

MULTIPLE ANALYSIS AND GRADIENCE IN N1 TRV N2 TO V N3 CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH¹

UDC 811.111'367

Vladan Pavlović

Faculty of Philosophy, Niš, Serbia and Montenegro

Abstract. *The paper first explores the ways the N1 TrV N2 to V N3 construction in English can be interpreted functionally: as a monotransitive, ditransitive and complex-transitive one. Then it moves on to show how such an analysis can be further refined by checking the verb groups appearing in this construction against a set of relevant criteria.*

Key words: *category, constituent, criteria, gradient*

1. INTRODUCTION

The starting point is a well-established fact now (Lakoff, 1987; Langacker, 1987; Taylor, 1989, and others) that linguistic categories, including the grammatical ones, have a prototype structure, with central members sharing a range of syntactic and semantic attributes. In other words, it is claimed that at least some linguistic categories, to a considerable extent, represent indeterminate systems and do not have neat boundaries, wherefore they should be explored through the study of *gradience*. The gradient can be defined as "a scale which relates two categories of description in terms of degrees of similarity and contrast". (Quirk et al., 1985:90). At the either end of such a gradient, or a scale, there are items that (relatively) clearly belong to one category or to the other, whereas the intermediate positions are occupied by the "in-between" cases which tend to satisfy the criteria for one or the other category in varying degrees. In that sense, as far as the grammatical categories are concerned, various linguists have explored the notion of gradience in grammar, producing analyses of the possessive genitive, the transitive construction and its metaphorical extensions (Taylor, 1989), the scale relating subordinate and coordinate conjunctions, complex prepositions and free noun-phrase sequences, expressions with idiomatic and non-idiomatic status, prepositional verbs and free combinations of verbs with prepositional phrases, the gradience from deverbal nouns (via verbal nouns) to parti-

Received September 26, 2005

¹ This paper represents the integral version of the paper presented at the 15th International Conference on British and American Studies held at the University of Timisoara, Romania, in May 2005.

ciples, the gradient related to ellipsis and the passive (Quirk et al. 1985) etc. Generally speaking, mainstream formal linguistics generally ignores or abstracts away from gradient phenomena, and it is exactly through the advent of such approaches as Cognitive Grammar the above mentioned authors (Lakoff, Langacker, Taylor) are representatives of, that a part of the discomfort with 'black-and-white' categorisation and structuralist approach is reflected.

Closely related to the notion of gradience is that of *multiple analysis*. It reveals yet another kind of indeterminacy – which out of two or more analyses to apply to the same grammatical unit (e.g. a sentence), i.e. how to specify its possible constituent structures. Namely, there are instances when such alternative analyses seem necessary for the reason that "some of the generalizations that have to be made require one analysis, and some require another" (Quirk et al., 1985:90). In that sense, clauses have, for example, been analysed in at least two ways – in terms of the elements such as S, V, C, A, as well as in terms of just the subject and the predicate; prepositional verbs such as *look at* or *approve of* also tend to require multiple analysis (V+PP or multi-word verb+NP). In many such cases (the) two analyses may be considered the end-points of a gradient, and the particular instances of a linguistic category in question may then vary in the place they occupy on the scale between one interpretation and the other.

2. METHODOLOGICAL PREREQUISITES

Starting from the outlined principles, the purpose of this paper is to show how the notions of multiple analysis and gradience can be applied to *NI TrV N2 to V N3* construction in English (e.g. *I want her to write a book*, *The poor harvest caused prices to rise sharply*, *She told me to call her again later*), as well as to show what conclusions can be drawn from such an analysis.

During the course of the analysis, references will be made especially to Quirk et al., 1985, where an outline is given as to how such an analysis may proceed.

The corpus used in the analysis consists of the sentences containing the above-mentioned construction that could be found in the dictionaries and the grammar books listed in the Appendix 1 at the end of the paper.

The intuition of a native speaker of English has also been taken into account and relied on.

Drawing on the insights provided by both the structuralist approach to grammar and the generative Government and Binding Theory, the paper will first present the different ways the *NI TrV N2 to V N3* construction can be analysed functionally. Then, in order for the paper to present the gradient nature of the structure in question, two preliminary steps had to be made. Firstly, the main verbs appearing in this construction (those marked *TrV* in the pattern above) have been classified according to the (predominantly semantic) criteria outlined in Quirk et al., 1985:1180 *et passim*). The following verb groups have been established:

1. Volitional verbs: *(can't) bear, desire, hate, like, love, prefer, want, wish*;
2. Prepositional verbs: *ask for, call for, ache for, aim for, burn for, burst for, care for, clamour for, crave for, hope for, itch for, long for, plan for, prepare for, wait for, yearn for*;

