

Resultatives Revisited: Expanding the Empirical Foundations

Beth Levin
Stanford University

“Yes. If anything happens to me, he gets everything. Oh my God, Kat, he could murder me dead and get all my money.”

Murder me dead? Somewhere a grammar teacher rolled over in her grave.
(K. Kijewski, *Stray Kat Waltz*, Putnam, New York, 1998, p. 64)

The perennial challenge: Identifying the conditions on a well-formed resultative construction.

- (1) Claire looked into the enclosure and saw that the two trees that stood inside of it were rubbed **barkless** at about Harvey’s [an elk] head height. (M. Logue, *Poison Heart*, Ballantine, New York, 2005, p. 41)

A resultative construction includes a result XP, the NP that it is predicated of, a verb, and in a transitive resultative construction the verb’s subject (the causer); certain arguments of the verb may sometimes be understood, but not expressed.

Goal of this talk: To use corpus data to better understand the complex interplay between all these elements in controlling the well-formedness of a resultative construction.

1 The scope and source of the data to be examined

- THE SCOPE OF THE DATA: Resultative constructions with result APs of the following two forms:

— Transitive resultatives: NP1 V NP2 AP, where the AP is predicated of NP2.

— Intransitive resultatives: NP1 V AP, where the AP is predicated of NP1.

- Resultatives where XP=PP are ignored here; see Grône (2014) for interesting recent discussion.

- SUBTYPES OF ‘NP1 V NP2 XP’ RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

— SUBCATEGORIZED NP: The postverbal NP is understood to be the object of the verb when used in isolation, as in *The waiter wiped the table (clean)*. Only possible with transitive verbs. The NP might in a few rare instances be a reflexive pronoun, as in *She scrubbed herself red with the loofah*.

— NONSUBCATEGORIZED NP: The postverbal NP is not understood to be the object of the verb when used in isolation, as in *My mother scrubbed her fingers *(raw)* or *The bells clanged us *(awake)*. Possible with both transitive and intransitive verbs.

— (“FAKE”) REFLEXIVE: A subtype of nonsubcategorized NP resultative with a reflexive pronoun as the postverbal NP, as in *The politician talked himself *(hoarse)*. Possible with both transitive and intransitive verbs.

These subtypes are recognized here as they are useful descriptively, even though many formal accounts do not distinguish among them, treating all resultative constructions as being of the nonsub-categorized NP type; see Grône (2014) for recent arguments on semantic grounds.

- **THE SOURCE OF THE DATA:** A collection of about 1400 naturally-occurring resultative constructions predominantly drawn from newspapers and fiction written since the late 1980s; some more recent web examples have been added to explore particular resultative types further.
- **A CAVEAT:** Since the examples are not drawn from a larger “balanced” corpus designed to be representative of current English, they bear on claims about what resultative options are possible, but the precise numbers should at best be taken to be suggestive of patterns that may exist.

2 Resultative constructions describe complex events

- Transitive resultatives are often given a complex event analysis (e.g., Carrier & Randall 1993:124-125, Dowty 1979:220, Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004, Pustejovsky 1991:64-65, RH&L 2001):

— CAUSING SUBEVENT represented by the verb; the activity bringing about the change of state.
— RESULT SUBEVENT represented by the XP; denotes the change of state that comes about.

- One reason: many can be easily given a paraphrase which explicitly references the two events.

(2) *Tracy wiped the table clean* is paraphrasable as ‘Tracy cleaned the table by wiping it’.

- There are constraints on the relation between the two subevents:

- (3)
- a. The subevents need not be temporally dependent.
 - b. The result subevent cannot begin before the causing subevent.
 - c. Only the result subevent can bound the event as a whole.
 - d. There is no intervening event between the causing subevent and the result subevent; that is, causation is direct.

(Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2001:783, (45))

- Resultatives share these properties with lexical causatives (Goldberg 1995:194–195), especially property (3d), which has been clearly established for lexical causatives (e.g., Fodor 1970, McCawley 1978, Pinker 1989:66, Shibatani 1976, Smith 1970).

- Nevertheless, these constraints tell us little about how the participants in the event denoted by the verb relate to the holder of the result state and the subject—the causer of this state.

- **The challenge:** Understanding the limits on the variability in this relation; further, even more variability is found in other languages, such as Mandarin and Igbo (Williams 2008).

3 Constraints on the components of resultative constructions

3.1 Constraints related to the verb

- Syntactic constraints: the verb in a transitive resultative must be transitive or unergative, while in an intransitive resultative it must be unaccusative (e.g., Carrier & Randall 1993, L&RH 1995).
- Transitive verbs in nonsubcategorized NP resultatives are subject to a further constraint. Two characterizations (but see Grône 2014):

- they must take an optional object (Carrier & Randall 1993)
- they must be manner verbs (L&RH 1991, 2013, RH&L 1998, 2010)
- Manner verbs: specify a manner of carrying out an action (e.g., *pound, sweep*); often the manner is conventionally associated with a particular result, although the result isn't entailed.
- Result verbs: specify the result of an action (e.g., *remove, put, cover, empty, clean*); lexically specify a scalar change (Hay, Kennedy & Levin 1999, Rappaport Hovav 2008).

