

Unexpected and Innovative Uses of Constructions: Is There a Need to Supplement a Dictionary with Constructional Information?

by Juhani Rudanko, Department of English, University of Tampere

1. Introduction and Background

This article raises the question of whether it is desirable to supplement the word-based information given in a dictionary, including the *OED*, with construction-based information. The method is first to identify a particular grammatical construction in English, and to review some aspects of its treatment in the literature. The study then investigates the incidence of the construction in Late Modern English and the question of how the senses of some verbs selecting the construction have been represented in the *OED*. This is done with the help of authentic examples of usage from electronic corpora. The discussion raises the question of how to treat usages in recent English that are characterized by two properties: they are unexpected and innovative and at the same time they are also fully idiomatic and easily understood in their contexts of use.

Consider sentence (1), abbreviated from an authentic sentence in the BNC:

(1) ... I talked him into going to London ... (G07 2566)

In (1) the matrix verb *talk* selects three arguments. The first is the subject argument, realized by the NP *I*. The second is the direct object argument, realized by the NP *him*. The third is the oblique argument, realized by the PP *into going to London*, which consists of the preposition *into* and a sentential complement. It is assumed here, in accordance with current work in syntax, including Chomsky (1981), that the lower clause has its own understood subject. This assumption is well motivated for instance because of the need to represent the argument structure of the lower predicate in (1).

The direct object in the pattern of (1) receives a semantic role from the matrix verb, and the construction in question is therefore one of control. More specifically, the construction is one of object control. To characterize the semantic roles of the three arguments, Sag and Pollard (1991) proposed the labels Influence, Influenced and SOA (State of Affairs). These labels are appropriate, but the more traditional labels of Agent, Patient or Undergoer, and Goal may also be used.

To represent the syntactic structure of the pattern, the following representation may be used here:

(1') [[I]_{NP} [[talked]_{Verb} [him]_{NP} [[into]_{Prep} [[[PRO]_{NP} [going to
London]_{VP}]_{S2}]_{NP}]_{PP}]_{VP}]_{S1}

(1') makes use of the traditional notion of nominal clause in that the lower clause is represented as a sentence dominated by a NP node.

The pattern of (1') is here termed the transitive *into -ing* pattern. *Into -ing* complements may also be found in an intransitive pattern, as in (2):

(2) And two people didn't, I thought, drift into talking like that after

knowing each other for such a short time ... (BNC, BP9 1271)

Clearly the matrix verbs selecting the two patterns are not necessarily the same. The intransitive pattern of (2), which is one of subject control, deserves study, but is left for a later treatment.

In this connection consider also sentence (3):

- (3) Just as he once battled for supreme fitness, he has poured his energy into learning to speak again. (BNC, CBC)

In (3) the matrix verb selects a direct object, and from the point of view of argument structure, the pattern is superficially similar to (1). However, in (3) the direct object designates a resource at the disposal of the referent of the higher subject, and the pattern may be viewed as one of subject control. It can be set aside in the study of the object control pattern of (1).

The object may also sometimes be a reflexive, as in (4):

- (4) She had been tricking herself earlier into thinking that ... (BNC, H9H 2573)

Trick of course also easily permits non-reflexive direct objects, as in (5):

- (5) I could not prevent my father from tricking him into marrying me instead of Rachel. (BNC, HD6)

In view of the similarity of sentence (4), in respect of argument structure, to a sentence such as (5), it seems appropriate to include the reflexive pattern here.

Similarly, passive versions of the pattern of (1) are of course also included, as in (6):

- (6) Stuart had once been coerced by her into delivering food parcels for old people at Christmas ... (BNC, HDC 1449)

As regards the grammar of the transitive *into -ing* pattern, the semantic labels of the three arguments shed light on the interpretation of the pattern, but it is helpful to view the pattern as a type of the caused motion construction in the sense of Adele Goldberg's work. In this framework the matrix verb is the source of verb-specific participant role labels. For instance in the case of *coerce*, as in (6), these might be given as Coercer, Coercee and Content of Coercion. For their part, the semantic role labels Agent, Patient, and Goal designate the role labels of the construction, corresponding to the labels Influence, Influenced, and SOA (state of affairs, JR) argument in Sag and Pollard (1991, 66). The participant roles are then matched with or mapped onto the argument roles corresponding to them. Thus the Coercer participant role is naturally mapped onto the Agent argument role of the caused motion construction.

