*as*) *mad as a hatter* has only 188 occurrences altogether. In Spanish, the situation is similar: *más loco que una cabra* has 96 occurrences in the esNOW corpus (0.01 per million), while there are 26120 times for the lemma *loco* (4.35 per million) and 21232 for *cabra* (3.53 per million). For this reason, giga-token corpora are needed to analyse idioms and their constructions in detail.

Data from several corpora of contemporary spoken English and Spanish (parallel and comparable) have been selected for this study and are described below.

(1) **OpenSubtitles** – a 8.31 giga-token multilingual parallel corpus that has been downloaded from the OpenSubtitles.org repository in 2011. It comprises 54 languages, but only the bilingual parallel subcorpus has been analysed (50 million aligned sentences of English-Spanish film subtitles). The Spanish component size is over 870 million words.

(2) **enTenTen15** – a 15 giga-token Web corpus of global, standardised English. It was created automatically in 2015. The enTenTen15 can be divided into subcorpora according to different diatopic varieties.

(3) **esTenTen18** – a 17.5 giga-token Web corpus of global, standardised Spanish. It was created automatically in 2018. It comprises a European Spanish component and a

---

[5] Idiomaticity and entrenchment are related, but different concepts. Both are used as scalar criteria for defining features of idioms, phraseological units, phrasemes, etc. Due to their semantic opacity and figurativeness, idioms are cognitively entrenched, irrespective of their frequency. But entrenchment does not necessarily imply idiomaticity. Even completely transparent sequences can be entrenched via frequency or association strength. As a result, these stored sequences are more quickly activated (Langacker 1987).

Latin American component, plus some other documents. It is further subdivided into 19 subcorpora of national varieties.

(4) **The British National Corpus** (BNC) – a 100 million word corpus of English, originally created by Oxford University Press in the 1980s and early 1990s. It contains samples of British English (90% written, 10% spoken), of the late 20th century from a wide range of sources and genres.

(5) **CORPES XXI** – a pan-Spanish reference corpus of over 286 million words (2001-2018) with oral and written components. Only the subcorpus of Peninsular Spanish (67 million words) will be used in this study.

(6) **News on the Web** (enNOW) – a 9 billion word corpus of English with data from web-based newspapers and magazines from 2010 to the present time. It is a dynamic corpus which grows monthly. It includes subcorpora of English language varieties.

(7) **The Global Web-based English (GloWbE)** – a 19 giga-token Web corpus of English with texts from twenty different countries.

(8) **The Corpus del Español NOW corpus (News on the Web)** (esNOW)) – a 7.2 billion word corpus of Spanish with data of data from web-based newspapers and magazines from 2012 to the present time. It is also a dynamic corpus which grows monthly. It includes subcorpora of different Spanish varieties.

(9) **Web/dialects** (WD) – a two billion word corpus of Spanish, web-crawled from two million of websites from 21 different Spanish speaking countries.

The parallel corpus of subtitles (corpus 1) will be analysed in order to identify and/or check the constructional counterparts in both languages through frequent translation equivalents. Constructions will be described in a monolingual fashion, then inter-linguistically and cross-linguistically: corpora 2 and 4 for English and corpora 3 and 5 for Spanish. (Corpora 4 and 5 are control corpora of web-crawled corpora 2 and 3). Corpora 2-5 will be analysed in a number of ways, including the frequency of this construction in the two languages (and national varieties), the basic elements of its syntactic structure, and the semantic and informative constraints which operate on these constructions, the lexical filledness of slots, usage and diatopy restrictions and so forth.

European and non-European varieties of English and Spanish will be analysed too: World English as well as British, American and Canadian varieties; and World Spanish together with Peninsular, Mexican and Argentinian varieties. Language varieties have been selected according to the size of the (sub)corpora available. Corpora 6-7 will be used to obtain complementary varietal data for English; and corpora 8-9 will be also analysed in the same way for Spanish varieties.

Corpora 1-3 are available through SketchEngine, corpus 4 can be web-searched through an in-built corpus query system or is freely available on line (through SketchEngine or BYU, for instance), whereas corpus 5 can only be accessed through its proprietary query system. Corpora 6-9 are freely available through the on-line portals developed by Mark Davis.[6] The total number of tokens per corpus is provided in Table 1.

Table 1
Total number of million tokens (million) per corpus.

CORPORA	LANGUAGE(S)	SIZE
OpenSubtitles	EN - ES	620 M
enTenTen15	EN	15,000 M
esTenTen	ES	17,500 M
BNC	EN	100 M
CORPES XXI	ES	286 M

GloWbE	EN	19,000 M
enNOW	EN	9,000 M
esNOW	ES	7,200 M
WD	ES	2,000 M

5. 'Insanity' idioms with *mad/loco* in comparison constructions

In CxG, the Comparative construction is a partially lexically filled phrasal pattern (semi-schematic construction) with two slot fillers that are explicitly compared on a single scale (comparison of equal extent). The slot fillers exhibit different degrees of restriction and interdependency. For instance, they are contingent upon each other in *as busy as a bee* and *más fresco que una lechuga* ('unexpectedly calm and relax or very calmy'). Following Treis (2018: i), in this paper we use the term Comparison construction to encompass a family of closely related constructions: (i) Comparative constructions for the expression of comparison of inequality and (ii) Equative constructions for the expression of comparison of equality.

Equative and comparative constructions usually involve some key components (Treis & Vanhove, 2017): the comparee (entity that is being compared), the standard of comparison (entity the comparee is being compared against), the standard marker (that is closely associated with the standard of comparison), the parameter of comparison (property of comparison), and the parameter or degree marker (closely associated with the parameter of comparison). In what follows we will deal with the *Mad as a* Y construction and its Spanish counterparts, and how they are rendered in translation.

5.1. Cross-language analysis

5.1.1. The (As) Mad as a Y construction

This constructional idiom with *mad* can be described as the following form/meaning pairing: FORM_[X BE (əz) mæd əz ə ˈY] ↔ MEANING_'X is crazy, strange or eccentric {intensification}' (ex. 1):

> (1) He is as mad as a hatter ... every time he opens his mouth Scotland cringes. [enTenTen15].

Example (1) is a special case of the Equative construction, described as FORM_[X BE əz Adj. əz Y] ↔ MEANING_'X is Z like Y' (ex. 2):

> (2) This isn't quite as mad as it seems. [enTenTen15].

Although both sequences share a common pattern, they are different constructions: while C_2 has compositional meaning, C_1 exhibits particular idiomatic usages. The *Mad as a* Y construction inherits the syntax and semantics associated with the Equative construction via an instance link, and, at the same time, dominates it via a subpart link (cf. Section 2). This two-way conditioning accounts for the morphosyntactic and lexical construal restrictions shown by the constructional idiom. It also accounts for productivity and idiom variability.

The form, meaning or function of *Mad as a* Y construction are different from its ordinary equative construction BE *as* Adj *as* Y.[7] In the former, the comparison stresses the aspect of

---

[7] This seems to be a common feature of cross-language analysis. See Sawada (2007) about idiomatic comparative constructions in English and Japanese whose form, meaning or function are different from those of their ordinary

intensification of the quality associated to the mental state denoted by *mad*. This comparative constructional idiom conveys intensification of the attribute *mad* ('mentally disturbed, insane, deranged') by comparing it with prototypical fillers in the restricted slot that convey this attribute in a high degree via a metaphoric link (*hatter*, *March hare*)[8]. For instance, *as mad as a hatter* is not to be understood literally as 'X being mad in the same way as Y', but 'very or extremely mad'. In this respect, this constructional idiom differs significantly from the ordinary equative constructions in which the degrees compared are identical rather than distinct.

The constructional nature of this partially lexically-filled phrasal pattern shines through its idiosyncratic properties. There are 8 instances of the *Mad as a* Y construction in the BNC. 6 of them with *hatter* and 2 with *March hare* in the Y slot. Both slot fillers would be metaphorically and/or metonymically linked to the comparative constructional idiom with *mad*. As to the comparison markers (lexically filled as_1 and as_2), there are 6 occurrences with both standard marker and degree marker, but also 2 with only the degree marker (as_2). Some preferences and usage restrictions apply in the BNC data. A preferential (or central) instance of the *Mad as a* Y constructional idiom includes both markers and *hatter* in the slot Y, e.g. **as mad as a hatter**.