(4) I just wiped the counter, but it's still dirty/sticky/covered in crumbs.

— Result XPs make possible the explicit expression of a result with a manner verb; given the direct causation condition, this result is understood to be directly caused by the manner action.

(5) # I just wiped the counter clean, but it's still dirty. (Contradiction)

(6) # I just wiped the counter clean, but the wiping had nothing to do with the cleanness. (Contradiction)

- Result XPs are not found with the causative variant of a causative alternation verb when it takes a volitional subject; they are found in this variant when the subject is non-volitional (e.g., a natural force or machine) or the verb is passive or in the anticausative variant (Grône 2012, 2014:277–297).

(7) THE PRINCIPLE OF RESULT IMPLICATURE: The fact of choosing a result verb to describe the action of an intentional agent gives rise to a strong implicature that the agent intends the result encoded by the lexical sense of the verb. (Grône 2014:285, (89); translation from French by BL)

3.2 Constraints related to the result AP

- In general, a result AP expresses a property, but a few could be said to express paths in that the property denoted is attained by displacement (e.g., *clear/free/loose*).
- The adjective heading the AP must be stage-level since a change to that state is effected; thus, when an adjective has both stage- and individual-level senses, only the stage-level sense is attested.

(8) a. The waiter wiped the wine bottle dry. (Stage-level)
b. *The sommelier decanted the wine dry. (Individual-level; cf. *dry wine/ginger ale*)

- The AP must denote an objective, not a subjective property (Wechsler 1997), but see Grône (2014).

(9) Sally painted the door red/a pale shade of red/?sticky/*beautiful/*noticeable.
(Wechsler 1997:310, (6a))

- The adjective must be maximal endpoint closed-scale (e.g., *clean*, *dry*; Wechsler 2005, 2012).
- A wider range of result APs is permissible in nonsubcategorized NP and reflexive resultatives, an observation attributed to looser relations between the scale associated with the adjective and the event (Wechsler 2005:271) or the causing and result subevents (L&RH 1999); see Grône (2014).

EXAMPLE: Wechsler (2005:270-271) cites some such resultatives with open-scale adjectives.

- With result verbs, the AP must elaborate the result lexicalized by the verb (L&RH 1995, among others), but see Grône (2014) for exceptions.

(10) ‘Did you iron those [receipts]?’ Jake asked. ‘Oh, of course not. I was on the road, Agent Lovett. But when I got each one, I laid it on a flat surface and smoothed it flat before putting it with the others.’ (D. Fanning, *Punish the Deed*, Severn House, Sutton, Surrey, 2010, p. 140)

4 Case studies of transitive resultatives with particular APs

Goal: To show how the verb, the AP, and the postverbal NP—whether subcategorized or not—work together via case studies of several APs and to provide insight into why this might be so.

4.1 When the AP is headed by *clean*

	Subcategorized		Nonsubcategorized	
	NP	Reflexive	NP	Reflexive
<i>clean</i>	77	3	7	0

(Two resultatives with *clean* in the sense of *a clean cut/break* are ignored here.)

- *clean* is overwhelmingly found in subcategorized NP resultatives.
- Cleanliness involves the absence of impurities from some entity, and in fact, the relevant impurities can be explicitly expressed as an argument of the adjective, as in *clean of crumbs*.
- This adjective names a property that holds of both inanimate and animate entities; this property is typically not inherent to an entity, but comes about as a result of some sort of action on it.
- The actions that are conventionally performed with the goal of achieving cleanliness usually effect the removal of stuff/impurities from a surface via contact of some type. Thus, the result AP *clean* is attested primarily with verbs of surface contact—the manner verbs which lexicalize such actions.
- Since these verbs may express the surface—the argument the result AP is predicated of—as their object, they are found in subcategorized NP resultatives.

- (11) a. SURFACE CONTACT VERBS: lick, scrape, scrub, soak, sweep, wipe
 b. OTHER VERBS: cream, hose, shake, slap, smack, splash
- (12) a. She moved her teacup and reached for the sponge, wiping the counter clean. (M. Powers, *Sunflower*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1998, p. 146)
 b. The bricks had been swept clean of every leaf. (M. Muller, *Trophies and Dead Things*, Mysterious Press, New York, 1990, p. 30)
 c. She had creamed her face clean ... (E. Taylor, *The Soul of Kindness*, Chatto & Windus, Great Britain, 1964, p. 104)

- The nonsubcategorized NP resultatives tend to involve verbs that denote actions that could be used to remove impurities from something, but these actions are directed at the impurities themselves; nevertheless, as a consequence, the surface becomes clean; although not an argument of the verb, it is expressed as the postverbal NP.

