Title	Various Explanations for Manner/Result Complementarity
Author(s)	Mima, Miho
Citation	待兼山論叢. 文学篇. 2025, 58, p. 37-53
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/100909
rights	
Note	

Various Explanations for Manner/Result Complementarity

Miho MIMA

1. Introduction

Many studies on lexicalization have examined issues of how grammatical or semantic components are represented as lexical items and how the lexicalization system differs among languages. In the field of lexical semantics, many previous studies have analyzed the grammatical or semantic components of verbal meaning. When conducting analyses, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998, 2010) set a descriptive hypothesis in (1) for English verbs. Thus, the manner/result complementarity implies that the two meaning components must be in a complementary distribution in the verb meaning. This hypothesis posits that there are no verbs that lexically encode both of manner and result meanings.

(1) MANNER/RESULT COMPLEMENTARITY:
    Manner and result meaning components are in complementary distribution: a verb lexicalizes only one.

(Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2013:50)

However, some studies have shown that this generalization faces some counterexamples. For example, Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2012) provided a subset of killing verbs that may encode both meanings simultaneously.

The proponents of (1) react to the counterexamples differently. Defending (1), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) claimed that these counterexamples should be resolved by context. Husband (2011) takes another standpoint, arguing that the hypothesis in (1) is amenable to the asserted/presupposed distinction.

The remainder of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 outlines the un-

derlying ideas regarding complementarity, providing an overview of Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2012). Section 3 compares two previous studies—Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) and Husband (2011)—seeking to save the counterexamples. Finally, Section 4 concludes this paper.

2. Previous Studies

This section deals with previous studies on manner/result complementarity. Section 2.1 describes the origins of the complementarity. Section 2.2 reviews an analysis of counterexamples.

2.1. Manner/Result Complementarity

According to Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013), there is a tendency in verbal lexicalization patterns known as "manner/result complementarity," as expressed in (1).

This complementarity is based on verbs' lexical semantic templates, which represent the grammatical or semantic components encoded in the verbal meaning. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) defined lexical semantic templates based on their lexical aspectual classifications, as expressed in (2). Manner verbs are classified as activity verbs, whereas result verbs belong to the category of achievement or accomplishment verbs.

(2) a. Activities: [x ACT]
     b. Accomplishments: [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y <STATE>]]]
     c. Achievements: [BECOME [y <STATE>]]

<div align="right">(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998:108)</div>

When building their theory of the composition of verbal meaning, the authors assumed that verb meaning consists of a constant, which is an idiosyncratic component of verbal meaning, and a particular lexical semantic template that represents an event structure (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998:106-107). In addition, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998:109) posited that the meaning encoded in constants must be reflected in a lexical semantic template. The rules are termed "the fundamental canonical realization rules."

(3) The fundamental canonical realization rules:

a. manner → [x ACT <MANNER>] (e.g., *jog, run, creak, whistle*···)

b. instrument → [x ACT <INSTRUMENT>] (e.g., *brush, hammer, saw, shovel* ···)

c. placeable object → [x CAUSE [BECOME [y WITH <*THING*>]]]

(e.g., *butter, oil, paper, tile, wax* ···)

d. place → [x CAUSE [BECOME [y <*PLACE* >]]]

(e.g., *bag, box, cage, crate, garage, pocket* ···)

e. internally caused state → [x <*STATE* >]

(e.g., *bloom, blossom, decay, flower, rot, rust, sprout* ···)

f. externally caused state → [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y <*STATE*>]]]

(e.g., *break, dry, melt, open*···)

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998:109)

These rules indicate that constants may be integrated into event structure templates, either as modifiers of ACT or as complements of BECOME. The semantic representations of the verbs *sweep* and *break* are shown in (4).

(4) a. The verb *sweep*: [x ACT <SWEEP>]

b. The verb *break*: [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y <*BROKEN*>]]]

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010:25) offered a lexicalization constraint as a predecessor to the hypothesis in (1), constraining the distribution of manner and result components. This hypothesis imposes a strong restriction on verbal lexicalization patterns. This study predicts that no verb lexicalizes both the manner and result components. It follows that there is no verb exhibiting the event structure template in (6), which is disallowed because the root is associated with the two primitive predicates (i.e., ACT and BECOME) in an event schema as both an argument and a modifier simultaneously.

