

CSABA CZEGLÉDI

ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF INFINITIVAL AND GERUNDIVE COMPLEMENTS IN ENGLISH

In this article I will first review briefly some of the major issues in the grammar of nonfinite complements in English that have emerged since the publication of Rosenbaum (1967), the first major work on nonfinite complementation in a generative framework to my knowledge. In the discussion that follows I will focus on some general questions of both theoretical and descriptive interest concerning the problem of how to account for the distribution of nonfinite complements in English and I will consider some concrete proposals. Finally, I will present the outlines of an alternative hypothesis on the distribution of nonfinite complements in English and provide some theoretical as well as empirical arguments in its favor.

The problem of constituent structure

There are two mutually and closely related fundamental issues, neither conclusively settled thus far, that must be resolved in a grammar of nonfinite complements in English. We must (a) determine their syntactic category and constituent structure and (b) formulate the principles in terms of which we can account for their distribution.

Two major classes of competing hypotheses have been proposed on the syntactic category and constituency of nonfinite constructions in English in generative grammar, or frameworks sympathetic to it. Chierchia (1984) argues that English infinitives and gerunds are verb phrases, while in

Chomsky (1981), and much other work inspired by GB, these structures are analyzed as embedded sentences. Koster and May (1982) address the issue directly in an influential article, where they provide a detailed comparison of the predictions the VP hypothesis and the S-bar hypothesis make, and they conclude that infinitives—and as the analysis extends readily to gerunds, they too—are sentences in English. It is interesting to note that in Maxwell's (1984) proposal, which is intermediate in a sense between the VP hypothesis and the S' hypothesis, infinitives and gerunds are treated differently. He argues that gerunds but not infinitives are sentences in English.

Parallel to the problem of constituency in syntax we have the property versus proposition dilemma in semantics. Syntactically nonfinite expressions may be VPs or S's, and semantically they may correspond either to properties or to propositions. Chierchia (1984:215—6) observes that in principle there can be, and in fact there are, four different views on this matter.

Nonfinite complements might be analyzed syntactically as VPs and semantically they might correspond to properties. This is Chierchia's (1984) own view as well as the general assumption in standard Montague Grammar, on which Chierchia's 'VP = P(roperty)' hypothesis is based. As a variant of this, nonfinite complements could be VPs which semantically correspond to open propositions. Alternatively, nonfinite constructions might be syntactically clausal, and semantically they may be associated with properties. Finally, as in Chomsky (1981), Koster and May (1982) and much other GB based work, nonfinite complements can be analyzed as S's which correspond to propositions in semantic structure.

I cannot take up these highly complex issues here, and for the purposes of this paper I will simply assume that nonfinite complements are sentences and that semantically they are associated with propositions.

The problem of distribution

The second fundamental issue is how to account for the distribution of infinitives and gerunds in English. It is familiar that the occurrence of untensed complements is restricted in various ways. The crux of the problem here is whether the distribution of nonfinite complement clauses is deter-

mined by idiosyncratic (syntactic or semantic) properties of predicates, in which case it is unpredictable, or whether it can be accounted for in terms of some general principles. If the null hypothesis is rejected and it is assumed that the account for the occurrence of infinitival and gerundive complements can be reduced to some general principles, the next problem that arises is whether those principles can be formulated in syntactic, semantic, or perhaps pragmatic terms, or a combination thereof.

It seems that no syntactic theory has been able to formulate the principles that would account for the distribution of nonfinite complements that was both observationally and explanatorily adequate. Standard syntactic machinery does not appear to be appropriate for the explication of the factors that govern the distribution of infinitives and gerunds in English. One is forced to conclude that the distribution of nonfinite complements, or complement selection in general, cannot be accounted for in purely syntactic terms.

As Grimshaw (1979:318) concludes in an analysis of interrogative and exclamatory complements, "It is clear that complement selection is not predictable on the basis of syntactic characteristics of predicates. For example, there is no syntactic reason why *wonder* and *inquire* should not allow *that*-complements, or why *believe* should not allow interrogative complements. Whatever the degree of predictability that may exist, it is to be found in the semantic, and not the syntactic, domain."