- (13) Others require you to take an air shower that blows you clean in the vestibule. (S. Boxer, “Moving From Scruffy Quarters to a Limestone Labyrinth”, *The New York Times*, April 15, 2001, p. 18)

- A few of the nonsubcategorized NP resultatives take body part postverbal NPs; their verbs denote the emission of a secretion from this body part (e.g., saliva, sweat); the secretion may draw impurities away with it, resulting in the cleanness of the relevant body part.

- (14) Caz had to spit her mouth clean ... (A. Keegan, *Cuckoo*, Headline Book, Great Britain, 1994; St. Martin’s, New York, 1995, p. 32)

- Gröne (2014) cites the nonsubcategorized NP resultative with the change of state verb *melt* in (15), which is comparable to the other nonsubcategorized NP examples: the snow on the tree melts, leaving the trees clean.

- (15) ... the warm snap had melted the trees clean. (COCA; Gröne 2014:427)

4.2 When the AP is headed by *bare* or semantically similar

	Subcategorized NP		Nonsubcategorized NP	
	NP	Reflexive	NP	Reflexive
<i>bare</i>	16	0	4	0
<i>barkless</i>	3	0	0	0
<i>clear</i> ‘unobstructed’	9	0	1	1
<i>free</i> ‘unobstructed’	7	2	2	0

- *bare* too is overwhelmingly found in subcategorized NP resultatives, as are three semantically similar adjectives, *barkless* and *clear* and *free* in their ‘unobstructed’ sense. The focus is on *bare*.

- Bareness involves the absence of any covering on a surface, and in fact, the relevant covering can be explicitly expressed as an argument of the adjective, as in *bare of leaves*.

- This adjective names a property that is typically externally caused, coming about as a result of some sort of action on an entity.

- The actions that are conventionally performed with the goal of achieving bareness usually effect the removal of stuff from a surface via contact of some type. Thus, the result AP *bare* is attested primarily with verbs of surface contact and sometimes with verbs of exerting force—the verbs which lexicalize actions that can cause loose stuff to come away.

- Since these verbs may express the surface—the argument the result AP is predicated of—as their object, they are found in subcategorized NP resultatives.

- (16) a. SURFACE CONTACT VERBS: peck, scrape, scratch, scrub, ...
 b. OTHER VERBS: salt, sand, shake, spray, ...

(17) The ice, in moving to the south, scraped the land bare of its overlying mantle of weathered rock. (<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/91992/Canadian-Shield>)

- The nonsubcategorized NP resultatives also involve verbs that denote actions that could be used to remove stuff from a surface, but these actions are directed at the stuff; nevertheless, as a consequence, the surface becomes bare; although not an argument of the verb, it is expressed as the postverbal NP.

- (18) a. The footing was sometimes icy, though the frozen ground had been blown bare in many places. (P.M. Carlson, *Crossfire*, Severn House, New York, 2006, p. 162)
 b. ... the outside land which had been eaten bare by goats and horses ... (A.W. Upfield, *Sinister Stones*, 1954; Collier Books, New York, 1986, p. 172)

4.3 When the AP is headed by *dry*

- As expected, there are no attested resultatives with the individual-level sense of the adjective *dry*.

- *dry* is found not only in subcategorized NP resultatives, but also in a fair number of nonsubcategorized NP resultatives.

- The two types of resultatives are distinguished by the nature of the entity the property *dry* is predicated of; this difference necessitates distinct types of actions to bring about the relevant result, which in turn explains why the resultatives are of different types.

	Subcategorized		Nonsubcategorized	
	NP	Reflexive	NP	Reflexive
<i>dry</i> (of a surface)	22	2	2	0
<i>dry</i> (of a container)	6	0	19	4

— SUBCATEGORIZED NP RESULTATIVES: The entity is a surface, e.g. *a dry counter*.

Various actions are conventionally performed with the goal of drying an entity’s surface; many involve using instruments designed to absorb or remove liquid that is on the surface; thus, these actions are directed at the surface and are lexicalized by manner verbs which take the surface as object, giving rise to subcategorized NP resultatives.

- (19) VERBS INCLUDE: blot, brush, dab, lick, rub, spin, towel, wipe, ...

(20) a. Toweling dry as he went, he padded to the bedroom ... (C. Weir, *Murder Take Two*, St. Martin’s, New York, 1998, p. 94)

- b. The waitress comes back, wiping the silverware dry with a cloth napkin ... (M.G. Jaffe, *Dance Real Slow*, Farrar Straus Giroux, New York, 1996, p. 24)
- c. ... a skinny little white woman was washing a huge pile of fresh mixed greens and spinning them dry. (M. Maron, *High Country Fall*, Mysterious Press, New York, 2004, p. 145)

— NONSUBCATEGORIZED NP RESULTATIVES: The entity is a container, e.g., *a dry well/tank*.