3. Public factual verbs: *acknowledge, announce, certify, confess, confirm, declare, deny, guarantee, proclaim, pronounce, report, repute* (esp. Pass.), *rumour* (Pass. only), *say* (Pass. only), *state, testify, tip*;
4. Private factual verbs: *assume, believe, conceive, consider, estimate, expect, deem, discover, fancy, feel, find, imagine, judge, know, note, notice, observe, perceive, presume, presuppose, prove, reckon, recognize, reveal, see* (Pass. only), *show, suppose, suspect, take, think* (esp. Pass.) *understand*;²
5. Verbs of intention: *intend, mean*;
6. Causative/Resulting verbs referring to speech acts which have the performative force of declarations: *appoint, elect, name, vote*;
7. General causative/resulting verbs: *cause, drive, force, get* (no Pass.), *lead, prompt*;
8. Verbs with a modal character, expressing such concepts as enablement, permission and compulsion: *allow, authorize, compel, constrain, enable, entitle, equip, fit, oblige, permit, require*;
9. Verbs of 'influencing' between which a common factor appears to be that the non-finite clause has a purposive meaning: *assist, bother, bribe, condemn, dare, defy* (no Pass.), *encourage, help, induce, inspire, press, summon*;
10. Verbs which introduce indirect directives: *advise, ask, beg, beseech, challenge, command, counsel, detail, direct, enjoin, entreat, exhort, forbid, implore, incite, instruct, invite, order, persuade, pray, remind, request, recommend, teach, tell, urge*.

It should be noted here that the grammar-book Quirk et al., 1985 considers the first two verb groups monotransitive, the last one ditransitive and the verbs in all the other groups are considered complex-transitive.

The second preliminary step deals with the *criteria* that have had to be established so as to help locate a particular group of verbs in the gradient. Those are the following criteria (mostly taken over and sometimes partially adapted from: Quirk et al. 1985:1218, 1219 and Huddleston and Pullum, 2002:1203):

- a) *N2* is a raised object (and therefore actually an argument of the verb of the subordinate clause: *I want her to write a book* can be analysed as *I want (for (she to write a book))*), to which subject-to-object raising is then applied (Wardhaugh, 1995:169);
- b) *N2* (the NP preceding the infinitive) cannot be made the subject of a passive main clause: **She is wanted to write a book*.
- c) The *N2 to V N3* sequence can be passivized without change of meaning: *I want a book to be written by her*.
- d) The *to V N3* part cannot normally be omitted without radically altering the meaning (another way to put this: the infinitive marker *to* need remain so as for the reduced construction to preserve the original meaning): *I want her to write a book* is not reducible to *I want her* (the meaning changes) but can be reduced to *I want her to*.
- e) Except when used in an extended, metaphorical sense, the main verb does not require that *N2* denote a sentient being capable of making decisions: *He wanted the book to intimidate her*.

² The verbs *feel, notice, observe, perceive* and *see* have been assigned to this group as they, in the construction in question, do not denote perception but mental inference.

These criteria have been chosen as instruments of analysis as they can help determine the number of constituents following the main lexical verb (the usual number of constituents after the verb at sentence level is one or two) and show how closely, syntactically and semantically, the main verb and the *N2*, on the one hand, and the main verb and *N2 to VN3*, on the other, are related.

At the end of this part, it should also be stressed that that the second verb (the one marked with a *V* only in the construction) need not always be a transitive one – it can also be the verb *to be*: *They reported him to be a thief*, as well as a linking verb: *They forced him to become a president*). The three "Ns" (*N1*, *N2* and *N3*) are taken to be nominals – words and word groups that occupy positions typically occupied by nouns and that perform functions typically performed by nouns (Stageberg, 1981:220-222).

3. THE RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

This part of the paper presents the results of the analysis of the *N1 TrV N2 to VN3* construction in English in view of the notions of multiple analysis and gradience.

3.1. Let us first consider the following sentences:

- 1) *I want her to write a book.*
- 2) *They expected John to win the competition.*
- 3) *She told me to call her again tomorrow.*

They all conform to the *N1 TrV N2 to VN3* pattern, yet all of them can be analysed in different ways functionally. Sentence 1 can be analysed as S V DO, sentence 2 as S V DO OC, and the third sentence can be analysed as S V IO DO. In other words, the first sentence can be taken as an example of monotransitive, the second one of complex-transitive and the third one of ditransitive complementation.³ In addition to this, the *N2* can be analysed as:

- the subject of the infinitive clause, in *sentence 1*: *I want (for(her to write a book))*, to which, as explained above, subject-to-object raising is applied, so that it can also be called a raised object;
- the indirect object of the main verb, in *sentence 3* (i.e. *N2* is here treated as a constituent at sentence level and not at the level of the subordinate clause);
- something that draws on both these analyses, in *sentence 2*; namely, it would be reasonable to argue, from the semantic point of view, that *N2* in this sentence requires the treatment of *N2* in the first sentence (that it is a unit raised from the subject position in the subordinate clause to the object position of the main clause): *They expected (for(John past to win the competition))*. From the formal point of view, however, the analysis of sentence 2 (considering *N2* simply an object of the main verb, and therefore a constituent at sentence level and not at the level of the subordinate clause) seems no less appropriate as it reflects the ability of *N2* to become the subject of the passive (*John was expected to win the competition*), which is not true of the *N2* in the first sentence. In other words, *N2* behaves as an object (a DO rather than an IO, actually) in relation to the main verb of the

³ "Many verbs are versatile enough to allow several complementation types. It is therefore likely to be misleading to talk of 'intransitive verbs', 'monotransitive verbs', 'complex transitive verbs', etc. Rather, it is often better to say that verbs have 'monotransitive use', 'monotransitive complementation' etc." (Quirk *et al.*, 1985:1168)

sentence, but like a subject in relation to the second – infinitive verb (and can also be called a raised object).

