

1. Nicole quickly solidified the gum with ice.

“solidify” a) **Causative accomplishment**

b) **do'** (x, ∅) CAUSE [**do'** (y, ∅)] CAUSE[BECOME **solidified'**(z)]

c) < _{IF}DEC < _{TNS}PAST < _{ASP}SIMP **do'** (Nicole, ∅) CAUSE [[**do'** (ice, ∅) CAUSE [**quick'** (BECOME **solidified'** (gum)>>>

d) x = effector (or could be “user”) = 1st arg of do' (x...
y = implement = 2nd arg of pred' (x, y)
z = theme (or entity, or patient) = arg of state (pred'(x), therefore...

e) x = Actor (Nicole)
z = Undergoer (gum)
y = Instrument (ice) (non-argument, non-macrorole)

Tests

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Progressive	Dynamic	Duration	for-PP	in-PP	Stative modifier	Cause
yes	no	yes	irrel	yes	yes	yes

1) COCA contains less than a dozen examples of the verb “solidify” being used in the progressive, and although the examples are more figurative rather than literal, they are being applied to make a vague or nebulous subject into something not so vague—so the meaning works. So in this example, what’s being “solidified” is “Mitt Romney’s status as frontrunner.

With Sarah Palin still on the sidelines, Mitt Romney **is solidifying** his status as the frontrunner for the 2012 Republican presidential nomination.

2) No examples in COCA which doesn’t seem surprising since “vigorously solidify” or “solidify vigorously” seem like oxymorons in that the verb “solidify” has the sense of a process whereby a liquid (or soft) substance becomes firm, so the nature of the process itself seems contrary to notions of dynamism, like ‘vigorously’ and ‘actively.’

3) COCA provides a single example in which “solidify” is being modified by a pace adverb, and the example itself includes the adverb (although it could be argued that ‘quickly’ is modifying Nicole and how she performed the action rather than the speed of the ‘solidification’ itself). Even so, this can be given a “yes,” since the process is not instantaneous—the verb could be considered the converse of “melt” (which has duration)—so this test is not really necessary.

Recordings and videos can **quickly solidify** the style, feel, and musical expression of conjunto music.

4) “Solidify” describes a change of state that I think takes place over a period of time, so it is inherently [+duration] which makes this test irrelevant.

5) Although I could not find any examples in COCA, the notion of “solidify” seems to contain an inherent endpoint after which the object undergoing the process has changed state—from being less solid to being more solid, whether literally or figuratively. Therefore, this should be a ‘yes.’

6) In addition to “the solidified gum” which is acceptable, here’s an example from COCA that works well:

Deep pools of **solidified** lavas conceal the central peak of Archimedes.

7) I think the verb “solidify” has an inherent causative notion since whatever becomes solidified would be functioning as the Undergoer, and so an instrument, force, or something else is required to cause the solidifying. In the example sentence we have Nicole as the Actor, ice as a possible instrument (not sure yet), with the state of the gum changing as a result of the action Nicole took. A paraphrase does not result in additional arguments:

“Nicole quickly used ice to cause the gum to become solidified.”

“Nicole used ice to cause the gum to solidify quickly.”

2. Long ago, Antonio may have articulated his worries to his parents.

“articulate” a) **Active accomplishment**

Causative active accomplishment

b) **do’** (x, [**express’** (x, (y))]) & INGR **know’** (z, x)

do’ (x, [**express’** (x, y)] CAUSE[BECOME **know’** (y, z)])

c) This sentence seems really tricky for a couple of reasons. The epistemic status operator (“may”) in this sentence makes me question whether this sentence could be an **active accomplishment** rather than a **causative active accomplishment**: if Antonio did not in fact articulate his worries (he only “may have”), then his parents cannot be construed as now knowing the worries, true? So for one reading, I might eliminate the “CAUSE”-al interpretation, and leave this as an active accomplishment. (I was tempted to make this simply an activity, since “his worries” is a mass concept, and without additional modification, such as “his worries about school,” could mean that this was an ongoing **activity**, something he may have done more than once, for various lengths of time and on numerous occasions, albeit “long ago,” which might refer to “during his elementary, middle-, and high-school years,” therefore, rather than being an active accomplishment during that period, the verb would be considered to have been an “activity”—but since he articulated to a specific target (his parents), and since we know that the activity is now over, I think it’s most likely a causative active accomplishment, with this semantic representation:

