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1. Introduction

What is possible or impossible for the meaning of linguistic expressions is a fundamental question in semantics (see e.g., the issue of manner/result complementarity1) in Rappaport
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1) Rappaport Hovav & Levin (2010) argued that result and manner cannot be entailed in the meaning of a non-stative verb at the same time: e.g., break includes a result, but its manner is vague. However, Beavers
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In other words, what determines the semantic structure of such expressions is a major inquiry in semantics; without semantic restriction an expression can have any meaning in a language, which we know is not the case. In relation to this inquiry, I empirically support a semantic principle in this paper, the Complementarity of Intentionality and Affectedness (henceforth, CIA) proposed in J. Lee (2016). According to this hypothesis, a minimal accomplishment predicate (the combination of a verb and its complement(s) which is a causative accomplishment) cannot entail intention and result at the same time (see details of this hypothesis in Section 2 below). For example, in the following transitive verb sentences with the minimal accomplishment predicates (e.g., opened the window in (1a)), either accidentally or intentionally can modify the predicates:

(1) a. She accidentally/intentionally opened the window.
    b. She accidentally/intentionally broke the table.
    c. She accidentally/intentionally kicked the door.

The modifications with the non-intentional adverb accidentally suggest that the minimal accomplishment predicates in (1) do not entail the agent’s intention about the events described by the predicates, although the default readings of the predicates are those in which the agents intentionally perform the relevant actions. Note, however, that non-intentionality is not entailed in the predicates, either, since the intentional adverb intentionally can modify the predicates. In short, intentionality is just vague in the minimal accomplishment predicates; whether the subject of a sentence has an intention can be specified by the utterance context or a linguistic context like the adverbial modifications in (1). By contrast, as shown in (2), the inherent results of the predicates cannot be denied in the continuations. That is, the patients of the events must be affected (see more about affectedness in Beavers, 2011):

(2) a. She opened the window, #but it was not opened.
    b. She broke the table, #but it was not broken.
    c. She kicked the door, #but it was not kicked.

& Koontz-Garboden (2012) presented some counterexamples to the semantic hypothesis: they argued that verbs of killing like electrocute entail both result and manner at the same time.

2) The term "accomplishment predicate" is used here to mean predicates with a causative event structure (e.g., bake the bread, build the house, or break the window) no matter whether they are temporally durative or punctual (see Dowty 1979: 91-99; Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998: 108).

3) This paper aims to identify the semantic structure of minimal accomplishment predicates, rather than that of predicates with adverbs. After the basic meaning of accomplishment predicates is identified, the modification with adverbs can be dealt with in compositional system.
The data in (2) show us that the relevant results are entailed in the meanings of the predicates. Thus, we can conclude that the minimal accomplishment predicates in (1) and (2) entail an inherent result, but not an intention, and so they support the CIA.

Unlike the transitive verb sentences, English conative constructions are known to entail intention, but not result (see more about conatives in Section 2.2 below and Ikegami, 1985; Levin, 1993; Goldberg, 1995; Broccias, 2001; Beavers, 2006; Vincent, 2013, among others):

(3) a. She (#accidentally) shot at the bird, but missed it.
   b. She (#accidentally) kicked at the ball, but missed it.
   c. She (#accidentally) hit at the wall, but missed it.

In (3) the non-intentional adverb accidentally cannot modify the conative predicates (e.g., shot at the bird), and this indicates that the agent’s intention is involved in the events denoted by the predicates. For instance, (3a) without the adverb roughly means that the referent of the subject deliberately shot the bird. Note, however, that the relevant results (i.e., contact) of the conative predicates can be denied as shown in (3). Therefore, the conative sentences in (3) also support the CIA, since only intention, but not result, is entailed in the minimal accomplishment predicates.

