

NADĚŽDA KUDRNÁČOVÁ
Masaryk University

VERBS OF LOCOMOTION AND THE SEMANTICS OF THE UNACCUSATIVE/UNERGATIVE DIFFERENTIATION*

This paper argues that it is the causative structuration of the motion situation that seems to be the crucial factor determining the status of intransitive verbs of locomotion and their potential to enter into a certain set of syntactical configurations. More specifically, the paper attempts to provide arguments against the commonly held view that locomotion verbs in directed motion constructions are unaccusative (this applies to both intransitive structures and transitive causative structures). If the subject argument of an intransitive manner of locomotion verb displays reduced agentivity (i.e. if it displays properties of both an agent and a patient), it is not admitted into transitive causative structures, in spite of the alleged unaccusativity of verbs that are admitted into them. The inability of path verbs to causativize is explained by appealing to the fact that these types of verbs render motion as not forming part of an energetic (i.e. a causal) chain. Related to this is the fact that the subject argument of these verbs falls outside the agent vs. patient classification, which is commonly claimed to be directly related to the verb's unergative vs. the unaccusative status, respectively.

1. Introduction: the decisive role of the causal structure of a motion event

This paper looks into semantic aspects of the unaccusative vs. the unergative differentiation of intransitive verbs. It focuses on verbs of locomotion and seeks to provide arguments in favour of the decisive role of the type of the causative structuration of the motion situation in licensing the verb's status. More specifically, the paper argues that if the mover as the subject argument in directed motion events expressed by means of intransitive manner of motion

* The preparation of this paper was funded in part by a Grant awarded by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno.

verbs is to appear in the direct object position in transitive causative structures, all aspects of the actual execution of the movement must fall under its control. This fact may be taken as an argument against the purported unaccusative status of intransitive manner of motion verbs in directed motion and of their transitive causative counterparts. The paper further argues that the subject argument in motion events expressed by means of path verbs falls outside the agent vs. the patient distinction, which seems to provide an explanation why, in spite of their alleged unaccusative status, path verbs do not undergo causativization.

2. The unaccusative vs. the unergative status of intransitive locomotion verbs in relation to their unaccusative vs. unergative differentiation

Based on their lexico-semantic properties, intransitive verbs of locomotion fall into two groups, namely, manner of locomotion verbs and so-called path verbs (cf. esp. Levin 1993, Miller and Johnson-Laird 1976, Talmy 1985). Manner of locomotion verbs (e.g., *walk, run, dance, swim, crawl, stagger*) encode information about the concrete physical manner in which the movement is carried out whereas path verbs (e.g., *come, go, arrive, leave, enter, approach*) encode information about “the configuration and position of the path, often specified in relation to the direction of motion” (Matsumoto 1996: 190). This verbal lexico-semantic differentiation is a reflection of the fact that the physical modality of motion and the traversal of the path are clearly distinguishable components in verbal meaning. They play a role in the causal structuration of the motion and are thus linked to the semantic status of the verb’s subject argument in terms of its agenthood/patienthood (i.e. in terms of its position in the causal structuration of a motion event).

On the theory propounded by Perlmutter (1978), intransitive verbs are of two types, namely, unaccusative verbs and unergative verbs. Perlmutter’s classification is primarily based on semantic considerations: intransitive verbs expressing volitional events are unergative while intransitive verbs expressing nonvolitional events are unaccusative (on the connections between unergativity and agenthood and between unaccusativity and patienthood cf. also Dowty 1991). That is, the verb’s status is determined by the semantic properties of its sole argument. On this analysis, the same verb may be unergative or unaccusative. Consider the following examples taken from Perlmutter (1978: 163-164):

- (1) John slid into third base. (unergative)
- (2) The wheels slid on the ice. (unaccusative)
- (3) John slid on the ice. (unaccusative if John slid on the ice involuntarily; unergative if John did it voluntarily)
- (4) Henry suddenly jumped over the fence. (unergative)
- (5) The unemployment rate suddenly jumped in July. (unaccusative)

Perlmutter and Postal (1984) list several groups of verbs which belong or prevailingly belong to each category. The category of unergative contains verbs expressing willed or volitional acts (e.g., *work, talk, play, laugh, walk, jog, dance, crawl*) and verbs expressing involuntary bodily processes (e.g., *cough, sneeze, breathe, sleep, cry*). The category of unaccusative verbs is more varied. Apart from a group of adjectival predicates, it contains verbs whose subjects are patients (e.g., *burn, fall, drop, fall, dangle*), including the class of inchoatives (verbs like *melt, freeze, open, close, disappear*), verbs of existing and happening (e.g., *exist, happen, occur, result*), verbs that denote involuntary emission of stimuli that impinge on the senses (e.g., *shine, glow, jingle, clang, smell*), aspectual verbs (e.g., *begin, continue, stop*) and durative verbs (e.g., *last, remain, survive*). In terms of the type of semantic role expressed by the verb's single argument, the argument of unergative verbs is an agent (a wilful, animate executor of an action) or an experiencer (a participant that feels a certain bodily process) whereas the argument of unaccusative verbs is a patient (animate or inanimate).