long ago’<_{IF}DEC <_{TNS} PAST _{STA} EPIS _{ASP} PERF **do’** (Antonio, [**express’** (Antonio, his worries)]) CAUSE BECOME **know’** (his worries, his parents)>>>

d) x = speaker = 1st arg of do’ (x, ...) = Actor

y = content, or theme, or possessed entity (Antonio’s worries are inalienable possessions? so is he considered ‘experiencer’ and his worries would be ‘stimulus’? whether stimulus, content, theme, the thematic relation of this argument is = 2nd arg of pred’ (x, y)

z = target, hearer = 2nd arg of pred (x, y) ?? or are his parents perceiver?? = 1st arg of pred’ (x, y)

- e) x = Actor = Antonio
 y = Undergoer = his worries
 z = non-macrorole, his parents

Tests

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Progressive	Dynamic	Duration	for-PP	in-PP	Stative modifier	Cause
yes	yes*	yes	yes	no	no	no

1) The verb ‘articulate’ is like a verb of speaking, saying, telling, communicating. It’s an activity that can go on forever, and works with the progressive:

I think the message the film **is articulating** is more important than the film itself.

What Blair **is articulating** is not paranoia toward the press but a sense of the isolation of leftist leaders

2) I wouldn’t think that verbs of saying are “dynamic,” but COCA does provide some examples. In this case, it seems impossible to use this test without a controlling agent involved, since the speaker is the one performing the action, he or she can do that “vigorously”—so this test should be a ‘yes.’

At every opportunity, plaintiffs ought to **articulate vigorously** their own version of an area's past so that the final decision does not

3) The verb can occur with pace adverbs, although these examples are both specifically using the verb articulate in its actual, physical sense—articulation in the sense of the physical properties of speech production. The example sentence “.. Antonio may have articulated his worries...” is using the verb in a more figurative sense, meaning, generally, “communicated,” so ... I’m not sure if this passes or fails this particular test, really.

A significant fraction of maximum tongue strength may be used in normal speech to **articulate quickly** and accurately.

He **articulated slowly** and distinctly, leaving no chance for misinterpretation.

4) No examples from COCA of “articulate” as something that can occur *for-* a period of time, but in the context of the example sentence, I think that (similar to other communication-related verbs), articulate has duration, and is an activity that can occur for a specified period of time. The example sentence could be thought of as meeting this test, since the “long ago” implies duration?

5) No examples from COCA of “articulate” as being an activity that occurs within a specific period of time. In the example sentence, the “long ago” mentioned doesn’t imply an endpoint. Also, if we add the “in an instant” to the sentence, it sounds odd.

6) The stative modified “articulated” works with things like “keyboard” and other things, but I think that this stative form is based on an intransitive meaning of the verb based on anatomy (per the American Heritage Dictionary), “to form a joint; be jointed.” So this is a completely different sense doesn’t apply. For an “activity,” this test should yield a ‘no’ but for an active accomplishment, it should be ‘yes.’ I think that “his articulated worries” sounds odd. My inability to neatly meet these tests is one of the reasons I’m not able to decide if this sentence is strictly an “activity” or an ‘active accomplishment,’ which is perhaps the point—the ambiguity forces us to provide two different LSs.

3. Will Kelli have written the poem before November?

- “write” a) **Active accomplishment**
 b) **do'** ([x, [write' (x, y)]) & INGR exist' (y)

c) $_{IF/INT} <_{TNS} FUT <_{ASP} PERF < do' (Kelli, [write' (Kelli, poem)] & INGR before.november' <exist'(poem)>>>>$

For this sentence, since the poem is the artifact that's created by the writing activity, its existence is what's important with respect to timeframe, hence the location of “before november” in this LS above. Also, as an activity we can assume that the writing will take place at various times over the course of time, and may continue beyond November if the poem is not complete.

d) x = creator = 1st arg of do' (x, ... = Actor
 y = creation or content = 2nd arg of pred' (x, y) = Undergoer = poem

e) x = Actor (Kelli)
 y = Undergoer (poem)
 As an activity, doesn't “write” require only one macro-role, an Actor? But this sentence, as an active accomplishment, has two macro-roles, as noted above.