However, we can see that there are strong potential counterexamples to the CIA in English. For example, some verbs of killing like murder or assassinate are normally considered to entail the agent’s intention (see e.g., Dowty, 1991; Talmy, 1985; Lemmens, 1998; Kamp, 1999-2007; Grano, 2015, among others), and the patient must die for a sentence headed by the verb to be true. If those verbs really entail both result and intention at the same time, and thus minimal accomplishment predicates headed by the verbs entail both result and intention simultaneously, then we clearly have many counterexamples to the CIA, and this semantic hypothesis should be modified or rejected. In this paper, however, I show with the data collected from the Web that some English verbs of killing do not actually entail intention, though intentional interpretations are their default readings. Rather, I argue that the Web data empirically support the CIA, and this semantic principle can serve as an important condition on how the meanings of minimal accomplishment predicates are systematically constructed in natural languages like English and Korean.

In Section 2, the basic idea of the CIA is summarized with the semantics of Korean accomplishment predicates and English conative alternations. In Section 3, I present naturally occurring data from the Web showing that some English verbs like murder do not actually entail intentionality. In Section 4, I also show that some English verbs like poison entail only an inherent result, but not intention. I conclude in Section 5.
2. The Complementarity of Intentionality and Affectedness

Before I discuss some English verbs of killing in Section 3 (for *murder* verbs) and in Section 4 (for *poison* verbs), I summarize in this section the main idea of the CIA, which was proposed based on the meanings of Korean accomplishment predicates and English conative alternations (J. Lee, 2016).

2.1 Korean accomplishment predicates

As already mentioned above, it is contradictory to deny the inherent results of the English predicates in (2), repeated in (4).

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad a. \text{She opened the window, #but it was not opened.} \\
& \quad b. \text{She broke the table, #but it was not broken.} \\
& \quad c. \text{She kicked the door, #but it was not kicked.}
\end{align*}
\]

In the preceding clause of (4a), it is asserted that the referent of the subject opened the window, and this entails the result state of the window being open. Thus, denying the result in the continuation is infelicitous; similarly, the other sentences in (4) are implausible, as well.

However, the corresponding sentences in some other languages are known to be fairly acceptable (see Japanese in Ikegami, 1985; Hindi in Singh, 1998; Thai in Koenig & Muansuwan, 2000; Salish languages in Bar-el et al., 2005; Chinese in Koenig & Chief, 2008; Korean in Park, 1993; among others). Korean is one of those languages that allow so-called non-culmination reading. For instance, the inherent results of the Korean accomplishment predicates in (5) can be denied unlike the English counterparts (see similar data and discussions in Park, 1993; Y. Lee, 2004; J. Lee, 2015; Beavers & J. Lee, In press).

\[
\begin{align*}
(5) & \quad \text{It is not that every Korean native speakers accept the sentences in (5). I do not discuss here why such variations take place; I focus on the nature of these readings when they occur.} \\
& \quad \text{One might argue that the denial is possible because of *-ciman ‘but’. However, if *-ciman ‘but’ is replaced with *-ko ‘and’, the denial seems to be still possible, although *-ciman ‘but’ sounds more natural since the default readings of the predicates are the ones in which the results actually occur, and the denials of the results contrast with the default readings. In addition, the English sentences corresponding to those in (5) are all unacceptable even though they have \textit{but}, which is hard to explain if *-ciman ‘but’ is really responsible for the cancellations.}
\end{align*}
\]
(5) a. kunye-ka mwun-ul yel-ess-ciman,
    she-Nom door-Acc open-Pst-but
    door-Nom open-Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
    (lit.) ‘She opened the door, but the door was not opened.’

b. kunye-ka changmwun-ul kkay-ss-ciman,
    she-Nom window-Acc break-Pst-but
    window-Nom break-Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
    (lit.) ‘She broke the window, but the window was not broken.’

c. kunye-ka kong-ul cha-ss-ciman,
    she-Nom ball-Acc kick-Pst-but
    kong-i cha-i-ci anh-as-ta.
    ball-Nom kick-Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
    (lit.) ‘She kicked the ball, but it was not kicked.’

No result inherent to the predicates of the first clauses actually occurs in these examples, and this kind of reading is called zero result reading in Beavers and J. Lee (In press) (or failed attempt reading in Tatevosov, 2008; zero Change-of-State non-culminating reading in Martin & Schäfer, 2017).

One crucial property of zero result readings is that they entail intentionality on the part of the subject (see J. Lee, 2015; Beavers & J. Lee, In press). This entailment relation is illustrated in the following:

(6) [Jane accidentally bumped into the door, but the door was not opened.]