Table 2
Distribution of the *Mad as a* Y construction in English corpora.

	BNC	enTenTen15	enNOW	GloWbE
As mad as a hatter	4	35	22	23
As mad as a March hare	2	14	5	7
As mad as a box of frogs	0	16	22	10
As mad as a bag of frogs	0	3	0	4
As mad as a cut snake	0	7	10	5
Mad as a March hare	0	33	14	6
Mad as a box of frogs	0	27	21	12
Mad as a hatter	2	191	71	58
Mad as a brush	0	5	11	3
Mad as a snake	1	2	2	2
Mad as a cut snake	0	13	8	5
Mad as a badger	0	2	3	1
Mad as a meat axe	0	0	3	2

However, the picture changes sensibly with much larger and updated corpora, like esTenTen, enNOW and GloWeb. As seen in Table 2, the different instantiations of this constructional idiom in the three giga-token corpora show a growing tendency towards the elision of the standard marker (as_1) and the creation of an ever stronger association between the degree marker (as_2) and the parameter of comparison (slot Y), which appears to contribute to the unit entrenchment. In these three corpora, the number of instances of the *Mad as a* Y construction without the standard marker is at least twice higher than those with the two markers: there are 224 instances with only as_2 in enTenTen15 (48 with both as_1 and as_2); 86 in enNOW (27 with both markers); and 64 in the GloWeb (30 with both markers). In addition, the Y slot is mainly saturated by the noun filler *hatter* (esTenTen: 231 instantiations, enNOW: 93, GloWbe: 81) to the detriment of *March hare* (esTenTen: 47,

comparative construction. For a comprehensive overview of cross-linguistic oriented analysis of constructions expressing similarity and equality, the reader is referred to the volume edited by Treis and Vanhove (2017).

[8] The expressions *(as) mad as a hatter* and *(as) mad as a March hare* were already common at the time when Lewis Carrol wrote *Alice in Wonderland* (1865). The former was linked to the hat-making industry and the effect of mercury poisoning on the central nervous system, and the latter to the prolonged and active breeding season of the brown hare, which begins in March.

enNOW: 19, GloWbe: 13). The preferential instance appears to include only the second marker and *hatter* in the slot Y, e.g. **mad as a hatter**.

Similar distributions can be found in the British and American components of the three corpora, where *hatter* seems to be central noun for this construction. The type frequency of the Y slot in each subcorpus of British English is as follows: 12 (enTenTen15), 34 (enNOW) and 30 (GloWbE); and for American English: 4 (enTenTen15), 17 (enNOW) and 20 (GloWbE).[9]

In any case, the two main slot fillers (*hatter* and *March hare*) dominate the constructional idiom as special parts of it. This accounts for some differential aspects at the syntagmatic level. For instance, the construction with the *March hare* tends to collocate with the verb *to be* and is usually introduced by presenters in a metalinguistic function, such as "the term", "the saying", "the phrase", "the expression", "the idiom" or "as the saying goes". This is a preferred use, as evidenced by the average number of concordances lines in the corpora (over 30%). Non metalinguistic uses point to a more canonical structure with *be* (and occasionally with *behave as* and the passive construction *be thought as*).

The construction with the slot filler *hatter* can also be used with presenters, but this is not a preferential use. In fact, this construction appears to be more productive, as it also allows other verbal collocates, like *go, appear* (besides the verb *be*), *become* and *cause* ("cause someone to become a mad as a hatter"). In addition, *mad as a hatter* can also be slot filler in general NP constructions (ex. 3) and Predicative constructions (ex. 4):

(3) There's also a great cast of the slightly eccentric through to flat out mad as a hatter types all of whom serve their part in the cast without raising any sneaking sense of affect. (enTenTen15)
(4) Things did not go smoothly for George III, who presided over the dissolution of much of the British Empire, and eventually died at Windsor Castle in 1820, blind, deaf and mad as a hatter. (enTenTen15)

Both constructions also show some differences in meaning. Intensification is visible through the words that collocate with the *mad-as-a-hatter* construction. Very frequently concordances include the adjective *mad* (intensified by this construction) or even refer to a certain degree of "madness" that goes in crescendo: *mad > mad as a hatter > danger* (ex. 5).

(5) One is obviously nuts, mad as a hatter, so mad in fact that they become a danger to their neighbour (and this is how things pan out in the religion world you point to).

The semantic prosody also tends to be negative,[10] usually rounding up a rather unflattering picture or assessment of someone (Ex. 6). However, some attested uses

---

[9] British and American subcorpora retrieve low numbers of occurrences of this constructional idiom. The Canadian subcorpora do not include a single instance.

[10] It is not uncommon that the negative assessment is reinforced by other negative co-occurring words (underlined): e.g., "Mr. Speaker, whether I <u>ramble</u>, whether I <u>make sense</u>, whether I am <u>mad as a hatter</u> , whether I am <u>short</u>, whether I am <u>fat</u>, it is nobody's business" (esTenTen15); or else by the implicit comparison (negative-positive) triggered by the conjunction *but*: "He was as mad as a hatter but he was one of the nicest blokes you could ever meet" (enNOW). Negative prosody can also be found in the use of co-occurring words that refer to inappropriate or abnormal behaviour (*hijinks, surrealistic, danger, arrogant, demanding, eccentric, erratic, crushing logic and common sense, self-destruction*), which could be connected to mental conditions (*brain damage, neurological consequences, ill people, toxic effects, psychological symptoms, mental problems*). In this case, both sets of co-occurring words are reminiscent of the

appear to stress a positive evaluation of someone, in the sense of 'stark mad or foolish, and yet…", especially with regard to this person's eccentricity or passionate personality (ex. 7):

> (6) […] the emperor is stark naked, mosquito-bitten, and mad as a hatter.
> (7) Isadora Duncan's most revolutionary quality was her public honesty as one can see here in these statements to the press concerning her marriage to a Russian poet named Esenin whom she described as "a genius ... mad as a hatter, strong, full of vitality". (enTenTen15)

Non-metalinguistic uses of the *Mad-as-a-March-hare* construction also reveal a different prosody. It does not seem to imply negative evaluation, as this kind of 'madness' is usually perceived as 'mildly insane' (not dangerous), even hilarious, and (positively) connected to some frenziness, possibly reminiscent of the excitedness of hares in their breeding season (Ex. 8-9).

> (8) I was happy that, even though my ada is still as mad as a March hare, he continues to have an inordinate amount of caring compassion for his elflings.
> (9) Time to get Mad, Mad as a March hare!

In addition, the *Mad as a hatter* constructional idiom is proner to creative manipulations and wordplay.[11] Modifications usually involve the second part of the construction, with addition of premodifiers, capitalisation or plural changes: "We are pretty cool I must say, mad as a <u>bunch </u>of hatter<u>s</u> but cool"; "You are as mad as the proverbial <u>H</u>atter"[12]; "Since you seem all to be as mad as <u>the whole worshipful company</u> of hatter<u>s</u>, […] I suppose I had better take you home" (enTenTen15).

Searches with the query sequence [**mad + as + a**] also retrieve more novel fillers for slot Y with the same construal meaning/function of intensification of the unbalanced state of mind (see also Table 2).[13] In these newly coined instantiations of the constructional idiom the standard marker tends to be elided: 74,15 % of all new instances of this constructional idiom in enTenTen15 keep only the degree marker (as_2); and the same situation can be observed in enNOW (66,3%) and GloWbE (77,22%). The construction also exhibits patterned variability as regards the choice of fillers for slot Y via a metaphoric link: animals (and containers with animals) or objects associated to rapid movements that are used to convey an agitated state of mind: *box of frogs*, *bag of frogs*, *bag of cats*, *snake*, *cut snake*, *wet hen*, *badger, brush* and *meat axe*. Regarding the attested variability of slot fillers within the construction, a typical instance would be **mad as a box of frogs**.

---

literal origin of the expression (neurotoxic effect and psychological symptoms associated with mercury poisoning in the hat-making industry).