She does in fact successfully demonstrate that the distribution of embedded exclamatives, a subclass of sentential complements, is fairly consistently predictable on semantic grounds. She shows that nonfactive predicates do not allow inherently factive complements, that exclamations are inherently factive, therefore exclamations are never embedded under nonfactive predicates. This has a very important consequence with respect to the theory: the selectional mechanism that is otherwise assumed in an idiosyncratic treatment of the distribution of exclamations with respect to factive and nonfactive predicates is no longer necessary, because "the semantic and pragmatic characteristics of exclamations and of the factive/nonfactive distinction automatically guarantee that the ill-formed combinations will not be generated" (ibid., 323).

Jackendoff (1983) derives two arguments from general theoretical assumptions and from considerations of language acquisition that show that, in addition to the system of syntactic rules, we need a set of semantic well-formedness rules to account for existing patterns of complementation in language in general and for the distribution of nonfinite complements in particular, and that in fact it may turn out that some of the observed syntactic regularities are predictable from certain semantic well-formedness rules. He points out that a theory of language with a close syntax—semantics mapping is superior to one in which this is lacking, because a theory with an impoverished semantic component cannot predict that “many apparently syntactic constraints follow from semantic constraints, so that once a language learner has learned the meaning of the construction in question, the observed syntactic distribution will follow automatically” (ibid., 13).

He argues that if we work on the reasonable assumption that language is a “relatively efficient and accurate encoding of the information it conveys” it is only natural to “look for systematicity in the relationship between syntax and semantics,” which, however, “is not to say that *every* aspect of syntax should be explainable in semantic terms” (ibid., 14). For example, there is no semantic reason why *draw*, unlike many other transitive verbs such as *say*, *mention*, etc., should not take eventive *that*-clause complements in English, as the equivalents of these in Hungarian all do, in sentences like

- (1) *John drew that Mary was wearing a hat.

Jackendoff’s theory indeed predicts that the semantic structure that corresponds to (1) is well-formed, yet the sentence is ungrammatical in English (see ibid., 232).

Quite a few interesting observations have been made in the literature that suggest that in a significant number of cases the occurrence of nonfinite complements in English is predictable from certain semantic properties of matrix predicates (see, for instance, Lees 1960, Vendler 1968, Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970, Menzel 1975, Klein 1982, Andersson 1985, and Wierzbicka 1988). They vary in explanatory value from the vacuous (such

as Wierzbicka's (1988:29) 'prediction' to the effect that infinitival clause complements on volitional matrix verbs express 'wanting') to some true generalizations. Some are more, others are less restricted in scope, and occasionally they make contradictory predictions, as we will see below, and none, it seems, achieves the desired degree of generality, which is probably the reason why each leaves some of the data unaccounted for. All this suggests that if there *are* more general principles that govern the distribution of nonfinite complements in English, we have not found them yet.

Let us now consider some of these observations and proposals in a little more detail. Consider the following examples:

- (2) a. Did you think to ask Brown?
b. Did you think of asking Brown?
- (3) a. I decided to go.
b. I decided on going.

The Kiparskys' explanation for the occurrence of gerundive complements on prepositional verbs in sentences like (2b) and (3b) as opposed to the choice of the infinitive in their nonprepositional counterparts in (2a) and (3a) is that "after prepositions infinitives are automatically converted to gerunds . . ." (Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970:157). Wierzbicka (1988:32), however, points out that the choice of complement in such examples is not arbitrary because "*decide ON* doesn't mean the same as *decide TO*. *Decide on* implies that a number of possibilities have been considered ('gone through' in a person's mind) and that the subject decided to 'stop' on one of these possibilities. *Decide to* doesn't imply any such series of possibilities." In her analysis, infinitival complements imply wanting and gerundive complements imply possibility. Thus, the explication of the meanings of (1a-b) in Wierzbicka's terms is like this:

- 1. a did you (at some point) think this:
'I want this: I will ask Brown'
and did you do it because of that?

1. b (when you were thinking of doing different things)
 did you think of (the possibility of) asking Brown?
 (cf. Wierzbicka 1988:30)

But compare (4) and (5),

- (4) a. I remembered to ask Brown.
 b. I remember asking Brown.
- (5) a. I regret to ask Brown.
 b. I regret asking Brown.

where a similar ‘wanting’ versus ‘possibility’ interpretation of the respective complements does not seem to be plausible.