#kunye-ka mwun-ul yel-ess-ciman,
she-Nom door-Acc open-Pst-but
door-Nom open-Pass-Comp Neg-Pst-Dec
(lit.) ‘She opened the door, but the door was not opened.’

In the context given in (6) Jane had no intention to open the door, and the sentence is not acceptable in this situation (contrast this with (5a) above). Likewise, if an inherent result is denied as in (7), the non-intentional adverb uytohacianhkey ‘unintentionally’ cannot modify the predicate.
These data suggest that zero result readings in Korean require the subject’s intention regarding the coming about of inherent results.

However, when the result of a predicate actually occurs to some degree, whether the agentive subject has an intention about the result or not is simply vague (see more discussions in J. Lee, 2015; Beavers & J. Lee, In press, and some related experimental studies in Oh, 2014a, 2014b). Consider the following example:

Because of the degree adverbs in the second clause, the first clause is interpreted as partial result (in which the result obtains only partially) or culmination (in which the result obtains completely). In addition, either silswulo ‘accidentally’ or uytocekulo ‘intentionally’ can appear in the first clause whether it is interpreted as partial result or culmination. This shows that both readings are vague with respect to intentionality.

It is not that zero result reading is more general than partial result or culmination, since the former includes intentionality, but the latter does not. Zero result is a wholly separate reading from the other types of readings. Supporting evidence for this distinction comes from a standard ambiguity test below. Consider the VP-ellipsis involving an accomplishment predicate in (9) (see Beavers & J. Lee, In press).

Under the assumption that elided VP is semantically identical to the antecedent (see Lakoff,
1970; Zwicky & Sadock, 1975), if the verb *yel-* ‘open’ were vague with respect to result and intention, any combination of readings is predicted to be possible in (9): either conjunct can be interpreted as zero result (with intention) or partial result or culmination (with or without intention). But this is not the case. Rather, only two kinds of interpretations are possible for (9). Both conjuncts either involve intentionality (regardless of result) or involve result (regardless of intentionality). In other words, the sentence in (9) means roughly "Jane tried to open a door and so did Tom" or "Jane opened a door and so did Tom". What is impossible is a reading where one conjunct describes zero result and the other non-intentional result (partial or complete).6) In other words, Korean minimal accomplishment predicates are ambiguous between a reading entailing intention (but not result), and a reading entailing result (but not intention).

Based on the ambiguity of Korean accomplishment predicates, the semantic hypothesis, *Complementarity of the Intentionality and Affectedness*, was proposed in J. Lee (2016, p. 338, (13)):

(10) **The Complementarity of Intentionality and Affectedness** (CIA): it is impossible that the subject of a minimal accomplishment predicate (the combination of a verb and its complement(s) which is a causative accomplishment) must have an intention with the inherent result of the predicate and the patient of the predicate must be affected at the same time.

a. The subject of a minimal accomplishment predicate must have an intention with the inherent result of the predicate and it is not that the patient of the predicate must be affected. [**Intended Result**]

b. The patient of a minimal accomplishment predicate must be affected and it is not that the subject of the predicate must have an intention with the inherent result of the predicate. [**Actual Result**]

c. It is not that the subject of a minimal accomplishment predicate must have an intention with the inherent result of the predicate and it is not that the patient of the predicate must be affected. [**Unspecified Result**]

In terms of the CIA, minimal accomplishment predicates in Korean are ambiguous between *actual result reading* (entailing a result but vague on intentionality) and *intended result reading* (entailing intentionality but vague on a result). Zero result reading is a specific case of

---

6) One may argue that the Korean accomplishment predicates are vague in terms of intention; zero result reading is a pragmatic, contextual meaning. But as shown in the ambiguity test, it is a separate reading of an accomplishment predicate distinct from the partial or culmination reading of the predicate. In other words, intentionality is part of zero result reading.
intended result reading, and partial result and culmination are specific cases of actual result reading. Note that the two readings (actual result and intended result) of an accomplishment predicate can describe the same situation (i.e., an intentional partial result context or intentional culmination context). A minimal accomplishment predicate can also have an unspecified result reading; an example of this is presented in the following (J. Lee, 2016, p. 340, (14)):

(11) ku-ka ilpwule / silswulo mwun-ul hyanghay cha-ss-ta.
    he-Nom deliberately / accidentally door-Acc towards kick-Pst-Dec

haciman pisnaka-ss-ta / kulayse mwun-i cha-i-ess-ta.
    but miss-Pst-Dec / so door-Nom kick-Pass-Pst-Dec

(lit.) ‘He deliberately / accidentally kicked towards the door. But he missed it/So the door was kicked.’

