Complementation with Verbs of Choice in English

PATRICK DUFFLEY and RAFIKA ABIDA
Université Laval

1. INTRODUCTION

"Your mission, should you choose to accept it, is to . . . ". This well-known phrase involving the verb *choose* followed by the *to*-infinitive is a good introduction to the question which is explored in this article, as it exemplifies a context in which the gerund-participle complement does not work and only the infinitive is acceptable. The *-ing* complement is possible with *choose* in other contexts, however (1).

(1) For instance, I'd rather be a bit too sweaty than be exposed to forty-below weather. Conversely, I'd rather be a bit chilly than be drenched with sweaty backs of knees and have perspiration in my eyes during a forty degree heat wave. In extremity, one is as bad as the other. But if it was a matter of smaller discomfort, I'd *choose* being too cold. At least I can think and function relatively normally when I'm too cold.

(www.shanmonster.com/interview/007.html)[1]

This article attempts to propose an answer both to the practical question of what forms of complementation are found with verbs of choice and to the theoretical question of explaining the control and temporal effects found with these verbs. This is done using an approach in which the syntax of the verbs under study is accounted for in terms of their semantics, the latter being defined in terms of the meaning-content associated with the linguistic forms occurring in the constructions examined, namely the *to*-infinitive and the gerund-participle, and the lexical content of the different verbs of choice themselves, together with the semantic value of the complement's function with respect to the main verb. Although it does not utilize a corpus in the strict sense of the word, nor employ statistical argumentation, the study is based mainly on an examination of attested usage in Canadian English as reflected by Canadian websites accessed in the fall of 2006.

As regards temporality, verbs of choice pose the semantic problem of the nature of the temporal relation between the events expressed by the main verb and the

---

[1]The websites cited in this article were all active as of the fall of 2006.

complement. Thus in a sentence such as (2), there is a relation of temporal sequence between *prefer* and *live*, the idea expressed by the construction being that of an inclination existing prior to the state of being a country-dweller.

(2) Besides, Waterloo was much more interested in combinatorics than Toronto was, and my wife *preferred to live* in the country.

(`newsrelease.uwaterloo.ca/news.php?id=1022`)

However in (3), *prefer* expresses an attachment to a current situation as compared to some other possibility, which implies a relation of simultaneity between the preference and the state of residing in Vancouver.

(3) I have to say even though I occasionally get homesick for my hometown, I much *prefer* living in Vancouver. Climate is nicer, more things to do year round.

(`www.discovervancouver.com/forum/topic.asp?TOPIC_ID=119886`)

This type of contrast has led some authors to define the distinction between the infinitive and the gerund-participle in terms of tense or aspect (Freed 1979; Stowell 1982).

The second type of theoretical question raised by verbs of choice is that of control, that is, the interpretation of the unexpressed subject of the infinitive or gerund-participle. Having occupied the attention of linguists as "a major goal of traditional syntactic analysis for many years" (O'Grady 2005:56), control has recently become a hot topic in Minimalist approaches to grammar (Boeckx and Hornstein 2004:431) because of the support that some authors think it could bring to this type of syntactic analysis. With a verb such as *prefer*, in most cases one observes subject control, as in all three examples given above where the logical subject of the non-finite complement is understood to be the same as the subject of the main verb. However, with the gerund-participle one also finds some cases where the controller is not identical to the subject of *prefer*, as in (4).

(4) David Rawsthorne, a transportation engineer working on the Burrard Bridge project, said staff are considering two options, both of which would see the sidewalks widened to six metres through an addition supported by struts. (...) one option would see an outrigger supported by struts; the other would have the sidewalk width at the towers remain the same. Rawsthorne said the options have the support of business associations and the "driving community," but several community, pedestrian and cycling associations *prefer reducing* lanes on the bridge.

(`www.vancourier.com/issues03/014203/news/014203nn6.html`)

We propose an analysis that explains these variations in controller assignment using semantic principles.

The overall goal of this article is therefore to examine in detail the verbs *prefer*, *choose*, *elect*, *select*, *pick*, and *opt*, the type of complements they take, and the temporal and control effects produced when they are followed by *-ing* and *to*-infinitive complements. The observational data concerning these verbs are explained using what we claim to be a natural-language semantics approach to syntax. The article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the natural-language semantics approach that constitutes the explanatory framework used to account for the data. Sections 3 to

8 examine each of the verbs listed above in detail, applying the explanatory framework. General conclusions are drawn in section 9.

2.   A Natural-Language Semantics Approach to Syntax

The natural-language semantics approach forms the framework of the analysis presented here. In this section, we provide details of this approach and how it applies to the constructions discussed.

2.1.   Meanings of the forms occurring in the constructions under study

Rather than invoking abstract categories such as tense and aspect, the natural-language semantics approach adopted attempts to work with the natural meaning-categories of the language under study. A case in point is the different views taken of the word *to* often used to introduce the infinitive in English. For one recent approach (Los 2005:297), this item is an exponent of "abstract tense", with the content of the tense node corresponding to the infinitive being defined by the tense of the higher clause, much like a subjunctive form. While seeing the *to*-infinitive as a "non-finite subjunctive" (p. 303) does bring out an interesting parallel, it treats *to* as a tense morpheme, which corresponds neither to its position preceding the verb stem whose tense it allegedly expresses, nor to its obvious status as an independent word (as attested by the possibility of inserting other words between it and the bare infinitive, e.g., *I want you to never ever ever go there again*). Moreover, it is a strange tense morpheme indeed which can be used all by itself without the verb stem whose tense it denotes, as is the second *to* in *He told them to leave but they refused to*. As pointed out by one of the reviewers of this article, this view of *to* also introduces an unjustified degree of homophony into the PF interface, the basis of children's acquisition of their native grammar, which does not sit well with the results of research in this area that have found that in infinitival complement constructions children learn *to* with the meaning 'direction towards' and not as a meaningless syntactic marker (Bloom et al. 1984:391).

In the natural-language semantics approach followed here, infinitival *to* is treated as one possible use of the preposition, with the same basic meaning. A precautionary note should be added here regarding the nature of meaning, however, as meaning is often treated without taking into consideration the fact that it exists in two states: first of all, as a schematic potential stored in memory as a permanent resource available for the needs of expression (Guillaume 1984:128); secondly, as an actual application of this potential to a particular experience which the speaker wishes to express. In its initial state, the general meaning of any word or morpheme resides in the unconscious. Because of this, as Ruhl (1989:235) has pointed out, "a word's general meaning may not be definable in conscious categories (other than by itself)." In its actualized state, meaning is theoretically accessible to consciousness, although it may be difficult to separate the content of one form from that of the other items co-occurring with it in the same utterance. We follow Ruhl in assuming, however, that

"with abundant data, consciousness can infer the range and limits of the meaning" (1989:235).

Based on a broad range of data, it is proposed here that the basic meaning of the preposition *to* is that of kinetic orientation potentially leading to a point (Duffley 1992:17–20; Duffley and Fisher 2005:36). This notion is so general that it can be construed in a great variety of domains. Applied to space, it produces the common-place impression of a goal-directed movement (5).

(5) He walked from the bus station to his home.

When complemented by an infinitive, its domain of application is generally that of time. The idea of a movement whose end-point is an event will usually create the impression of subsequence we have observed in uses such as (2). *To*'s meaning can also be construed in the mental domain, however, as in (6) and (7).

(6) He compared Saddam Hussein to Stalin.

(7) This play corresponds perfectly to my idea of comedy.

The comparison in (6) involves a mental movement from one term of the comparison to the other. A similar movement is implied by the notion of correspondence in (7), whereby the play in question is mentally attached to the category defined by *my idea of comedy*.