The analysis of the transitive *into -ing* pattern as a caused motion construction gains traction from verbs that are often used with two arguments only. For instance, consider *frighten*, which is found with the transitive *into -ing* pattern, as in (7a). The verb is also commonly found with a simple NP object, as in (7b):

- (7) a. 'Before I frightened you into running away from me.' (BNC, HH1 6357)
 b. "I'm sorry if I frightened you." (BNC, JY8)

When using the caused motion approach, it is possible to say that the verb retains its basic meaning of 'to throw into a fright; to terrify' (*OED*) even in (7a), and that the participant roles of the verb are Frightener and Frightened in both (7a) and (7b). What distinguishes (7a) from (7b) is that the former represents an instance of the caused motion construction, but the latter does not. In the caused motion construction the third argument, introduced by the spatial preposition *into*, is supplied by the construction. And what makes the constructional analysis insightful is the point made by Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004) that there are two subevents involved and the relation between the two subevents is not random but regular:

... the meaning of a resultative sentence contains two separable subevents. One of them, the VERBAL SUBEVENT, is determined by the verb of the sentence. The other subevent, the CONSTRUCTIONAL SUBEVENT, is determined by the construction. A resultative sentence means more than just the conjunction of the verbal subevent and the constructional subevent. . . . That is, for the bulk of cases . . . the verbal subevent is the MEANS by which the constructional subevent takes place. (Goldberg and Jackendoff 2004, 538)

In the quotation Goldberg and Jackendoff refer to resultatives, but in their usage this term is to be understood in a broad sense, and it also includes causatives such as the transitive *into -ing* construction. The third argument supplied by the caused motion construction in (7a) has the semantic role of Goal. Taking advantage of the caused motion construction, it is then possible to analyze the interpretation of sentence (7a) along the lines 'before I caused you to run away from me by means of frightening you'.

The caused motion analysis of the transitive *into -ing* pattern gains additional traction from a verb such as *talk*. This verb only assigns one participant role, Talker, and the other two roles of the caused motion construction are supplied by the construction. The interpretation of the resulting sentences is as expected. For instance, sentence (1) *I talked him into going to London* may be paraphrased 'I caused him to go to London by means of talking to you'.

The Goal argument of the transitive *into -ing* construction is introduced by the preposition *into*. *Into* is a spatial or locative preposition in a broad sense. Illustrating its use with a concrete NP complement or Landmark, as in *We got into the car*, Lindstromberg (1998, 30) observes that it "seems to give movement and result equal emphasis." It expresses the crossing of a boundary, and in a study that similarly focuses on concrete Landmarks, Tutton likewise observes that *into* gives prominence to the path followed by the moving entity, or Figure, in order to reach the goal (Tutton 2009, 19). In the transitive *into -ing* construction under discussion here, the Landmark, or the complement of *into*, is an *-ing* clause, and it designates an action or a state that is more abstract in nature than an NP like *the car*, but the construction still gives prominence to both the movement, or the path, of the Figure and to the resulting end point of the movement.

One purpose of this study is to investigate whether the hypothesis that the

transitive *into -ing* pattern is a caused motion construction receives support from English usage in the last three centuries. Another purpose is to examine the way the causative uses of verbs selecting the transitive *into -ing* construction have been represented in the *OED*, and the question is raised whether such representations need to be supplemented with constructional information.

The data of this study, in the main, come from three electronic corpora. For the earlier history of the construction in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Corpus of Late modern English Texts Extended Version CLMETEV is consulted. This is a corpus of some fifteen million words, compiled by Hendrik de Smet at the Catholic University of Leuven. The corpus runs into the early twentieth century. For present-day English, the British National Corpus, the BNC, and the Corpus of Contemporary American English, COCA, are examined, with two specific search strings. The electronic corpora are not directly comparable with each from the point of view of text type. However, the focus of this study is on the system of the English lexicon and the way it is represented in a dictionary, rather than on the investigation of British and American English or of particular text types *per se*, and it therefore seems possible to use data from these two regional varieties in this fashion to shed light on the system of the lexicon and the syntax-semantics interface.