Quirk et al.’s (1985) view on the meaning of sentences like (4) and (5) is that *-ing* complements on retrospective verbs, such as *remember* and *regret*, express anteriority and infinitival complements on this subclass of verbs express posteriority. In other words, *-ing* complements suggest that the action described in the complement sentence happened before, whereas infinitival complements express that it happened after, the point in time expressed by the tense of the matrix verb. Compare also the following examples (Quirk et al. 1985:1193):

- (6) a. I regret to tell you that John stole it.
 b. I regret telling you that John stole it.

Contrast in temporal deixis relative to that expressed in the matrix clause, however, hardly explains why the infinitive is preferred in (7a) and the gerund in (7b) below. Quirk et al. (1985:1191—2) suggest that the infinitive is favored in (7a) but the gerund in (7b) because the former is associated with potentiality and the latter with performance.

- (7) a. He started to speak, but stopped because she objected.
 b. He started speaking, and kept on for more than an hour.

- (8) a. Sheila tried to bribe the jailor.
b. Sheila tried bribing the jailor.

They note about the examples in (8) that (8a) expresses an abortive attempt at an act of bribery with the infinitival clause suggesting potentiality, whereas (8b) implies the fruitless *performance* of an act (ibid., 1191). But they also observe that the meaning of the matrix verb may cancel out the performance interpretation of an *-ing* clause, as in

- (9) He escaped being branded as a traitor.

where *escaped* clearly implies that the event expressed in the embedded sentence did not actually occur.

While Bolinger (1968:123—5) expresses a similar view, arguing that infinitival complements express “something projected,” hypothetical or potential as opposed to gerundive clauses, which express something reified, “something actually done,” it is instructive that Wood (1956) appears to believe that the reverse is the case: the gerundive complement is the abstract form, which may suggest intention, and the infinitival complement expresses reification. The verb *think*, Wood says, means ‘did it occur to you?’ in sentences like (2a) and that it means ‘have the intention’ in ones like (2b) (1956:15). And this is his comment on the contrast between infinitival and gerundive complements on the verb *like* when it is used in sentences like (10) and (11) below: “When *like* and (*do*) *not like* take the gerund they suggest enjoyment or repugnance respectively . . . But with the infinitive it suggests rather desire, preference or choice, and in the negative reluctance . . .” (ibid.). Compare

- (10) a. I like to sing.
b. I like singing.
(11) I like to read in bed but I don’t like having meals in bed.

In Wierzbicka’s (1988) theory, contrary to Wood (1956), Bolinger (1968) and Quirk et al. (1985), the elements of thinking, wanting and future

are always present in the meaning of volitional infinitival complements. Thus, infinitival clauses imply futurity, “sequence of times,” “future orientation” as opposed to gerundive complements, which imply simultaneity, “sameness of time,” or “present (contemporary, simultaneous) orientation.” It is these semantic contrasts, she argues, that are responsible for the grammatical differences between the (a) and (b) examples in (12—15) below.

- (12) a. He tried to fry the mushrooms.
b. He tried frying the mushrooms.
- (13) a. I have kept this old jacket to give to a jumble sale.
b. I keep this old jacket for working in the garden.
- (14) a. You will need a spanner to tighten that nut.
b. A spanner is used for tightening nuts.
- (15) a. John wants to go.
b. *John wants going.

She extends the ‘future orientation versus sameness of time’ semantic contrast to the analysis of causative structures. It is asserted that (16) describes two consecutive actions, whereas the *-ing* complement in (17) refers to an activity that occurred simultaneously with that expressed by the matrix verb.

- (16) He got her to do the dishes.
- (17) He got them talking.

The same is said to apply to aspectual verbs like *begin* in (18).

- (18) a. He began to open all the cupboards.
b. He began opening all the cupboards.

While Wierzbicka (1988) emphasizes the semantic contrast in relative time reference between the infinitival and gerundive complements of aspectual verbs, Quirk et al. (1985) point to an aspectual difference between

them. In (18b) the plural noun suggests the repetition of the action, which is the reason why the *-ing* complement, they claim, is preferred to the infinitive. Compare also

- (19) a. I heard them shoot at him.
b. I heard them shooting at him.

where the *-ing* clause complement in (19b) expresses the repetition of shots.

In addition to differences in aspect, relative temporal deixis, and the potentiality vs. performance dichotomy, semantic contrasts of a different kind have also been noted in the literature. Dixon (1984) (quoted in Wierzbicka 1988:85) argues that a semantic difference in implication and presupposition underlies the grammatical difference between the nonfinite complements in sentences like (20a and b).

- (20) a. Mary began to hit John.
b. Mary began hitting John.

