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RÉSUMÉ

ABSTRACT

This thesis, inspired by certain principles of Cognitive Linguistics and the Psychomechanics of Language, deals with English verbal complementation with the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle. We explain the various expressive effects and the principles underlying the use of the structures 'main verb + complement' with the infinitive and the gerund-participle as complements of verbs comprising the notion of 'risk', i.e. risk, venture, adventure, hazard, chance, dare, face, jeopardize, endanger and imperil, through the analysis of a corpus of attested usage. The general problems of tense and control are addressed. Three parameters allow an explanation of the expressive effects of the structures under study: 1) the grammatical meaning of the complement, 2) its function with respect to the main verb, and 3) the lexical meaning of the main verb. The analysis of the first two parameters is based on the hypotheses proposed by Duffley (2000; 2006).
A ship in harbour is safe – but that is not what ships are for.

John A. Shedd

Twenty years from now you will be more disappointed by the things that you didn't do than by the ones you did do. So throw off the bowlines. Sail away from the safe harbor. Catch the trade winds in your sails. Explore. Dream. Discover.

Mark Twain
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CHAPTER ONE:
The Problem

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In this beginning of the 21st century, the concept of risk seems to be just about everywhere. The tragic events of September 11th 2001, natural catastrophes, climate change, the unceasing wars and struggles in the Middle East, the spectre of AIDS and other contagious diseases, and all the other challenges faced by our times have transformed our societies and have brought about a reign of fear. We are more than ever afraid of doing all sorts of things for the wrath they might incur on us. We now calculate the risks inherent to almost everything we do; experts in risk assessment and risk management are guiding decisions and actions in areas as diverse as finance, medicine, law, insurance, economy and industry.

In the English language, there are a number of verbs which include in their semantics a certain notion of risk, namely risk, venture, adventure, hazard, chance, face, dare, jeopardize, imperil, and endanger. More precisely, these verbs, which we will call here verbs of risk, share a common element of meaning in that they include in their meaning exposure to the possibility or chance of a bad, unpleasant or undesired outcome. In addition to sharing a semantic notion, verbs of risk also have something in common syntactically in that they can all be used with complements. As is the case for other
semantic categories of verbs, there are many problems associated with the combination of verbs of risk with an infinitive or a gerund-participle. One of these is that although these verbs are semantically related, they vary with respect to which complement they normally occur with. For instance, traditional grammars classify *risk* as a verb taking only the *-ing* (e.g. Swan 2003: 294), as in (1) below:

(1) She risked losing me, however unhappy it made her, to keep your name clear. (British National Corpus: JY8 4642)

On the other hand, *venture* normally takes a *to*-infinitive (Collins Cobuild: 1860) as in the following example:

(2) It was at that moment that he ventured to propose to her. (BNC: CD2 1174)

Why does one verb 'prefer' an *-ing* form rather than a *to*-infinitive and vice versa? The distribution of these verbs with non-finite complements obviously needs to be explained; to this effect, the factors contributing to this distribution need to be investigated. To our knowledge, no systematic study of the verbs of risk in their uses with the gerund-participle and the infinitive as complement has been done. Only a few comments regarding these verbs are found in the literature, principally as to which verbs take the infinitive or the *-ing*, as we saw above. It will thus be our goal in this study to explain the various expressive effects and the principles underlying the use of the structures ‘main verb + complement’ with the infinitive and the gerund-participle as complements of verbs comprising the notion of ‘risk’. We will however limit our analysis of the type illustrated in example (1) and (2) above, that is, where the main verb is followed directly by a complement. Uses where another element intervenes between the main verb and the *to*-infinitive are more complex and will therefore be left to future research. An extensive examination of corpora will also provide information as to the validity of the common view that the verbs of risk examined

---

1 Note that Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 80) use the term “gerund-participle” to refer to the *-ing* form. We will follow their usage of the term here, as we agree that “the use of a single term to refer to the inflectional form of the verb marked by the *-ing* suffix seems perfectly justified by the grammatical morphology of English” (Duffley 2006a: 1).
here can only be followed directly by one of the two complements (to-infinitive or gerund-participle) and not by the other.

On the lexical level, there seems to be a parallel between the verbs risk and venture, so that in some cases they even seem interchangeable. For instance, both sentence (3) and (4) seem to be appropriate in most contexts:

(3) I risked a comparison.
(4) I ventured a comparison.

In the example below, venture could also be easily replaced by risk without much change in the message conveyed:

(5) Shrugging off his pack, Demarr ventured a glance around the large rock behind which he had taken refuge. (Robson 2000: 3)

Here, venture a glance could be paraphrased as 'take the risk of looking in one direction'.

However, risk would not do to replace the verb venture in the following context:

(6) Her expression was almost welcoming and Melissa ventured to sit beside her. (BNC: GVP 2079)

As we can see from this brief discussion, a good look at the lexical content of these two verbs, and other verbs of risk as well, is certainly needed in order to explain these facts of usage and these verbs' selection of the gerund-participle or the infinitive as complements.

On a more general level, the combination of verbs of risk with a complement poses two problems typically associated with any structure of the type 'main verb + complement' with the infinitive and the gerund-participle. The first concerns the temporal relation between the events expressed by the verbs, a problem which has been referred to as the question of 'tense' and which can be illustrated by the contrast between (7) and (8):
(7) He tried opening the window.
(8) He tried to open the window.

In the first example there is a relation of simultaneity between the ‘trying’ and the ‘opening’; in the second sentence on the other hand, there is a relation of subsequence. The problem of ‘tense’ is also an issue with verbs of risk. Thus in (9) below the complement event is subsequent to the main verb’s event, while in (10) it is contemporaneous:

(9) Millions of families face losing their homes to foreclosure.
(10) I was feeling so up-beat that I risked mentioning it to my family.

We shall tackle the problem of temporality in this study in order to propose explanations for the facts of usage found with verbs of risk.

The problem of ‘control’ concerns the identification of the subject of the complement. This question has recently been the center of much attention, as some linguists are seeking arguments from it to support the Minimalist Program (e.g. Hornstein 1999; Boeckx & Hornstein 2004; Landau 2003; Culicover & Jackendoff 2005). As with the examples above with try, the subject of the complement can be identical to the subject of the main verb. However, it can also be distinct, as in sentence (11):

(11) He recommended opening the window.

With most verbs of risk, the subject of the complement seems always to be understood as identical to that of the main verb. We wish to verify with attested data whether this is indeed the case and to propose an explanation for the control readings found with these verbs.

Apart from these theoretical concerns, we feel that the study undertaken here can play a role in the improvement of the teaching of English as a second language. The approach to the teaching of verbal complementation to advanced students as represented by
reference grammars such as Swan (2003) and teaching manuals such as Bland (2008), i.e. giving a list of verbs allowing only an infinitive versus those allowing only a gerund-participle, seems rather unsatisfactory. Indeed, there is nothing like this to encourage laziness and kill students’ curiosity. We agree with Duffley (1990) when he says that “grammar has to be seen as more than just a collection of rules, of do’s and don’t’s, in order for it to reflect the way native English speakers really speak and to become a positive factor for stimulating the student’s curiosity and desire to learn” (p. 88). It is mainly through a better understanding of how the English language works that we will be able to offer better explanations to ESL students.

Before proposing our analysis, however, we must first review the various approaches which have been taken to the general problem of verbal complementation with the infinitive and the gerund-participle. Since there is quite an abundant literature on the subject, we will limit ourselves to highlighting the general tendencies of description and explanation found in the work of certain prominent authors. It will be seen that, although some of these studies bring valuable contributions to the field, there are still some important issues that need to be addressed.

1.2 PREVIOUS WORK ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE GERUND-PARTICIPLE AND THE INFINITIVE

1.2.1 General vs. Particular

A fair number of grammarians have traditionally looked at the distinction between the gerund-participle and the infinitive in terms of the distinction between general versus particular reference. Among others, Sweet (1903), Jespersen (1940), Wood (1956), Kruisinga & Erades (1960), Zandvoort (1969), and Schibsbye (1970) have made this distinction or have at least alluded to it. According to this view, “the use of the verbal ing gives the sentence the character of a general statement that is applicable in all cases and consequently also in the one under discussion, whereas the verb stem is used to refer to the
case in hand only” (Kruisinga & Erades 1960: 336). Schibsbye (1970) gives the following examples to show the contrast between the two types of complement:

(12) I like getting up early.

(13) I should like to get up early tomorrow. (p. 28)

He argues that in the first sentence, “the gerund refers chiefly to the action in general”, while in the second sentence “the infinitive refers chiefly to the particular occasion” (p. 27). This analysis illustrates a recurrent problem in the analysis of complementation: frequently, the explanation of the two complements’ meaning is based on the overall meaning or expressive effect of the sentence, not on the contribution of its parts, that is the words and the morphemes, to the creation of this overall effect. For instance, in (13) above, the author should have acknowledged the fact that the impression of reference to a particular situation is due to the meaning of the word tomorrow (p. 28).

Similarly, Jespersen (1940) gives the following two examples:

(14) I hate lying.

(15) I hate to lie.

and argues that the first sentence refers to the “vice in general”, while the second one applies to “this particular case” (p. 192). While it is true that one may get an impression of generality or particularity from a sentence containing an -ing or a to-infinitive, this is not always the case. Indeed, in a sentence like (16) below, the interpretation is clearly that of a particular event, the opposite of what we should expect if the gerund-participle denoted the activity in general:

(16) A woman faced losing all her limbs last night after being bitten by a tiny spider. (BNC: CH6 4090)

Moreover, contrary to what is claimed by the grammarians cited above, the infinitive can also evoke a generic or habitual event in (17):
(17) She is a beautiful filly and likes to trot. (BUC: E09 0910 in Duffley 2006a)

Here, as noted by Duffley, the sense expressed by like + to-infinitive is that of ‘always be ready and willing to’ (p. 77).

Curiously, authors adhering to this type of approach even contradict each other, sometimes claiming the exact opposite distinction. In her extensive study of what she calls ‘aspectuals’, Freed (1979) postulates that a to-infinitive used as complement entails a “generic reading” while the gerund-participle “refers to the unspecified duration of a SINGLE EVENT” (p. 152):

(18) That never ceases to amaze me.

(19) Lacey ceased crying when she heard her parents come in the door. (p. 153)

While this is true of these particular uses, Freed’s approach is unable to account for cases where the gerund-participle refers to something in general and where the to-infinitive refers to a particular case, such as Jespersen’s uses seen above.

Since both the gerund-participle and the to-infinitive can create an impression of generality or particularity, a distinction between the two forms obviously cannot be based on these expressive effects. As the examples with verbs of risk presented above show, this approach cannot account for the distribution of the two complements with this set of verbs either. Finally, we have to conclude that such a view is not based on a sufficiently extensive examination of the data, as counterexamples are easily found.

1.2.2 Hypothetical vs. Reification

A more global approach to complementation is taken by Bolinger (1968). His approach is based on the belief that “the complementizers are chosen for their own sake, not as a mechanical result of choosing something else” (p. 122). For him, the choice of a complement depends on the choice of the main verb, but also on the meaning of the
complement. He claims that where a semantic contrast can be discerned between the -ing and the infinitive it is that of reification versus hypothesis or potentiality. Accordingly, he argues that a normal context for example (20) below would be an observation made by someone actually playing golf in the rain (p. 126):

(20) It’s nice playing golf in the rain.
(21) It’s nice to play golf in the rain.

In contrast, sentence (21) would better suit an observation made in general terms (p. 126). In fact, Bolinger recognizes that the contrast he proposes for the gerund-participle and the infinitive is not always realized (p.124). For him, “what counts is the fact that where a semantic contrast can be discerned it is along the lines of reification versus hypothesis” (p. 126).

Bolinger’s approach has also influenced the work of many other grammarians. The distinction hypothetical vs. reification echoes through the very influential *A Comprehensive Grammar of English* (1985) by Quirk et al., in which it is claimed that “as a rule, the infinitive gives a sense of mere ‘potentiality’ for action”, while “the participle gives a sense of the actual ‘performance’ of the action itself” (p. 1191). The two examples below are given to illustrate this point:

(22) Sheila tried to bribe the jailor.
(23) Sheila tried bribing the jailor.

Quirk argues that, in (22), “Sheila attempted an act of bribery, but did not manage it”, and that (23) implies that “she actually did bribe the jailor, but without (necessarily) achieving what she wanted” (p. 1191). While making no attempt at giving a semantic definition of to-infinitival and -ing complements, Huddleston & Pullum, the authors of *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (2002), also make some comments that show Bolinger’s influence: commenting on a pair similar to the one above, they state that with the to-
infinitive *try* "involves effort towards a goal: the opening is only potential", while when combined with the gerund-participle it "indicates actual activity" (p. 1243).

Unfortunately, one does not have to look very far to find counterexamples. The category of hypotheticality can hardly account for an example such as (24):

(24) I chanced to meet him at the shopping center.

Where the *to*-infinitive obviously denotes an accomplished event. Moreover, the idea that the *-ing* refers to an event as actualized cannot apply to the following example with the verb *risk*:

(25) You can wear a tweed coat if you like but you risk being cold and wet. (BNC: B03 1171)

Here, the *-ing* obviously refers to an event which is not yet realized; in fact, the event of being cold and wet is purely hypothetical.

As was the case with the 'general versus particular' analysis, Bolinger, Quirk et al., and Huddleston & Pullum’s analyses are also based on the overall meaning of the sentences rather than on that of the complements themselves. Although there is an attempt to provide an intrinsic meaning for each type of complement, this meaning is in fact tied only to certain uses of these forms and does not achieve sufficient generality.

### 1.2.3 Referring vs. Non-Referring Expressions

Conrad’s approach (1982) to complementation with the gerund-participle and the infinitive is very close to that of Bolinger. However, instead of the distinction between hypothetical and reification, Conrad proposes that the basis of the contrast between gerundial and infinitival complements is to be found in referentiality. Thus, it is argued that the gerund functions as a referring NP, i.e. "the gerund always refers to one locatable instance, or several locatable instances, of actions, processes, states, etc" (p. 91):
According to Conrad, in (26) above, the -ing is interpreted as referring, since it is understood as denoting the actual performance of some action (p. 172). On the other hand, the infinitive is claimed to be non-referring, i.e. it has “the negative characteristic that it does not refer to concrete individual instances of the action” (p. 146). In fact, Conrad claims that the infinitive usually evokes mere dispositions, as is the case after verbs of emotional reaction:

(27) He liked to read aloud to them on Sundays. (p. 165)

Interestingly, in his section on the -ing and the infinitive after ‘activity-characterizing verbs’, Conrad discusses the verb risk. He gives the following two examples with the gerund-participle, where according to him risk doing something means do something which is dangerous:

(28) The manager risked shaking his head.

(29) But he thought he might risk changing the subject. (p. 173)

In these cases, Conrad claims that the -ing can be interpreted as referring since it implies that the action has actually been performed. However, he points out that there is another use of risk “in which it has future time relation”:

(30) Some widows embark on a make-shift second marriage, often aware that they risk making a mistake which will not be easily rectified.

(31) Many grammar schools would rather send their boys to a provincial university, which they know, rather than risk being turned down at Oxbridge. (p. 173)

In these two examples, the gerund denotes a potential, future action that has not been realized and the complement is consequently non-referential. Thus, where we should expect a to-infinitive, we find a gerund instead. Conrad accounts for this type of use by stating that
“after risk the gerund is neutral with respect to the difference between the gerund and the infinitive after try” (p. 173).

Obviously, the way Conrad deals with such examples as those above with the verb risk is unsatisfactory. This is only one case of the many ‘exceptions’ to his theory that he discusses in passing. For this reason, referentiality does not appear to be a pertinent semantic factor for distinguishing between the infinitive and the -ing with verbs of risk; as the data discussed above shows, it is simply not general enough to account for all cases in discourse.

1.2.4 Factivity

Another approach to complementation is taken by Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1971). Although this analysis is from a different school than Bolinger’s, in essence it is very similar, as Bolinger’s notions of potentiality and reification have had an important influence on the Kiparskys. In turn, the Kiparskys themselves have also exerted considerable influence on subsequent work by authors such as Stockwell et al. (1973), Menzel (1975) and Givon (1990), the latter grammarian proposing a distinction similar to that of Kiparsky & Kiparsky using the notion of ‘implicativity’.

In their influential article, the two grammarians make the claim that the choice of complement type can be explained in terms of ‘factivity’. Thus, the gerund-participle is said to occur only after ‘factive predicates’, meaning that the speaker presupposes that the complement of the sentence expresses a true proposition, as in:

(32) I regret having agreed to the proposal.

(33) I don’t mind your saying so. (p. 347)

2 In general terms, the difference between the gerund and the infinitive after try is simply claimed to be that between referential vs. non-referential (p. 172-173).
The 'factive' notion is believed to be found in the deep structure of these predicates. On the other hand, to-infinitive can only occur with 'non-factive predicates', that is those predicates where there is no presupposition of the complement’s truth as, for example, in:

(34) I believe Mary to have been the one who did it.

(35) I supposed there to have been a mistake somewhere. (p. 348)

There are however more than a few problems with the Kiparskys’ approach. First of all, factivity does not always permit one to distinguish between the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle complements, as the Kiparskys point out that a number of verbs including anticipate, remember and admit occur with both factive and non-factive complements. They provide justification for this fact by claiming that “such verbs have no specification in the lexicon as to whether their complements are factive” (p. 360). They do not explain how and why these verbs are devoid of such specification however. In addition, Kiparsky & Kiparsky point out that “the infinitive construction is excluded, for no apparent reason, even with some non-factive predicates, e.g. charge” (p. 348). Once again, they provide no explanation for these ‘irregularities’ or ‘exceptions’ in their system. One last problem is that they postulate another semantic distinction called ‘emotivity’ to explain why some factive predicates such as regret can also occur with the to-infinitive:

(36) I regret for you to be in this fix. (p. 363)

The claim is that factivity does not operate with emotive complements, i.e. “those to which the speaker expresses a subjective, emotional, or evaluative reaction” (p. 363). How and why such a rule applies is not explained however.

Abstract logical notions such as propositions and truth values, which were developed in order to deal with sentences and the messages they convey, are not appropriate tools for dealing with the meanings of word-level or morpheme-level forms such as the complement forms which are the object of this study. Moreover, there are major problems with the Kiparskys’ approach in that it is unable to deal with certain uses of the
gerund-participle and the infinitive in a satisfactory manner. The Kiparskys do not discuss the meanings of the infinitive and the gerund-participle explicitly, the two complements being only accounted for in terms of whether the predicate they occur with is factive or not.

1.2.5 Temporal Approach

Attempts to explain the distinction between the gerund-participle and the to-infinitive complements in terms of temporal impressions are quite common in the literature. Dixon (1984) was one of the earliest to make claims regarding the distinction between the -ing and the to-infinitive complements on the basis of temporality, claims which have been refined and improved in Dixon (1992; 1995). Dixon’s hypotheses draw on the postulates that “there is a universal pool of grammatical construction types, and each language draws its own selection from the pool” (1995: 175). Interestingly, one universal he proposes seems to have been inspired by Bolinger’s distinction between potentiality and reification, as Dixon claims that there are always two possibilities for all languages which have complement clauses: “a ‘potential (irrealis)’ type, typically referring to something that has not happened but which people want or intend should happen (as in ‘I want to go’, ‘I ordered him to run’); and an ‘actual (realis)’ type, typically referring to some existing or certain event or state (e.g. ‘I remembered that he had gone’, ‘I decided that I would apply’)” (p. 183). This universal can be internally nuanced in different languages, some of them making distinctions between various sub-types of potentiality or actuality. Dixon’s distinction between the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle is made partly in terms of temporality, although one of his types of TO complement (the ‘modal’ type) is said to be derived from the ‘potential’ universal, while the -ing complement is seen as an ‘actual construction’.

Although Dixon’s work is driven by the search for universals, his approach to complementation is largely semantic; for him, “which complement clauses a given verb may accept is determined by the meaning of the verb and the meanings of the complement clauses constructions” (1992: 207). More specifically, “an ING complement refers to an
activity or state as extended in time, perhaps noting the way in which it unfolds” (p.218), as in (37):

(37) I propose (our) walking from John o’Groats to Land’s End to raise money for charity.

This view of the -ing is clearly inspired by its use in the progressive construction in English, Dixon claiming that the -ing in (37) “introduces the idea of a continuous activity” (p. 219). This example also shows that for Dixon, the durative view of the gerund-participle is not restricted to simultaneity with the main verb, his claim being that “the time reference of an ING clause can often be inferred from the lexical meaning of the main verb” (p. 219). Besides the case illustrated in (37) above where the -ing refers to “something projected for the future”, Dixon points out that this complement can also refer to “something which took place in the past” (p. 219). Although Dixon is quite right in pointing out the various temporal impressions the gerund-participle can give rise to, how the idea of a continuous activity, i.e. durativity, can combine with a past or especially a future impression defies the imagination. For instance in:

(38) If he had chosen as his running-mate a northern Christian, he would have risked losing the majority-Muslim vote in the heavily populated north, where he has no power base. (BNC: CRB 1325)

It is hard to conceive how the notion of a continuous activity can be reconciled with the fact that the complement’s event in this case is understood to not have even occurred.

As for the to-infinitive, Dixon claims that there are two different types which both have different meanings. The first type, the modal (FOR) TO complement, “refers to (the potentiality of) the subject’s getting involved in some activity” (p. 233), as in (39):

(39) I want Mary to be a doctor.

Here the complement is clearly future and non-realized. As to the second type of to-infinitive, the judgment TO complement, it refers to “a judgment or opinion which the main
clause subject makes, through the complement clause, generally relating to a state or property of the subject of that clause” (p. 237). Example (40) below illustrates this type of complement that has “a rather different meaning” (p. 222) than modal TO complements:

(40) They declared Fred to be insane.

Here the complement’s event is understood to be contemporaneous with that of the main verb. Dixon’s approach suffers from the same basic problem as all the others: the overall meaning of the sentence is taken to be the meaning of the complement, i.e. of one of its components. Moreover, the relation between the two types of complement is not totally clear, and so one is left wondering how the same form can evoke two different notions, one future and one judgemental.

