CH7 Verbal Complement
Verbal Complements - combining two events

- Main Event + Secondary Event

- Main CL + Subordinate CL

- Finite VP (Tensed V)

- Non-finite VP (To-V, V-ing)

- that CL
Verb and Complement

- Finite main clause:
  She would resign from the committee.

- Nominal object:
  She’s expecting a baby.

- Nominalized clausal object:
  She expected his resignation from the committee.

- Verbal complement: Modality V + to-VP
  She expected to resign from the committee.

- Verbal complement: Manipulation V + to-VP
  She expected him to resign from the committee.

- Clausal complement: PCU V + that CL
  She expected that he would resign from the committee.
Event Integration

- The isomorphic relation that exists between the meaning of a main verb and the syntax of its complement clause.
- The **semantic bond** (semantic integration) between two events:

  “the stronger the **semantic bond** is between the two events, the more extensive will be the **syntactic integration** of the two propositions into a single clause.”
Overview of the event-integration scale

P-C-U verbs

modality verbs

manipulation verbs

weakest bond...............strongest bond
## Complement types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic scale of verbs</th>
<th>syntax of COMP-clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. She <em>let go</em> of the knife</td>
<td>CO-LEXICALIZED VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. She <em>made</em> him shave</td>
<td>BARE-STEM COMP VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. She <em>let</em> him <em>go</em> home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. She <em>had</em> him <em>arrested</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. She <em>caused</em> him <em>to switch</em> jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. She <em>told</em> him <em>to leave</em></td>
<td>INFINITE COMP VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. She <em>asked</em> him <em>to leave</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. She <em>allowed</em> him <em>to leave</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. She <em>wanted</em> him <em>to leave</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. She’d like him <em>to leave</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Complement types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic scale of verbs</th>
<th>syntax of COMP-clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. She’d like for him to leave</td>
<td>FOR-TO COMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. She suggested that he leave/should leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. She wished that he would leave</td>
<td>MODAL SUBJUNCTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. She agreed that he could leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. She knew that he had left</td>
<td>INDIRECT QUOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. She said that she might leave later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. She said: “I might leave later.”</td>
<td>DIRECT QUOTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implicativity and Co-temporality

- **Implicative verbs**: if the main clause is true, then the complement clause is also true.
  
  *Ex: She made him shave > He shaved*  
  *She asked him to shave* > He shaved

- **Temporal contiguity and event integration**: the more temporally contiguous two events are, the more likely they are represented cognitively as a single event, rather than as two independent events.
The dimension of Control

- The degree of intent or authority
- The degree of direct contact
- Degree of resistance by the manipulee.
Intent, Control and Agentivity

- **Intent**: 1. John *made* Mary quit her job.
  2. John *cause* Mary to quit her job.

- **Control (ability to act)**:
  1. *John made her* **deliberately** quit her job and leave.
  2. John caused her to **deliberately** quit her job and leave.

- **Agentivity**:
  1. *John’s behavior* made Mary quit her job.
  2. *The political situation* made Mary quit her job.
  3. John’s behavior caused Mary to quit her job.
  4. The political situation caused Mary to quit her job.
More Examples

- Votionality/control of the manipulee:

  1. (a) Mary made John quit his job.
     (b) Mary made John lose his job.
  2. (a) Mary made John drop to the ground.
     (b) Mary made John trip and fall down.
  3. (a) Mary made John climb faster.
     (b) Mary made John grow faster.
Manipulee of *Let*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-volitional</th>
<th>Volitional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. She let go of him.</td>
<td>3. She let him go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. She let go of his arms.</td>
<td>4. ?She let his arm go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex: 1. She *let go* of him, breathing hard.

(> { She was breathing hard})*He* 

2. She *let him go*, breathing hard

(> { She was breathing hard})*He*
Control and Temporal Contiguity

- **Co-temporal (temporally contiguous)**

  - *Two years ago* John finally made Mary quit her job.
  - John made Mary finally quit her job *yesterday*.

  - *Two years ago* John made Mary finally quit her job *yesterday*.
  - John’s behavior two years ago caused Mary to finally quit her job yesterday.
Resistance, coercive and independence

- The lower a subordinate verb is on the complementation scale, the more control and independence it exercises.
- The two events are more independent of each other in time and space.
- If two events are fully integrated, they share the same time and space.
Spatial-temporal Integration

Physical perception:
- She saw him come out of the theater.
- She saw him coming out of the theater.
- She saw that he came out of the theater.

Mental reflection:
- She saw that he may have loved her.
- She saw that he would never love her.

=> Only when two events are co-temporal and co-spatial that the truth of one implies the other.
Referential cohesion

- Referential cohesion across contiguous clauses is the sharing of referents across the clauses:

- Ex: 1. She saw him come out of the theater.
   (>as he was coming out)
   2. She saw him coming out of the theater.
   (> as either he or she was coming out)
   3. She saw that \{ he \} came out of the theater.
   \{ John
   Mary \}
Hierarchy of Referential Cohesion

- Mary wanted to leave.
  - Mary wanted, Mary leave
- Mary told Joe to leave.
  - Mary told Joe, Joe leave.
- Mary saw that Joe left.
  - Mary saw, Joe left.
- Subject co-reference > any co-reference > no co-reference
Authority and strong Manipulation

- I **want** you to stop harassing her, immediately.
- ? I **wish** that you would stop harassing her, immediately.
- I **expect** you to be done by noon!
  - So get on with it!
  - …? If you don’t mind.
- I **expect** that you **should** be done by noon.
  - … ??So get on with it!
  - … ?If you don’t mind.
  - … if everything goes on schedule.
For-to

- I’d like you to (stronger) leave right away.
  be able to leave when you are ready.

- I’d like for you to (more polite and indirect) leave right away.
  be able to leave when you are ready.
Manipulation > preference > epistemic

Uses of ‘suggest’:

- **Manipulation**
  She suggested that John *leave* right away
  I suggested that you *leave* right away

- **Preference**
  She suggested that John *should* leave right away.

- **Epistemic certainty**
  She suggested that John *might have* left.
Deontic > Epistemic

Uses of ‘agree’:

- **Manipulation**
  *She agreed that John *leave* right away.

- **Weak permission**
  She agreed that John should *leave*

- **Epistemic certainty**
  She agreed that John may have *left*.
  She agreed that John had already *left*.
Tense agreement

- **Cognition verbs** require tense agreement:
  - I knew that you were/\*are coming.
  - I know that you came.
  - I knew that you would come.
  - I knew that you had/\*have come.

- **Utterance verbs** such as ‘say’ do NOT require obligatory tense agreement
  - I said (that) you were coming.
  - I said (?that) you are coming.
  - I said: “you are coming.”