A syntactic account of Perlmutter's basically semantic categorization has been first proposed by Burzio (1986) within the framework of generative grammar. On his analysis, the subject of unergatives is subject in both deep and surface structures. By contrast, the subject of unaccusatives originates as an object in deep-structure and is then moved to the subject position at the surface level. Unaccusatives thus lack an external argument.

Burzio's basically syntactic account is consistent with the semantic status of the verb's sole argument in each verbal category. The subject argument of unergative verbs is semantically an agent (*John walked/ran/danced/swam*) whereas the subject argument of unaccusative verbs is semantically a patient or a theme.¹

The unergative/unaccusative categorization has become the subject of a substantial body of research (see, e.g., Alexiadou et al. 2004, Dowty 1991, Hale and Keyser 2002, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1992 and 1995, Kuno and Takami 2004, Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2000, Van Valin 1990, among many others). Deriving from the assumption that lexico-semantic properties of verbs are manifested at a syntactical level, a number of diagnostics have been developed. Although originally couched in semantic terms, the unergative/unaccusative distinction is claimed to be syntactically encoded, i.e. manifested in the verb's ability to appear in a certain set of syntactic configurations. The verb's categorization is thus taken as deriving from the interpretation of the argument structure as the syntactic projection of the verb's semantic structure. Some verbs are invariably unergative or invariably unaccusative, whereas other verbs display a variable behaviour (for arguments in favour of a gradient rather than a bipolar

¹ Agency cannot be equated with internal causation because there are verbs which denote internally caused eventualities and yet are not a result of an exercise of will (cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). Leaving aside the inanimate world (e.g., *blossom, melt*), this is a typical case of bodily processes like blushing or sneezing.

nature of the unergative/unaccusative categorization see esp. Sorace 2004). In addition, certain verbs may class among unergatives in one language and among unaccusatives in another (this phenomenon is referred to as “unaccusative mismatches”).

As regards locomotion verbs, their categorization is based on whether the verb encodes information about the manner of motion or not. Path verbs (i.e. verbs that are mute as regards a concrete physical modality of the motion) are classified as belonging to unaccusative verbs. This means that their subjects originate as deep-structure objects. Their sole argument is thus not an agent but a theme/patient (*John came*, *John arrived*, *John approached the station*, *John went to the station*, *John left the station*, etc.).

In contrast to path verbs, manner of locomotion verbs display a variable behaviour. When used without a directional phrase, they are claimed to belong to unergatives. Their subject argument is thus evaluated as an agent: *John walked* (/ran/ danced/ swam). However, when used with a directional phrase, manner of locomotion verbs are claimed to undergo a change from the category of unergatives to the category of unaccusatives, whose subject argument is a patient/theme (cf. Geuder and Weisgerber 2006, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1992 and 1995, Rosen 1996, Tenny 1984, Tubino Blanco 2011, van Hout 2004, Van Valin 1990, among many others): *John walked to the station* (/ran to the station/danced across the ballroom/swam to the shore). The change in the status of these verbs enables them to causativize: *John walked Mary* (/ran Mary) to the station, *John danced Mary across the ballroom*, *John swam Mary to the shore*. To repeat, the subject argument of unaccusatives originates as a deep-structure object, i.e. it represents the verb’s internal argument. The reason underlying the purported unaccusativity of these verbs is, therefore, the fact the position for the external argument is not occupied and can thus be taken up by an external cause (on unaccusativity in relation to causativizability also see Borer and Wexler 1987).²

Path verbs are also claimed to belong to unaccusative verbs. As such, they should display the potential to enter into causative structures. This is, however, not the case: **John went himself to the door*, **John went Mary to the door*, **John went himself to exhaustion*, **John went Mary to exhaustion*.

