

You are driving me up the wall! A corpus-based study of a special class of resultative constructions

Gloria Corpas Pastor

<https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6343>

[Abstract](#) | [Index](#) | [Outline](#) | [Text](#) | [Bibliography](#) | [Notes](#) | [Illustrations](#) | [References](#) | [About the author](#)

ABSTRACTS

ENGLISHFRANCAIS

This paper focuses on resultative constructions from a computational and corpus-based approach. We claim that the array of expressions (traditionally classed as idioms, collocations, free word combinations, etc.) that are used to convey a person's change of mental state (typically negative) are basically instances of the same resultative construction. The first part of the study will introduce basic tenets of Construction Grammar and resultatives. Then, our corpus-based methodology will be spelled out, including a description of the two giga-token corpora used and a detailed account of our protocolised heuristic strategies and tasks. Distributional analysis of matrix slot fillers will be presented next, together with a discussion on restrictions, novel instances, and productivity. A final section will round up our study, with special attention to notions like "idiomaticity", "productivity" and "variability" of the pairings of form and meaning analysed. To the best of our knowledge, this is one of the first studies based on giga-token corpora that explores idioms as integral parts of higher-order resultative constructions.

[Top of page](#)

INDEX TERMS

Mots-clés :

[Grammaire de Construction](#), [construction résultative](#), [idiome](#), [collocation](#), [corpus](#), [productivité](#)

Keywords:

[Construction Grammar](#), [resultative construction](#), [idiom](#), [collocation](#), [corpus](#), [productivity](#)

[Top of page](#)

OUTLINE

[Introduction](#)

[1. Resultatives and lower-order constructions](#)

[2. Data collection and methodology](#)

[2.1. Choice of corpora](#)

[2.2. Search protocol](#)

[3. Results and discussion](#)

[4. Conclusion](#)

[Top of page](#)

FULL TEXT

File not available

[Send by e-mail](#)

This paper has been carried out in the framework of several research projects on language technologies (ref. PID2020-112818GB-I00, E3/04/21, UMA-CEIATECH-04). The author would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

[Introduction](#)

Recent years have witnessed a dramatic change of paradigm in phraseology research. Traditional methods have given way to various quantitative, distributional, and computational approaches. Particularly relevant to this paper are three emerging theoretical threads (and their complementary methodologies): Construction Grammar, Computational Phraseology and Corpus Linguistics (Dobrovolskij & Piirainen [2018], Fellbaum [2019], Goldberg [2019], Corpas Pastor & Colson [2020]).

We adopt a constructionist approach to the usage-based study of property resultatives (Gries [2013]). Resultative constructions are schematic patterns that convey a change of state caused by the completion of an action or event. When expressing motion, resultatives lexicalise the manner in which the action is performed and indicate the trajectory of the movement and the result outside the verbal unit by means of an adjectival or prepositional phrase (Levin & Rappaport Hovav [2006]). Instances like *drive someone up the wall*, *drive someone out of his/her mind* or *drive someone mad* illustrate metaphorical extensions of the caused motion construction where states are considered locations. In this paper, the terms *resultative construction* and *resultative* will be used interchangeably to encompass all subtypes.

Our initial claim is that this array of idiomatic expressions are just instances of the same type of resultative constructions which convey a person's change of mental state (typically negative). Differences among instances are due to various collocational preferences that seem to operate at various levels, including grammaticalisation and coercion processes.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 1 revolves around core notions of Construction Grammar (CxG), with a special focus on resultative constructions. Section 2 will describe the methodology used in this paper. Resultative constructional idioms of this type will be extracted from two giga-token corpora of contemporary English through protocolised tasks in the form of heuristic strategies and steps. Section 3 will present the results and main findings of our corpus-based study of idiomatic property resultatives, with a focus on pairings of form and meaning (Martí Solano [2020], Corpas Pastor [2021]). Corpora will be analysed in a number of ways, including the frequency of this construction in English (in the two varieties selected), the basic

elements of its syntactic structure, and the semantic and informative constraints which operate on these constructions, the lexical filledness of slots, usage and diatopic restrictions, etc. In the concluding part (Section 3), the relevance of our study will be discussed, with special attention to notions like “idiomaticity”, “productivity” and “variability”, among others, which will be revisited from a corpus-based and computational perspective.

To the best of our knowledge, this is one of the first studies based on giga-token corpora that explores idioms as part of more general property resultative constructions.

1. Resultatives and lower-order constructions

Construction Grammar (conventionally abbreviated to CxG) refers to a family of formal and usage-based constructionist approaches that understand language as an intricately structured, semantically motivated network of symbolic units, referred to as *constructions* (Hoffmann & Trousdale [2013]). Constructions have been characterised in different ways. For the purposes of this paper, the usage-based definition proposed by Goldberg [2006: 5] will be adopted:

Any linguistic pattern is recognized as a construction as long as some aspect of its form or function is not strictly predictable from its component parts or from other constructions recognized to exist. In addition, patterns are stored as constructions even if they are fully predictable as long as they occur with sufficient frequency.

Each construction is considered to be symbolic because it comprises a pairing of a particular form with a particular meaning and/or function. In other words, constructions have a form side that is conventionally associated to a meaning pole which is by default non-compositional (it cannot be derived or computed from the assembly of individual parts).¹ These conventionalised form-meaning pairs vary greatly in size, complexity and schematicity (Croft & Cruse [2004]), ranging from morphemes (e.g., *dis-*, *-ed*), to words (e.g., *hand*, *daredevil*), filled idioms or partially lexically-filled phrasal patterns (e.g., *make a mountain out of a molehill*, *send someone to Coventry*), and more abstract patterns, like the covariational conditional construction [*the Xer... the Yer*] or the ditransitive construction [Subj V Obj_i Obj_j]. In this constructional network, traditional idioms are no longer viewed as exceptions or irregularities, but as constructions of their own that may share certain aspects with fully productive expressions (and vice versa).

Following this line of reasoning, an idiom like *drive someone up the wall* (‘to make (someone) irritated, angry, or crazy’)² would be a special case (constructional idiom, C_i) of another, more abstract construction (resultative construction, C_r). Instances of C_r can be found in examples (1-4):

(1) There are times when he wants to re-create an event but to the exact detail that he remembers, and I must admit that it drives me up the wall. (AEM)³

(2) He accepted to play the king’s fool as long as this did not do violence to his conscience and did not drive him insane, allowing him to push social reform. (EnTT15)

(3) Parents and passers-by were able to push the gate open just enough to prevent it from closing completely. The child had to be physically pulled free, but escaped serious injury. (EnTT15).

(4) I found myself at the Sporting Club in Tribeca, New York City, screaming myself hoarse, painted all over with green, red, and white theatrical paint (AEM).

(5) Men often drink themselves crazy to get over the day’s experiences while women often cry their eyes out. (EnTT15)

Key components of the Resultative construction are the agent (causer), the patient (experiencer of the caused action), the result/goal (the new state) and the verbal action that causes the change of state. According to Boas [2003: 9], resultatives can be (i) transitive, i.e., based on transitive verbs occurring with an additional phrase supplying the resultative interpretation (as in ex. 1, 2 and 3); (ii) intransitive, i.e., based on intransitive verbs occurring with both a non-subcategorised noun phrase⁴ (NP) and a resultative phrase to yield the resultative interpretation (as in ex. 4); and (iii) based on transitive verbs with both a non-subcategorised NP and a resultative phrase (as in ex. 5).

Goldberg & Jackendoff [2004: 536-537] use the alternative term “Property Resultative Constructions” to denominate this type of metaphorical extension where states are considered locations.⁵ Resultative constructions can be also considered a metaphorical extension of the Caused Motion Construction: ‘A causes B to move to C by doing D’ (Goldberg [2006]). In this respect, Levin & Rappaport Hovav [2006] point out that resultatives expressing motion lexicalise the manner in which the action is performed and indicate the trajectory of the movement and the result outside the verbal unit by means of an adjectival or prepositional phrase. Thus, *drive someone up the wall* (C_i) can be seen as a partially lexically filled instance of the Resultative construction (C_r), which is described below in two alternative ways:

FORM: [SB₁ V₁ OBJ₁ OBL₁] ↔ MEANING: ‘Agent₁ causes Patient₁ to become State₁ by V₁-ing’.

FORM: [X V Y Z] ↔ MEANING: ‘X causes Y to become Z by V-ing’, where Y is animate and Z is usually an adjectival or prepositional construction.

Following Hoffmann [2017], we will use the second description (more informal and schematic) of the form and meaning parts of these types of conventional pairings. The arbitrary nature of the two poles is represented by a bidirectional arrow.

We argue that *drive someone up the wall* is dominated by the Resultative construction via an instance link, i.e., the instance inherits the syntax and semantics associated with the superordinate construction. And the other way round, *drive someone up the wall* would dominate C_r by a subpart link (as a proper subpart of C_r that exists independently). We also claim that the same inheritance links can be observed with regards to the other instances of resultatives in the examples above (*drive someone insane*, *pull someone free*, and *freeze solid*). The intricate mutual-influence relationships that govern constructions can be further illustrated by C_i with regard to the Verb-specific *drive*-construction (C_s, ex. 3) which is both an instance of C_r and a part of C_i, and so forth.