(5) Lexicalization Constraint

A root can only be associated with one primitive predicate in an event schema, as either an argument or a modifier.

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2010:25)

(6) *[[x ACT $_{<ROOT>}$] CAUSE [y BECOME <ROOT>]]

(Extracted from Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:333)

The next section reviews one analysis that deduces that there are verbs lexicalizing both manner and result components, countering the constraint in (5).

2.2. Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2012)

This section examines a study by Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2012), who argued that some verbs denote both manner and result components in their verbal meaning. These authors posed that such verbs have both components by using several diagnostics that indicate that the counterexamples behave like both manner and result verbs.

The first diagnostic is the *selectional restrictions* on the subject by the manner verb. They do not occur with "natural force or inanimate" (Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:344), as shown in (7). In contrast, (8) illustrates that the resulting verbs co-occur with not only animates but also inanimate and natural forces.

(7)   a. John scrubbed/wiped the floor with a stiff brush.
      b. #The stiff brush scrubbed/wiped the floor.
      c. #The earthquake scrubbed/wiped the floor.

(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:344)

(8)   a. John broke/shattered the vase with a hammer.
      b. The hammer broke/shattered the vase.
      c. The earthquake broke/shattered the vase.

(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:344)

The second test is the compatibility with *nothing is different about it*: if a sentence is compatible with this phrase, then the verb should not incorporate a result component. Manner verbs need not exhibit the results brought about by the corresponding manner events; therefore, manner verbs pass this frame, as shown in (9). However, result verbs cannot deny the events caused by an agent, yielding a contradiction, as in (10), and we cannot say that nothing happened to

the vase broken by Shane.

(9)   a. Tracy just swept the floor, but nothing is different about it.
      b. Tracy just wiped the floor, but nothing is different about it.
      c. Bob just yelled, but nothing is different about him.
      d. Bob just ran quickly, but nothing is different about him.

<div align="right">(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:337)</div>

(10) a. #Shane just broke the vase, but nothing is different about it.
      b. #Shane just shattered the bottle, but nothing is different about it.
      c. #Shane just destroyed the house, but nothing is different about it.

<div align="right">(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:337)</div>

Another indication of a result component comes from the restricted varia-tion in resultative phrases in so-called resultative constructions (Rappaport Ho-vav and Levin 1998). Result verbs inherently lexicalize a result component, so they can only occur with restricted resultative phrases that are already encoded in the verbal meaning when they appear in resultative constructions, as in (11). In (12), the meaning of the resultative phrase *valuable* in (12a) and *off the table* in (12b) is not encoded verbally. Thus, we cannot say that the dishes are broken and valuable simultaneously in (12a).

(11) a. Kim broke the stick in half.
      b. Kim broke the stick into pieces.

<div align="right">(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:341)</div>

(12) a. *Kelly broke the dishes valuable.
      b. *Kelly broke the dishes off the table.

<div align="right">(Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998:122)</div>

However, in the case of manner verbs, there is no restriction on the range of resultative phrases, as manner verbs do not lexicalize any result state. Thus, manner verbs can co-occur with any resultative phrase predicated on their ob-jects of manner verbs, as shown below.

(13) a. Cinderella scrubbed the table clean/shiny/bare.

    b. Cinderella scrubbed her knees sore.

    c. Cinderella scrubbed the dirt off the table.

    d. Cinderella scrubbed her housecleaning competitors out of business.

<div align="right">(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:340)</div>

To establish whether a given verb falls within the category of manner verbs, Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2012) tested whether manner is lexicalized in the verb by combining it with the phrase *didn't move a muscle*. If the verb passes this frame, then the activity involves a manner that presupposes the movements of the agent's muscle. Otherwise, the verbs do not lexicalize how events are caused. Examples (14) and (15) show that manner verbs cannot deny an action performed by an agent, whereas result verbs can do so by providing alternative ways. Thus, there is no information regarding the meaning of the result verbs.

(14) #Jim ran/jogged/blinked but didn't move a muscle.

<div align="right">(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:345)</div>

(15) Kim broke my DVD player, but didn't move a muscle – rather, when I let her borrow it a disc was spinning in it, and she just let it run until the rotor gave out!