[11] A plausible explanation for this could be found in the correlation between decomposability, flexibility (understood as productivity) and salience (cognitive entrenchment). Gibbs et al. (1989) presents the findings of an experiment in which subjects were asked to judge the similarity between a list of distorted idioms and the interpretation of the original ones. Their study confirms that decomposable idioms are judged by native speakers to be less disrupted by lexical changes. In a later study, Gibbs and Colston (2012) claim that the more salient an element is to the overall meaning of the idiom, the more prone to modification the idiom appears to be. This means that the less productive (less schematic) a constructional idiom is, the more fixed (more substantive) and cognitively salient is, and, therefore, there is a higher tendency that it appears manipulated in discourse. Corpas Pastor (1996) had already observed a similar phenomenon with regards to creative manipulations of Spanish idioms.

[12] The noun *hatter* in capitals is a clear reference to the Mad Hatter character in Carroll's novel. The premodifier *proverbial* is also a common presenter, but it is not a preferential use in the case of *mad as a hatter* (unlike *mad as a March hare*, see above).

[13] There are some instances in plural: *mad as hatters*, *mad as cut snakes*.

Numerous hapax legomena evidence token productivity for the *Mad as a* Y construction. The BNC has only one hapax with *snake* in slot Y and without the standard marker (*as₁*): *mad as a snake.* And the three giga-token corpora register different hapax legomena within the Noun Phrase construction with *bag* as a the filler of the first slot and the two markers: *as mad as a bag of* N, where N= *badgers, bats, cats, cut snakes, ferrets, frogs, hammers, legs, spiders, spanners, squirrels,* etc. Other hapax are *mad as a hare*, *mad as a sack of bees*, *mad as a hat made of butter*, *mad as a fish in a raincoat*, *mad as a fruitcake*[14], *mad as a kid*, *mad as a flag*, *mad as a hat*, *mad as a mongoose*, *mad as a bicycle*, *mad as a balloon*, etc.

Those are instances of the semi-schematic intensifying construction (*As*) *mad as (a)* Y; and they can also perform premodifying functions: "all sorts of mad as a bag of snakes Tweets" (enNOW); take comparative suffixes: "madder than a box of frogs" (GloWbE); go into compounding processes or other creative uses: "you've gone frog mad" and "mad as a tricorn hatter" (enTenTen15), etc.

5.1.2. The Más loco que un(a) Y and '(Loco) Como un(a) Y' constructions

Spanish 'insanity' constructional idioms show a radically different picture, which is conjectured to be language-specific. The results of the analysis point to more substantive and less productive constructions. They also convey a basic meaning of intensification or pragmatic evaluation of a person's (real or apparent) mental state, that is perceived as abnormal, unbalanced, strange, eccentric, etc.

The Spanish counterparts of the *Mad as a* Y construction instantiate Equative constructions and Comparative constructions with *loco* and a lexically restricted slot Y. The meaning is non-compositional and conveys intensification of the attribute ('very crazy', 'mad in a high degree'). Both constructional idioms also inherit the syntax and semantics associated with the more abstract constructions of which they are special parts via an instance link. The Equative construction can be described as a pairing of FORM: [X SER/ESTAR tan Adj. 'komo Y] ↔ MEANING: 'X is Z like Y' (ex. 10):

(10) A medida que los seres humanos comienzan a explorar, se dan cuenta de que la ciudad no está tan vacía como parecía. (esTenTen18).
"As humans begin to explore, they realise that the city is not as empty as it seemed"

The *(Loco) como una* Y construction is also a special case of the Equative construction. It can be described as follows: [X ESTAR tan 'loko 'komo un(a) Y] ↔ MEANING: 'X is crazy, strange or eccentric {intensification}' (ex. 11):

(11) […] pero puedo jurar que ese hombre estaba tan loco como una cabra, quiero decir que no fingía. (CORPES XXI)
"[…] but I can swear that man was really mad, I mean he wasn't pretending."

Although non-elided exemplars can be found, most occurrences in the corpora used in this study instantiate elided constructions. These symbolic units are the result of a well-known process within lexicalised intensification patterns in Spanish (García-Page Sánchez, 2008, and Suñer, 2014), which involves the elision of the parameter marker *tan* (ex. 12) and, alternatively, of the parameter of comparison (*loco*, 'mad') as well (ex. 13).

---

[14] Cf. (*as*) *nutty as a fruitcake*.

(12) Estás como una cabra tío. (esTenTen18)
  "You are nuts, man."

(13) Hasta Mújica ha dicho que Maduro está "loco como una cabra". (esNOW)
  "Even Mújica has said that Maduro is 'as mad as a goat'".

The same intensification of the attribute *loco* ('mad') can be conveyed in Spanish by a different form-meaning pairing: FORM: [X ESTAR 'mas ˈloko ke ˈun(a) Y] ↔ MEANING: 'X is crazy {intensification}' (ex. 14):

(14) Parece que el personaje de Shiú está más loco que una cabra. (esTenTen18)
  "It seems that Shiú's character is a raving lunatic."

This again is a special case of the phrasal Comparative construction of inequality (superiority), that has a compositional meaning and can be described in the following way: FORM: [X SER/ESTAR 'mas Adj. ke Y] ↔ MEANING: 'X is more Z than Y' (ex. 15)

(15) Al ser código interpretado, JavaScript es más lento que Java. (esTenTen18)
  "Being interpreted code, JavaScript is slower than Java."

Both comparative constructional idioms have a similar non-compositional meaning ('very crazy') and convey intensification of the attribute *loco* by comparing it with the fillers in slot Y. The semantic prosody is not necessarily marked. In fact, both poles are possible. Some occurrences show the speaker's positive stance through affective (ex. 16)[15] or humorous connotations (ex. 17):

(16) Es maniacodepresivo y la verdad, aunque lo quiero mucho, está loco como cabra. (CORPES XXI)
  "He's manic-depressive, and to tell you the truth, as much as I love him, he's crazy as hell."

(17) Me parto, estás como una cabra (esTenTen).
  "I'm laughing my head off, you're absolutely crazy."

By contrast to their English counterparts, there is less variability as regards slot fillers. The range is narrower in the Spanish constructional idioms, and comprises nouns denoting female goats (*cabra*, *chiva*, *chota*), an object associated with them (*cencerro*, 'bell') and another object arbitrarily connected (*regadera*, 'water can'). Both comparative and equative constructional idioms share *cabra* as the preferred noun filler, although they differ significantly as regards the other slot fillers (see Table 3).

Table 3
Distribution of the *(Loco) como un(a)* Y and *Más loco que un(a)* Y constructions.

	CORPESXXI	esTenTen18	esNOW	Web/Dialects
Más loco que una cabra	13	240	62	30
Más loco que un cencerro	0	2	3	0

---

[15] Notice the use of the connector *aunque* (lit. 'although', 'even though'), that conveys implicit contrast, similarly to *but* (cf. note 10): (*querer mucho*) POSITIVE + *aunque* + NEGATIVE (*loco como una cabra*).

Más loco que una chota	0	0	0	0
Más loco que una chiva	0	1	0	1
Más loco que una regadera	0	3	0	2
Loco como una cabra	8	194	255	21
Loco como un cencerro	0	3	1	1
Loco como una chota	0	0	0	0
Loco como una chiva	0	0	0	0
Loco como una regadera	0	5	0	0
Como una cabra	81	1,875	506	242
Como una regadera	14	442	79	65
Como un cencerro	17	361	51	32
Como una chota	16	247	33	37
Como una chiva	4	12	3	0

In the case of the comparative constructional idiom, the standard of comparison is almost exclusively instantiated by *cabra*, which is the central noun in this construction. Hence, the preferred exemplar would be **más loco que una cabra**. As a whole, the elided equative construction appears to be more frequent a type than the comparative one. However, most tokens correspond to the constructional idiom with both the parameter marker (*tan*) and the parameter of comparison elided (equative type 2). In this case, the most frequent slot filler is again *cabra*, followed at a distance by *regadera*, *cencerro* or *chota*, depending on the corpus used, with very few instances for *chiva* (mainly in Peninsular Spanish). The preferred exemplar for the equative type 2 would be **como una cabra**. The equative 1 depicts a similar restriction as regards the slot filler, that is almost exclusively instantiated by *cabra*, but the frequency of the type is much lower. Both constructional idioms share the stative predicative verb *estar* ('stative be') as the main verbal collocate, either in present (e.g., *está*) or in simple past tense (e.g., *estaba*). There are some instances of conditional periphrases (e.g., *puede, podría estar*). As in English, most verb instances appear in the third person singular (mainly masculine), followed by the second person singular and the first person singular, which also evidence the dialogic nature of this construction (mainly used in conversation and/or colloquial registers). Other low frequency verbal collocates for the comparative construction are *venir* ('come'), *andar* ('be', lit. 'walk), *parecer* ('look like') and *volverse* ('turn), which also predicate a state.