The following discussion will provide arguments both for and against the unaccusative status of manner of locomotion verbs in structures with directional phrases. Nevertheless, arguments against their unaccusativity will appear to be by far the stronger. The discussion will attempt to demonstrate that the factor licensing the verb’s syntactic behaviour should be sought in the position of the subject argument in the causal chain of events. In concrete terms, if the verb’s subject argument does not display properties of a fully-fledged agent, i.e. if the motion event is not covered by the mover’s conation in its entirety, the verb is not admitted into transitive causative structures: **John limped Mary to the door*,

² An explanation along these lines seems to be preferred owing to the fact that the unaccusative hypothesis would otherwise lose much of its consistency.

**John limped himself to the door, *John limped himself to exhaustion, *John limped Mary to exhaustion.*

As regards path verbs, the discussion will attempt to demonstrate that path verbs do not causativize because the unaccusative/unergative distinction does not apply to them.

3. Arguments in favour of the unaccusative status of locomotion verbs in directed motion events

3.1. The status of structures without directionals

The claim that manner of motion verbs in constructions with directionals change their status is, in one respect, justified. It rests on a tacit assumption that what may be called “bare” constructions, i.e. constructions without complementizers (including directional phrases), do not represent basic constructions in the sense that directionals would be merely appended to the verb. In other words, it makes sense to argue that bare constructions are specific constructions in their own right (cf. Kudrnáčová 2008).

It should be added, at the same time, that Levin and Rappaport Hovav contradict themselves by observing that the augmentation of argument structure is carried out in a monotonic way (cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). An observation along these lines runs counter to the claim that a directional effects the shift of the verb’s semantics from the category of unergatives to the category of unaccusatives (whose subject argument is no longer an agent but acquires the status of a patient), which, in its turn, enables the verb to appear in causative structures. The monotonicity of the argument augmentation would, in actual fact, necessitate that the verb retain its semantic categorization, i.e. that it does not undergo a change in its (basically) unergative status.

3.2. The theory of co-identification

Another argument that speaks in favour of the unaccusative status of manner of locomotion verbs complemented by a directional phrase may be provided by the theory of the so-called event co-identification. More specifically, the unaccusativity of manner of locomotion verbs in directed motion structures is in line with a view that the manner in which the motion is carried out and the traversal of the path are co-identified (hence identical) events (cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1999, and Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2001). From the event co-identification it follows that the two components of a motion event are not causally related. Viewed from the point of view of the unergative/unaccusative differentiation, the non-causal relation between the movement in its concrete physical modality and the progression along a path is correlated with the verb’s unaccusative status.

It is nevertheless difficult to adopt the view that the mover in directed motion events encoded in manner of locomotion verbs does not have an agentive status, i.e. that it does not play a role in the causative structuration of the motion situation (more so in view of the fact that the agentivity of the mover is conceptually related to the concrete manner of the execution of the motion). The following discussion will provide facts that speak in favour of the mover's agentive status, i.e. that speak against the unaccusative status of given verbs.

4. Arguments against the unaccusative status of manner of locomotion verbs in directed motion events

4.1. The causal link between the manner of motion and the traversal of path

As frequently noted in the literature, the physical manner of motion and the progression along the path are causally related (e.g., Croft 1991, Pinker 1989 or Talmy 1985). Croft (1991: 160-161) demonstrates the causative nature of directed movement encoded in manner of motion verbs by way of examples with the verbs *sail* and *burn*:

- (6) The boat sailed into the cave.
- (7) *The boat burned into the cave.
- (8) The branding iron burned into the calf's skin.

In (6), the verb *sail* lexicalizes a concrete physical type of movement, therefore it can function as a cause of the progression along a specific path. The verb *burn* in (7) cannot have this function because it designates an action during which the theme (the entity that is moving) undergoes a change of state. As observed by Goldberg (1991: 368), the theme can only change its location, it cannot change its state at the same time (see also Kudrnáčová 2008; for a modified version of Goldberg's account see Yasuhara 2013). This stipulation may now be seen from a reverse order: a change in the theme's state cannot have a causal function with respect to the movement, which explains the ungrammaticality of the example in (7). The verb *burn* may, however, appear in a directed motion construction (ex. 8) if the activity of burning causes the theme's movement by creating its way in a given spatial environment. In other words, what the constructions in (6) and (8) have in common is that the themes make their way in some spatial environment.³ Consider in this connection the following example with *burn one's way*:

³ Note, however, that the theme in (8) does not change its state. That is, the stipulation that a theme cannot simultaneously undergo a change of state and a change of location still holds. The two types of change are conceptually so distant that they cannot be rendered as causally related. Viewed at a more abstract level, semantic relatedness and direct causality are conceptually closely linked concepts.

