I'M DONE MY HOMEWORK: COMPLEMENT COERCION AND ASPECTUAL ADJECTIVES IN CANADIAN ENGLISH

PATRICK MURPHY
University of Toronto

ABSTRACT

Self-paced reading and eye-tracking studies have generally found that combining aspectual verbs (like *begin* and *finish*) with entity nouns (like *the book* or *the coffee*) is associated with increased reading times on and around the noun (McElree et al. 2001; Traxler et al. 2002; Pickering et al. 2005). This processing cost is widely interpreted as evidence of complement coercion—aspectual verbs semantically select for an event (like *dancing* or *the dance*) and can take entity objects only if they are coerced into an event through a computationally costly process of type-shifting (Pustejovsky 1995; Jackendoff 1997). This paper presents an eye-tracking study of the Canadian English *be done* NP construction, e.g., *I am done/finished my homework* (not to be confused with the dialect-neutral *I am done/finished with my homework*) to mean *I have finished my homework*. Results suggest a processing penalty for entity-denoting nouns like *the script* (compared to event description nouns like *the audition*) in this construction, which supports Fruehwald & Myler's (2015) proposal that *done* and *finished* in this construction are aspectual adjectives that behave like aspectual verbs in requiring complement coercion and type-shifting for entity-denoting nouns.

[1] INTRODUCTION

The focus of this paper is complement coercion, such as in the sentence *the child began the book* (Briscoe et al. 1990; Pustejovsky 1991, 1995; Jackendoff 1997; Asher 2011; Egg 2003). According to the literature on coercion, aspectual verbs like *begin* select as their complement an event description like *to dance*, *dancing*, or *the dance*. However, *the book* denotes an entity; such a mismatch can be solved if the entity-denoting noun is reinterpreted as an event involving that entity. In the case of *the child began the book*, *the book* is likely to be understood as *reading the book* or *looking at the book* (other interpretations, such as *writing the book*, are also possibilities depending on the subject and context). Note that the event interpretation of *the book* is specifically tied to its position as the complement of an aspectual verb, and is not universally available. As noted by Asher (2011), a sentence like *the child's book*

will begin in two minutes (meaning the child's {reading, writing, etc.} of the book will begin in two minutes) is semantically odd. In addition to aspectual verbs, psychological verbs like *enjoy* have traditionally been analyzed as event-selecting verbs that require complement coercion for entity-denoting objects (although more recently, [Katsika et al. 2012](#) have presented evidence that psychological verbs do not fit into this category). The term *coercion* was introduced to linguistics by [Moens & Steedman \(1988\)](#), and it has also been used for mass/count and aspectual mismatches.

Early processing studies of complement coercion using self-paced reading and eye-tracking techniques discovered that the combination of event-selecting verb and entity-denoting NP is slower or more difficult to process compared to other verb and object combinations ([McElree et al. 2001](#); [Traxler et al. 2002](#); [Pickering et al. 2005](#)—but see also [de Almeida 2004](#)). These early studies generally presented or cited the *enriched composition* view of coercion, which involves a (computationally costly) semantic repair mechanism, commonly called type-shifting, acting on the noun to satisfy the selectional requirements of the verb ([Piñango et al. 1999](#); [Pylkkänen & McElree 2006](#); [Pustejovsky 1991, 1995](#); [Jackendoff 1997](#); [Katsika et al. 2012](#)). However, these studies primarily focused on providing psycholinguistic evidence that these coercion sentences are unique, rather than distinguishing between different theories about what coercion involves.