When predicated of a container, *dry* indicates the container is empty of liquid. This state is usually brought about by acting on the liquid in the container—the container’s contents—rather than on the container itself; these actions, then, tend to be lexicalized by verbs that take the liquid as their object. Consequently, the container appears as a nonsubcategorized NP.

- (21) a. Having ... drunk the teapot dry ... (E. Dark, *Lantana Lane*, p. 94)
- b. Davina and I erupted from the knife-sharp grass, shrieking our lungs dry as we brandished our spears at the enemy soldiers. (M. Meyers, *Swimming in the Congo*, Milkweed Editions, Minneapolis, MN, 1995, p. 29)

- The reflexive resultatives can be viewed as an extension of the nonsubcategorized NP uses.

- (22) One of them [=teakettles] must’ve whistled itself dry ... (S.J. Conant, *Ruffly Speaking*, Doubleday, New York, 1995, p. 76)

4.4 When the AP is headed by *flat/smooth*

	Subcategorized NP		Nonsubcategorized NP	
	NP	Reflexive	NP	Reflexive
<i>flat</i>	33	0	4	0
<i>smooth</i>	32	1	4	0

- These adjectives are overwhelmingly found in subcategorized NP resultatives.
- Both name properties that hold of inanimate entities; these properties are typically externally caused, coming about as a result of some sort of action on an entity.
- A variety of actions are conventionally performed with the goal of achieving one of these properties in an entity; as these actions involve exerting a force, they are lexicalized by manner verbs. As these forces are directly exerted on an entity which is expressed as the verb’s object, it follows that the preponderance of resultatives with these APs are subcategorized NP resultatives.

- (23) VERBS WITH *smooth*: brush, pat, rake, roll, rub, scuff, shave, tape, wear, ...
- (24) The old walnut floors had been polished smooth ... (M. Sefton, *Knit One, Kill Two*, Berkley, New York, 2005, p. 19)
- (25) VERBS WITH *flat*: bomb, bulldoze, crunch, crush, hammer, mash, pat, pin, plaster, press, smash, squash, tap, ... (NOTE: Many are verbs of contact by impact or exerting force)
- (26) Ben and I spent some time drinking coffee and discussing how funny it is when you crunch empty eggshells flat with your hand ... (M. Macdonald, *Road Kill*, St. Martin’s, New York, 2000, p. 14-15)

- Interestingly, three of the four nonsubcategorized NP examples with *flat* involve the verbs of contact by impact *stomp* and *tread* which typically express their surface argument as an oblique in isolation, so in some sense these examples are less different from the subcategorized NP resultatives than the label suggests.

(27) I stomped/trod *(on) the hat.

- (28) a. As Imogen bent the box, and trod it flat to compact it enough to put it out by the dustbins . . . (J. Paton Walsh, *A Piece of Justice*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1999; St. Martin's, New York, 1995, p. 10)
- b. She wished she would have taken his expensive hat and stomped it flat. (E. Fowler, *Love Mercy*, Berkley Books, New York, 2009, p. 175)

- Very occasionally, an action can be performed on an entity in such a way that it brings about one of these results in another entity, perhaps because the two entities are in contact, as in (29). In such instances, the relevant action is expressed via a nonsubcategorized NP resultative.

(29) “Before you go, crank me flat.” (L.M. Roberts, *Almost Human*, Ballantine, New York, 1998, p. 17)

4.5 When the AP is headed by *open/closed/shut*

	Subcategorized NP		Nonsubcategorized NP	
		Reflexive		Reflexive
<i>open</i>	59	0	12	0
<i>closed</i>	16	0	3	0
<i>shut</i>	49	0	4	0

- These adjectives are overwhelmingly found in subcategorized NP resultatives.
- As Levison (1993) points out in a study of the verb *open*, there are two prominent subtypes of the notion of opening; they extend to the adjective *open*, as well as to the adjectives *closed* and *shut*:
 - That relevant to containers whose contents is or is not accessible: e.g., *an open jar/can/book*.
 - That relevant to doors/gates which serve as barriers when shut or portals when open; a subtype of a more general notion of conduit, which includes canals, roads, valves: e.g. *an open door/window*.
- The barrier/portal notion is particularly prominent in the resultative data and is the focus here.
- What is common across the two notions is whether there is a state in which access is (dis)allowed.
- Such states usually come about through actions involving the application of force in some way, and, such actions are lexicalized by manner verbs. As these forces are typically directly exerted on an entity which is expressed as the verb's object, it follows that the preponderance of resultatives with these APs are subcategorized NP resultatives.

(30) VERBS WITH THE PORTAL/BARRIER NOTION INCLUDE: hit, kick, pull, push, ram, shove, flick, fling, creak, squeak, crank, . . .