In his analysis, (20b) implies that the action described in the complement clause did actually happen, while (20a) has no such implication. Klein's (1982) findings also seem to confirm a similar hypothesis formulated in terms of strong versus weak pragmatic implicativeness (a refinement of the implicative—nonimplicative distinction introduced by Karttunen 1971). He argues that, for matrix verbs which allow either type of complement, gerundive complements are associated with stronger pragmatic implicativeness than infinitival complement clauses as regards the realization of the event described in the complement.

The hypothesis

As we have seen in this very brief review of some interesting proposals that seek to explain the distribution of nonfinite complements in English on semantic or pragmatic grounds, choice between infinitival and *-ing* clause complementation often appears to be predictable in terms of as-

pectual differences, contrasts in relative temporal deixis, presupposition and implication, or the potentiality—performance dichotomy expressed by the respective clause types. But, as I have already observed early in this paper, some of the alternative hypotheses that have been presented either make empirically discordant predictions or fall short of offering a complete account for the relevant set of facts that is formulated in syntactic and semantic or pragmatic categories and principles that achieve a degree of generality which can induce such a set of statements to be viewed as a convincing explanation which can be incorporated in a grammar that is meant to be a psychologically relevant model of the native speaker's language competence.

In what follows I will present the outlines of an alternative, and perhaps more general, hypothesis as an attempt to account for the distribution of infinitival and *-ing* clause complements in English. The hypothesis I am going to present will be supported both by arguments derived from theoretical considerations and by empirical evidence. Some of the empirical evidence to be presented will be independent (and therefore of great value) in that it comes from a totally unrelated but surprisingly relevant area of English.

Since basically any theory of meaning in natural language seeks to establish, among other things, the principles which bring into correspondence units of meaning with units of syntactic structure, it is crucial that an adequate model of the native speaker's knowledge of meaning account for the way locutions of varying complexity identify the semantic or ontological entities to which they correspond. In set theoretical terms, to identify an entity entails presupposing a set in which that entity is a member as well as distinguishing this member from any and all other members of the same set. From this it follows that the identification of an element in a set implies the contrasts that distinguish the particular element from all other members of that set. The set itself will be identified by the property or properties that are shared by all its members.

If the elements of semantic structure to which linguistic expressions correspond are viewed as set theoretical entities, i.e., elements in sets, it is clear that the understanding of implied contrasts between a particular ele-

ment of a particular set of semantic entities and all other elements of that set is vital for the understanding of the meaning of linguistic expressions. It is evident that the understanding of implied contrasts presupposes the knowledge of the particular set an element of which is being identified. Therefore the proper identification of the set is crucial. It is reasonable to conclude, then, that the understanding of implicit contrasts is an important part of understanding the meaning of sentences because implied contrasts simply *are* an important part of the meaning of sentences.

The next question that we obviously need to ask is what devices, if any, are there in language to express these aspects of meaning. In particular, is there anything in the syntactic or phonological form of sentences that can be shown to contribute systematically to this aspect of their meaning?

One well-known device in language for the expression of implied contrasts is focusing. Semantically, two types of focus are commonly recognized in current linguistic and logical theories, which I will call, following Ruzsa (1988—89:584—87), strong, or contrastive, and weak focus. If focus is understood semantically as an identificational operator, contrastive focus may be defined as exhaustive listing, and weak focus may be interpreted as identification by exclusion (cf. É. Kiss 1987 and 1992, É. Kiss and Szabolcsi 1992, Kenesei 1983 (quoted in É. Kiss 1987:40), and Ruzsa 1988—89). Since it is not my goal to explore problems of focus in detail here, I will not discuss it any further. All I wish to point out finally is that the recognition of these functions of focus lends empirical support to the hypothesis about implied contrasts being proposed. Rather than elaborate on the notion of focus, I will turn to the more immediate concern of trying to determine whether or not there is any further empirical evidence in English that implied contrasts are systematically expressed in grammar.

Quirk et al. (1985) observe a very interesting systematic contrast between the position adverbial and other adverbials in how they contribute to the meaning of sentences. They note that “sentences which superficially differ only in so far as one has a position adverbial and the other a direction, goal, or source adverbial are found on closer inspection to involve a considerable difference in the meaning of the verb concerned, triggered by the different prepositions:

- (21) He is travelling in Yorkshire.
 (22) He is travelling to Leeds (*or* from Halifax).” (Their original numbers are [1] and [2], respectively, cf. *ibid.*, 480—81.)