Wierzbicka’s (1988) approach can also be categorized as essentially temporal. Working with a somewhat different framework than Dixon’s although unmistakably inspired by his early work on complementation (1984), Wierzbicka’s work is part of the pre-cognitivist era. She uses a ‘natural-semantic metalanguage’ in her description of the meaning of complement structures which is composed of a hypothetical set of universal semantic primitives. In 1988 this metalanguage contained 15 elements: I, you, this, someone, something, time, place, want, don’t want, say, think, know, imagine, become, and part; in 2003 it had gone up to approximately 60 primitives. According to her, these elements can combine in a limited number of patterns to render the meanings of real-language constructions.

Regarding the to-infinitive, which she terms the TO complement, it is associated with a “personal, subjective, first-person mode” (p.164). Depending on the situation in which this complement is used, at least one of these elements, I want, I think, or I know, is present in its semantics. Accordingly, she postulates three types of TO complement: TO and wanting, TO and opinion, and TO and emotion. The following three examples illustrate these respective types:
Following Dixon, a second element which Wierzbicka claims is part of the semantics of the *to*-infinitive is a “clear future orientation (‘this will happen’)” (p. 165). In example (41) above, this future orientation is accounted for in the semantic description by the component *I will*.

(44) Mary went to the library
    because she thought this:
    I want this: I will read the latest issue of *Language*. (p. 28)

However, example (45) below presents a context where the presence of a future component is less clear:

(45) I know Mary to be a Mormon.

To solve this problem, Wierzbicka invokes a disclaimer, which “if spelled out more precisely, probably contains a reference to the future” (p. 166). Wierzbicka’s approach to the *to*-infinitive complement is thus too specific to account for all its uses; as with the other authors reviewed so far, it seems difficult to account for such example as (24) with *chance*. Indeed, in both (24) and (45) the event evoked by the complement is actually already realized, a fact which poses a problem for any approach that defines the *to*-infinitive as denoting an event as future.

Regarding the gerund-participle, Wierzbicka claims that “the ING form refers inherently to time; it has so to speak a temporal valence, which has to be satisfied” (p. 73). Drawing a correspondence with participial uses, Wierzbicka postulates that the *-ing* complement implies “sameness of time” (p. 69), with the restriction that this simultaneity in time only applies with main verbs denoting actions, processes or states. When the *-ing* combines with “atemporal semantic types such as facts and possibilities, it is free of the
'sameness of time' constraint because under those circumstances, time is irrelevant” (p. 69).

Wierzbicka's approach to the gerund-participle is fraught with problems. For one thing, contrary to her claims, simultaneity is not always observed with temporal predicates as examples (46) and (47) show:

(46) The longer they had delayed acting, the more difficult it had become for them to act. (BNC: CDS 260)
(47) He postponed calling a meeting as long as he could. (Duffley & Tremblay 1994: 568)

In both of these examples, the event denoted by the complement remains unrealized. Moreover, some of Wierzbicka's semantic analyses seem rather far-fetched in their attempt to find some form of 'sameness of time'. Consider for instance (48) below and the corresponding analysis she gives for it:

(48) I remember dancing with the Prince of Wales. →
    I can see in my mind this:
    'I am dancing with the Prince of Wales'
    I can see this not because it is happening to me now
    I can see this because some time before now
    I thought of the same thing: it is happening to me now. (p. 71)

This attempt to reconcile the obvious fact that the complement's event is past and already realized with Wierzbicka's presumption that the -ing has to imply sameness of time seems rather implausible. A final problem with this type of approach to the -ing is that it certainly creates the illusion of two different -ings, one temporal and the other one atemporal, thereby destroying the semantic unity of this form.

1.2.6 Cognitive Grammar Approach

The most recent studies on complementation have been conducted in the framework of Cognitive Linguistics, and are more specifically influenced by Langacker's Cognitive
Grammar. These studies bring a new perspective and new methods to the field. Langacker’s work on complementation (1991; 1992) was greatly inspired by Wierzbicka’s (1988). Like her, he claims that “temporal coincidence is also the hallmark of the -ing” (1991: 444). In view of the rather obvious exceptions to this generalization, Langacker later weakens his claims by saying that “the most one might hope to say for the entire class of such constructions is that there is always some kind of overlap between the main- and subordinate-clause profiles” (p. 445). To him, this is however not a challenge to the theory that he puts forward, as prototype theory affords him the possibility of accounting for such ‘exceptions’ by treating them as extensions of the prototype, temporal overlap being “only prototypical” (p. 445). As we shall see in Chapter 2, we will not satisfy ourselves here with such an approach.

With respect to infinitival complements, Langacker agrees with Wierzbicka when she argues that some vestige of the goal-directed sense of to as a path preposition is still present when it is used as a complementizer, but only “if the claim is formulated at that level of generality” (1992: 304). Indeed, prototype theory allows for this notion of goal-directedness to be manifested with different degrees of salience. In fact, Langacker even argues that to is not a preposition when it is used in combination with an infinitive:

I see no reason to believe that the infinitival to is still prepositional, or that it profiles any kind of spatial or other path with the infinitivalized process lying at its endpoint. To the extent that they are present, the path-like notions of goal and futurity can be attributed to the overall construction, the semantics of the main-clause verb, or unprofiled specifications in to’s base (p. 305).

The only aspect remaining of the original path sense of the preposition to that Langacker acknowledges is that “the to-marked process receives a holistic construal vis-à-vis the main clause relationship” (p. 305). Contra Langacker, however, it must be said that this holistic construal is not due to the element to, as the examples below show in which the infinitive with and without to can be compared:

(49) I had ten people to call last night.

(50) I had ten people call last night. (Duffley 2006a: 31)
In the second sentence it is obvious that the bare infinitive by itself construes the event that it represents as a whole. Moreover, the fact that these two sentences do not have the same expressive effect calls for acknowledging that to must bring some semantic content to the whole construction. In view of these examples, Langacker’s approach to the to-infinitive amounts to attributing no semantic value whatsoever to the element to in infinitival complement constructions.

Verspoor (1996; 2000) also looks at verbal complementation from a cognitive perspective, mostly concentrating on the -ing. Her approach uses the concepts of perceptual scope and construal relations, as she claims that the choice of a complement depends on the construal in space, i.e. the perspective, of the conceptualizer (i.e. the speaker or the main clause subject). Thus, she proposes that the -ing’s meaning is to symbolize an event as “viewed from such a close range that the boundaries of the event are not within the conceptualizer’s visual scope” (1996: 420-421); the boundaries being absent from his perceptual scope, the conceptualizer only views a part of the event. This however amounts to considering the gerund-participle to be an imperfective marker. Like many grammarians before her, Verspoor grounds her view of the -ing on the assumption that “the -ing symbolizes an event in progress” (p. 435). For instance, Verspoor claims that in example (51) below “an -ing structure symbolizes that at the moment that the act of remembering or imagining is taking place, a mental representation of at least part of the event itself causes the recollection” (p. 445):

(51) I remember taking out the garbage.

Can it really be said however that the -ing makes reference to part of the event here? The event of taking out the garbage seems rather to be viewed as a complete action that has already been performed. The analysis of the gerund-participle as an imperfective form is also problematic for verbs of risk, as can be seen in (52) below:

(52) I risk offending him if I don't go. (BNC: FRE 1942)
It seems hard to argue that the -ing’s event is viewed as incomplete in this case; offending is necessarily seen as a whole here; moreover, it is future and non-realized.

Hamawand (2002)’s approach to complementation is very similar to that of Verspoor, being based on the assumption that the selection of a type of complement clause is the product of construal and semantic compatibility. By semantic compatibility, he means that “every grammatical constituent has a meaning which contributes to the meaning of the whole” (Hamawand 2002: 12), and that these constituents need to be compatible in order to fit together. Hamawand considers the main verb, the complementizer and the complement clause as relevant to the explanation of the choice of a type of complement. While this approach to complementation is semantically more global than any we have seen so far, it falls short of expectations, especially with regards to its treatment of the gerundive complement. Hamawand claims that “the -ing gerund designates an imperfective simple atemporal relation, which views only the internal configuration of the process and conceptualises it as unchanging through time” (p. 65). Following Langacker, he even says that “to the -ing gerund, one can attribute precisely the same value that it has in the progressive construction, referring specifically to an activity which is in progress at the moment of time serving as the reference point for the utterance” (p. 99). It obviously goes without saying that the same criticism addressed to Verspoor (1996) also applies here; again, one sees the methodological error of taking one actual use of a form and treating it as if it represented its full potential.

Regarding the meaning of the to-infinitive complement, Hamawand acknowledges the semantic role played by to. He claims that the use of to with the infinitive in complement clauses is motivated by its lexical meaning as a preposition, where it denotes the notion of a path towards a goal (p. 95). Thus, he claims that in combination with the infinitive, “to expresses motion, direction, inclination, etc. towards the action addressed by the infinitive” (p. 95). Moreover, he argues that this meaning can be extended in two different ways. The first one is ‘subsequent potentiality’, such as in (53) below, where the realization of the complement’s event is futurised with respect to that of the matrix verb:
They planned to climb Mount Everest.

They managed to climb Mount Everest. (p. 96)

The second extended meaning is ‘subsequent actualization’, such as in example (54) above, where the event denoted by the complement is seen as realized as a consequence of the main verb’s event (p. 96). However, Hamawand claims that in some exceptional cases, to expresses convolutions, a convoluted extension being “one which is not directly related to the original concept” (p. 96). He gives as an example (55) below, where to would refer to a state occurring at the time of the event denoted by the main verb:

I believe him to be honest. (p. 96)

It should however be pointed out that this type of use involves a form of logical subsequence: while (55) presents the speaker’s belief as a reality, the attribution of honesty to the person referred to is represented as based on the speaker's belief, i.e. dependent on the latter. In other words, the person in question is associated to the property of being honest by the belief of the speaker (cf. Duffley 2006a: 27-28).

In terms of the temporal relationship that these complements entertain with the matrix verb, Hamawand claims that the to-infinitive denotes a relation of subsequence, as seen above, while the -ing can evoke either simultaneity or anteriority (p. 68). While we believe that the first generalization is correct, it is however not true that the gerund-participle is limited to simultaneity or anteriority in terms of its temporal relation with the main verb as the event denoted by the gerund-participle can also be subsequent to the event denoted by the matrix verb, as in (9) above. Hamawand does not however seem to be aware of this third possibility, nor of the cases where the -ing does not stand in any kind of temporal relation with the main verb. For instance, in the sentence below, Duffley (2006a:38-39) argues that it is not significant whether the solving of the housing problem has already been accomplished or not:

He described solving the housing problem as providing convenient housing for every citizen. (Sichting 1985: 127 in Duffley 2006a)
It is also interesting to note that there is a contradiction in Hamawand’s treatment of the gerund-participle: it is not clear at all how anteriority, which he claims is an extension of the -ing’s prototypical meaning, can be derived from the prototype ‘activity in progress’. The notions of anteriority and ongoingness seem rather to be of contradictory nature. In sum, although Langacker (1991; 1992), Hamawand (2002) and Verspoor (1996) propose a fresh perspective on complementation with the gerund-participle and the infinitive by using new methods of analysis, their hypotheses seem to be inadequate to address all the facts of usage.

1.2.7 Presence of a Tense Operator

Another approach dealing with the temporality issue needs to be considered here before proceeding further. Working from a generative standpoint, Stowell (1982) proposes that the to-infinitive includes a tense operator, saying that “the tense of a to-infinitive is that of a possible future” (p. 562). More precisely, this tense operator specifies that “the time frame of the infinitival clause is unrealized with respect to the tense of the matrix in which it appears” (p. 562). Stowell gives the following two examples to illustrate his point:

(57) Jenny remembered [PRO to bring the wine].
(58) Jim tried [PRO to lock the door].

He then argues that, “in each case, the tense of the infinitival complement is understood as being unrealized with respect to the tense of the matrix” (p. 563); thus, in (57) “Jenny has not yet brought up the wine at the point at which she remembers to do so” (p. 563), while in (58) “Jim does not succeed in locking the door when he tries to do so. However, what Stowell has overlooked here is that in example (57), the combination of the verb remember with a to-infinitive implies that the complement’s event has actually been realized. How a future tense can imply the realization of the event it characterizes totally defies the imagination. Stowell also applies his notion of tense to the gerund-participle. In contrast to the to-infinitive, the gerund “has no internally determined tense and therefore that its understood tense is determined externally by the semantics of the control verb” (p. 563).
However, the fact that both the gerund-participle and the to-infinitive can evoke events as unrealized with respect to the main verb's event seems to invalidate the claim that their distinction is based on the notion of tense. As regards our own study, we will not refer to the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle complements as intrinsically possessing tense. We certainly recognize that their uses can give rise to temporal impressions with respect to the main verb; however, rather than evoking abstract categories such as tense, we will adopt a natural-language semantics approach, which works with the natural-meaning categories of English.

1.3 APPROACHES TO CONTROL

Regarding the problem of control, various approaches have been taken over the years, both of the syntactic and semantic type. In the brief section which follows, we shall briefly discuss the history of research done on control, highlighting the more recent developments.

The term ‘control’ was first coined by Postal (1970) to address the problem of cases where an understood argument of a complement or adjunct clause is linked to an explicit element located elsewhere in the sentence. In particular, control has been given special attention in cases where infinitival or gerundial verb phrases lack an overt subject, as in these examples found in Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet (1990: 247):

(59) John tried _ playing tennis.
(60) John tried _ to play tennis.

As Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet put it, the problem of control concerns the interpretation of the ‘missing subject’. Very early on in the history of control, ‘raising’ structures (61) were distinguished from ‘control’ constructions (62):

(61) John seems to like Mary. (raising)
(62) John tried to like Mary. (control)

In very general terms, the two are differentiated by the fact that raising structures allow an expletive subject and are able to form a passive with the embedded clause while preserving the original meaning, as opposed to control structures which prohibit these syntactic manipulations. It is also believed that the subject of a control structure will be understood as having two thematic roles, whereas the subject of a raising structure is seen as playing only a role associated with the embedded predicate. More recently, in the Government Binding framework, the two are contrasted structurally along these lines:

(63) John\(_i\) seems \([t_i \text{ to like } \text{Mary}]\).

(64) John\(_i\) tried \([\text{PRO}_i \text{ to like } \text{Mary}]\).

The first syntactic approach to control to emerge was Rosenbaum's Equi-NP deletion (Rosenbaum 1967). Under this view, a sentence such as (65) below was derived from (66), and a copy of the controller, here the subject of the main clause, was thought to appear as subject of the infinitive clause and to be subsequently deleted:

(65) John promised to go.

(66) John promised \([\text{John to go}]\).

To account for the choice of the controller Rosenbaum proposed a Minimal Distance Principle (MDP), according to which the closest c-commanding potential antecedent has to be taken as controller. This principle predicts that when there is a direct object, that object must be the controller of the infinitival complement, as it is closer to it than the subject. Its most famous problem was however that it failed to account for verbs like promise, where the controller of the complement clause generally coincides with the subject of the matrix clause and not with the closest NP, as predicted by MDP:

(67) John promised Mary to clean the room.
Thus, verbs of the *promise*-type are most often marked as exceptions in syntactic theories. Postal (1970) subsequently proposed the existence of a pronoun having no phonological realization called *Doom* as an equivalent of the Equi-NP deletion. Eventually, *Doom* became the pronominal element PRO of the Government Binding Theory. As seen in (64) above, it is believed that PRO, by means of binding theory, is linked to an antecedent which is its controller. PRO is also believed to receive its θ-role by structural principles. Later approaches to control include work done in the framework of Montague Grammar (e.g. Thomason 1976; Bach 1979; Dowty 1985) and Lexical-Functional Grammar (Bresnan 1982).

The last decade has seen a renewal of interest in the problem of control resulting in an intense publication of work in this field. In particular, syntactic approaches to the problem of the ‘missing subject’ in the framework of Minimalism have been the object of much debate. Minimalism tries to do away with many transformations and devices traditionally used in Government Binding theory. While this mainstream syntactic theory uses the binding of an abstract PRO to explain control, Hornstein (1999) argues that obligatory control (OC) structures (i.e. cases where the subject of the complement is the same as the subject of the main verb) can be accounted for by movement alone, proposing that for these structures “PRO is simply a residue of movement – the product of copy-and-deletion operations that relate two θ-positions” (68). Thus OC PRO is seen as identical to an NP-trace, and (68) is believed to be derived from (69), through a succession of syntactic operations:

(68) John hopes to leave.

(69) [IP John [VP John [hopes [IP John to [VP [John leave]]]]]]. (p. 79)

In (69), *John* first merges with the verb *leave*, checking the verb’s θ-role, before raising to the specifier position of the IP where it checks the D-feature of the IP. Then, *John* moves to the specifier of the upper VP where it checks the external θ-feature of the verb *hope*. Finally, *John* raises to [Spec, IP] of the matrix verb where it checks the D-feature of the IP and also the Case. It must be noted that because of Hornstein’s assumption that a D/NP
receives" a \( \theta \)-role by checking a \( \theta \)-feature of a verbal/predicative phrase that it merges with, \textit{John} ends up with two cases, "the leaver role and the hoper role" (p. 79), a consequence of treating OC PRO as movement. Moreover, the null Case associated with PRO, proposed by Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) is unnecessary in this analysis of OC PRO. Other analyses done in the spirit of eliminating PRO from UG include Manzini & Roussou (2000), Boeckx & Hornstein (2003), Barrie (2003), and Cecchetto & Oniga (2004). In general, the arguments provided to eradicate PRO have to do with the stipulatory nature of PRO and null Case, and of course the flagrant lack of evidence for the existence of PRO.

Hornstein's innovative approach to control has however been criticized by many in recent years (e.g. Landau 2003; Culicover & Jackendoff 2001). Indeed, his attempt to reduce some cases of control to movement, eliminating PRO in favour of a trace and abandoning the \( \theta \)-criterion, is a major departure from Government and Binding Theory. Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) have argued against such a strictly syntactic account of control, referring to the possibility of dissociating the choice of the controller from syntactic motivations. They show that "the same syntactic configuration can be associated with different controller choice" (p. 419), as seen in (70) below, and that "the controller can appear in different syntactic configurations, while preserving meaning", as (71) shows:

(70) a. \textit{John} talked about \( \nu_{\text{gendancing}} \) with \textit{Jeff}.
b. \textit{John} refrained from \( \nu_{*\text{gendancing}} \) with \textit{Jeff}.
c. \textit{John} persuaded \textit{Sarah} to \( j^*i \) dance.
d. \textit{John} promised \textit{Sarah} to \( i^*j \) dance.

(71) a. Fred's order from Bill [to \( i^* \) leave immediately].
b. The order from Bill to Fred [to \( i^* \) leave immediately].
c. Bill ordered Fred [to \( i^* \) leave immediately].
d. Fred received Bill's order [to \( i^* \) leave immediately].

In (71), the fact that Fred is the recipient of the order and the controller of \textit{leave} remains true across widely different syntactic structures. Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) argue that the solution to such problems has to be provided on the semantic level, or rather by what they call the "conceptual structure" (p. 469). In this study, we will follow Culicover & Jackendoff's lead in favouring a semantic approach over a syntactic one, although we will
not adopt their view of semantics. This choice is motivated first of all by the fact that the existence of a syntactic entity such as PRO is highly questionable, as it is a form which has no observable physical existence. Secondly, we agree with Culicover & Jackendoff (2001; 2005) when they argue against analysing control in purely syntactic terms based on the evidence that the semantic content of the constituents of the syntactic structure obviously plays a crucial role in determining control relations.

Other authors have also studied control in terms of semantics. Farkas (1988) proposed an approach to control for a selected group of verbs in which controller choice follows directly from the abstract notion of responsibility and the lexical meaning of the main verb. In particular, Farkas analyses the class of verbs which she calls responsibility (RESP)-inducing verbs and which includes convince, persuade, ask, force order, help, encourage, tell, advise, and promise (p. 33). Her central claim is that the “preferred analysis” (p. 33) for this type of verbs in terms of controller assignment derives from the Principle of Controller Choice (PCC). According to this principle, the choice of controller is determined by the responsibility relation, a two-place relation where an individual i is responsible for bringing about the complement’s event (a situation s); this individual is called the ‘initiator’, and is thus the controller, because “the realization of s crucially depends on i” (p. 36). For instance, in the example below, Jim is the controller, as he is the one responsible for the realization of the complement’s event:

(72) John persuaded Jim to write a letter. (p. 45)

The rationale behind this is that “if x persuades / convinces / forces / urges / requires y to VP y is responsible for bringing about a situation” (p. 41). The same principle (PCC) can also be applied to the verb promise:

(73) John promised Jim to write a letter. (p. 45)
Contrary to example (72), in this case it is the subject *John* which is the controller as he is the one responsible for writing a letter. Moreover, this shows that the verb *promise* is not considered as an exception in her approach.

As Farkas points out, within the class of RESP-inducing verbs there are however some ambiguous cases as to controller choice. For instance, she claims that under certain circumstances, example (84) is considered as ambiguous by some speakers of English:

(74) The pupil asked the teacher to leave early. (p. 47)

There are two possible readings here, the first one being when the subject *the pupil* is selected as the controller, and the second one being when it is *the teacher* who fulfils that role. The second interpretation would normally be the one selected by the PCC, which Farkas calls the unmarked case. To account for the first reading which is referred to as the marked case, she proposes the Marked Controller Choice Principle (MCC). This principle governs the selection of the participant whose actions are determined by the initiator as the controller. Thus, in the second reading of (74) above, *the teacher* is the controller because his/her actions are determined by the pupil. The verb *ask* therefore allows either the PCC and the MCC to determine its controller. The default choice however remains PCC, with MCC acting only as a marked option. According to Farkas, the conditions under which this choice is allowed would be stated in the lexical entry of those verbs which allow MCC.