Later studies used reading measures (and other evidence) to delve more deeply into understanding the mechanisms underlying coercion. One alternative possibility is that complement coercion involves extra structure in the form of a silent VP between the coercion verb and the noun, and that this (rather than an operation such as type-shifting) is the reason for the increased processing requirements of coercion ([de Almeida & Dwivedi 2008](#)). However, [Pylkkänen & McElree \(2006\)](#) present evidence against coercion involving a silent VP, including an inability to adverbially modify the supposed silent VP. Another possible explanation that does not rely on type-shifting is that the processing effect of coercion is a result of pragmatically having to infer an event from an entity (e.g., to determine whether *began the book* refers to *reading, writing, looking at*, etc.). However, multiple studies find that varying the need to infer the event ([Traxler et al. 2005](#) by providing a context sentence, and [Frisson & McElree 2008](#) by choosing coercion sentences with more or fewer possible interpretations) does not affect the processing effect of coercion. The type-shifting view of coercion remains common in the literature (e.g., [Katsika et al. 2012](#)), although note that the nature of complement coercion is still an ongoing area of research and there are other current proposals ([Asher 2011](#); [Piñango & Deo 2016](#)).

The linguistic phenomenon of interest in this paper is the *be done NP* construction seen in (1) and (2), which is found in Canadian English and in a few varieties of American English, specifically in Philadelphia and Vermont ([Yerastov 2008, 2012](#);

Fruehwald & Myler 2015). Both *done* and *finished* are possible.

- (1) I'm finished my homework.
- (2) I'm done my homework.

The meaning is equivalent to the aspectual verb *finish* in the perfect, as in (3).

- (3) I've finished my homework.

The meaning of the Canadian construction has overlap with the (dialect-neutral) prepositional *be done with* NP construction in (4) and (5), but they are not the same. The Canadian construction requires that the object be completely finished, while the prepositional construction also allows cases where the subject has lost interest (if someone completes half of their homework and moves to another task, they are *done with their homework* but not *done their homework*).

- (4) I'm finished with my homework.
- (5) I'm done with my homework.

The difference in interpretation between the Canadian construction and the prepositional construction is evidence that the Canadian construction should not be analysed as involving a silent preposition, or at least not one equivalent to *with*. Yerastov (2008, 2012) argues that the Canadian construction is best analyzed as the regular English perfect like in (3) but with a non-standard auxiliary (*be* instead of *have*), based in part on parallels with the *be*-perfect in Scottish English. However, Fruehwald & Myler (2015) argue against the *be*-perfect analysis for this Canadian English construction for a variety of reasons. Notably, *all* is compatible with the Canadian construction (6) and with adjectives (7) but not perfect participles (8).

- (6) I'm all done my homework.
- (7) I'm all ready for school.
- (8) *I've all done my homework.

In addition, they note that the Canadian construction (9) and adjectives (10) can be embedded under the perfect, but the perfect itself (11) cannot be embedded under another perfect.

- (9) I have been done my homework for a while now.
- (10) I have been ready for school for a while now.
- (11) *I have had done my homework for a while now.

Instead, [Fruehwald & Myler](#) propose that the Canadian construction involves an adjective that directly takes as its complement an NP (without a silent intervening PP or VP). This is not common in English, but is also not unprecedented (as in *be worth NP*). Because *done* and *finished* are adjectival versions of aspectual verbs, [Fruehwald & Myler](#) argue that these aspectual adjectives semantically select for an event description and require complement coercion and type-shifting for interpretation of entity-denoting nouns. Given that complement coercion with aspectual verbs has been investigated and supported with reading measures, [Fruehwald & Myler](#)'s proposal should also be testable with reading measures.

The present study is an eye-tracking experiment testing this analysis of the Canadian construction by comparing reading times of entity-denoting nouns and event description nouns in the Canadian construction, with the hypothesis that entity-denoting nouns will be associated with more processing difficulty. Sentences in the dialect-neutral prepositional construction will also be tested, although [Fruehwald & Myler](#)'s analysis does not have any specific predictions here. Note that this paper will be assuming the type-shifting or enriched composition analysis of coercion, in line with the language used by [Fruehwald & Myler](#) in their analysis, although this experiment was designed to determine whether the Canadian construction exhibits coercion effects, rather than to distinguish between different reasons or explanations for coercion effects (like [Traxler et al. 2005](#) and [Frisson & McElree 2008](#) comparing pragmatic and semantic analyses).