The equative type 1 exhibits an even more restricted set of verbal collocates: almost all occurrences in corpora take *estar*, although there are over 20 occurrences with ergative verbs like *ponerse* and *volverse* ('turn), as well as some cases with the verb *ser* ('*be*'). However, variability can be observed in the case of the adjective component of the pattern, the lexically filled *loco.* There are several attested cases with synonymous 'insanity' adjectives like *majareta*, *zumbado, sonado,* etc. (ex. 18). Interestingly enough, synonymous and closely-related adjectives can also enter as alternative lexical fillers in the comparative construction of superiority. Examples like *más chiflado/ chalado/ necio/ pirado/ tonto/ chocho/ testarudo que una cabra* or *más zumbado/chiflado que una regadera* can be found in corpora, although their frequencies are not significant. These types of idiom constructions still retain many of their phrasal properties.

(18)   Durante 23 años, la Generalitat ha estado en manos de un tipo sonado como un cencerro que ha jugado con la sociedad catalana para hacer realidad "su" proyecto vital. (esTenTen18)
"For 23 years, the Generalitat has been in the hands of a guy who sounds mad and who has played with Catalan society to make "his" life project a reality".

The equative type 2 also shares the verb *estar* as the main collocate. There is some verbal variability as well, although the range of verbal collocates appears to be affected by the noun filler. For instance, this unit collocates with verbs that denote becoming or turning out to be 'crazy', but the actual verbs seem to vary according to the noun filler: *chota* selects *acabar, cencerro* selects *acabar* and *quedarse,* and *regadera* selects *terminar*. The choice of verbal collocates is more extensive with *cabra*: reflexive verbs in an ergative function (*volverse*), verbs related to behaviour like *ser* ('be'), *portarse* ('behave'), *comportarse* ('behave'), *desvariar* ('rave') and *reaccionar* ('react'), motion verbs like *ir* ('go'), *andar* ('go', 'walk'), *trotar* (trot), *circular* ('circulate'), and others, like *emborracharse* ('get drunk') or *pujar* ('bid'). In collocation with these verbs, the unit *como una cabra* shows some delexicalisation towards an intensifying function (ex. 19)

(19)   Usted la ve angelical, con su piel apiñonadita, pero desvaría como una cabra (esTenTen18).
"You see her angelic, with her terse and ivory skin, but she is as mad as a hatter".

Equative type 2 constructions can also fill in adjectival slot fillers of various schematic constructions. A typical instance is as predicatives of *loco* with adjectival o adverbial functions: e.g. "loco, como una cabra", "como una cabra de loco", "¿loca? probablemente como una regadera", "tienes que estar loca, pero como una cabra" (esTenTen18); "Estaba majareta perdido, como una chota" (CORPES XXI), etc. Some internal flexibility is also possible by means of intensifying adjectives that premodify the noun fillers: e.g. "estás como una auténtica regadera", "está como una puta cabra". Postmodification is also possible: "como una cabra loca".

The concordances examined illustrate interesting cases of construal inheritance by the noun fillers. Hence, the parameters of comparison, when used in isolation, cease to convey their literal meanings and exhibit construal idiomatic meanings instead. In example (20), *regadera* does not mean 'watercan', but 'insane, mad'; the same can be seen in example (21), where *chota* even takes the masculine gender (*choto*), not to denominate a male goat, but to refer to a man who is stark mad[16]:

(20)   Todos podemos ser raros, locos, enfermos, regaderas o extraños. (esTenTen18)
"We can all be weird, crazy, sick, insane or strange."
(21)   Choto.— Sí, tía, Choto de chota, ya sabes... de estar como una chota. (CORPES XXI)
"Male Hare. Yes, aunt, Male Hare from Mad as a March Hare, you know... from to be as mad as a March Hare."

Finally, comparison constructional idioms appear to be marked diatopically. To this end, we have looked up the most frequent instances of the comparison constructional

---

[16] See Goldberg (2019;73ff) on how constructions emerge and are used creatively.

idioms (equative and comparative) in three subcorpora of European Spanish (Peninsular) and non-European varieties (Mexican and Argentinian). For a better control of variables, the subcorpora have been extracted from the Spanish TenTen and NOW corpora (compiled like the English ones), and the Web/Dialects, whose design resembles GloWbE to a certain extent. The results per idiom construction are listed in Table 4.

Table 4
Distribution of the *(Loco) como un(a)* Y and *Más loco que un(a)* Y constructions in Spanish varieties.

	esTenTen18			esNOW			Web/D		
	ES	**MX**	**AR**	**ES**	**MX**	**AR**	**ES**	**MX**	**AR**
Más loco que una cabra	22	9	17	1	2	3	5	3	2
Loco como una cabra	35	9	9	16	12	16	2	4	2
Como una cabra	379	42	47	140	19	37	133	15	22
Como una regadera	109	16	3	55	3	5	40	2	2
Como un cencerro	70	2	6	41	2	0	25	0	1
Como una chota	56	10	1	32	0	0	27	2	1
Como una chiva	57	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Unlike enTenTen15, the esTenTen18 depicts a clear picture for all three varieties. *Como una cabra* features at the top of Peninsular Spanish and Mexican Spanish. The second position in Peninsular Spanish is occupied by *como un cencerro*, followed by *loco como una cabra.* This is the second most frequent idiom in Mexican and Argentinian Spanish (in the absence of *como un cencerro*). It should be noted that the range of possible slot fillers for the more schematic construction *Como un/una* X is observed to be more limited. In fact, in Argentinian Spanish the slot is basically occupied by *cabra* (*regadera* and *chota* are just happax legomena). A similar picture can be seen in the Argentinian subcorpora of Web/Dialect, with only one difference: the most frequent construction is *como una cabra* (followed by *más loco que una cabra*). On this occasion, the esTenTen subcorpora turn out to be more appropriate to study this type of constructions, followed by Web/Dialect. In comparison, NOW subcorpora of Spanish provide much less information. Since English and Spanish subcorpora have been compiled in almost identical way, we argue that the differences are to be attributed to the construction conglomerates themselves or to differential preferred ways to convey this type of meanings in both languages.

5.2. Translation aspects

Idiom comparative constructions with *mad* and *loco* in English and Spanish exhibit important differences with regards to the number of actual idioms (constructions and constructs or exemplars), their varietal distribution, their fixation and construal nature, their pragmatic meanings and their productivity. However, this type of contrastive analysis does not appear to have found its way into bilingual dictionaries. For instance, the *Collins Spanish Dictionary*[17] includes *to be (as) mad as a hatter* or *March hare* as a run-on entry

---

[17] *Collins Spanish-English Dictionary* (On-line version):
http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english-spanish
http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/spanish-english.

under the lemma *mad* and provides "estar más loco que una cabra (inf)" as the only correspondence in Spanish. The *Oxford Spanish-English Dictionary*[18] also includes both idiom constructions as synonymous phrases, and two possible correspondences for both: "estar loco de atar" and "estar más loco que una cabra (informal)". One could say that both bilingual dictionaries give just the most prototypical and basic translation equivalents.

Translation strategies and frequent equivalents have been studied on the *OpenSubtitles* parallel corpus (English into Spanish). This corpus was chosen for three main reasons: (a) even larger corpora are needed to study idiom constructions in translated texts, (b) idioms tend to be used in conversations and other types of speech interactions, (c) corpora of subtitles are closer to spoken language. Table 5 shows the distribution of *Mad as* Y 'insanity' constructions and their Spanish translation equivalents within the parallel corpus chosen.