Although Farkas’ work is interesting because of its focus on the main verb’s semantics, it remains a very specific and limited study. Her analysis considers only responsibility-inducing verbs, leaving out others like *think, imagine*, etc. which do not appear to possess this characteristic. The categorization of verbs also appears to be problematic, as there are no clear indications as to how to discriminate between RESP-inducing verbs and non-RESP-inducing verbs. This is simply specified in their lexicon. Finally, her recourse to marked cases is also questionable; MCC looks suspiciously like a catch-all for cases of control relations that do not fit with the main theory.
Building on work such as that of Jackendoff (1972), Chierchia (1989) puts forth a formal theory of thematic roles to explain control with the gerund-participle and the infinitive. He provides definitions for the four main $\theta$-roles, i.e. agent, theme, goal and source:

For any eventuality $\beta$:

a. $\text{Ag}(\beta) = x_i$, for that unique $x_i = \beta$ whose action causes $\beta$ (or, if you prefer, the event classified as $\beta$) to occur. If there is no such $x_i$, $\text{Ag}(\beta)$ is undefined.

b. $\text{Th}(\beta) = x_i$, for that unique $x_i = \beta$ such that whenever $\beta$ occurs, $x_i$ moves, changes possession or is acted upon by $\text{Ag}(\beta)$. If there is no such $x_i$, $\text{Th}(\beta)$ is undefined.

c. $\text{Go}(\beta) = x_i$, for that unique $x_i = \beta$ such that whenever $\beta$ occurs, $\text{Th}(\beta)$ moves towards $x_i$. If there is no such $x_i$, $\text{Go}(\beta)$ is undefined.

d. $\text{So}(\beta) = x_i$, for that unique $x_i = \beta$ such that whenever $\beta$ occurs $\text{Th}(\beta)$ moves from $\beta$ to $x_i$. If there is no such $x_i$, $\text{So}(\beta)$ is undefined. (p. 139)

Thematic roles are defined in terms of the entailments associated with eventualities. Chierchia proposes that thematic roles are organized in a hierarchy, which uses the notion of “highest available $\theta$-role” (p. 163):

$$\text{Theme} > \text{Goal} > \text{Agent} > \text{Source} > \ldots$$

In control structures the controller is determined by this hierarchy: “if the basic relation $r$ has a theme-argument, then $\text{Th}$ will be the value of $\theta$. Otherwise, it will be the next higher thematic role, and so on” (p. 144). In example (75) below, since Mary is the theme, she is identified as the controller:

(75) John forces Mary to win.

However, since no theme and agent is present in the next example, it is the goal (Mary) which is understood as the controller:

(76) John recommended reading War and Peace to Mary.
Chierchia’s approach leaves a certain number of occurrences unexplained however, as it allows for marked and unmarked cases. Interestingly, the relatively small class of verbs behaving like *promise* is categorized as unmarked, selecting the source as controller. However, the idea of “source” does not seem applicable to *promise* and its controller. Moreover, even if one concedes that the subject of *promise* is to be taken as the source, its object would seem to fit the θ-role of goal; following Chiechia’s hierarchy, this object should then be the controller of *promise*, which is not the case. On the other hand, the large class of verbs like *require, order, ask, and tell* is treated as marked, choosing the goal instead of the source as their controllers. A theory which cannot deal with exceptions should be revised, especially if what is treated as an exception is a frequent phenomenon.

A more comprehensive semantic approach is proposed by Culicover & Jackendoff (2005), who seek an explanation of control at the level of “conceptual structure” rather than syntactic structure. Both thematic roles and the meaning of the main verb are key elements in their explanation. As infinitival and gerundial complements are mostly cases of what the authors call ‘unique control’, our discussion will focus on that here. Instead of the traditional distinction between obligatory and non-obligatory control, the authors introduce a three-way distinction: free, nearly free, and unique control. Free control occurs when there is no restriction on the possibility of controllers, e.g. *Amy thinks that dancing with Dan intrigues Tom*. Nearly free control is the case when the range of possible controllers is more limited, e.g. *John talked to Sarah about taking better care of herself / herself / themselves / oneself*. Finally, unique control (a.k.a obligatory control) occurs when there is only one target that can be selected as controller, even if there are two possible targets as in *Sally persuaded Ben to take better care of himself* (pp. 422-425). Only actional complements will be considered, as they are the core of Culicover and Jackendoff’s analysis. A distinction is made between actional and situational complements, actional referring to complements expressing voluntary actions, and situational applying to complements expressing situations (which also include actions) (p. 428). The term *situation* is used “for any sort of state or event” (p. 427), while the term *action* applies to a “special subclass of situation, detectable by the test *What X did was*” (p. 427).
Culicover & Jackendoff propose a Unique Control of Actional Complements Hypothesis (UCAC) which claims the following: “Infinitival and gerundive complements that are selected by their head to be of the semantic type Voluntary Action have unique control. The unique controller is the character to which the head assigns the role of actor for that action whatever it syntactic position” (p. 427). The standard cases of the verbs persuade and promise are discussed according to this hypothesis:

(77) John promised Susan to take care of himself.

(78) John persuaded Susan to take care of herself.

In example (77) John is the controller, while in (78) it is Susan who plays this role. The difference in controller choice is attributed by the authors to the meaning of the predicates. With promise, the complement is controlled by “the giver/maker of the promise, wherever that character may be located in the syntax” (p. 434), as this giver/maker is the actor of the action denoted by the complement. With persuade, the controller is the person or the entity who is persuaded to do what is denoted by the complement.

Culicover & Jackendoff also attempt to formalize their approach, as they claim that control relations with actional complements can be accounted for by a control equation. Indeed, each predicate or matrix verb includes as part of its meaning an equation dictating the binding of the complement to one of its other arguments. Thus, any verb containing the predicate intend as part of its meaning will have the following control equation:

\[ X^a \text{ INTEND } [\alpha \text{ ACT }] \] (p. 445)

Following this equation, any verb of this class will see its ‘intender’ be assigned the role of actor i.e. controller.

There are however some cases of control that are more difficult to account for in terms of Culicover & Jackendoff’s approach, in particular “two cases in which the designated character does not end up as controller” (pp. 451-452). In order to solve this
problem, the authors propose a mechanism called coercion, which is in fact “a conventionalized omission of semantic material in syntactic expression” (p. 453). The first type of coercion posited is ‘bring about’ coercion, whose workings can be seen through examples (79) and (80):

(79) Hillary plans for the cat to be fed.

(80) Hillary plans to bring it about that the cat be fed. (p. 452)

Thus, ‘bring about’ coercion serves to preserve the control condition dictated by the UCAC hypothesis, that is that the intention must be executed by the intender, i.e. Hillary, which was apparently not the case in (79). The second type of coercion, ‘someone allow’ coercion, is involved to solve the problem posed by verbs like ask, pray and plead:

(81) John asked/begged/pleaded to take care of himself.

(82) John asked someone to bring it about that he take care of himself. (p. 454)

As pointed by Culicover & Jackendoff, these verbs select the source of the speech act as controller when the addressee is implicit. ‘Someone allow’ coercion implies that the implicit addressee (someone) controls the action, as predicted for the larger class of verbs of communication of which verbs of request are a sub-class. The very notion of coercion itself deserves criticism however: postulating an element which is not physically observable to account for ‘difficult’ examples is not the best solution. Looking at what is observable is a far preferable approach from a scientific point of view. Another important question that Culicover & Jackendoff do not address concerns the conditions governing the application of coercion: it seems to be simply a means of plugging up the holes in their theory.

In sum, all three of the semantic approaches discussed above can be criticized for being incomplete, as all three suffer from a lack of definition of the complement’s semantic content. Moreover, none of them considers the relation between the complement and the main verb, the complement’s syntactic function. Finally, although Chierchia (1989) and Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) claim that their respective approach is applicable to both
the gerund-participle and the infinitive, they do not deal adequately with the gerund-participle: they offer very little explanation and examples of how their hypotheses apply to the cases where a gerund-participle acts as complement of a matrix verb. As to Farkas (1988), she does not even consider the problem posed by the gerund-participle used as complement. The approach we will be working with will attempt to explain the phenomenon of control both with the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle. Our approach to control is related to that of Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) in some ways. However, while these authors recognize the role played by the meaning of the matrix verb, there is no reference to the meaning of to or of the infinitive, the meaning of the -ing, or to the function of the complement itself in the sentence. Consequently, their approach works only with a part of the puzzle, since these elements are not taken into account in their analysis. As will be outlined in Chapter Two, our approach to control will consider these elements as involved in the production of control readings with the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle complements.

1.4 Summary

We saw in this chapter that various approaches have been proposed to deal with the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle complements. However, despite the great variety of solutions submitted, none can account for the diversity of cases found in real usage. More importantly, these approaches are unable to explain the various expressive effects and the principles underlying the use of ‘main verb + complement’ structures with the infinitive and the -ing as complements of verbs of risk. Attempting to define the distinction between the two complements in terms of abstract pre-determined categories such as ‘potential vs. actual’, ‘referring vs. non-referring’, or ‘factive vs. non-factive’ simply does not work. The cognitive approach, although interesting, overlooks crucial semantic elements which contribute to the overall meaning of the constructions under study here.

In Chapter Two, we will present the theoretical framework used in our study of verbs of risk. Hopefully, this will answer many of the questions raised by this survey of the literature on verbal complementation with the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle.
2.1 Basic Assumptions

The present study is inspired by certain principles of both Cognitive Linguistics and the Psychomechanics of Language. In particular, we adopt Cognitive Grammar's postulate that "grammar and meaning are indissociable" (Langacker 2000: 1). For this theory, according to which language is best regarded as an integral part of cognition, grammar is inherently meaningful: "all grammatical elements are reasonably attributed some kind of semantic import" (Hamawand 2002: 30). For instance, complementizers are considered as meaningful elements in a construction (cf. Hamawand 2002), a stance which clashes with the established tradition which regards some of them as empty or devoid of semantic signification. As in Cognitive Grammar, the speaker's ability to conceptualise situations in a variety of ways is also given great importance in our approach (cf. Langacker 1991: 294). Unlike formal semantics, where meaning is equated with truth conditions, Cognitive Grammar identifies meaning with conceptualisation: "CG embraces a subjectivist view of meaning in that the meaning of an expression involves the way the conceptualiser chooses to think about it and represent it, as well as the properties inherent to the scene conceptualised" (Hamawand 2002: 37). The speaker and his interaction with the world thus have a major role to play in language. Moreover, Cognitive Grammar advocates that
humans’ cognitive ability for abstraction or schematization gives rise to the ability to construe a situation with varying degrees of specificity and details (Langacker 2000: 2). As this seems to be particularly relevant to an explanation of verbal complementation in English, it will be taken into consideration in our analysis.

We will also draw on notions from Gustave Guillaume’s general theory of language called the Psychomechanics of Language. Psychomechanics completes the view of language proposed by Cognitive Grammar by taking into account the fact that human language has two modes of existence, tongue and discourse. Tongue (what Guillaume called *langue*) can be described as a set of mental programs that a speaker has available in his subconscious, and which provides a means for the speaker to represent his experience; it is “the part of language that resides permanently in the preconscious mind” (Hirtle 2007: 87). In fact, tongue is “the prior conditioning factor that gives rise to words and sentences in the present of speech while the speaker carries out an act of language” (p. 87). On the other hand, discourse (what Guillaume called *discours* in French) is the final product of an act of language, namely actual language consisting of words and sentences: “discourse is the result of intermittent acts of constructing words and sentences” (p. 12). In other words, tongue is a potential, language as yet to be realized, while discourse is an actualization, that is language that has been realized.

Accordingly, in Psychomechanics meaning is thought to exist in two different states: as potential meaning (a.k.a. systemic meaning) and as actual or actualized meaning (a.k.a contextual meaning). Potential meaning is “a meaning which, prior to any contextual meaning in discourse, exists in the mind even though we cannot become aware of it directly” (Guillaume 1984: 82); it is meaning in its initial state. According to Guillaume, “each systemic meaning makes possible a certain range of contextual meanings in discourse” (p. 81). Systemic meaning thus exists in tongue as a potential for contextual meaning, which is meaning in its realized state. So, all the different expressive effects a form can have in discourse are explained by the single potential meaning existing in the preconscious mind of the speaker.
This view of meaning provides an interesting explanation of polysemy. Both pragmatic elements pertaining to the utterance situation and linguistic elements having to do with the interactions and relations between the meaning of the words used in an utterance conspire with the potential meaning of a form in order to produce the resultant observable message in discourse. The failure to distinguish between the potential and actual levels of language leads to a basic methodological problem which we avoid here: as we saw in our discussion of other approaches to complementation in Chapter One, confusion often results from taking the actual uses of a form in discourse to be its potential meaning in tongue.

With respect to syntax, both Cognitive Grammar and the Psychomechanics of Language recognize that each grammatical unit contributes to the meaning of a sentence. In Cognitive Grammar, semantic structure looms large and conditions in many ways the syntactic structure: “the expectation rather, is that the syntactic (and morphological) facts of a language will be motivated by semantic aspects” (Taylor 2002: 29). The notion of semantic compatibility, which advocates a close correspondence between the various elements of a construction, is also important. Every grammatical unit is believed to have a meaning of its own which contributes to the meaning of a whole, and consequently, “the meaning of a construction is a compositional function of the meanings of its internal parts” (Hamawand 2002: 12). For Psychomechanics, which is primarily a word-based theory, syntax depends on the semantics of individual word units. More precisely, “syntax is not autonomous but conditioned by, among other things, the lexical and grammatical meanings of the words that go together to make up the sentence” (Duffley 1992: 6). Thus, an understanding of the nature of words and their meaning is necessary before undertaking the task of looking at the nature of a construction or sentence. Accordingly, we shall try to identify as precisely as possible the contribution of each word and morpheme to the meaning of the examples analysed in our study. Such a view seems essential to any attempt at explaining the contrast between the use of the infinitive and the gerundive complements with verbs expressing the idea of risk.
2.2 PARAMETERS USED

Based on the work of Duffley (2000; 2006a), our analysis will be guided by three explanatory parameters: 1) the meaning of the verbal complement, 2) the function of the complement with respect to the main verb, and 3) the lexical meaning of the main verb. Except for the meaning of verbs of risk where a lexical analysis will have to be conducted, we adopt the hypotheses proposed by Duffley (2000; 2006a) for the parameters above.

2.2.1 The Meaning of the Gerund-Participle

As for the grammatical or potential meaning of the gerund-participle, Duffley (2006a) proposes that it simply corresponds to the notion of interiority (p.19). This meaning can be actualized in two different ways in discourse. The first corresponds to the expressive effect which is most often observed in the progressive construction, that is *be + -ing*. In a sentence such as (83) below there is an impression of imperfectivity, the subject being situated between the beginning and the end of eating a chocolate bar:

(83) She is eating a chocolate bar (p. 151).

Here, the event-originator is located at a specific point within the interiority of the event denoted by the *-ing*, thus giving “the impression of an event divided into an accomplished and a yet-to-be accomplished portion” (p. 152-153). As we saw in Chapter One, this particular instantiation of the gerund-participle in discourse is taken for its basic meaning by most grammarians.

However, there is a second way in which the gerund-participle’s meaning can be realized in discourse, and this type of use is of more relevance to us for the cases we have at hand with verbal complementation. In contrast to the impression seen in the example above, in a sentence like (84) below, the *-ing* evokes the event it denotes as a whole:

(84) ...
(84) I remember telling you that I wanted nothing more to do with you. (BNC: JXV 2211)

This holistic effect is due to the fact that the realizer of the event denoted by the -ing is not located at any particular point within the latter: "the totality of the interiority is profiled, which amounts to evoking the event itself as a sort of abstract substance whose nature is depicted by the gerund-participle’s lexical content" (Duffley 2006a: 20). The same type of expressive effect can be seen in example (85):

(85) We discussed moving into a new house in Lawrenceville. (lascene.blogspot.com/2006_09_01_archive.html)

Obviously, the activity of moving is seen as a holistic entity here also; it is the totality of moving which is profiled, not just a portion of it. Following the traditional terminology, this type of expressive effect is generally associated with the use of the -ing as a gerund.

One can see from this brief expose that the effect produced by the use of the -ing in the progressive construction is only one of its various actual meanings. To account for both uses in discourse, a more general pre-conscious potential meaning like that of interiority needs to be postulated for the gerund-participle.

### 2.2.2 The Function of the Gerund-Participle Complement

In terms of the function played by the gerund-participle complement in the construction under study here, Duffley (2000) proposes that the gerund-participle is simply the direct object of the main verb, a function which is first and foremost defined semantically as ‘that which is [verb]ed’ in the event expressed by the verb which it is the direct object” (p. 226). So, in (86) below, losing is that which is hated:

(86) She hated losing at the best of times but this was the worst. (BNC: BP7 522)

The same also goes for example (84) seen previously; the semantic role played by the -ing there is to identify what is remembered.
In addition to this semantic criterion for identifying direct objects, certain syntactic tests provide further supporting evidence. First of all, active/passive correspondences like that between sentence (87) and (88) below is one possibility for confirming the identification of a direct object:

(87) He had tried reading isolated pages. (BNC: HR8 1572)

(88) Reading isolated pages had been tried.

The -ing being the direct object of the main verb in the active sentence, in (88) it predictably occupies the subject position in the passive construction. In addition, anaphoric reference to the direct object is also possible by means of a pronoun:

(89) He had tried it/that.

Finally, pseudo-cleft constructions, which place communicative focus on the entity referred to by the direct object, can usually be constructed:

(90) Reading isolated pages is what he had tried.

(91) What he had tried was reading isolated pages.

The conjunction of these criteria indicates that the gerund-participle has the function of a direct object when complementing a matrix verb. However, these tests cannot be applied mechanically to identify the direct object of a sentence. The passive transformation is a case in point, because the meanings of certain verbs do not square well with passivization. For instance, as (93) below shows, sentence (92) can hardly be passivized without awkwardness:

(92) He lacks motivation.

(93) *Motivation is lacked by him.
Therefore, although these tests are useful, following Duffley (2006a) we will take the semantic role of 'that which is [verb]ed' as the fundamental criterion for identifying a direct object in this study.

### 2.2.3 The Semantic Effect of the Gerund-Participle as Complement

The relation in time between the events expressed by the complement and the matrix verb is one semantic effect which requires explanation. As seen in Chapter One, the gerund-participle is in fact indifferent as regards temporality, since, depending on the context in which it is used, it can express something which is prior, contemporaneous or subsequent with respect to the event expressed by the main verb:

(94) I remember digging for what seemed like hours to lift those bulbs. (BNC: ACY 185)

(95) He tried reading Advanced Physical Dynamics and Introverted Equations for the 3-D Aeronautical Practice. (BNC: AMB 1320)

(96) I am contemplating abandoning my quest for silver to go for gold. (BNC: CH7 2664)

Actually, the relation of a direct object to its verb is of a non-temporal nature by itself; the function of the direct object is simply to link one of the elements of the sentence to the main verb’s event as ‘that which is [verb]ed’. In the sentences above, the -ing thus denotes that which is remembered, tried, or contemplated. The following examples confirm the fact that a noun direct object has no particular temporal relation with the event represented by the main verb:

(97) I remember your visit. (BNC: H8T 2058)

(98) He tried the back door but it was firmly bolted. (BNC: BPD 1929)

(99) He is contemplating postgraduate studies. (BNC: AHX 1243)

As Duffley (2006a) proposes, the explanation of any temporal or ‘tense’ effects with the gerund-participle lies in the fact that “any temporal relation between the events
expressed by the -ing and the main verb is simply a logical implication based on the latter’s lexical meaning” (p. 37). For instance, an event which is remembered as in (94) had to happen before the actual act of remembering. In (95), there is a relation of simultaneity because the act of trying necessarily occurs at the same time than the action which is tried; an event is obviously tried only during its realization. Finally, an event which is contemplated as in (96) is obligatorily something which has not happened yet. In fact, since the gerund-participle is of a non-temporal nature, any temporal implication derives from the main verb; if its lexical meaning implies some relation in time with its object, then some temporal effect will be produced in correlation with the -ing complement. However, this does not occur with all verbs: there are a good number of cases where the -ing does not stand in any kind of temporal relation with the main verb:

(100) His job includes looking after under-21 teams. (BNC: HAE 2670)

(101) They value being loved more than being served.

(102) I haven’t noticed any shortening of the nylons’ lifetime at all using this method and it sure beats washing them by hand!
(www.stretcher.com/stories/990517a.cfm)

In these examples, it is totally irrelevant whether the complement event has already been accomplished or not. In (101), for instance, the event represented by the gerund-participle is simply represented as being valued.

Control relations between the main verb and the gerund-participle can also be explained by the latter’s meaning and its function within the construction. Duffley (2006a: 47) demonstrates that control with the gerund-participle can be understood by looking at the logic of the interaction of the same three parameters which were used above to explain temporal effects: the lexeme of the matrix, the grammatical representation of the event provided by the -ing, and the latter’s function with respect to the matrix. Thus in (94), (95), and (96) above, an event which is remembered, tried or contemplated will normally be understood as implying subject control: for instance, one generally contemplates actions or things that he plans to do himself.
The same parameters can also explain non-controlled interpretations as in (103) and (104):

(103) At one board meeting she proposed introducing padded coat hangers. (BNC: GU9 731)

(104) He recommended opening the window.

Normally, when one recommends or proposes something, the recommendation or proposal is understood to be carried out by someone else. There is no need to use formal equations or abstract entities like PRO to explain the phenomenon of control with the gerund-participle as complement; a semantic explanation taking into consideration the elements present in the sentence or the discourse is sufficient to account for these effects.

2.2.4 The Meaning of the to-infinitive

With regards to the to-infinitive meaning, Duffley’s hypothesis is based on the recognition of the two elements composing it, i.e. to and the bare stem or infinitive, both of which are treated as separate meanings. The idea that to has a meaning in this use is contrary to the general view that this element is meaningless (e.g. Chomsky 1957; Lehrer 1987; Langacker 1991; Fischer 2003). However, if this were true, there should be no difference in meaning between (105) and (106), as pointed out by Duffley (2006a: 24):

(105) She had a machine correct the tests.

(106) She had a machine to correct the test.

Duffley postulates instead that the potential meaning of to is that of a movement potentially leading to a point (1992: 17-20). This very general meaning can be applied to various domains, notably that of space such as in (107) below:

(107) He went to America and made a fortune. (BNC: CDY 2312)
This is the classic use of *to* where it denotes a physical movement from one point in space to another. However, this should not be taken for the basic meaning of *to*, as it is only one of its various uses in discourse. In the complement constructions analysed in this study, *to*'s domain of application is generally that of time.