3.2 It is one of the most important purposes of this paper to show that even such, relatively fine, (multiple) analysis of this particular construction proves not sufficiently adequate to reveal some of the other subtleties that can be found here, and that this is yet another grammatical structure that can profit from invoking the notion of gradience. Therefore, a table will now be presented that explores the ways the above-mentioned groups of verbs respond to the outlined criteria, showing thereby how actually more than three categories can be distinguished here. It is the response of the given verb groups to those criteria that has made us posit the verb groups containing the verbs present in sentences 1 and 3 above (those are verb groups 1 and 10 presented in the previous part of the paper) as end-points of a gradient, with all the other verb groups (including the one containing the verb in sentence 2 above) at some point(s) on the scale between them.

Type of compl.	Criteria Verb classes	a) N2 is a raised object	b) N2 cannot be S of a passive MCI	c) no change of meaning in passive N2 to V N3	d) change of meaning when to V N3 is omitted	e) no semantic restriction on N2
MonoTr	1. Volitional verbs: (<i>can't</i>) <i>bear, desire, hate, like, love...</i>	+	+	+	+	+
	2. Prep. verbs: <i>ask for, call for, ache for, aim for, burn for.</i>	-	+/-	+	+	+
CxTr	3. Public factual verbs: <i>acknowledge, announce, certify...</i>	+	-	+*	-/+*	+
	4. Private factual verbs: <i>assume, believe, conceive...</i>	+	-	+*	+	+
	5. Verbs of intention: <i>intend, mean</i>	+	-	+	+	+
	6. Performative verbs: <i>appoint, elect, name, vote</i>	-	-	-*	-	-/+
	7. General causative/resulting verbs: <i>cause, drive.</i>	-/+	-	-	+/-	-/+
	8. Verbs with a modal character: <i>allow, authorize.</i>	-	-	-/+	-	-/+
	9. Verbs of 'influencing': <i>assist, bother, bribe...</i>	-	-	-/+	-	-
DiTr	10. Verbs which introduce indirect directives: <i>advise, ask, beg, beseech...</i>	-	-	-	-	-

3.3. Comments will now be made related to the data presented in the table, with the listed criteria as the starting point.

3.3.1. The first criterion is the one having to do with whether or not *N2* is a raised object. Raising is a transformation postulated in generative grammar that presumably takes a constituent from an embedded clause and moves it to a position in the higher adjacent (often main) clause. There are different kinds of raising: subject-to-subject, object-

to-subject (or tough movement), negative raising, raising with passivization and, finally, subject-to object-raising. (Wardhaugh, 1995:169-172; Wekker and Haegemann 1985:163 *et passim*). Due to the nature of the construction in question, prominence will here be given to the last kind.

Raising has been chosen as one of the criteria because, as explained already, it can help determine the number of constituents following the main lexical verb. This is important for the reason that it is easier that way to make a difference between a typically monotransitive and a typically ditransitive interpretation of the construction in question. Namely, it makes sense to say that where subject-to-object raising is involved, we actually have a case of monotransitive complementation, with the raised – *N2* constituent actually belonging to the lower, non-finite clause, which then, as a whole, functions as a direct object. That is typical of the first, emotion group of verbs given in the classification above. On the other hand, no raising is involved in the "deep-structure" interpretation of a sentence such as *Mary persuaded John to wash the dishes*. This sentence is actually interpreted as *Mary past persuade John (for([e] to wash the dishes))*, i.e. the verb *persuade* (as well as all the other verbs in group 10 above) is not seen as a raising but as a control verb, the one whose second argument - the object - controls the interpretation of the non-lexical subject of the lower clause, wherefore it is also called an object-control verb. It is well known that apart from object-control, we can also talk about subject-control, when it is the first – subject – argument of the main lexical verb in a sentence (notably the verb *promise*) that controls the empty subject of the non-finite lower clause. It has also been pointed out (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002:1230) that there are still some verbs that can exhibit both kinds of control: *ask, beg, petition* and some others. But no matter what kind of control relationship a verb shows (let us for the time being concentrate on the verbs belonging to group 10 above only), the point is that sentences with such verbs can be considered examples of ditransitive, and not any more monotransitive, complementation, with *N2* functioning as an IO, and the rest of the construction – the non-finite verb phrase/clause (*to V N3*) functioning as a DO.

Having thus discussed the two end-point verb groups in the gradient with regard to the criterion of raising, we will now focus on the in-between ones.