(31) a. With a groan I shoved open the massive front door. (D.M. Davidson, *The Cereal Murders*, Bantam, New York, 1993, p. 15)

- b. When she rammed open the door and came charging in, he looked up at her, stunned and fearful. (J. Graham, *Sarah's Window*, Putnam, New York, 2001, p. 119)
- (32) VERBS WITH THE CONTAINER NOTION INCLUDE: rip, slice, slit, steam, thwack, zip, ...
- (33) a. '... some of my mail looks to have been steamed open and stuck down again. ...' (B. Crossley, *Candyfloss Coast*, Virago, London, 1991, p. 87)
- b. Against the concrete floor of the balcony, I thwacked open the roll [of quarters] ... (R. Mehta, "The Cold Call", *The New York Times Magazine*, July 24, 2011, p. 50)

- The nonsubcategorized NP resultatives include the verbs in (34). Several involve actions that affect a lid or closure that needs to be removed to allow access to the contents of a container. Thus, the container itself is not an argument of the verb.

- (34) VERBS INCLUDE: buzz, bleep, blow, flip, pop
- (35) He walked back to the fence at the rear of the parking lot before popping the can open and swallowing several large gulps. (J. Dawson, *A Credible Threat*, Fawcett Columbine, New York, 1996, p. 85)

- There are also a few resultatives with passive verbs that describe the resulting spatial configuration of the container that (dis)allows access to its content, as in (36).

- (36) He had a magazine butterflyed open across his lap and when I walk in he looks up and nods. (M.G. Jaffe, *Dance Real Slow*, Farrar Straus Giroux, New York, 1996, p. 20)

- Although further study is needed, it appears that *closed* can be predicated both of barriers and containers, while *shut* is almost exclusively predicated of barriers ranging from doors, drapes, and windows to body parts such as lips/mouths and eyelids/eyes.

- (37) a. For extra effect I quickly put the tape in my purse and zipped it closed. (S. Chapman, *Hard Wired*, St. Martin's, New York, 1997, p. 276)
- b. She tapped the office door closed with her foot. (N. Gordon, *Sharp Shooter*, Chronicle Books, San Francisco, CA, 2002, p. 38)
- (38) About to ask where, she clamped her lips shut, and he grinned. (J. LaPierre, *Death Duties*, Perseverance Press, Palo Alto, CA, 2004, p. 158)

4.6 When the AP is headed by *raw*

	Subcategorized NP		Nonsubcategorized NP	
	Reflexive		Reflexive	
<i>raw</i>	34	4	6	0

- This adjective too is overwhelmingly found in subcategorized NP resultatives.
- As expected, the individual-level sense of *raw*—uncooked (e.g. *raw meat*) or unprocessed (e.g. *raw materials*)—is not attested in resultative constructions.

- Attested instances involve *raw* in the sense ‘abraded, chafed’—a sense predicated of body parts—and, in fact, the NP is almost invariably a body part.

- This property is externally caused to hold of a body part coming about as a result of certain actions involving repeated contact with this body part. Thus, these actions are typically lexicalized by verbs of surface contact, a type of manner verb which takes the surface—i.e. the body part—as the object, giving rise to subcategorized NP resultatives.

(39) VERBS INCLUDE: bite, burn, floss, flay, lick, pluck, rub, scour, scrape, scrub, ...

(40) a. Aunt Essie ... scoured her fingertips raw with a brush to get all the tar out from under her nails ... (M. Maron, *Home Fires*, Mysterious Press, New York, 1998, p. 39)

b. ... the wiry grasses that would whip her legs raw within minutes. (V. McDermid, *Booked for Murder*, The Women’s Press. London, 1996, p. 7)

- In the few nonsubcategorized NP examples, the verb denotes an action that is performed on some unexpressed entity using a body part as instrument; it is in the performance of this action that the body part becomes abraded or chafed.

(41) She worked them [=her hands] raw some days. (M. Logue, *Poison Heart*, Ballantine, New York, 2005, p. 224)

4.7 When the AP is headed by *awake*

	Subcategorized NP		Nonsubcategorized NP	
	NP	Reflexive	NP	Reflexive
<i>awake</i>	41	6	11	16

- Wakefulness, a state holding only of animate entities, can be brought about in various ways.
- These actions impinge on the sleeper in different ways as then reflected in systematic differences in the type of resultative construction that verbs of particular semantic types occur in.
- A causer can cause a sleeper to awake through physical contact or manipulation. Such actions are lexicalized by verbs of contact by impact and verbs of force exertion—manner verbs.
- Since these verbs may express the sleeper—the argument that the result AP is predicated of—as their object, they are found in subcategorized NP resultatives with the result AP *awake*.

(42) VERBS INCLUDE: poke, bump, hug, jerk, kiss, slap, tickle, tug, ...