<div align="right">(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:347)</div>

Finally, the authors provide the diagnostic of *object deletion*: manner verbs can delete objects, whereas result verbs cannot. This follows from each verb's lexical semantic template and condition "Argument Realization Condition," where at least one explicit argument must be realized in each subevent structure in the whole event structure (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998:113). In the case of result verbs, the condition disallows deletion of the argument y of the predicate BECOME in their lexical semantic template (i.e., [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y *<STATE>*]]]); hence, result verbs do not delete object arguments, as in (16b, d, f). In contrast, it is not problematic for manner verbs to delete object arguments because their lexical semantic template (i.e., [x ACT $_{<MANNER>}$]) lacks object arguments in situ, as in (17).

(16) a. Kim broke the vase.

    b. *All last night, Kim broke.

    c. Kim shattered the can.

    d. *All last night, Kim shattered.

    e. Kim destroyed the house.

    f. *All last night, Kim destroyed.

                              (Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:339)

(17) a. Kim scrubbed the floor.

    b. All last night, Kim scrubbed.   (Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:339)

Table 1 summarizes the diagnoses discussed above and the respective behaviors of manner and result verbs.

Table 1: Interim Summary of the Diagnoses

Diagnostics	Manner Verbs	Result Verbs
Selectional Restriction on Subjects	Restricted	Not restricted
Denial of Result	No contradiction	Contradicted
Range of Resultative Phrases	Wider	Narrower
Denial of Action	Contradicted	Not contradicted
Object Deletion	Deleted	Not deleted

Let us now discuss manner of killing verbs. Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2012) argued that manner of killing verbs behave like both manner and result verbs, using the above diagnostics.

First, manner of killing verbs does not co-occur with inanimate or natural force subjects, as in (18). In addition, they cannot deny the action performed by the causer, as shown in (19). Thus, manner of killing verbs fall within the category of manner verbs.

(18) a. John hanged/crucified Jesus with sailing rope.

    b. #Sailing rope hanged/crucified Jesus.

    c. #The wind hanged/crucified Jesus (by opening the trap door/raising his cross).   (Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:345)

(19) a. #The governor crucified/electrocuted the prisoner, but didn't move a muscle – rather, after taking office she failed to issue a pardon!

b. #The governor drowned/hanged the prisoner, but didn't move a muscle – rather, during the execution she just sat there, tacitly refusing to order a halt! (Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:347)

The manner of killing verbs also behave like result verbs. It is contradictory that they appear in the frame in (20), similar to result verbs. This implies that the verbs lexicalize the resulting state caused by an agent. In addition, although they restrict the variation of resultative phrases in (21a-d), they allow resultative phrases that specify the result state (i.e., death) in (21e-f). Furthermore, the manner of killing verbs does not allow object deletion, as shown in (22).

(20) a. #Jane just drowned Joe, but nothing is different about him.

b. #Jane just hanged Joe, but nothing is different about him.

c. #Jane just crucified Joe, but nothing is different about him.

(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:338)

(21) a. #Shane electrocuted the prisoner to a crisp.

b. #Shane drowned Sandy blue.

c. #Shane hanged the prisoner thin.

d. #The Romans crucified Jesus to the tomb.

e. Faulty ground wires in a building electrocuted him to death in 2004.

f. When he came, his semen short circuted (*sic*) the sander and electrocuted him dead.

(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:341)

(22) a. *All last night, Shane crucified.

b. *All last night, the executioner electrocuted.

c. *All last night, Shane drowned.

(Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2012:339)

Table 2 summarizes the behaviors of the three types of verbs. The data shown above suggest that manner of killing verbs have both manner and result

components in their verbal meaning.

Table 2: Summary of the Diagnostics

Diagnostics	Manner Verbs	Result Verbs	Manner of Killing Verbs
Selectional Restriction on Subjects	Restricted	Not restricted	Restricted
Denial of Result	No contradiction	Contradicted	Contradicted
Range of Resultative Phrases	Wider	Narrower	Narrower
Denial of Action	Contradicted	Not contradicted	Contradicted
Object Deletion	Deleted	Not deleted	Not deleted

Researchers have attempted to demonstrate other potential counterexamples of complementarity. In the next section, we examine analyses that seek to explain potential counterexamples from distinct perspectives.

3. Rescuing the Counterexamples

This section reviews two approaches taken to save the manner/result complementarity. By considering them in contrast, we can identify the similarities and differences between the two approaches.