- (9) Donna took a sip of the brandy, feeling it burn its way to her stomach. (BNC: G0P)

4.2. Purported obligatoriness of directionals

The claim mentioned above, namely, that manner of locomotion verbs in directed motion events undergo a change from the category of unergatives to the category of unaccusatives seems justified to the extent that it provides an explanation why transitive causative structures typically involve the presence of directional phrases (e.g., *John walked Mary to the station*, *John walked himself to the station*).

As has been mentioned, the unaccusative status of manner of locomotion verbs in intransitive directed motion events (*John walked to the station*) necessitates that the corresponding transitive causative structures employ a directional phrase. Admittedly, it is often the case that transitive causative structures are implausible if a directional phrase is missing:

- (10) *John walked (/ran) Mary.
- (11) John walked (/ran) Mary to the station.
- (12) *John danced Mary.
- (13) John danced Mary across the ballroom.

A closer look reveals, however, that not all transitive causative structures require that a directional phrase be used (cf. Filipović 2007, Kudrnáčová 2013 or Randall 2010). The event of ‘walking the dog’ may serve as a typical example:⁴

- (14) John always walks the dog before breakfast.

Consider also the following interesting example from the British National Corpus:

- (15) /.../ and he had jockeys to ride them instead of the boys in the stable. Understand? Er yes. Now would they normally get their er a jockey to gallop the horse rather than just the stable boy? (BNC: HYC)

Related to the account that syntactic structures with unaccusative verbs require the presence of a directional phrase is an account that explains the behaviour of verbs by appealing to the type of event structure encoded in them. More specifically, such an account takes the unaccusativity/unergativity categorization

⁴ It should be admitted, however, that the verb *walk* used in the phrase ‘walking a dog’ may undergo a process of semantic bleaching (thus it need not designate actual ‘walking’), which goes hand in hand with an increase in the idiomaticity of the phrase (*walk the dog* designates making the dog move, in some way or other, to keep it fit).

as underlain by the telicity of the event: unaccusatives tend to encode telic events while unergatives tend to encode atelic events (e.g., Ritter and Rosen 2000, Rosen 1996, Rothstein 2004, van Hout 2004). Transitive causative structures are thus claimed to be open for delimited events only:

- (16) *Bill walked Sue along the beach in an hour. (Rosen 1996: 197)
- (17) ?? The people of Amsterdam danced the Canadians along the streets of Amsterdam. (Rothstein 2004: 136)

The claim that transitive causative structures only admit delimited events can be questioned in light of the fact that the change of a punctual temporal adverbial (*in an hour*) to a durative one (*for an hour*) renders the causative structure in (18) grammatical:

- (18) Bill walked Sue along the beach for an hour.

As can be seen, this structure is grammatical even though the event is not telic. As regards the example in (17), the use of a non-delimited phrase seems, in actual fact, quite plausible (one can thus say *John danced Mary round the ballroom*). It is thus clear that telicity itself cannot serve as a factor differentiating between unaccusatives and unergatives. That transitive causative structures with non-delimited path phrases are not ruled out can also be illustrated by way of the following two examples:

- (19) John walked her towards the door.
- (20) The general marched the soldiers in the park. (Van Valin 2005: 34)

The path phrase *towards the door* (ex. 19) encodes a non-delimited event and the same interpretation is valid for the path phrase *in the park* (ex. 20), which designates the spatial setting of a given caused motion. In Vendler's terminology, the verbs in these sentences represent an activity, not an accomplishment (cf. Vendler 1957). Van Valin (2005: 34) terms this type of activity "a causative activity" (the verb in the sentence *The sergeant marched the soldiers to the park* then represents "a causative accomplishment", cf. Van Valin 2005: 34).

We have thus seen that irrespective of whether the constraints placed on the causativization of intransitive verbs of locomotion are explained by appealing to verbal lexical semantics or to the event structuration, the requirement for the obligatory presence of a delimited path phrase cannot be maintained because it rests on the assumption that the result in a caused motion event can only be represented by attaining some spatial point which represents the resultant change of location.⁵

⁵ Certainly, it may be reasonably argued that the most natural correlate of causativity is – at least in the motion domain – the telicity of the event, i.e. the attaining of a spatial end-point.

The discussion presented thus far sought to provide arguments against the purported obligatoriness of path phrases in transitive causative structures (and the telicity of motion events encoded in them). At this point in the discussion it should be added that the unaccusative status of directed motion events (encoded in path verbs and manner of locomotion verbs complemented by directionals) and the unergative status of manner of motion verbs used without directional phrases is sometimes considered to be conceptually linked to the fact that path verbs and manner of motion verbs belong to the category of so-called ‘result verbs’ and ‘manner verbs’, respectively.