Verb group 2 (the one with prepositional verbs) is rather specific, as the verbs belonging to it, requiring (in most cases) the obligatory preposition *for* when appearing in the given construction, *cannot* be analysed as either raising or control ones. In addition to this, though the appropriate constructions with these verbs might be reanalysed as those having a single-word verb followed by a non-finite clause introduced with the subordinator *for*, the same point could be made yet again. This verb group is also important as it shows that, even though it is labelled monotransitive, it actually does not share one of the characteristics we have just said is typical of monotransitive complementation within this construction. A few words should also be said regarding the seven remaining verb groups labelled complex-transitive. The way these verbs respond to the given criterion is indicative in the sense that it, for the first time in our analysis, points to the fact that complex-transitive complementation as well, no matter how homogenous it may seem at the first sight, can only benefit from the gradient approach. It shows that the verbs from three complex-transitive verb groups above (those with the public and private factual verbs, as well as the verbs of intention) are used with a raised object and therefore are more like the monotransitive ones, while three other verb groups (those including performative verbs, verbs with a modal character and verbs "of influencing") are closer to the ditransi-

tive verbs in that they are not raising but control ones. In addition, there is another verb group - the one subsuming general causative/resulting verbs - in which some verbs, *force* and *compel* for example, are control verbs (such verbs constitute a majority in this group, hence a "minus" in the first position in the table where this verb group crosses the criterion in question), whereas there are also such verbs as *cause* that are raising ones. Such an insight may be an answer to the question why structuralist syntax does not provide any definite answer as to how exactly to perform the IC analysis of a complex-transitive verb phrase – it *seems* acceptable both to make the first cut after the very verb and therefore consider the rest (*N2 to V N3*) a single unit, with the remaining cut being made between the DO (*N2*) and the OC (*to V N3*), and to make the first cut before the OC and the next one between the verb and the DO, showing that way that there are actually two constituents and not one at sentence level after the verb. Generative grammar (which, unlike structuralism, operates with the concept of raising and control) may explain the logic behind the "seeming", directing our attention to the fact that both these approaches are perfectly valid, *but* each one in appropriate situations. Thus, the first one seems preferable in cases where we have raising complex-transitive verbs, whereas the second one appears more suitable to the control ones. This is yet another instance where the explanatory potential of generative grammar proves superior to that of the structuralist approach.

3.3.2. We now turn to the second criterion, the one dealing with whether the NP preceding the infinitive (the *N2*) can or cannot be made the subject of a passivized sentence and to how the given verb groups respond to it.

Generally speaking, the situation here is more straightforward than in the previous case. The typical characteristic of the verbs at the beginning of our scale - the ones involved in monotransitive complementation - is the fact that they do not allow for *N2* to become the subject of the corresponding passive sentence. In that sense, one cannot say **You are wanted to write a book*. This again proves the point that *N2* in sentences containing verbs from this verb group is not a separate constituent at sentence level (not a separate argument of the verb) but rather a part of the non-finite subordinate clause functioning as the DO. At the other end of the scale, the location of the ditransitive verbs, the situation is reverse – *N2* can easily be made the subject of the corresponding passive sentence (e.g. *He was persuaded to leave*), which proves this time that it indeed is a separate constituent at sentence level and one of the two arguments in the postverbal position, the second being the *to V N3* part functioning as DO.

We will now focus again on the in-between cases. The first thing to notice is the fact that the (prepositional) verbs form the second group, labelled monotransitive, again aberrate from the way monotransitive verbs in this construction typically behave. Namely, unlike the other monotransitive group, they often do allow *N2* to become the subject of a passive sentence (e.g. *The government was not called for to resign so quickly*). The second point of interest here is the fact that the verbs form all the *complex-transitive* verb groups behave in a *uniform* manner – all of them also do allow passivization, whereby *N2* becomes the subject (e.g. *He was presumed to have committed the crime*). This might, at first, seem at odds with what was said about the behaviour of these verbs in relation to the first criterion, as the logical thing to expect here is only for the *control* verbs in these seven complex-transitive verb groups to have a passive as *N2* is clearly a separate unit there, the one that is more closely connected to the main verb than to the construction following it (*to V N3*), and that can therefore easily become the subject of a passive sen-

tence. Yet, as the table shows, raising complex-transitive verbs passivize no less readily (e.g. *He was intended to use the notes as an introduction to the course*), unlike their monotransitive counterparts. Essentially, however, there is nothing strange here - this just proves the point we have already made that the analysis of *N2* in the given complex-transitive verb groups draws on the ways *N2* is analysed in both typically monotransitive and typically ditransitive complementation patterns of the construction in question – it can be considered either the subject in relation to the second, infinitive verb or as the DO in relation to the main verb of the sentence, with the addition the response of *N2* to the criterion of passivization here provides that these complex-transitive verbs incline towards the latter interpretation. To put it in other words, it is the very possibility of *N2* in complex-transitive complementation patterns to become the subject of corresponding passive sentences that proves that there always are essentially two elements - the DO and the OC - after these verbs, no matter whether they are considered control or raising ones. In still other words, it is indeed "this divisibility into two elements of a semantically clausal construction following the verb that is the defining property of complex-transitive complementation" (Quirk et al. 1985:1195). Finally, it should also be pointed out in connection with these verbs that a very small number of them, as already shown in the above list of verb groups, due to their inherent properties, actually have no passive at all - notably the verb *get* and *defy*. On the other hand, there are also those verbs that are *primarily* used in the passive (the verbs such as *repute* and *think*, and some other public and private factual verbs), as well as those that, when appearing in this construction (*N1 TrV N2 to V N3*), are used in the passive only. Such verbs are: *rumour*, *say* or *see*.