3.1. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013)

Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) claimed that manner/result complementarity is valid considering that the foregrounded verbal meaning in a given context is the lexicalized verbal meaning relevant to the debate on manner/result complementarity. They assumed that a verbal meaning has two facets: (i) the lexical meaning, which corresponds to the verb's core meaning, and (ii) the contextually associated meaning, which corresponds to the meaning determined by context. They take this view under the assumption that we interpret either the manner or result meaning as a lexicalized verbal meaning, depending on the context of the verb.

Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) selected the verb *cut* from the changes in the state domain. Although they admit that the verb *cut* behaves like both a

manner and result verb, they argue that the verb does not lexicalize both the manner and result components simultaneously.

Let us first consider how they support the verb *cut* as a possible counterexample. A piece of evidence for "*cut* as a result verb" comes from the formation of the zero-related nominal. This formation refers only to the result of verbal meaning. Thus, prototypical result verbs, such as *break*, *crack*, and *split* are acceptable in this formation, as in (23a). *Cut* is also acceptable, as shown in (23b). Therefore, they consider *cut* to be a result verb. Example (24) indicates that manner verbs require light verbs to express the action, not the physical result of the action (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2013:54).

(23) a. a break, a crack, a split

b. a cut   (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2013:54)

(24) (give it) a wipe, (give it) a kick, (go for) a walk/run

(Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2013:54)

They also provided evidence that *cut* is a manner verb. First, manner verbs can occur in conative constructions that do not entail the resulting states caused by the causing events. Their occurrence in this construction indicates that verbs alone denote actions. Example (25) shows that *cut* is categorized as a manner verb. Result verbs such as *break* do not share this property, as in (26), because they inherently lexicalize the result component.

(25) Finally, she got the blade pulled out and started cutting at the tape on Alex.

(Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2013:54)

(26) *Janet broke at the bread.   (Levin 1993:41)

They reported that *cut* is a manner verb because it does not have an anticausative usage. As it is generally accepted that some manner verbs fall within the category of unergative verbs, they lack anticausative use, as shown in (27a-b). Alternatively, some result verbs are attested as having it, as shown in (27c).

(27) a. *The cake cut. (c.f. The waiter cut the cake.)

   b. *The table wiped. (c.f. The waiter wiped the table.)

   c. The window broke. (c.f. The boy broke the window.)

<div align="right">(Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2013:54)</div>

Having shown that *cut* lexicalizes both the manner and result components, we now turn to the question of whether manner/result complementarity holds for this verb, as viewed in Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013).

The first argument is that result meaning is no longer expressed when verbs are used in specific contexts, presupposing the manner of usage. For instance, *cut* lexicalizes manner when appearing in conative constructions. The conative use of a verb involved in a result state foregrounds the specific manner of its action (i.e., motion and contact); therefore, we infer manner as a foregrounded facet of verbal meaning. Thus, the lexicalized meaning of *cut* is only the manner information. This claim bears out manner/result complementarity.

The second argument is that the manner meaning is backgrounded when verbs are used as result verbs. For example, we picture a cutting event as being brought about by using "sharp-edged instruments" (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2013:55). The instruments involved in an event seem to be flexible according to how we recognize the event. Thus, the authors concluded that contexts in which the result component is always lexicalized foreground the result lexicalized in the verb rather than in the manner. This claim is in agreement with the manner/result complementarity.

That is how Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) rescue a counterexample for complementarity. Their analysis focuses on the contexts in which the verbs occur when considering their lexicalized meanings.

At this point, I point out that their claim raises the following question: They do not state why manner is expressed as either a lexicalized meaning or an inferred meaning, whereas the result is no longer expressed in manner-salient contexts. As mentioned previously, conative constructions require us to interpret *cut* as a manner verb; therefore, result meaning is no longer expressed. In contrast, when used as a result verb, the lexicalized meaning of *cut* is result and manner is inferred because we picture a cutting event brought about by an instrument. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) do not explain these differences.

Table 3: Summary of the Lexicalized Meaning Depending on Contexts

Contexts	Manner	Result
Manner Salient (e.g. Conative Constructions)	Lexicalized Meaning	- (No longer expressed)
Result Salient (e.g., Zero-related Nominals)	Inferred Meaning	Lexicalized Meaning

I argue that these facts result from the representation of these components in the lexical semantic templates. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998:108) posit that manner verbs are represented as in (28a) and result verbs as in (28b).