2. A Diachronic Survey of the Transitive *Into -Ing* Construction and of the Treatment of the Verbs Selecting It

Turning to the recent history of the transitive *into -ing* construction, the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts Extended Version, CLMETEV, is used here as the source of data to examine the recent history of the construction. As Hendrik de Smet, the compiler of the corpus has acknowledged, the corpus is not a perfect database, for one thing because of the predominance of male authors, but it has two major advantages. First, at about 15 million words, it is relatively large. Second, it is chronologically structured into three parts, and this makes it possible to investigate the construction in the course of the time period covered. (For a discussion of the corpus, see de Smet 2004.)

The first subcorpus covers the period 1710 till 1780, and is 3.0 million words in size. The MonoConc program was used to retrieve data, and the search string adopted was “into *ing.” Insertions between *into* and the following *-ing* form of the construction can be assumed to be rare, and the search string seems appropriate from the point of view of recall. From the point of view of precision, the search string retrieves a number of irrelevant tokens. Two illustrations are given in (8a-b):

- (8) a. ... those gowns may be altered into something of a plainer cut ...
 (1766, Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*)
 b. We are going into mourning foe the Queen of Sweden ... (1717,
 Walpole, *Letters*)

However, the numbers of irrelevant tokens are not excessive, and the search string is appropriate even from the point of view of precision.

The search of the first part of CLMETEV only yields two tokens of the transitive *into -ing* construction. These are given in (9a-b):

- (9) a. I do not wonder my niece was frightened and terrified into taking

this measure, ... (1749, Fielding, *Tom Jones*)

b. The wisest men can deceive themselves into feeling the distresses of a tragedy, ... (1751, Fielding, *Amelia*)

The sentences of (9a-b) are amenable to the analysis of the transitive *into -ing* pattern as a construction. The verbs *terrify* – to analyze the second of the matrix verbs coordinated in (9a) -- and *deceive* prototypically occur with two participant roles, as in (10a) and (10b):

- (10) a. I say this, my lord, not to terrify your lordship. (1783-4, Godwin, *Four Early Pamphlets*)
 b. It thought it impossible you could deceive me. (1823, Hazlitt, *Liber Amoris*)

In (9a-b) the participant roles are matched with the Agent and Patient argument roles of the caused motion construction, and the third a role is supplied by the construction. As regards (9a) with *terrify*, for instance, it might be simplified here into the active *Somebody terrified my niece into taking this measure* for ease of exposition. The ordinary meaning of *terrify*, with two arguments, is ‘to make much afraid, to fill with terror, to frighten or alarm greatly’ (*OED*, sense 1), and the causative meaning is accommodated under a separate sense in the *OED* ‘to drive *from, out of, into*, etc. by terrifying’ (*OED*, sense 1.b). Adopting the analysis of the transitive *into -ing* pattern as a construction, it is also possible to say here that part of the meaning of the simplified sentence is ‘somebody caused my niece to take this measure by means of making her much afraid’. The *by* phrase in the definition of the sense in the *OED* echoes the adjunct of means introduced by *by* in the paraphrase.

Turning to the second part of the corpus, a much larger number of tokens are found. When the pattern is viewed as a construction, semantic classes can be established on the basis of the nature of the verbal subevent. Here are the higher verbs with their frequencies, grouped into semantic classes:

The referent of NP₁ causes the referent of NP₀ to perform the action, or move into the state of affairs, expressed by S₂

by means of deception: *betray, cheat, deceive* (2), *delude*,

by means of bullying, fear or terror: *bully* (3), *frighten* (3), *terrify* (2)

by means of verbal persuasion: *flatter, talk, wheedle*

by means of force or pressure: *draw, force*

by other means: *laugh, provoke, sentimentalize, shame, surprise, tease*

There are thus 18 verb types and the number of tokens is 24. This represents a dramatic increase in comparison with the first part of the corpus, and represents a normalized frequency of 4.1 per million words.