Even more interesting from the present perspective is the observation that “sentence (21) [1] seems to give equal weight to what he is doing (travelling) and where he is doing it (in Yorkshire), whereas sentence (22) [2] seems to give weight only to the direction: ‘Where is he travelling to/from?’ ‘Where is he going (to)?’ ‘Where is he coming from?’ This is confirmed both by the plausibility of the paraphrases (*go, come*) and by the absence of an acceptable question:

- (23) *What is he doing from Halifax? Travelling?
 beside:
 (24) What is he doing in Yorkshire? Travelling?” (Cf. *ibid.*, 481.)

This means in terms of the implicit contrasts expressed that an important aspect of the meaning of (21) is the contrast implied between ‘is travelling in Yorkshire’, or probably more accurately ‘travel in Yorkshire’, on the one hand and ‘doing/do something else’ on the other, i.e., some or any other activity he might be engaged in. By the same token, an important aspect of the meaning of (22) is the contrast implied between ‘to Leeds/from Halifax’ and some or any other place he could be traveling to/from. Thus, the position adverbial seems to be special among place adverbials in that it signals a different implicit set: the goal or source adverbial in (22) appears to invoke an implied set of goals or sources, with the agent and activity expressed in the sentence being kept constant, whereas the position adverbial in (21) does not appear to signal an implicit set of possible positions but a set of activities (with or without the position being kept constant). It is significant in this respect that the activity cannot even be elicited in (22) by a question keeping the agent and the place constant (cf. the ungrammaticality of the question in (23) above), but it can in (21), with or without the place kept constant (cf. the grammatical question in (24)).

The implied contrasts expressed in (21) and (22) above can be made explicit by spelling out one or more members of the relevant sets invoked by the adverbials something like this:

- (25) He is travelling in Yorkshire (as opposed to sleeping at home; lying in hospital (in Yorkshire); etc.)
- (26) He is travelling to Leeds (*or* from Halifax) (as opposed to Manchester; etc.)

Quite surprisingly, one might say, the grammar of adverbials furnishes us with additional relevant evidence. Quirk et al. (1985:519) observe that if two spatial adjuncts of the same semantic class cooccur in a clause but at different levels of syntactic structure, so that one is a sentence adjunct, the other a predication adjunct, then the predication adjunct will be more prominent than the sentence adjunct, the latter expressing information which is understood as relatively given. For example, of the two position adjuncts in

- (27) Many people eat in restaurants in London. (Quirk et al. 1985:519)

the sentence adjunct may be expressed with a closed-class adverb “indicating that it is relatively ‘given’ . . .,” and when this happens, the order of adjuncts may be reversed (ibid., 519):

- (28) Many people eat here/there in restaurants.

The point here is that if both sentence and predication adjunct of the same semantic class are present in a clause, the former tends to be understood as ‘given’ relative to the predication adjunct, and the latter invokes a set of similar conditions with which itself is implicitly contrasted, while the rest of the components of meaning expressed in the sentence, including the contribution of the sentence adjunct, are kept constant. This implicit contrast may be spelled out like this:

- (29) Many people eat in restaurants in London. vs. 'Many people eat at home in London'/etc.

This is confirmed by Quirk et al.'s (1985:519—20) observation that only the sentence adjunct can be fronted:

- (30) a. In London, many people eat in restaurants.
b. *In restaurants, many people eat in London.

These facts show that certain classes of adverbials differ systematically as to what kind of implicational sets they trigger in sentences and thus they provide independent evidence from an area of English grammar totally unrelated to nonfinite sentence embedding which supports the general hypothesis that certain types of implied contrasts *are* systematically expressed in English by specific grammatical devices and that the indication of particular types of implied contrasts *is* an important aspect of both syntactic and semantic structure.

The proposed implicational generalizations illustrated above may be easily extended to nonfinite sentential complements. The specific form the general hypothesis will now take is that infinitival complement clauses and *-ing* clauses differ as to what kind of implicit contrasts they trigger. I will try to show, in particular, that infinitival complements trigger implicit contrasts between the proposition expressed in the matrix clause and its negation or opposite, keeping, remarkably, the entity denoted by the matrix subject and the event described in the complement clause constant. Thus, the contrast implied by

- (31) John likes to sing.

can be spelled out like

- (32) John likes to sing vs. John doesn't like/ hates to sing.