Resultatives have been extensively analysed in the literature. A state of the art, albeit brief, would be outside the scope of this study. Instead, the interested reader is referred to the seminal works by Boas [2003], Goldberg & Jackendoff [2004] and Beavers [2012]. In this paper we will focus on a special class of resultatives exemplified above: *verb-specific constructions* (Croft [2012]). They have also been termed *mini-constructions* (Boas [2003]) and *collocational constructions* (Corpas Pastor [2015], [2017a]).⁶

Verb-specific constructions are partially lexically-filled phrasal patterns (Goldberg [2006: 215]). They are characterised as form-meaning pairings that capture generalisations at the level of verb classes. Verb-specific constructions are more substantive – and, therefore, less schematic – than general constructional schemas (e.g., ditransitive, resultative, etc.). According to Boas [2003], they are represented by an event-frame⁷ with its own semantic/pragmatic and syntactic specification. In this type of constructions only verbs of a given class may occur in the construction at hand, but not every member of the verb class can always do so. These constructions are always partially lexicalised regarding their verbal slot, which is instantiated by a set of verbal fillers selected in some arbitrary fashion, similarly to the collocational restrictions described in the literature (cf. Copras Pastor [2015, 2017b]).

It should be noted that verb-specific constructions are related to other lexically-filled phrasal patterns: *constructional idioms*. According to Booij [2002: 320], constructional idioms are “syntactic constructions with a (partially or fully) non-compositional meaning contributed by the construction, in which – unlike idioms in the traditional sense – only a subset (possibly empty) of the terminal elements is fixed”. These symbolic units exhibit varying degrees of productivity and schematicity (Taylor [2015]).⁸

The *Drive Y Z* construction also classes as a constructional idiom, as its meaning/function is not entirely compositional. For instance, in ex. 6 the non-compositional nature of this construction shines through the adverb *literally*, while negative prosody is implied by the danger of remembering a traumatic experience (notice the use of the connector *or*). The interplay between literal and idiomatic readings is also present in ex. 13. Negative prosody is marked in ex. 7 (notice the use of expletives *goddammit*, *damn*) and also implicit in ex. 11 and 12. Like most idioms, the metaphorical basis of the construction functions as an intensifying element: compare *irritate somebody* versus *drive somebody mad* and *drive somebody up the wall*. An example of explicit intensification can be also found in ex. 8, 9, 13 and 15 (notice a frequent use of exclamation marks and gradation, like *so much*, *nearly*, etc.). In some cases, the emotions are intense, difficult to control, but not necessarily negative,⁹ as in ex. 15. Resultatives with APs *wild* and *crazy* (and occasionally *mad*) may also carry sexual connotations (ex. 8-10). This is particularly the case in some resultatives with PPs like *over the edge*, as they tend to convey intense desire and lust (ex. 16).

(6) But it's also so horrific and terrible that it must quickly be forgotten or it could literally drive you insane. (AAM)¹⁰

(7) Goddammit I know. This is driving me crazy. They want it faster and it has to support all these other damn systems. (AAM)

(8) I love you so much. You drive me wild. (enTT15)¹¹

(9) These girls are very open minded and would drive you crazy with their sexy figures and erotic talks. (enTTT15)

(10) The Changeling is a gripping and darkly comic tale of how love and sex drive us mad, and one of the most powerful tragedies ever written. (enTT15)

(11) They smell large amounts of money and they circle like sharks in bloody water. Money is like pheromones to them and it drives them into a frenzy with desire to obtain it. (enTT15)

(12) Injustice and cruelty drives him to despair and loss of faith. (enTT15)

(13) The crumbs I can deal with – it was the footprints and smudges that drove me batty! (enTT15)

(14) When my son was very young, and I was telling him off, I said, “You’re driving me up the wall!”. He instantly imagined himself actually driving me up the wall, and burst out laughing. When I realised what he was laughing at, I had to join in. (enTT15)

(15) It took a ton of self control, because the tempting peanut buttery chocolate smell alone was nearly driving me insane (AAM).

(16) As always, because we have such a close bond, we orgasmed together, well it was actually her third when I finally let myself go into her to drive her totally over the edge. (enTT15).

In general, constructional idioms have often been considered as just idiomatic sequences, but this view ignores the fact that these are not isolated cases but productive constructions that can be used with a variety of fillers, mainly in the verbal slot (Corpas Pastor [2021]). In this respect, resultative verb-specific constructions could also be classed as a special type of constructional idioms.

In this light, examples (1-2) and examples (6-15) instantiate higher- and lower-order constructions: (i) a resultative construction, (ii) a verb-specific resultative construction, and (iii) a resultative constructional idiom. They all contribute to the meaning/form pairings of a given instance, as lower-order constructions are inter-dependent on higher-order constructions, and vice versa. We will refer to this construction conglomerate as the *Drive-class Y Z* construction (*Drive-class* construction, for short). This special case of the Resultative construction can be described¹² as follows:

FORM: [X DRIVE Y_{animate} Z] ↔ MEANING: ‘X causes Y to become Z (insane, mentally unstable, very unsettled and/or irritated) {intensification, metaphorical implications, and usually negative prosody}’

2. Data collection and methodology

Cognitive Construction Grammar (Goldberg [1995], [2006], [2013]) and Radical Construction Grammar (Croft [2001], [2013]), consider frequency¹³ as a distinctive feature: symbolic units emerge through repeated experience with actual instances of constructions and their generalisations, and this also fosters entrenchment. The higher the input frequency of a particular

construction (construct and/or pattern) is, the stronger will be its entrenchment in the neural work (Hoffmann [2013: 315]). In many approaches to CxG, constructions are equated to mental representations that are learned through language use and are particularly sensitive to a number of factors, such as type and token frequency or prototypicality, among others. For this reason, usage-based constructionist approaches are particularly amenable to corpus-based methods (Yoon & Gries [2016]).

This section will include a description of the corpora selected for the study, as well as the heuristic data analysis approach applied.

2.1. Choice of corpora

It is an established fact that to study resultatives a large corpus is needed. According to Boas [2003: 11], "in order to construct an adequate theory of resultative constructions, we should not restrict ourselves to a limited set of data, but should instead aim at collecting large amounts of empirical data in order to cover the subject of study in its entirety". In the case of idiomatic resultative constructions, corpus data are even more necessary due to their low number of occurrences. Compare the frequency of *drive* (someone) *up the wall* in the corpus enTenTen15 (628 tokens/ 0.04 per million tokens) with the figures for *drive* (2,169,187/ 140.75) and the prepositional phrase *up the wall* (2,826/ 0.18).

Boas [2003] used the British National Corpus (BNC) of 100 million words in his account of English resultatives. He studied the Resultative construction with *drive* consisting of an animate object with an adjective or prepositional phrase synonymous with *mad* in the BNC corpus. He concluded that this type of verb-specific resultative construction (*drive-crazy*) is very productive in English, it is partially lexically filled and largely conventionalised (like the majority of resultative constructions), and it shows a clear preference for adjectives or adjectival phrases (APs) (*mad, crazy, insane, wild, nuts, batty, dotty, crackers*) over prepositional phrases (PPs) (*to madness, to insanity, to distraction, to suicide, to despair, to desperation, up the wall, into a frenzy, over the edge*).

In Corpas Pastor [2021], we studied the *Drive Y Z* construction¹⁴ in three very large web-crawled corpora: enTenTen15¹⁵, News on the Web¹⁶, and The Global Web-based English corpus¹⁷. We compared Boas's [2003] results with occurrences of 'insanity' synonyms in the three giga-corpora analysed. We focused on APs and related PPs (*to madness, to insanity*). Our findings are summarised in Table 1:

Table 1. Distribution of 'insanity' synonyms in the Drive Y Z construction (Corpas Pastor [2021])

	BNC	enTenTen15	enNOW	GloWbE
mad	108	5,094	821	429
crazy	70	13,514	2297	1168
insane	23	3,771	443	333
wild	22	2,194	244	102
nuts	18	68	615	410
batty	4	468	53	37
dotty	4	9	2	1
crackers	4	8	4	4
to madness	5	763	19	8
to insanity	1	402	9	16

In the aforementioned paper we argue that the present situation differs from Boas' account [2003] in that the inventory of 'insanity' adjectives and causative verbs has changed substantially. New adjectives have appeared (*mental, frantic, berserk, potty, loopy, bonkers, bananas*), while others tend to be used much less (*dotty, crackers*). At the same time, the set of verbs used in the *drive* construction with the most typical or central adjectives (*mad, crazy, insane, wild*) seems to have expanded as well: *make, get, send, turn*¹⁸. The large data retrieved from the giga-token corpora also show that the *Drive X Y* construction formally occurs with the central verb *drive* and two central 'insanity' adjectives (*mad* and *crazy*), that are variably dependent: the central adjective of the construction seems to have moved from *mad* to *crazy* in World English (and non-British varieties), with a strong preference for *mad* in British English.¹⁹

We also concluded that giga-token corpora provide much richer data on this type of low-occurring constructions. However, frequency differences across three corpora could be determined by their different size, composition and/or type: enTenTen15 and GloWbE are web-crawled reference corpora of mixed genres that include a large number of English varieties, while enNOW is a monitor corpus that contains web-based newspapers and magazines from 2021 to the present time (its size increases around two billion words each year).