As the terms themselves suggest, manner verbs lexicalize the type of the process leading to the result whereas result verbs lexicalize the result of the event (on the difference between manner and result verbs see also Fillmore 1970; on the complementary nature of the relation ‘result – manner’ see Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998 and 2013; on arguments against the complementarity see esp. Erteschik-Shir and Rapoport 2010). Result verbs are largely constrained in their syntactic behaviour whereas manner verbs may appear in a number of syntactic constructions. Consider the following examples taken from Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998: 103):

- (21) a. Mary scrubbed her fingers to the bone. (*scrub*: manner verb)
b. *Mary broke her knuckles to the bone. (*break*: result verb)
- (22) a. Mary rubbed the tiredness of her eyes. (*rub*: manner verb)
b. *Mary broke the beauty of the vase. (*break*: result verb)
- (23) a. Mary swept the leaves off the sidewalk. (*sweep*: manner verb)
b. *Mary broke the dishes off the table. (*break*: result verb)

As regards intransitive verbs of locomotion, path verbs are claimed to belong to the result class (which is correlated with the fact that they encode an achieved location) whereas manner of locomotion verbs are claimed to belong to the manner class (which is correlated with the fact that they encode a process leading to achieving a change of location):

- (24) a. John walked.
b. John went.
- (25) a. John walked to the station.
b. John went (/came) to the station.
- (26) a. John walked himself to the station.
b. *John went (/came) himself to the station.
- (27) a. John walked Mary to the station.
b. *John went (/came) Mary to the station.
- (28) a. John walked himself to exhaustion.
b. *John went (/came) himself to exhaustion.
- (29) a. John walked Mary to exhaustion.
b. *John went (/came) Mary to exhaustion.

It certainly cannot be denied that minimizing the lexical information contained in verbs is a necessary procedure if one strives to account for as many syntactic constructions as possible. However, an argumentation in this vein poses problems because it rests on the inherent telicity of path verbs. In actual fact, certain path verbs are underspecified as to the reference of an achieved location, leaving the type of path to be determined by the intrasentential context. For example, the path verbs *go* and *descend* can be used not only in telic, bounded motion situations (*John went to the window*, *The plane descended to the ground*) but also in atelic, unbounded ones (*John went towards the window*, *The rain descended for five hours*). Interestingly, the verb *fall* also invites both interpretations (in spite of the fact that it involves the pull of gravity and thus might be expected to exclude an atelic interpretation) as illustrated by way of the following example from the British National Corpus:

- (30) A shooting star fell towards the city's crown of lights. (BNC: FS8)

4.3. Agentivity of the mover

4.3.1. Manner of locomotion verbs

As argued for by Ritter and Rosen (1998), the subject argument in directed motion structures with manner of locomotion verbs (*John walked to the station*) is a fully-fledged agent, which attests to the fact that this participant is an external, not an internal argument of the verb. That is, the verb retains its unergative status even in the presence of a directional phrase. From this it follows that, in transitive causative structures, the mover retains its agentivity (a similar standpoint is, e.g., taken by Folli and Harley 2006, who contend that in transitive causative structures of the type *John walked her to the station* both arguments must be agents). It is thus open to debate whether verbs in these structures undergo the change in their unergative status. Consider:

- (31) John ran (/walked) himself to the window.
- (32) John ran himself ragged (/walked himself to exhaustion).
- (33) John ran (/walked) Mary to the station.
- (34) John ran (/walked) Mary to exhaustion.

If the mover's activity is not wholly under their volitional control, i.e. if the mover includes properties of both an agent and a patient, the mover cannot take up the direct object position in transitive causative structures (which are commonly claimed to require unaccusative verbs). Consider, for example, the motion situation lexicalized in limping, which includes elements that point to the mover's state. Since those elements fall outside the mover's intentional control (the same is valid for strutting, e.g.), they cannot fulfil a causal role, i.e. cannot participate in the participant's change, be it a change of state or a change of location. This

seems to be the reason why verbs of this type cannot enter into transitive causative structures (on this and further factors deciding on the possibility of the formation of transitive causative structures cf. Kudrnáčová 2013 and 2014).⁶ Consider:

- (35) *John strutted (/staggered/lolloped/scurried/scampered) himself to the station.
- (36) *John strutted (/staggered/lolloped/scurried/scampered) himself to exhaustion.
- (37) *John strutted (/staggered/lolloped/scurried/scampered) Mary to the station.
- (38) *John jogged (/staggered/strutted/lolloped) Mary to exhaustion.