(43) a. Last night, the dog poked me awake every hour to go outside. (G. Dunford, “Charity’s for the Birds”, *The Toronto Sun*, November 27, 1994, p. 6)

b. ... the moment he was deeply asleep Vinck was tugging him awake ... (J. Clavell, *Shogun*, Atheneum, New York, 1980, p. 652)

- While the result AP *awake* is attested primarily with verbs which lexicalize such actions, it is also attested with some experiencer object psych-verbs, which comment on the psychological effect of such actions.

(44) I slept fitfully, and every time Nicki cried out I was startled awake. (M. O’Callaghan, *Down for the Count*, St. Martin’s, New York, 1997, p. 99)

- A causer can also cause a sleeper to awake by making a sound—usually a loud or shrill sound—or less often by directing a gaze at the speaker. Such actions are lexicalized by verbs of sound emission or manner of speaking or a verb such as *stare*.
- The sleeper is not an argument of these verbs, so in such instance the construction is a nonsubcategorized NP construction. The sound/gaze is left unexpressed, although it impinges on the speaker.

(45) VERBS INCLUDE: bark, crow, jangle, scream, shout, shrill, stare, . . .

- (46) a. . . . the roosters that scratch in the yard of Brastagi’s best hotel crowed me awake that dawn a few months ago . . . (T. Robbins, “Treks for the Sophisticated Traveler”, Section 6, Part 2, *The New York Times*, March 16, 1986, p. 8)
- b. He had set an alarm, which rang at five thirty the following morning, shrilling them both awake. (R. Pilcher, *Voices in Summer*, St. Martin’s, 1984, p. 116)

- Less often a sleeper might wake him/herself through an involuntary bodily process whose occurrence disturbs the sleeper or through a deliberate activity intended to return the sleeper to a state of wakefulness. The latter, in particular, may have an unexpressed argument.
- These verbs lexicalizing these actions do not themselves take the sleeper as an internal argument even if they take such an argument, but as the state is predicated of the sleeper, the result AP *awake* is predicated of a reflexive pronoun, giving rise to a reflexive resultative.

(47) VERBS INCLUDE: blink, cough, puff, read, snort, scream, shout, shower, stretch, . . .

- (48) a. Her dreams during brief intervals of sleep continued the theme, replaying in distorted form various incidents of the day, woven in with vivid but imaginary events, so that, when she tossed herself awake, she couldn’t be sure which of them had actually happened. (A. Fraser, *Next Door to Murder*, Severn House, New York, 2008, p. 33)
- b. Yarborough was “a biblio-holic” and history buff who “read himself awake each morning.” (J. Gonzalez, “Hundreds mourn Yarborough”, Texas Section, *The Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, January 31, 1996, p. 17; Nexis)

4.8 When the AP is headed by *hoarse*

	Subcategorized NP	Nonsubcategorized NP Reflexive	
<i>hoarse</i>	0	0	12

- Unlike the other APs, *hoarse* occurs only in reflexive resultatives in my corpus and in Boas (2003).
- Hoarseness is a state that holds only of humans (and perhaps some other animates).
- Given its nature, it cannot be directly externally caused to hold of someone, so there are no actions that are conventionally directed at a human to bring it about; hence, the lack of subcategorized NP resultatives.

- However, people can bring this state on themselves via certain activities that affect their throat such as singing, speaking, or coughing, and, indeed, verbs expressing these activities are the ones attested in resultative constructions.

- Since these activities affect the self, these constructions are invariably reflexive resultatives.

(49) VERBS INCLUDE: cough, roar, shout, sing, talk, yell, ...

(50) At the end of the last race she shouted herself hoarse. (K. Fforde, *Going Dutch*, Arrow Books, London, 2007, p. 88)

5 Stepping back: General observations regarding transitive resultatives

- SUBCATEGORIZED NP RESULTATIVES:

— The causer acts directly on the postverbal NP via some form of physical manipulation or contact that serves to bring about the result state.

— Concomitantly, various types of verbs denoting actions involving contact with a surface or exerting a force on an entity are prevalent in such resultatives, independent of the specific result AP.

- NONSUBCATEGORIZED NP RESULTATIVES:

— The action denoted by the verb impinges on the postverbal NP, i.e. the holder of the result state, as the action is directed at an unexpressed entity which bears a close relation to the postverbal NP.

— Building on discussion in Iwata (2014), a causer can be said to transmit a force to the postverbal NP in a nonsubcategorized NP resultative through the mediation of the unexpressed entity, with the force transmission bringing the result about.