3.3.3. We will now discuss the response of the given verb groups to the third criterion - whether or not the *N2 to V N3* sequence can be passivized without a change of meaning. Namely, it has been noticed that with the verbs belonging to the first (monotransitive) verb group (the emotion verbs) there is no change of meaning when the part of the construction in question is passivized (*I want a book to be written by her* means the same as *I want her to write a book*). On the other hand, one cannot say the same of the group of verbs occupying the other end of our gradient – the verbs which introduce indirect directives and that have been labelled ditransitive. Namely, if one compares *Peter persuaded John to help Sue* and *Peter persuaded Sue to be helped by John*, one will clearly see that these two sentences do not mean the same thing – in the first example Peter is persuading *John* to do something whereas in the second one Peter is persuading *Sue* to do something. This is yet another proof that *N2 to V N3* in the first case is a single unit – a non-finite clause with a lexical subject, i.e. a relatively autonomous structure in which any grammatical changes which occur tend to have only a very limited effect on the rest of the sentence. That is not the case in the second example, where semantic disparity occurs because the same part of the construction (*N2 to V N3*) is not a single unit any more; on the contrary, there are *two* units here, whereby *N2* is an IO within the main clause, and it is only from that position that it controls the semantic interpretation of the lexically empty subject of the lower clause.

Having thus discussed the relation of the two outermost members of the gradient to this particular criterion, we now move on to the in-between cases. Before we proceed, however, it should first be noted that, as long as our analysis focuses on this criterion, we will always assume that the second *V* (the one between the infinitive particle *to* and *N3*) is a transitive (and not a linking) verb capable of being passivized (i.e. middle verbs, for example, are ex-

cluded). As the verbs in groups 3, 4, and 6 (public and private factual verbs as well as causative/resulting verbs referring to speech acts which have the performative force of declarations, or simply - performative verbs) are affected by such a constraint to a significant degree, being most often used with the verb *to be* when appearing in this construction, the points in the table where these verb groups intersect with the given criterion are "starred" (*), so as to show that this criterion is applicable to them in not too many cases.⁴

Having this constraint in mind, we first turn to verb group 2, the one involving prepositional verbs and the one labelled monotransitive. It is the first time that this verb group, as a whole, has responded to a criterion in the same way as the verb group 1 (*They arranged for the charges to be investigated by the committee* means the same as its active counterpart: *They arranged for the committee to investigate the charges*). However, the response of this group to the first two criteria has, hopefully, been sufficient enough to convince us that, although both verb groups have been classified as monotransitive, there are considerable differences and not only similarities between them. As far as the remaining seven, complex-transitive, verb groups are concerned, their response to this criterion can again serve to prove they do not behave in a uniform way - there are those among them that are closer to the monotransitive as well as those that are closer to the ditransitive type. In that sense, it can be observed that the verbs from verb group 3, 4 and 5 (the public and private factual verbs and the verbs of intention) seem to be more related to the former type. To give some examples, the sentences such as *They reported the jewellery to have been stolen by him*, *They expected the professor to be seen by the students* or *He didn't intend what was said there to be taken literally*, (these sentences contain verbs from the given verb groups respectively) do not seem to differ in meaning when compared to their counterparts in which the *N2 to V N3* sequence is active. On the other hand, the verb groups 6 and 7 (the ones with performative verbs, general causative verbs), and, in most cases, the verb groups 8 and 9 (verbs with a modal character and verbs of "influencing") are closer to the other, ditransitive end of the scale in that a change of meaning does occur when the part of the construction in question is passivized. For example, *They elected/forced/allowed/encouraged the present Dean to be succeeded by Mr. Brown* does not mean the same as the "original" active counterpart - *They elected/forced/allowed/encouraged Mr. Brown to succeed the present Dean*.

The high degree of correspondence between the reaction of all the ten verb groups to this criterion and to the criterion of raising should come as no surprise - it is a logical outcome of the fact that it indeed does not make too much difference to ask whether the *N2 to V N3* part is a single unit (a non-finite infinitive-clause with a lexical subject), the one that is, as explained already, relatively autonomous and can passivize without the whole sentence changing its meaning, or two units (an object and a non-finite infinitive clause without a lexical subject), on the one hand, and to ask whether a verb is a raising or a control one, on the other. There are only two points of divergence here. The first one is, as noted already, with the verb group 2, (which is to be expected, because, as explained, these verbs are hard to analyse as either raising or control ones). The second point of divergence is with the verb group 7 (the general causative verbs). It was previ-