Table 5
'Insanity' constructions with *mad as* Y and Spanish translations in *OpenSubtitles*.

EN		EN	
(As) mad as a hatter	8	**Como una cabra**	4
		Loco de remate	1
		Totalmente loco	1
		Tan loco como una cabra	1
		Chiflado	1
		Volverse loco	1
Mad as a hatter	6	Loco de remate	2
		Loco como una cabra	1
		Como una regadera	1
		Volverse loco	1
		Loco	1
Mad as a March hare	4	Loco de atar	1
		Hecho un loco de atar	1
		Como una cabra	1
		Locos como liebres de marzo	1
Mad as Y [*snakes*]	1	Loco de remate	1
Mad as a bag of X [*gerbils*]	1	Tan loco como una bolsa llena de roedores	1
(As) mad as a Y [*mongoose*]	1	**Como un cencerro**	1

The English subcorpus contains only 21 occurrences of *Mad*-idioms: (*as*) *mad as a hatter*, *mad as a March hare*, *mad as snakes*, *mad as a bag of gerbils*, *as mad as a mongoose*. The constructs (*as*) *mad as a hatter* and *mad as a March hare* tend to be translated as *como una cabra* (5), the most frequent and generally spread idiom construction in Spanish. This is a trait of normalisation. Other translation equivalents can also be found: *loco como una cabra* (1), *tan loco como una cabra* (1), *como una regadera* (1). While idioms with *loco* and *cabra* can be found at the top of the ranking in all Spanish varieties analysed, insanity idioms with *regadera* tend to index Peninsular Spanish (cf. NOW_es and Web/Dialects) and Mexican Spanish (cf. esTenTen). In this vein, the less construal construction *as mad as a mongoose* (less fixed as a construction and less entrenched) is translated by means of construction *como un cencerro*, that is more fixed, stable and entrenched (another trait of normalisation and convergence). Notice also that *como un cencerro* indexes Peninsular Spanish (normalisation) (cf. esTenTen and Web/Dialects). Other preferred translation equivalents, as found in the OpenSubtitles

---

[18] *Oxford Spanish-English Dictionary* (On-line version)
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/spanish/

corpus, are collocation constructions: *loco de remate* (3), *totalmente loco* (1), *loco de atar* (2) and *volverse loco* (2); the word *loco* (1) and synonyms *chiflado* (1). Notice in this case the preference for simple forms and the avoidance of idiomaticity and other figurative uses in translation (simplification).

In addition, some omissions have been identified (ex. 22), as well as cases of calque (ex. 23).

> (22) […] when the whole world was tumbling about our ears, there was Colonel Grau, mad as a hatter, trying to solve his little murders.
>   Cuando el mundo entero se desmoronaba, allí estaba el coronel Grau, intentando resolver sus crímenes.

> (23) They' re all as mad as bloody march hares anyway.
>   Están locos como malditas liebres de marzo, de todos modos.

It should be borne in mind that calque is a powerful mechanism for neology. Although no examples have been found of "locos como liebres de marzo" or "tan loco como una bolsa llena de roedores" in the Spanish monolingual corpora, we have identified an interesting case of calque in the English corpora: *mad as a goat*, with cultural references to political issues between the Presidents of Venezuela and Uruguay (ex. 24-26). Whether this novel expression turns into conventionalised construct remains to be seen.

> (24) After the remarks, the former Uruguayan President Jose Mujica said President Maduro was "mad as a goat".
> (25) "They're all crazy in Venezuela " and Venezuelan leader Maduro is "mad as a goat".
> (26) Called "mad as a goat" by Uruguay's Jose Mujica this week, Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro retorted laughingly.

6. 'Insanity' idioms with *mad/loco* in resultative constructions

Resultative constructions are schematic patterns that convey a change of state caused by the completion of an action or event. In this light, the general meaning of the resultative construction would be: A (agent) causes B (patient) to become result/goal. When expressing motion, resultatives lexicalise the manner in which the action is performed and indicate the trajectory of the movement and the result outside the verbal unit by means of an adjectival or prepositional phrase (cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 2006). According to Goldberg (2006), resultatives can be seen as a metaphorical extension of the Caused Motion Construction: 'A causes B to move to C by doing D'. Key components of Resultative constructions are the causer (agent), the cause (patient), the new state (result/goal) and the verbal action that causes the change of state. Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004, pp. 536-537) also use the term Property Resultative Constructions to denominate this type of metaphorical extension where states are considered locations. In this paper we will the term Resultative construction to encompass both types.

Unlike Comparison constructions, resultatives tend to be rather schematic, although some verb-specific resultatives can be partially substantive with regard to the verbal action and, to a lesser extent, the change of state. Following Hoffmann (2017), resultative constructions in English and Spanish could be described as form-meaning pairings, in which both the formal and the semantic and functional parts of the symbolic unit can be

used as a convenient tertium comparationis for cross-linguistic analysis. So, a unitary description of this construction would suffice for the two languages: FORM: [X V Y Z] ↔ MEANING: 'X causes Y to become Z by V-ing', where Z is usually an adjectival or prepositional construction. In what follows we will deal with constructional idioms with *mad/loco* within resultative constructions.

6.1. Cross-language analysis

6.1.1. The Drive Y Z construction

As a special case of the Resultative construction, the *Drive Y Z* construction can be described as follows: FORM: [X DRIVE Y Z] ↔ MEANING: 'X causes Y to become Z (insane, mentally unstable, very unsettled and/or irritated) {intensification, metaphorical implications, negative prosody}' (ex. 27)

(27) Some women have been driven mad by their suffering and have passed the trauma on to their children. (enTenTen15)

According to Croft (2012, p. 392), this is a verb-class-specific construction. Verb-specific constructions are characterised as form-meaning pairings that capture generalisations at the level of verb classes. In this type of constructions only verbs of a given class may occur in the construction at hand, but not every member of the verb class can always do so. That means that these constructions are always partially lexicalised regarding their verbal slot, which is instantiated by a set of verbal fillers selected in some arbitrary fashion, akin to the verb+noun collocational restrictions described in the literature.

In a former study, Boas (2003) calls them mini-constructions, which are represented by an event-frame with its own semantic/pragmatic and syntactic specification. Boas (2003, p.315) notes that this type of verb-resultative construction in English is very productive, as evidenced by the range of expressions found in BNC. He studies the Resultative construction with *drive* consisting of an animate object with an adjective or prepositional phrase synonymous with *mad*. He finds that the first type (with an 'insanity' adjective) is much more frequent in English than the second type (with a prepositional 'insanity' noun phrase). For instance, *drive some mad* retrieves 108 occurrences in the BNC and *drive someone to madness* only 5.

We have compared Boas's results with occurrences of 'insanity' synonyms in the three giga-corpora used for the present study. The situation depicted is similar to the one described by Boas. For instance, 5,904 occurrences of *drive someone crazy* are retrieved from enTenTen15, but only 763 of *drive someone to insanity*. The central adjective of the construction seems to have moved from *mad* to **crazy** in World English. So, the preferred exemplar or construct would be **drive someone crazy**. However, the three subcorpora suggest relevant differences. There is a strong preference for *mad* in British English, with type frequencies of 239 (enTenTen), 230 (enNOW) and 155 (GloWbE), whereas non-British varieties tend to have *crazy* as the central adjective of the construction. The type frequency for *crazy* in the American English subcorpora is 236 (enTenTen15), 645 (enNOW), and 401 (GloWbE); and 11 (enTenTen15), 52 (enNOW) and 109 (GloWbE) in Canadian English.

Table 6
Distribution of 'insanity' synonyms in the *Drive Y Z* construction.