[2] CANADIAN ENGLISH BE DONE NP EXPERIMENT

This experiment tests whether there is a penalty for entity nouns compared to event nouns in the Canadian English *be done NP* construction and in the dialect-neutral *be done with NP* construction.

[2.1] Method

Participants

Thirty-six native speakers of Canadian English (mean age = 25, sd = 11), primarily from Southern Ontario, took part in this experiment at the University of Toronto, for \$10 or course credit. An additional 28 participants took part but were excluded from analysis: five due to excessive blinks or track loss, 21 for not being native speakers of Canadian English,¹ and two for indicating that the *be done NP* construction did not sound natural or acceptable to them. They provided written informed consent prior to partaking in the experiment.

[1] Students participating for course credit were not prescreened for language background, to avoid restricting opportunities for course credit.

Items

The stimuli for this experiment contrasted event description nouns (like *the audition* and *the interview*) with entity-denoting nouns (like *the script* and *the resume*) in the Canadian English *be done NP* construction and in the dialect-neutral *be done with NP* construction. Crossing these two factors resulted in four conditions, as seen below.

- (12) After the girl was finished *the fight* against the playground bully, she went for a walk. (Canadian construction + event object)
- (13) After the girl was finished *the comic* about flying superheroes, she went for a walk. (Canadian construction + entity object)
- (14) After the girl was finished with *the fight* against the playground bully, she went for a walk. (Prepositional construction + event object)
- (15) After the girl was finished with *the comic* about flying superheroes, she went for a walk. (Prepositional construction + entity object)

In total there were 32 such quadruplets. They all followed a similar structure of a preposed subordinate clause (which included the construction of interest) and a shorter main clause. However, there were also differences between the quadruplets: half had a singular subject and half a plural subject, half had the adjective *done* and half had the adjective *finished*, and they also varied regarding their conjunction and temporal reference (past with *after*, present with *because*, and future with *when*). Participants only saw one sentence from each quadruplet, which means that they saw either an event description object or an entity-denoting object. The object that they did not see could be reused and shown to them in a later quadruplet, and so in the 32 quadruplets there were a total of 16 event description nouns and 16 entity-denoting nouns (rather than 32 of each). The nouns are provided below.

- (16) Entities: comic, resume, prescription, script, report, autobiography, article, album, juice, coffee, hamburger, message, letters, essay, champagne, software
- (17) Events: fight, interview, presentation, audition, lecture, speech, conversation, concert, party, celebration, visit, gala, battle, competition, game, discussion

The mean length of the event nouns (7.625 characters) and entity nouns (7.25 characters) did not differ significantly, according to an independent t-test ($t_{29.293} = 0.40018$, $p = 0.69$). In addition, the (log-transformed) frequencies of the event nouns and entity nouns did not differ significantly in the usenet-based Hyper-space Analogue to Language (HAL) corpus (event: 9.69, entity: 9.47, $t_{28.157} = -$

0.39698, $p = 0.69$) or in the movie subtitle-based SUBTLEX corpus (event: 3.15, entity: 2.92, $t_{29,982} = 1.1263$, $p = 0.27$), both of which were accessed through the English Lexicon Project (Balota et al. 2007). Reading times would not be expected to vary between the two groups of nouns as a result of their length or frequency.

Procedure

Participants were seated in a height-adjustable chair wearing the EyeLink II head-mounted video-based eye-tracker (which had a sampling frequency of 250 Hz). The text was displayed on a computer screen in black 25 pt Times New Roman font on a white background. They were instructed to read each sentence at a normal reading pace, well enough to understand the sentence and answer comprehension questions (which followed every trial). Comprehension questions were asked about different parts of the sentence (the subject, the object, or the event in the second clause). For example, the comprehension question after *When the musician is finished the concert at the new venue, he will take some time off* asked what the musician will do, and the participant chose from a set of options. The eye-tracker was calibrated using a series of three fixed targets across the display at the beginning of the experiment, and recalibration was performed later on when judged necessary by the experimenter.