⁴ It should be obvious that this is just a broad generalization, and that this constraint itself applies to the verbs in these groups in varying degrees. For example, the verb *acknowledge*, when used in this construction, very rarely indeed occurs with any other verb except the verb *to be*, whereas the verb *report*, which belongs to the same verb group - that of public factual verbs, is used with transitive verbs far more often (eg. *They reported him to have stolen the jewellery*).

ously judged ambivalent in relation to the first criterion as some verbs from it were labelled raising and some control ones. However, when checked against this criterion, even the raising verbs from this group, the ones we may expect to allow passivization of the *N2 to V N3* part without affecting the meaning of the whole sentence, actually do not "behave as expected". Namely, sentences such as *I caused that to be done by him*, have been judged "very iffy, to say the least" by a native speaker, and alternative constructions (*I caused that to happen*, for example), i.e. those that do not seem counterintuitive that much, have been proposed instead. Obviously, what is needed here is a deeper semantic analysis of these as well as all the other verbs explored here, an analysis that will, for limitations of space, be only touched on when we reach the fifth criterion.

3.3.4. The fourth criterion has to do with whether or not the *to V N3* part can (normally) be omitted without radically altering the general meaning of the whole sentence. Alternatively, it asks whether the infinitive marker *to* need or need not remain so as for the reduced construction to preserve the original meaning. This criterion is important as it shows how closely related syntactically the main verb and *N2* are, which is sometimes easier to see precisely when the *to V N3* part is cut out. Judging by what has been said so far, it seems reasonable to expect that the verbs on the monotransitive end of the scale should be less related to *N2* (as *N2* is first and foremost a constituent of the lower, non-finite clause) and that the converse should be true of the (ditransitive) verbs, at the other scale-end, where *N2* is a verb argument in its own right. It is also to be expected that these syntactic details should have influence on the semantic interpretation of the resulting reduced construction. And indeed, the two end-point verb groups in our gradient react to these criteria in two opposite ways. For example, with the monotransitive verbs of verb group 1, it is not possible, as already explained, to reduce a sentence such as *I want her to write a book* to *I want her* without (significant) change of meaning, and the infinitive particle *to* need remain so as for the original meaning to be preserved - *I want her to*. On the other hand, the converse is true of the verbs belonging to verb group 10 (the ditransitive ones). For example, *I persuaded him to take part in the competition* is reducible to *I persuaded him* without any radical change of meaning and no infinitive particle *to* need be retained. Now we again move on to the in-between verb groups and analyse how they respond to the given criterion, hoping that some interesting conclusions can be drawn here as well. To begin with, it can again be noticed that the other monotransitive verb group – verb group 2, behaves the same way the first monotransitive verb group does. For example: *They were all aching/burning/bursting/ for the famous director to finally make public his new project* does not mean the same when reduced to *They were all aching/burning/bursting/ for the famous director* only. The verbs in verb group 3 behave in a very specific way. Namely, first of all, they can be divided into two groups – those where the resulting reduced construction is not grammatical at all and those where such an observation does not hold. The verbs that belong to the former group are *pronounce* and *proclaim*. For example, it is ungrammatical to say **The citizens proclaimed him* or **I now pronounce you*. It makes sense to label such verbs *truly* complex-transitive ones, as they obligatorily require an OC to retain not only the original meaning but also grammaticality (Berk, 1990:50-51). It is for this reason that the part of the table where verb group 3 and the fourth criterion intersect has been starred (*). Secondly, the latter subpart of this verb group can be further divided into two groups: the verbs (such as *warn*) where the meaning does not change when the relevant part of the construction is dropped out (*They warned him not to do that* entails *They warned him*); on the other hand, with the

verb such as *confirm* change of meaning can occur when the *N1 TrV N2 to V N3* construction is reduced. For example: *The executive board confirmed the rumours of job losses to have been gross and perhaps even intentional misinterpretation on the part of the workers* cannot be reduced to only *The executive board confirmed the rumours of job losses* without significant loss of meaning. The verbs in verb group 4 behave in the same way as the verb such as *confirm* from the previous one does – they require an overt OC to retain the original meaning. Compare, for example, the following pairs of sentences: *The boss considered Peter* and *The boss considered Peter to be a very bad choice indeed*; *We found the children* and *We found the children to require better living conditions*; and especially: *I believe this psychiatrist* and *I believe this psychiatrist to be a fraudster*. Generally speaking, verb group 5 (verbs of intention) behaves in the same way. *The writer clearly intends his readers to identify with the main character* is not reducible to *He intends his readers*. The behaviour of verb groups 6, 8 and 9 (those encompassing performative verbs, verbs with a modal character and verbs of "influencing") shows that they are, as far as this criterion is concerned, closer to the ditransitive end of the gradient. The *to V N3* part can be omitted here without any significant change of meaning. For example, sentences such as *They elected her to succeed the present Prime Minister*, *They authorized Peter to sign the agreement* or *Smith bribed an official with the Crown Prosecution Service to leak confidential information about the notorious and feared underworld family* can all be reduced in the above-mentioned way without any significant loss of meaning. The verbs in verb group 7 (the one subsuming general causative verbs), as the "+/-" sign in the appropriate place in the table suggests, behave in an ambivalent way, just as they did in response to the first criterion. Namely, the construction *N1 TrV to V N3* with some of these verbs (*drive*, for example) cannot be reduced as described without the loss of meaning (*Hunger drove her to commit several petty thefts* is not the same as *?Hunger drove her*) whereas the same *is* possible, in principle at least, with a verb such as *force* (*She forced me to help him* entails *She forced me*).