	BNC	enTenTen15	enNOW	GloWbE

mad	108	5,094	821	429
crazy	70	13,514	2297	1168
insane	23	3,771	443	333
wild	22	2,194	244	102
nuts	18	68	615	410
batty	4	468	53	37
dotty	4	9	2	1
crackers	4	8	4	4
to madness	5	763	19	8
to insanity	1	402	9	16

Corpus data also suggest a progressive schematisation of this resultative construction. On the one hand, the inventory list of synonymous 'insanity' adjectives identified by Boas have developed differentially as regards frequency: for instance, *dotty* or *crackers* are less commonly used nowadays. By contrast, new adjectives are becoming to be used instead. These adjectives follow the adjectival morphological patterns which are typical of this construction: (a) *mental, frantic, berserk*; (b) *potty, loopy*; and (c) *bonkers, bananas*.[19] Of them, the most frequent is *bonkers* (292 occurrences in enTenTen15),[20] followed by *bananas* (103) and *mental* (64) (ex. 28).

(28) I have a massive streak of impatience that both drives me and can drive other people mental in the way, I think, impatience always does. (enNOW)

On the other hand, the inventory of causative verbs that can enter in this construction seems to have expanded as well. A cursory look at other verbs used in the *drive* construction with the most typical or central adjectives (*mad, crazy, insane* and *wild*) have retrieved the following list, in descending order of frequency: *make*[21] (>7000)*, get* (>1000)*, send* (>300) and *turn* (>100)*.* These verbs seem to have developed grammaticalised senses, akin to support verbs and other delexical verbal components found in verb+noun collocations (ex. 29). In addition, other verbs appear, with more restricted meanings and in combination with particular adjectives, like *set* someone *wild* or *render* someone *insane* (ex. 30).

(29) I have struck this problem many times and it has sent me insane Luckily my hair is already grey. (enTenTen)
(30) It's true that sometimes working from home on a weekend does render you slightly insane. (GloWbE)

---

[19] The underlining is ours.

[20] Verb frequency data have been taken from enTenTen15, as this corpus seems to contain the higher number of occurrences for the *drive*-construction. Approximate figures are provided, as counting had to be performed manually. In the case of instances with *make* and *get*, it has not been always possible to distinguish between resultative-causative and ergative constructions automatically.

[21] Boas (2003) also mentions that this construction occurs occasionally with *make* and *send* as the verb. In the case of *make somebody crazy*, the emotions are intense, but not necessarily negative. For instance, "She makes me crazy" may have sexual connotations ('I like her very much, she turns me on') and "Chocolate makes me crazy' imply that someone has an intense craving difficult to control. In both cases, uncontrolled desire triggers positive emotions that promote an adaptive response to each reward (cf. Shiota et al., 2014).

In this light, the *Drive Y Z* construction could be rather considered a Resultative construction that formally occurs with the central verb *drive* and two central 'insanity' adjectives (*mad* and *crazy*), that are varietally dependent. In addition, the construction can occur with other verbs (delexical or restricted) and with other 'insanity' adjectives (and prepositional phrases) that convey an emotional negative state.

This verb-class-specific construction inherits the syntax and semantics associated with the resultative-causative construction: 'X (agent) causes Y (patient) to become Z (result/goal)'. And at the same time, it develops a much more specific meaning: X causes Y to undergo an unstable emotional state (frequently negative) and become unbalanced, uncontrolled, very unsettled or irritated'. The verb *drive* receives a construal interpretation as 'motion' verb metaphorically linked to change of state (not place), and the limited set of 'insanity' adjectives are also linked to one's mental landscape of strong emotions (frequently negative and/or exarcebated). The *drive* construction becomes, then, an encoding idiom with not particular grammatical or syntactic restrictions. The verb(s) in this construction, for instance, can be conjugated in all tenses and forms (ex. 31):

(31) Having been driven mad after the loss of his men in battle, he retires to the forests of Cumbria, he laments his loss. (enTenTen15).

6.1.2. The Volver a alguien loco construction

Resultative constructions in Spanish are much less frequent than in English. In fact, they are considered to be a very low-productive type of construction. According to Rodríguez Arrizabalaga (2016:55):

Due to its low level of productivity in Spanish, the resultative construction has almost gone unnoticed in the Spanish linguistic studies, where either its existence has been completely denied or it has been considered a fake resultative pattern, being just similar to its English counterpart in form.

English resultative constructions can be both transitive (ex. 32) or intransitive (ex. 33), whereas only transitive can be found in Spanish (ex. 34). In example (32) a driver is taken out of the wrecked car by cutting part of it and in example (33) someone applies some dying product to his hairs until they become blonde. Both are transitive resultative constructions.

(32) A seriously injured driver has been cut free from the wreckage after a head-on crash near Cheltenham. (enNOW).
(33) In 2017, I cried my eyes out when we won. (enNOW)
(34) Messi se unió al extraño club de aquellos jugadores que decidieron teñir su cabello de rubio para sorprender a todos los fanáticos del fútbol. (esNOW)
"Messi joined the strange club of those players who decided to dye their hair blond to surprise all football fans."

This is a main typological difference that explains why example (33) above cannot be translated into Spanish literally as "*En 2017, lloré mis ojos hacia fuera cuando ganamos", but as "En 2017, me hinché de llorar cuando ganamos" (lit. 'I – got swollen – by crying').

The Spanish corpora used for this retrieve occurrences of resultative constructions equivalent to the *Drive Y Z* construction. The lexically specified verb is *volve*r (lit. 'turn') and the central adjective is *loco* ('mad'). This Spanish construction is equivalent to its English counterpart in principle. It also behaves like any resultative construction, as the verb can be conjugated in almost all tenses, persons and forms (e.g. "os habrían vuelto locos", esNOW), and the adjective can take plural forms, suffixes, adverbials, be postmodified by prepositional phrases and so forth: e.g. "lo han vuelto loquísimo", "te volverán loca de angustia", "los han vuelto medio locos", etc. (esNOW).

Like its English counterpart, the Spanish resultative construction can be considered a constructional idiom, as its meaning/function is not entirely compositional (34). Note the insertion of *literalmente* ('literally') before *locos* in example (35):

(34) Es este encierro que me vuelve loca, es este abandono que me persigue. (CORPES XXI)
(35) Aun así, y pese a que lo que les da de comer les vuelve literalmente locos, los "content marketers" son felices en el desarrollo de una profesión que simultáneamente les fuerza a tragos muy amargos. (esTenTen18)

Here, the verb-class specific construction with *volver* also inherits the syntax and semantics associated with resultative-causative construction and develops a similar specific meaning by which Y is caused to undergo intense emotional state with a final result of mental unbalance, uncontrol or irritation. However, the Spanish construction seems to imply lower intensity, since the adjective *loco* can take adverbials and suffixes of degree in order to convey a higher degree of intensity, or be postmodified by usual collocates ("lo han vuelto loco de remate") or enfatic reduplications ("se volvió loca loca").

Another difference affects the productivity of the constructional idiom in Spanish. The adjective slot only allows a very limited set of colloquial synonyms with a very low type frequency: *majara*, *majareta*, *majarón* and *tarumba* (ex. 36-38). In those cases, the agent tends to be inanimate:

(36) Un clericalismo en el que cada uno sería papa en su casa, volviendo majara al Espíritu Santo. (esTenTen18)
(37) Esta forma de pensar nos vuelve a todos majaretas y creo que no es del todo sana, porque de manera inconsciente nos damos a nosotros mismos un buen banquete de culpabilidad que no es nuestra, nosotros no tenemos la culpa de que la gente abandone por doquier animalitos. (esTenTen18)
(38) Pero yo estuve en la obra, les creí, me volvieron medio tarumba, mi conciencia se rebeló y, con un proceso difícil de salida, al fin me marché.

By contrast, the exemplar with *loco* occurs with very high frequencies in all corpora studied (especially in the web-crawled corpora: > 80,000). Due to processing limitations of the tools used and the complex morphology of Spanish verbs, it has not been possible to extract automatically the exact frequencies of this construction (and synonymous adjective fillers). Besides, the extraction of the *Volver a Y loco* construction performs with low precision, as many ergative constructions of the type *volverse loco* ('go crazy') are retrieved as well. For this reason, no distribution table is provided.

Finally, as in the case of the English resultative construction with *drive*, a couple of alternative verbs can occur in the Spanish construction: *poner* (lit. 'put') and *traer* (lit. 'bring'). Both evidence inheritance from the more schematic resultative construction and meaning specification or delexicalisation along the lines of *drive* (ex. 39-40). The two of them are colloquial and pertain to informal registers. Interestingly enough, the verb-specific construction with *traer* exhibits a restricted conjugation paradigm, mainly in simple present.