The prepositional nature of infinitival *to* can be seen most clearly in uses such as (8). Here *to* plays the same role as the preposition *for* in (9).

(8) His desire to rule had finally been satiated.

(9) His desire for power had finally been satiated.

To expresses the relation between the noun *desire* and the complement of the preposition. The fact that the latter is a noun in (9) and a bare infinitival in (8) accounts for certain differences in the behaviour of the overall constructions, such as the fact that *to* + infinitive phrases are not amenable to clefting (10) or to stranding (11).

(10)   a. The show was what I went to.

　　　　b.*Cut spending was what I chose to.

(11)   a. What did you go to?

　　　　b.*What did you choose to?

These facts show that the bare infinitive is not an ordinary nominal: it does not correspond to a 'what' and so its meaning bars it from structures in which it is equated with one, as in (10) and (11).

The bare infinitival corresponds semantically to a more abstract version of the meaning of the simple form of the verb, with which it shares the same linguistic sign. The simple form, as its name suggests, simply situates an event in time. This involves treating the event holistically and therefore conceiving the stretch of time corresponding to the event as containing all of what is involved in its lexical content. If the event is action-like, each of its interior instants involves change, and the simple form evokes the complete duration required to situate all of its various phases in time (12).

(12) She *opened* the door.

This has been called a "metaphase" view of an event (Hirtle 1995:268). If the event is state-like, each of its interior instants is identical to the others, and the simple form may evoke any of the moments of the state's existence as containing all of what is involved in the state (13).

(13) She *looked* happy when I saw her.

This has been termed a "monophase" view of an event (Hirtle 1995:269). The bare infinitive manifests the same expressive capacity of evoking either an action in its full duration (14) or a state in its full-fledged existence at some point within its duration (15).

(14) Careful! He might *open* the door.

(15) He might *be* sick.

Consequently, the bare infinitive is treated here as denoting the integral actualization of its lexical content in time. Since the infinitive does not include present or past tense as part of its semantic make-up, the image of integral actualization evoked by the infinitive is represented in the abstract; that is, it is not tied down to the present or past time-spheres. This makes it compatible with any time:

(16) I am watching Dad *wash* the car.

(17) I watched Dad *wash* the car.

(18) I am going to watch Dad *wash* the car.

As an exponent of the notion of integral actualization in time, the bare infinitive is no ordinary nominal. The fact that it does not correspond to a 'what' entails among other things that it cannot be substituted by a pronoun:

(19) I can't *reach* the shelf, but you can (*it).

(20) He watched Dad *wash* the car. *Why can't I watch Dad it too?

Also, because of the particular type of meaning it expresses, the bare infinitive places severe restrictions on the type of elements with which it is semantically compatible; in English, it is only construable with *to*. This is not unlike the behaviour of the infinitive in other languages; in French, for instance, the infinitive can only follow certain prepositions to the exclusion of others: *avec faire*, *sur faire*, *sous faire*, *en faire*, *dans faire*, *parmi faire*. In English, if the main verb requires any other preposition than *to*, it will be construed with the gerund-participle rather than the infinitive (e.g., *refrain from doing something; talk about doing something; work on doing something*).

The meaning of the gerund-participle is a rather murky question in English grammatical analysis. The most recent major grammar of English (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:83) argues in favour of using the term *gerund-participle* (which has been adopted here as well), since its authors see no reason to give priority to one or the other of the traditional terms; however, this grammar proposes no definition of the

semantic content of this form at all. The gerund-participle is implied to be tenseless (pp. 159–160) and aspectless (p. 1265), but these are merely negative characterizations that moreover do not distinguish this form from the past participle. Other authors do propose a meaning for the gerund-participle. A recent cognitive study (Hamawand 2002:64) defines both the *-ing* participle and gerund as designating an "imperfective simple atemporal relation which views only the internal configuration of the process", that is, which "excludes its initial and final states". This analysis builds on a long tradition of defining the *-ing* form as an imperfective. However, it meets an impasse when faced by uses such as (21), where the gerund-participle clearly denotes something already accomplished at the moment in time corresponding to the main verb.

(21) He admitted *stealing* the ring.

Such a use would have to be called perfective according to commonly accepted aspectual categories (Comrie 1976).

The definition of the *-ing* form utilized here is based on a reconstruction of its meaning potential which can explain not only its use in the progressive but also uses such as (21). This entails that the *-ing*'s meaning must be much more general than the notion of progressivity, that is, of an ongoing event. The hypothesis on which our analysis is based is that, as a pre-conscious potential, the gerund-participle simply corresponds to the schematic concept of an event's interiority (Duffley 2006:19–21). When this notion is applied to the expression of a particular message, it can be actualized under conditions in which the subject of the *-ing*'s event is situated at some specific moment within the event's interiority, or under conditions in which this interiority is evoked as a homogenous whole. The latter view corresponds to uses such as (21); the former, to the gerund-participle's use in the progressive. In general, whenever the gerund-participle is used as a noun, the interiority of its event is evoked holistically as a homogenous entity.

2.2.   Role played by the complement forms in the constructions under study

The gerund-participle and the infinitive are used in conjunction with a main verb in the constructions we are considering. This requires that the semantic relation between the complement and the main verb be defined in order to identify its contribution to the overall message expressed. We argue that the gerund-participle has the same function as a noun in cases such as (3) and (4): more specifically, it fulfills the role of direct object. This can be evidenced by the possibility of substitution by a direct object pronoun and by active/passive correspondences (22)–(24).

(22) Huge majorities apparently *prefer reducing* unemployment to fighting inflation.

(23) Huge majorities apparently prefer *that*.

(24) Reducing unemployment is apparently preferred by huge majorities.

These constructional correspondences have been chosen as indicative tests because they correlate with the semantic dimension of direct object function, which is characterized by the impression that the direct object denotes 'that which is preferred'.

The situation with the *to*-infinitive is slightly more complex, as it is not usually a direct object. This can be seen from the impossibility of substituting a direct object pronoun for it (25)–(28) and the lack of passive equivalents to active constructions (29)–(30).

(25) I prefer the green bicycle.

(26) I also prefer it.   (it = the green bicycle)

(27) I prefer to go tomorrow.

(28) *I also prefer it.   (it = to go tomorrow)

(29) Everyone without exception preferred to play on the new courts.

(30)* To play on the new courts was preferred by everyone without exception.

Based on the parallel between constructions such as those illustrated in (31)–(33), it is postulated here that the *to*-infinitive is a prepositional phrase denoting a goal or result of the main verb's event.

(31) I want to have peace and quiet.

(32) I long to have peace and quiet.

(33) I long for peace and quiet.

Just as the preposition *for* defines the relation between the verb *long* and the noun phrase *peace and quiet* in (33), so the preposition *to* defines the relation between *want* and *have peace and quiet* in (31), and between *long* and *have peace and quiet* in (32). Since *long* cannot be construed with a direct object, the semantic analogy between the sentences above indicates that the *to*-infinitive is not a direct object but a goal-specifier after *want* as well, with *to* expressing the possible movement required to achieve the actualization of the target of the desire.

This article argues that a natural-language semantics approach using the parameters defined above, along with the lexical content of the main verb, can account for the control and temporal readings observed with the infinitive and gerund-participle after verbs expressing the notion of choice. This will constitute an illustration of the fruitfulness of placing meaning at the heart of syntactic analysis.

3.   THE VERB *PREFER*

In this section we examine in depth the verb *prefer*. We begin with a definition of the verb, then turn to temporal effects, control effects, the role of the complement, and an explanation of temporality and control.