3.3.5. The fifth and the last criterion the listed verb groups have been checked against states that, except when used in an extended, metaphorical sense, the main verb does not require that *N2* denote a sentient being capable of making decisions. The criterion is important as it attempts to take into account, at least in a rudimentary way, some of the basic semantic (and not only grammatical) characteristics of the verbs in question. Again, the two outermost verb groups respond to this criterion in two opposite ways. The emotion verbs of verb group 1 react positively to the criterion – they indeed do not require *N2* to denote a sentient being; for example, *I didn't want the story to frighten Mary*. On the other hand, the verbs of verb group 10, which introduce indirect directives, do not behave that way. One cannot, for example, say: *I didn't persuade the story to frighten Mary*. Now again we move to the intermediate verb groups. As far as verb group 2 (consisting of monotransitive prepositional verbs) is concerned, it behaves in the same way as verb group 1 – there is nothing wrong with the sentences such as *We were all aching/burning/bursting for the performance to begin* or *The people called for the Government to resign as soon as possible*. As far as the complex-transitive verb groups are concerned, three out of seven of them are also closer to the monotransitive end of the scale – verb groups 3, 4 and 5 (public and private factual verbs and verbs of intention). For example: *They declared the painting to be a forgery*, *He pronounced several countries to be a threat to the peace in the world* (sentences containing verb group 3 verbs), *They found her blood to contain poison*, *The Government intended the law to help the recovery of the economy* (sentences with verbs from verb groups 4 and 5 re-

spectively). The following three complex-transitive verb groups (performative verbs, general causative verbs and verbs with a modal character) behave ambivalently, with some of the verbs from them meeting and some of them not meeting the criterion. Imposing semantic restriction on *N2*, most of the verbs among these three verb groups are closer to the ditransitive end of the scale. There are occasional exceptions however. For example, the verbs *elect* in verb group 6, *cause* in verb group 7, and the verbs *allow* or *enable* in verb group 8, can all be used with an inanimate object - *They elected bankruptcy to be a preferable fate in the circumstances, The poor harvest caused prices to rise sharply, If the soil is allowed to dry out the tree will die, Insulin enables the body to use and share sugar*. All the verbs of influencing (verbs such as *assist, bribe, induce* and the others form verb group 9) do impose semantic restriction on *N2* and are therefore closer to the following, ditransitive, verb group 10.

4. CONCLUSION

This part of the paper presents the most important conclusions that can be drawn from the presented analysis of how the concepts of multiple analysis and gradience can be applied to the *N1 TrV N2 to V N3* construction in English as well as some of the problems the analysis was faced with.

To begin with, the analysis has, hopefully, provided substantial evidence to prove that the three functional interpretations (monotransitive, ditransitive and complex-transitive) of the construction in question can be further refined to no insignificant degree by the application of the concept of gradience. Namely, using (only) five criteria, quite a lot of other categories between which differences are very small have been distinguished. This is especially true of the complex-transitive verbs, which, it should be obvious, do not constitute a uniform group when used in the *N1 TrV N2 to V N3* construction. In other words, some of the complex-transitive verb groups are closer to the monotransitive and some are closer to the ditransitive end of the scale. The verbs belonging to the former category are public and private factual verbs and verbs of intention (verb groups 3, 4 and 5 in the list above). Moreover, private factual verbs and verbs of intention react to as many as four out of five criteria in the same way as the monotransitive verbs of verb group 1; similarly the public factual verbs respond to three criteria in the same way as the verbs from verb group 1 and ambivalently in relation to yet another criterion. In that sense, it turns out that two out of these three complex-transitive verb groups have *more* in common with the monotransitive verb group 1 than the other monotransitive verb group (verb group 2 encompassing prepositional verbs). On the other hand, verb groups 6 to 9 (performative and general causative verbs, verbs with a modal character and verbs of "influencing") are closer to the ditransitive end of the scale. The closest to it are the performative verbs and verbs of "influencing", as it is only one criterion that they differ in response to when compared to the ditransitive verbs, and not entirely at that as the responses to those criteria are ambivalent (meaning - there are some verbs from those two verb groups that behave in the same way as the verbs from verb group 10). The next closest verb groups to the ditransitive one are verb group 8 (verbs with a modal character) with two, and verb group 7 (general causative verbs) with three points of difference in comparison with verb group 10 (the differences are rather small as the reaction of those two verb groups to the appropriate criteria are again ambivalent). Generally speaking, none of the eight "intermediate" verb groups reacts to the given criteria in the same way;

in addition to that, there are altogether nine points in the table where a verb group responds ambivalently to a criterion. Taken together, these two observations mean that there are at least eighteen different ways in which the given verb groups can be distinguished by using the given five criteria. We say *at least eighteen* since the number is probably greater due to the fact that in some cases the same verb group responds ambivalently to several criteria (verb group 8 to two and verb group 7 to three), with one and the same verb from the verb group in question behaving one way in relation to one criterion, and the other way in relation to another.