Secondly, I will attempt to demonstrate that gerundive complements on the other hand invoke an implicit contrast between the event expressed by the complement clause and any number of other events in the relevant set triggered by the complement sentence, in which the member denoted by the complement clause is thus identified, keeping the event or state expressed by the matrix verb and the entity denoted by the matrix subject constant. Thus, the contrast implied in

(33) John likes singing.

may be spelled out like this:

(34) John likes singing as opposed to jogging/drawing/etc.

It appears then that infinitival complements render the meaning of the matrix verb more prominent than that of the complement clause (as though sentences with infinitival clause complements were answers to Yes/No questions, which invariably imply the contrast with their implicit negatives, and therefore the implicit negative can always be spelled out converting the sentence into an alternative question, cf. Quirk et al. 1985:239), while *-ing* clause complements seem to serve to highlight the embedded activity or event in a way similar in effect to focusing.

Given that gerunds seem to highlight ‘themselves’ in contrast with potential embedded events but infinitives do not, the hypothesis predicts that gerunds can but infinitives cannot easily be made the focus of a cleft sentence. This prediction is borne out, thus confirming the hypothesis. Chierchia (1984:414) observes that gerunds can be clefted but infinitives cannot:

(35) It is writing papers that Mary likes and John hates.

(36) *It is to write papers that Mary likes and John hates.

Interestingly enough, it seems that the reverse is the case with respect to pseudo-clefting: gerunds cannot, but some infinitives can appear in the focus of a pseudo-cleft:

(37) *What Mary likes is writing papers.

(38) What Mary wants is to write papers.

I do not have an explanation for this fact but I suspect that the answer lies in some still not clearly understood differences between the semantic effects of clefting and pseudo-clefting.

Below I present a few examples highlighting (by capitalization) the elements that trigger the respective implicit contrasts as described above, suggesting that the meaning expressed by the expressions printed unchanged in the examples is kept constant in the contrasts implied.

They are arranged in three groups: Group A contains sentences with matrix verbs that take either infinitival or gerundive complements; Group B is a list of sentences whose matrix verbs allow only infinitives; and Group C contains examples with matrix verbs that take only gerundive nonfinite complements.

Group A. Examples with matrix verbs for which the choice between infinitival and gerundive complementation is available.

(2a-b) repeated here as

(39) a. Did you THINK to ask Brown?

b. Did you think OF ASKING BROWN?

(3a-b) repeated here as

(40) a. I DECIDED to go.

b. I decided ON GOING.

(8a-b) repeated here as

(41) a. Sheila TRIED to bribe the jailor.

b. Sheila tried BRIBING THE JAILOR.

(12a-b) repeated here as

(42) a. He TRIED to fry the mushrooms.

b. He tried FRYING the mushrooms.

- (43) a. John **BEGAN** to peel the potatoes.
 b. John began **PEELING THE POTATOES**.
 (10a-b) repeated here as
 (44) a. I **LIKE** to sing.
 b. I like **SINGING**.
 (11) repeated here as
 (45) I **LIKE** to read in bed but I don't like **HAVING MEALS** in bed.

The meaning of (45) could be spelled out something like this: 'As regards reading in bed, I like it, but of the things I could do in bed, having meals is one that I don't like doing.'

Choice between infinitival and gerundive complement clauses is not available for the matrix verbs of the sentences in Groups B and C below. It appears that the ungrammaticality of the alternative patterns of complementation in these examples correlates with the fact that the interpretations formulated in terms of implicit contrasts associated with the alternative complementation types are bizarre.

Group B.

- (46) Mary **TENDS** to come/*coming late to lectures.
 (47) John **WANTS** to go/*going to Paris.
 (48) I **WISH** to eat/*eating alone.
 (49) He **VENTURED** to touch /*touching the fierce dog and was bitten on the arm.
 (50) She **DESERVED** to win/*winning because she was the best.
 etc.

Group C.

- (51) I enjoy **SINGING**/*to sing.
 (52) She dreams of **BECOMING**/*to become **AN ACTRESS**.
 (53) Bill imagined **LEAVING**/*to leave.
 (54) He suggested **TAKING**/*to take **THE CHILDREN TO THE ZOO**.

- (55) We are considering GOING/*to go TO CANADA.
etc.