Each trial began with a fixation target on the screen in the position that would be taken by the first letter of the sentence. Participants were instructed to fix their gaze on this target, at which point the experimenter started the trial and made the sentence appear on the screen, all on one line. After reading silently, participants pressed the trigger at the back of a game controller to bring up the comprehension question, which they answered with the triggers as well. Feedback was not provided. After selecting their response, participants were immediately brought back to the screen with the fixation target, and the next trial started once they fixated on that target. Viewing was binocular, but only the left eye was recorded. All participants performed very well on the comprehension questions.

Participants encountered the stimuli in a random order, mixed in with stimuli from three other eye-tracking experiments that they were simultaneously participating in. The present experiment comprised 32 of the 120 total sentences that each participant saw.² Each participant was assigned to one of four lists, which affected which of the four sentences in each stimulus quadruplet they saw. The entire session took approximately 30 minutes.

[2.2] Results

Each sentence was divided into six regions, as in (18). Region 3 was the object, and thus the critical region.

[2] Regarding order effects, reading times for this experiment (total time, as defined below, for all interest areas in this experiment) were 9% faster in the second half of the 120-trial session than the first half.

- (18) [_{R1} After the girl] [_{R2} was finished (with)] [_{R3} the fight] [_{R4} against] [_{R5} the playground bully,] [_{R6} she went for a walk.]

Five reading measures are reported here for the critical region (R3): first-pass time (a.k.a gaze duration), first-pass regression ratio, go-past time (a.k.a. regression path duration), second-pass time, and total time. First-pass time is the time from first entering the region before moving on or looking back; first-pass regression ratio is the likelihood of reading a region for the first time and then re-reading an earlier region; go-past time is the time from first entering a region until moving on to a later region (including time spent re-reading an earlier region); second-pass time is the time from entering the region for a second time before moving on or looking back; and total time is all of the time spent in the area regardless of when it happened. The reading measures selected were those used in previous eye-tracking studies of coercion (Traxler et al. 2002, 2005; Pickering et al. 2005).

Manual cleanup of the data was performed to remove trials with blinks or track loss on the critical region (or one saccade away from it) on first-pass reading and trials where the fixations indicate that the participant did not read the whole sentence (for example, they only fixated at the beginning of the sentence and then pressed the trigger to move on, possibly accidentally). Comprehension questions were used to encourage participants to read the stimuli carefully, but incorrect comprehension questions were not used to exclude trials (on multiple occasions, participants remarked to the experimenter that they pressed the wrong button, suggesting that they were paying attention). In total, 11.2% of the trials were deleted.

The five reading measures for R3 are shown below, separated by construction for better visibility. Keep in mind when looking at the results that a longer reading time (or more regressions) for entities compared to events is the finding that suggests coercion effects. In the tables, FP Time is first-pass time, FP Reg is first-pass regressions, GP Time is go-past time, and SP time is second-pass time.

TABLE 1: Scores for critical region (R3) for *be done NP*

Object	FP Time	FP Reg	GP Time	SP Time	Total Time
Entity	381 ms	27.4%	545 ms	319 ms	650 ms
Event	359 ms	25.4%	480 ms	263 ms	586 ms

TABLE 2: Scores for critical region (R3) for *be done with NP*

Object	FP Time	FP Reg	GP Time	SP Time	Total Time
Entity	330 ms	17.8%	395 ms	270 ms	494 ms
Event	324 ms	20.5%	411 ms	288 ms	518 ms

R ([R Core Team 2017](#)) and *lmerTest* ([Kuznetsova et al. 2017](#)) were used to perform a linear (or logistic, in the case of first-pass regressions) mixed effects analysis of the relationship between each of these five reading measures, the noun type, and the construction. Fixed effects were noun type (event or entity) and construction (Canadian or prepositional). The contrast coding chosen for these two categorical factors (noun type and construction) was simple coding, rather than R’s default treatment coding, in order to test main effects rather than simple effects. This means that the effect of noun type presented below is tested across levels of construction, and the effect of construction is similarly tested across noun types. These are the desired hypotheses to be tested (in addition to the interaction between noun type and construction). For these two-level factors, this involved coding one level as -0.5 and the other level as 0.5. “Event” was the reference level (-0.5) for noun type and “prepositional” was the reference level for construction.