The differences in the results obtained by Boas [2003] and Corpas Pastor [2021] could be partially explained by the small-scale corpus used by the former. For this study, two giga-token corpora of English have been selected: the enTenTen15 (enTT15) and Araneum Anglicum Maius (AAM or Araneum, for short), a 1.2 billion-word Web corpus created in 2013 and released in 2015²⁰. These two corpora are roughly comparable in terms of compilation method (automatic creation), pre-processing, time frame, mixed genres and language varieties covered²¹. Both of them are available through Sketch Engine²². They differ in size: while both of them are huge corpora of contemporary English (over 1 billion words), enTenTen15 is twelve times bigger than the Araneum that, in its turn, is twelve times bigger than the BNC. See Table 2 for a summary description of the two corpora:

Table 2. Corpus size and components

		enTenTen15	Araneum Anglicum Maius
Tokens²³		15,411,682,875	1,200,023,361
Words		13,190,556,334	888,466,066
Types		46,275,610	4,696,677
Documents		33,655,541	1,159,878
Subcorpora			
BrE	Tokens²⁴	667,443,008	65,859,463
AmE	Tokens	179,947,609	8,913,437
Genres			
Mixed genres: Arts, Business, Computers, Games, Health, Home, News, Recreation, Reference, Regional, Science, Shopping, Society, Sports.			Mixed genres (non-specified). ²⁵

General English (World English) and the two main varieties (British and American) will be considered. World English encompasses all English varieties included in each corpus (including American and British English), plus documents in English with non-country specific top language domains (TLD), such as .eu, .org, .gov, .com, .net, etc. The enTenTen15 corpus includes subcorpora of British and American English by default, as well as other subcorpora of Australian, Canadian, European, Indian, New Zealand and South African varieties. The Araneum corpus does not include subcorpora of language varieties. In this case we have created two subcorpora from documents whose URL ends in the country specific Internet domains .uk and .us.

2.2. Search protocol

Our methodology is partially based on Boas [2003] and Corpas Pastor [2021]. It includes a recursive data collection protocol which consists of three heuristic phases:

- Initial selection of matrix verbs and resultative phrases;
- Quantitative analysis based on distributional data;
- Extraction of further instances through query patterns.

First, all slot fillers identified by Boas [2003] and Corpas [2021] for the *Drive-class* Y Z construction have been selected and sorted according to their corresponding slot (Y or Z), and per pattern within slot Z (APs, PPs). List A encompasses all matrix verbs ('drive-mental state': e.g., *drive, send*). List B includes resultative APs (e.g., *mad, potty, bonkers*) and List C encompasses resultative PPs (*to insanity, up the wall*). Lists A²⁶ and C have been further enlarged with other resultative PPs that occur in idiomatic resultative constructions with *drive²⁷*, which we have extracted randomly from various dictionaries. Table 3 displays the base fillers for the verbal slots (i.e., verbs that fuse in this construction) and the resultative phrases (APs and PPs).

Table 3. Base slots fillers

A	B	C
Verbs	APs	PPs
drive	bananas	around the bend
get	batty	into a frenzy
make	berserk	on edge
put	bonkers	over the edge
render	crackers	out of mind
send	crazy	out of one's mind
set	dotty	out of one's wits
turn	frantic	round the bend
	loopy	to despair

	insane	to desperation
	mad	to distraction
	mental	to insanity
	nuts	to madness
	potty	to suicide
	wild	up the wall

Lists A, B and C enable us to extract distributional data for this construction automatically.²⁸ To this end, a PHP script has been written to extract data from the Sketch Engine JSON API²⁹ (application programming interface)³⁰. The script generates the necessary CQL (corpus query language) query patterns by means of the matrix verbs and resultative phrases in Table 3. Fig. 1 shows a fragment of the script.

The script uses automated HTTP requests to communicate with the API. Araneum and enTenTen15 (sub)corpora have been queried automatically in a sequential fashion. Four CQL query patterns have been launched in order to extract frequency data for each construct (V+AP or V+PP pattern) from each corpus: (i) MatrixVerb_AP_enTT15, (ii) MatrixVerb_PP_enTT15_PP, (iii) MatrixVerb_AP_AAM, and (iv) MatrixVerb_PP_AAM. Then, the API answers have been stored by means of tables.

By way of illustration, for the query `[lemma="drive"][tag="(NP.*|PP)"][lemma="crazy"]` in one of the corpora, we obtained the frequency result `"consize": 1114`, which we entered in the corresponding table. In addition, to create the subcorpora we have used two general query patterns that encompass all constructs in pattern V+AP or V+PP per corpus. These pattern-filtered subcorpora are intended to be used for qualitative analysis of the data.

Figure 1. Script screenshot

```
/**
 * Get the URL to query SketchEngine API.
 * @param String $action Query type (SketchEngine): wordlist, wsketch, thes, wsdiff, view, freqs, collx
 * @param String $corpname Name of the corpus we want to query. Ej: preloaded/ententen20_tt31
 * @param String $query Query in CQL format
 * @return String URL generated from provided data, in format SketchEngine API expects
 */
function getSEurl($action, $corpname, $query, $subcorp=null){
    $url = "https://api.sketchengine.eu/bonito/run.cgi/$action?".
        "corpname=$corpname". // Name of the corpus to query
        "&format=json"; // returns JSON format
    if($subcorp != null) $url .= "&usesubcorp=".urlencode($subcorp);

    switch($action){
        case "view":
            $url .= "&async=0". // Wait until get all results
                "&pagesize=20". // Number of results obtained (per page)
                "&structs=x". // To avoid appearing of tags <p>, <s>, etc.
                "&q=$query"; // CQL query
            break;
    }
}
```

The third step of our protocolised method allows us (a) to uncover (novel) slot fillers not included in Table 3, and (b) to extract additional instances of fillers in Table 3 which could not be retrieved/quantified automatically in the previous phase of our analysis, due to sequence discontinuity, wrong POS and parsing errors, typos, substandard spellings, grammatical errors, among others. For example, sequences like "as in "Without Umbra stabilizing the sword, it drove whoever touched it insane" (enTenTen15), "dive him mad" (Araneum), "is driving me mad", "druv me crazy", "drovey me crazy" (enTenTen15), etc. can only be retrieved and quantified this way.

To this end, six pattern-based search sequences have been used in the form of CQL advanced queries (see below). Results have been used to enlarge/revise the inventory of slot fillers and to refine the quantitative analysis performed in the previous phase.

1) V. + Pers. Pron./Pers. Noun + Resultative APs (List B, Table 3)

```
[tag="V.*" & lemma!="(get|drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn)"] [tag="(NP.*|PP)"][tag="J.*" &
lemma="(bananas|batty|berserk|bonkers|crackers|crazy|dotty|insane|mad|
mental|nuts|frantic|loopy|potty|wild)"]
```

2) V. + Pers. Pron./Pers. Noun + Resultative PPs (List C, Table 3)

```
[tag="V.*" & lemma!="(drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn|drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn)"]
[tag="(NP.*|PP)"]([lemma="a?round"]|[lemma="the"]|[lemma="bend"]|
[lemma="into"]|[lemma="a"]|[lemma="frenzy"]|[lemma="to"] |[lemma="distraction|insanity|madness|suicide|despair|desperation"]|
[lemma="over"]|[lemma="the"]|[lemma="edge"]|[lemma="on"]|[lemma="edge"]]
```

```
[lemma="out"][lemma="of"][lemma="mind"][lemma="out"][lemma="of"]
[tag="PP.+"][lemma="mind|wits"][lemma="up"][lemma="the"][lemma="wall"])
```

3) *Matrix V. (List A, Table 3) + Pers. Pron./Pers. Noun + Adj.*

```
[tag="V.*" & lemma="(drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn|drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn)"] [tag="(NP.*|PP)"][tag="J.*" &
lemma!="(bananas|batty|berserk|bonkers|crackers|crazy|dotty|insane|mad|mental|nuts|frantic|loopy|potty|wild)"]
```

4) *Matrix V. (List A, Table 3) + Pers. Pron./Pers. Noun + Prep. + N.*

```
[tag="V.*" & lemma="(drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn)"] [tag="(NP.*|PP)"][tag="IN"][tag="N.*" &
lemma!="(distraction|insanity|madness|suicide|despair|desperation)"]
```

5) *Matrix V. (List A, Table 3) + Pers. Pron./Pers. Noun + Prep. + Det. + N*

```
[tag="V.*" & lemma="(drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn)"] [tag="(NP.*|PP)"][tag="IN"][tag="DT"][tag="N.*" &
lemma!="(bend|frenzy|mind|wall)"]
```

6) *Matrix V. (List A, Table 3) + Pers. Pron./Pers. Noun + Prep. + Adj. pos. + N*

```
[tag="V.*" & lemma="(drive|make|put|render|send|set|turn)"] [tag="(NP.*|PP)"][tag="IN"][tag="PP.+"][tag="N.*" &
lemma!="(mind|wits)"]
```

3. Results and discussion

This section summarises the main findings of our study. We have performed quantitative and qualitative analyses of the construction under scrutiny in the two corpora selected (enTenTen15 and Araneum). Quantitative data will be provided by means of tables and also as part of the discussion. Tables 4-11 have been obtained automatically through the script described in Section 2. Due to the low frequency of most slot fillers, only raw figures have been entered (i.e., total number of occurrences in both corpora). Normalised frequencies (also retrieved automatically via the script) are provided throughout the discussion when appropriate. Further instances and any other distributional data, obtained by means of the six pattern-based CQL queries (phase 3), will be provided as part of the discussion.