The presented analysis, far from being extensive and comprehensive, has certainly left a great deal of the complexities of the issues explored unaccounted for. For example, the given criteria are not calibrated enough to show that some passives of the verbs from verb group 8 (verbs with a modal character), e.g. *be allowed*, have a "semi-auxiliary interpretation in which they lose their connection with the corresponding active construction, especially as regards agency" (Quirk et al., 1985:1205). In addition to this, the ambivalent response of some verb groups to the given criteria gives us but a hint of the many more differences that exist between the verbs belonging to one and the same verb group. Let us take the last, ditransitive verb group as an example. First of all, some verbs from this group are silent on whether the required behaviour was affected (e.g. *ask, order, tell*) and some are not (e.g. *persuade*). One can compare, for example, *I told him to do that* and *I persuaded them to do that*. Secondly, after the verbs such as *ask* or *pray*, one can use *for* as a subordinator introducing a non-finite clause (*He asked for Peter to chair the meeting*), whereas after some other verbs from the same group (e.g. *persuade*) one cannot (**I persuaded for Peter to chair the meeting*). Thirdly, the intervening nominal (N2), with some of the verbs from this verb group can sometimes be omitted and sometimes not, which might indicate a looser syntactic relationship between the main verb and the N2 in the former case, and a tighter one in the latter (compare: *He asked to leave* and **He persuaded to leave*). The criteria we used here have remained silent on all such details. Fourthly and most importantly, some linguists (e.g. Berk, 1999:243) do *not* consider verb group 10 a ditransitive verb group at all. Namely, they have pointed to the fact that whenever normally ditransitive verbs (especially *advise, tell, order, persuade*, and other "communication" verbs) occur in the construction in question, they typically take on deontic quality. In that sense, they say that it is wrong to functionally analyse a sentence such as *I told Peter to hand me the hammer* as S V IO DO, i.e. in the same way as a sentence such as *I told Peter that it was raining*. The claim is that the former sentence has deontic force, something it lacks in a typically ditransitive construction, and should therefore, be reanalysed as S TrV DO Verb Complement.

Despite such problems, however, one may claim that the use of the concept of multiple analysis and especially of gradience can still reveal numerous facets of a problem, make it clearer and indicate more accurate ways of dealing with it. This applies, of course, not only to grammar but to all the other levels of language as well. However, as grammar, in comparison with semantics for example, appears to be a relatively neglected part of language structure as far as the use especially of the concept of gradience is concerned, we hope that the approach taken here will, in the future, be more and more applied to various grammar phenomena as well, as a fruitful means of increasing our knowledge about them.

Appendix 1 – Corpus

1. *Collins COBUILD Resource Pack* (on CD-ROM), (2000), HarperCollins Publishers Ltd., London.
2. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Sixth edition, 2001, S. Wehmeier (ed.), Oxford University Press, Oxford.
3. R. Quirk *et al.*, (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London and New York,.

Appendix 2 – Abbreviations

- A – adjunct
- C – complement
- DO – direct object
- IO – indirect object
- N1, N2, N3 – nominals
- NP – noun phrase
- OC – objective complement
- Pass. – passive
- PP – prepositional phrase
- TrV – transitive verb

REFERENCES

1. L. Berk, (1999) *English Syntax: From Word to Discourse*, OUP, New York, London.
2. <http://webs.uvigo.es/h04/jperez/icehl/syntax.htm#denison> (1, 2005)
3. R. Huddleston and G.K. Pullum, (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, CUP, Cambridge.
4. G. Lakoff, (1987) *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
5. R. Langacker, (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
6. R. Quirk *et al.* (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London and New York.
7. N. Stageberg, (1981) *An Introductory English Grammar*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
8. J.R. Taylor, (1989): *Linguistic Categorization. Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
9. R. Wardhaugh, (1997): *Understanding English Grammar: A Linguistic Approach*, Blackwell Publishers Inc., Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA.
10. H. Wekker and L. Haegeman, (1985): *A Modern Course in English Syntax*, Routledge, London.

**VIŠESTRUKA ANALIZA I GRADIJENTNOST U
KONSTRUKCIJAMA TIPA N1 TRV N2 TO V N3
U ENGLESKOM JEZIKU**

Vladan Pavlović

U radu se najpre proučavaju načini na koje konstrukcija N1 Trv N2 to V N3 u engleskom jeziku može da se interpretira sa funkcionalne strane. Naime, pomenutoj konstrukciji se može pripisati i monotranzitivna, i ditranzitivna i kompleks-tranzitivna (složeno-prelazna) interpretacija. Ovakva analiza se potom produbljuje time što se proučava kako se (semantički utvrđene) grupe glagola koje se u ovoj konstrukciji javljaju ponašaju u odnosu na izabranu grupu relevantnih kriterijuma.