The analyses were planned with the maximal random effects structure justified by the experimental design ([Barr et al. 2013](#)), which means random intercepts for subjects and items (36 participants and 32 nouns), along with by-subject random slopes for noun type and construction, and by-item random slopes for construction (by-item slopes for noun type were not possible because each item was either one noun type or the other). This random effect structure was used for first-pass time, go-past time, and total time. For first-pass regression ratio and second-pass time, a model with random slopes failed to converge, and so the results from a simpler model (with only random intercepts) will be presented instead.

The analyses for each of the five reading measures are presented below, as well as violin plots for each of the five measures (data averaged by participant for each condition). The significance markers are as follows: “***” < 0.001 < “**” < 0.01 < “*” < 0.05 < “.” < 0.1.

First-pass time

FIGURE 1: Violin plot, first-pass time, critical region (R3)

TABLE 3: Mixed effects model, first-pass time, critical region (R3)

Fixed Effects	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t-value	Pr(> t)	Sig
(Intercept)	348.73	14.500	37.34	24.046	< 2e-16	***
Noun Type	17.21	13.52	32.51	1.273	0.21193	
Construction	41.27	12.61	87.02	3.273	0.00153	**
Noun:Construction	15.76	22.83	644.13	0.690	0.49024	

First-pass time is the time from first entering the region before moving on or looking back.

In interpreting this model (and following models), attention should primarily be paid to the main effect of noun type and the interaction between noun type and construction. A main effect of noun type (with a positive estimate) would indicate a coercion effect across both constructions, while an interaction (with a positive estimate) could indicate stronger coercion effects in the Canadian construction, although neither the main effect nor the interaction were found at a statistically significant level for this reading measure.

A main effect of construction would indicate that one construction resulted in overall longer reading times on the noun, across noun types. This was statistically significant in this reading measure (with a positive estimate, meaning that the Canadian construction had overall longer reading times for the noun), although

this is of less interest because it is not relevant for coercion.

First-pass regressions

FIGURE 2: Violin plot, first-pass regressions, critical region (R3)

TABLE 4: Mixed effects model, first-pass regressions, critical region (R3)

Fixed Effects	Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	Pr(> z)	Sig
(Intercept)	-1.32892	0.13291	-9.999	< 2e-16	***
Noun Type	-0.05234	0.18142	-0.289	0.77295	
Construction	0.42588	0.16096	2.646	0.00815	**
Noun:Construction	0.32141	0.32141	1.000	0.31732	

First-pass regression ratio is the likelihood of reading a region for the first time and then re-reading an earlier region. As with first-pass time, there was a significant effect of construction but no effect of noun type and no interaction between construction and noun type.

Go-past time

TABLE 5: Mixed effects model, go-past time, critical region (R3)

Fixed Effects	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t-value	Pr(> t)	Sig
(Intercept)	455.66	23.19	43.31	19.646	< 2e-16	***

Fixed Effects	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t-value	Pr(> t)	Sig
Noun Type	26.16	24.73	32.01	1.058	0.2982	
Construction	103.69	20.75	49.45	4.998	7.66e-06	***
Noun:Construction	82.82	36.23	70.75	2.286	0.0253	*

Go-past time is the time from first entering a region until moving on to a later region (including time spent re-reading an earlier region). The analysis found a significant effect of construction, no effect of noun type, and an interaction between construction and noun type. This interaction is important. Post-hoc analyses found that entity nouns were read significantly longer than event nouns in the Canadian construction according to a by-subjects analysis (paired t-test: $t_{35} = -2.240$, $p = 0.032$), although this did not quite reach significance in a by-items analysis (independent t-test: $t_{23.091} = -1.673$, $p = 0.108$). There was no difference between noun types in the prepositional construction in either the by-subjects ($t_{35} = 0.77491$, $p = 0.444$) or by-items analysis ($t_{29.77} = 0.813$, $p = 0.423$).