— For the force transmission to be effective, there has to be some kind of relation between the unexpressed entity and the postverbal NP, usually physical contiguity. Attested options include:

Postverbal NP	Unexpressed entity	Example
Container	Contents	drink the teapot dry
Surface	Debris or stuff on it	blow the ground bare
Force recipient	Body part/instrument	stomp the hat flat/run the pavement thin
Instrument	Force recipient	scrub one's fingers raw
Hearer or seer	Sound or gaze	bark/stare the neighbor awake
Addressee	Gesture/sign/words	shout someone awake
Attached entity	Connection to "anchor"	kick oneself free

— Some of the relations listed above between a postverbal NP and an unexpressed entity are also attested in subcategorized NP resultatives. In nonsubcategorized NP resultatives, the unexpressed entity tends to be an understood argument of the verb, while the postverbal NP is not; in contrast, in subcategorized NP resultatives, the postverbal NP is always an argument of the verb.

— Presumably, the attested relations are those that allow the event as a whole to satisfy the direct causation constraint.

— Unattested are resultatives where a projectile is set in motion by a causer, comes in contact with another entity, changing its state. Thus, all resultatives with *kick* involve the causer’s foot making contact with the postverbal NP; none involve a ball or other projectile. (A possible exception may be *shoot X dead*, but *shoot* involves the gun and not the bullet.)

6 Intransitive resultatives

- The conventional wisdom is that intransitive resultatives are all subcategorized NP resultatives: their subject is an argument of the verb.
- This assumption correlates with the assumption that the verb itself is unaccusative—typically, a verb of change of state.
- Potentially problematic verbs have been taken to have a dual categorization as unaccusative and unergative, expressing a change of location in intransitive resultatives.
- An examination of naturally occurring examples reveals more diversity among intransitive resultatives than previously acknowledged.

6.1 Instances with understood agents/causes

- Intransitive resultatives with verbs of exerting force and the result APs *open*, *shut*, or *free* are predicated of the force recipient, but may involve an understood agent or cause.

(51) VERBS INCLUDE: pull, shove, tug, yank, . . .

- (52) a. The front door yanked open wider. “Hello,” said a round-faced boy with Lara’s same blue eyes and grave half-smile.
- b. Their yellowed stalks were sharp against her skin as she tugged them from the dry, cold soil. A musty scent rose from the plants as their roots pulled free.

- Outside of the resultative construction these verbs are solely transitive, lacking middle and anticausative uses in isolation.

- (53) a. *Wooden doors yank easily.
- b. I yanked the door./*The door yanked.

- In some examples, the unexpressed agent can be easily recovered from context as in (52b); cf. Rapaport Hovav (2014) on a comparable phenomenon with respect to the anticausative variant of the causative alternation.

- The surface contact verb *scrape* is found in a similar resultative: here someone makes the door scrape the ground (also unexpressed), resulting in its being open.

(54) We both heard the sound of the door scraping open but I didn’t move. (G.F. Edwards, *A Toast Before Dying*, Doubleday, New York, 1997, p. 152)

6.2 Instances with verbs like *kick* or *jerk*

- RH&L (2001) discuss intransitive resultatives such as (55) with body-internal motion verbs and the result APs *free*, *clear*, or *loose*.

(55) A bantam chick kicks free from its shell. (S. Cohen, “Iowa Hatchery Feathers Nest with Rare Fowl”, *Chicago Tribune*, March 21, 1996, p. 8; Nexis)

- They contrast them to transitive reflexive resultatives such as (56) in terms of the way the subevents are related to each other.

(56) One climbed on, but the other was dragged by his leg for two or three car lengths until he kicked himself free. (Z. Dubin, “It’s a Memory I Have Not Forgotten in 67 Years”, *Los Angeles Times*, September 3, 1997, p. F2; Nexis)

- However, there are other facets of these intransitive resultatives that deserve comment.
- The adjectives in these resultatives name properties that hold of an entity when its physical attachment to a second entity—the anchor—is broken; breaking this link gives rise to physical displacement of the entity, so in some sense resultatives with these adjectives could be seen as describing changes of location.
- The actions that the verbs name are directed at severing the link between the subject and its “anchor”; in the process, they may involve coming into contact with the anchor itself.

(57) The cable cuts through the water with surprising force, dragging Hanna beneath the surface and shredding her palms before she is able to kick free and swim ashore. (D. Fry, “Girl Gains Vision with a Little Help from Her Friends”, *The Seattle Times*, April 1, 1990, p. K7; Nexis)

- What is clear is that the subject itself is not a force recipient or patient of the verb, unlike in typical intransitive resultatives, rather the subject is an effector of the action.

6.3 The resultative construction *dodge clear*

- *dodge* is unlike the typical manner of motion verb found in intransitive resultatives: this verb may take a thing being avoided as object (e.g., *dodge a car/bullet*).
- Yet, it appears in intransitive resultatives where the result AP is predicated of the theme and the entity being avoided is inferred.

(58) The colt dodged clear and the bull went past him. (R. Moody, *Little Britches*, Norton, New York, 1950, p. 216)

Conclusion: Accounts of intransitive resultatives need to be refined to accommodate such data.