In these movements, supplementary (i.e. non-core) aspects of the motion do not effect the mover's translocation. That is, causation only covers those aspects that are related to the mover's translocation, which, in its turn, results in the impossibility to employ these types of verb in transitive causative structures. In the actual execution of the motion, the mover must therefore display the role of a fully-fledged agent, i.e. it cannot display properties of a patient. Viewed from the perspective of the unaccusative/unergative distinction, if the verb is to causativize, it must belong to the unergative class.

The agentive status of the mover in directed motion constructions with manner of locomotion verbs shows itself in the possibility to form reflexive constructions – consider examples in (31) and (32), which explicitly render the mover as being in full volitional control of the execution of the movement (cf. Kudrnáčová 2013). Consider also:

- (39) John marched himself to the station.
- (40) John danced himself across the ballroom.

A remark is due here. As is clear from the examples in (31) and (32), reflexive resultative phrases do not necessarily have to encode the mover's change of location; they may also encode its change of state. However, as with reflexive structures encoding a change of location, reflexive structures encoding a change of state attest to the agentivity of the mover (i.e. to the unergative status of the verb) as shown by the implausibility of forming reflexive constructions (cf. examples (35) and (36)). It should be noted here that the reflexive is treated as fulfilling a syntactic rather than a semantic role. This contention stems from the observation that resultative phrases can only be predicated of direct objects (cf. Simpson 1983). From this stipulation it follows that if resultative phrases are to

⁶ It may now be added to Kudrnáčová (2013, 2014) that the stipulation concerning the mover's full volitional control in causative structures is in line with the relation between the causing event and the caused event: if all aspects of the caused event are to be covered by the causing event, the two events must necessarily display a total overlap.

be predicated of subjects of unergatives, the slot for the direct object must be filled, i.e. the reflexive must be used.⁷

Last but not least, it may be added that related to the agentive status of the subject argument in intransitive directed motion events is the possibility of forming constructions of the type

- (41) John danced mazurka across the room.

If *John* here were a deep object (i.e. if the verb classed among unaccusatives), it would be difficult to argue that the sentence contains two objects – one in the subject position, the other in the direct object position (on this see Markantonatou 1999).

4.3.2. Path verbs

As has been mentioned above, path verbs do not causativize (neither are they admitted into passive structures), in spite of the fact that they are frequently held to display an unaccusative status. They do not allow for the possibility of inserting an external argument into the sentence (relegating the internal argument to the direct object position). Consider the examples in (26b) – (29b), repeated here for convenience:

- (26b) *John went (/came) himself to the station.
 (27b) *John went (/came) Mary to the station.
 (28b) *John went (/came) himself to exhaustion.
 (29b) *John went (/came) Mary to exhaustion.

As argued for by Kudrnáčová (2010 and 2013), the impossibility of path verbs to enter into causative structures is most probably underlain by the fact that, as opposed to events encoded in manner of locomotion verbs, path verbs render movement as freed from the energetic profile, i.e. as freed from the mover's position in the causal structure of the motion situation. Path verbs do not lexicalize the type of the mover's activity (which is, in events encoded in manner of locomotion verbs, causally related to the traversal of the path). Since they do not encode information about the concrete modality of the motion, they do

⁷ Kudrnáčová (2006) has shown that phrases encoding the mover's change of state can be predicated not only of direct objects (*John ran himself to exhaustion*) but also of agents (*John ran to exhaustion*). The reflexive type of structure renders exhaustion as a state ensuing from the movement, i.e. as a fully-fledged result that does not form part of the movement itself. By contrast, the non-reflexive type of structure renders exhaustion as representing the final quantum of the movement (that which is cast as a state). In this structure, then, the state of exhaustion represents the intensity of the movement and thus can be put on a par with directional *to*-phrases (as in *John ran to the station*).

not provide information about whether their sole argument is the causer of the change in location, i.e. whether the movement is agentive or not. The movement in path verbs is rendered in its simplest form, as a bare change in the participant's location (on this cf. also Kudrnáčová 2008). An explanation along these lines may be supported by appealing to Langacker's account that verbs like *come*, *go* and *arrive* "impose an absolute construal on the movement they designate. This does not imply that the movement is conceived as being inherently non-energetic, but rather that only the thematic process itself (i.e. the movement per se) is saliently evoked and placed in profile" (Langacker 1991: 390).

Viewed from the perspective of the verb's status, path verbs seem to fall outside the unaccusative/unergative distinction (which is conceptually related to the fact that their sole arguments fall outside the agent/patient distinction).