(28) a. Manner verbs: [x ACT$_{<MANNER>}$]
  b. Result verbs: [[x ACT] CAUSE [BECOME [y <*STATE*>]]]
                    (Extracted from Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998)

In the case of manner usage, the contexts force the verbs appearing there to have a lexical semantic template, as in (28a), which indicates that there is no event produced by the causing event. Thus, the result meaning is no longer expressed.

In contrast, in the case of result usage, the contexts force the verbs to have the template as shown in (28b), which specifies the result state (i.e., [y <*STATE*>]) caused by the causing event (i.e., [x ACT]), so it is natural that the context involving a result state allows us to interpret it. Regarding manner, Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) presupposed that *cut* lexicalizes both the manner and result components. Thus, we suppose that *cut* has the lexical semantic template in (29), indicating that we recognize not only the result state but also the manner. Furthermore, the caused event (i.e., [BECOME [y <*STATE*>]]) presupposes the causing event (i.e., [x ACT$_{<MANNER>}$]), so we can infer the manner even in contexts associated with results.

(29) [[x ACT$_{<MANNER>}$] CAUSE [BECOME [y <*STATE*>]]]

It is possible that the grammatical distributions of manner and result state (i.e., manner is realized as a modifier of the predicate ACT, whereas result is a

complement of the predicate BECOME) is sensitive to the meaning component that is foregrounded when interpreting the event. The following section shows that Husband (2011) relates the distinct semantic component to manners versus results in verbal meaning.

3.2. Husband (2011)

Husband (2011) takes a different view than Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013), claiming that manner and result meanings are lexically entailed components. He proposed that the manner of killing verbs that form achievement predicates such as *guillotine*, *decapitate*, and *behead* are not counterexamples of complementarity.

In the case of the manner of killing verbs, Husband (2011) considers manner and result components to have different kinds of meanings: assertions versus presuppositions. Note that these are both lexical entailments. On this point, Husband (2011:120) states that "verbs seem to always assert only one component of their meaning, with other meanings forming some kind of presupposition." This statement guarantees that verbs lexicalize only one meaning that bears the manner/result complementarity. The author revised the manner/result complementarity as follows:

(30) Manner/Result Complementarity (revised):
Manner and result meaning components are in complementary distribution with respect to an asserted level of meaning: A verb can assert only one.
(Husband 2011:120)

Husband argues that the manner component is an assertion and the component is a presupposition in the case of the manner of killing verbs. To confirm the distinction between them in verbal meaning, he applied the following tests (Levinson 1983, Chierchia and McConell-Ginet 2000). Assertions are considered to be questioned and negated, while presuppositions are not, as shown in (31). Example (31) shows that manner components serve as an assertion and result components as a presupposition, considering that speaker B can respond in alternative ways in which the participant was killed, while speaker B' cannot respond with whether the participant died.

(31) a. A: Was King Louis XVI guillotined?

      B: Yes, he was killed by a guillotine.

      B': #No, he didn't die.

  b. A: Was Cicero decapitated?

      B: No, he was stabbed.

      B': #No, he didn't die.

  c. A: Did terrorists behead Daniel Pearl?

      B: No, he was shot in the back of the head.

      B': #Yes, he died.   (Husband 2011: 119)

Moreover, Husband (2011:121) believes that the distinction between assertions and presuppositions arises from the characteristics of the event structure, in which manner is realized in the modifier position of the predicate ACT, whereas the result state is in the argument position of the predicate BECOME, as shown in (28). Husband (2011:121) suggests that grammatical status differs between arguments and modifiers. For example, arguments are inferential even when they are omitted, while modifiers are not. Therefore, Husband (2011) concluded that manner is interpreted as an assertion, if present, whereas the result is a presupposition. Each representation of an event structure is sensitive to how the verbal meaning is understood in a given context. Hence, Husband (2011) shares a view similar to that of Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) when viewed from a broader perspective.

In summary, Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) paid attention to the context of the verbs in question and investigated which facet is salient in the verbal meaning. Salient meaning refers to lexicalized meaning, which is relevant to the debate over the manner/result complementarity. In contrast, Husband (2011) correlates the distinction between manner and result to that between assertions and presuppositions and then reconsiders complementarity as reflecting that a verb asserts either a manner or a result component. Therefore, it is possible that the presumed counterexamples conform to manner/result complementarity. The authors studied the counterexamples from various standpoints, but at the same time, they made similar assumptions regarding how we comprehend manner and result components from verbal meanings.