Tables 4-11 are organised per matrix verbs in descending order of frequency of co-occurrence with *crazy* (central AP) in enTenTen15: *drive* (8,481), *make* (2,152), *get* (128), *send* (45), *turn* (44), *put* (20), *set* (9) and *render* (1). Raw frequencies are provided for both enTenTen15 and Araneum (World English at the top; British English below, right, American English, left below). For instance, the figures in Table 5 for *drive someone insane* are to be read as follows: 2,073 occurrences in enTenTen15 (24 in the British subcorpus, 25 in the American subcorpus), and 223 occurrences in the Araneum (7 in the British subcorpus, 2 in the American subcorpus).

A word of caution is needed as regards diatopic varieties, as not all documents can be traced back to a particular variety (e.g., TLDs .com, .org, .net, etc.), nor all .uk and .us TLDs necessarily correspond to British and American varieties. For instance, a document identified as .uk is located in Britain, but it could have been produced by a non-British speaker or in any other English-speaking country. In addition, the low number of instances may compromise results on language varieties, since corpora much larger than enTT15 are needed. Distributional data on American and British English in the tables below should be taken as indicative only.

The verb-specific construction *Drive Y Z* licenses resultative constructions with the homonymous verb in its 'drive-mental state' sense (see Table 4). This specific sense is inherited by the verb from the general resultative construction (caused motion), and, through a process of semantic coercion, it is interpreted not as a caused change of place, but as a caused change of mental/emotional state: in this case, resultative APs and PPs in the sense of emotionally unsettled, irritated, unbalanced, etc. No wonder, then, that the verb *drive* is the central verbal slot filler of this particular construction (*drive someone mad/mental/to insanity*, etc.).

Table 4. Matrix verb *drive*

V=drive	Z=AP		Z=PP		
	enTT15	AAM		enTT15	AAM
bananas	24	12	around the bend	20	7
	5 / 0	0 / 0		8 / 2	1 / 0
batty	286	44	into a frenzy	59	3
	3 / 11	0 / 0		1 / 0	0 / 0
berserk	20	2	on edge	1	0

	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
bonkers	208	45	over the edge	281	28
	7 / 2	2 / 0		8 / 7	0
crackers	7	1	out of mind	2	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crazy	8,481	1,114	out of one's mind	121	19
	105 / 154	20 / 8		1 / 2	0 / 0
dotty	5	1	out of one's wits	1	1
	1 / 0	1 / 0		0 / 0	1 / 0
insane	2,073	223	round the bend	21	2
	24 / 25	7 / 2		2 / 2	0 / 0
mad	25	32	to despair	21	26
	22 / 21	26 / 0		10 / 3	4 / 0
mental	60	8	to desperation	64	8
	4 / 0	1 / 0		2 / 0	0 / 0
nuts	23	9	to distraction	315	38
	3 / 4	0 / 0		11 / 4	4 / 0
frantic	20	8	to insanity	67	12
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 1	0 / 0
loopy	12	0	to madness	141	5
	0 / 0	0 / 0		3 / 6	0 / 0
potty	21	3	to suicide	22	23
	7 / 0	1 / 0		12 / 6	2 / 0
wild	1,030	57	up the wall	26	30
	9 / 22	2 / 0		19 / 8	4 / 0

The *Drive* Y Z construction can take all 15 'insanity' adjectives in Z. However, not all APs are equally central. For instance, the adjectives with a higher number of occurrences in both corpora (see Table 4), which also exhibit the highest standardised frequencies, are: (1) *crazy*³¹ (0.55; 0.93), (2) *insane* (0.13; 0.19) and (3) *wild* (0.07; 0.05). The rest of resultative APs with *drive* are (4) *batty* (0.02; 0.04), (5) *bonkers*³², (6) *mental*, (7) *bananas*, (8) *mad*³³, (9) *nuts*, (10) *potty*, (11) *frantic*, (12) *berserk*³⁴, (13) *loopy*; (14) *crackers*, (15) *dotty*.

Drive also seems to have a central position in the construction with PP resultatives. This matrix verb fuses in constructions with all 15 PP resultatives in the 'drive-mental state' sense. The list of preferred PP resultatives (central exemplars) can be also established by their token frequency (raw/standardised) and their coverage, i.e., whether they are instantiated in both corpora or only in one of them. We will assume that all PPs are present in enTT15 by default. Cases of phrasal resultatives that only appear in AAM will be indicated. Central are (1) *to distraction* (0.02; 0.03), (2) *over the edge* (0.02; 0.02), and (3) *to madness* (0.01, <0.01), followed by the rest of the PPs, all of them with normalised frequencies below 0.01: (4) *out of mind*, (5) *to insanity*, (6) *to desperation*, (7) *into a frenzy*, (8) *up the wall*, (9) *to suicide*, (10) *to despair*, (11) *round the bend*, (12) *around the bend*, (13) *out of mind*, (14) *on edge* and (15) *out of one's mind*.

With regard to alternations, a preference for APs over PPs is also confirmed by our data. Compare *drive + insane* (enTT15: 2,073 / 0.13; AAM: 223 / 0.13) and *drive + to insanity* (enTT15: 67 / <0.01; AAM: 12 / 0.01); *drive + mad* (enTT15: 25 / <0.01; AAM: 32 / 0.03) and *drive + to madness* (enTT15: 141 / 0.01; AAM: 6 / <0.01). Interestingly enough, *drive + to madness* (3rd position in the rank) is more frequent as a resultative PP than *drive + mad* (7th position), when compared to the rest of adjectival slot fillers. The preference for APs over PPs can be also easily attested by the number of total instances in both corpora. There are 12,263 occurrences of *drive* with resultative APs in enTT15, but only 1,161 with PPs (1,560 and 202 instances in the AAM, respectively).

Diatopic preferences cannot be easily established because of data sparsity (in addition to other issues mentioned above). In any case, considering coverage in both corpora and normalised frequencies ≥ 0.01 , some constructs with APs appear to be more typical in American English (AmE) than in British English (BrE), and vice versa, although they do not mark diatopy in a clear

way³⁵. For instance, *drive + crazy* (BrE: 0.16; AmE: 0.86)³⁶, *drive + wild* (BrE: 0.01; AmE: 0.12) and *drive + batty* (BrE: <0.01; AmE: 0.06) are more frequently found in American English, while *drive + potty* (BrE: 0.01; AmE: 0)³⁷, *drive + mental* (BrE: 0.01; AmE: 0) and *drive + bonkers* (BrE: 0.01; AmE: 0.01)³⁸ are perhaps more typical of the British variety. Results for *drive + mad* are, to a certain extent, contradictory: according to the standardised frequencies in enTT15, it would be more frequent in the American subcorpus (0.12) as compared with the figures for the British variety (0.03). However, in the AAM the situation depicted seems to be the opposite (BrE: 0.39; AmE: 0).³⁹ Results for constructs with PPs are even more inconclusive as both raw and standardised frequencies are comparatively much lower.

While *drive* seems to be the central matrix verb, other verbs can also fuse in the Drive Y Z construction. According to Boas [2003], this construction occurs occasionally with *make* and *send* as verbs. Findings in Corpas Pastor [2021] confirmed a frequent use of those verbs plus two more (*make*: >7000, *get*: >1000, *send*: >300, *turn*: >100)⁴⁰, as well as occasional uses of the verbs *set* and *render* in this construction. The author notes that these alternative matrix verbs seem to have undergone grammaticalisation (in the case of the four frequent verbs) or semantic specialisation due to strong restrictions in the APs inventory of slot fillers (e.g., *set + wild*, *render + insane*).

⁴¹The remaining part of the discussion will be organised around those subsets of matrix verbs that can fuse in the Drive-class construction: (a) frequent, grammaticalised verbs that represent alternative ways to convey meaning akin to the drive-'mental state' sense (Tables 5-8): *make*, *get*, *send* and *turn*; (b) less frequent verbs that convey meaning akin to the drive-'mental state' sense with strong restrictions on the resultative phrases that may follow the postverbal NP (Tables 9-11): both *render* and *set*, as well as *put*, which has been added to the list of matrix verbs that can fuse in the Drive-class resultative construction (cf. *put some on edge*, see Section 3).