In (11) the intentional or non-intentional adverbs can freely appear in the sentence. In particular, the first sentence with silswulo ‘accidentally’ can be used to describe a situation that the referent of the subject tried to kick a ball next to the door, but she lost her control of the leg and so it moves towards the door, which she did not want to kick. The inherent result of the predicate in (11) is specified in the continuations: the contact can occur or not. The minimal accomplishment predicate with hyanghay ‘towards’ entail neither intention nor result, so it should belong to Unspecified Result of the CIA.

In summary, minimal accomplishment predicates in Korean do not entail intention and result at the same time; either intention or result is entailed, or neither is entailed in the predicates. This mutual exclusivity of entailments of intention and result is also found in English conative alternations discussed in the following subsection.

2.2 English conative alternations

The CIA is supported by some English conative alternations (J. Lee, 2016). As briefly discussed in (3) above, the non-intentional adverb accidentally cannot be added to the predicates. This indicates that the conative predicates entail intentionality:

(12) a. #Tom accidentally shot at the bird.
    b. #Tom accidentally kicked at the ball.
    c. #Tom accidentally hit at the wall.
However, the conative constructions do not entail their relevant results, as seen in the following:

(13) a. She shot at the bird, but the bird was not shot.
    b. She kicked at the ball, but it was not kicked.
    c. She hit at the wall, but it was not hit.

The data in (12) and (13) lead us to conclude that the English conative constructions belong to the semantic category of Intended Result of the CIA. They seem to be semantically identical to Korean accomplishment predicates with an intended result reading, while they are syntactically different: English employs the preposition *at*, but no explicit marking is used in Korean.

The corresponding transitive verb constructions in conative alternations are just like normal transitive verb sentences. They are vague in terms of intentionality:

(14) a. She accidentally/intentionally shot the bird.
    b. She accidentally/intentionally kicked the ball.
    c. She accidentally/intentionally hit the wall.

But the inherent result of the verbs (i.e., contact) is entailed in the transitive verb constructions, as illustrated in the following:

(15) a. She shot the bird, #but missed it.
    b. She kicked the ball, #but missed it.
    c. She hit the wall, #but missed it.

Then the transitive verb sentences of the alternations should belong to Actual Result of the CIA, just like other typical transitive verb constructions in English.

Summarizing, the different readings of Korean accomplishment predicates and the English conative alternations support the CIA, since they do not entail both intention and result at the same time. However, some English verbs of killing like *murder* or *assassinate* are strong potential counterexamples to the CIA; they are normally said to entail both intention and result simultaneously (see e.g., Dowty, 1991; Talmy, 1985; Lemmens, 1998; Kamp, 1999-2007). In the sections that follow, I argue, however, that the verbs of killing do not actually entail intention, thus they support the CIA, as well.
3. English Verbs of Killing: Murder Verbs

The verbs of killing in English can be classified into two types: *murder* verbs and *poison* verbs (Levin, 1993, pp. 230-233). The former does not lexicalize a means component (no information about how the killing came about is provided), but the latter does (Levin, 1993, p. 231). I do not discuss whether this is really true or not (see a related discussion in Beavers & Koontz-Garboden, 2012); I just use this classification for the sake of convenience when presenting the data found in the Web. In this section, I argue that some *murder* verbs in English do not entail intention, and they belong to the semantic category of Actual Result.