7 Conclusion

- These case studies suggest that fine-grained studies that focus on the individual contribution of each ingredient of a resultative construction have much to contribute to the larger understanding of this construction, including the factors giving rise to each subtype.
- They continue to suggest the importance of the direct causation condition, while pointing to the resultative subtypes that might most profitably help us better understand the nature of this condition.

References

- Boas, H.C. (2003) *A Constructional Approach to Resultatives*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA.
- Carrier, J. and J.H. Randall (1993) “Lexical Mapping”, in E. Reuland and W. Abraham, eds., *Knowledge and Language II: Lexical and Conceptual Structure*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 119-142.
- Dowty, D.R. (1979) *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*, Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Fodor, J.A. (1970) “Three Reasons for Not Deriving *Kill* from *Cause to Die*”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 429-438.
- Goldberg, A.E. (1995) *Constructions* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Goldberg, A.E. and R. Jackendoff (2004) “The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions”, *Language* 80, 532-568.
- Grône, M. (2012) “L’influence de la volition sur la distribution des verbes à alternance causative dans les résultatives de l’anglais”, *Anglophonia* 32, 99-123. (<http://anglophonia.revues.org/173>)
- Grône, M. (2014) *Les résultatives de l’anglais: Une étude de leur syntaxe et de leur productivité à l’aune de la sémantique lexicale et de la pragmatique*, Doctoral dissertation, Université Paris Diderot—Paris 7.
- Hay, J., C. Kennedy, and B. Levin (1999) “Scalar Structure Underlies Telicity in ‘Degree Achievements’”, *Proceedings of SALT 9*, 127-144.
- Iwata, S. (2014) “Aspect and Force Dynamics: Which Is More Essential to Resultatives?”, *English Linguistics* 31, 234-263.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1991) “Wiping the Slate Clean: A Lexical Semantic Exploration”, *Cognition* 41, 123-151.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1995) *Unaccusativity*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1999) “Two Structures for Compositionally Derived Events”, *Proceedings of SALT 9*, 199-223.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (2013) “Lexicalized Meaning and Manner/Result Complementarity”, in B. Arsenijević, B. Gehrke, and R. Marín, eds., *Studies in the Composition and Decomposition of Event Predicates*, Springer, Dordrecht, 49-70.
- McCawley, J.D. (1978) “Conversational Implicature and the Lexicon”, in P. Cole, ed., *Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics*, Academic Press, New York, 245-259.
- Pinker, S. (1989) *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Pustejovsky, J. (1991) “The Syntax of Event Structure”, *Cognition* 41, 47-81.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. (2008) “Lexicalized Meaning and the Internal Temporal Structure of Events”, in Susan Rothstein, ed., *Crosslinguistic and Theoretical Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 13-42.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. (2014) “Lexical Content and Context: The Causative Alternation in English Revisited”, *Lingua* 141, 8-29.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (1998) “Building Verb Meanings”, in M. Butt and W. Geuder, eds., *The Projection of Arguments*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, CA, 97-134.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (2001) “An Event Structure Account of English Resultatives”, *Language* 77, 766-797.

- Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (2010) “Reflections on Manner/Result Complementarity”, in M. Rappaport Hovav, E. Doron, and I. Sichel, eds., *Syntax, Lexical Semantics, and Event Structure*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 21-38.
- Shibatani, M. (1976) “The Grammar of Causative Constructions: A Conspectus”, in M. Shibatani, ed., *Syntax and Semantics 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, Academic Press, New York, NY, 1-40.
- Smith, C.S. (1970) “Jespersen’s ‘Move and Change’ Class and Causative Verbs in English”, in M.A. Jazayery, E.C. Polomé and W. Winter, eds., *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill, Vol. 2, Descriptive Linguistics*, Mouton, The Hague, 101–109.
- Wechsler, S. (1997) “Resultative Predicates and Control”, *Texas Linguistic Forum 38: The Syntax and Semantics of Predication*, Department of Linguistics, University of Texas, Austin, TX, 307-321.
- Wechsler, S. (2005) “Resultatives Under the ‘Event-Argument Homomorphism’ Model of Telicity”, in N. Erteschik-Shir and T. Rapoport, eds., *The Syntax of Aspect*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 255-273.
- Wechsler, S. (2012) “Resultatives and the Problem of Exceptions”, in I.-H. Lee et al., eds., *Issues in English Linguistics (Papers from the 1st World Congress of Scholars of English Linguistics, Hanyang University, Seoul, South Korea, June 30, 2012)*, Hankookmunhwasa, Seoul, 119-131.
- Williams, A. (2008) “Patients in Igbo and Mandarin”, in J. Dölling and T. Heyde-Zybatow, eds., *Event Structures in Linguistic Form and Interpretation*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 3-30.

(beth.levin@stanford.edu)
 (http://web.stanford.edu/~bclevin/)