Table 5. Matrix verb *make*

V=make	Z=AP		Z=PP		
	enTT15	AAM		enTT15	AAM
bananas	6	3	around the bend	10	1
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 2	0 / 0
batty	8	2	into a frenzy	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0	0
berserk	6	0	on edge	9	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		1 / 0	0 / 0
bonkers	8	2	over the edge	7	1
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 4	0 / 0
crackers	15	0	out of mind	4	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crazy	2,152	345	out of one's mind	1	0
	16 / 56	3 / 2		0 / 0	0 / 0
dotty	0	0	out of one's wits	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
insane	246	36	round the bend	0	0
	3 / 4	1 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mad	32	25	to despair	0	0
	22 / 20	10 / 4		0	0
mental	149	18	to desperation	1	0
	12 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
nuts	1	0	to distraction	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
frantic	45	3	to insanity	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

loopy	26	2	to madness	0	0
	0 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
potty	5	0	to suicide	7	1
	0 / 1	0 / 0		1 / 0	0 / 0
wild	338	11	up the wall	9	0
	8 / 6	1 / 0		2 / 0	0 / 0

Table 6. Matrix verb *get*

V=get	Z=AP			Z=PP	
	enTT15	AAM		enTT15	AAM
bananas	4	0	around the bend	3	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
batty	1	0	into a frenzy	5	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		1 / 0	0 / 0
berserk	1	0	on edge	16	3
	0 / 0	0 / 0		1 / 2	0
bonkers	1	0	over the edge	23	2
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crackers	4	0	out of mind	6	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crazy	128	12	out of one's mind	428	66
	3 / 3	0 / 0		8 / 5	2 / 1
dotty	0	0	out of one's wits	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
insane	19	2	round the bend	1	1
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mad	25	21	to despair	3	0
	5 / 8	1 / 0		1 / 0	0 / 0
mental	98	14	to desperation	1	0
	1 / 4	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
nuts	4	0	to distraction	1	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
frantic	6	0	to insanity	2	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 1	0 / 0
loopy	0	0	to madness	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
potty	23	5	to suicide	0	0
	0 / 1	1 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

wild	63	4	up the wall	1	0
	2 / 2	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

Table 7. Matrix verb *send*

V=send	Z=AP			Z=PP	
	enTT15	AAM		enTT15	AAM
bananas	1	0	around the bend	8	1
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
batty	1	0	into a frenzy	160	8
	0 / 0	0 / 0		2 / 4	0 / 0
berserk	4	0	on edge	3	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
bonkers	7	0	over the edge	742	37
	0 / 0	0 / 0		13 / 15	1 / 0
crackers	1	0	out of mind	1	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crazy	49	5	out of one's mind	3	1
	2 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
dotty	0	0	out of one's wits	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
insane	33	6	round the bend	6	0
	2 / 0	2 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mad	20	10	to despair	2	0
	1 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mental	20	1	to desperation	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
nuts	1	0	to distraction	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
frantic	3	0	to insanity	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
loopy	9	0	to madness	0	0
	2 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
potty	1	0	to suicide	3	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
wild	64	3	up the wall	4	1
	2 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

Table 8. Matrix verb *turn*

V=turn	Z=AP	Z=PP
--------	------	------

	enTT15	AAM		enTT15	AAM
bananas	0	0	around the bend	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
batty	0	0	into a frenzy	1	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
berserk	2	0	on edge	4	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
bonkers	0	0	over the edge	1	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crackers	0	0	out of mind	1	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crazy	44	4	out of one's mind	0	0
	1 / 3	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
dotty	0	0	out of one's wits	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
insane	17	0	round the bend	0	0
	1 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mad	21	4	to despair	3	1
	1 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mental	27	1	to desperation	0	0
	1 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
nuts	0	0	to distraction	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
frantic	0	1	to insanity	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
loopy	0	0	to madness	2	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		1 / 0	0 / 0
potty	1	0	to suicide	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
wild	64	2	up the wall	0	0
	1 / 1	1 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

In a similar way to the *Drive*-verb specific construction, other matrix verbs of the *Drive*-class construction also show very clear semantic selection restrictions: their resultative predicates typically denote a negative change in the mental state of Y. This type of lexical subcategorisation seems to be inherited from the higher order construction (*drive*-verb specific). Regarding distribution, corpus data provide less relevant information since the number of instances retrieved is much lower. This is particularly the case with PPs. In general, the Araneum proves to be far less useful than the enTenTen15, while diatopy remains rather blurred in both corpora.

The inventory of resultative phrases seems to be more restricted and conventionalised, depending on the individual matrix verb. The Z slot appears to also play a role in this scale of schematicity and productivity: APs appear to be less restricted than PPs when it comes to licensing *Drive*-class constructions. Eight APs can be found in constructions with *make*, *get*, *send*, and *turn* (namely, *berserk*, *crazy*, *insane*, *mad*, *mental*, *frantic*, *potty*, and *wild*), whereas only three PPs are subcategorised by the above verbs (*on edge*, *over the edge* and *out of mind*).

Matrix verbs can be ordered in a cline of productivity with regard to the total number of resultative phrases licensed: (1) *get* (25 = 13 APs/12 PPs), (2) *send* (14 = 4 APs/10 PPs), (3) *make* (25 = 13 APs + 8 PPs), and (4) *turn* (15 = 9 APs + 6 APs) within the *Drive*-class construction.⁴¹ Overall, APs tend to exhibit a greater degree of combinatory potential than PPs. As seen before, eight adjectives can appear with all four alternative matrix verbs. In addition, five adjectives (*bananas*, *batty*, *bonkers*, *crackers* and *nuts*) appear in constructions with three matrix verbs (*make*, *get* and *send*), while *loopy* can be found only with two of them (*make* and *send*). An analogous, albeit more restricted, situation can be found in PP resultative phrases. As stated before, only three PPs appear in constructions with the set of four alternative matrix verbs. Four PPs can only be found with three verbs: two with *make*, *get*, and *send* (*around the bend*, *up the wall*), and other two with *get*, *send*, and *turn* (*into a frenzy*, *to despair*); and two PPs with two particular matrix verbs: *out of one's wits* with *get* and *send*, and *to suicide*, only with *make* and *send*. Finally, *to madness* can only be found with *turn*.

Interestingly enough, these four matrix verbs index diatopy to a certain extent. A cursory look at their AP slot fillers shows that the constructs with *make* seem to be more frequent in American English: *make + crazy* (BrE: BrE: 0.02, AmE: 0.31), *make + insane* (BrE: <0.01, AmE: 0.02), *make + wild* (BrE: 0.01, AmE: 0.3); *make + crazy* appears to be slightly more frequent in the British variety according to the enTT15, but data from AAM depicts a completely different scenario (BE: 0.05, AmE: 0.22). A similar situation is found with regard to *get* and *turn*. Compare *get + crazy* (BrE: <0.01, BrE: 0.02), *get + mad* (BrE: 0.01, AmE: 0.04), *get + mental* (BrE: 0.01, AmE: 0.02), *get + potty* (BrE: 0, AmE: 0.01), and *get + wild* (BrE: <0.01, AmE: 0.01); as well as *turn + crazy* (BrE: <0.01, AmE: 0.02), *turn + insane* (BrE: <0.01, AmE: 0.01), *turn + mental* (BrE: 0.01, AmE: 0.01), *turn + wild* (BrE: <0.01, AmE: 0.01). There seems to be a slight preference for constructs with *send* in British English: *send + crazy*, *send + insane*⁴², *send + mad* and *send + wild* have a normalised frequency of 0,01 in BrE (AmE: 0).

Table 9. Matrix verb *put*

V=put	Z=AP		Z=PP	
	enTT15	AAM	enTT15	AAM
bananas	0	0	around the bend	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0
batty	0	0	into a frenzy	2
	0 / 0	0 / 0		1 / 0
berserk	1	0	on edge	27
	0 / 0	0 / 0		5 / 10
bonkers	0	0	over the edge	334
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 3
crackers	0	0	out of mind	22
	0 / 0	0 / 0		2 / 1
crazy	20	2	out of one's mind	466
	0 / 0	0 / 0		17 / 6
dotty	0	0	out of one's wits	1
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0
insane	1	1	round the bend	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0
mad	14	1	to despair	0
	1 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0
mental	20	5	to desperation	0
	5 / 2	0 / 0		0 / 0
nuts	0	0	to distraction	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0
frantic	1	0	to insanity	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0

loopy	0	0	to madness	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
potty	3	0	to suicide	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
wild	20	1	up the wall	1	0
	2 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

Table 10. Matrix verb set

V=set	Z=AP		Z=PP	enTT15	AAM
	enTT15	AAM			
bananas	0	0	around the bend	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
batty	0	0	into a frenzy	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
berserk	1	0	on edge	20	10
	0 / 0	0 / 0		3 / 1	1 /
bonkers	0	0	over the edge	21	3
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 1	0 / 0
crackers	0	0	out of mind	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crazy	9	2	out of one's mind	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
dotty	0	0	out of one's wits	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
insane	0	0	round the bend	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mad	8	0	to despair	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mental	13	3	to desperation	0	0
	0 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
nuts	0	0	to distraction	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
frantic	0	0	to insanity	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
loopy	0	0	to madness	1	0 (0)
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
potty	1	0	to suicide	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

wild	12	2	up the wall	0	0
	0 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

Table 11. Matrix verb *render*

V=render	Z=AP		Z=PP		
	enTT15	AAM		enTT15	AAM
bananas	0	0	around the bend	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
batty	0	0	into a frenzy	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
berserk	3	0	on edge	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
bonkers	0	0	over the edge	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crackers	0	0	out of mind	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
crazy	1	0	out of one's mind	1	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
dotty	0	0	out of one's wits	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
insane	18	0	round the bend	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mad	4	0	to despair	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
mental	9	1	to desperation	0	0
	0 / 1	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
nuts	0	0	to distraction	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
frantic	1	0	to insanity	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
loopy	0	0	to madness	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
potty	0	0	to suicide	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0
wild	2	2	up the wall	0	0
	0 / 0	0 / 0		0 / 0	0 / 0

The second subset of alternative matrix verbs that license the *Drive*-class construction are *put*, *render*, and *set*. *Set* and *render* can be considered causative verbs which imply a change of position/physical place (caused motion). Like *put*, *set* is also a highly polysemous verb. These three verbs show a progressive semantic specialisation within this

construction, which is particularly noticeable through their highly conventionalised preferences for a handful of resultative phrases, and vice versa.