In the *to* + infinitive construction, the bare stem acts as the end-point of the movement signified by *to* (Duffley 2006a: 26). Thus, in (108) below the infinitive is seen as the result of the process denoted by the matrix verb:

(108)  I persuaded Dave to open the door (p. 27)

As to the potential meaning of the bare stem itself, Duffley agrees with Langacker (1991:444) in seeing a parallel between it and the simple form: “both forms evoke a full instantiation, be it of an action or a state, in the time stretch corresponding to the immediate scope of predication, the difference between them being that in the case of the infinitive this instantiation is not grounded by means of tense or person” (Duffley 2006a: 30). The infinitive is not tied down to any temporal period, which allows it to represent things in the abstract and makes it compatible with any adverbial time, as the examples below with modal auxiliaries show:

(109)  She could sing classical music quite well, and play the piano, but it was the Greek folk-tunes I remember best. (BNC: G13 1448)

(110)  She must be eight and a half. (BNC: KCP 3853)

(111)  If everything continues to go well, she will stay for no more than seven days. (BNC: CEN 502)

The bare infinitive is simply a more abstract version of the simple form of the verb: like the latter it simply situates an event in time as a holistic entity whose event time contains all of what is involved in the verb’s lexical content (Hirtle 1988). This perfective view of the realization of the event can be represented in two different ways, depending on whether the event is action-like or state-like. With action-like events, on the one hand, locating the event in time necessitates conceiving the full actualization of the event. This
means that the event evoked by the simple form is seen as unfolding in time from its beginning to its end, thus producing a complete image of the event, as seen in (112):

(112) The ferry crossed the channel.

(113) The ferry was crossing the channel.

A comparison with the present progressive highlights the meaning of the simple form. Contrary to (112), where the crossing of the ferry is pictured as complete from beginning to end with the ferry having made it to the other side of the channel, example (113) presents a partial view of the crossing. In the case of state-like events, the event represented by the simple form actualizes its full meaning at each instant of its existence:

(114) The lake was cold this morning.

In (114), all of what is involved in the idea of the lake being cold is fully present in just one instant of its duration. The bare infinitive will be treated here as simply representing the full actualization of its lexical content like the simple form, but without any specification of ordinal person or temporal location.

2.2.5 The Function of the to-infinitive as Complement

It should now be clear that what is generally called an ‘infinitive’ or a ‘to-infinitive’ is actually a two-word sequence. As mentioned already, the relation between to and the bare stem is quite straightforward: the infinitive simply acts as the end-point of the movement denoted by to.

In terms of the function of the to-infinitive phrase with respect to the main verb, Duffley (2000) demonstrates that, in most of the cases of the type under study here, it is a prepositional phrase acting as an adverbial goal or result specifier with respect to the main verb (p. 231). Thus, in a sentence like (115) below, the bare stem expresses the final goal towards which the event expressed by the main verb is oriented:
(115) Humiliated, I decided to fetch the manager. (BNC: A6C 1303)

One piece of evidence for this claim is the fact that the to-infinitive complement in (115) cannot be replaced by the pronouns *that*/*it*, as would be the case if the infinitive had a direct object function:

(116) * Humiliated, I decided that/*it.
(117)  I decided to.

As (117) shows, it would be more appropriate to evoke the to-infinitive phrase anaphorically by means of *to*. This does not mean that a to-infinitive does not have the capacity of being a direct object; however, when it acts as such, anaphoric reference to it is possible by means of a pronoun:

(118)  I consider not to participate a bad idea.
(119)  I consider not to a bad idea.
(120)  I consider that a bad idea. (Duffley 2006a: 41)

Further evidence suggesting that the to-infinitive complement is not a direct object in most of its complement uses is provided by the fact that pseudo-cleft constructions are not possible:

(121)  The manager was who I called.
(122)  * Fetch the manager was what I decided to.

Moreover, active/passive correspondence is generally not a possibility either:

(123)  He tried to discourage her in every way. (BNC: AC3 1482)
(124)  * To discourage her was tried in every way.
Verbs like *hope are also interesting in this respect, as they do not take a direct object, but can be complemented by an infinitive:

(125) I hope to stay here for a long time. (BNC: CEP 10501)
(126) *I hope a long stay in your beautiful city.

2.2.6 The Semantic Effect of the to-infinitive as Complement

The set of parameters set out above can also be used to explain the temporal effects found with the to-infinitive as verbal complement. It was noted in Chapter One that it is commonly observed that the to-infinitive evokes its event as potential (e.g. Bolinger 1968; Dixon 1992; 1995) or as having “a clear future orientation” (Wierzbicka 1988) with respect to the main verb. This can be seen in (127) below:

(127) She wanted to tell you so many things, but you were too busy talking to listen. (BNC: G1M 2652)

The basic meaning of the preposition to explains the expression of this temporal relation of subsequence with the to-infinitive construction: the meaning of to being that of a movement potentially leading to a point, the infinitive is seen as the goal or result of the event represented by the main verb. In (127), the infinitive’s event represents the goal of a desire or ‘wanting’; consequently, because of this notion of a targeted goal, the infinitive’s event is felt to be posterior to the main verb’s event. This can be illustrated by the following diagram:
In this type of use, the matrix's event and that of the to-infinitive stand in a before/after position in time. Moreover, the infinitive event in (129) is evoked as non-realized, as the dotted line in the diagram indicates.

The temporal impression of futurity is not observed in all cases however: as pointed out in section 1.2.2, the to-infinitive can sometimes evoke an accomplished event, as in (128) and (129):

(128) The next night he remembered to pick up a video on the way back from work. (BNC: AOR 989)

(129) She managed to edge herself out of her corner, away from Ivan, back into the current. (BNC: FBO 778)

In these examples, the movement signified by to is represented as totally carried out, giving the impression of a result:
Nonetheless, for both examples (128) and (129), there is still a before/after relationship between the main verb and the event represented by the infinitive. For instance, in (128), the remembering logically needed to occur before the subject could carry out the infinitive’s event, being conceived as that which led to the actualization of the picking up.

It should be pointed out that the notions of potentiality and futurity do not apply to examples (128) and (129) because the events represented by the infinitive have been actualized; for this reason, the temporal effect seen with the use of the to-infinitive is best called subsequence rather than futurity. The to-infinitive can thus give rise to two main types of temporal impression in discourse: subsequent potentiality (e.g. She wanted to tell you) and subsequent actualization (e.g. He remembered to pick up a video).

The three parameters detailed above for the to-infinitive provide an adequate basis for the control effects observed with this phrase. When the to-infinitive is used as a complement in the function of an adverbial goal specifier, it always implies a coreferential control reading, both with verbs involving subsequent potentiality (e.g. want, try, intend) and subsequent actualization (e.g. remember, manage, begin) (Duffley 2006a):

(130) One day soon she intended to pay it all back, with interest. (BNC: JY3 569)

(131) He began to pray silently to himself. (BNC: B1X 1453)
The key to the explanation of this fact is the function of the to-infinitive in the sentence: as an adverbal goal or result specifier, the prepositional to specifies the relation existing between the infinitive and the matrix. Thus in (130) intend implies a movement towards the goal represented by the infinitive, and to represents the infinitive pay as the term to which this movement leads. Accordingly, the realizer of the intention is logically understood to be coreferential to that of the paying. The notion of movement is already implicit in the lexical meaning of the verb intend: intend involves a desire to move towards the achievement of the infinitive’s event, and unless specified otherwise, the intender is the prospective realizer of this event. Similarly, in (131), to profiles the movement initiated by the subject of the main verb towards a result, that of praying. Necessarily, the realizer of the praying is the same as the one who decided to initiate it.

2.3 SUMMARY

In this chapter, we have outlined our main theoretical assumptions, which derive from both Cognitive Grammar and the Psychomechanics of Language. More precisely, our usage-based approach is based on the hypotheses proposed by Duffley to explain verbal complementation with the infinitive and the gerund-participle. We defined the meaning and the function of both forms. A general explanation of the semantic effects produced by the use of these complements in discourse was also provided and illustrated with examples. The three explanatory parameters were shown to provide explanations for the gerund-participle’s indifference to both temporality and control. These parameters also allowed us to perceive the reasons behind the to-infinitive’s constant subsequent interpretation and coreferential control reading.

These hypotheses have already been applied successfully to explain the expressive effects of various semantic types of verbs. In Duffley (2006a), verbs of effort, verbs of positive and negative recall, verbs of liking and the so-called aspectual verbs are discussed. In addition, these hypotheses have also been tested on verbs of fear (Fisher 2007), verbs of negative attitude (Labbé 2002), and the verbs intend, mean, propose and their synonyms
(Duffley & Joubert 1999). Our study will thus be a further opportunity to test Duffley's hypotheses and explanations by confronting them with the facts of usage provided by the verbs of risk.
CHAPTER THREE: 
DATA ANALYSIS

"Language is like shot silk; so much depends on the angle at which it is held."

John Fowles

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Having laid out our theoretical foundations in Chapter Two, the present chapter will investigate further verbal complementation with verbs of risk, considering in particular temporal and control relationships. Our corpus is composed of examples containing verbs of risk construed with a gerund-participle or a to-infinitive with a sufficient context, which obviously varies for each example, in order to allow a proper understanding and explanation of the various uses of these verbs. In total, almost 1 500 examples have been examined. Our corpus is composed of attested data from present-day written English, with a handful of examples from the 19th century. The majority of examples constituting it were obtained from the following sources: the British National Corpus (BNC), the Brown University Corpus (BROWN), and the Lancaster-Oslo / Bergen Corpus (LOB). When the number of examples from these three sources was insufficient for a specific verb, a search was conducted on Internet. Most of the Internet examples were accessed through the Canadian Index for Periodicals (CPI.Q), a data bank containing articles from more than 700 newspapers and magazines from Canada and other English-speaking countries. A few examples collected personally in books and dictionaries were also added. The variety of sources for our corpus provided for a fair representation of both English and American usage, including Canadian usage, with a small output from Australian and New Zealand English contributed mostly by Internet examples.
In this chapter, we will analyse the data collected for each verb under investigation. The lexical meaning of the verb will first be discussed, in relation with a description of usage in our corpus. Temporal and control effects will then be examined. The role of the complement used in the constructions found in the corpus will also be determined. Finally, an attempt at explaining the temporal and control effect will be made. Before we proceed to the analysis of the corpus data, a brief note on selecting pertinent verbs of risk will be made.

3.2 A NOTE ON SELECTING VERBS OF RISK

Setting the limits as to what will be considered for the purposes of this study a verb of risk and what will not is not a black-and-white affair. Although humans excel at categorizing, categories in language are flexible and not always clear-cut. Jackendoff rightly notes that “fuzziness is an inescapable characteristic of the concepts that language expresses” (2004: 125). Along the same lines, Langacker states that “linguistic relationships are not invariably all-or-nothing affairs, nor are linguistic categories always sharply defined and never fuzzy around the edges” (2004: 131). Although there is no semantic field of ‘verbs of risk’ roped off from other verbs, it is possible to group verbs together according to their core meaning or some semantic element they share. Thus verbs like love, like, enjoy, fancy, and desire can be grouped together as verbs of liking, for they share a common semantic element.

The concept of risk and the word itself have greatly evolved over the last few centuries. Most analysts link the emergence of this notion with maritime ventures in the pre-modern period (Lupton 1999). As mentioned in 1.1, the era of modernity has brought changes in our industrialized world which have led to an increase in the use of the term risk. In the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the core meaning of the noun risk is defined as “the possibility of something bad happening at some time in the future; a situation that could be dangerous or have a bad result” (p.1313). Although risk can have
slightly different senses in areas such as insurance, it is normally understood in these terms in everyday language.

Three criteria, two semantic and one constructional, were used to select verbs for the purposes of our study. The first criterion for a verb to be considered a verb of risk is that it includes in its meaning a reference to exposure to the possibility or chance of a bad, unpleasant or undesired outcome. The second semantic criterion is that this verb can be loosely paraphrased by the verb *risk*. For instance, *face* in (132) could be paraphrased by *risk*, as in (133):

(132) He faces losing all his belongings.

(133) He risks losing all his belongings.

Obviously, as it is often the case with paraphrases and synonyms, subtleties in the message conveyed are lost, but the essential semantic component remains. Verbs of risk do not seem to be as tightly connected semantically as verbs of liking (*like, love, enjoy,* etc.), as they seem to belong more to a pragmatic category than a semantic one. Each verb of risk expresses a somewhat different shade of the core meaning. Sometimes, this is because the emphasis is put on something else than just the possibility of an unwanted consequence. *Dare* is a case in point, as it carries the meaning of courage or boldness. Obviously, some of the verbs studied here may have a few attestations for which it is impossible to substitute the verb *risk*. We will not be too strict about this. Sometimes, other factors such as context make paraphrasing awkward. Moreover, some of the verbs analysed in this study may have some uses in which they can clearly be considered as verbs of risk, and other senses where it is clear that the message expressed does not contain an element of risk. These will be mentioned in each case for the sake of clarity and thoroughness.

The last criterion for selecting verbs of risk pertinent to our study is constructional: as mentioned in 1.1, the verbs chosen all occur with the gerund-participle and/or the *to*-infinitive directly following the verb. Having clarified how verbs of risk have been selected in this study, let us now plunge into the heart of our analysis.
3.3 *The Verb Risk*

### 3.3.1 Lexical Meaning and Complementation

The verb *risk* is always construed with the gerund-participle in our corpus. In total, we looked at about 400 examples, coming from LOB, BROWN and CPLQ, and including 150 examples from the BNC. When construed with an *-ing* the verb *risk* can have two different senses. The first has been characterized by the *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* as “to do something that may mean that you get into a situation which is unpleasant for you” (p. 1313). This actual meaning, which is the most frequent one in our corpus, is seen in the following six examples:

1. A few people stayed loyal to the traditional beer, but they risked being scoffed at by their more fashionable friends. (BNC: B2V 53)
2. I walk a tightrope; if inroads are made into my routine I risk overbalancing. (BNC: AEA 1194)
3. It is possible to get cheaper tickets but you risk landing at 3am and then facing an hour or more coach journey culminating in a vagrancy charge because all the hotels are shut. (BNC: BPE 197)
4. Farmers are advised not to stop travellers and vehicles on the road or they risk committing a serious traffic offence. (BNC: K3K 637)
5. Brian Mulroney fostered a "greed society" like that of the United States and was so pro-American he risked making Canada the 51st state, says Prime Minister Jean Chretien. (CPIQ: *Globe & Mail*)
6. Inequality between men and women in sports has a long history--one going back at least 2,700 years to the ancient Olympic Games. Women were barred from taking part in or even attending the ancient Games, first held in 776 B.C. in Olympia, Greece. Any woman who dared to violate the law risked being thrown to her death from the steep cliffs of Mount Typeaum. (CPIQ: *Current Events*)

---

*The term *sense* refers here to what Psychomechanics calls actual, actualized or contextual meaning in opposition to potential meaning. As the potential meaning of a word resides in the unconscious mind and is therefore inaccessible to our consciousness, our analysis will center on actualized language, concentrating on the actual occurrences of language in discourse. For further explanations, cf. 2.1.*
The second meaning of *risk* in discourse when followed directly by the gerund-participle can be described as “to do something that you know is not really a good idea or may not succeed” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary: 1313). It is illustrated by the examples below:

(140) She risked standing, poised to duck back under the slab of rock if she saw even the shadow of a movement. (BNC: F9X 604)

(141) Shuddering with fear and anticipation at the prospect of the weekend ahead, she risked opening her eyes again. (BNC: JXU 4108)

(142) I would never have risked travelling with a family in such a car. (BNC: AT3 2182)

(143) We were on a stretch of straight road, climbing up towards the Heights, and he risked taking his eyes from the road for a second to look fully at me. I couldn't read anything from his face. (LOB: P15 4)

(144) GAZA STRIP: Gaza Baptist Church used to draw hundreds of Palestinian worshipers to its two Sunday services. But on a recent Sunday in January, less than 10 people risked attending the only evangelical church in the 25-mile coastal strip. (CPLQ: *Christianity Today*)

(145) Government agencies are seldom in the forefront when a new operating system comes along, and that's good sense. The only time I risk installing brand-new software is when I'm being paid to evaluate it. (CPLQ: *Government Computer News*)

These two different actual meanings of the verb *risk* can also be looked at in terms of Fillmore’s ‘frame semantics’. In their study of the RISK frame, Fillmore & Atkins identify two possible categories or types of direct objects occurring with the verb *risk* when followed by an -ing. The first is HARM, meaning that the gerund-participle object corresponds to a “potential unwelcome development” (1992: 82). This type of use correlates with the first sense of *risk* identified above in examples (134) to (139). Indeed, in these examples, the subjects face *being scoffed at, overbalancing, landing at 3am, committing a serious traffic offence, making Canada the 51st state, and being thrown to her death from the steep cliffs of Mount Typaeum*, which all represent possible harm. The second category of -ing direct object is DEED, that is “the act that brings about a risky situation” (p. 83). This corresponds to the second sense of *risk* displayed in examples (140)
to (145). In these, the subjects of the sentence perform a risky deed, viz. standing, opening her eyes again, travelling with a family in such a car, taking his eyes off the road, attending the only evangelical church in the 25-mile coastal strip, and installing brand-new software. These two categories of gerund-participle object proposed by Fillmore & Atkins for the verb risk are clearly distinct in our corpus and represent two different actualized meanings of the potential meaning of risk.\(^2\) The following examples are interesting in this regard:

(146) On the other hand, by refraining from identifying himself he risked being bludgeoned or arrested. (BNC: A0U 2443)

(147) “We have repeatedly warned people that if they assist burglars in disposing of stolen property, they risk being put out of business,” said Mr Shatford. (BNC: CEN 1283)

(148) Yet if they report to a GP or social worker with complaints about this, they risk being written off as neurotic middle-aged women. (BNC: B3G 1099)

(149) There was no answer to her gibe, and, despite the fact that the fumes in the room told her the substance on her hair was likely to blind her if it made contact, she sat up and risked opening one eye. (BNC: JY6 7)

The gerund-participle following the verb risk in examples (146) to (148) represents possible harm faced by the subject. However, it is interesting to note that the risky deed behind this possible harm is identified in (146) by the noun phrase following the preposition by: if the subject refrains from identifying himself (the risky deed), he risks suffering some unwanted consequence. The same phenomenon is also seen in examples (147) and (148), although in these cases the risky deed is specified by a clause introduced

\(^2\) In fact, Fillmore & Atkins propose another category of object that occurs with the verb risk: VALUED OBJECT. However, they did not find any evidence of its occurrence with a gerund-participle in his corpus. We did find only one example of this very rare type of use with an -ing: “I knew I'd get that look. You know that look, the one that says "oh, you're one of those people." And what did I do to warrant such a response? I confessed to my friends that I was planning to attend a Buffy the Vampire Slayer question and answer audience with James Marsters, one of the actors in the series, in Berlin. (...) And as for the Buffy audience, it could best be described as an experience unlike any other. We met people from the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, and England. One woman risked keeping her job in order to fly into Berlin from Paris for the weekend. I guess a five hour drive from home isn't so crazy after all.” (www.suite101.com/article.cfm/bavaria_southern_germany/109155/2) In this example, keeping her job can be seen as “a valued possession of the victim, seen as potentially endangered” (Fillmore & Atkins 1992: 82). In other words, she risked her job in order to fly in from Paris for the weekend. This type of use generally occurs with other direct objects than -ings, such as in He risked his health in taking that job (p. 82), where his health is the valued object which is endangered.
by the conjunction *if*. Such *if*-clauses are relatively frequent in our corpus, representing 35 cases out of 122 where the *-ing* corresponds to HARM in the BNC. On the other hand, in sentence (149), the gerund-participle constitutes the risky deed itself performed by the subject of the verb *risk*. The possible harm she faces is mentioned in the context preceding the clause with *risk*, which is that the *substance on her hair was likely to blind her if it made contact*. The possible harm faced by the subject when committing a risky deed is almost never mentioned explicitly in our corpus, but it can generally be inferred.

With regard to the verbs construed as complements with the verb *risk* in our corpus, they are quite varied, whether they correspond to DEED or HARM. However, when the *-ing* complement denotes possible harm, some tendencies stand out. First, out of 122 examples from the BNC, 27 are construed with the passive construction following *risk*, as in (134) and (146)-(148) above, and 20 others with the verb *lose*, as below:

(150) He suddenly risked losing the crowning glory of a lifetime's secret endeavour to an unknown malarial “fly-catcher” as the humble naturalist-explorers were known. (BNC: FEP 325)

(151) Then if she can't keep up payments she risks losing her home, as thousands of families have done. (BNC: CHI 8374)

(152) So they risk losing most potential economic growth if a climate treaty sets ceilings on emissions. (BNC: ABH 1960)

The passive constructions all denote unpleasant things which might be done to the subject of *risk*. Even more interestingly, most of the verbs used as gerund-participle complements have a negative connotation such as, *drown, offend, damage, disrupt, undermine, inhibit, destroy, suppress, break, overbalance, reduce, slip, stop, impede, wear out, splutter*, and *lose* illustrated above. In fact, when context is added to verbs that do not necessarily have a negative connotation like *become, acquire*, and *emphasize*, for example, these are found to also be part of a clause having a negative overtone. This fact of usage is obviously in concordance with this actualized meaning of *risk*, as the complement’s verb necessarily has to correspond to some kind of harmful consequence, whence the negative connotation.
As mentioned above, all examples of the verb \textit{risk} in our corpus were construed with the gerund-participle, no \textit{to}-infinitives having been found directly following this verb. 
\textit{To}-infinitives can only occur with the verb \textit{risk} in constructions of the type \textit{risk} + direct object + \textit{to}-infinitive, as in the following:

(153) A father risked his life to save his twin babies from a fire which had engulfed the childrens' bedroom. (BNC: K1E 387)

(154) The Resistance risked torture and death to help allied servicemen escape. (BNC: K1N: 2739)

(155) People risked everything to help escapers and want nothing in return. (BNC: FSC 248)

In these examples, the infinitive functions as a purpose clause answering the question ‘for what purpose’: an ‘in order to’ clause could be inserted between the direct object and the \textit{to}-infinitive in these examples, as in (156) below:

(156) A father risked his life in order to save his twin babies.