Second-pass time

TABLE 6: Mixed effects model, second-pass time, critical region (R3)

Fixed Effects	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t-value	Pr(> t)	Sig
(Intercept)	283.948	7.562	30.462	37.551	< 2e-16	***
Noun Type	18.703	13.775	444.782	1.358	0.17522	
Construction	13.084	13.770	443.439	0.950	0.34251	
Noun:Construction	73.684	27.508	437.494	2.679	0.00767	**

Second-pass time is the time from entering the region for a second time before moving on or looking back. The analysis found no effect of construction or noun type, but there was an interaction between construction and noun type.

Post-hoc analyses using independent t-tests found that entity nouns had a significantly longer second-pass time than event nouns in the Canadian construction (by-items: $t_{19.041} = -2.552$, $p = 0.019$) but there was no difference between noun types in the prepositional construction (by-items: $t_{24.526} = 0.933$, $p = 0.360$).³

Total time

[3] Not all trials had a second-pass time. By-subjects analysis was not possible due to missing data, and so only by-items analysis is presented.

FIGURE 3: Violin plot, go-past time, critical region (R3)

TABLE 7: Mixed effects model, total time, critical region (R3)

Fixed Effects	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t-value	Pr(> t)	Sig
(Intercept)	560.65	32.14	47.73	17.443	< 2e-16	***
Noun Type	19.51	36.28	31.97	0.538	0.5945	
Construction	106.62	22.32	107.87	4.777	5.64e-06	***
Noun:Construction	78.93	43.25	157.08	1.825	0.0699	.

Total time is all of the time spent in the area regardless of when it happened. The analysis found a significant effect of construction, no effect of noun type, and a marginal interaction between construction and noun type. A visual inspection of the data finds the longest total time for entities in the Canadian construction.

Summary

The following table shows a summary of the significant results on each measure. The relevance of these findings will be discussed below. In the table, FP Time is first-pass time, FP Reg is first-pass regressions, GP Time is go-past time, and SP time is second-pass time.

TABLE 8: Summary of results (significance codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 marginal 0.1 n/s 1)

Effect	FP Time	FP Reg	GP Time	SP Time	Total Time
Noun Type	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s
Construction	**	**	***	n/s	***
Interaction	n/s	n/s	*	**	marginal

FIGURE 4: Violin plot, second-pass time, critical region (R3)

past time and second-pass time) there was a significant interaction between noun type and construction, and in one other measure (total time) the interaction was marginal. The meaning and implication of this interaction will be discussed below, but first it is important to mention that failure to find this result on every measure is not unexpected. Go-past time is based on first-pass time and first-pass regressions, so smaller (non-significant) trends in those measures can compound into a larger effect that is visible (and statistically significant) in go-past time. The measures where a significant or marginal interaction was found (go-past time, second-pass time, and total time) in this experiment line up with the reading measures where a significant or marginal coercion effect was found in [Traxler et al. \(2002\)](#), the original study establishing coercion effects in eye-tracking.

As for the meaning of this interaction, post-hoc t-tests showed that the interaction was a result of entity-denoting nouns having longer go-past time and second-pass time in the Canadian construction but there being no difference between noun types in the prepositional construction. The penalty for entity-denoting nouns found in the Canadian construction on these measures is consistent with the processing effects of coercion, and so this result supports [Fruehwald & Myler's 2015](#) proposal that the adjectives in this construction select for an event description and require complement coercion for interpretation of an entity-denoting noun (in a similar manner to *finish* and other aspectual verbs).