Compared with the former group (matrix verbs *make, get, send, turn*), only a subset of APs can combine with the verbs in the second group (*set, render and put*). Five adjectives can combine with these three verbs (*berserk, crackers, insane, mad and wild*); *dotty* and *nuts* can be AP slot fillers in constructions with *put* and *render*, *potty* can occur with *put* and *set*; and finally, *dotty* only collocates with *render*. A similar progressive cline of restrictions is observed with regard to the resultative PPs: only two (*on edge* and *over the edge*) can combine with both *put* and *set* within the construction, and the other phrases can combine with just one of these three verbs: three with *put* (*into a frenzy, out of mind, up the wall*), one with *set* (*to madness*) and one with *render* (*out of one's minds*). This would place *put* as the most productive matrix verb of this second subset (13 = 8 APs + 5 PPs), followed by *set* (9 = 6 APs + PPs) and *render* (9 = 8 APs + 1 PPs), the latter being selected by only one PP. As in the case of the first subset, PPs exhibit a relatively lower combinatory potential than APs.

Due to the low number of instances found in both corpora, it is not possible to draw conclusions about diatopic differences within constructions licensed by this second subset. However, there are some interesting findings. Although constructs like *put + wild* (BrE: <0.01/ AmE: 0) and *put + out of mind* (BrE: 0.03/ AmE: <0.01) seem to appear slightly more frequently in the British variety, some other constructs with *put* and *set* index primarily American English: *set + mental* (BrE: 0/ AmE: 0.01), *set + wild* (BrE: 0/ AmE: 0.01), *set + over the edge* (BrE: 0/ AmE: 0.01), *set + on edge* (BrE: <0.01/ AmE: 0.01), *put + mental* (BrE: <0.01/ AmE: 0.01), and, more specially, *put + over the edge* (BrE: 0/ AmE: 0.02)⁴³ and *put + on edge* (BrE: 0.01/ AmE: 0.06)⁴⁴.

Finally, Figures 2-3 summarise the combinatorial preferences of matrix verbs and resultative phrases in the Drive-class construction. White cells indicate that the combination of matrix verb and resultative phrase can be found in both corpora (enTT15 and AAM). Cells in light blue indicate combinations which have been found in only one corpus (generally, enTT15), and cells in dark blue mean that the combination is not found in any of the corpora used in this study

Figure 2. Combinatory potential: matrix verbs and APs

	drive	make	get	send	turn	put	set	render
bananas								
batty								
berserk								
bonkers								
crackers								
crazy								
dotty								
insane								
mad								
mental								
nuts								
frantic								
loopy								
potty								
wild								

Figure 3. Combinatory potential: matrix verbs and PPs

	drive	make	get	send	turn	put	set	render
around the bend								
into a frenzy								
on edge								
over the edge								
out of mind								
out of one's mind								
out of one's wits								
round the bend								
to despair								
to desperation								
to distraction								
to insanity								
to madness								
to suicide								
up the wall								

The final stage in the methodology deployed in this study was intended to unveil the productivity of this type of resultative construction by exploring novel slot fillers, as well as their combinatory potential. To this end, six pattern-based search sequences were launched (see Section 2). CQL searches 3, 5 and 6 have not retrieved any relevant data. That means that the inventory of resulting APs in Table 3 is exhaustive, i.e., no additional adjectival slot fillers for the Drive-class construction have been found in the corpora. It also means that there are no novel PPs in the patterns [preposition + determiner + noun] and [preposition + possessive + noun] (e.g., *round the bend, out of one's wits*).

However, new prepositional resultative phrases have been retrieved by CQL search pattern 4 [preposition + noun] (e.g., *to madness*). The 'drive-insanity' resultative appears to be very productive, according to the number of new slot fillers retrieved. PPs stick systematically to the pattern with preposition *to* and nouns that denote a (typically) negative mental state or emotion: *to destruction, to depression, to frustration, to dementia, to delirium, to hatred, to cruelty, to anger, to fury, to repentance, to grief, to idiocy, to distress* or even *to frenzy* (cf. *into a frenzy*), among others⁴⁵. Interestingly enough, these PPs tend to fuse only in the construction with the matrix verb *drive*, with the Drive-class Yanimote notable exception of *put + to grief*, with 71 occurrences in the enTT15 corpus. It is worth mentioning that novel PPs seem to combine freely with those in Table 3, as can be seen below (ex. 17):

(17) "This bill bans non-scientific 'therapies' that have driven young people to depression and suicide," the governor tweeted. (AAM)

This could be interpreted as indicative of a lower-order verb-specific *drive* construction, a dominance of the PPs with *to* as a subpart link, and the interplay between the *Drive*-class construction and the verb-specific *drive* construction. This scenario of high numbers of novel slot fillers also correlates with a higher degree of schematisation and a general intensifying function of the construction. This could explain the large number of instances of *drive + to success* in both corpora (enTT15: 456; AAM: 30), and other nouns with similar positive connotations (*to victory, to perfection, to excellence, etc.*).

The construction appears to be even more productive with regard to the verbal slot fillers. CQL query 1 looked into new verbs that fuse in the construction with resultative APs. Novel verbs found in corpora tend to appear in combination with central, frequent adjectival slot fillers: mainly with *crazy*, and, to a lesser extent, *insane, mad*, and *wild*. There are no instances with other APs in Table 3. Novel verbs with *crazy* show delexical meanings and grammaticalisation (*bring, do, generate*, cf. ex. 18), or, else, enriched construal meanings which also exhibit a certain degree of intensification (ex. 19): they incorporate caused-motion resultative meaning (*sprint, push*) and the *drive*-‘mental state’ meaning (*mess, jangle, shit*). Particularly numerous are the instances found in enTT15 with verbs related to sex (ex. 20), which also convey additional emphasis (*rub, sex, fuck, excite*). Verbs that fuse in constructions with *insane* and *mad* are less numerous and fall in one of the semantic groupings mentioned above (ex. 21): delexical (*bring/generate + insane*), enriched construal meanings (*strike + mad, run + mad, scare + insane*) or sexual connotations (*suck + mad, wank + wild, fuck + wild*).

(18) I have one with a minimal bottom shelf (like an inch and a half off the floor). And oftentimes it holds my dogs. It generates me crazy, but for reasons unknown they love to lay on it. (enTT15)

(19) Trey lets him go, then starts interjecting chords and rhythms that just push Page crazier and crazier. (enTT15)

(20) "Peter, I'll be thinking of you throughout, even if it does happen like we have planned and Ray is on top of me on the bed in the motel room, fucking me crazy. (enTT15)

(21) When the Furies struck you mad you couldn't deal with your pain rationally, when you got your sanity back you needed to be strong for your mother. (enTT15)

They all convey intensification, mainly through the adjective slot filler. In some cases (ex. 22), the typical resultative AP fuses as a separate construction into other constructions, inheriting the construal intensification aspect, akin to degree adverbials ('in a high degree', 'very much').

(22) Than most of the old timers not help [sic] should have loved him so well still though fascinated him mad and that trading thoughts already investment funds despite her concerns and turned back and forth in front of the mirror. (enTT15).

Another interesting finding with regard to constructs with verbs denoting sexual intercourse is that they license inanimate Y (patient/experiencer) whose construal interpretation involves coercion as animate. This is particularly the case of (usually male) sexual organs and the anaphoric pronoun *it* (ex. 23).

(23) Her silky soft feet are all wrapped around his juicy tool, wanking it wild until it's hard. (enTT15).

CQL 2 search pattern revealed the verbal productivity of the construction with PPs in the Z slot. The resultative phrases with higher combinatory potential are *over the edge, to madness, to despair, to suicide, to distraction, to insanity, and to desperation*. They tend to favour verbal slots around similar semantic groupings as the AP resultatives discussed above: some delexical or grammaticalised verbs (*take, bring*), a majority of caused-motion verbs (*push, shove, draw, drag, nudge, move, steer, lead, stir, tip, bring, etc.*), as well as causative verbs that convey a certain degree of manipulation (*force, coax, compel, impel*), verbs which focus on the construal meaning 'drive-mental state' as a deliberate act of annoyance (*goad, tease, tempt, sting, annoy*). See ex. 24- 29 below.

(24) The harshest challenges can lead one to despair, suicidal thoughts, and insanity. (enTT15)

(25) What tipped her over the edge though was the incestual relations between him and Elaine, whom she believed to be Natasha, only to see "Natasha" pursue someone else at the ball. What exactly was her mental state that day when she killed most of the royal family with a poisoned dagger? (enTT15).

(26) Even after hearing the music so many times, Maggie's performance at The Current moved me to distraction. (AAM)

(27) But now, in his extremity, he turned upon him, presenting the enormity of his sin and the hopelessness of pardon, that he might goad him to desperation. (enTT15).

(28) In India, they said that the cotton that had been genetically engineered would provide 1,500kg per acre. But the company, after lying to farmers, pushing them to suicide, had to admit that it is only 500 kg per acre. (enTT15)

(29) This journey of delicate indiscretions, lost dreams and brutish actions leads Blanche to madness, aided by her handsome, masculine brother-in-law, Stanley Kowalski. (enTT15)

While the construction seems to be extremely productive with regard to the verbal slot fillers that can fuse with certain resultative PPs, truth is that their combinatory potential seems to be even more conventionalised than the instances with resultative APs. Not all these novel slot fillers exhibit a similar combinatory potential: *lead* and *push* fuse in the *Drive*-class constructions with all those resultative PPs, *tilt, trip, nudge, pull* or *carry* only collocate with *over the edge*, while *goad* can combine with *over the edge, to desperation* and *to madness*, but no instances have been found with *to despair, to distraction, to insanity* or *to suicide*. Another example is the verbal slot filler *bring*: it combines with *over the edge, to despair, to distraction, to madness* and *to suicide*, but no instances have been found with *to distraction* or *to insanity*.

