ABKAROVITS, ENDRE

CONTRADICTIONS IN DESCRIBING AND USING THE -ING FORM AS OBJECT (COMPLEMENT)

The problem of how to learn and teach the valency of a verb

As a learner and teacher of English I have been facing the same problems and questions for a long time: How does one achieve a certain knowledge of which non-finite forms should be employed after a finite verb? Should one rely on learning these things gradually through practice or should one make more conscious efforts by learning lists of verbs recommended by grammar books or patterns indicated by dictionaries? Are these reference books reliable, do they give satisfactory assistance to the learner or confuse him rather?

I have often observed that students of English try to use some form by analogy instead of remembering precisely what patterns a given verb can accept. E.g. although the verb suggest can be used in several acceptable constructions ('I suggested (his) going there.', ,I suggested that he should go there.', 'I suggested that he go there.', 'I suggested that he went there.'), nevertheless the student is likely to use the only wrong pattern possible: * 'I suggested him to go there.' Why is he doing so? The reason may be that he has never been taught which patterns the verb can accept and which ones not. At some stage of learning the language he encounters the verb for the first time, its main meaning may be taught in one of the acceptable constructions, later on it may appear in other structures, but perhaps no teacher will ever make an attempt to sum up all these different constructions, in which the verb can be used. On the other hand the learner is tested at all written examinations whether he masters the knowledge of valency or not. It is almost impossible to teach verbs from the very outset with all their possible

patterns, we can only draw the attention of the learner to some more problematical points. In this situation the only thing we can do is to rely on the information that certain reference books can offer. But can we really depend on the patterns and lists of the most widely used dictionaries and grammar books? My impression, before examining and comparing these books thoroughly, was that their lists differ to a large extent, they select their verbs haphazardly sometimes, and even the dictionaries seem to be misleading, incomplete, or inaccurate in some places. Hornby seems to agree when giving similar examples: 'The ordinary grammar book and dictionary often fail to supply adequate information on such points.' (Hornby: XVII) (That is another matter that even his dictionary is not always exempt of these problems.)

When I set out to write this paper, my aim was to check whether my earlier impressions were correct, whether these verbs, that can be followed by the -ing form, are really described in contradicting, incomplete lists and patterns, or not. A relatively complete list of the most common verbs of this type might result from such an investigation, helping students and teachers to use these verbs and their complementation in some correct way. Before giving the table, let me however mention a few general points concerning the terms and categories of the -ing form.

What terminology should be employed?

Many learners of English find it senseless to call the -ing form in the various constructions by different names. They are however in good company, as even grammarians do not always make the distinction. (Quirk et alias call all -ing forms participles in their books. The Longman dictionaries call both types 'the -ing form'. Hornby uses both terms, but the most contraversial pattern (19C) is described as -ing form (meaning both gerund and participle depending on the form of its logical subject), Corder uses 'gerund' and 'participle' alternatively where participle is used by most authors. Scheuerweghs, Zandvoort, Allan, Ganshina, Graver, Swan distinguish at least between the two main types.)

If a grammarian makes the distinction, he usually does it on the basis of certain characteristics. It is quite generally accepted that besides some verb characteristics that are typical of all (or most)

verbals, the gerund is said to have some traits in common with the noun, and the participle has certain adjective or adverb characteristics. Some authors divide even the gerund into two types: gerund proper and verbal noun. The former has only certain noun characteristics (it can be the object or subject of the sentence, it can be preceded by a possessive pronoun / noun in the genitive, etc.), while the latter has acquired all the traits of the noun (it is used in the plural, it can be preceded by an article or an adjective, etc.). In my paper it is only gerund proper that is considered to be gerund. This classification problem may explain the phenomenon that in some dictionaries, although no gerund pattern is indicated, the dictionary itself gives examples with the -ing form. The reason - apart from possible inattention - may be that they are felt to be (verbal) nouns by some authors. At the same time other authors do not separate the verbal noun from the gerund, which is made clear by their definitions or examples. (Swan: 332, AEP: 145, Sch: 177-185, Zandvoort: 24)

There are certain functions where the distinction between gerund and participle seems to be illogical and unpractical. It is always difficult to make students accept that the -ing form in the sentence 'On entering the house, I found a burglar in my room.' is a gerund, while in 'Entering the house, I found a burglar in my room.' is a participle. I think however that it is just the function of the object (complement) where the distinction makes some sense, as this may be usually (but not always) the criterion for using or not using the possessive.