(39) Susana trae loco a Gonzalo, le confunde al chiquillo.
(40) Demasiadas horas de rodaje y demasiados apuntes de filosofia del arte me ponen loco loco.

6.2. Translation aspects

As seen in Section 4.2., comparison constructional idioms with *mad* are low frequency units which makes large parallel corpora a most appropriate resource to study translation strategies and equivalence. In the case of the *Drive X Z* construction, abundance of data can illustrate tendencies, regularities and norms. However, the corpus management systems in place do not support real retrieval of exact figures, type frequency of all slot fillers, frequencies of constructs, translation equivalents and so forth (cf. Section 5.1 above).

For this reason, a table with resultative constructional idioms in English and usual Spanish translation equivalents found in the parallel corpus will be provided below (see Table 7). In order to uncover regularities, the most frequent and central adjectives of the construction with *mad* will be analysed. No distribution of idioms and their correspondences can be given at this stage.

Table 7
Resultative constructional idioms with 'mad' adjectives and Spanish translations in *OpenSubtitles*.

DRIVE Y MAD	DRIVE Y CRAZY	DRIVE Y INSANE	DRIVE Y WILD
Volver a Y loco	**Volver a Y loco**	**Volver a Y loco**	**Volver a Y loco**
tener a alg. loco	tener a Y loco	enloquecer	volver a alg. salvaje
volverse loco	volverse loco		
enloquecer	acabar loco		
exasperarse	enloquecer		
cabrearse	desquiciar		
enojarse	enfurecer		
enfadarse	enojarse		
molestarse	encantarle a alg. algo		
poner a alg. furioso	poner a alg. histérico		
abocar a la locura	tocarle a alg. las pelotas		
perder el juicio	llevar a alg. a la locura		
amar a alg. con locura	conducir a alg. hasta la locura		
	traer a alg. de cabeza		
	poner a alg. de los nervios		
	sacar a alg. de quicio		
	reventar a alg. los tímpanos		

Data from the parallel corpus evidence that the resultative idiomatic 'insanity' construction tends to be rendered into Spanish by the equivalent construction with the most

central adjective, irrespective of the adjective fillers in the source text, even when the source text contains inserted elements or creative uses of any kind (ex. 41).

     (41) These visits are gonna drive me fucking crazy.
        Estas visitas me van a volver loco.

There are almost no instances of the other verbs than can occur in this construction (*poner, traer*). Instead, a predicate construction with *tener* (false resultative) can be found as translation equivalent for the constructions with *mad* and *crazy* (*tener a* alg. *loco*). This is in line with well-known phenomena such as simplification and normalisation of the translated discourse, especially figurative language (Marco, 2009; Author, 2017; San-Villar, 2018). A similar feature can be observed when low frequency alternative adjectives (*majara, tarumba, majareta, majarón*) are rendered by the more standardised constructs (ex. 42):

     (42) It wasn't the wind that drove him crazy, it was her.
        A ése no le ha vuelto majara el viento, sino ella, la Carmen.

The preference for simple lexical items (*enfadarse, enojarse*, etc.) points in the same direction. Some of those simple lexical items seem to put particular interpretations in the spotlight, stressing negative emotions, attraction and loss of control, intense dislike, irritation: *desquiciar, encantar, enfurecer*, etc. This is again connected to the explicitation traits found in translated texts. A special case is *enloquecer* which denotes the preference for highly occurring ergative constructions to the detriment of resultatives, which are not so frequent in Spanish, even to the extreme of overuse and overrepresentation in the source text (ex. 43).

     (43) You've been trying to drive me crazy for quite a while.
        Has estado tratando de enloquecerme lo suficiente.

Some equivalents are, in fact, resultative constructional idioms of the same type, but with the goal/result realised by a prepositional phrase (ex. 44): *llevar a alg. a la locura, abocar a alg. a la locura, conducir a alg. hasta la locura, sacar a alg. de quicio*.

     (44) Is your mockery supposed to turn a knife in my wounds and my friends' laughter
       to drive me mad?
      ¿Vuestro escarnio habría de corroerme las llagas, las carcajadas de los amigos
      abocarme a la locura?

They correspond closely to the *drive Y to insanity/madness* constructs which, by the way, are no translated in the corpus as *volver a alguien loco*, but almost systematically as *cometer/llevar a alg. a la locura* or by *cometer una locura*. This is also a feature of

translationese and interference, as the preferential literal renderings for *Drive Y wild* as *volver a alguien salvaje* (45).

    (45) She's got somethin' dat [sic] drives men wild.
        Ella tiene algo que vuelve a los hombres salvajes.

7. Discussion

The results of this study, which examines 'insanity' constructional idioms in English and Spanish, show that, due to the low frequency of idioms, giga-token web-crawled corpora provide better coverage than standard reference corpora. The findings show that in this particular study it is the size of the corpora which matters more than their quality, including balance. In addition, cross-varietal differences are more striking with high-frequency constructions. However, varietal differences are better represented in Spanish corpora. Spanish corpora usually contain a higher number of exemplars per idiom and per million of words. These differences could be attributed to the construction conglomerates themselves or, else, to differential preferred ways to convey this type of 'insanity' meanings in both languages.

CxG and the notion of constructional idiom are powerful means to account for so-called idiomatic variability, idiomatic irregularities, compositional versus figurative meanings, etc. (cf. Wulff, 2008; Langlotz, 2012; Fellbaum, 2019). From this perspective the constructional idioms analysed in this paper show differences as regards frequency, their varietal distribution, their fixation and construal nature, their pragmatic meanings and their productivity. English constructions are more prone to creative extensions towards new patterns that are more schematic, partially filled and more productive (i.e. type frequency understood as a major determinant of productivity). In contrast, Spanish 'insanity' idioms tend to be more substantive, partially filled, and less productive. Creative extension appears as a means of conveying intensification, and there are clear cases of construal inheritance by the noun fillers, as well as various degrees of (progressive) schematisation. Concepts like central slot fillers and preferred exemplars or constructs reveal to be of paramount importance as well. Regarding translation strategies and equivalents, it is observed a tendency to avoid idiomaticity and diatopic traits. Translated constructions show a clear preference for the central, preferred constructions, gravitate towards a neutral standard (very frequent and typical constructions), and reflect features of translationese (simplification, normalisation and convergence).

8. Conclusion

This paper which, to the best of our knowledge, represents the first large corpus-based study which investigates '(intensified) insanity' constructions in English and Spanish (and takes diatopic variation into account), advances the notion of constructional idiom as a powerful tool for cross-linguistic comparison, contrastive analysis and linguistic aspects of translation. This study sheds light upon both cross-lingual and, to certain extent, cross-varietal phraseological aspects. Conclusions from this study include three main findings: (1) giga-token web-crawled corpora provide better coverage for idioms than standard reference corpora (and that corpus size matters more than quality); (2) cross-varietal differences appear to be more outstanding the higher the normalised frequency of a given construction;

and (3) varietal differences are better represented in Spanish corpora, which usually contain a higher number of exemplars per idiom and per million of words. In addition, the empirical evidence reported in this paper could help developing some CxG concepts further. For instance, the extensive creativity found in the discursive actualisation of the selected constructional idioms could help re-visiting specific sub-constructions (e.g. Croft's verb-class-specific construction or Boas's mini-constructions). Finally, the results of this study could also be further applied to reflect upon the connections between CxG and other corpus-based bottom-up approaches, like Hank's (2013) Theory of Norms and Exploitations.

Funding Information

References

Author (1996).

Author (2015a).

Author (2015b).

Author (2017).

Author (2018).

Baayen, R.H. (2011). Demythologizing the word frequency effect: A discriminative learning perspective. *The Mental Lexicon* 5, 436-461.

Baranov, A.N. and Dobrovol'skij, D. O. 2013. *Osnovy frazeologii*. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka.

Barðdal, J. (2008). Productivity: Evidence from Case and Argument Structure in Icelandic. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Barðdal, J. (2011). Lexical vs structural case: a false dichotomy. *Morphology* 21(3), 619-654.