Most of the verbs listed are of the type of *frighten*, reviewed above, in that they frequently occur with two arguments. For instance, *deceive* and *bully* are of this type. When they are found with the transitive *into -ing* construction, the construction supplies the third Goal argument, as in (11a-b):

- (11) a. The rash and impassioned young man, deceived into believing that

that his ward was wholly at his disposal, readily advanced the money ... (1782, Burney, *Cecilia*)

b. ... she had employed this person (whoever he was) to bully him into marrying her. (1848, Gaskell, *Mary Barton*)

In the *OED* the ordinary sense of *bully*, which is found when the verb is used with two arguments, is given as ‘to act the bully towards; to treat in an overbearing manner; to intimidate, overawe’ (*OED*, sense 1). An illustration of this sense is given in (12):

- (12) He saw, that he had no chance of bullying the servant. (1802, *OED*, M. Edgeworth, *Moral T.*)

The *OED* also takes note of the causative use of *bully* by recognizing a separate sense for it, which is given as ‘to drive or force by bullying; to frighten *into* a certain course; with *away, into, out of, to*’ (*OED*, sense 2). The separate entry testifies to the c nature of the *OED*, and also points to the established and conventionalized status of the causative use of the verb. It is noteworthy how closely the definition of the sense parallels the Goldberg-Jackendoff analysis because of the *by* phrase in it.

The most interesting verbs are probably *laugh* and *sentimentalize*. Here are the tokens:

- (13) a. Do not be laughed into doing that which you know to be wrong. (1837, Disraeli, *Venetia*)
 b. Let not members of Parliament be lectured and sentimentalized into voting for such a law, ... (1839, Norton, *A Plain Letter to the Lord Chancellor*)

Laugh has a basic intransitive use with a sense that is defined in the *OED* as follows:

intr. to manifest the combination of bodily phenomena (spasmodic utterance of inarticulate sounds, facial distortions, shaking of sides, etc.) which forms the instinctive expression of mirth or of sense of something ludicrous, and which can also be occasioned by certain physical sensations, esp. that produced by tickling. (*OED*, s.v., sense 1.a)

In a somewhat similar way, *sentimentalize* is used intransitively with the sense ‘to indulge in sentimental thoughts or expressions’ (*OED*, s.v., sense 1.a). However, both of these verbs are also recognized in resultative uses in the *OED*. The gloss in question for *laugh* is ‘bring into a given state or position by laughing; esp. persuade (a person) out of a belief, a solemn mood, etc., by laughter or mockery’ (*Shorter OED*) or ‘to produce a specified effect upon (a person) by laughing’ (*OED*, sense 6), and that for *sentimentalize* is ‘bring *into* or *out of* a condition by the expression of sentiment’ (*Shorter OED*). The caused motion analysis of the constructions in question captures the similarity of the glosses, including the instrumentality expressed by the *by* phrases in them. The glosses, referring the notions of “*into* or *out of* a condition,” also feature the idea of movement into (or out of) an abstract space that is relevant to the construction.

Turning to the third part of the corpus, the analysis of the pattern as a type of

caused motion construction is maintained, with the verbal subevent linked to the means by which the constructional subevent is brought about. The following verbs, grouped into semantic classes, are found with the pattern in the third part of the corpus.

The referent of NP₁ causes the referent of NP₀ to perform the action, or move into the state of affairs, expressed by S₂

by means of deception or trickery: *betray* (3), *fool*, *delude* (2), *deceive*, *entrap*, *trick* (2)

by means of bullying, fear or terror: *frighten* (6), *intimidate*, *scare*, *shock*

by means of verbal persuasion: *cajole*, *coax* (2), *talk*, *wheedle*

by means of force or pressure: *drag*, *draw*, *force*, *goad*, *harass*, *hurry*, *sting*, *torture*

by other means: *bribe*, *exasperate*, *idealize*, *irritate*, *lead* (2), *lure* (2), *rouse*, *seduce*, *soothe*, *tick*

There are 32 verb types, and the number of tokens is 44. The normalized frequency of the pattern has thus risen to 7.3 per million.