The lack of difference between the noun types in the prepositional context could indicate that the preposition anticipates the upcoming type-shifting operation and attenuates the processing cost, or that it eliminates the selectional requirement for an event description (and thus the need for type-shifting when en-

FIGURE 5: Violin plot, total time, critical region (R3)

countering an entity-denoting noun). Various authors have remarked that adding prepositions to aspectual verbs changes the interpretation in ways that are relevant for coercion. [Verspoor \(1997\)](#) compares *begin* and *begin on*, arguing that the prepositional version “indicates only that something is being done with the NP object, leaving a more specific interpretation to be established using contextual information”—which could mean anticipating the type-shifting operation.⁴ Looking at the equivalent in Dutch, *beginnen aan*, [Honselaar \(1980\)](#) (cited and translated in [Sweep 2012](#)) argues that *beginnen* needs to be combined with an event object while *beginnen aan* combines much more freely; [Sweep \(2012\)](#) argues that *beginnen aan* “makes logical metonymy [referring to complement coercion sentences like ‘Mary began the book’] easier to understand”. A deeper semantic analysis of coercion (or the lack of coercion) in the *done with NP* prepositional construction is outside the scope of this paper, although these precedents in the literature regarding prepositions and aspectual verbs does support the plausibility of the preposition anticipating type-shifting or eliminating the need for type-shifting.

[3] CONCLUSION

Previous literature has shown that entity-denoting objects have a processing cost when following event-selecting verbs (like *begin the book*). This cost has been associated with the need to coerce and reinterpret *the book* as an event in that context

[4] This has precedent in the processing literature. Processing difficulty related to mass-to-count coercion (like in *yesterday, I bought imported beers [...]*) has been shown to be attenuated when a numeral is provided before the object to make the reader anticipate a count interpretation (*yesterday, I bought three imported beers [...]*) ([Frazier & Frisson 2005](#)).

(*begin [the book] to begin [reading the book]*). Results from an eye-tracking study presented here found that entity-denoting objects also have a processing cost in the Canadian English *be done NP* construction (*I'm done the book*), suggesting that these aspectual adjectives behave similarly to aspectual verbs in selecting for event descriptions and requiring coercion for interpretation of entity-denoting nouns, as was argued by Fruehwald & Myler (2015).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Margaret Grant, Philip Monahan, Guillaume Thomas, and Suzi Lima for their involvement in this project, as well as Mercedeh Mohaghegh, Kelly-Ann Blake, Kristen DonPaul, and Erin Pettibone for various kinds of help. I also want to thank the audience of the Workshop on Approaches to Coercion and Polysemy (CoPo 2017) at the University of Oslo for their feedback.

REFERENCES

- de Almeida, Roberto G. 2004. The effect of context on the processing of type-shifting verbs. *Brain and language* 90(1-3). 249–261.
- de Almeida, Roberto G. & Veena D. Dwivedi. 2008. Coercion without lexical decomposition: Type-shifting effects revisited. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 53(2/3). 301–326.
- Asher, Nicholas. 2011. *Lexical Meaning in Context: A Web of Words*. Cambridge University Press.
- Balota, David A., Melvin J. Yap, Keith A. Hutchison, Michael J. Cortese, Brett Kessler, Bjorn Loftis, James H. Neely, Douglas L. Nelson, Greg B. Simpson & Rebecca Treiman. 2007. The English lexicon project. *Behavior Research Methods* 39(3). 445–459.
- Barr, Dale J., Roger Levy, Christoph Scheepers & Harry J. Tily. 2013. Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of memory and language* 68(3). doi:10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3881361/>.
- Briscoe, Ted, Anne Copestake & Bran Boguraev. 1990. Enjoy the paper: lexical semantics via lexicology. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 42–47. Helsinki.
- Egg, Markus. 2003. Beginning Novels and Finishing Hamburgers: Remarks on the Semantics of *to begin*. *Journal of Semantics* 20(2). 163–191. doi:10.1093/jos/20.2.163. <https://academic.oup.com/jos/article/20/2/163/1621112>.