'I like his/him playing the violin.' - gerund

'I heard him playing the violin.' - participle

Most authors agree which verbs belong to the second type and they also agree that the possessive cannot precede the participle. It is far more complicated what the choice depends on in the first type. Dictionaries and grammar books do not dedicate enough attention to this problem. Most of them suggest that it is mainly a matter of style: possessive/genitive is mainly restricted to formal, written language, accusative is preferred in spoken language and in the case of inanimate objects, longer phrases, and other parts of speech used as nouns. Some books make however clear that the issue is not as simple as that, they

produce some shorter lists of verbs that accept only possessive/genitive. (Corder: 65, Sch: 196) Graver joins these authors without mentioning concrete examples. (AEP: 156)

Object or object complement?

Another much debated issue is what the function of the -ing form is. After transitive verbs in the active voice the -ing form immediately following the verb (perhaps along with a possessive pronoun or a noun in Saxon genitive) is called an object. In the type object + present participle the latter can be described as object complement. The most cotroversial construction is the one when we have object + gerund, as it is rather strange to claim that the function of the gerund in 'I like his playing the violin.' is that of an object, but in 'I like him playing the violin.' is that of an object complement. This is the reason why some authors try to create new terms to describe this phenomenon. Ganshina writes e.g. 'The ing-form when preceded by a noun in the common case or a pronoun in the objective case has a function intermediate between that of the present participle and the gerund... Such an ing form may be called a half-gerund.' (Ganshina: 230) Corder calls this 'fused-participle construction'. (IEP: 64) Hornby says 'It is not always clear whether the word following the (pro)noun is a present participle or a gerund and the distinction is not important.' (GPUF: 30)

Henry Ihms writes that tha so-called 'half-gerund' used by Sweet, Ganshina and others does not exist. According to him we have here an instance of syntactic displacement. (The same process took place in the case of the construction 'accusative with the infinitive'.) In the participial construction after verbs of physical perception the object has a double function: it is the object of the finite verb and the logical subject of the participle. (E.g. I saw her coming.) In many gerundial constructions it is however only the subject of the -ing form, but not the object of the main verb. (I hate people being unhappy.) This seems to prove that it is not the usual participial construction. Ihms thinks however that the following shift has taken place here. Originally there was greater emphasis on the object than on the -ing form. Later on the -ing form gained more emphasis, and the object of the finite verb was gradually transformed into the subject of the non-finite, the

participial phrase became an independent unit (comprising the object) just like the construction 'possessive + gerund'. In 'I remember my grandfather / him giving me a sovereign.' there used to be some longer pause between the object and the -ing form, but after the shift of the stress the pause comes before the object, to such an extent that in his opinion the whole phrase (object + -ing form) can be regarded as the object of the centence. The link between the accusative and the -ing form is still less close than that between the possessive and the gerund, as we can insert a whole clause between the former ones sometimes, while only the insertion of an adverb is possible between the latter two. Ihm's final conclusion is that we have a gerund after the possessive / genitive and a participle after the accusative, and claims that the identity of the meaning and the fact that they are often interchangeable are not a good enough reason to exclude their formal difference (the difference of their origin).

We generally expect an object to occur after a transitive verb. Among the verbs to be found in the various lists there are however several that are not considered to be transitive by all authors. Ganshina says that the function of the non- finite is not that of an object, but '... part of a compound verbal predicate associated with the finite form of verbs denoting the beginning, the duration, and the end of an action such as to begin, to start, to keep (on), to continue, to stop, to leave off, to give up ,to have done (= to finish).' (Ganshina: 227)

Keep is considered to be transitive in LD, but intransitive in Hornby's dictionary. In CGEL go (on) and keep (on) are classified as 'catenative' verbs, which 'have meanings related to aspect and modality but are nearer to main verb constructions, than are semi-auxiliaries.' (CGEL: 1192) In GPUE the -ing form after these verbs is called participle (42).