3.1.   Definition

According to Gove (1996), the verb *prefer* has seven senses, the second of which is relevant to the present study, that of "to like better, value more highly". This sense can be illustrated by a sentence such as *He preferred to live abroad*. The core of *prefer*'s meaning thus has to do with a comparative attitude of putting one thing before another.

3.2. Temporal effects

In many uses of the verb *prefer*, the complement's event is felt to be prospective or subsequent with respect to the existence of the preference denoted by the matrix, whether the complement is the *-ing* form or the *to*-infinitive, as exemplified by (34)–(35).

(34) Both Ann and I said we *preferred going* second, but I didn't insist on it, because I understood somebody had to go first.

  (`answers.yahoo.ca/question/index?qid=20060813151405AAnuFHB`)

(35) *I preferred to go* some place I knew we could get fuel and even easily spend the night if needed. Ceders was an option (we had the fuel — just).

  (`blogs.aviation.ca/index.php/commercialflightpath/2006/w35/`)

In addition, the effect of temporal coincidence can be expressed by the *-ing* complement, where the complement's event coincides in time with that of the main verb. This is true for situations where the speaker is referring to a state of preference, as in (3), repeated here as (36).

(36) I have to say even though I occasionally get homesick for my hometown, I much *prefer living* in Vancouver. Climate is nicer, more things to do year round.

  (`www.discovervancouver.com/forum/topic.asp?TOPIC_ID=119886`)

Here, the preference and the living coincide in time, in that the person who prefers living in Vancouver is understood to be living in this city. Simultaneity is also the case in (37)–(38).

(37) I *prefer living* a simple life without a lot of responsibilities. More time for fun!

  (`forums.plentyoffish.com/5894728datingPostpage2.aspx`)

(38) I *prefer staying* with the host I'm at now.

  (`www.webhostingforum.com/archive/index.php/t-126.html`)

In these examples, the complement's event is felt to be coincident in time with respect to the existence of a preference for it denoted by the matrix verb.

3.3. Control effects

The most common type of control associated with the verb *prefer* when complemented by the *-ing* form is subject control, with the subject of *prefer* being felt to be the realizer of the event denoted by the *-ing* complement, as exemplified in (39)–(40).

(39) I asked students if they *preferred doing* experiments before or after discussing the theory in class (i.e. did they prefer the classical approach to lab work?)

  (`educ.queensu.ca/~russellt/howteach/shawn-ar.htm`)

(40) Our Lepchas *preferred remaining* on the river-bank, whence they had to bring up water to us, in great bamboo "chungis," as they are called.

  (`www.harvestfields.ca/HerbBooks/01/001/07.htm`)

   In some cases, however, the verb *prefer* can produce non-subject control inter-
pretations when complemented by the *-ing* form. In (41)–(42), the subject of *prefer*
is not responsible for performing the complement's event in either construction (*re-
ducing mercury emissions* in the first case or *increasing supply* in the second), but
some other agent whose identity may be understood from the context.

(41) If you *prefer reducing* mercury emissions to licensing them, I endorse your whacko
     tree-hugging agenda.
                    (www.canadaka.net/modules.php?name=Forums&file=
                                        printview&t=5790&start=0)

(42) Traditional economists *prefer increasing* supply to address energy needs whereas con-
     servation through efficiency is proposed by others.
               (www.lsflst.ca/.../Canadian%20Sustainability%20Curriculum
                        %20Review%20Initiative%20-%20Theme%201.pdf)

The infinitive, on the other hand, shows constant subject control readings, with the
subject of the main verb being understood to be the prospective realizer of the infini-
tive's event, as in all uses quoted thus far.

3.4.   Role of the complement in the construction

As demonstrated above, the *-ing* form following the verb *prefer* has the role of a di-
rect object denoting "that which is preferred". Such constructions allow substitution
by a pronoun as in (23), repeated here as (43), and can be rephrased in the passive as
in (24), repeated here as (44).

(43) Huge majorities apparently prefer *that*.

(44) Reducing unemployment is apparently preferred by huge majorities.

   When the *to*-infinitive follows the verb *prefer*, the complement's event does not
play the role of a direct object; rather it represents the goal of an existing preference
denoted by the main verb. Rosenbaum (1967) claims that the infinitive used after the
verb *prefer* has the function of a direct object, proposing the following examples that
exhibit properties generally associated with this function (45)–(47).

(45) Everyone preferred to remain silent.

(46) *Passivization:* To remain silent was preferred by everyone.

(47) *Pseudo-clefting:* What everyone preferred was to remain silent.

Rosenbaum's grammaticality judgments are questionable, however; while the exam-
ple with pseudo-clefting is acceptable, the passive construction seems somewhat odd.
Indeed, no examples of the passive construction with the infinitive were found in the
Brown University Corpus (1964), the British National Corpus (2001), or any other
source used for this study, which weakens Rosenbaum's claim considerably. By it-
self, the pseudo-clefting test is not sufficient evidence of direct object status since it
also applies to verbs like *hope*, where the *to*-infinitive is clearly not a direct object
(48)–(51).

(48) Everyone in the city hoped to be able to see the Queen.

(49) *Everyone hoped it.

(50) *To be able to see the Queen was hoped by everyone in the city.

(51) What everyone hoped was to be able to see the Queen.

The infinitival phrase *to remain silent* in (45) is argued here to be a goal-specifier stating the target of a preference. Consequently, the event denoted by the infinitive is understood to be prospective with respect to the matrix verb, with the preposition *to* explicitly signifying the idea of movement contained in the matrix verb. Since the infinitive's event is seen as the target of the preference, and not as that which is "preferred", passive constructions are not natural.

3.5.   Explanation of temporality and control

The pieces are now in place to propose an explanation for temporal and control interpretations with the verb *prefer*. As regards temporality, the effect of subsequence is observed with both infinitival and gerund-participle complements, whereby the complement's event is felt to be prospective with respect to the main verb. The *-ing* complement shows temporal variation following *prefer*, since it is also possible to have readings that imply temporal coincidence between the main verb and the complement's event. This can be accounted for by the fact that *prefer* can evoke a state of preference, in which case there is no inherent contradiction in the notion of a preference and a preferred event being concurrent in time. This possibility is not attested, however, with *prefer* + *to*, because the *to*-infinitive represents its event as the targeted goal of a preference, something that the subject wishes to preferentially actualize, which means that the infinitive's event is always felt to be subsequent with respect to *prefer*. This is also the case when the actualization of the infinitive's event is something habitual, as in (52).

(52) Other insurance companies *prefer to reduce* their customer's annual premium for the selection of a hail-resistant shingle.
                    (`www.insurance-canada.ca/claims/other/IENGAHail407.php`)

Here the reduction of customers' premiums is the result of a habitual choice on the part of the insurance companies, with the preference being conceived as a prior condition leading to the actualization of *reduce*.

   These findings are consistent with research on the general semantic distinction between the bare and *to*-infinitives in English reported in Duffley (1992), which found that there is always some form of subsequence between the events expressed by the main verb and the *to*-infinitive in complement constructions, either in the form of subsequent potentiality (e.g., *I wanted to leave*) or of subsequent actualization (e.g., *I finally managed to leave*). In the first type, the infinitive's event is the goal of a desire or intention; in the second type, it is the result of the realization of the main verb's event. *Prefer* manifests both possibilities, as can be seen from the potential ambiguity of *He preferred to stay home*, where the infinitive's event can be understood to be either the goal of a wish (subsequent potentiality) or the result of an act of choice (subsequent actualization).