5. Summary and conclusion

The discussion presented in this paper can be summarized as follows. The paper sought to provide evidence that the presence/absence of a directional phrase does not decide on the verb's unaccusative/unergative status as is often claimed in the literature. Instead, what seems to play a crucial role in the verb's categorization is whether the subject argument is in full control over the movement or not (which is line with the fact that manner of locomotion verbs present motion as an outcome of the mover's energetic output). If the subject argument's volitional control covers all aspects of the motion, the verb is admitted into transitive causative structures, irrespective of whether a directional phrase is present or not. If, however, some aspects of the motion are not covered by the subject argument's volitional control (as is the case in locomotion events like limping or strutting), the verb cannot be used in transitive causative structures. In other words, the direct object position in these structures is barred for participants that display (some of the) properties of a patient, which serves as an argument against the obligatory unaccusativity of verbs appearing in them.

As regards path verbs (which are commonly treated as belonging to the unaccusative class), the paper has attempted to provide arguments in favour of the interpretation that these verbs actually fall outside the unaccusative vs. the unergative distinction. The reason behind this observation is that path verbs encode movement in its simplest form, i.e. as a bare change of location abstracted from forming part of a causal (hence an energetic) chain. The arguments of path verbs are thus viewed as falling outside the agent/patient differentiation.

The discussion has attempted to demonstrate that the question of the unergative/unaccusative differentiation of intransitive verbs of locomotion can be adequately addressed by an account based on the analysis of a causal structuration of a motion situation as it manifests itself in the verb's semantics (and hence in the semantics of the mover). Needless to say, the possibility of the mover to assume a dual agent/patient status in certain verbs of manner of

locomotion attests to the well-known proposal offered by Dowty, namely, that an agent and a patient do not represent discrete semantic roles. Nevertheless, what seems to be open to debate is Dowty's proposal concerning the role of the varied degree of the argument's agentivity in relation to the verb's unaccusative/unergative status. Dowty proposes that verbs displaying a high degree of agentivity and, at the same time, a low degree of patienthood are invariably unergative, while verbs displaying a low degree of agentivity and a high degree of patienthood are invariably unaccusative (Dowty 1991: 608). Related to this is Dowty's proposal that the roles of Proto-agent and Proto-patient include different sets of entailments. In concrete terms, Dowty (1991: 572) takes the Proto-agent role as subsuming the following features: (a) volitional involvement in the event, (b) sentience/perception, (c) causing an event or a change of state in another participant, (d) movement relative to another participant, (e) exists independently of the event. The Proto-patient role subsumes the following features: (a) undergoes a change of state, (b) represents an incremental theme, (c) causally affected by another participant, (d) stationary relative to the movement, (e) does not exist independently of the event.⁸ Contrary to Dowty, the paper argues that what decides the verb's syntactic applicability is not the degree of the volitional involvement of the mover in the action (i.e. the degree to which the mover agentivity is reduced) but the (simple) fact that the mover is not in full volitional control of the movement, i.e. that he is not a fully-fledged agent.

References

- Alexiadou, A., E. Anagnostopoulou and M. Everaert (eds.). 2004. *The unaccusativity puzzle: explorations of the syntax-lexicon interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borer, H., and K. Wexler 1987. The maturation of syntax. In T. Roeper and E. Williams (eds.), *Parameter-setting and language acquisition*, 123-172. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Burzio, L. 1986. *Italian syntax: a government-binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Croft, W. 1991. *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dowty, D. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67: 547-619.
- Erteschik-Shir, N., and T. Rapoport 2010. Contact and other results. In M. Rappaport Hovav, E. Doron and I. Sichel (eds.), *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure*, 59-75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Filipović, L. 2007. *Talking about motion. A crosslinguistic investigation of lexicalization patterns*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fillmore, Ch. 1970. The grammar of hitting and breaking. In R.A. Jacobs and P.S. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar*, 120-133. Waltham, MA: Ginn.

⁸ As Tenny (1994: 102-105) points out, Dowty's account does not make clear which verbs serve as examples of any of the combination of the features proposed.