3.1 Kill

The verb *kill* is known not to entail intentionality (see e.g., Lemmens, 1998; Marmaridou, 2000; Van Valin, 2005; Rooryck and Wyngaerd, 2011; Solstad and Bott, 2017). The following examples are from Lemmens (1998, p. 118, (33), (34)):

(16) a. ... [Mr. Parks] isn’t to blame because he killed the woman without "will or conscious mind." (WSJ)
   b. ... the House deliberately killed a handful of projects... (WSJ)

In (16a) "Mr. Parks killed the woman while sleepwalking" (Lemmens, 1998, p. 118), and the neutrality regarding intentionality is supported by the fact that it can be also modified by *deliberately* as in (16b). However, the verb *kill* entails the inherent result (death), as illustrated in (17).

(17) Jane killed Tom, #but he is not dead.

Accordingly, minimal accomplishment predicates headed by *kill* (e.g., killed Tom in (17)) should belong to Actual Result.

This categorization of the accomplishment predicates with *kill* seems not to be surprising, since it is very natural not to be able to deny death as in (17), and we can easily find many examples like *Jane accidentally/unintentionally killed Tom*. Note, however, that the modification of a non-intentional adverb like *accidentally* does not guarantee that the agent has no intention about the killing event, since *accidentally* can also describe a mistaken agent. Consider the following example (see J. Lee, 2015; Beavers & J. Lee, In press).
(18) [A balloon and a ball are in the room. Jane intended to kick the ball and not the balloon, but mistook the balloon for the ball and tried to kick the balloon, thinking it was the ball.]

Jane accidentally kicked the ball.

In (18) Jane intended to kick what she thought to be a ball, but accidentally still modifies the predicate *kicked the ball*; the adverb describes the mistaken agent here, not non-intentionality. Thus a single isolated sentence like *Jane accidentally killed Tom* is not enough to specify the intended meaning of *accidentally* in the sentence. We must look into the context, as well, in order to see whether *accidentally* is used to describe non-intentionality or mistaken agent. Hence, we must extract an expression under discussion together with its context from the Web like the following:

(19) "The day I accidentally killed a little boy

In 1977 Maryann Gray was a 22-year-old college graduate with her whole life ahead of her, when a little boy darted out in front of her car. For years, Maryann didn't talk about Brian, but she thought about him constantly - and his death has had a lasting influence on her life."


In (19) we can see from the context that the adverb *accidentally* describes the real non-intentionality of the subject, rather than a mistaken agent. In other words, the context makes sure that the minimal accomplishment predicate *killed a little boy* does not entail intentionality. Since the result must actually occur (the death cannot be denied) as already shown in (17), we can now say with certainty that minimal accomplishment predicates involving *kill* belong to the category of Actual Result of the CIA.

3.2 Murder

Unlike the verb *kill*, the verb *murder* has been considered to entail intentionality in the literature (Dowty, 1991; Talmy, 1985; Lemmens, 1998; Kamp, 1999-2007; Van Valin, 2005; Rooryck and Wyngaerd, 2011; Grano, 2016; Solstad and Bott, 2017; among others). It is called

7) Note that most papers in the literature just assume that verbs such as *murder* entail intention without grammatical or empirical evidence.

(20) a. *They murdered him, but didn’t intend to.
   b. *They accidentally murdered him.

With the sentences in (20) Lemmens (1998) argues that intentionality is entailed in the verb *murder*. If this is really true, then this can be a counterexample to the CIA, since the inherent result (death) of *murder* cannot be denied just like other English verbs of killing (e.g., *Taylor murdered Jane, #but she is not dead*). However, we can find the expression *accidentally murdered boyfriend* as in (21a) and many similar expressions in the Web. The news story in (21a) tells us that the agent had no intention to kill her boyfriend, and similarly for (21b).

(21) a. "YouTube Star Accidentally Murdered Boyfriend After A Video Stunt Went Wrong

   While filming a weekly video, Perez allegedly shot and killed her boyfriend from point blank range. The couple had decided to film a stunt in which Perez would shoot Ruiz while he held up a hardcover encyclopedia up in front of his chest. As one would imagine, the bullet went right through the encyclopedia and struck Ruiz."
   (https://www.providr.com/youtube-star-accidentally-murdered-boyfriend/)

b. "Accidental Murder occurs when a situation that wasn’t intended to be lethal ends with the death of someone anyway. Occasionally, this happens because a fight just goes too far (Bob and Alice start fighting, and the fight gets more heated than anyone expects, and Alice ends up braining Bob with a heavy object or accidentally knocking him onto something sharp... and she doesn’t realize he’s dead until it’s over)."
   (https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/AccidentalMurder)

The contexts given in (21) suggest that *murder* does not entail intentionality. Furthermore, in (22), a person, who responded to a question on an online board, mentioned the concept, *felony murder rule*:

(22) "Is accidentally killing someone murder?"