With regards to control, the gerund-participle complement shows variability between subject and non-subject control readings. This is due to the fact that one can prefer an action which is carried out by someone other than oneself: just as one can prefer Formula 1 racing without driving in F1 races, so can someone prefer increasing the supply of energy rather than imposing conservation measures without being the agent responsible for the increasing, as in (42) above. The infinitival complement, in contrast, produces constant subject control readings because the preference is conceived as a desire on the part of the subject of *prefer* to achieve the actualization of the infinitive's event or an act of choice leading the chooser to actualize it. This implies that to be the actualizer of the complement's event is the preferential aim or the result of the choice of the subject of the matrix verb.

These findings are also consistent with research into the distinction between the gerund-participle and the *to*-infinitive in complement structures (Duffley 2006) in which it was found that the control interpretation of the *-ing* form as direct object depended crucially on the meaning of the main verb, with some verbs implying subject control (*I enjoy lying in the sun*), some non-subject control (*I recommend lying in the sun*), and others allowing both interpretations (*I mentioned looking for a new job*). An event represented as enjoyed will be understood to be a source of enjoyment for the person performing it; an action represented as recommended will be understood to be something that the person to whom the recommendation is made is meant to do; an action which is merely mentioned could be something the speaker has done or is thinking of doing, or a suggestion to the hearer, or perhaps even something to be realized by a third party. As for the *to*-infinitive, on the other hand, the goal-directed meaning of *to* represents the infinitive's event as something whose actualization by the subject of the main verb is in prospect. This produces constant subject control interpretations in matrix verb + *to*-infinitive goal/result-specifier constructions, both with subsequent potentiality (*want*, *wish*, *intend*, *hope*, *try*, etc.) and subsequent actualization (*manage*, *get*, *remember*, *begin*, etc.).

4.   THE VERB *CHOOSE*

According to Gove (1996), *choose* has as its first sense "to select (as one thing over another) with free will and by exercise of judgment", as in *choose the lesser of two evils*. *Choose* can also be synonymous with *elect* in the sense of "to decide upon especially by vote", as exemplified by *They chose him to lead the nation*. The core of this verb's meaning therefore has to do with the exercise of free will leading to a settling upon one option over others.

With the verb *choose*, the effect of subsequence is present whether the verb is followed by the *-ing* or the *to*-infinitive, as exemplified by (53)–(54).

(53) No wonder Eoin O Broin *chose going* to Europe over sitting looking at Sammy Wilson.

(`www.sluggerotoole.com/archives/2004/10/recruitment_row.php`)

(54) I *chose to go* to Uganda because I am treating fourth year as an opportunity to see all of the different areas of veterinary medicine, and wildlife.

(`www.usask.ca/wcvm/students/uganda/journey/staff.php`)

In (53)–(54), both events denoted by the *-ing* and the *to*-infinitive evoke the notion of potentiality and subsequence with respect to the main verb.

Sag and Pollard (1991:65) classify *choose* as a *promise-* or *commitment*-type verb that shows subject control, where the "committor" or the subject of the main verb is identical to the subject who performs the action of the complement. According to their analysis, *choose* should therefore show obligatory subject control, as it does in (53) and (54). While this is typical of most the uses that were gathered in the course of this study, a number of examples were found with non-subject control readings (55)–(56).

(55) Canadians surveyed in a new Toronto Star/CBC/La Presse poll *chose reducing* waiting lists and increasing access through better management as the best way to improve the health-care system.

<div align="center">(www.ekos.com/admin/articles/torstar-06-12-2002a.htm)</div>

(56) I've been teaching a course on Game Culture & Design for George Brown College in Toronto since last January, and am in the midst of conducting some hands-on workshops with the students. We're building game mechanics and rules systems playable on the tabletop. (...) I deliberately *chose going* to the movies as a concept because it's a broad topic and doesn't immediately evoke game play ideas.

<div align="center">(www.secretlair.com/index.php?/clickableculture/entry/
game_design_exercises/)</div>

Although one might argue for some sort of proxy control of the Canadian public over the reduction of waiting lists in (55), one can also argue that the reduction of waiting lists is conceived merely as one option for governmental action chosen from among other possibilities. In (56), on the other hand, no proxy control interpretation is possible: going to the movies is presented simply as a concept chosen by the teacher for the purposes of the game-building exercise and not as an action that the teacher wishes to perform through the intermediary of a representative.

When complemented by the *to*-infinitive, on the other hand, *choose* does show obligatory subject control in all cases (57)–(58).

(57) The federal government *chose to make* Unemployment Insurance harder to get, and changed the name of the programme to Employment Insurance ...

<div align="center">(enmasse.ca/?p=67)</div>

(58) Then, as I lay on the ground, I remembered that I had two choices: I could *choose to live*, or I could *choose to die*. I *chose to live*.

<div align="center">(www.vivaconsulting.com/wellness/choices9.html)</div>

No examples of non-subject control were found with the infinitive.

The *-ing* form following the verb *choose* has the function of a direct object denoting "that which is chosen" (59).

(59) Children often *choose watching* television or *playing* video games over reading a book.

In this example, the complement phrase *watching television or playing video games* functions as a direct object, representing "that which is chosen" by children. It behaves similarly to a noun in a direct object position, as exemplified in (60)–(61).

(60) Watching television or playing video games is often chosen by children over reading a book.

(61) Children often choose *that* over reading a book.

The *to*-infinitive after *choose* functions as a goal-specifier. In (62)–(64), the complement phrase *to quit her job* expresses the goal of the choice that *Mary* made:

(62) Mary chose to quit her job.

(63)*To quit her job was chosen by Mary.

(64) *Mary chose *it*.

In such constructions, there is an implied movement from the making of the choice to the attainment of the specific goal of that choice evoked by the infinitival complement.

The effect of subsequence is associated with the verb *choose*, whether it is followed by the *-ing* or the *to*-infinitive. The absence of a simultaneous reading with the direct object construction shows *choose* to be different from *prefer*: while the latter can evoke a state of preference that may be contemporaneous with the action or state preferred, as in (3) above, *choose* can only denote an action that is prior to the actualization of the object of the choice. Concerning control effects, the ubiquitous presence of subject control with the *to*-infinitive follows from the hypothesis adopted here: since *to* represents the movement from the choice to the actualization targeted by the chooser, only the latter can be understood as realizer of the infinitive's event. Non-subject control readings, on the other hand, are possible when *choose* is followed by the *-ing* form because an event represented as "chosen" may correspond to an option selected from a set of possibilities for whose realization some other agent will be responsible, as in (55) and (56).

5. THE VERB *SELECT*

According to Gove (1996), the verb *select* means "to choose from a number of things usually by fitness, excellence, or some other distinguishing feature". It therefore focuses on the picking out of one item from a group. With *select*, the effect of temporal subsequence is present whether the verb is followed by the *-ing* or the *to*-infinitive. This is exemplified in (65)–(66).

(65) 25% *selected improving* governance. Rounding out the choices were making plan changes to contain costs, a priority chosen by 16% of respondents.
        (www.ccnmatthews.com/news/releases.Controller?action= check4Cookies&searchText=false&showText=all&a...)

(66) If you *select to pay* by cheque, please forward the cheque to MVP Soccer within five (5) business days along with a copy of the registration confirmation.
        (https://www.mvpsoccer.ca/MVP/Public/RegisterOnline.asp)

When followed by the *-ing* complement, the verb *select* exhibits both subject and non-subject control readings. The effect of subject control is observed in (67), and the effect of non-subject control is exemplified in (68)–(69).