However, as this type of use is of a more complex nature, it will be left for future investigation. The verb \textit{risk} can be found followed directly by a \textit{to}-infinitive in headlines:

(157) Maui News | Lives risked to fight fire  
(www.mauinews.com/edit/2007/7/2/01edit0702.html)

(158) Avalanche Risked To Save Father And Son  

In this type of construction, \textit{risk} is a past participle and not a main verb, thus it is not of a type which falls within the scope of this study.

\textit{3.3.2 Temporal and Control Effects}

The most frequent temporal relationship between the main verb \textit{risk} and the gerund-participle in our corpus is that of subsequence. For instance, in:
(159) It would seem that just like climbers, mountain bikers will have to learn to live with the odd restriction where their activity clashes with other recreation or conservation interests, otherwise they risk losing certain routes permanently. (BNC: CCP 1306)

(160) Children who own a "Performance" winter jacket bought at Old Navy clothing stores should stop wearing it immediately, because they risk becoming entangled on nearby objects. (CPI.Q: Globe & Mail)

the events losing and becoming exist at a point in time subsequent to the state of risk expressed in the matrix: in both of these cases, the complement’s event is future and non-realized. Example (161) is enlightening with regards to the impression of temporal subsequence:

(161) A former Justice Department prosecutor, Lawrence Barcella, said that the policy risked offending otherwise friendly countries, which might even bring kidnapping charges against the FBI. (BNC: A5M 429)

The presence of the auxiliary might in the clause following the risk + -ing clause, confirms that the offending is non-realized.

One also observes in some cases a relationship of simultaneity between the verb risk and its complement, although this type of temporal relation is less frequent than that of subsequence, as it only occurs in 28 out of 150 examples in the BNC. Three of these are given below:

(162) But I still don't know why Scano's boy risked going to the villa unless they’ve lost a guard too, which would really put them in difficulty. (BNC: CJX 2952)

(163) “Do you enjoy banking, Herr Wolff?” she risked asking. (BNC: HP0 2970)

(164) Dorothy and I are fortunate poets. Our publisher produced both our books traditionally. That means that someone else risked investing in publishing our books. (CPI.Q: The Christian Science Monitor)
In such cases the event expressed by the gerund-participle is clearly felt to coincide in time with that of the main verb.

With regard to the control relationship between the matrix and the complement, almost all cases in our corpus exhibit subject control. For instance, in (165) above, the understood subject of asking corresponds to that of the main verb, i.e. she. In (166), the understood realizer of investing is someone else. Two cases of non-subject control were also found, but as they constitute a very special type of use, they will be discussed in section 4.4.

3.3.3 Role of the Complement in the Construction

The gerund-participle is the direct object of the verb risk: in all our examples, it corresponds to ‘that which is risked’, thereby fulfilling the fundamental semantic criterion for direct object function. This is the case whether the complement represents a possible harm or whether it evokes a risky deed. For instance, in

(165) Any moderate risked being called a traitor. (Fillmore & Atkins 1992: 92)
(166) Few have risked challenging this. (BNC: EEN 36)

Being called and challenging both correspond to ‘that which is risked’.

Other tests confirm the semantic relationship which this function involves. Anaphoric reference to the direct object by means of a pronoun is one such test, as the examples below illustrate in reference to (165) and (166):

(167) Any moderate risked that.
(168) Few have risked it.

Pseudo-cleft constructions also confirm the gerund-participle’s function as a direct object:
(169) What any moderate risked was being called a traitor.

(170) Challenging this is what few have risked.

Finally, active/passive correspondences also yield grammatical results, as in the sentences below:

(171) Challenging this has been risked by few.

(172) Being called a traitor was not risked by any moderate.

When the complement corresponds evokes a possible harm, the passive sometimes sounds awkward, as it presents the information differently from the active construction and can be clumsy as a paraphrase with many clear cases of direct object function, as in example (92) seen earlier.

3.3.4 Explanation of Temporality and Control

We are now in a position to propose an explanation for temporal and control interpretations with the verb risk. Our observations show that temporal effects of simultaneity or subsequence are both possible. As the gerund-participle has the function of direct object in all uses, it identifies 'that which is risked', and its relation with its transitive matrix verb is basically non-temporal. This function, combined with the meaning of the gerund-participle which is simply to evoke an event holistically without any temporal reference, means that any temporal relationship perceived between risk and its complement is due to implications based on the actual meaning of the verb risk. When risk evokes the notion of potentially incurring harm, there is an impression of temporal subsequence, as in examples (159)-(161) above where the subject puts himself in a risky situation which might result in an undesirable or unpleasant result. Since this consequence has not happened yet, it is normal that the gerund-participle evokes its event as future and unrealized vis-à-vis the main verb’s event. On the other hand, when risk evokes the performing of a risky deed, the impression produced is necessarily one of simultaneity, as in (162)-(164). This temporal effect can be explained by the fact that if you risk doing something which could have some
unwanted or unfortunate consequences, both events, the risking and the risky deed represented by the complement, necessarily have to occur at the same time. Indeed, in this case the risking is the very performance of the risky deed itself.

With regards to control, the gerund-participle complement almost always shows subject control readings in our examples with risk. Here again, this effect is attributable to the semantic content of the matrix. If someone puts himself in a situation in which he may incur potential harm, it is usually the risker who brings down upon himself the actualization of the event, as in He risked losing his job. A few cases of non-subject control were however found when the gerund-participle corresponds to HARM; they will be discussed in section 4.4. As for the second sense of the verb risk, if someone performs some action which may have harmful consequences (DEED), this someone is perforce the author of the risky deed evoked by the -ing, as in She risked opening her eyes again. In this sense of risk, one risks something by performing it oneself, which explains the constant subject control reading.

3.4 THE VERBS VENTURE AND ADVENTURE

3.4.1 Lexical Meaning and Complementation

The verb venture is always found with the to-infinitive in our corpus. In total, 175 examples were collected from LOB, BROWN, and CPI.Q, including 90 examples from the BNC. The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary paraphrases venture + to-infinitive in the following terms: “to say or do something in a careful way, especially because it might upset or offend somebody” (p. 1697). Collins Cobuild states that “if you venture a question or a statement, you say it in a cautious hesitant manner because you are afraid it might be stupid or wrong” (p. 1860). Similarly, when discussing verbs which are similar verbs to venture, Hayakama (1994) comments that “when the purpose is to show some courteous disagreement or resolve, venture is preferred” as in “I venture to contradict you” (p. 490). In similar fashion, Webster's Third defines venture as “to dare or have the courage or
boldness to advance, offer, or put forward especially when rebuff, rejection, or censure seem likely to ensue” (p. 2441). While these definitions and paraphrases would be far too precise to account for all the examples of venture in our corpus, they do bring out the fact that, when someone ventures to do something, that person proceeds in a hesitant way. We thus propose that the meaning of venture is ‘to hesitantly advance into the unknown’. This is illustrated by the following examples:

(173) He never left our shores and he only once ventured to cross the border into Scotland. (BNC: J55 200)

(174) In the late seventeenth century, before union with England, the Scots ventured to carve out a colony in the New World--with fateful results. (CPLQ: Americas)

(175) Ministers are reluctant to believe that Your Majesty's resolve is irrevocable and still venture to hope that before Your Majesty pronounces any formal decision Your Majesty may be pleased to reconsider an intention which must so deeply and so vitally affect all Your Majesty's subjects. (BNC: EFN 2077)

(176) There's a small restaurant just off the main beach road in Colombo, Sri Lanka's capital city, whose curries are so violent that local residents seldom venture to recommend it to their foreign friends. (CPLQ: Newsweek International)

(177) In the light of the quite different issue which was before the House in Gillick's case I venture to doubt whether Lord Scarman meant more than that the exclusive right of the parents to consent to treatment terminated, but I may well be wrong. (BNC: FDC 160)

(178) I venture to write and enquire if you would oblige me by calling at this Officer, at some time convenient to yourself: I am not at liberty to offer any further information at this juncture, but I think I may say that our meeting will be to your advantage. (BNC: FPM 2407)

The hesitancy or the cautious manner in which one proceeds when venturing to do something is even more explicit in the following examples:

(179) With apologies to Winston Churchill I venture to mis-quote: “Never has so much rubbish been written by a few, against so many.” (BNC: BN3 1624)
(180) All of Henderson's novels have a crisp authority and a snappy pace. This one is about Kelly Jacobs, a lifeguard and widow of a navy Seal, who slowly ventures to love again even as the past returns to haunt her. (CPI.Q: Booklist)

(181) I read Keith Crain's Nov. 14 column on fixed-price selling as the "next big idea," and not knowing his background in the auto business, other than this publication, I would venture to say that he has never sold a car in his life. (CPI.Q: Automotive News)

(182) I would venture to suggest that many of the potential No votes could be converted to Yes if the prime minister were to resign before Oct. 26. Most of us would feel safer about loopholes in the Constitution if he were not lurking in the towers, or anywhere else, of power. (CPI.Q: Globe & Mail)

(183) May I venture to say what I really think about Eastern women and Western women? Frankly, I think the Western women are more sensible, less freakish, more solid, than many of the women we see in New York and other large Eastern cities. (CPI.Q: Forbes)

In (179), the speaker cautiously apologizes in advance because he knows Churchill might have objected to this use of his famous phrase referring to the heroism of RFA pilots in World War II. In (180), the use of the adverb *slowly*, pertaining to how the subject ventures to love again, tells of her reluctance to do so. In examples (181) and (182), the modal *would* highlights the hesitation of the subjects, as *would* is used here to hedge the speaker's statement, presenting the venturing as a mere possibility. Finally, (183) is interesting because the subject feels the need to politely ask for permission before going ahead and saying what he thinks.

The element of risk, which is common to all the verbs under study here, is present in the meaning of *venture* because of the unknown territory into which the subject advances. Contained in this 'unknown', there are things that could happen, possible unwanted consequences and unfortunate events, which prompt the subject who goes forward with some action to do so hesitantly and cautiously. In Fillmore & Atkins' terminology the to-infinitive in *venture + to*-infinitive constructions represents DEED, something the subject does which might cause potential harm. This possible harm is generally not mentioned explicitly, although it is explicit in some examples like (184) below:
At the risk of being treated as a terrible simplifier I venture to assert that the author of Daniel 7:12 was evidently writing or at least putting the last touches to his prophecies immediately after the reconsecration of the Temple (in December 164?). (BNC: H0K 1685)

Here, the speaker commits the deed of asserting that the author of Daniel 7:12 was evidently writing or at least putting the last touches to his prophecies immediately after the reconsecration of the Temple. The speaker runs the risk of being treated as a terrible simplifier.

In addition to the element of risk implied by the meaning of the verb venture, going forward hesitantly into unknown territory implicitly requires courage. This explains the fact that venture is sometimes felt to be akin to the verb dare, as in the following:

(185) Father Tom ventures to help where others no longer dare. (CPL.Q: The Christian Science Monitor)

(186) Dorothy Lipovenko has bravely ventured to question current ideology - an ideology which equates institutionalized abortion with women's best interests. (CPL.Q: Globe & Mail)

(187) Any man who gets to be the managing editor of the New York Times can safely be described as a man blessed with self-confidence. E. Clifton Daniel, now 75, demonstrated that quality anew last week when he ventured to name the ten most important headlines of the 20th century. (CPL.Q: Time)

In (185), it seems obvious that to help 'where no others dare' requires Father Tom to be brave. The adjective bravely is used in (186) to describe in which state of mind the subject was when she ventured to question current ideology. Finally, the context in (187) tells us that E. Clifton Daniel is a self-confident man, and that he showed it when he ventured to name the ten most important headlines of the 20th century; he thus demonstrated courage and bravery. In these three examples, the verb venture could be replaced with dare without a great difference in meaning.

As for the verbs used as complements of venture in our corpus, they are quite varied, although this verb shows a natural affinity for verbs of linguistic expression: of the
90 examples gathered from the BNC, 67 are construed with verbs such as say, suggest, affirm, ask, address, add, write, mis-quote, disagree, question, propose, express, criticise and tell, representing more than 73% of all occurrences of the verb venture. The fact that 'hesitantly going forward into the unknown' has an affinity for this type of verbs seems logical: we often feel a hesitation before saying something, not knowing how it is going to be received. With verbs of linguistic expression, the unwanted consequence of the venturing is generally understood to be rejection, rebuff, or censure, although this is rarely mentioned explicitly in the context.

Having clarified the semantics of venture, the question of why it never occurs with the gerund-participle still remains to be answered. We hypothesize that the idea of ‘hesitantly advancing into the unknown’ has a natural affinity with the idea of movement expressed by the preposition to. This is confirmed by the occurrence of the verb venture with many other prepositions expressing movement, such as towards, into, in, inside, beyond, along, out, away, and forward:

(188) It was only nine years since Charles Sturt had returned, starving and almost blind, from discovering the Darling and the Murray Rivers; it was to be another five years before he ventured towards the centre of Australia in search of that mythical inland sea. (BNC: HRB 525)

(189) Cautiously she ventured into her own bedroom first. (BNC: G1S 2586)

(190) In a fortunate moment I noticed a sign reading Jardin de Paris Restaurant Français, and abandoning Anastasia on a pavement, a procedure to which East Europeans do not seem to take exception, I ventured in to discover whether anyone spoke French. (BNC: AE8 1463)

(191) I am the owner of this theatre and you should have sought my permission before you ventured inside, young lady. (BNC: CKD 1681)

---

3 This type of usage seems to be connected also to the construction start + to say, discussed in Duffley 2006a. Indeed, in examples like He started to say something, but thought better of it (Freed 1979 in Duffley 2006a: 92), we see a movement caught in the middle because the speaker suddenly realized the possible consequences of his statement. This type of use is a manifestation of the fact that we sometimes hesitate before saying something, because we might suffer some possible unwanted consequences. However, as we shall see later, these two uses differ with regards to the actualization of the event evoked by the infinitival complement. In the case of start + to say, the complement's event is understood to be non-realized; with venture + to + any verb of linguistic expression, the event represented by the complement is understood to be actualized.
One of the most popular misconceptions about the past is that our ancestors were rooted in one particular place, that they rarely ventured beyond their restricted horizons and that consequently they were limited in their outlook and in their knowledge of life beyond the parish. (BNC: HWD 348)

The rain came as I reached the drive of the hotel, set amongst trees, and I ventured along it in search of shelter. (BNC: CJD 271)

It only ventures out at night, and spends most of its time up in trees or scrambling through scrub. (BNC: K24 951)

But most of all eagles wanted to see the young take flight, and venture away from their parents and explore the world where they, like the adults, must learn to survive the winter. (BNC: FP3 1065)

The point is that we will never know what God can do with us until we've ventured forward with a little faith. (BNC: G5H 214)

In addition to these prepositions, which all indicate some kind of movement, the verb venture is also found with the preposition to construed with a noun complement:

He ventured to the Blighted Isle in search of his father's armour. (BNC: CM1 748)

In 1863 he led a tour to Paris and Switzerland; in 1864 he ventured to Italy with parties of tourists. (BNC: ASJ 245)

Examples (197) and (198) show the preposition to in its stereotypical use, denoting a physical movement in space from one point to another. Overall, the examples presented above illustrate the very strong binding between the verb venture and the idea of movement, which accounts for its construal with the to + infinitive construction rather than with the gerund-participle.

As regards the verb adventure, no occurrence of this verb followed directly by a to-infinitive or a gerund-participle was found in either the BNC, LOB, BROWN and CPLQ.

When the number of examples found in the BNC, LOB, BROWN and CPLQ proved insufficient for our purposes, we conducted a search on the Internet, using Google. In these cases, we looked for a combination of adventure (conjugated) + to-infinitive or gerund-participle with 5 highly frequent verbs (say, get, go, be, have). For each search, we looked at a maximum of 10 pages of results, for a total of 100 hits per separate
The small number of examples found shows that the verb *adventure* is a rather infrequent means for expressing risk. Moreover, one third of the examples found dated from the 19th century, which suggests that this verb is somewhat archaic. This would explain why some dictionaries (cf. *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*) do not even list *adventure* as a verb anymore, but only as a noun.

Historically, the verb *adventure* is closely related to the verb *venture*. The former developed as an aphetic form of the latter in the 15th century (*Oxford English Dictionary Online*). A look at dictionary definitions of the verb *adventure* shows that the two are indeed very close in meaning. “To dare, to run the risk, make the experiment; to go as far as, to venture” is one sense of *adventure* according to the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Again, in ‘to go as far to’, we see the idea of forward movement expressed. Similarly, *Webster’s Third* defines *adventure* as “to expose to possible danger or loss”, giving *risk* and *venture* as synonyms (p. 31) Another sense given by this dictionary for *adventure* is “to suggest venturesomely: *adventure* an opinion” (p. 31). However, the latter cannot be held to be the meaning of *adventure*; it is rather the meaning of this verb followed by a direct object. Moreover, ‘to adventure an opinion’ does not mean ‘to suggest’, but ‘to put forward into unknown territory’. Our hypothesis as to the meaning of *adventure* is that it is similar, if not identical, to *venture*, i.e. ‘to hesitantly advance into the unknown’, but that it is felt to be archaic. With *adventure*, one also feels a clearer sense of adventuresomeness; thus, in its intransitive use, *adventure* could be said to mean ‘to advance adventurously into the unknown’. In its transitive use, *adventure* can be defined as ‘to put forward hesitantly or adventurously into the unknown’.

5 As it is the case with other verbs studied here, not all uses of the verb *adventure* carry an element of risk. For instance, in the following example, *adventured* pretty much means “happened”: “And perchance this cap did him as much good when he was dead, as it would have done if he had been living. Sure I am, that faithful linen did him far more service, which *adventured* to go down with him into the grave, for the winding of his body therein.”

(books.google.ca/books?id=21tnpV1w6QC&pg=PA276&lpg=PA276&dq=%22adventured+to+go%22&source=web&ots=Ho21DAq0J&sig=vfKsKPxuEWHAdCL_XtE9pC0K0&hl=fr&sa=X&oi=book_result&resnum=5&ct=result).
The following examples bring out the hesitancy of the subject in going forward into something which he is not too comfortable with:

(199) A friend of mine, who I will henceforth refer to as Musical G, or maybe just G, invited me to find a date and go surfing. I will admit that I have adventured to go surfing before, but it wasn't of the least embarrassing circumstances I've ever been in. While it is true that I enjoyed myself immensely, I can't help but think that a date situation that is set up to make you look like a complete fool may not be the best idea. (yellowlives.blogspot.com/2007/09/major-bubbles-needs-date.html)

(200) My first shopping experience: I spent Sunday walking around, doing a little shopping. I went to the grocery store for some coffee (hello caffeine headaches!), and a few other department stores and street markets. This was the first time I was alone since I arrived in Taiyuan. I was the center of attention in every shop I was in. People stared, pointed, smiled, laughed, said hello, said things to me in Chinese, looked at me, tapped their friends and then they looked over too, followed me around, started looking at whatever I was looking at - as if they never noticed it before. I was never scared or nervous, but I admit I was completely self-conscious and not used to so much attention. Of course, I always smiled and nodded and pretended not to notice or care, but between you and me, it sorta freaked me out. I walked around for about 2 hours and then I just couldn't take it anymore. I mean, people at work stare at me, and I've been going out to dinner with my colleagues every night where people on the street stare at us (mostly me because I'm a woman), but this is the first time I was all alone. I imagine this is something that one would get used to, but it hasn't happened to me yet. The downside of feeling so watched was that I was too embarrassed to take a lot of pictures that I would have normally taken.

It's a week later and I adventured to go shopping again. While I knew better where to go and had an idea of stuff I wanted to get, I still didn't enjoy all the attention I received. I tried to remember what my mother told me, that many people probably have never seen a woman like me, except maybe on TV, and that I am an ambassador of America and I should be proud... oh, blah blah. You try walking down a crowded street with everyone and their brother looking at you and pointing. (www.sharonline.net/china/index.htm)

Example (200) is particularly interesting: the long context shows why shopping caused hesitation on the part of the speaker, as shopping in the Chinese city of Taiyuan proved to be quite an adventurous enterprise for this blogger. The examples below clearly illustrate the close relation between the verbs adventure and venture:
(201) Trustee Arends adventured to say we would have accomplished the same things without the lobbyist. The reason she made the motion to not include the lobbyist is because she does not think he is worth $36,000 a year and she added, as has been told to us by many, the school disconnection process has been stymied for quite some time.
(www.village.bartlett.il.us/assets/pdfs/agendasminutes/minutes/brd/080401brd.pdf)

(202) I adventured to say, so far as discretion did go, in defence of our friend, and did urge much in behalf of youth and enticing love, which did often abate of right measures in fair ladies; all which did nothing soothe her highness’ anger, who said, “I have made her my servant, and she will now make herself my mistress; but, in good faith, William, she shall not, and so tell her.”
(books.google.ca/books?id=rd0IAAAAAIAAJ&pg=PA107&lpg=PA107&dq=%22adventured+to+say%22&source=web&ots=oBcMmXpCcq&sig=MnI6HBNLnu0L0bs1wUhYGWdzKY&hl=fr&sa=X&oi=book_result&resnum=7&ct=result)

This type of use corresponds to much more the common structure *venture* + *to say* : as does *venture* mean ‘to put forward hesitantly into the unknown’, so that *adventure* could be replaced here by the verb *venture* without much change in meaning.

As with *venture*, all of the examples of *adventure* in the corpus are construed with the *to*-infinitive, a fact which is explainable by this verb’s lexical meaning: the idea of ‘advancing adventurously into the unknown’ has a natural affinity with the idea of movement expressed by the preposition *to*. Moreover, the fact that *adventure* also occurs with a wide range of prepositions indicating movement lends strength to this argument. In the following examples, *adventure* occurs with the prepositions *down, towards, away, along, forward, beyond, and into*:

(203) So I left Pete to do the hard work while I adventured down the “world’s most dangerous road” from La Paz to Coroico on a mountain bike and spent 2 days relaxing around a pool in the jungle-like mountains of Coroico.
(www.travelpod.com/travelblogentries/worldroarmers/s._america_2006/1146349260/tpod.html)

(204) We were surprised to find when we arrived that it was snowing out! And I don’t mean just a little, it was practically a blizzard! Nonetheless we adventured towards our first stop, Anne Frank’s House.
(ajg8-londoncalling.blogspot.com/2008_04_01_archive.html)
This rooster adventured away from home down to the river...
(www.suemorrisonfineart.com/gallery/1699/Shoreline%20Birds/)

We adventured along the beach and found it full of cute little hermit crabs, nice rocks and shells, tons of coconuts.
(drivingsocrates.com/ecosystems-are-inward-as-much-as-outward-facing-part-i)

He brought humor and a colorful personality to the lives of his many friends, and inspired others to believe in themselves as they adventured forward in life.
(www.idahotributes.com/search/show_listing/2387)

The Bronco broke a lot of new ground, offering the best of both freeway and off-road driving, opening up the big country to Americans who had seldom adventured beyond shopping malls and interstate highway rest areas.