Uri Granta:

"While accidentally killing someone is usually considered *manslaughter* (or sometimes
even *justifiable homicide*, it is possible to accidentally murder someone. For example:

- In English and Welsh law, intent to cause serious harm rather than death is sufficient to count as murder.
- Furthermore, the doctrine of transferred malice means that if you intend to murder someone but accidentally kill someone else (either instead or in addition) then that too is viewed as murder.
- In most US states (but not in England or Canada), the felony murder rule means that any death occurring as a result of a dangerous felony is considered murder, regardless of intent.”


The notion of *felony murder rule* is more explained in (23). For instance, if Tom unintentionally kills a person while robbing a bank, then it is considered as a murder according to the felony murder rule:

(23) “Felony murder rule

The *rule of felony murder* is a legal doctrine in some common law jurisdictions that broadens the crime of murder: when an offender kills (regardless of intent to kill) in the commission of a dangerous or enumerated crime (called a felony in some jurisdictions), the offender, and also the offender’s accomplices or co-conspirators, may be found guilty of murder. The concept of felony murder originates in the rule of transferred intent, which is older than the limit of legal memory. In its original form, the malicious intent inherent in the commission of any crime, however trivial, was considered to apply to any consequences of that crime, however unintended.”

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Felony_murder_rule)

Based on the actual use of *murder* in (21) and the rule of felony murder in (23), it seems reasonable to assume that *murder* does not actually entail intentionality, contrary to the general assumption in the literature; perhaps, intentionality with *murder* may arise by conversational implicature. Then, minimal accomplishment predicates headed by *murder* should be categorized as Actual Result, just like the predicates headed by *kill*, though the former tend to be interpreted with intentionality, unlike the latter.

8) I just assume that the intentionality of *murder* is implicature, but as reviewers pointed out, grammatical evidence is required to verify whether it really has all the properties of implicature. I leave this issue for future research, and focus on whether intention is really entailed in verbs of killing.
3.3 *Assassinate*

The verb *assassinate* has been also considered to entail intention (Lemmens, 1998; Marmaridou, 2000; Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer, 2006; Hofmann, 2015; *inter alia*). The following examples are from Lemmens (1998, p. 108):

(24) a. *They assassinated John, but didn’t intend to.
   b. *They accidentally assassinated him.

Just like *murder*, the denial of intentionality causes the sentences with *assassinate* to be ungrammatical in (24). But the expression *accidentally assassinate a contemporary Argentine writer* is possible, as shown in (25). Note, however, that *accidentally* in the expression does not automatically mean that the predicate *assassinate a contemporary Argentine writer* does not entail intention. In the context given in (25), it is possible for the adverb *accidentally* to describe a mistaken agent since the insurgents mistook the writer for a soldier.

(25) "This includes discussions of strategy or a blackly comic sequence in which insurgents accidentally assassinate a contemporary Argentine writer, mistaking him for a navy officer."

(Politics and Public Space in Contemporary Argentine Poetry *The Lyric and the State* by Ben Bollig)

The sentence and the context in (25) cannot be used as evidence for *assassinate* not entailing intentionality. This example also shows why the context of an expression must be investigated along with the expression itself.

Interestingly, Lemmens (1998, p. 108) says that the two sentences in (24) can be acceptable when a wrong person is killed by the assassins. This would amount to saying that *assassinate* does not entail intention, and the sentences in (24) are basically acceptable. Actually, we can find some data in which assassins killed a wrong person. Consider the following example:

9) Marmaridou (2000, p. 133) assumes that intentionality is a presupposition of the verb *assassinate*, so the sentence #The Prime Minister was accidentally assassinated sounds odd. However, the sentence *Tom did not assassinate the Prime Minister* plausibly describes a situation where Tom did not have any intention to kill the Prime Minister, suggesting that intentionality is not a presupposition of *assassinate*.