(67) I was having difficulty getting started. I found myself wasting time, putting off writing (and feeling anxious about it). Finally, I approached the problem by setting up some immediate positive consequences for writing that I could earn without large amounts of work. First, I selected a positive consequence. I *selected playing* pinball machines (one of my favorite activities).

(www.coun.uvic.ca/learn/program/hndouts/reinf_ho.html)

(68) Moreover, when asked which one or two of six reforms would be the most effective in making government work better, 43% of adults choose basing the pay of government employees on their performance, and 28% *select making* it easier to hire and fire government employees.

(www.excelgov.org/usermedia/images/uploads/PDFs/
1995full_report.pdf)

(69) The poll also shows that the ability to "beat Bush" was a significant determinant of the caucus vote — 26 percent selected this trait as the most important quality guiding their choice of candidate. These voters gave two-thirds of their support to Kerry (37 percent) or Edwards (30 percent). In fairness to Dean, slightly more voters (29 percent) *selected taking* strong stands as the most important quality determining their vote and, of these voters, more voted for Dean (31 percent) than for Kerry (26 percent) or Edwards (23 percent).

(www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/
archives/000365.php)

When followed by the *to*-infinitive, the verb *select* shows constant subject control, as in (70)–(72).

(70) Afterwards, students can *select to take* another 4 exam drill sessions to further strengthen the CISSP/CISM exam skills.

(www.i-totalsecurity.net/cisspcism.php)

(71) If you *select to make* payment using PayPal, you will receive an automatic payment notification via their system.

(www.ontariojobwatcher.ca/jobdirectory/faq_public.vm)

(72) They *selected to look* at the Area calculation for 16 different solder paste deposits on the boards.

(www.gsilumonics.com/process_online_ordering/pdfs/360.pdf)

In the above sentences, the logical subject of *select* is identical to that of the complement.

The *-ing* complement following *select* functions as a direct object. The complement's event is conceived as "that which is selected", as in (73) (adapted from (69)).

(73) Slightly more voters *selected taking* strong stands as the most important quality determining their vote.

Besides denoting "that which is selected", the gerund-participle can be the subject of a passive construction and can be substituted by a pronoun, as in (74)–(75).

(74) Taking strong stands was selected by slightly more voters as the most important quality determining their vote.

(75) Slightly more voters selected *that* as the most important quality determining their vote.

In its use with the *to*-infinitive, the verb *select* is employed as a variant of *choose* and the infinitival phrase denotes the result of the exercise of choice. This makes it a goal/result-specifier which is neither replaceable by a nominal pronoun nor reconstruable as subject of a corresponding passive construction (76)–(79).

(76) They *selected to look* at the Area calculation for 16 different solder paste deposits on the boards.

(77) *They selected *that*.

(78) *To look at the Area calculation for 16 different solder paste deposits on the boards was selected by them.

The verb *select* was observed to be construable with both the *-ing* and the *to*-infinitive as verbal complements, and the effect of subsequence was found to characterize both types. This is mainly related to the lexical meaning of *select*, since when someone selects doing/to do something, the act of selection precedes the performance of the selected action. In addition, *select* shows alternation between subject control and non-subject control interpretations when followed by the *-ing* complement. When followed by the *to*-infinitive, however, *select* produces only subject control readings, with the infinitive having the function of result-specifier, that is, something whose actualization is achieved by the person making the selection.

6. THE VERB *ELECT*

According to Gove (1996), the verb *elect* in its transitive use can be synonymous with *choose* in the sense of "to make a selection", as in *concentrators in geological sciences elect either geology or geography*. It can also signify "to choose (a course of action) especially by preference, to decide upon", as in *elected suicide as a preferable fate*. *Elect* places focus on the conferring of a special status on the option that is elected.

Whether the verb *elect* is followed by the *-ing* form or the *to*-infinitive, the complement's event is felt to be subsequent to that of the main verb (79)–(80).

(79) You are also able to *elect increasing* annuity payments that start out lower but are indexed during retirement for inflation of up to 3% per year.
(www.1-seniors-singles-mature-dating.com/Seniors%20Gov/
seniors.gov/frb/help.htm)

(80) When it became clear that the project was being abandoned, I *elected to answer* questions that were going unanswered at the original corporate web site.
(www.funnelwebcentral.org/)

When complemented by the *-ing* form, *elect* usually shows subject control, where the subject of the main verb is seen as coreferential with the realizer of the complement's event, as in (79) and (81).

(81) Dislike of fish or fear of mercury, dioxins and PCBs cause some to *elect taking* ultra-refined EPA/DHA concentrates or a fish oil that is low in contaminants.
(www.yourhealthbase.com/archives/ihn157fr.htm)

However, one case was found of non-subject control (82).

(82) 99% of workshop participants received ILI and were offered HCV testing and HAV/
HBV vaccination. Of those:

- 84% *elected testing* for HCV (15% +)

- 81% (of eligible clients remaining in program) received 1 dose of vaccine

- 94% (of eligible clients remaining in program) received 2nd dose of vaccine

(`www.hep-c-alert.org/arHIP-presentation.ppt`)

Here the workshop participants are not understood to be the ones performing the testing. When followed by the *to*-infinitive, however, the verb *elect* always produces subject control readings, where the subject of the main verb is conceived as the prospective realizer of the infinitival event.

The -*ing* complement following *elect* functions as a direct object. The complement's event is conceived as "that which is elected", as can be seen in (83).

(83) For an additional $49.95 winner may *elect having* Dickinson arrive in one of our 11 x 14 inch museum mounts (as atop) which is an antique gold hardwood frame with matching inner frame (known as a fillet).

(`cgi.ebay.ca/`
`Charles-W-Peale-JOHN-DICKINSON-colorengravingprint_`
`W0QQitemZ110059000876QQihZ001QQcategoryZ...`)

Such constructions can be reformulated in the passive (84) and the -*ing* complement can be substituted by a pronoun (85).

(84) For an additional $49.95, having Dickinson arrive in one of our 11 x 14 inch museum mounts may be elected.

(85) For an additional $49.95, winner may elect *that*.

The *to*-infinitive phrase following the verb *elect* does not function as a direct object, acting rather as an adverbial goal-specifier with respect to the main verb. Thus, in (86), the prepositional phrase *to pursue graduate work in English* is seen as the goal of the main verb's event.

(86) Many students also *elect to pursue* graduate work in English.

(`www.umanitoba.ca/faculties/arts/english/undergraduate/`)

Thus, the infinitival complement phrase does not refer to that which is "elected" and the corresponding passive form is unacceptable (87).

(87) *To pursue graduate work in English is also elected by many students.

Moreover, the *to*-infinitive is pronominalized by *to*, and not by *it* (88).

(88) Many students elect *to*/*it*.

The verb *elect* thus takes both the -*ing* and the *to*-infinitive as verbal complements and the effect of subsequence is observed in both constructions. This is attributable to the lexical meaning of *elect*, since when someone elects to do/doing something, the act of choice precedes the performance of the goal or object of election. In addition, *elect* shows both subject and non-subject control interpretations

when followed by the *-ing* complement, and only subject control when followed by the *to*-infinitive. Once again, the meaning of *to* and the goal-specifier function of the infinitive necessarily construe the subject of *elect* as the prospective realizer of the complement's event, while the fact that direct object function represents the *-ing*'s event merely as something elected allows for non-subject control readings as well with the gerund-participle.