Recent studies have investigated the issue of manner/result complementari-

ty. Recently, several articles have been devoted to how verbal meaning should be decomposed and what kinds of event structures should be combined with a particular root (Beavers and Koontz-Garboden 2020, Ausensi 2021, Yu et al. 2023, among others). One study argues that "manner/result complementarity serves as a useful descriptive device for describing possible verb meanings, but does not strictly translate to distinct positions within an event structure template in the way originally proposed by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998, 2010)" (Yu et al. 2023: 1592), and it instead considers a root's status as being either eventive or stative because of the presence of some result verbs that can be interpreted as having a manner component (e.g., *With a few slices of her claws, she tore him free.* (Yu et al. 2023: 1596)). If this idea is correct, we must reconsider which instances counter the complementarity. Regardless, we state that the issue of manner/result complementarity remains debatable.

4. Conclusion

This study deals with manner/result complementarity, which is related to lexicalization issues. Many previous studies have examined how verbal meaning is decomposed and what information is lexicalized in verbs. These analyses revealed a tendency for manner and result meanings to exhibit a complementary distribution in verbal meaning, which is linked to manner/result complementarity.

However, this complementarity constrains the verbs' lexicalization patterns; a verb cannot lexicalize both manner and result components. This constraint has aroused a great deal of controversy regarding the existence of verbs lexicalizing both components. This study presents an overview of Beavers and Koontz-Garboden's (2012) analysis that supports the existence of counterexamples to complementarity. In addition, this study compares Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) and Husband (2011), who argue from distinct perspectives that counterexamples do not hold true, noting that they seem to have similar assumptions when arguing against possible counterexamples.

Finally, this study notes that there has been renewed interest in the decomposition of verbal meanings and in reconsidering the concept of manner/result complementarity. New data that cannot be explained by the current descriptive

hypothesis have appeared, opening new room for debate over manner/result complementarity.

[Reference]

Ausensi, Josep. 2021. "The semantics of roots determines argument structure." *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 25*, 95-111.

Beavers, John and Andrew Koontz-Garboden. 2012. "Manner and result in the roots of verbal meaning." *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3), 331–369.

Beavers, John and Andrew Koontz-Garboden. 2020. *The Roots of Verbal Meaning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chierchia, Gennaro and Sally McConnel-Ginet. 2000. *Meaning and Grammar: An Introduction to Semantics* (2nd edition), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Husband, Matthew E. 2011. "Rescuing manner/result complementarity from certain death." *Proceedings of the Annual Meating of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 47(1), 111-124.

Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2013. "Lexicalized Meaning and Manner/Result Complementarity." In *Studies in the Composition and Decomposition of Event Predicates,* eds. Boban Arsenijević, Berit Gehrke, and Rafael Marīn, 49-70. Dordrecht: Springer.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka, and Beth Levin. 1998. "Building Verb Meanings." In *The Projection of arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, eds. Miriam Butt and Wilhelm Geuder, 97–133. Standford: CSLI Publications.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka, and Beth Levin. 2010. "Reflections on Manner/Result Complementarity." In *Lexical Semantics, Syntax, and Event Structure* eds. Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron, and Ivy Sichel, 21–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yu, Jianrong, Josep Ausensi and Ryan Walter Smith. 2023. "States and changes-of-state in the semantics of result roots: Evidence from resultative constructions." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 41*, 1589-1628.

(Graduate Student)

SUMMARY

Various Explanations for Manner/Result Complementarity

Miho Mima

This paper presents an overview of analyses of a descriptive hypothesis: Manner/Result Complementarity, proposed by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010) and Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) to explain the complementary distribution in the realization of the syntactic arguments of manner and result verbs. However, the hypothesis entails a restriction on the rules of lexical decompositions and how the decomposed lexical meaning reflects the syntactic argument realizations. Thus, many studies have explored from a variety of perspectives counterexamples to the complementarity. Some articles have argued that there are some verb classes which behave counter to the complementarity, and others attest that possible counterexamples must be true of the complementarity. The main concern of this paper is to outline the analyses that discuss the existence of such counterexamples and to compare them. Contrasting them helps us understand the similarities and differences between the analyses and discover room for further investigation into the issues of Manner/Result Complementarity.