10) A wrong person was assassinated in the example, but this does not mean that the agent was mistaken since it is not the case that the agent mistook the mother for the former president.
(26) “She was the daughter of the former president whose mother was accidentally assassinated by a bullet intended for her father.”

Basically a passive is semantically identical to its active counterpart unless something like quantifier is involved in the arguments. Then the passive in (26) supports that the verb *assassinate* should be neutral for intentionality. In addition, the verbal noun *assassination* can be modified by the adjective *accidental* as shown in (27), and there seems not to be a mistaken agent in this context.

(27) "The Match Box – Traverse Theatre, Edinburgh

The death was sudden: an accidental assassination when a bullet meant for someone else or no one at all catches Mary on a normal school day."

Assuming that the verb *assassinate* and its nominal form *assassination* have the same core meaning though their syntactic categories are different, the modification of *accidental* in (28) indirectly supports that the verb *assassinate* does not entail intention. Another example is given in the following excerpt from a news article:

(28) "JFK: An Accidental Assassination?

From investigating Oswald’s jagged biography, his emigration to the Soviet Union as a communist and other documents anew, Reston shows the ex-Marine felt a hatred for the other man riding in the parade convertible. That was tall John Connally, the governor of Texas, who was shot and severely wounded, but lived. Connally had denied Oswald a chance to erase his dishonorable discharge from the Marines, a source of severe distress to Oswald. His Russian widow testified before the Warren Commission that her husband bore a grudge against the Texas governor, but none against the president. Reston feels that this clue, hiding in plain sight, unlocks a new explanation of the Kennedy assassination."
In (28) an author of a book presents a hypothesis that Oswald had actually aimed at the then Texas governor rather than John F. Kennedy, and this hypothetical situation is described by *An Accidental Assassination*. This further suggests that the verb *assassinate* does not entail intention; only death is entailed in the verb (e.g., *Jane assassinated the king, but he is not dead*). Hence, minimal accomplishment predicates headed by *assassinate* should belong to the category of Actual Result.

3.4 Suicide

Although nobody seems to explicitly argue that the verb *suicide* entails intention in the literature, it seems not easy to think of a situation where someone unintentionally suicides. However, as shown in (29a) the verb *suicide* is modified by *accidentally*, and there is no mistaken agent in the situation. Also, in (29b), the noun *suicide* is modified by the adjective *accidental*: the story is about a teen who unintentionally killed himself while playing Roulette.

(29) a. "I sometimes accidentally suicide when trying to jump down a cliff to surprise the enemy..."
   (http://forum.worldoftanks.eu/index.php?/topic/664264-suicide/)
   b. "Autopsy suggests accidental suicide for ‘Roulette’ teen’s death: cops
   While a Saturday autopsy couldn’t determine if a Brooklyn teen died in a game of Russian roulette, a police source says the evidence points to an accidental suicide."  

Assuming that the verb *suicide* and the noun *suicide* have the same core meaning, the data in (29) suggest that intentionality is not entailed in the verb *suicide*. Thus a minimal accomplishment predicate headed by the verb *suicide* should belong to Actual Result. Summarizing, the naturally occurring data from the Web indicate that the *murder* verbs are not really a counterexample to the CIA, but rather they satisfy the mutual exclusivity of entailments of intention and result imposed by the semantic hypothesis.
4. English Verbs of Killing: *Poison* Verbs

The other type of English killing verbs is called *poison* verb (Levin, 1993, p. 30, 232-233). In this section, I examine the following three *poison* verbs, *electrocute*, *hang*, and *smother*, and argue that they also support the CIA; only result (but not intention) is entailed in the verbs.

4.1 *Electrocute*

In the news story of (30a), the man electrocuted himself, and there is no mistaken agent in this situation. That is, the adverb *accidentally* here describes the non-intentionality of the man regarding the event of electrocution. In addition, the adjective *accidental* in (30b) also expresses the non-intentionality of the construction workers who electricity killed.