The problems of calling an -ing form a gerund or a participle, and whether its function is that of an object or not, are sometimes closely connected. Authors who suppose that 'go on' is intransitive, think that the -ing form after it cannot be an object and it is not a gerund consequently. Others think that the verb has developed into a transitive verb or behaves like that by analogy, so the -ing form following it is a

gerund functioning as an object. Zandvoort writes: 'yet the affinity of
He went on laughing with the other combinations (keep /on/, continue) is
obvious. In such cases the difficulty of distinction is in inverse
proportion to its relevance or reality. Some of the difficulties dealt
with above are caused by the fact that, though in the majority of the
cases verbal forms in -ing naturally fall into one of two clearly marked
categories, their formal identity has favoured the development of certain
uses that do not easily fit into either.' (Zandvoort: 47)

<u>Object + present participle</u>

The agreement about the verbs after which we can use this
construction is far greater among the authors than in the case of the
gerund. One of the most complete lists is in CGEL:

    verbs of perception: <u>feel</u> (1), <u>hear</u> (1), <u>notice</u> (1), <u>observe</u> (1),
    <u>overhear</u> (1), <u>perceive,</u> <u>see</u> (1), <u>smell,</u> <u>spot,</u> <u>spy,</u> <u>watch</u> (1)
    verbs of encounter: <u>catch,</u> <u>discover,</u> <u>find,</u> <u>leave</u>
    verbs of coercive meaning: <u>have,</u> <u>get</u>
    (/1/ means that bare infinitive is also possible.)

Further examples from other books: <u>start, set, keep</u> (LES), <u>sense</u> (AEP),
<u>glimpse, take, send</u> (Sch), <u>bring, depict, draw, paint, show</u> (GPUE)
Quirk et alias claim that <u>notice</u> and <u>observe</u> can also accept the genitive
(GCE: 842), and <u>feel, find, leave</u> are used in the object + <u>to be</u>
construction, too. I shall mention <u>have</u> later on in connection with the
gerund table.

There is some uncertainty about describing <u>imagine.</u> Hornby labels it with
the patterns 19A (obj. + pres. participle) and 19C (poss./acc. + gerund),
Allen also has it in the list of the participle.

<u>A table of verbs that can be followed by the gerund.</u>
The following table has been compiled on the basis of ten different
books. It contains verbs that are followed either by a subjectless gerund
or a gerund with its own (logical) subject. The possible use of an
infinitive is also indicated. The table does not contain phrasal or
prepositional verbs. When followed immediately by a verbal, we usually
have to use a gerund after these. (But not always: e.g. <u>go on, set out,</u>
<u>start out,</u> etc.) The three dictionaries group the verbs around certain
patterns and label them with the grammatical codes of all possible

constructions (in theory). The other books written on grammar, usage, and practice do not always denote all the valencies possible, they just give (usually incomplete) lists to illustrate a certain function. To unify the diferent code systems, I am going to use my own symbols in the table.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
acknowledge	2d	1	1		1(2d)					1
admit	2d	2d	2d		1(2d)	1	1	+		1
adore	1	1	1							
advise	2b	2b	2b	2	2b	2	2			
advocate	1	1	1		1			+		
allow	2b,d	2b,d	2b,d	2	2b	2	2b			
anticipate	1	1	1		1		1			
appreciate				1A	1	1	1			
attempt	2a	2a		2	2a	2	2		2	
avoid	1	1	1	1(A?)	1	1	1	+B	1B	1
(can't)bear	1	2a	2a,b	2a,b		2	2	+	2	
(will) bear	2c		2c	2c				+		
begin	2a	2a	2a	2	2a	2	2	+	2	2
begrudge	1		1							
cease	2a	2a	2a	2	2a		2			2(1)
chance	1	1	1							
commence	2a	2a	1			1		+		
confess	2d	1							1	
consider	2d	2d	2d	1(A?)	1	1	1	+	1B	1
contemplate	1	1	1A		1	1		+		1
continue	2a	2a	2a	2	2a	2	2	+	2	2
defer			1		1		1	+B	1B	1
delay	1	1	1	1(A?)	1	1	1	+B	1B	1(2)
deny	2d	2d	2d	1B	1	1	1	+B	1B	1
deprecate			1					+		