7. THE VERB *PICK*

In Gove (1996), the verb *pick* was found to have various senses, among which one that is relevant to this study: the sense of *pick* as a synonym of *choose*, referring to the action of selecting from among a group. *Pick* represents selection through the notion of going into the group and pulling out the desired candidate. The verb *pick* can be followed by the *-ing* form (89), although this form of complementation is not common, as there are no attested examples in either the British National Corpus (2001) or the Brown Corpus (1964).

(89) I *picked having* a guy roommate because I wanted to avoid all this stuff. I find women quite often judge the scattered way I'm organized.

<div align="center">(forums.plentyoffish.com/datingPosts5362361.aspx)</div>

Pick can also be complemented by the *to*-infinitive (90)–(92).

(90) I'm glad that I *picked to attend* the university. I think that UCC is a great campus and there are a lot of programs and options available to students.

<div align="center">(www.tru.ca/irp/docs/2003%20ucc%201st%20year%
20experience%20report.pdf)</div>

(91) Sometimes I *picked to play* in manager mode and I picked Barcelona, and I would try to buy as many Mexicans as I could.

<div align="center">(www.bigsoccer.com/forum/showthread.php?t=384549)</div>

(92) This year's theme "UnderCover Reader!" is all about learning of the mysterious and exciting world of espionage by reading about travel, spying, gadgets, secret messages, detection and disguises. There are special programs to attend. He *picked to go* the day the RCMP Canine Unit will be at the library.

<div align="center">(www.creativekidsathome.com/creativekids/2005/07/
learning_to_read.html)</div>

When followed by the *-ing* form, the action of picking is felt to occur prior to that of the event denoted by the *-ing* complement. Thus, in (93), the event of *having a guy roommate* is felt to be subsequent to the moment at which the choice was made.

(93) I *picked having* a guy roommate.

Similarly, the effects of subsequence are also present when the verb *pick* is followed by the infinitival complement. The event expressed by the *to*-infinitive complement is understood to be realized after that of the main verb, as in (94).

(94) He *picked to go* the day the RCMP Canine Unit will be at the library.

In this example, the prepositional phrase *to go the day the RCMP Canine Unit will be at the library* is seen as an event that is located in the future with respect to the already realized act of picking.

The effect of subject control is observed with the verb *pick* followed by the *-ing* form, whereby the subject of *pick* is conceived as the realizer of the complement's event. In (95), for instance, the speaker is seen as the subject both of *pick* and of the *-ing*'s event.

(95) I don't know why I *picked playing* hockey versus being an accountant or something.
        (www.collectionscanada.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk3/ftp04/MQ55932.pdf)

However, the *-ing*'s complement can also exhibit non-subject control readings, where the subject of *pick* is not coreferential with that of the complement's phrase (96)–(97).

(96) *Cube Inmate*, 03-30-2005, 12:45 AM: I voted ONE referee. It allows both teams to get a feel for what ONE guy will allow that game, and they can then change their collective game plans accordingly from there. With two referees calling two different types of games … it is a disaster. What is a penalty at one end isn't at the other. *Elpatzer*, 03-30-2005, 08:56 AM: I *picked reducing* goalie equipment. I just long for the days when goalies had to make saves.
        (forum.calgarypuck.com/archive/index.php/t-9660.html)

(97) In terms of hard trade-offs, the public *pick increasing* the supply of health professionals as their top choice and privatization as the least favoured.
                        (www.atkinsonfoundation.ca/publications/
                                        0064Deck_6_Ekos_Poll.ppt)

On the other hand, when the *to*-infinitive is used after *pick*, the effect of subject control is constantly present. Thus, in all the examples of the infinitival construction cited above, the subject of the verb *pick* is coreferential with that of the *to*-infinitive's event.

The *-ing* complement following *pick* functions as a direct object. The complement's event is conceived as "that which is picked", as in (97), where the complement phrase *increasing the supply of health professionals* functions as a direct object with respect to the main verb. The *-ing* complement can be the subject of the corresponding passive construction (98), as well as being acceptable in pseudo-clefts (99).

(98) Increasing the supply of health professionals is picked by the public as their top choice.

(99) Increasing the supply of health professionals is what the public picks as their top choice.

The gerund-participle can also be replaced by the nominal pronoun *that* (100)–(101).

(100) When asked their top choice, the public picked *increasing the supply of health professionals*.

(101) When asked their top choice, the public picked *that*.

When the *to*-infinitive occurs as a complement of *pick*, it seems to function in the same way as after the verb *choose*, that is, as a goal/result-specifier denoting the desired or achieved result of the choice. This can be seen in (102), where the prepositional phrase *to attend* represents a possibility that the subject chose to realize. It cannot be replaced by the nominal pronoun *that* (103).

(102) I'm glad that I picked to attend UCC.

(103) If my friends hadn't picked to attend UCC, I would never have picked to (*that).

In addition, the *to*-infinitive does not work as subject of the passive construction (104).

(104) *To attend UCC was picked by many students.

Thus, the infinitival complement following the verb *pick* plays the role of a goal/result-specifier, with the event denoted by the *to*-infinitive constituting either a goal intended to be achieved by the subject of the matrix verb or an objective attained by means of the choice.

　　The analysis of the verb *pick* showed that the effect of subsequence is present whether this verb is followed by the gerund-participle or the infinitive. Even with an *-ing* direct object, the notion of picking evokes an action that is understood to precede in time the event picked. *Pick* shows two types of control effects. With the gerund-participle, both subject and non-subject control are possible due to the freedom of interpretation afforded by the fact that direct object function simply evokes the complement's event as "picked", a semantic configuration compatible both with the idea that the picker will be the realizer of the event picked or that someone else will be. Representing picking by means of the preposition *to* as a choice oriented towards the goal of realizing the infinitive's event, on the other hand, allows only the interpretation that the picker wishes to actualize the event denoted by the infinitive.

8.   THE VERB *OPT*

The last verb to be considered is *opt*. According to Gove (1996), this verb has two closely related senses, the second of which is pertinent for our discussion: "to decide to do one of two or more alternatively possible things", as in *He opted to go to Europe*. The emphasis with *opt* is on an act of the will leading to a going for one alternative. In all of the contexts in the 100-million-word British National Corpus in which *opt* is construed with a verbal complement, it is followed by the *to*-infinitive form, as in (105).

(105) He felt it was possible and he *opted to* at least try to stay out of the glitterama . . .
                                        (British National Corpus 2001:APO 1288)

This is also the only form of complementation given for this verb by Huddleston and Pullum (2002:1230). A broader search of usage revealed, however, that the gerund-participle is used as a complement of *opt* by some speakers (106)–(108).

(106) I was totally impressed with it. One tough decision to make now is the color scheme. Or lack of, since I may *opt going* with a black and white theme.
                                        (www.resindog.com/resindog/id59.html)

(107) In the afternoon I *opted having* a Diet-Pepsi instead of coffee, cookies.
                    (bestabs.com/idealbb/pview.asp?topicID=2378&pageNo=2&num=20)

(108) So, in our server, we *opted taking* out the shotgun in our weapons list. No shotguns.
                            (www.clantrac.org/modules.php?name=Forums&file=
                                            viewtopic&t=1074&start=0)

The latter usage has not been picked up by any grammar or dictionary to our knowl-
edge.

In all uses of the verb *opt*, both with the infinitive and the gerund-participle, the
complement's event is felt to be prospective or subsequent with respect to the action
of opting denoted by the matrix. This can be observed in all the examples given
above.