Emily Carr was an artist who boldly adventured into the British Columbia landscape and recorded the beauty of the forests in her home province.
(www.carleton.ca/gallery/schoolwork/emilycarrpage.html)

These examples illustrate the very strong semantic binding between the verb adventure and the idea of movement, which accounts for this verb's construal with the to-infinitive construction rather than with the gerund-participle.

### 3.4.2 Temporal and Control Effects

In all uses of both the verbs venture and adventure in the corpus, the infinitival complement’s event is felt to be subsequent with respect to that of the main verb, corresponding to a realized result of the venturing, as in:

I venture to suggest, however, that you are probably, in common with most people, doing some parts of the process but not all of it. (BNC: B2F 685)

Yet they adventured to go back; but it was so dark, and the flood so high, that in their going back they had like to have been drowned nine or ten times.
(books.google.ca/books?id=zgIDAAAAQAAJ&pg=PA118&lpg=PA118&dq=%22adventured+to+go%22&source=web&ots=PShfzJeDA&sig=kOfY2
As regards the type of control relationship seen between the verbs *venture* and *adventure* as main verbs and the to-infinitive as complement, one always observes subject control. For instance, in (210) and (211) above, the subject of the main verb is understood to be the actual realizer of the infinitive’s event.

### 3.4.3 Role of the Complement in the Construction

The to-infinitive does not fulfill the role of a direct object with the verbs *venture* and *adventure*, but rather that of result-specifier. First, it is not felt to correspond to ‘that which is ventured/adventured’. In

(212) Later chroniclers attempted to compile this information into histories of the Empire, and some ventured to make lists of reigning Emperors. (BNC: CN173)

(213) The Indians maintained afterwards that white men were then skulking about near to us, and that they had seen them from the inside of their houses, though no one adventured to go out to search for them. (publications.ohiohistory.org/ohстemplate.cfm?action=detail&Page=022226.html&StartPage=205&EndPage=266&volume=22&newtitle=Volume%2022%20Page%2020205)

*to make lists* and *to go* are not felt to be ‘that which is ventured/adventured’. Consequently, the to-infinitive cannot be construed as subject of a corresponding passive construction:

(214) * To make lists of reigning Emperors was ventured by some.

(215) * To go out to search for them was adventured by no one.

Anaphoric reference by means of a pronoun is not possible either:

(216) *Some ventured that / it.

(217) Some ventured to.
Examples (217) and (219) show that to is the preferred preposition for substitution. Pseudo-cleft constructions also yield questionable results:

(220) * What some ventured was to make lists of reigning Emperors.
(221) * To make lists of reigning Emperors was what some ventured.
(222) * What no one adventured was to go out to search for them.
(223) * To go out to search for them was what no one adventured.

The to-infinitive functions rather as an adverbial result specifier when it is used as complement of venture and adventure. With both of these verbs the infinitival phrase denotes the destination to which the ‘hesitantly advancing into the unknown’ leads.

3.4.4 Explanation of Temporality and Control

All of the pieces are in place to propose an explanation for temporal and control interpretations with the verbs venture and adventure. With regards to temporality, as with other cases of actualization observed with a to-infinitive complement, there is a relationship of result-type subsequence between the matrix and the complement’s event. The relationship between these two verbs and the infinitival complement is similar to that observed with verbs of achievement like manage:

(224) Using both hands, she managed to unlock the door. (BNC: FS2 473)

In (224), the verb manage means ‘to deal successfully with a challenging situation’, a lexical meaning which always implies actualization of the to-infinitive complement’s event: the meaning of the preposition to is that of a movement potentially leading to a point, and so the infinitive is seen as that to which the main verb’s event leads. There is
consequently a before/after relation in time between the ‘dealing with a challenging situation’ and the result achieved, since the successful struggling leads to the unlocking of the door.

The same type of subsequent result impression is at work with *venture* and *adventure*. Since the lexical meanings of *venture* and *adventure* involves the notion of a movement leading into unknown territory, the infinitive’s event is understood to correspond to this unknown territory and therefore to be actualized, just as with *manage*. Indeed, ‘to advance hesitantly / adventurously into the unknown’ necessarily leads to the presence of the subject in the unknown territory, a resulting situation to which certain unknown risks are attached. The following examples allow us to see more clearly this before/after relationship in time between the verb *venture* and its *to-*infinitive complement:

(225) A couple of summers ago, Rich and I ventured to Poland for a holiday.
(boakes.org/category/general/travel/europe/poland/)

(226) Two or three patrons had ventured to sit down at a table, but they wore the restless look of one in haste to catch a train.

Example (225), where the verb *venture* is followed by the preposition *to* and a noun, illustrates the notion of movement in space between a point A occupied by the subjects before the venturing actually occurred, and a point B, which is Poland. Poland is thus the end-point of the movement in space signified by the preposition *to*, giving rise to a before/after position in space. In (226), we have the same relationship of subsequence, but what we see is a movement in time. In the *to* + infinitive construction, the bare stem acts as the end-point of the movement signified by *to*. In this case, the verb *sit* is the terminal point, and henceforth the resulting situation ensuing upon the ‘hesitantly advancing into the unknown’. Thus, the meanings of *venture* and *adventure*, combined with the meaning of the *to-*infinitive and its function, explain the constant temporal effect of subsequence observed with these verbs when they are followed by an infinitival complement.
Now that we have a better understanding of temporal relationships with these verbs, we are better equipped to compare the verbs *venture* and *risk* in this regard. The following examples will help to bring out the difference in meaning between these two verbs, and the respective temporal relationships they give rise to when construed with a complement:

(227) Some 50 years ago, Australian physician John Cade observed the calming effect that lithium had on small animals. After testing the safety of lithium on himself, Cade ventured to try it on people suffering from the wild mood swings of manic depression. (CPI.Q: *Science News*)

(228) Cade risked trying it on people suffering from the wild mood swings of manic depression.

(229) In the late seventeenth century, before union with England, the Scots ventured to carve out a colony in the New World--with fateful results. (CPI.Q: *Americas*)

(230) The Scots risked carving out a colony in the New World with fateful results.

When examples (227) and (229) are paraphrased with *risk* + -ing, we observe a relationship of simultaneity between the main verb and its complement, instead of one of subsequence as is the case with *venture* + to-infinitive. In examples (228) and (230), *risk* means 'to perform a risky deed', which necessarily entails that the deed and the performance of this deed are simultaneous in time. In the parallel constructions with *venture* + to-infinitive, *venture* means 'to hesitantly advance into unknown territory' and the advancing leads to the presence of the subject in unknown territory. The complement’s event is understood to be actualized with both *risk* and *venture*, but the lexical meaning of each verb and the meaning and function of their respective complements give rise to a different relationship in time between the matrix and the complement.

As regards control, we saw that both *venture* and *adventure* produce constant subject control readings. Again, this impression is the logical product of the interactions between the meaning of the to-infinitive, its function as complement, and the lexical meaning of the main verb. For instance, in (228), *venture* implies a movement towards the result represented by the infinitive, and *to* simply links the matrix and the infinitive *sit* as the term to which this movement leads. Accordingly, it comes as no surprise that the
realizer of the ‘hesitantly advancing into the unknown’ is logically understood to be the same as that of the sitting. In fact, one could not venture or adventure to perform an action which is carried out by someone else than oneself.

3.5 THE VERB HAZARD

3.5.1 Lexical Meaning and Complementation

The verb hazard occurs with both the to-infinitive and the gerund-participle complements in our corpus. The data however suggest a tendency for construal with the infinitive, with 45 cases as opposed to 19 with the -ing. All our examples were gathered on the Internet, as the verb hazard was never found to occur with these complements in our main corpuses.\(^6\) This suggests that this verb is less frequent in Modern English in comparison to risk and venture.

With the infinitive, the verb hazard evokes a meaning which is best described as ‘to go ahead and actualize a hazardous event’:

(231) I hazard to say that you could open one of these on your living room carpet with no worries whatsoever. (www.aquahobby.com/products/e_eheim_professional_canister_filters.php)

(232) We hazard to say that no military has ever been more discriminating and gone to such lengths to avoid inflicting civilian casualties. (www.nybooks.com/articles/15540)

(233) I would hazard to guess that more accidents are caused by people using their cell phones while driving than by people who had been drinking. (www.topix.com/forum/city/bridgeport-ct/T6S7C8MNC174LOBQE)

(234) I would hazard to guess that this book is intended for the "arm-chair naturalist." Very few of us can afford vacations to the distant locales where

\(^6\) As for the verb venture, we looked for a combination of hazard (conjugated) + to-infinitive or gerund-participle with the verbs say, get, go, be, and have. A separate search for “would hazard to say/saying” and “would hazard to guess/guessing” was also conducted, as these were felt to be frequent occurrences of hazard.
many of the marine mammals in this book live.  
(www.amazon.com/review/R3V6A7QC514RJD)

(235) We ride the Colorado river below the Parker strip to stay away from the nuts like this, and only on weekdays do we hazard to go near Havasu or Needles.  
(www.sea-doo.net/board/thread.asp?threadid=93681)

In these sentences, the subject puts forward an opinion and exposes himself to possible rebuff, censure or rejection. This type of use of hazard + to say/guess is very similar to the very frequent occurrence of venture + to + verbs of linguistic expression. These examples with hazard could be paraphrased with venture without a significant difference in meaning: the notion of ‘to hesitantly advance into the unknown’ is closely akin to that of ‘to go forward and actualize a hazardous event’. With both verbs, the subject feels hesitant; however, with hazard a greater sense of tentativeness is felt. Quite rightly, Webster’s New Dictionary of Synonyms describes hazard as suggesting “more uncertainty or precariousness than venture and less hope of a favourable outcome” (p. 857). This nuance in meaning felt between the two verbs is due to the potential meaning of the word hazard, as the latter carries more implication of danger or chance than the word venture. If someone goes on a venture, danger is not always implied in such an enterprise; the subject may simply venture to an exotic or exciting destination for instance. The nuance between these two verbs is best seen in the following examples:

(236) Stifling a giggle, she hazarded a guess that the wardrobe would be full of the son’s clothes. (BNC: AMC 606)

(237) Stifling a giggle, she ventured a guess that the wardrobe would be full of the son’s clothes.

The verb hazard presents the guess as more chancy than venture does.

The frequent occurrence of would preceding the verb hazard in our corpus is a further testimony to the subject’s hesitation in ‘going forward and actualizing the event’, as in (233)-(234) above and the following:
In spite of being what seemed like the busiest day in several years, I would hazard to say that (Dr. Embry's) presentation was one of the best received this year. (www.cspg.org/students/students-outreach-lecture.cfm)

I would hazard to say that this was sloppy political work and that someone needs a new lawyer. (www.moralhealth.com/blog/_archives/2007/8/30/3193167.html)

And I would even hazard to say that it wasn't made to be watched; sometimes an artist endeavours to do something totally different and new and original, and while occasionally it is groundbreaking and incredible, usually it isn't. (everything2.com/node/692122)

I would hazard to guess that if you stopped 10000 Torontonians on the street and asked them who John Abell was they wouldn't have a clue. (citynoise.org/article/5488)

Indeed, the modal would brings out more clearly the uncertainty or the hesitancy of the subject in hazarding to say or guess something. This type of use of would is a common occurrence with verbs of saying and guessing as in:

I would say that she was almost better than Churchill. (BNC: AJD 1273)

I would guess quite a bit of money goes into the local economy. (BNC: KRL 3913)

As with venture and adventure, the complement in hazard + to-infinitive constructions always represents DEED. When hazard is followed by an infinitival complement, the subject goes forward and actualizes a hazardous deed which might result in unfortunate or unwanted consequences. The possible harm is not mentioned explicitly in the context, but it can generally be inferred. It is in this potential hazard that the element of risk present in all the verbs considered for this study lies. It is also because of this hazard that the subject feels hesitation prior to going ahead and actualizing the complement's event. Not surprisingly, as with venture and adventure, the verb hazard can also be paraphrased easily with the verb dare in certain cases, as in the following:

So I hazarded to go to Puncher's home, hoping that I would meet my heart's desire, bent over a basin of washing, singing the familiar Christmas carol.
Indeed, ‘to go ahead and actualize a hazardous event’ implicitly requires courage or bravery, a notion which is prominent in the meaning of the verb dare. Hazard to say can also be paraphrased as ‘be so bold as to say’ in some cases.

On the other hand, similarly to the verb risk, hazard can have two different actual meanings when it is construed with the gerund-participle: DEED or HARM. In the following set of examples, the verb hazard means ‘to face a potential hazard’:

(245) While pet shops may meet these prices, without the above guarantees you hazard getting an animal that may have been culled from a breeder's stock, a rancher's unwanted leftovers or from an inexperienced breeder. (www.petplace.com/small-mammals/buying-a-chinchilla/page1.aspx)

(246) To simply enjoy himself and his life, without constantly toning himself down and checking the depressive pulse of others, meant he hazarded being seen as a traitorous villain and, as a consequence, ending up in total isolation. (books.google.ca/books?id=HvJiENVaRUMC&pg=PA303&lpg=PA303&dq=%22hazard%22&source=web&ots=fPNkJibfDC&sig=xGUA2m\n
(247) To refuse the honour proposed would have been uncourteous, I might say ungracious: in accepting it, I hazarded being thought ostentatious. (books.google.ca/books?id=M3MoFShNJZQC&pg=PA64&lpg=PA64&dq=%22hazard%22&source=web&ots=u2gN47XMxb&sig=9JSAC1KeHR3x52fD5s1YuDwfg&hl=fr&sa=X&oi=book_result&resnum=5&ct=result #PPA304,M1)

In this type of use, the meaning of hazard is very similar to that of the verb risk. It is thus no surprise that in all cases of hazard with a gerund-participle denoting a possible hazard in our corpus, the main verb could be paraphrased by risk without much change in meaning. However, in all our examples of hazard + being, the potential hazard is always some
damage to the subject’s reputation. In the light of this, it seems like this sense of *hazard* is slightly more specific than *risk*, which might also explain its less frequent occurrence.

In addition to this actual meaning, *hazard* can also mean ‘to perform a hazardous deed’, as in the following:

(248) At the risk of making one of William Blake's idiotic generalizations, I might hazard saying that in the 1960s and '70s there existed a sort of dichotomy between prayer and action in the priesthood, resulting at times in a failure to integrate both into the one following of Jesus Christ.
(www.ewtn.com/library/PRIESTS/PRLIFEPR.TXT)

(249) My next teacher was livid that his predecessor had instructed a relative novice to such a potentially hazardous method. My dad and grandfather, both accomplished cornetists and trumpeters, didn't like the idea either. I quit it and have never hazarded going back to it since. That was 60 years ago. Wow!!!!!!!

(250) No sooner had the news of the "Black Hawk Purchase" spread through Illinois, Indiana and Ohio than a crowd of settlers from those states, fired with the tales of the wonderful beauty and fertility of the land included in the Purchase strip, began to hurry by team and flat boat to the Mississippi. Many of them, though the land was not open to settlement until the first of June, hazarded getting across the river early in the spring and squatting on the land.
(iagenweb.org/boards/clayton/biographies/index.cgi?rev=63798)

(251) I've never been to an SF convention! I like SF on film and TV, but have never hazarded going to a convention.
(members.ozemail.com.au/~bcoster/jo_anne_home.htm)

In these examples, the complement’s event represents a hazardous deed which the subject performs. As shown above regarding *hazard + to*-infinitive, there is felt to be less certainty about the outcome. In some cases, such as (248)-(250) for instance, *hazard* can be replaced by *risk* while keeping the essentials of its meaning. In others such as (251), the main verb is best paraphrased with *dare + to*-infinitive, because of the greater emphasis on boldness.
3.5.2 Temporal and Control Effects

One observes a temporal relation of result-type subsequence between the main verb *hazard* and the to-infinitive complement, the complement’s event always being understood to be realized as a result of the actualization of the main verb’s event, as in the following examples:

(252) This is, I hazard to say, probably the most overrated book in the history of the literary world. (www.amazon.com/review/RLSRG9CBLNHUN)

(253) Leaving out a few prominent blogs like Andrew Sullivan's, I would hazard to guess that most people who read blogs are bloggers themselves. It is truly an echo chamber. (blogs.salon.com/0002486/)

In both of these uses, the event represented by the infinitival complement is felt to be actually accomplished as the actualized result of ‘going ahead and actualizing a hazardous event.’

In the cases where *hazard* is followed by a gerund-participle, a temporal impression of future-type subsequence can also be observed in some cases. For instance, in:

(254) As the de-Anglicizing message caught on over the next decade, those who attempted "to snuff out [Gaelic] by their tacit discouragement" hazarded being reproached as anti-national and as betraying unbecoming cultural cringe”.

(255) The appropriate role of the Jewish community towards black civil rights activism was not a simple matter, Hertzberg contended, and although one hazarded being labeled "a white 'Uncle Tom' " if one was "anything less than vocally doctrinaire" in support of the black freedom struggle, nonetheless, “this danger must be risked”. 
the events *being reproached* and *being labelled* are situated at a future point in time with respect to the performance of the hazardous deed. Simultaneity effects are also observed when *hazard* is followed by a gerund-participle, as in the context below:

(256) Where you really noticed a difference was with the starters: the lamb chops, while delicious, were a little dry and tough, as was the chicken. Surprisingly, I'd hazard saying it was the fish tikka which held up best. I'd still prefer to eat from the menu though!
(eatingleeds.co.uk/2007/12/aagrah-and-pizza-express.html)

Here, the event *saying* is felt to coincide in time with that expressed by the matrix.

With regard to control, the infinitive and the gerund-participle both show constant subject control readings with *hazard* as the main verb, i.e. the latter's subject is always understood to be the actual realizer of the complement's event, as in all of the uses quoted so far.

### 3.5.3 Role of the Complement in the Construction

The *to*-infinitive following the verb *hazard*, as in (257) below, does not play the role of direct object, as it does not correspond to 'that which is hazarded':

(257) Few have hazarded to say such nonsense to the judge.

This is confirmed by the fact that it cannot be paraphrased by means of a passive construction in which it fills the role of subject:

(258) * To say such nonsense has been hazarded by few.

It is also impossible to substitute the *to*-infinitive by a direct object pronoun, as the following illustrate:

(259) * Few have hazarded it/that.
Few have hazarded to.

To is the preferred preposition for anaphoric reference in such cases. Finally, pseudo-clefting does not work very well either:

(261) * What few have hazarded is to say such nonsense.

(262) * To say such nonsense is what few have hazarded.

We therefore argue here that the infinitive with hazard, as with venture and adventure above, acts as an adverbial result specifier. Consequently, the to-infinitive denotes the result of ‘going forward and actualizing a hazardous event’.

The gerund-participle following the verb hazard, on the other hand, does function as the direct object of the matrix, and this is true whether the complement represents a potential hazard or a hazardous deed. Thus, in the following, the -ing corresponds to ‘that which is hazarded’:

(263) Few fish will hazard getting eaten by an anemone simply for the chance to snack on the crab. (reefkeeping.com/issues/2004-08/reefslides/index.php)

(264) Many of them, though the land was not open to settlement until the first of June, hazarded getting across the river early in the spring and squatting on the land. (iagenweb.org/boards/clayton/biographies/index.cgi?rev=63798)

This function is confirmed by the test of passivization:

(265) Getting eaten by an anemone will be hazarded by few fish.

(266) Getting across the river was hazarded by many of them.

Pronoun substitution and pseudo-clefting also yield grammatical results:

(267) Few fish will hazard that.

(268) Many of them hazarded it.
(269) What few fish will hazard is getting eaten by an anemone.

(270) Getting across the river was what many of them hazarded.

3.5.4 Explanation of Temporality and Control

Now that we have looked at the different parameters in play, we can propose an explanation for temporal and control effects with the verb *hazard*. As regards temporality when the matrix is followed by an infinitival complement, an effect of result-type subsequence was constantly observed in our corpus. The relationship felt between the two verbs is of the same type as that observed with the verbs *venture, adventure* and *manage*. In 3.5.1, we argued that the meaning of *hazard* is ‘to go ahead and actualize a hazardous event’, and we also pointed out the subject’s hesitation to do so: overcoming this prior phase of hesitation before going forward to perform the infinitive’s event constitutes a precondition to the actualization of that event. The following examples illustrate this relation more clearly:

(271) So I hazarded to go to Puncher’s home, hoping that I would meet my heart’s desire, bent over a basin of washing, singing the familiar Christmas carol.

(272) So I went to Puncher’s home, hoping that I would meet my heart’s desire, bent over a basin of washing, singing the familiar Christmas carol.

In (271), the hazarding is conceived as a movement in time leading to the actualization of the going: after overcoming his hesitation, the subject finally went ahead and actually realized the hazardous event of going to Puncher’s home. This impression of a prior phase of overcoming hesitation is totally absent from (272). In all uses of *hazard + to-infinitive* found in our corpus, the movement signified by *to* is always completed, thus giving rise to the impression of a result. Thus, the meaning of *hazard*, combined with the meaning of the *to-infinitive* and its function, can explain the constant temporal impression of result-type subsequence observed in our corpus.
On the other hand, when the gerund-participle is used with *hazard*, our observations show that temporal effects of simultaneity or subsequence are both possible, as is the case with the verb *risk*. As argued earlier, the gerund-participle has the function of direct object in the uses observed, identifying ‘that which is hazarded’. Since the direct object relation to the main verb is basically non-temporal and the *-ing* simply evokes the event in a holistic way, any temporal relationship between the main verb and its complement is due to the meaning of the transitive verb. When the impression felt between *hazard* and the gerund-participle’s event is that of subsequence, the latter always evokes a potential hazard. When this is the case, as in example (265) above, the subject faces a possible unwanted consequence. It is thus logical that the gerund-participle evokes its event as future vis-à-vis the main verb, this possible hazard not having been actualized yet. As for the impression of simultaneity, the verb *hazard* always means ‘to perform a hazardous deed’ in this case. This is easily explainable by the fact that if you hazard doing something which could bring harm upon you, the hazarding and the hazardous deed necessarily coincide in time: the hazarding is indeed the very performance of that deed. This correlation between the actual meaning of *hazard* and that of its complement, being either HARM or DEED, is consistent with what was observed for the verb *risk*.