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
deserve				2c	2c					
detest	1	1	1	1A		1	1	1		1(2)
discontinue	1		1					+		
disdain	2a		2s		2a					
dislike	1	1	1	1A	1	1	1A	+	2	1A
dread	2a	2a	2a	2	2a		1A	+		2
(can't) endure	2a	2a	2a,b		1	1		+		
enjoy	1	1	1	1(A?)	1	1	1	+	1B	
entail		(1)			1			+		
envisage	1	1			1			+		
escape	1	1	1	1A	1	1	1	+		1
evade	1	1	1							1
excuse	1	1	1A	1A	1	1	1		+	
face			1			1		+		
fancy	2d	1	1A	1A	1(2d)		1A	+	+	1
favour								+		1
fear		2a	1(2)		2a			+	2	
finish	1	1	1	1A	1	1	1	+	+	1
(can't) forbear	2a		2a		2a					
forbid	2b	2b			2b	2		+		
forget	2a	2a	2a	2A	2a	2			2A	2
forgive				1A	1	1	1A		1A	
grudge	1		1		1			+		
hate	2a,b	2a,b	2a,b	2A	2a,b	2	2	+	2A	2A
(can't)help(=avoid)	1	1	1	1A	1	1	1	+	1A	1
hinder			1					+	1	
imagine	1	1	1A	1A	1A	1	1	+	1A	
include	1		1		1			+		1
intend			2a,b	2	2a,b	2	2	+	2	2
involve	1		1A		1	1	1A	+		
justify	1	1	1A		1			+		
keep (on)	1		1	1A	1		1	+		1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	.8	9	10
like	2a,b	2a	2a,b	2A	2a,b	2	2A	+	2	2A
loathe	1	1	1		2a,b		1			
love	2a,b	2a	2a,b	2	2a,b	2	2	+	2A	2
mean	2a,b	2a,b	2a,b	2A	2a,b		2A	+		
mention			1	1A	1	1				
mind	1		1	1A	1	1	1A	+	1A	1A
miss	1	1	1	1A	1	1	1	+		1
necessitate	1	1	1		1			+		
need	2c		2c	2c	2c	2c	2c	+	2c	
neglect	2a		2a		2a					2
omit	2a		2a		2a				2	2
pardon			(1)	1A	1		1	+		
permit	2b	(2b)	2bA	2	2b	2	2b		2A	
plan					2a					2
postpone	1		1	1B	1	1	1	+B	1B	1
practise	1	1	1	1A	1	1			+	1
preclude	1		1					+		
prefer	2a,b	2a,b	2a,b	2	2a,b	2	2	+	2A	2
prevent	1	1	1A		1	1	1A	+	1A	
prohibit	1				1					
propose	2a	2a	2a	2	1	2	2A	+	+	
recall	1	1	1A		1A			+		
recollect	1	1	1	1	1		1A	+		A
recommend	2b	2b	2b		2bB		2	+		
regret	1(2a)	1	2a	2	2a	2	2	+	2	2
relish	1		2a(?)					+		
remember	2aA	2a,bA	2a,A	2A	2a,A	2	2A	+	2	2A
repent	1		2a(?)		1			+		A
report	2b		2a.d		1			+		
require	2c,b	2b	2a,b		2b	2c	2c	+		
resent	1	1	1A		1	1	1A	+		1
resist	1		1	1A	1	1	1	+		1
resume	1	1	2a(?)		1					

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
risk	1	1	1	1B	1	1	1	+B	1B	1
save	1	1	2a(?)				1A			
shun	1	1	2a(?)							1
(can't) stand	2a	2a	1	1A	1	1	1	+	1A	1A
(will) stand	2a			2c						
start	2a	2a	2a	2	2a	2	2	+	2	2
stop (=cease)	1	1	1	1A	1	1	1A	+	+	1
suggest	1	1	1		1	1	1A	+	1B	1
teach	2b	2b								
tolerate			1		1			+		
try	2a	2a	2a	2	2	2	2	+	2	2
understand			2b	1A	1(2d)	1	1A	+	1A	
urge			2a,bA		2					
visualize	1	1								
want	2c	2c	2c	2c	2c	2c	2c	2c	2c	2c