One might perhaps conjecture that (54) could be given a reading characteristic of the infinitival pattern, which is, incidentally, probably the reading many Hungarian learners of English tend to associate with similar sentences, and therefore even advanced students complement *suggest* with an infinitival clause in hundreds of instances, as any teacher of English in Hungary can testify. If it is an error, which it probably is, it does not seem to be the kind which is only committed occasionally by the innocent learner of English as a foreign language but one that is prone to infect also the language of educated (even professional) native speakers and writers of English such as James Joyce, as the reader can verify from the quotation in (56) below.

- (56) Uncle Charles smoked such black twist that at last his nephew suggested to him to enjoy his morning smoke in a little outhouse at the end of the garden. (James Joyce: *A Portrait of the Artist As a Young Man*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1916, p. 60.)

The same is also documented in Chierchia (1984:300), where, unfortunately, it is not clear whether these are his own examples (and errors), in which case what we see is another instance of overgeneralization by an exceptionally competent user of English as a second language (since Chierchia, although his English is often impressingly eloquent in style, does not probably qualify as a native speaker), or he cites authentic material.

- (57) a. John suggested to Bill to decide to leave together
b. John suggested to Bill to signal to leave together (Cf. Chierchia 1984:300, his original number (24))

The following admittedly deviant but authentic anacoluthon with *suggest* complemented by an infinitival clause is attested by Mair (1990:143).

- (58) Hilary Torrance suggested that a letter from the parents to be sent to County Hall putting forward the views regarding the cuts of 2 weeks and enrolment week for the 1984/85 session. (Mair's original number (168))

It is particularly interesting because, as he explains, a “lengthy and discontinuous” embedded subject “causes the writer to switch to a construction that is normal with frequently used and semantically related verbs of wishing such as *expect* or *want*” (Mair 1990:143).

I find it exciting that the theory of implicit contrasts sketched in this article offers a principled explanation even for slips like these.

WORKS CITED

- Andersson, Evert (1985). *On Verb Complementation in Written English*. Lund Studies in English. Malmö: liber Förlag.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1968). "Entailment and the Meaning of Structures." *Glossa* 2: 119—27.
- Chierchia, Gennaro (1984). "Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives and Gerunds." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. (1984). "The semantic basis of Syntactic Properties." *Berkeley Linguistic Society, Proceedings* 10: 583—95. Quoted in Wierzbicka (1988).
- É. Kiss, Katalin (1987). *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (1992). "Az egyszerű mondat szerkezete." In Kiefer (1992:79—177).
- É. Kiss, Katalin and Szabolcsi Anna (1992). "Grammatikaelméleti bevezető." In Kiefer (1992:21—77).
- Grimshaw, Jane (1979). "Complement Selection and the Lexicon." *Linguistic Inquiry* 10 (Spring): 279—326.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1983). *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Karttunen, L. (1971). "Implicative Verbs." *Language* 47: 340—58.
- Kenesei, István (1983). "A hatókör és a szórend összefüggései a magyar nyelvben." Unpublished, Szeged: József A. University. Quoted in É. Kiss (1987).
- Kiefer, Ferenc (ed.) (1992). *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan*. Vol. 1, *Mondattan*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kiparsky, Paul and Carol Kiparsky (1970). "Fact." In Bierwisch, M. and K. E. Heidolph, eds., *Progress in Linguistics*, Janua Linguarum, Series Maior. The Hague: Mouton, 143—73.

- Klein, Eberhard (1982). *Semantic and Pragmatic Indeterminacy in English Non-finite Verb Complementation*. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik. Tübingen: Narr.
- Koster, Jan and Robert May (1982). "On the Constituency of Infinitives." *Language* 58: 116—43.
- Lees, Robert B. (1960). *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Mair, Christian (1990). *Infinitival Complement Clauses in English: A Study of Syntax in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maxwell, Michael B. (1984). "The Subject and Infinitival Complementation in English." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.
- Menzel, Peter (1975). *Semantics and Syntax in Complementation*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rosenbaum, Peter S. (1967). *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Research Monograph Series. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Ruzsa, Imre (1988—89). *Logikai szintaxis és szemantika*. 2 vols. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Vendler, Zeno (1968). *Adjectives and Nominalizations*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1988). *The Semantics of Grammar*. Studies in Language Companion Series. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wood, Frederick T. (1956) "Gerund versus Infinitive." *English Language Teaching* XI: 10—17.