When comparing the respective occurrences of the *to*-infinitive and the gerund-participle with *hazard*, it is interesting to observe that some verbs can occur with both types of complement:

(273) They censor, they edit, they constrict, they limit without anybody telling them what to do. That is the nature of the business and I would hazard to say that it always has been.
(www.masternewmedia.org/2005/05/23/the_future_of_news_is.htm)

(274) Where you really noticed a difference was with the starters: the lamb chops, while delicious, were a little dry and tough, as was the chicken. Surprisingly, I'd hazard saying it was the fish tikka which held up best. I'd still prefer to eat from the menu though!
(eatingleeds.co.uk/2007/12/aagrah-and-pizza-express.html)

In both examples, the event represented by the complement is actually realized and corresponds to the role of risky deed. The difference in meaning resides here merely in a
difference in construal on the part of the speaker. In example (273) with the to-infinitive, there is a movement implied between the hazarding and the saying, and a before/after relation is represented between the two. However, with the gerund-participle, the main verb’s event and that of the complement are simultaneous in time, with the verb hazard, being conceived as meaning ‘to perform a hazardous deed’. The possible use of both hazard + to + say and hazard + saying is attributable to the speaker’s ability to conceptualise a given situation in different ways (cf. Langacker 1987: 38-40). This is because hazarding is conceived as leading to the actualization of the infinitive’s event due to the meaning of to. An -ing direct object, on the other hand, corresponding to ‘that which is hazarded’, can denote either the DEED hazarded (i.e. performed by an act of hazarding) or the HARM hazarded (i.e. faced as a possible hazard). Moreover, our corpus demonstrates that the to-infinitive can only represent a hazardous deed with the verb hazard; it can not evoke a possible hazard or harm. The gerund-participle can however correspond to both of these meanings, and can thus give rise to two different temporal interpretations.

With regard to control, we saw that the verb hazard produces constant subject control with both types of complement. This impression is again due to the interactions between the three parameters of meaning involved in this type of construction. For instance, in (275) hazard implies a movement towards the result represented by the infinitive and to acts as the link between the main verb and say, this latter being the terminal point to which this movement leads. It is therefore logical that the realizer of ‘going forward and actualizing a hazardous deed’ is necessarily coreferential with that of the complement’s event (i.e. the hazardous deed). Similarly, when the gerund-participle evokes a hazardous deed, the same logical implication prevails. In this meaning of hazard, one hazards something by actually performing it. When the meaning of hazard is ‘to face a potential hazard’, as in I hazarded being thought ostentatious, the one who hazards is understood as the one who may bring down upon themselves the consequence expressed by the complement. In all the cases attested thus far, subject control has been observed (i.e. the hazarding is conceived as potentially thrusting the hazader into the realization of an
unwanted event). Given the uses found with risk of the type (401) and (402), however, one must remain open to the possibility of non-subject control readings with this construction.

3.6 THE VERB CHANCE

3.6.1 Lexical Meaning and Complementation

The verb chance, as a verb expressing risk, is always occurring with the gerund-participle in our corpus. Only one example of chance was found in the BNC; all the others were gathered from a search on the Internet\(^7\). In total, our corpus comprises a little more than one hundred occurrences. When construed with the gerund-participle, chance can have two different meanings. In almost all cases (90% of the total), the meaning of chance is very similar to that of the verb risk, ‘to perform a risky deed’. In the following examples, chance corresponds to the Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary’s definition, ‘to risk something, although you know the results may not be successful’ (p. 243):

(275) Based on reviews, I chanced requesting Room 55, and it was available for four of the five nights we wanted. The fifth night was in room 25. (www.tripadvisor.com/ShowUserReviews-g187147-d233585-r5804585-Duquesne_Eiffel_Hotel-Paris_Ile_de_France.html)

(276) When our food came, it was only luke warm. We chanced eating it and hoped we wouldn't get sick. It tasted ok. (newyork.citysearch.com/review/11279692)

(277) "Finny?" I chanced calling out his name, and prepared myself for the bitter reply. "Go to bed, Gene," he yawned. "You're going to owe me big tomorrow." I couldn't help but smile, a slow, goofy looking thing that carried me through the night and into the morning. I was forgiven. (www.fanfiction.net/s/3834390/1/A_Separate_Belief)

---

\(^7\) For chance, in addition to our group of selected verbs (be, have, go, get and say), we also looked at over 75 other verbs possibly used in combination with it. For the other verbs examined in this study, we had to limit our search to the first group of selected verbs because of time and space constraints. For frequency comparison with other verbs, examples of chance construed with be, have, go, get, and say were collected.
Thus, in the cases above, *chance* means ‘to perform a chancy deed’, the complement representing the deed in question. The possible unwanted consequence is normally not mentioned although it can usually be deduced from the context. It is however explicit in example (279), where the possible harm is a ‘bitter reply’. While *risk* in its sense of ‘to perform a risky deed’ often entails a possible tragic or serious outcome, in a good number of cases with *chance* the possible consequences often seem trivial or of a less important nature. This is the case in examples (280) and (281) below, where the possible harm corresponds merely to getting a negative answer, and in (282) where the subjects run the risk of getting caught in the rain without their raincoats:

(278) The show was great and we went for a few drinks after. Arriving back at the flat, I chanced asking him in again. This time I kept my eyes on his face. We had a few more drinks and our confidence was high, so high we drifted towards the bedroom. (www.clarelibrary.ie/eolas/coclare/literature/ncww/smell_of_incense.htm)

(279) With my warranty on THIS unit about to run out on August 7, 2004, I chanced calling up Garmin Tech Support to see if they would send me a brand new unit (charged to my credit card) and then refund this amount when they received the one I currently possess. (www.pdastreet.com/forums/archive/index.php/t-45981.html)

(280) Mom and Dad drove to our house, loaded up my bike, and the three of us drove to the trailhead in Big Rapids where Dad and I began our journey. Since it had rained all morning we brought along our raincoats but seeing clear skies in the north, we chanced leaving them in the car. (havybeaks.vox.com/library/posts/tags/cycling/)

However, with *risk*, the consequences of performing a chancy deed may often turn tragic as in (281) below:

(281) After what happened to Flavia, he would never have risked injecting illegal penicillin into you. (BNC: FSC 1009)

With the verb *chance*, as its lexical context would imply, events are represented as being left to chance, the subject showing a particular trusting to luck, as mentioned by *Webster’s New Dictionary of Synonyms*: “*chance* may suggest a trusting to luck and a sometimes
irresponsible disregarding of the risks involved in an action or procedure" (p. 857). The following examples are very interesting for their explicit references to luck:

(282) At the airport, there were the typical large queues and chaos associated with return charter flights home, but I awaited my turn in line and chanced requesting an aisle seat. Finally, some luck... "No problem sir". (www.travbuddy.com/Dont-stay-the-Birmar-2-Hotel-v6362)

(283) I chanced flying us in on the day of the cruise last time and the only hiccup we had was her luggage getting left at another airport. Luckily we still had plenty of time and the luggage was on the next flight in. (www.cruisemates.com/forum/viewtopic.php?p=3590255)

(284) So as if the flu-related symptoms weren’t enough, I chanced eating a Weis bar last week, which for someone with a citrus allergy, is like playing Russian Roulette with an automatic. (www.tasteslikedrunk.com/)

(285) The baby was getting heavy in her arms, but she looked to be asleep and Laura chanced putting her back into her crib, fully ready to rock her some more if she protested. She was in luck though, Isis hit the mattress and didn't stir. (www.survivalinstinct.net/viewstory.php?sid=335&chapter=1)

(286) Of course, I am now fairly well versed on it, including the need to report when I return to the states. I guess I could have chanced slipping out and back, but with my luck on stuff... I'd be writing this from a prison computer. (www.cruisersforum.com/forums/f57/cruising-decal-kindred-v-i-n-14061.html)

Examples of this type constitute 10% of our corpus.

A handful of examples were also found to have a similar meaning to the verb *risk* when it means ‘to face a potential harm’. In the occurrences below, *chance* means ‘to take the chance of some harm coming to oneself’:

(287) Everywhere you moved there was artillery coming in the trenches and outside the trenches. Anywhere you moved you chanced getting your head blown off. (www.robertbarfield.com/affidavits.html)

(288) "When is he going to stop," Vicki asked, "Just by doing this he chanced setting the entire forest on fire as well as the other tents." (www.hardydetectiveagency.com/victoria/truecourage/truecourage10.htm)
She looked so pathetic and sounded so distraught, I chanced upsetting her and strung both arms around her and soft-talked. “Hey, take as long as you like, baby. I’m not going anywhere. I’ll just freshen up then come back down and admire all that poorly displayed until you rejoined me, okay?”

There was no way Henry could get off the roof safely. If he jumped, he chanced breaking a leg or worse from that height.

In these uses where the gerund-participle represents HARM, i.e. a possible unwanted or unfortunate consequence, chance could be replaced by the verb risk without much difference in meaning. However, in some cases, less certainty about the actual realization of the consequence is felt than with the verb risk. This squares well with one sense of the noun chance, which is that of a mere unpleasant or dangerous possibility: since with the verb chance there is a sense of the harm being a mere possibility, the outcome may also be favourable to the chancer. Expressions like ‘by any chance’, ‘no chance’, ‘the chances are...’ and ‘take chances’ all refer to the notion of a possibility. It is also interesting to note that with the verb chance we observe the reverse of risk: most examples with chance have the DEED-type of meaning, while with risk the HARM-type is the most frequent sense.

Finally, it is not rare to find the verb chance construed with a to-infinitive, as in the following:

Driving home over a high mountain pass one winter day, Wyoming artist Mel Fillerup chanced to see two moose trotting through an aspen forest, lifting their long legs high through the deep snow. (CPI.Q: American Artist)

He was the sort of boy who always had a stick in his hand unless he chanced to have a stone. (CPI.Q: The Magazine of Fantasy and Wild Thing)

However, in this construction, chance has the meaning of “to happen or come about accidentally” (Hayakama 1996: 59). Since in these examples chance does not carry an element of risk in its meaning, they do not fall within the purvey of this study.
3.6.2 Temporal and Control Effects

The most frequent temporal relationship between the matrix *chance* and the gerund-participle in our corpus is that of simultaneity. In this type of examples, *chance* always means 'to perform a chancy deed', as in examples (275)-(280) and (282)-(286) above. A few examples were also found where the relationship between the main verb and the complement’s event is one of subsequence. These examples all correspond to *chance* meaning 'to take the chance of some harm coming to oneself', as in (287)-(290). In this type of use, the complement’s event is always future and non-realized.

As regards the type of control relationship holding between the verb *chance* and the -ing as complement, subject control is always observed in our corpus. For instance, in (289) and (290) above, the subject of the matrix is understood to be the actual realizer of the event represented by the gerund-participle.

3.6.3 Role of the Complement in the Construction

As with the other verbs examined in this study, the gerund-participle functions as direct object of the verb *chance*. It fulfills the semantic criterion for this function, as it corresponds to 'that which is chanced':

(293) The ammunition was running so low that few commanders chanced sending out men on horseback.

(294) Only imbeciles would chance setting the entire forest on fire.

Substitution of the -ing by a direct object pronoun, pseudo-cleft constructions and passivization are all possible, as the following examples illustrate:

(295) Few commanders chanced it/that.

(296) Only imbeciles would chance it/that.

(297) What few commanders chanced was sending out men on horseback.
Setting the entire forest on fire is what only imbeciles would chance.

Sending out men on horseback was chanced by few commanders.

Setting the entire forest on fire would be chanced by only imbeciles.

3.6.4 Explanation of Temporality and Control

The explanatory framework applied in this study can account for the temporal and control effects observed between the verb chance and its complement quite readily. As with risk and hazard, temporal effects of simultaneity and subsequence are both possible with chance. As explained earlier, with the -ing as complement, any temporal relationship between this latter and the matrix is due to the lexical meaning of this matrix. As with risk and hazard, a correlation was observed between the temporal effect of simultaneity and the meaning of chance as ‘performing a chancy deed’. When chance has this meaning, the chancing and the performance of the risky deed always coincide in time. It is simply logical that, if you perform (i.e. chance) an event which could possibly have an unfortunate outcome (i.e. a chancy deed), the chancing and the actualization of the chancy deed occur at the same time. On the other hand, when the temporal impression between chance and the gerund-participle is that of subsequence, the latter always evokes some kind of possible harm, as in example (292). Here, chance means ‘to take the chance of some harm coming to oneself’, and it is necessarily the case that the -ing’s event is evoked as unrealized in relation to the occurrence of the main verb. Indeed, this harm is only a possibility, something which may come to realization only after the subject ‘takes a chance’.

The control readings obtained with the verb chance are also explainable by the semantic content of the latter. When the gerund-participle evokes a risky deed, one chances this deed by actually performing it. This naturally entails that the subject of the matrix is the same entity who realizes the complement’s event. In the second meaning of chance, chancing is conceived as doing something which could potentially bring the harm represented by the -ing down upon the chancer’s head. Thus, the one who chances is logically understood as the one who may eventually be affected by the consequence expressed by the gerund-
participle. In all the uses found in our corpus, chancing is conceived as potentially making the chancer the realizer of an undesirable event. Theoretically, however, there would seem to be no semantic obstacle to the harm being conceived as something actualized by some other entity, as with risk in (401) and (402).

3.7 THE VERB DARE

3.7.1 Lexical Meaning and Complementation

The verb *dare* always occurs with the to-infinitive in our corpus.³ 371 examples of this verb were found, with the majority of them coming from the BNC and only a handful from LOB and other sources. No examples of *dare* + gerund-participle were found at all. As regards the lexical meaning of *dare*, dictionaries put the emphasis on the subject’s courage, bravery or boldness. *Webster’s Third* describes *dare* as “to have the bravery, boldness, or fortitude to contend against, venture, or try” (p. 574). Another definition is “to be brave enough to do something” (*Oxford Learner’s Dictionary*, p. 385). Corpus data confirm that the verb *dare* involves a special note of courage or bravery in its semantics. We propose that the meaning of *dare* when followed by a to-infinitive is in most cases ‘to bravely go ahead and perform a risky deed’. This is illustrated in the following:

(301) Last week a Resident of Mere was moaning because a squirrel had dared to eat nuts from a tree in her garden. (LOB: B27 49)

(302) When at last he dared to creep from his hiding-place and move on tip-toe up the dark stairs, he had counted to 372 and managed to convince himself that any fate was preferable to having an accident down there amongst the coats. (BNC: ACW 1619)

(303) Now, an anonymous female member of the Saudi Royal Family has dared to speak out about the reality of life for women in Saudi Arabia. (BNC: CJP 402)

³ Note that the verb *dare* also occurs followed with a bare infinitive. In this case however, *dare* behaves as a modal. As we are only concerned with verbs followed directly by a gerund-participle or a to-infinitive here, we did not consider this type of use. For a detailed account of *dare* used as a modal, cf. Duffley (1994).
(304) As late as the 1180s, St Hugh of Lincoln dared to tease Henry II of England about the tanner's blood in his veins. (BNC: EA7 218)

(305) When Vigier de la Rousselle dared to advocate the continuation of appeals to Paris in 1312, the whole matter was taken up in a very political way by the authorities in Bordeaux, who accused Vigier of contempt of ducal authority and had him executed on a charge which was, in effect, that of treason. (BNC: EDF 1119)

In these examples, the subject went ahead and did something audacious or which required courage. In some cases, some kind of effrontery on the part of the subject may even be felt, as in (305) and (308). In Fillmore & Atkins' terminology, the to-infinitive always represents DEED, that is something which the subject does and which may have some unfortunate or unwanted consequences. Thus, with dare, the element of risk common to the verbs studied here is present in the guise of the possible consequences involved in performing a risky deed. The following examples are interesting because the risk which is run by the subject is explicitly mentioned:

(306) Any vines that dare to lean against this tree risk being vigorously chewed. (BNC 323)

(307) This was as near as they dared to approach to avoid the risk of fire damage to the vehicles. (BNC: HJD 1426)

(308) He gives ya quality gear but he don't take no shit, and if you dare to call him Mister he might just shoot your crawly ass off. (BNC: HWX 2274)

(309) A newspaper that dared to carry articles critical of the Barisan now faces a ban in Sarawak. (BNC: G33 2072)

Compared to the verb risk, dare puts special emphasis on courage or boldness, an idea which does not seem prominent with risk, although it can be implied in some cases. With the verb dare, it is precisely because there is a risk involved in the realization of some daring deed that courage is required. This emphasis on boldness is especially obvious in examples where dare is state-like:
(310) He dared to be a Christian, in a country which had supplanted religion with a political ideal, discouraging worship without actually suppressing it forcibly. (BNC: CDA 643)

(311) Against that background, does the Prime Minister still dare to say to those people and their families that their prolonged misery is a price well worth paying? (BNC: HHV 19818)

(312) Dare to put in such an offer? (BNC: HHV 19818)

In these examples, the verb *dare* means ‘to possess enough courage to go ahead and perform a risky deed’. For instance, (312) could be paraphrased as *Do you have the guts to put in such an offer?* These cases where *dare* has a state-like quality are however rare in our corpus.

It is also interesting to see that the adverb *hardly* is sometimes used between the subject and the main verb in our corpus:

(313) It had only two doors and by the time they had been pushed roughly into the back, with the Woman leaning round in the front seat to point the small gun at them, they hardly dared to breathe. (BNC: AC4 3049)

(314) Is it because one does not turn to art for comfort? For safety? Because if you want comfort and safety you keep well away from art? From real art? You only turn to it as people climb mountains and cross deserts to find out what you are made of by doing what you hardly dare to do. (BNC: H08 686)

The use of *hardly* in the sentences above brings out the fact that there is great difficulty involved in performing some deed; it also highlights the need for the subject to draw on his courage.

The special emphasis on boldness or bravery with *dare* comes out even more clearly in comparison to the verb *venture*. In some examples, *venture* can be replaced by *dare* without much change in meaning, vice versa:

(315) There are those who even dare to say that we should intervene militarily and hope that some form of peace will come about as a result. (BNC: HHX 11410)
The similarity between *dare* and *venture* is not surprising considering that the meaning of *venture*, ‘to go forward hesitantly into unknown territory’, implicitly requires courage. However, the fact that most examples of *dare* + *to*-infinitive cannot be replaced by *venture* is revealing of these verbs’ lexical meaning:

(316) Most people hate Harry but they don’t dare to say so (CC: 410)

(317) ? Most people hate Harry but they don’t venture to say so.

Example (317) sounds somewhat awkward with the verb *venture* because *dare* puts emphasis on courage, something which is not at the forefront in the semantics of *venture*. This element of meaning is however required by the context in (316).

As to the verbs with which the verb *dare* can be construed, they are quite varied overall. We pointed out the fact in 3.4.1 that *venture* has a natural affinity with verbs of linguistic expression which represent 55% of all occurrences. *Dare* was also found to occur frequently with this type of verbs in our corpus: there are 105 examples of this type in the BNC (28% of all occurrences):

(318) No one else dares to speak to the Lady Prioress like that. (BNC: H9C 1647)

(319) He dared to criticise the leader outright. (BNC: CG0 145)

(320) It was nearly a week before Ingrid dared to ask for a transfer to the officer’s mess. (BNC: FPX 821)

(321) The only outlet through which we dared to express our distress was sharing our fantasies of burning down our school! (BNC: CF4 739)

The possible consequences faced by the subject in these examples are the same as those with the verb *venture*, i.e. rejection, rebuff or censure.

Another important observation with respect to the verbs found in combination with *dare* is that the latter is often construed with verbs such as *think, believe, reflect, hope,*
imagine, dream, conceive, predict and expect, which represent 11% of all uses in the BNC. This is illustrated in the examples below:

(322) He didn't as yet quite dare to imagine himself as a real artist. (BNC: CBN 295)

(323) Lots of love, Alexander. Lisa stared at the message for a long, long time, trying to stifle the sudden swift beat of her heart. Perhaps I've been wrong about him, after all! Perhaps there was no deception! She actually dared to think it. And suddenly the emotions that went tearing through her were so terrifying, so cataclysmic, that she had to thrust them from her. If she had been wrong about him? If he had not deceived her? At the thought she felt her heart unfold with joy within her. Then she stopped herself short. (BNC: H97 3854)

In (322), the verb *dare* seems fitting because it requires audacity for some people to imagine themselves as artists. In (323), the subject is torn between her love for Alexander and a feeling of betrayal - it takes courage for her to think that she has not been deceived.

We also observed a frequent occurrence of negation with the verb *dare*, as in (322) above for instance. This is the case for 105 examples, which represents more or less 25% of the corpus. The high occurrence of negation is something peculiar to *dare* in the entire corpus, as this type of use was relatively marginal for the other verbs studied. Negation is perhaps frequent with *dare* because of this verb’s emphasis on courage or boldness. It indeed seems common to say that someone does not have the courage to do something. The verb *dare* is also the only one for which we found occurrences of imperatives and rhetorical questions, as in the following:

(324) Dare to tell me that you see nothing there of him, that you have no feeling for the strokes of your hands, that you have no will in you to venture after him! (BNC: K8S 1757)

(325) You dare to answer me so? shrilled Matilda. (BNC: HH1 793)

In (324), the speaker is basically inciting his interlocutor to exercise his courage and to go ahead and tell him something. In (325), we observe a rhetorical question which is in fact an
indirect speech act; the speaker implies that the person she is talking to should not have dared to answer her so.\footnote{In Israel (1996) the author argues that “Rhetorical questions can be understood as a species of indirect speech act in which a speaker, by superficially and insincerely requesting information, actually conveys a very definite opinion” (pp. 634-635), a position which we share.}

### 3.7.2 Temporal and Control Effects

In all of the examples with the verb *dare*, the to-infinitive complement’s event is felt to be subsequent with respect to that of the main verb. In most cases, the event evoked by the infinitive is actually accomplished, as in:

(326) He had dared to slaughter a sacred cow. (BNC: ADB 638)

Here the infinitive’s event is the result of ‘bravely going ahead and performing a risky deed’. In some cases however, one gets the impression that the event represented by the complement is non-realized, as the following example illustrates:

(327) This was the band’s first gig ever, and Bernadette’s first time ever drumming on stage. They had rehearsed only a few times. But Bernadette thought she still dared to do the experiment, as a lifetime of piano playing had taught her about rhythm (dear.kitty.blogsome.com/2006/12/10/)

It is very rare however to find the to-infinitive’s event as non-realized with the verb *dare*: the only clear attested case is in (327), where we are under the impression that the subject possesses enough courage to perform the daring but that he has not done it yet.