(The numbers referring to the books in the list:
   1 = LD, 2 = LL, 3 = Hornby, 4 = LES, 5 = AEP, 6 = Swan,
   7 = T & M, 8 = Sch, 9 = TEP, 10 = GCE)
(The patterns used in the list:
   1 = only gerund can follow the finite verb, infinitive not
   2 = both infinitive and gerund can follow the verb (no specification)
   2a = both infinitive and gerund can follow as direct object
        (Depending on the choice there may be smaller or bigger changes
        in the meaning.)
   2b = either gerund or object + infinitive follow the verb
        (E.g. We advised (their) starting early
              We advised them to start early.)
   2c = if a gerund is used after the verb, it corresponds to a passive
        infinitive (An active infinitive is possible in other meanings)

2d = besides the gerund, object + <u>to be /to have</u> are also found
sometimes after the verb

A = if a gerund is used, it can be preceded either by the
possessive pronoun or the accusative of the personal pronoun
(the common or genitive case of the noun)

B = only the possessive / genitive is accaptable before the gerund)
(The table contains the possible infinitive constructions only if the use
of the gerund is indicated by the book concerned.)

Comments on the table

In spite of the varying lists it is clear that in the case of most
verbs there is an agreement among the different books as far as the
valency of the verbs is concerned. We can draw certain conclusions from
the number in which these verbs turn up in the various dictionaries and
the lists of grammar- and practice books. Those with the highest
frequency could be recommended for teaching at schools especially. Books
on usage, parctice, and sometimes even grammar books do not go into
details, they do not try to inform the student of all the possible
patterns in which a given verb can be used. It is quite natural for books
like 'Living English Structure' to do so and it is only logical that 'An
Advanced English Practice' contains longer lists. What is surprising is
that even such a bulky grammar book as GCE does not attribute too much
attention to the problem and its list is far shorter than that of Graver.
I am not quite satisfied with the way the issue is treated by such
widely-read grammarians as Zandvoort or Thomson and Martinet.
Scheuerweghs offers us no lists, but his rich collection of examples is
really valuable. Among the dictionaries it is understandable that
'Longman's Lexicon of Contemporary English' is represented by less items
in the list as it is based on groups of synonyms, and it may not be easy
to force each verb into some group. In other respects there is much
agreement between the two Longman dictionaries, though 'Longman's
Dictionary of Contemporary English" is of course more detailed as far as
more rarely used verbs are concerned. These dictionaries have a system of
denoting verb patterns, but this system or its application is not always

satisfactory. One of my main interests would have been to find out when the gerund can be preceded by the possessive or the accusative form or by both. With patterns T4 and V4 the Longman dictionaries do not make it quite clear which case it is. T4 stands for a gerund as direct object that may be preceded (but not necessarily) by a possessive pronoun. V4 stands for object + -ing form. The presence of both patterns would be the most likely indication of the occurence of both possessive and accusative but there are far fewer verbs labelled in this way than there should be. Among the examples given by these dictionaries there are very few with a possessive preceding the gerund, which makes the investigation of the problem even more difficult. Hornby has a special pattern (19 c) for this construction but in my whole list there are only 12 verbs indicated by this pattern while alone in two short exercises of 'Living English Structures' we can find 29 verbs after which the logical subject of the gerund is used in both ways. Similarly it is very difficult to find out which verbs govern only a possessive form. Many books do not mention this issue at all, while 'An Intermediate English Practice' has a list of 8 verbs of this type, Scheuerweghs mentions 7.

Besides the above problems one has to face difficulties of a different nature, too. Although dictionaries are updated and revised from time to time, certain mistakes may not be noticed for shorter or longer periods. When I was consulting the 1974 edition of Hornby's dictionary, I noticed that several verbs the initial letter of which was n, r, or s were labelled by the pattern 6D (both gerund and infinitive) instead of the pattern 6C, which I expected to find after them. When I checked them in the 1983 edition of the dictionary, I found several (e.g. necessitate, recall, recollect, recommend, resent, resist, risk, (can't) stand) corrected, but others (e.g. relish, repent, resume, save, shun) have still been left uncorrected. Besides the correction of what has already been printed, new patterns have been introduced for several verbs. The lesson to be drawn from this is that it is not enough to have a good dictionary, but you should have a relatively recent edition (or rather the recent editions of more than one good dictionaries) as well. It is also interesting that some of the verbs that are to be found in the lists of several widely used grammar- and practice books are not shown in

these functions in these popular dictionaries. (e.g. appreciate, deserve, forgive, mention, understand - the latter two are mentioned only by Hornby)