The most interesting token from the point of view of the caused motion analysis of the pattern is probably the verb *idealize*. Here is the token:

- (14) ... and prone to idealise everyone into being his superior except those who were obviously a good deal beneath him. (1903, Butler, *The Way of All Flesh*)

Among the glosses in the *OED* is the gloss 'to represent in an ideal form or character' and a construction grammar analysis offers a paraphrase of part of the meaning of sentence (14) along the lines 'prone to cause everyone to be his superior (in his thoughts) by means of representing them in an ideal form or character'.

Turning to the BNC, two search strings were employed for the purposes of the present study. These were "into thinking" and "into doing," with these lower verbs representing two different kinds of verbs, in that think often selects subjects with the semantic role of Experiencer and do often selects Agents. The two search strings are limited to two lower verbs and cannot therefore be expected to retrieve a comprehensive list of relevant matrix verbs that select the construction. An alternative search string of the type "into [v?g*]" with "[vv*]" within four words to the left was also considered and pilot studies were conducted using it, but this search string set aside for the reason given below. (In this search string symbol "[v?g*]" stands for the *-ing* form of a verb and the symbol "[vv*]" stands for a lexical verb.)

The search strings produced 145 hits for *into thinking* and 59 hits for *into doing*. There were a handful of tokens that were irrelevant, as in (13):

- (13) And so, they're putting all the effort into doing it. (KCH)

However, the huge majority of the hits were of the relevant type.

Among the tokens retrieved, there were again two types of innovative usage. First, there were uses of verbs established independently in the language but not featured with the causative construction in the *OED*. Here are illustrations:

- (14) a. The possibility of using animals in scientific education and research is, however, dominated by esoteric debate to the extent that the average reader is easily overawed into thinking that there is no room for non-specialist opinion which is other than rattle-brained (of which there is no lack). (CRV)
 b. ... if you are so well able to fascinate the old lady into thinking you indispensable to her comfort!” (HGV)
 c. ...a particularly beautiful final tribute to Barrett from the band he once used to lead, even though it confuses you into thinking he has passed on. (CK6)

The verbs *overawe*, *fascinate*, and *confuse* are of course established verbs in the language, but the causative uses are not featured in the *OED*. The caused motion analysis of the transitive *into -ing* pattern provides a handy way for interpreting the usages in question. From a syntactic point of view, it may be noted that all three verbs are normally found with two arguments when carrying their ordinary senses, and in the case of the sentences of (14a-c) the caused motion construction then supplies the third argument role, that of Goal. As far as semantic interpretation is concerned, the Goldberg-Jackendoff analysis again proves helpful. For instance, using (14c) for the purpose of illustration, the ordinary sense of the verb *confuse*, when used with two arguments, is ‘to distract, perplex, bewilder’ (*OED*, part of sense 2). The analysis based on the notions of constructional and verbal subevent and the specific relation between them then makes it possible to say that part of the meaning of sentence (14c) is along the lines of ‘it causes you to think he has passed on by means of perplexing you’.

The other type of unexpected or innovative usage is of the type where is no entry for such a verb in the *OED*. Only one token of this type is found among the data retrieved, but it is still of interest as a coinage that is both unexpected and idiomatic. Consider sentence (15):

- (15) Jennie did not realize the purpose of the mirrors and would shout, ‘Don’t be looking at yerself, don’t be admiring yerself in the mirror.’ If the Girls were Tillerized into thinking of nothing but the Tiller organization, so was Jennie. (BNC, B34)

The token of (15) is of methodological interest, because it cannot be retrieved with the search string “into [v?g*].” One may speculate that the search string based on the tag of the higher verb fails in this case precisely because of the innovative nature of the usage in question. In any event, the token should be considered, which was the reason for employing the search string that did not limit the search on the basis of the tag of the matrix verb.