The infinitival construction with this verb universally produces a message im-
plying subject control. With the gerund-participle, on the other hand, both types of
control are possible. The most common type corresponds to subject control, as in
(105)–(108). However, at least one unambiguous case of non-subject control has
been found:

(109) Hello All: First timer on this message board. Have D-1 for 36 years. No real compli-
        cations because I have had better control after my teens & 20's. Hope to hear about
        people who have other autoimmune conditions, I'm going thru some tough glucose ad-
        justments with Graves disease. I know sooner or later I will have to *opt stopping* the
        thyroid by means of RAI, so anyone out there with this similar condition or info would
        be helpful.

                      (www.dlife.com/mvnforum/mvnforum/printpost?post=3768)

The acronym RAI stands for Radioactive Iodine Treatment, a procedure used to treat
hyperthyroidism that consists in administering radioactive iodine to a patient and
exploiting the fact that the thyroid actively accumulates iodine, which it uses to pro-
duce thyroid hormones required for normal body function. Given the nature of the
treatment, it is to be understood that it is not the speaker who will be responsible for
stopping his thyroid, but the doctor administering the treatment, or perhaps the RAI
procedure itself.

The *-ing* form following the verb *opt* has the function of a direct object denoting
"that which is opted". Such constructions allow substitution by a generic noun or a
pronoun (110)–(111), and can be rephrased in the passive (112).

(110) We opted taking out the shotgun in our weapons list.

(111) We could have opted other things, but we opted that.

(112) Proceeding to surgical excision was opted, as even these other methods of sampling
        mentioned above (if negative for malignancy) would not have ...

                                  (www.vhjoe.com/Volume3Issue2/3-2-2.htm)

When the *to*-infinitive follows the verb *opt*, the complement's event represents
the goal or result of the opting. This can be seen in the fact that anaphoric reference
is made by means of *to* rather than a pronoun (113)–(114), and by the absence of
corresponding passive and pseudo-cleft constructions (115)–(116).

(113) Everyone opted to go to Europe.

(114) You mean everyone except Joe opted to (*it).

(115) *To go to Europe was opted by everyone.

(116) *What everyone opted was to go to Europe.

The analysis of the verb *opt* and its complementation shows that the effect of subsequence is present whether *opt* is followed by the gerund-participle or the infinitive. This is due to the lexical meaning of this verb, which even in the direct object construction denotes an action understood to be carried out prior to the event chosen, and not a state of preference possibly contemporaneous with its object. *Opt* shows both types of control effects. With the gerund-participle, both subject and non-subject control are possible due to the freedom of interpretation left open by the fact that direct object function simply evokes the complement's event as "opted", a semantic relation compatible both with the idea that the opter will be the realizer of the event opted or that someone else will be. Representing opting by means of the preposition *to* as a choice oriented towards the goal of realizing the infinitive's event, on the other hand, allows only the interpretation that the opter wishes to actualize the event denoted by the infinitive.

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Within the context of a natural-language semantics framework, we have examined the use of verbs of choice such as *prefer* and *choose* with the *–ing* complement and the *to*-infinitive.

9.1. Verbs of choice with the *-ing*

It has been shown that the *-ing* complement functions in all of the constructions examined here as a direct object with respect to the matrix verb. As a direct object, the temporal relation of the *-ing* complement to the main verb is not defined by its function, which simply represents the gerund-participle's event as "VERBed", but rather by the semantic content of the matrix. Due to the meanings of the main verbs examined in this study, the *-ing* form usually produces the temporal effect of subsequence, whereby the event of the complement is understood to follow that of the main verb in time: when someone prefers, chooses, picks, etc. doing something, the existence of the choice precedes the realization of the chosen action. This shows the invalidity of previous approaches that treat the *-ing* form as denoting simultaneity or sameness of time between the matrix verb and the *-ing*'s event.

The verb *prefer*, however, does allow temporal coincidence, in that the event preferred can sometimes already exist. This was observed with examples like (117).

(117) At U of T, this time, since I far prefer living in Toronto to living in Waterloo.

<div align="right">(weblog.latte.ca/2006/Apr)</div>

In such examples, "that which is preferred" exists in time at the same moment as the preference. That *prefer*, unlike any of the other verbs of choice, allows temporal coincidence may be explained by the fact that it can denote a state, whereas all of the other verbs denote actions. A state of preference can coincide with the object of the preference, but an act of choice necessarily precedes the existence of the course of action chosen.

With the verbs considered in this article, the *-ing* form exhibits both subject and non-subject control. The predominance of subject control can be explained by the semantic content of the main verbs: an event that is seen as preferred, chosen, selected, elected, opted, or picked by the subject is most often understood as something that the subject wishes to perform. On the other hand, non-subject control readings are also possible with all of the verbs examined here, as the subject of the main verb may settle their choice on an action that they wish to be carried out by another party, especially a government or an institution. It has been observed that this typically occurs in contexts where people are polled about their opinion or their wishes. This shows that the general context in which the utterance occurs also plays a role in determining control assignment, a fact which indicates, contra Sag and Pollard (1991), that control is not an inherent property of the main verb, but rather that the semantics of the verb is just one factor (albeit an important one) among a complex set of elements, including the context in which the utterance is made.

It is significant to note that in contexts where verbs of choice are followed by the *-ing* complement, there is often an explicit mention of other alternatives in the context. With the verb *prefer*, the two options are frequently stated using a construction of the form "prefer *x* to *y*", as exemplified in (117), or by means of an expression like "as opposed to" (118).

(118) I have lived long enough to know that I prefer being in a relationship *as opposed to* not being in one. We definitely are not meant to be alone.

                    (www.plentyoffish.com/womenonline.aspx?page=8)

Another way of expressing alternatives is by using the expression "instead of" (119).

(119) Some people these days prefer living together *instead of* marriage as you can each have your own bank accounts, etc.

            (answers.yahoo.ca/question/index?qid=20061121080332AATKefg)

With the verb *choose*, the presence of other alternatives in the context can be stated by the construction "choose *x* over *y*", as in (120), or "choose *x* instead of *y*", as in (121).

(120) Hockey and American Football are more interesting to watch, but I would never choose playing those *over* soccer.

                    (www.theisonews.com/forums/viewtopic.php?t=141568&
                            postdays=0&postorder=asc&start=90&sid=91)

(121) And if the church is my home, the youth group is my family. But, why are we here in youth group anyway? Well, first off, because we choose to be. But why do we choose being with this community *instead of* watching TV? Why do we choose volunteering our service *instead of* catching up on sleep or going shopping?

                    (www.firstuunashville.org/news/sermons/2003youth.html)

With the verb *pick*, the *-ing* complement is very much at home in contexts where other options are mentioned, as in (97). This is explained by the fact that the presence of other alternatives or options in the context leads the speaker to view the options as entities belonging to a set rather than as prospective goals, so that the action of picking corresponds to the notion of going into the set and pulling out the desired option rather than to that of moving towards achieving a goal.

9.2.   Verbs of choice with the *to*-infinitive

We have argued that the *to*-infinitive functions as a prepositional phrase denoting the goal or result of the matrix verb's event. When the *to*-infinitive is used as a verbal complement of *prefer*, *choose*, *select*, *elect*, and *pick* or *opt*, a temporal relation of subsequence is always implied between the events denoted by the matrix and the infinitive. The effect of subsequence produced in such constructions results from the inherent meaning of the preposition *to*, which evokes a kinetic orientation potentially leading to a goal, and the adverbial function of the infinitival phrase, which implies that the preposition defines the relation between the events expressed by the main verb and the complement. Accordingly, the event of the matrix verb represents a before-position and the preposition *to* represents a movement leading to the complement's event, so that the resulting message is that the infinitive's event is prospective with respect to the preference or choice. The infinitive event can be understood to be unrealized, as in (35), where it is an object of desire, that is, something the subject of the main verb wishes to achieve. The choice or preference can also be construed as an exercising of the subject's free will which leads to the actualization of the event expressed by the infinitive, as in (57). Verbs of choice thus fit into the overall picture of temporal readings found with the *to*-infinitive in complement constructions, where it can produce the impression either of a subsequent potentiality or a subsequent actualization. While non-complement usage is beyond the scope of this article, it may be pointed out that in subject function, the *to*-infinitive shows the same fundamental expressive capacity. The huge majority of uses of the infinitive as subject — 90% in the corpus examined in Duffley (2006:148) — denote non-real events; actualized events are viewed through evaluative judgments on the opportuneness of their coming to be.