When I began to examine the verbs followed by the -ing form I was prepared to find a lot of contradictions in the different books by reason of my earlier experience. After completing the table I have to admit that the situation is not as bad as all that. Especially if you have a look at the whole group of patterns offered for the same verb by different books, you can judge quite definitively which forms are permitted after a given verb. (It might be true however that just one or two books would not suffice.) In spite of this general conclusion it is necessary to call attention to some contradictions in the table. (The differing figures do not always contradict each other. E.g. the pattern 2d can coexist with pattern 1, because not all books find it important to indicate that besides the more common gerund we can sometimes have object + to be / to have after the given verb. In some places another figure is given in brackets showing that the other form can also occur, but less frequently. Another reason for differing figures may be that one book enumerates the possible patterns in all the different meanings of the verb, another separates these according to the different meanings and function.

And now let us see some concrete examples where differing patterns are offered by the authors. (Can't) bear and (will, won't) bear are not separated in some books although the gerund after the latter has a passive meaning, so it is not quite justified to put them into the same pattern. In the case of avoid, consider, delay, enjoy Corder and Scheuerweghs claim that only the possessive pronoun or the genitive case of the noun is acceptable before the gerund, while in Allan's list only 3 (deny, postpone, risk) are mentioned to be the ones which do not accept the accusative, the former four not. I think this is rather the result of some inattention because none of the examples contains an accusative. Another surprising example is the verb have, this is however illustrated by an example too: 'I won't have your writing homework in pencil'. (LES: 190) Corder also gives a similar example (IEP: 64), but in both sentences have is used in the meaning 'permit', I have not found any example with the possessive in the more common causative sense of the word.

The majority of the books studied agree that we should use a gerund after dislike but Corder (IEP: 53), and Zandvoort (25) find the infinitive also acceptable. Zandvoort claims the same about recollect, which is very unlikely if we take the components of the word into consideration, which clearly show backward reference. In the case of remember most books agree that backward reference involves the use of the gerund while if we have to call something into our mind before doing it, this second action is expressed by an infinitive. The infinitive is less frequently used in Zandvoort's opinion, and Longman's Lexicon finds an object + infinitive also possible but that may be another misprint: V3 instead of V4. (Zandvoort: 25, LL: 305) Regret is usually found with both infinitive and gerund patterns, but both Longman dictionaries suggest that the normal usage is the gerund, the pattern with the infinitive is not indicated, but we find a few examples with it, they seem to be treated as set phrases. Forget, which is a third verb of the same group, though very important, is excluded from the lists of Thomson and Martinet (and similarly from that of Zandvoort). With like, love the pattern object + infinitive is neglected in LL. (LL: 241)

Sometimes the figure of a verb pattern is missing although we can find examples of the construction in the same place. (E.g. the figures in brackets in my table in the case of pardon, permit, entail) The patterns of propose (AEP) and dread (T&M) differ from those in other books because - indicated or not - only one meaning was chosen before compiling the list. It is also interesting to compare the patterns of four similar verbs in Longman's Dictionary: like (T3, 4, V3, 4), love (T3, 4, V3), prefer (T3, 4, V3), hate (T3, 4, V3, 4). Why is V4 missing with love and prefer? Is the object + ing construction impossible in the authors' opinion or is it just another misprint?

Suggest may only be followed by possessive and gerund in Corder's opinion, while Thomson and Martinet tolerate both possessive and accusative before the gerund. I think the former is more likely.

Loathe, (can't) endure, commence have differing evaluation in the books that have been consulted, but this cannot be a mistake or a misprint, as examples are shown to illustrate both pattern 1 and pattern 2.

It is interesting to observe the changing lists in the two comprehensive books of Quirk et alias (GCE and CGEL). While in their more recent book (CGEL) a number of new verbs have been introduced (<u>(can't)</u> <u>bear, begrudge, commence, confess, deserve, enjoy, envisage, imagine,</u> <u>justify, loathe,</u> etc.), others have disappeared from their earlier list (<u>acknowledge, contemplate, defer, delay, evade, finish, include,</u> <u>postpone, practise, resist, shun, suggest).</u> What may be the reason for replacing them for others? Has their evaluation changed or do they simply want to give examples without attempting at offering complete lists (which could be expected of books of that size)? In the 1986 impression of the GCE we still find the same list as in the first edition of 1972, while in the CGEL published in 1985 for the first time there is a completely new list with new groupings. (The earlier grouping was hard to follow. I do not see any reasons for calling <u>permit, acknowledge,</u> or <u>postpone</u> verbs of emotion). Another advantage of the new list is that they also denote which verbs are likely to be followed by a perfect gerund.