The verb *Tillerize*, as used in (15), is obviously based on the proper name *Tiller*, as in *the Tiller organization*, and a paraphrase supplied by the construction grammar approach is on the lines of ‘if the girls were moved into thinking of nothing but the Tiller organization as if by a method characteristic of the Tiller organization’ (Rudanko 2000, 82). Even though most speakers of English have probably never heard the word, they have no difficulty in understanding the usage in its context, taking the contribution of the transitive *into -ing* construction into account. This testifies to the salience of constructional information in understanding novel utterances. As far as the status of the transitive *into -ing* construction in current

English is concerned, an unexpected and novel usage of the type of (15) highlights the productivity of the construction as an important part of the system of English predicate complementation.

Turning to COCA, the corpus is huge in size at approximately 400 million words, and the size, in addition to the more qualitative consideration brought up in the case of *Tillerize*, makes it desirable in this study to adopt the word-based search strings that were employed for the BNC. In this case, the search string “into thinking” produced as many as 635 hits, and the search string “into doing” produced 318 hits. The huge majority of these are relevant, but there are some thirty that are not, most of these having been retrieved by the search string “into doing.” Here are some illustrations of irrelevant tokens:

16.
 - a. But there has been a leap into thinking that vitamins and minerals can prevent anything form fatigue to cancer ... (2009, News)
 - b. ... I think they are so into doing those big disaster programs at the moment that I would like to have a movie ... (1998, SPOK)
 - c. You have to learn how to allocate those hours into doing something productive. (1998, NEWS)

As far as innovative and unexpected usages involving the transitive *into -ing* pattern among the tokens are concerned, there do not appear to be any of the type of *Tillerize*, which are not conventionalized verbs. However, there are matrix verbs found with the caused motion construction that are not featured with the pattern in the *OED*. Here are illustrations:

17.
 - a. ... an entry-level computer aimed at grandparents and switchers (PC users migrating to the Mac) has ignited the geek community into thinking outside the 6.5-square-inch box. (2005, MAG)
 - b. These things desensitize you into thinking that violence is okay, and that it is a normal, everyday thing. (2004, NEWS)
 - c. It would be an injustice for a person in my position to sugar-coat such issues or tranquilize an audience into thinking that all is okay when, in my professional judgment, we need to be mobilizing the workforce to get the system back into working order. (2003 ACAD)

From a syntactic point of view the three verbs *ignite*, *desensitize*, and *tranquillize* are generally found with two arguments, outside of the transitive *into -ing* pattern. For instance, for the verb *ignite* the *OED* has an entry “2. In popular use: To set fire to, to kindle,” and illustrations include *Half a box of matches was consumed in the effort to ignite it [a lamp]* (1860, J. Tyndall, *Glaciers of Alps*). And for *tranquillize*, which may also be spelled as *tranquilize*, the *OED* has an entry “1. To render tranquil; to calm, soothe,” illustrated for instance with *A cigar which he lighted for the purpose tranquilized him* (1860, J. Tyndall, *Glaciers of Alps*). In both of these illustrations from the *OED* the verbs select two arguments. By contrast, in the sentences of (17a-c) the caused motion construction supplies the Goal role. As far as semantic interpretation is concerned, the analysis of the pattern as a type of the caused motion construction is again helpful. To use *desensitize* as an illustration, the normal sense of the verb, when the verb is used with two arguments, is ‘to reduce or eliminate the sensitivity of’ (*OED*, s.v.). In the case of (17b), there again two

subevents involved, and part of the meaning of (17b) is along the lines of ‘these things cause you to think that violence is okay ... by means of reducing or eliminating your sensitivity’. This type of paraphrase is obtained from the Goldberg-Jackendoff analysis of the caused motion construction.

4. Conclusion

The present study argues that the recent history of the transitive *into -ing* pattern supports the hypothesis, put forward on the basis of current English, that the pattern should be seen as a type of the caused motion construction. Verbs such as *frighten* commonly select two arguments, and when they occur with the *into -ing* pattern, the caused motion construction supplies the third argument. The argument for the caused motion construction analysis is strengthened by the specific interpretation of the construction, where it is possible to identify a constructional subevent and a verbal subevent and a regular relationship between the two.