In its function as a goal-specifier, the *to*-infinitive also produces constant subject control readings. This too is explained by the function of the *to*-infinitive and the meaning of the preposition *to*: if the infinitive's event is represented as the goal that the subject of the verb of choice aims to achieve by its choice, this implies that the subject making the choice is the prospective realizer of the infinitive's event. In other words, the idea denoted by *to* of a potential movement of the subject of the matrix verb toward the infinitive's event results in the co-indexing of the realizers of both events. This jives with what has been found with other verbs in infinitival complement constructions in which the goal-directed meaning of *to* represents the infinitive's event as something whose actualization by the subject of the main verb is in prospect. Consequently, one observes constant subject control interpretations, both with verbs involving subsequent potentiality (*want, wish, intend, hope, try*, etc.) and subsequent actualization (*manage*, *get*, *remember*, *begin*, etc.).

These conclusions are limited to complement constructions in which the matrix verb is followed immediately by the *to*-infinitive or gerund-participle. The presence of an object between the complement and the main verb introduces a further complexity in the determination of control that is beyond the scope of this article. In a construction such as *Bob persuaded Joe to come to the meeting*, for instance, the direct object function of the noun *Joe* must be taken into account, along with the

meanings of the main verb *persuade*, of *to*, and of the infinitive, in order to explain the object control reading observed here. The introduction of another actor into the picture also opens up the possibility of split control readings in which both the subject and the object are understood to be controllers of the complement event (*Harry told Sally how to defend themselves against a legal suit*). The nature of the semantic relations within these more complex structures needs to be carefully worked out in order to discern the contribution of the linguistic items of which they are composed to the control interpretations possible with each construction. This constitutes a fascinating prospect for further research.

9.3. Overall conclusions

This article has shown how the semantics of the matrix verb interact with the type of complement used to produce temporal and control effects. A meaning-based explanation of the temporal implications produced by the gerund and the infinitive as verbal complements has been proposed. These implications have been demonstrated to be completely independent of the grammatical category of tense, being determined rather by the semantic content of the main verb and its complements, together with the semantic value of the function of the complement with respect to the matrix verb. Control assignment has been accounted for neither as a form of syntactic binding (Manzini 1983) nor in terms of thematic roles (Culicover and Jackendoff 2005), but rather as determined principally by the semantic interaction between the meaning and functional role of the components involved in such constructions. Of the two perspectives on control just mentioned, the analysis proposed here is closer to the spirit of Culicover and Jackendoff's study, in that the focus is placed on semantic factors, in particular the lexical content of the predicate that governs the infinitival or gerund-participial complement. These authors argue (pp. 415–470) in favour of a semantic approach to control based on the "conceptual structure" corresponding to the meaning of the matrix verbs. We subscribe fully to their criticism of the syntactic approach for being unable to account for the fact that the same syntactic configuration can be associated with different controller choices, as in (122)–(123), and the fact that control readings can remain constant over widely different syntactic configurations, as in (124)–(127) (Culicover and Jackendoff 2005:419):

(122) John persuaded Sarah to dance.

(123) John promised Sarah to dance.

(124) Bill ordered Fred to leave immediately.

(125) Fred's order from Bill to leave immediately.

(126) The order from Bill to Fred to leave immediately.

(127) Fred received Bill's order to leave immediately.

Culicover and Jackendoff conclude that the only thing pertaining to control that the syntax has access to is that there is some infinitival or gerund lacking a local subject. The type of control possible and the identity of the controller are determined rather by "conceptual structure, in particular the verb meaning interacting with the

meaning of the complement" (p. 469). While we would agree that the explanation is to be found on the level of meaning, the equation between conceptual structure, as understood by these authors, and linguistic semantics is not made here — our claim being that more careful attention must be paid to the inherent semantic content of the expressions involved in the constructions under study before moving to the level of the logic of conceptual structures. Thus, while Culicover and Jackendoff correctly observe that the kinds of control possible with a given predicate and the identification of the controller are not determined by syntax but by the verb meaning interacting with the meaning of the complement, they propose no definition at all of the meaning of *to*, of the infinitive, or of the gerund-participle. Without an understanding of the semantic content of the complement itself, however, it is impossible in our opinion to have a clear view of how it interacts with the main verb's lexical content. This is not to say that higher-order conceptual relations such as thematic roles do not play a role in controller assignment — the fact observed above with respect to (124)–(127) that in some cases control can remain constant over a considerable variation in syntactic construction testifies to this. However, when different control possibilities are observed with the infinitive and the gerund-participle after the same verb, as has been attested with most of the verbs considered in this article (as well as with verbs such as *propose*, Duffley and Joubert 1999), it becomes apparent that the natural-language semantics of both the complement and the main verb must be taken into consideration in order to provide a complete account of control. This attests to the fruitfulness of working with what could be called a "material syntax" (Duffley and Fisher 2005:35) based on the inherent content of the linguistic items actually occurring in a construction rather than jumping too hastily to the level of abstract universal categories.

REFERENCES

Bloom, Lois, Jo Tackeff, and Margaret Lahey. 1984. Learning *to* in complement constructions. *Journal of Child Language* 11:391–406.

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2004. Movement under control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:431–452.

British National Corpus. 2001. Oxford: Oxford University Computing Services.

Brown University Corpus of American English. 1964. Providence, RI: Department of Linguistics, Brown University.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culicover, Peter W., and Ray Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duffley, Patrick J. 1992. *The English infinitive*. London: Longman.

Duffley, Patrick J. 2006. *The English gerund-participle: A comparison with the infinitive*. New York: Peter Lang.

Duffley, Patrick J., and Ryan Fisher. 2005. Verb + *to* + infinitive vs. verb + *to* + gerund-participle: A preliminary exploration. *Langues et linguistique* 31:31–61.

Duffley, Patrick J., and Jean-François Joubert. 1999. The gerund and the infinitive with the verbs *intend*, *mean*, *propose* and their close synonyms. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 44:251–266.

Freed, Alice F. 1979. *The semantics of English aspectual complementation*. Boston, MA: D. Reidel.

Gove, Philip B. 1996. *Webster's third new international dictionary, unabridged*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Guillaume, Gustave. 1984. *Foundations for a science of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hamawand, Zeki. 2002. *Atemporal complement clauses in English: A cognitive grammar analysis*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Hirtle, Walter H. 1995. The simple form again: An analysis of direction-giving and related uses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24:265–281.

Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum 2002. *Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Los, Bettelou. 2005. *The rise of the* to-*infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Manzini, Maria Rita. 1983. On control and control theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:421–446.

O'Grady, William. 2005. *Syntactic carpentry: An emergentist approach to syntax*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rosenbaum, Peter S. 1967. *The grammar of English predicate complement constructions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ruhl, Charles. 1989. *On monosemy: A study in linguistic semantics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sag, Ivan A., and Carl Pollard. 1991. An integrated theory of complement control. *Language* 67:63–113.

Stowell, Tim. 1982. The tense of infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:561–570.