The lists make it clear that verbs of the same sense group do not necessarily behave in the same way:

'His lawyer <u>advised him to drop</u> the case / <u>his dropping</u> the case, since it was difficult to succeed.' (AEP: 169)

'I <u>recommend you to consult / your consulting</u> an expert.' (AEP: 168)

*'I <u>suggested</u> her to go home.' (Swan: 323)

Similarly the group of verbs expressing feelings <u>(enjoy, like, love,</u> <u>hate, prefer, loathe, dislike)</u> do not all accept the same patterns. All the authors in the survey seem to agree that <u>enjoy</u> can be followed only by a gerund, most of them say the same about <u>dislike</u> (with the exception of two, as we have seen above), the use of <u>loathe</u> is judged inconsistently. The other four can accept both gerund and infinitive, the authors agree, but what the choice depends on is the subject of the debate. Several authors claim (e.g. Swan: 339) that it depends on the liking referring to a particular occasion or having some general validity. The examples of other authors seem to contradict to this rule sometimes:

'Of course children always hate to cause trouble.

'She is the sort of person who likes to cause trouble.

'Nobody really loves to work.' (IEP: 54)

The lesson we can draw is that that we should not oversimplify these rules of usage.

Finally a remark about the occurence frequency of the -ing form. In order to know which of the above verbs are really worth teaching, we should know how often they occur in spoken or written English followed by the -ing form as their object (complement). For lack of space that will be the subject of another paper. It is generally supposed that the -ing form is more typical of written than spoken English. Some studies (e.g. that of Andersson) show however that even there the verbs with the infinitive are far more common, while the most frequent occurences of the -ing form are those of the present participle after some verbs of physical perception.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Abbreviations used in the text are in brackets)

Allen, W. Stannard: Living English Structure. Longmans, 1959. (LES)

Andersson, Evert: On verb complementation in written English. Lund Studies in English 71. CWK Gleerup, Malmö, 1985.

Corder, S. Pit: An Intermediate English Practice Book. Longman, 1960. (IEP)

Ganshina, M. - Vasilevskaya, N.: English Grammar. Moscow, 1953.

Graver, B. D.: Advanced English Practice. Second Edition. Oxford University Press, London, 1971. (AEP)

Hornby, A. S.: An Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Oxford University Press, 1974 and Seventeenth Impression, 1983. (Hornby)

Hornby, A. S.: Guide to Patterns and Usage in English. Oxford University
    Press, 1976. (GPUE)

Ihms, Henry: Das 'Half-Gerund'. Ein Irrweg sprachlicher Deutung. In Die
    Neueren Sprachen, 80:3 (1981): pp. 202-207.

Ihms, Henry: Das Verkannte Präsenspartizip im Englischen. Eine semantisch
    (textlinguistisch)-orientierte Untersuchung. In Die Neueren
    Sprachen, 85:3 (1986), pp. 283-301.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, ed. by Paul Procter, Longman,
    1978. Reprinted in 1986. (LD)

Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English, ed. by Tom McArthur, Longman,
    1982. (LL)

Quirk, R. - Greenbaum, S. - Svartvik, J. - Leech, G.: A Comprehensive
    Grammar of the English Language. Longman, London and New York,
    1985. (CGEL)

Quirk, R. - Greenbaum, S. - Leech, G. - Svartvik, J.: A Grammar of
    Contemporary English. Longman, 1972. (GCE)

Scheuerweghs, G.: Present - Day English Syntax. Longmans, 1966. (Sch)

Swan, Michael: Practical English Usage. Oxford, 1982.

Thomson, A. J. - Martinet, A. V.: A Practical English Grammar. 2nd
    Edition, 1969. and 3rd Edition 1980, Oxford, (T&M)

Zandvoort, R. W.: A Handbook of English Grammar. Sixth Edition, Longman,
    1972.