Boas, H.C. (2003). *A Constructional approach to resultatives*. Stanford (Calif.): CSLI publications.

Boas, H.C. (2010). Comparing constructions across languages. In Boas H.C. (Ed.), *Contrastive Studies in Construction Grammar* (pp. 1-10). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Booij, G. (2002). Constructional idioms, morphology, and the Dutch lexicon. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14(2), 301-329.

Booij, G. (2013). Morphology in Construction Grammar. In Hoffmann, T.H., Trousdale, G. (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 255-273). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Burger, H. (1998). *Phraseologie. Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Bybee, J.L. 2013. Usage-based theory and exemplar representation. In Hoffman T. & Trousdale G. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 49-69). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cignoni, L., Coffey, S. & Moon, R. (1999). Idiom variation in Italian and English: Two corpus-based studies. *Languages in Contrast* 2(2), 279-300.

Colson, J.P. (2008). Cross-linguistic phraseological studies: An Overview. In Granger S. and Meunier F. (Eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 191-206). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Corpas Pastor, G. (1996). *Manual de fraseología española*. Madrid: Gredos.

Croft, W. and Cruse, A.D. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, W. (2012). *Verbs: aspect and causal structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corver, N., Van Craenenbroeck, J., Harwood, W., Hladnik, M., Leufkens, S. and Temmerman, T. (2019). Introduction: The compositionality and syntactic flexibility of verbal idioms. *Linguistic*s 57(4), 725-733.

Dobrovol'skij, D.O. (2011). Phraseologie und Konstruktionsgrammatik. In A. Lasch and A. Ziem (Eds.). *Konstruktionsgrammatik III. Aktuelle Fragen und Lösungsansätze* (pp. 111–130). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Dobrovol'skij, D.O. (2015). On the Systematic Variation of German Idioms: Converse Pairs as a Constructional Phenomenon. *Journal of Social Sciences* 11 (3): 248–257.

Dobrovol'skij, D. O. (2020). German Constructional Phrasemes with Deictic Elements in Bilingual Dictionaries. In P. Cotta Ramusino and F. Mollica (Eds.). *Contrastive Phraseology: Languages and Cultures in Comparison* (pp- 115-128). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dmitrij Dobrovol'skij, D. and Piirainen, E. (2018). Konstruktionspatterns in der Idiomatik und ihre kognitiven Grundlagen. *Yearbook of Phraseology* 8 (1). 31–58 https://doi.org/10.1515/phras-2017-0004.

Ebeling, S.O. (2018). Exploring cross-linguistic congruence: The case of two stance frames in English and Norwegian. *BeLLS* 9(1), 69-92. doi: https://doi.org/10.15845/bells.v9i1.1419

Ebeling, J. and Ebeling, S.O. (2013). *Patterns in Contrast.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fellbaum, C. (2019). How flexible are idioms? A corpus-based study. *Linguistics. An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences* 57(4), 735-767. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2019-0015.

Fiedler, S. (2007). *English Phraseology: a Coursebook.* Tübingen: Narr.

Fillmore, C., Kay, P. and O 'Connor, M. C. (1988). Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions. The case of *Let alone. Language* 64 (3), 501-538.

García-Page Sánchez, M. (2008). Propiedades sintácticas de la comparativa estereotipada en español. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 59, 339-360.

Gibbs, R. W., and Colston, H. L. (2012). *Interpreting figurative meaning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, R. W., Nayak, N. P., Bolton, J.L. and Keppel, M.E. 1989. Speakers' assumptions about the lexical flexibility of idioms. *Memory & Cognition* 17(1). 58–68.

Glass, C. (2019). *Collocations, Creativity and Constructions: A Usage-based Study of Collocations in Language Attainment.* Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Goldberg, A. E. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, A. E. (2013) Constructionist Approaches. In Hoffmann T. & Trousdale G. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 15-31). Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195396683.013.0002.

Goldberg, A. E. (2019). *Explain Me This. Creativity, Competition, and the Partial Productivity of Constructions.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gries, S. T. (2103). Data in Construction Grammar. In Hoffmann T. & Trousdale G. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 93-108). Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195396683.013.0006.

Hanks, P. (2013). *Lexical analysis: norms and exploitations.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press.

Hay, J.B. and Baayen, R.H. (2005). Shifting paradigms: gradient structure in morphology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 9 (7), 342–348.

Hoffmann, T. (2017). From Constructions to Construction Grammars. In Dancygier, B. (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 284-309). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/9781316339732.019.

Horvath, J. and Siloni. T. (2017). "Constructions" and Grammar: Evidence from Idioms. In Claire Bowern, C., Horn L. & Zanuttini R. (Eds.), *On looking into words (and beyond)* (pp. 471-489). Berlin: Language Science Press. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.495462.

Ishida, P. (2008). Contrastive idiom analysis: The case of Japanese and English idioms of anger. In Granger S. & Meunier F. (Eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 275-291). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/z.139.24ish.

Kay, P. and Fillmore, C. J. (1999). Grammatical Constructions and Linguistic Generalizations: the *What's X doing Y?* Construction. *Language,* 75(1), 1-33. doi: 10.1353/lan.1999.0033.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. I: Theoretical prerequisites.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Langlotz, A. (2002). *Idiomatic Creativity A Cognitive-Linguistic Model of Idiom-Representation and Idiom-Variation in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Levin, B. & Rappaport Hovav, M. (2006). Argument Realization. *Computational Linguistics*, 32(3), 447-450.

Marco, J. (2009). Normalisation and the translation of phraseology in the COVALT Corpus. *Meta,* 54(4), 842-856. doi: https://doi.org/10.7202/038907ar.

Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English. A Corpus-Based Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mellado Blanco, C. (2019). Phrasem-Konstruktionen kontrastiv Deutsch-Spanisch: ein korpusbasiertes Beschreibungsmodell anhand ironischer Vergleiche. *Yearbook of Phraseology,* 10, 65-88.

Molina Plaza, S. (2015). Contrastive Analysis of Stretched Collocations with Get and Take: Their Use and Pedagogical Implications. *Journal of Social Sciences,* 11(3), 179-193.

Philip, P. (2008). Reassessing the Canon: "fixed" phrases in general reference corpora. In Granger S. & Meunier F. (Eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 95-108). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rodríguez Arrizabalaga, B. (2016). Construcciones resultativas en español. *Philologica Canariensa,* (22), 55-87. doi: 10.20420/PhilCan.2016.103.

Sanz-Villar, Z. (2018). Interference and the Translation of Phraseological Units in a Parallel and Multilingual Corpus. *Meta,* 63(1), 72-93. doi: https://doi.org/10.7202/1050515ar.

Shiota, M. N., Neufeld, S. L., Danvers, A.F., Osborne, E.A., Sng, O. and Yee, C. I. (2014). Positive Emotion Differentiation: A Functional Approach. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 8(3), 104–117. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12092.

Stefanowitsch, A. and Flach, S. (2017). The Corpus-based perspective on entrenchment. In Schmid H.J. (Ed.), *Entrenchment and the psychology of language learning: how we reorganise and adapt linguistic knowledge* (pp. 101-127). Boston, MA and Berlin: APA and Walter de Gruyter.

Suñer, A. (2014). Las comparativas prototípicas. In *Phraseology* En Sáez, L. & Sánchez López, C. (Eds.), *Las estructuras comparativas* (pp. 337-369). Madrid: Visor Libros.

Taylor, John R. (2015). Cognitive linguistics. In Allan K. (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Linguistics* (pp. 455-469). London and New York: Routledge.

Treis, Y. (2018). Comparison in Kambaata: Superiority, Equality and Similarity. *Linguistic Discovery,* 16(1), 64-99.

Treis, Y. and Vanhove, M. (Eds.) (2017). *Similative and Equative Constructions: a cross-linguistic perspective.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wulff, S. (2008). *Rethinking Idiomaticity. A Usage-based Approach*. London and New York: Continuum.

Wulff, S. (2013). Words and idioms. In Hoffmann, T.H., Trousdale, G. (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 274–289). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195396683.013.0015.

Yoon, J. and Gries, S. T. (Eds.) (2016). *Corpus-based Approaches to Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.