Viewing the transitive as a type of the caused motion construction, the present study investigated a number of electronic corpora to explore unexpected or innovative usages involving the construction. The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts provided the basis of a historical survey. For present-day English, the BNC and COCA were examined, even if only in part.

The present study testifies to the vitality of the transitive *into -ing* pattern. With the exception of the first part of the CLMETEV, large numbers of tokens of the pattern were found in the electronic corpora considered, and among them there were invariably tokens that were innovative or unexpected. The present study further testifies to the comprehensive nature of the *OED*. Quite often the *OED* contained senses for matrix verbs that explicitly recognized the causative usage. For instance, the verb *laugh* was encountered in a causative use in the second part of the CLMETEV *Do not be laughed into doing that which you know to be wrong* (Disraeli), and the *OED* has an entry with the sense ‘bring into a given state or position by laughing’. It may be noted that the specific entry in the *OED* dovetails with the caused motion analysis of the verb in that the relation of means is expressed by the *by* phrase in the entry.

When the BNC and COCA, were reviewed, two types of innovative usages emerged. The first type concerned verbs that are established verbs in the language, but are not recognized with the transitive *into -ing* pattern in the *OED*. Such verbs include for instance *idealize*, *ignite* and *desensitize*. It was observed that verbs of this type were likely to have ‘‘ordinary’’ uses with two arguments, and when used in the caused motions construction, the construction supplied the third argument.

The second type of innovative usages concerned verbs for which there is no entry in the *OED*. *Tillerize*, from the BNC, is of this type. The usage represents a conversion, with a verbal affix added, from the noun *Tiller*.

Regarding the question of whether the two types of unexpected or innovative usages should be represented in the *OED*, no definitive answer is offered here. The practice of including causative senses for verbs that are attested in the language, as in the case of *bully*, is sensible and motivated for instance by the needs of foreign learners of the language. In the case of established words that are found with the caused motion construction in the language, but are not recorded with it in the *OED*, it will be easy enough to add causative senses, and there would seem to be no downside to doing that. The addition of such senses also gives the usage a more

conventionalized status. Alternatively, an authoritative dictionary might be supplemented with constructional information, perhaps in an appendix. As far as tokens of the type of *Tillerize* are concerned, the case is the strongest for supplementing the dictionary proper with some constructional information. In the light of the searches in COCA, it is possible to surmise that such tokens are rare. At the same time, it would seem that no dictionary can ever hope to record all unexpected usages of proper names in the case of patterns that are highly productive in English today, as is the transitive *into -ing* pattern. As a consequence, there may be a case for including some constructional information relating to productive patterns in a dictionary.

Acknowledgement. The author is indebted to Ian Gurney for his comments (private communication) on the meaning of the transitive *into -ing* construction.

References

- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.
- De Smet, Hendrik. 2005. A Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, *ICAME Journal* 29, 69-82.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. and Ray Jackendoff. 2004. The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions. *Language* 80, 532-568.
- Lindstromberg, Seth. 1998. *English Prepositions Explained*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- OED = The Oxford English Dictionary*. 1989. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Postal, Paul. 1974. *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and Its Theoretical Implications*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 1989. *Complementation and Case Grammar: A Syntactic and Semantic Study of Selected Patterns of Complementation in Present-Day English*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 2000. *Corpora and Complementation*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 2010. Explaining Grammatical Variation and Change: a Case Study of Complementation in American English over Three Decades. *Journal of English Linguistics* 38, 4-24.
- Sag, Ivan and Carl Pollard. 1991. An Integrated Theory of Complement Control. *Language* 67, 63-113.
- Shorter OED = The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*. 1993. Edited by Leslie Brown. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, Michael and Joyce Escobedo. 2001. The Semantics of *To*-Infinitival vs. *-Ing* Complement Constructions in English, in Mary Andronis et al. eds., *Chicago Linguistic Society CLS 37: The Main Session*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Tutton, Mark. 2009. When *In* Means *Into*: Towards an Understanding of Boundary-Crossing. *Journal of English Linguistics* 37, 5-27.