Restrictions also operate at the level of the PPs. By way of example, *to desperation* tends to have only *bring, lead* and *push*, while *over the edge* can take far many more verbal fillers than the other resultative PPs. The construal meanings of the verbal slots that fuse in the construction with *over the edge* tend to be coerced by this particular PP through a process of grammaticalisation, intensification and pragmatic specialisation (semantic prosody). Connotations related to intense feelings and

emotions are usually negative (emotional distress), as Y (patient slot) is so irritated or unsettled that he or she loses their self-control, gets absolutely worked out and/or behaves in an extreme way (ex. 25, 30 and 31).

(30) Homicide detective Kay Griffith never had a problem controlling her anger—until murder suspect Tommy Rayne finally pushes her over the edge. After assaulting him, she’s suspended from her job. (AMM)

(31) One of his former TV producers in the Middle East, Serene Sabbagh, resigned from Fox recently because of its “bias and racism”. What tipped Sabbagh over the edge was the bombing of Qana. (enTT15)

However, this is not necessarily always the case. There are many instances of this construct with *over the edge* and slot fillers like *push*, *take*, *tip*, *tilt*, *bring*, where the physical symptoms of strong feelings are directly associated with intense (almost uncontrolled) sexual pleasure (ex. 32-33):

(32) I thruster my hips a couple of times to bring me over the edge as my cock started shooting hot baby juice. (enTT15).

(33) He was now on the verge of ejaculating himself, my own orgasm acting as the impetus to take him over the edge. (enTT15).

Finally, intensification is also a shared feature of all the constructs retrieved through CQL query 2 (cf. ex. 24-34). An interesting case is *to distraction*. This resultative PP exhibits a wide range of potential slot fillers to form constructs that convey intensification, similarly to degree adverbials (cf. APs *mad* or *crazy* above). See ex. 34:

(34) Society or culture may pressure us to marry “at least once.” Our family and friends may pressure us to distraction to marry. (For those who are divorced this is even harder to deal with.) (AAM).

Some more instances found in both corpora are “love her to distraction”, “torments me to distraction”, “work myself to distraction”, “annoy me to distraction” (AAM); and “become addicted to distraction”, “were plagued to distraction”, “be familiar, almost to distraction”, “bore us to distraction”, “be tempted to distraction”, “pushed to distraction”, “was obsessed to distraction” (enTT15), among many others.⁴⁶

4. Conclusion

This paper contributes to the radical change of paradigm brought about by computational and corpus-based approaches to the study of phraseology and idiomaticity. It also contributes significantly to the theoretical strand it adheres to: Construction Grammar. A corpus-based methodology has been developed in order to study a type of resultative construction: the *Drive* Y Z construction. To this end, we have retrieved instances semi-automatically using a script and six CQL search queries. Our heuristic protocol has allowed us to establish the combinatory potential of base slot fillers and to uncover novel, productive instances of this base construction.

Our findings confirm our initial hypothesis. Exemplars like *send someone up the wall*, *drive someone insane*, *love some to distraction*, *fascinate someone mad*, *lead someone to suicidal thoughts*, which have traditionally been classed as idioms, collocations or free-word combinations are, in fact, instances of the same type of construction. The metaphoricity, collocability, semantic coercion, grammaticalisation, intensification and productivity observed in all exemplars analysed can be traced back to a complex network of higher-order and lower-order constructions within the *Drive*-class $Y_{animate} Z_{state}$ construction. To put it short, the Verb-specific *drive* construction stems from and contributes to the higher-order Resultative construction $V_{caused-motion} Y Z$, and, at the same time, represents the starting point of the *Drive*-class construction.

The notion of central slot fillers is also a powerful theoretical concept that helps explaining inheritance links with associated lower-order and higher-order constructions. Central slot fillers fuse with novel slot fillers in Resultative constructions in a recursive fashion through instance and part links, which also explains combinatory potential and restrictions. This process appears to be highly conventionalised, as only particular collocational and pattern preferences are licensed. This intricate network of constructions can also explain productivity, idiomaticity, variability and language change.

Our study also reveals the importance of using large-scale data. Giga-token corpora are needed to retrieve meaningful results. Insufficient data provide less significant findings. In particular, our results demonstrate that big data enables more detailed and precise description of the construction in question with all its variations, restrictions, and mutual interplay between its components, listing the sets of fillers found in the corpora, summarising findings on productivity and diatopy. However, to handle such extensive data effectively it has to be adequately retrieved and processed. In this paper, a protocol for semi-automatic data retrieval and processing has been introduced and illustrated. This is another substantial contribution of this study.

Given the above findings, we conjecture that the differences observed in Boas [2003] as compared to Corpas Pastor [2021] could be due to language change, but also most probably to the volume of data used. In a similar fashion, the way data are processed is also relevant. Unlike Corpas Pastor [2021] (and Boas [2003]), results in this study have been retrieved semi-automatically (with the exception of a limited number of manual counts), which has made the study of very large volumes of text possible.

This paper also confirms that larger corpora provide more (and better) quality findings than smaller corpora, even in the case of giga-token corpora. In this respect, the enTenTen15 corpus has provided more informative results than the Araneum Anglicum Maius. However, even larger corpora are needed to study diatopic variation. While some indicative findings have been reported, the number of tokens included in a huge corpus like enTenTen15 remains largely insufficient to establish relevant differences between English varieties. Another issue is coverage of data in giga-token corpora. For instance, the available corpus data suggest that some constructs within the *Drive*-class seem to convey intense sexual connotations. However, it is not clear whether these results could be biased, as a result of different document selection criteria among corpora.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BEAVERS John (Ed.), 2012, *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- BENKO Vladimír, 2014, "Aranea: Yet Another Family of (Comparable) Web Corpora", in SOJKA Petr, HORÁK Aleš, KOPEČEK Ivan & PALA Karel (Eds.), *Text, Speech and Dialogue. 17th International Conference, TSD 2014, Brno, Czech Republic, September 8-12, 2014. Proceedings. LNCS 8655*, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 257-264.
- BOAS Hans C., 2003, *A constructional approach to resultatives*, Stanford (Calif.): CSLI Publications.
- BOOIJ Geert, 2002, "Constructional idioms, morphology, and the Dutch lexicon", *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14(4), 301-329.
- BYBEE Joan L., 2013, "Usage-based theory and exemplar representation", in HOFFMANN Thomas & TROUSDALE Graeme (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 49-69.
- CORPAS PASTOR Gloria, 2015, "Register-specific collocational constructions in English and Spanish: a usage-based approach", *Journal of Social Sciences* 11(3), 139-151.
- CORPAS PASTOR Gloria, 2017a, "Collocational constructions in translated Spanish: What corpora reveal", in MITKOV Ruslan (Ed.), *Computational and Corpus-Based Phraseology. Second International Conference. Europhras 2017. November 13-14. Proceedings*, Berlin, London, UK: Springer, 29-40.
- CORPAS PASTOR Gloria, 2017b, "Collocations in e-Bilingual Dictionaries: from Underlying Theoretical Assumptions to Practical Lexicography and Translation Issues", in TORNER Sergi & BERNAL Elisenda (Eds.), *Collocations and Other Lexical Combinations in Spanish. Theoretical and Applied Approaches*, London: Routledge, 139-160.
- CORPAS PASTOR Gloria, 2021, "Constructional idioms of 'insanity' in English and Spanish: a corpus-based study", *Lingua* Vol. 254, (3).
- CORPAS PASTOR Gloria & COLSON Jean-Pierre (Eds.), 2020, *Computational Phraseology*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- CROFT William A., 2001, *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CROFT William A., 2012, *Verbs: aspect and causal structure*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CROFT William A., 2013, "Radical Construction Grammar", in HOFFMANN Thomas & TROUSDALE Graeme (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 211-232.
- CROFT William A. & CRUSE Alan, 2004, *Cognitive linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DOBROVOL'SKIJ Dmitrij & PIIRAINEN Elisabeth, 2018, "Konstruktionspatterns in der Idiomatik und ihre kognitiven Grundlagen", *Yearbook of Phraseology* 8 (1), 31-58.
- FELLBAUM Christiane, 2019, "How flexible are idioms? A corpus-based study", *Linguistics. An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences* 57(4), 735-767.
- GOLDBERG Adele E., 1995, *Constructions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- GOLDBERG Adele E., 2006, *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- GOLDBERG Adele E., 2013, "Constructionist Approaches", in HOFFMANN Thomas & TROUSDALE Graeme (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 15-31.
- GOLDBERG Adele E., 2019, *Explain Me This. Creativity, Competition, and the Partial Productivity of Constructions*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- GOLDBERG Adele E. & JACKENDOFF Ray, 2004, "The English resultative as a family of constructions", *Language* 80, 532-568.
- GRIES Stefan Th., 2013, "Data in Construction Grammar", in HOFFMANN Thomas & TROUSDALE Graeme (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 93-108.
- HOFFMANN Thomas, 2013, "Abstract Phrasal and Clausal Constructions", in HOFFMANN Thomas & TROUSDALE Graeme (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 307-328.
- HOFFMANN Thomas, 2017, "From constructions to construction grammars", in DANCYGIER B. (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 284-309.
- HOFFMANN Thomas & TROUSDALE Graeme (Eds.), 2013, *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LANGLOTZ Andreas, 2006, *Idiomatic Creativity. A Cognitive-Linguistic Model of Idiom-Representation and Idiom-Variation in English*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- LEVIN Beth & RAPPAPORT HOVAV Malka, 2006, "Argument Realization", *Computational Linguistics* 32(3), 447-450.