- Folli, R., and H. Harley 2006. On the licensing of causatives of directed motion: waltzing matilda all over. *Studia Linguistica* 60: 121-155.
- Geuder, W., and M. Weisgerber 2006. Manner and causation in movement verbs. In Ch. Ebert and C. Endriss (eds.), *Proceedings from "Sinn und Bedeutung 10"*, ZAS Papers in Linguistics 44, 125-137. Berlin.
- Goldberg, A. 1991. It can't go down the chimney up: path and the English resultative. *BLS* 17: 368-378.
- Hale, K., and S.J. Keyser 2002. *Prolegomenon to a theory of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kudrnáčová, N. 2006. The locative inversion construction and the character of the path. In R. Povolná and O. Dontcheva-Navrátilová (eds.), *Discourse and Interaction* 2, 89-96. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Kudrnáčová, N. 2008. *Directed motion at the syntax-semantics interface*. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Kudrnáčová, N. 2010. On factors barring the causativization of path verbs. In R.W. Wolny and M. Łodej (eds.), *Crosscurrents: studies in English linguistics*, 41-47. Kielce: Holy Cross University.
- Kudrnáčová, N. 2013. *Caused motion: secondary agent constructions*. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Kudrnáčová, N. 2014. *Transitive causative constructions with verbs of self-agentive locomotion*. Paper presented at the conference "Concept Types and Frames in Language, Cognition, and Science", University of Düsseldorf, August 25-27, 2014.
- Kuno, S., and K. Takami 2004. *Functional constraints in grammar: on the unergative-unaccusative distinction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Langacker, R.W. 1991. *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 2: Descriptive application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Levin, B. 1993. *English verb classes and alternations: a preliminary investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, B., and M. Rappaport Hovav 1992. The lexical semantics of verbs of motion: the perspective from unaccusativity. In I. M. Roca (ed.), *Thematic structure: its role in grammar*, 247-269. Berlin: Foris.
- Levin, B., and M. Rappaport Hovav 1995. *Unaccusativity: at the syntax-lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levin, B., and M. Rappaport Hovav 1999. Two structures for compositionally derived events. In T. Mathews and D. Strolovitch (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 9*, 199-223. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Markantonatou, S. 1999. Syntactic optionality and lexical semantics. The case of English manner of motion verbs. In L. Mereu (ed.), *Boundaries of morphology and syntax*, 271-290. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Matsumoto, Y. 1996. Subjective motion and English and Japanese verbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 7: 183-226.
- Miller, G.A., and P.N. Johnson-Laird 1976. *Language and perception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perlmutter, D.M. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *BLS* 4: 157-189.
- Perlmutter, D.M., and P. Postal 1984. The 1-advancement exclusiveness law. In D.M. Perlmutter and C. Rosen (eds.), *Studies in relational grammar* 2, 81-125. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Pinker, S. 1989. *Learnability and cognition: the acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Randall, J.H. 2010. *Linking: the geometry of argument structure*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rappaport Hovav, M., and B. Levin 1998. Building verb meanings. In M. Butt and W. Geuder (eds.), *The projection of arguments: lexical and compositional factors*, 97-134. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Rappaport Hovav, M., and B. Levin 2000. Classifying single argument verbs. In P. Coopmans, M. Everaert and J. Grimshaw (eds.), *Lexical specification and insertion*, 269-303. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rappaport Hovav, M., and B. Levin 2001. An event structure account of English resultatives. *Language* 77: 766-797.
- Rappaport Hovav, M., and B. Levin 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*, 49-70. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Ritter, E., and S.T. Rosen 1998. Delimiting events in syntax. In M. Butt and W. Geuder (eds.), *The projection of arguments: lexical and compositional factors*, 135-164. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Ritter, E., and S.T. Rosen 2000. Event structure and ergativity. In C. Tenny and J. Pustejovsky (eds.), *Events as grammatical objects*, 187-238. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Rosen, S.T. 1996. Events and verb classification. *Linguistics* 34: 191-223.
- Rothstein, S. 2004. *Structuring events: a study in the semantics of lexical aspect*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Simpson, J. 1983. Resultatives. In L.S. Levin, M. Rappaport and A. Zaenen (eds.), *Papers in lexical-functional grammar*, 143-157. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Sorace, A. 2004. Gradience at the lexicon–syntax interface: evidence from auxiliary selection and implications for unaccusativity. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou and M. Everaert (eds.), *The unaccusativity puzzle: explorations of the syntax-lexicon interface*, 243-268. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talmy, L. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description 3: grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 57-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tenny, C.L. 1994. *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Tubino Blanco, M. 2011. *Causatives in minimalism*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- van Hout, A. 2004. Unaccusativity as telicity checking. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou and M. Everaert (eds.), *The unaccusativity puzzle: explorations of the syntax-lexicon interface*, 60-83. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Valin, R.D. 1990. Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. *Language* 66: 221-260.
- Van Valin, R.D. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vendler, Z. 1957. Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review* 66: 143-160.
- Yasuhara, M. 2013. On eventuality per sub-event: an event-based account of argument structure. *Language Sciences* 40: 252-262.