- Frazier, Lyn & Steven Frisson. 2005. Carving up word meanings: Portioning and grinding. *Journal of Memory and Language* 53(2). 277–291.
- Frisson, Steven & Brian McElree. 2008. Complement coercion is not modulated by competition: Evidence from eye movements. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 34(1). 1–11.
- Fruehwald, Josef & Neil Myler. 2015. I'm done my homework—Case assignment in a stative passive. *Linguistic Variation* 15(2). 141–168.
- Honselaar, Wilhelmus J. J. 1980. *Valenties en diathesen: een bijdrage tot russische valentie- en genustheorieën en een toepassing daarvan bij de semantisch-syntactische descriptie van enige verba, deictische woorden en preposities in het Nederlands*. Universiteit van Amsterdam. Google-Books-ID: lbJyjcEACAAJ.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. *The architecture of the language faculty*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Katsika, Argyro, David Braze, Ashwini Deo & Maria Mercedes Piñango. 2012. Complement coercion: Distinguishing between type-shifting and pragmatic inferring. *The Mental Lexicon* 7(1). 58–76.
- Kuznetsova, Alexandra, Per Bruun Brockhoff & Rune Haubo Bojesen Christensen. 2017. *lmerTest: Tests in linear mixed effects models*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lmerTest>.
- McElree, Brian, Matthew J. Traxler, Martin J. Pickering & Rachel E. Seely. 2001. Reading time evidence for enriched composition. *Cognition* 78(1). B17–B25.
- Moens, Marc & Mark Steedman. 1988. Temporal ontology and temporal reference. *Computational Linguistics* 14(2). 15–28.
- Piñango, Maria Mercedes & Ashwini Deo. 2016. Reanalyzing the Complement Coercion Effect through a Generalized Lexical Semantics for Aspectual Verbs. *Journal of Semantics* 33(2). 359–408. doi:10.1093/jos/ffv003. <https://academic.oup.com/jos/article/33/2/359/2413887>.
- Piñango, Maria Mercedes, Edgar Zurif & Ray Jackendoff. 1999. Real-time processing implications of enriched composition at the syntax-semantics interface. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 28(4). 395–414.
- Pickering, Martin J., Brian McElree & Matthew J. Traxler. 2005. The difficulty of coercion: A response to de Almeida. *Brain and Language* 93(1). 1–9.
- Pustejovsky, James. 1991. The generative lexicon. *Computational Linguistics* 17(4). 409–441.

- Pustejovsky, James. 1995. *The generative lexicon*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina & Brian McElree. 2006. The syntax–semantics interface: On-line composition of sentence meaning. In Matthew J. Traxler & Morton A. Gernsbacher (eds.), *Handbook of Psycholinguistics*, vol. 2, 539–581.
- R Core Team. 2017. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Sweep, J. 2012. *Metonymical object changes: a corpus-oriented study on Dutch and German*. UtrechtLOT9789460930911. <https://dare.uva.nl/search?identifier=849907fc-d37e-4e85-b567-b6c74c0627cc>.
- Traxler, Matthew J., Brian McElree & Rihana S. Williams. 2005. Context effects in coercion: Evidence from eye-movements. *Journal of Memory and Language* 53(1). 1–25.
- Traxler, Matthew J., Martin J. Pickering & Brian McElree. 2002. Coercion in sentence processing: evidence from eye-movements and self-paced reading. *Journal of Memory and Language* 47(4). 530–547.
- Verspoor, Cornelia Maria. 1997. Contextually-Dependent Lexical Semantics, .
- Yerastov, Yuri. 2008. I am done dinner: A case of lexicalization. In *Proceedings of the 2008 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, Vancouver, BC.
- Yerastov, Yuri. 2012. Transitive be perfect: An experimental study of Canadian English. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 57(3). 427–457.

AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

Patrick Murphy
University of Toronto
p.murphy@mail.utoronto.ca