MARTÍ SOLANO Ramón, 2020, "Productivity and semantic classification of the phraseological pattern on + the + N", *Lingüística en la Red*, Universidad de Alcalá.

RUIZ DE MENDOZA Francisco & LUZONDO Alba, 2014, "Figurative and non-figurative motion in the expression of result in English", *Language and Cognition* 8(1), 32-58.

SCHÄFER Roland & BILDHAUER Felix, 2013, *Web Corpus Construction* (Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies 22), San Francisco: Morgan & Claypool.

SHIOTA Michelle N., NEUFELD Samantha L., DANVERS Alexander F., OSBORNE Elizabeth A., SNG Oliver & YEE Claire I., 2014, "Positive emotion differentiation: A functional approach", *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 8(3), 104-117.

TAYLOR John R., 2015, "Cognitive linguistics", in ALLAN Keith (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Linguistics*, London and New York: Routledge, 455-469.

YOON Jiyoung & GRIES Stefan Th. (Eds.), 2016, *Corpus-based Approaches to Construction Grammar*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[Top of page](#)

NOTES

1 The notion of "construction" could be considered an extended version of the Saussurean concept of linguistic sign, in which the form pole encompasses not only pronunciation and spelling, but also its morpho-syntactic properties, and meaning aspects can contain semantic information, as well as pragmatic features, contextual properties, preferences, usage constrains, etc. (Croft & Cruse [2004: 258]).

2 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>.

3 The two giga-token corpora used in this study are described in Section 2.1.

4 The postverbal NP is not understood to be the object of the verb when used in isolation: cf. *scream myself* (*hoarse), *men drink themselves* (*crazy).

5 From a purely cognitive viewpoint, the underlying metaphor would be A CHANGE OF STATE IS A CHANGE OF LOCATION (Ruiz de Mendoza & Luzondo [2014]).

6 These alternative terms refer to the same phenomena, although the focus is slightly different: verb-specific constructions highlight the role of verbal semantics, mini-constructions stress the event-frame aspect, whereas collocational constructions place the spotlight on the semantic and combinatory preferences between matrix verbs and their post-elements.

7 The event-based frame semantic representation of *drive-crazy* is described by Boas [2003: 234] as:
Ag: Entity causing object that (typically negative) has mental impression capabilities
Pt: animate object that (typically negative) has mental impression capabilities
p3: SYN: AP (77%), PP, 23%
SEM: (typically negative mental state).

8 See also, Langlotz [2006] and Goldberg [2019].

9 According to Shiota *et al.* [2014], uncontrolled desire triggers positive emotions that promote an adaptive response to each reward

10 Araneum Anglicum Maius (AAM, cf. 2.1.).

11 enTenTen15 (enTT15, cf. 2.1.).

12 Non-compositional meaning aspects are given in curly brackets.

13 Usage-based approaches consider two types of frequency: (a) high token frequency that frequently leads to the entrenchment of phonologically filled constructions or constructs (Croft & Cruse [2004: 292ff]); and (b) high type frequency of a pattern, which leads to the storage of a more abstract construction due to the inbuilt human ability to recognise patterns and to schematise (Bybee [2013]).

14 We carried out a corpus-based contrastive analysis of 'insanity' idioms with *mad/loco* in comparison constructions and in resultative constructions (English and Spanish), including translation issues.

15 enTenTen15 (enTT15) is a 15 billion Web corpus that was web-crawled in 2015. See a full description below.

16 *News on the Web* (enNOW) is a 13.9-billion-word corpus of English with data from web-based newspapers and magazines from 2010 to the present time. It is a dynamic corpus which grows monthly. It includes subcorpora of English language varieties.

17 *The Global Web-based English* (GloWbE) is a 19-billion-word Web corpus of English with texts from twenty different countries.

18 Verb frequencies were obtained from the enTenTen15, as this corpus seems to contain the higher number of occurrences for the drive-construction (Corpas Pastor [2021]).

19 The findings in Copas Pastor [2021] suggest that the preferred exemplar or construct in World English would be *drive someone crazy*. However, the author reports a strong preference for *mad* in British English, with type frequencies of 239 (enTenTen), 230 (enNOW) and 155 (GloWbE), whereas non-British varieties tend to select *crazy*, according to frequency data for American English (enTenTen15: 236, enNOW: 645, and GloWbE: 401) and Canadian English (enTenTen: 11, enNOW: 52, GloWbE: 109).

20 For a detailed description of the Aranea family of corpora, see Benko [2014].

21 Both corpora have been web-crawled automatically from Internet resources, filtered by language, pre-processed (text deduplication and boilerplate removal), part of speech tagged (POS) and parsed. On standard methods used to compile corpora automatically from Internet sources, see Schäfer & Bildhauer [2013].

22 <https://www.sketchengine.eu/>.

23 *Tokens* includes word and non-word tokens (e.g., “man” versus the semi-colon “;”).

24 Sketch Engine does not provide information about the number of types per subcorpus (existing or created).

25 See Benko [2014] and the information about this corpus at http://ucts.uniba.sk/aranea_about/index.html.

26 Only the verb *put* has been added to List A as it is a component of the instance *put sb. on edge*.

27 We have added *round the bend*, *around the bend*, *out of one’s mind* and *out of one’s wits*, which are defined in the *Merriam-Webster* as ‘MAD/CRAZY’ (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>), as well as *out of one’s wits*, entered in *The Collins English dictionary* under the noun *wits*, as synonym of ‘sanity’ but normally used in the negative (<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/>).

28 In Copas Pastor [2021], only approximate figures could be provided for *drive* + APs, as instances had to be counted manually.

29 <https://www.sketchengine.eu/documentation/api-documentation/>.

30 The author would like to thank Javier Alejandro Fernández Sola who has written the PHP script for communication with Sketch Engine through the use of automated HTTP requests. The script is available upon request from lexytrad@uma.es.

31 Standardised frequencies over 0.01 are indicated within brackets: enTT15 first and then AAM, separated by a semi-colon. For instance, according to our data in Table 4, *drive so. crazy* would be the preferred exemplar or construct, with a total/raw frequency of 8,481 (standardised frequency: 0.55) in enTT15 (1,114/0.93 in AAM).

32 *Bonkers* has one more occurrence than *batty* in AAM (45 versus 44), although they both have the same standardised frequency in the latter corpus (0.04). In the case of slight discrepancies like the one just mentioned, we have decided to use the enTT15 data because it appears to be more fine-grained than AAM. This could be due to the larger size of enTT15.

33 *Mad* has a standardised frequency of <0.01 in enTT15 and 0.03 in AAM. This could be due to the different sizes of the two corpora and/or their varying composition.

34 *Berserk* and *frantic* show the same raw frequency (20) in enTT15, but *frantic* appears to be slightly more frequent in AAM (0.01).

35 Our analysis is based on data from the largest corpus, enTT15. Frequency data from AAM will be also provided whenever relevant.

36 Standardised frequencies in AAM: 0.3 (BrE), 0.9 (AmE).

37 Standardised frequencies in AAM: 0.02 (BrE), 0 (AmE).

38 Standardised frequencies in AAM: 0.03 (BrE), 0 (AmE).

39 This is in line with the findings in *Corpas Pastor [2021]*: results for raw frequencies indicate that *drive + mad* is typical of British English (enTT15: 239, enNOW: 230, GloWbE: 155), whereas non-British varieties tend to prefer *crazy* as the central adjective of the construction, regarding type frequencies in the American subcorpus (enTT15: 236, enNOW: 645, GloWbE: 401) and in Canadian English (enTT15: 11, enNOW: 52 (enNOW), GloWbE: 109). It should be noted, though, that no standardised frequencies were used, which means that results could be biased due to the varying sizes of the corpora used.

40 Approximate raw frequency figures were provided from enTenTen15, as this corpus appeared to contain the higher number of occurrences for the *drive*-construction. Counting was performed manually.

41 It should be noted that *turn* is both a (caused) motion verb and a verb-specific construction in the turn-'mental state' sense. This could lie behind its lower combinatorial properties within this construction. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/turn>.

42 In the AAM the standard frequency of *send + insane* is 0.03 in BrE (AmE: 0).

43 Standardised frequencies in AAM: 0 (BrE), 0.22 (AmE).

44 Standardised frequencies in AAM: 0.03 (BrE), 0.11 (AmE).

45 The most frequent PPs found in the two corpora are *to destruction* (enTT15: 95; AAM: 6), *to depression* (enTT15: 43; AAM: 5), and *to frustration* (enTT15: 23; AAM: 1).

46 Cf. also other intensifying constructions with the pattern *to N_i: to pieces, to bits* (e.g. love someone to pieces).

Electronic reference

Gloria Corpas Pastor, "You are driving me up the wall! A corpus-based study of a special class of resultative constructions ", *Lexis* [Online], 19 | 2022, Online since 26 March 2022, connection on 29 March 2022. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/lexis/6343>; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6343>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Gloria Corpas Pastor

IUITLM, University of Malaga, Spain / RIILP, University of Wolverhampton, UK

gcorpas@uma.es