Tests

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Progressive	Dynamic	Duration	for-PP	in-PP	Stative modifier	Cause
yes	no	yes	yes (irrel)	no	yes	no

1) COCA provides close to two-dozen instances of “write” in the progressive, as in this example:

All this time the Poet **is writing** furiously, and after he finishes, he begins to recite the poem.

2) Many of the examples that seemed to emerge in COCA for this test seem to be more used as pace adverbs, such as in “writing furiously” or “writing feverishly”—the act of writing does not seem to be something that can take a dynamic adverb like “vigorously” or “actively,” so this should be a ‘no.’

3) Several examples, including these

He put his finger in the dead girl's blood, then walked over to the wall, **writing quickly** so he could finish while the blood was still wet and glistening.

We see the reporter **writing quickly**. Dorothea snaps more pictures.

A middle-aged woman stood behind the counter, **writing quickly** across pink receipts.

4) COCA provided several examples of writing in a durational context.

I **wrote for** six months, it was terrible!

All the same, I slipped in front of the word processor and **wrote for** an hour or so. It went pretty well, as I remember.

Dimitri **wrote for** twenty minutes or so, telling Akakios little of this...

All those reports he **wrote for** years while in Mexico and then later running the Camarena case, those detailed reports...

5) COCA yielded zero examples of this verb being used in the sense of having an inherent endpoint, which provides evidence that the verb “write” is an activity, and has no inherent endpoint. In the case of this example sentence, however, the endpoint of the writing will (theoretically) be a poem, so the endpoint will occur when that poem is complete.

4. Ming-Sum had almost certainly remained in the shed for days.

“remain” a) **State**

b) **be-LOC'** (x, y)

c) < _{IF}DEC < _{TNS}PAST < _{ASP}SIMP < _{STA}EPIS **almost.certain'** (**be-in'** (for days' [shed, Ming-Sum])>>>>

d) x = location = 1st arg of pred'(x,y)= shed;

y = theme = 2nd arg of pred' (x, y) = Ming-Sum

e) In this example, there's only a single macro-role, the Undergoer (Ming-Sum), since this seems to be a “state verb of pure location.” (I'm not sure if I should have used **be-in'** (y, x) [MR1] or **be-LOC'** (x, y) [MR1], and I also see that the x and y are reversed in these two -- does it make a difference?)

Tests

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Progressive	Dynamic	Duration	for-PP	in-PP	Stative modifier	Cause
no*	no	no	yes	no	no	no

1) Although stative verbs normally should register “no” on the progressive test, I think that “remain” falls into the category that Van Valin tells us Carlson calls “‘stage-level predicates’ ... like sit, stand, and lie ... which ‘depict a situation which is not necessarily permanent,’ and in such circumstances, the progressive is possible”—which may explain why COCA does provide some examples (but only 7, total) of “remain” in the progressive. As with Ming-Sum’s location in the example sentence, these are not necessarily permanent states either, so the progressive is acceptable.

Olsen **is remaining** on until a replacement is hired.

I think the Bush administration **is remaining** true to American economic principles.

Hillary Rodham Clinton, whose stand-by-her-man declarations have helped rescue her husband before, **is remaining** silent despite quiet pressure from some Democratic loyalists for her to speak out.

2) COCA yields zero results for the dynamic test (remain[s] vigorously, actively, and so on). The few instances of “remain vigorously” that emerge are discounted because the adverb is modifying an embedded clause. So this test is a “no.”

...the graying of baby boomers, how it represents a cultural shift as people **remain vigorously** active into their 50s and 60s - a break from parochial attitudes about aging.

It might have been hoped that we had learned our lesson, and would **remain vigorously** engaged in (at a minimum) Europe and Asia.

3) COCA yields zero examples for this use, so the result of this test is also “no.”