(30) a. "Chandler man accidentally electrocuted in garage
   A Chandler man died after accidentally electrocuting himself while working in his garage over the weekend."

   b. "Accidental Electrocution – A silent workplace killer
      .....
      According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), construction workers accounted for 899 total worker deaths in 2014, which is over 20 percent of the total worker death count. Of these 899 deaths, electrocution was the second-leading cause death, responsible for 74 construction worker fatalities. Only gravity (falls) kills more workers than electricity.
      .....

The data in (30) suggest that intention is not entailed in the verb *electrocute* (and the verbal noun *electrocution*). Rather, they are vague in intentionality; but, they entail death (e.g., *The executioner electrocuted Jane, #but she is not dead*). Accordingly, minimal accomplishment predicates involving *electrocute* should be categorized as Actual Result.
4.2 Hang

The adverb accidentally modifies hung themselves in (31a), and the adverb describes the non-intentionality of the people who hung themselves. Also in (31b), the adjective accidental modifies hanging, and it also describes the non-intentionality of the boy who died.

(31) a. "These People Accidentally Hung Themselves In Stunts And Pranks Gone Very, Very Wrong
11-Year-Old Died Staging A YouTube Prank To Scare His Mom

In September 2016, an 11-year-old boy decided to imitate a YouTube video he had recently seen. The video depicted someone pretending to hang himself in order to scare his mother.

The family's other children had observed the 11-year-old as he attempted the stunt, but by the time they realized he was not breathing, the damage had been done. He spent four days in a coma before passing away."
(https://www.ranker.com/list/accidental-hanging-deaths/april-a-taylor)

b. "4-year-old found dead from accidental hanging by his hoodie"
(https://nypost.com/2017/09/20/4-year-old-found-dead-from-accidental-hanging-by-his-hoodie/)

Death is part of hang (e.g., Tom hung Mary, #but she is not dead). The minimal accomplishment predicates with hang should be Actual Result.

4.3 Smother

In the BBC news article with the title in (32a), we can see that the mother had no intention to suffocate her baby. Similarly in (32b) the adjective accidental describes the non-intentionality regarding the event of smothering the baby.

(32) a. "US mother who accidentally smothered her newborn son as she slept is suing the hospital where his death occurred for $8.6m (£6.6m)."
b. “Baby died of accidental smothering, coroner says”
-coroner-says-1.1078279)

The data in (32) indicate that the verb smother does not entail intentionality. But the denial of the inherent result of the verb is contradictory (e.g., Jane smothered her baby, #but the baby is not dead). Hence, the three poison verbs (electrocute, hang, and smother) are not a counterexample to the CIA. Rather, minimal accomplishment predicates headed by a poison verb should belong to the semantic category, Actual Result. More generally, minimal accomplishment predicates with the verbs of killing discussed above should all belong to Actual Result, supporting the CIA.

5. Conclusion

Based on the meanings of English conative alternations and Korean accomplishment predicates, J. Lee (2016) proposed a semantic hypothesis, the Complementarity of Intentionality and Affectedness (CIA): intention and result cannot be simultaneously entailed in a minimal accomplishment predicate (the combination of a verb and its complement(s) which is a causative accomplishment). However, minimal accomplishment predicates headed by English verbs of killing (e.g., murder or assassinate) are strong potential counterexamples to the CIA, since many of the verbs have been considered to entail both intention and result at the same time in the literature (e.g., Dowty, 1991; Talmy, 1985; Lemmens, 1998; Kamp, 1999-2007). In this paper I have presented some naturally occurring data found in the Web, and argued that some minimal accomplishment predicates involving English verbs of killing are not really counterexamples to the semantic hypothesis; they all entail only result, and they are vague on intention. This semantic principle helps us to understand what is possible and what is impossible for the meaning of minimal accomplishment predicates in English and Korean: a minimal accomplishment predicate entails either intention or result, or neither of them is entailed in the predicate. In other words, this mutual exclusivity of entailments of result and intention may serve as a basic condition on the semantic structure of the predicates in the languages. However, this paper has only focused on some verbs of killing in English; hence further investigations of minimal accomplishment predicates involving other killing verbs or other types of verbs are needed to support or falsify the CIA. In addition, if the CIA is supported by more evidence, then the fundamental question of why such a semantic principle exists in languages awaits further research.
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