4) All examples in COCA involve temporal duration but without an inherent beginning or terminal point, so this test is a 'yes.' Plus, the example itself demonstrates using the verb with 'for three days.'

Scars will **remain for** the rest of his life, and according to insiders, he will remain in [the hospital...]

Friendship can come about in half an hour and still **remain for** a lifetime.

Prints will **remain for** a long time in paths and roadways that were wet when a coyote walked along them.

5) The only examples from COCA involve PP of location or status ("remain in power"), not "in-" with a temporal endpoint, so this fails the "in an hour" test.

6) This test makes no sense to me in this context. It's supposed to be used to distinguish semelfactives from achievements, though, so I'm not sure it should be applied to this sentence at all.

7) The causative test cannot be applied properly to this sentence, since an additional argument would have to be provided for a paraphrase.

5. Lucas accidentally demonstrated the tricks to the audience.

"demonstrate" a) **Causative active accomplishment**

b) [**do'** (x, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **see'** (y, z)]

c) <_{IF}DEC <_{TNS}PAST <_{ASP}SIMP <**accident'** ([**do'** (Lucas, Ø)]) CAUSE [BECOME **see'** (the audience, the tricks)]>>>>

d) x = performer (or, effector, or speaker) = 1st arg of do' (x,... = Actor = Lucas;

y = 1st arg of pred'(x, y) = perceiver, experiencer = the audience;

z = 2nd arg of pred'(x, y) = theme, stimulus, performance = the tricks;

e) x= Actor ("Lucas"; z=Undergoer ("the tricks") therefore, z = Undergoer)

Tests

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Progressive	Dynamic	Duration	for-PP	in-PP	Stative modifier	Cause
yes	yes?	yes	yes (irrel)	no	yes	yes?

1) The verb demonstrate in some senses seems similar to "show" or possibly instruct, guide. It has a dynamic rather than stative quality, and COCA provides many examples of it being used in the progressive:

Like many new technologies, Thide's first thermolytic unit **is demonstrating** its capabilities far from where it was developed.

As Korea demonstrated 30 years ago and Thailand **is demonstrating** now, brand-new technology-is available, as a rule, quite cheaply on the open...

For once the United States Postal Service **is demonstrating** its marketing skills, [with the release of the Elvis stamp.]

Digital Equipment Corp. **is demonstrating** a prototype of a system that retrieves X-ray and other images from a databank.

Today, our country **is demonstrating** leadership.

2) Although I found no examples of demonstrate in conjunction with dynamic adverbs, it seems like it is acceptable. When you go through a store and see salespeople demonstrating products, they can vary the tempo, the delivery, and so forth, providing a dynamic demonstration. But does this apply?

Also, I think demonstrate implies learning on the part of the person viewing the demonstration.

3) COCA provided about a dozen instances of “quickly demonstrated,” as in these:

Being elected Democratic majority whip in 1961, Humphrey **quickly demonstrated** that he knew how to capitalize on his new proximity to power.

The Obama administration **quickly demonstrated** its solidarity with the victims of the disasters by emphasizing multilateral cooperation in its participation....

Ping **quickly demonstrated** a gift for applications, for crystallizing arcane theory into a range of viable products.

Both the House and the Senate **quickly demonstrated** their willingness to approve the new department as an important part of the president's...

Your students will **quickly demonstrate** their level of hand coordination.

These examples all seem to have in common, though, that what's being “demonstrated” is an attribute of the Actor involved, so the sense is different than that of “showing” an Undergoer to a third party.

4) Demonstrate as an activity that can be done “for –” a specific timeframe sounds odd. He demonstrated the tricks for an hour.” He spent an hour demonstrating??

5) Although I couldn't find examples in COCA for “demonstrate in an hour” or other time period, it seems acceptable. “She demonstrated all the features of the new computer in an hour.”

6) COCA has well over 500 different examples of “demonstrate” as a stative modifier, such as these:

demonstrated ability, demonstrated leadership, demonstrated need, demonstrated commitment, demonstrated effectiveness, demonstrated reliability, demonstrated interest, demonstrated success...