With respect to the type of control relationship felt to exist between the verb *dare* and the to-infinitive, we observed constant subject control in all cases in the corpus. For instance, in (326) above, the understood subject of the complement corresponds to that of the main verb, i.e. *he*.  

\footnote{In Israel (1996) the author argues that “Rhetorical questions can be understood as a species of indirect speech act in which a speaker, by superficially and insincerely requesting information, actually conveys a very definite opinion” (pp. 634-635), a position which we share.}
3.7.3 Role of the Complement in the Construction

The function of the *to*-infinitive with respect to the verb *dare* is that of an adverbial result specifier denoting the result of 'to bravely go ahead and perform a risky deed'.\(^\text{10}\) First of all, in the two sentences below:

(328) But above all, some feminists have dared to question the monolithic status of language itself, its claims to neutrality and to absolute truth. (BNC: CGF 1534)

(329) All was quiet, but only five of us had dared to come. (BNC: B2E 1196)

*to question* and *to come* do not correspond to 'that which is dared'. Moreover, the infinitive does not pass the tests for the function of direct object, as the following examples illustrate:

(330) * To question the monolithic status of language itself has been dared by some feminists.

(331) * To come had been dared by only five of us.

(332) * What some feminists have dared was to question the monolithic status of language itself.

(333) * To come is what only five of us had dared.

(334) * Some feminists/few foreign aid workers have dared that/it.

(335) * Only five of us had dared that/it.

(336) Some feminists/few foreign aid workers have dared to.

(337) Only five of us had dared to.

Thus, neither passivization, pseudo-cleft constructions nor substitution by means of a pronoun are possible with the *to*-infinitive following *dare*. Examples (336) and (337) demonstrate that the preposition *to* is the preferred option for substitution.

\(^{10}\) Note that, with the rare stative-like uses of *dare*, the infinitival complement functions as an adverbial specifier denoting the goal of "to possess enough courage to go ahead and perform a risky deed".
3.7.4 Explanation of Temporality and Control

The pieces are now in place for us to propose an explanation for the temporal and control interpretations observed when the verb *dare* is used with a *to*-infinitive following it directly. With regard to temporality, an effect of subsequence was constantly observed. The explanation for this is similar to that proposed for the verbs *venture*, *adventure* and *hazard*. The meaning of *dare* is, in the majority of cases, 'to bravely go ahead and perform a risky deed', and we pointed out the necessity for the subject to exercise courage to do so. In fact, boldness or courage is a kind of pre-condition that must be 'checked' before going forward and actualizing the daring; the possession of this quality by the subject is necessary for the accomplishment of the event represented by the bare stem. This impression of *dare* being a prior condition implies a before/after relationship in time between *dare* in its action-like sense and the complement's event. The impression of subsequence is even more obvious in the state-like sense of *dare*, as in example (327) above: here the infinitive's event is understood to be future and unrealized at the point in time corresponding to the possession of the courage to go ahead and actualize some deed, the infinitive's event.

It may also be interesting to address the reasons why the verb *dare* is never found to occur with a gerund-participle. Since courage is a pre-condition which is necessary in order for the subject to go ahead and actualise the complement's event, this entails a necessary before/after relation between the matrix and its complement. This type of relation is not expressed by the direct object. A temporal relationship of subsequence is sometimes observed with the *-ing* but this is not due to the conceptualization of a movement through time from the matrix verb's event to the complement's; it is merely a by-product of the interaction of the function of direct object with the meaning of the main verb.

With regard to control, *dare* always produces subject control with an infinitival complement. This control effect is the logical product of the interactions between the three explanatory parameters. For instance, in (329), *dare* implies a movement of the darer towards the result represented by the infinitive; this notion of the darer's movement is explicitly expressed by the preposition *to*, so that the actualization of the infinitive's event
is understood to be the terminal point to which the daring brings the darer. It is therefore natural that the realizer of the daring is understood to be the same as that of the complement’s event.

3.8 THE VERB FACE

3.8.1 Lexical Meaning and Complementation

The verb *face* is always found with the gerund-participle in the corpus. In total, almost 100 examples were considered, with 21 coming from the BNC, 74 from CPI.Q, and the rest from other sources. No examples of *face* + to-infinitive were found. As regards the lexical meaning of the verb *face*, dictionaries bring out the notion of ‘being up against a difficult situation’. The *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* describes *face* as “if you face or are faced with a difficult situation, or if a difficult situation faces you, it is going to affect you and you must deal with it” (p. 559). *Webster’s Third* defines it as “to recognize or contemplate as an often unpleasant or difficult eventuality confronting one” (p. 812). Besides risks, the subject can also *face* challenge or a prospect, as the following show:

(338) Roberts faces greater risk after seizure.  

(339) But as parents, the Nanaimo couple face a challenge that will mount as Helena grows up: the fact that providing a loving home for their child is not enough.  
(www.canada.com/victoriatimescolonist/news/story.html?id=5c9a6b2a-2360-4789-8c32-5c151f29ab8c)

(340) Contractors working in Iraq could soon face the prospect of operating in a war zone with no guarantee of immunity from local laws.  
(www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0808/082508rb1.htm)

This shows that the idea of risk is not part of *face*’s meaning per se; it can however be part of the message conveyed, depending on what kind of complement follows *face*. With the
gerund-participle as complement, the idea of risk comes into the picture if what is faced by the subject is a possible harm. If it corresponds merely to a prospect or a challenge, there is no trace of this notion in the message expressed:

(341) DAY 1: I take one last look at my kitchen of the last 12 years. Can I really face going through breakfasts from the food truck and barbecue dinners for the next three weeks? It took two men exactly two hours to dismantle the place. Oven, cook top, and old Sub-Zero fridge are on the front lawn waiting for Goodwill to pick up (CPI.Q: *House Beautiful*)

(342) In the future, as people live longer, more of us will face living with a disability. Fortunately, new technologies and new attitudes will make the future more enabling for us all. (CPI.Q: *The Futurist*)

A good number of *-ing* complements were found however which did denote some form of harm:

(343) Under that scheme, owners who face being made homeless due to mortgage arrears are allowed to stay in their homes as tenants for 12 months as the council takes up a head lease. (BNC: K97 4014)

(344) If they don't, they face having their caravans towed away. (BNC: K28 236)

(345) Thanks to innovative approaches to animal control, fewer strays face going to the pound. (CPI.Q: *Country Living*)

(346) Users face losing negotiated discounts on Microsoft software if the US Department of Justice divides the software giant into two or more companies. (CPI.Q: *Computer Weekly*)

(347) THE blue-suited salaryman is having a rough time. He faces being fired or demoted. Worse, he is losing the respect of his family. (CPI.Q: *The Economist*)

The meaning of the verb *face* here is something like ‘not turn away from’ or ‘be ready to meet face-to-face without withdrawing’. This meaning is compatible with a direct object. As one would expect, the idea of being in a situation where one knows one is going to meet face-to-face with something that could possibly cause withdrawal only makes sense with a gerund-participle expressing HARM. The latter can not express DEED, because what is faced cannot be construed as a risky deed performed by an act of facing. Neither can it be a
VALUED OBJECT, as something faced is not conceivable as something which the ‘facer’ is putting at risk by the act of facing it.

When face is followed by an -ing evoking a potential harm, some kind of fate often seems to be involved, as if the subject cannot exercise free will, but rather is up against the possibility of an unpleasant situation over which he has no or very little control:

(348) Lucy has lost an eye, lost her father and now she faces losing her dearest friends. (BNC: CH6 3717)

(349) An elderly St. John’s couple who faced being split apart because the husband is being admitted to a veterans’ pavilion has been granted a reprieve. (CPI.Q: The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation)

(350) Some of Britain’s top insurance companies face going bust if the recession goes on, an expert warned yesterday. (BNC: CH2 805)

(351) Politicians and those lobbying for aid to the more than 3,000 fishery workers who face losing their jobs often compare the lack of fish in the sea with a drought in Western Canada. (CPI.Q: Globe & Mail)

Indeed, in the majority of cases, the circumstances leading to the subject facing some unpleasant event are outside of his control. These circumstances are made explicit in example (349)-(351), in which a condition/consequence relation is perceivable: for instance, in (351) a recession would, as a consequence, cause some of Britain’s top insurance companies to go bust. The verb face seems here to evoke a merely future event (which is not to the subject’s advantage or liking) that the person can see coming. The impression of lack of control on the part of the subject observed with face is a peculiar characteristic of this verb which is not felt with risk, chance and hazard: in most cases with these three verbs, the subject still has some control or responsibility over the situation, the potential harm often being a result of one’s own actions:

(352) Those individuals that worked above or below these groups norms risked being ostracised by their fellow workers. (BNC: GVN 431)

(353) “When is he going to stop,” Vicki asked, “Just by doing this he chanced setting the entire forest on fire as well as the other tents.”
(To simply enjoy himself and his life, without constantly toning himself down and checking the depressive pulse of others, meant he hazarded being seen as a traitorous villain and, as a consequence, ending up in total isolation.

However, in a few cases with the verb *face* + gerund-participle, the subject’s being up against the prospect of some possible harm may be due to something under his control:

(355) The 47-year-old consultant now faces being struck off the Medical Register for attempting to murder a terminally-ill patient. (BNC: CH2 6802)

(356) The 78 women at Avdel Systems in Welwyn Garden City, Herts said, they faced losing 20 per cent of their pensions if they retired at 60.

(BNC: CEN 444)

These examples are interesting because the context gives the reason for the subject facing potential harm. In (356) for instance, retirement at 60 is a condition which leads to the loss of 20 percent of the pensions. What is being faced is a consequence of a condition, but the subjects in (355) and (356) would like not to have to face these consequences.

As for the verbs used as complements of *face*, out of the 21 examples from the BNC, 9 are construed with *lose*, 8 with *be*, 2 with *have*, 1 with *give*, 1 with *go*, and 1 with *tell*. In all cases, the context makes it clear that the event represented by the gerund-participle has a negative connotation, which is quite natural since it denotes potential harm. All of the examples construed with the verb *be* are passive (*being made homeless*, *being fired*, *being sued* and *being moved out of office*). The passive is significant represents its subject as being on the reclining end of the event, i.e. helpless, having little or no control over the situation he is facing. Given the small number of examples of *face* referring to risk in proportion to the high number not involving this notion, the use of *face* to refer to risk seems fairly marginal.)
3.8.2 Temporal and Control Effects

In all uses of the verb *face* in our corpus, the gerund-participle complement is always future and prospective vis-à-vis the matrix:

\[(357)\] Flat owners face losing their homes after being landed with a bill for ground rent going back fifteen years. (BNC: K1X 3506)

Thus, above, the event *losing* exists at a point in time subsequent to that of *face*.

As regards the type of control relationship holding between the verb *face* and the *-ing* as complement, subject control is always observed. For instance, in (357) above, the subject of the matrix is also the one who may undergo the event represented by the gerund-participle.

3.8.3 Role of the Complement in the Construction

As for all of the other verbs occurring with a gerund-participle in this study, the *-ing* form is simply the direct object of the verb *face*. It fulfills the semantic criterion for the direct object function, as it corresponds to ‘that which is faced’:

\[(358)\] On Tuesday night, many faced losing any savings over £50,000. (www.guardian.co.uk/money/2008/oct/11/savings-banks)

Anaphoric reference to the *-ing* by means of a pronoun, pseudo-cleft constructions, and active/passive correspondences all yield acceptable results, as the following examples illustrate:

\[(359)\] Many faced that.
\[(360)\] What many faced was losing any savings over £50,000.
\[(361)\] Losing any savings over £50,000 was what many faced.
\[(362)\] Losing any savings over £50,000 was faced by many.
Thus, all the standard criteria confirm that the gerund-participle functions as a direct object when it occurs as complement of the verb *face*.

### 3.8.4 Explanation of Temporality and Control

Now that we have looked at the different parameters in play, we should be able to propose an explanation for temporal and control effects with the verb *face*. The constant subsequence relationship felt between the main verb and the gerund-participle is mostly due to the lexical meaning of *face*. As with other verbs of risk when the -ing evokes HARM, the temporal relationship is one of subsequence. More precisely, *face* in these cases means 'to be ready to meet face-to-face without withdrawing'. When the -ing represents a potential harm, as in (358) above for instance, *face* simply evokes the subject as being up against a situation where he may be harmed in the future. As was mentioned above in 3.8.1, the verb *face* is compatible with a construal in which what is faced is a future event. Moreover, if one is facing a future event, one is obviously looking towards the future. It is therefore logical that the gerund-participle's event be represented as unrealized in relation to the occurrence of the main verb.

The control readings observed with the verb *face* are also explainable by the semantic content of this verb. When the gerund-participle evokes HARM, what one actually faces is naturally something which may affect oneself. Normally, the one who faces the harm is logically understood as the one who may eventually find himself actualizing the undesirable event expressed by the gerund-participle. Theoretically, however, it would seem possible for someone to face an event representing possible harm which concerns both himself and other people. This case was not observed in our corpus and so requires further research in order to be checked out.
3.9 THE VERBS JEOPARDIZE, ENDANGER, AND IMPERIL

3.9.1 Lexical Meaning and Complementation

The verbs jeopardize, imperil and endanger are treated together here as they are close synonyms, and they behave similarly with respect to complementation and temporal and control effects. 111 examples of jeopardize were examined. As no occurrences of this verb were found in our main corpuses, all our examples were gathered from a search on Google. Besides the high-frequency verbs say, get, go, be and have, occurrences were also gathered for the verbs hold, keep and maintain, as their semantic content seemed to make them likely partners of jeopardize. All the examples in the corpus occurred with the gerund-participle. As for the lexical meaning of jeopardize, Webster's Third describes it as “to expose to danger (as of imminent loss, defeat, or serious harm)” (p. 857). More precisely, in the great majority of cases in the corpus, the verb jeopardize means ‘to put the future realization of something in jeopardy’, as in the following:

(363) The good news is that my mom is doing much better. She was discharged from the hospital after about two and a half weeks, and I flew home a couple days after that. I wasn't ready to go, but I had already missed too much school. Any longer and I might have jeopardized getting promoted. Sigh. (hmp3guru.blogspot.com/)

(364) Our standing committee is prepared to look at this report on May 10. I would hope that we aren't going to drag it out here. It might jeopardize going ahead with that report on May 10. (charlesburton.blogspot.com/2007_05_01_archive.html)

(365) Please do not leave anything other than what the recycling bin is labelled for. Doing so may jeopardize having that site available as the owner or ALPAR will have to clean up trash and dispose of it at the landfill. (anchoragecreeks.org/pages/links.php)

(366) That raise is what will pay for school this September, so an excessively long delay jeopardizes being able to take all the classes I'd like to take in order to finish quickly. (coyote-howling.livejournal.com/tag/em)
(367) Answering would jeopardize keeping the entire thing a secret from her; she was smart enough to deduce why it wouldn’t involve him anyway, but he wasn’t going to encourage that sort of thought, not for a minute. (www.harrypotterfanfiction.com/viewstory.php?chapterid=199695)

(368) It must have been patently obvious to everyone concerned at the time that this change in position would jeopardize holding the trial as scheduled. (csc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/1989/1989rcs1-1659/1989rcs1-1659.html)

(369) Making use of an approved leave of absence will not jeopardize maintaining the satisfactory academic progress that must be reported annually to the Graduate Dean. (www.mcd.ucsc.edu/grad/mcdhdbk2007-08.pdf)

In the examples above, the gerund-participle best fits the category of VALUED OBJECT, i.e. a valued possession which is seen as potentially endangered. With jeopardize, the -ing is a projected object which has not yet come into existence. For instance, in (367), keeping the entire thing a secret from her is something whose existence is felt to be in danger. The notion of risk present in the meaning of the verb jeopardize thus lies in the fact that a future event seen as a valued object is put at risk. Moreover, the subject of jeopardize is either an action which puts the complement’s event in jeopardy, as in examples (364)-(369), or an animate subject which jeopardizes the event evoked by the -ing by performing some kind of deed, as in (363). In a few cases, the verb jeopardize was also found with a meaning similar to risk’s sense of ‘face a potential harm’:

(370) Please adhere to these parking rules so that you do not jeopardize having your vehicle towed at your expense! (www.ectb.org/ectb/tournament_schedule.asp?tournament=2007)

(371) Although this might seem a bit harsh, we cannot jeopardize having our entry forms being late due a few irresponsible parents. (danceruniverse.com/stories/issues/200512/company-fees/)

(372) She adds, "You think I would jeopardise being away from my child for five to 25 years if I even had an inkling that I was guilty of something?" (www.contactmusic.com/news.nsf/article/remy%20mas%20victim%20speaks%20out_1068698)

In this type of usage, jeopardize means ‘to put oneself in danger of some potential harm coming to oneself’, and the main verb can be substituted by the verb risk without a great
change in meaning. Although this usage might seem 'improper' or 'sloppy' to some speakers, it shows very clearly the semantic affinity between the verbs risk and jeopardize.

It is interesting to note that the modals could, might, may, would, will, should and can are used before jeopardize in the majority of the examples in the corpus (59% of all occurrences). If-clauses are found in a few cases as well. This is due to the fact that a condition/consequence relationship is often present when jeopardize is followed by a gerund-participle, the jeopardizing being the consequence of a prior condition, a phenomenon which can be illustrated by example (363), where if the subject had stayed any longer by his mother's side at the hospital (condition), he might have jeopardized getting promoted (consequence). The same relation is also seen in (365), where answering would lead to the consequence of putting the future realization of having that site in jeopardy. A frequent use of the modals and a condition/consequence relation are also found with the verb endanger in our corpus.

The verbs endanger and imperil are not very frequent with the gerund-participle, as only 16 examples for endanger and 5 for imperil were gathered from a search on Internet for the same verbs as for jeopardize. Dictionary definitions for endanger are very similar to those for jeopardize. Webster's Third describes endanger as "to bring into danger or peril of probable harm or loss" (p. 748). In fact, endanger takes on two different actual meanings in our corpus. The most frequent one, similar to that of jeopardize, is 'to put the future realization of something in danger':

(373) Should the programme be held nevertheless, it would strongly endanger holding this year's event and also next year's contract. (habeascorpus.hu/en/pepsiisland.htm)

(374) A member of the Chilean Truth and Reconciliation Commission, José Zalaquett, has stated that amnesty may not be granted if this endangers getting at the truth. (home.wxs.nl/~loz/maneng76.htm)

(375) Philander first put them in mind, that unless they turned back quickly they would endanger being benighted.
In this type of use, the -ing evokes a VALUED OBJECT, a desired future event whose realization would be put at risk by some other action. The second actual meaning of endanger in our corpus is similar to the verb risk meaning 'to face a potential harm'. In the following, endanger means 'to be in danger of some potential harm coming to oneself':

(376) Every year, thousands of individuals and incorporated entities become insolvent. Anyone can be subject to this, but there are different insolvency procedures available that can help to tackle the problem. Those that endanger being made insolvent could avoid or escape the risk if they research the prospects further; there are ways to beat it. (www.freshfinance.net/articles-insolvency.htm)

(377) If you only are into the newest coolest Indie music, you endanger being a status quo version of hipsteriness. Shake it up by occasionally going through different phases of music. (chuckdaddyxpress.blogspot.com/)

(378) Others argue that reporters should not carry weapons when covering a war because they endanger being viewed as "taking part" in the combat. (www.rutgersobserver.com/home/index.cfm?event=displayArticlePrinterFriendly&uStory_id=81e3b034-b9d9-4566-a0e7-b93e9751ff51)

In these three examples, the gerund-participle represents HARM.

All examples with the verb imperil in the corpus can be replaced by endanger or jeopardize without a significant change in meaning. This is not surprising as this verb denotes something very similar to these two verbs when followed by a gerund-participle:

(379) Well this certainly imperils getting a letter of recommendation from this office. (books.google.ca/books?id=5D4kyGqeoC&pg=PA34&lpg=PA34&dq=%22imperils+getting%22&source=web&ots=xHnZ7aZFo&sig=M4Hp8ihRHb5jeOPh4biCWvesCKw&hl=fr&sa=X&oi=book_result&resnum=2&ct=result)

(380) Doing this will in no way imperil getting military support from the Soviet Union. (www.walterlippmann.com/docs1581.html)
(381) IHT encourage practitioners to take note of this report and to highlight the rate of depletion to concerned authorities. In the longer term, failure to achieve this objective imperils maintaining UK’s impressive record in reducing the number of skidding related accidents.


In these examples, imperil means ‘to put the future realization of something in peril’ and its complement evokes a VALUED OBJECT. Considering the small number of examples found with jeopardize, endanger and imperil, the use of these verbs followed by a gerund-participle seems to be relatively infrequent, with endanger and imperil being more characteristic of a formal style.

3.9.2 Temporal and Control Effects

In all uses of the verbs jeopardise, endanger and imperil in the corpus, the gerund-participle’s event is felt to be subsequent with respect to that of the main verb. This is the case in (380) above and in the following:

(382) Backers of the initiative had little choice but to submit their voter signatures this week, despite the budget impasse. A delay might have jeopardized getting the petitions certified in time for the Feb. 5 ballot.

(www.calcoast.org/news/cpr000051.html)

(383) The point I make is, that to have gone to the trouble and effort to get this information, it would defeat the object entirely to get involved in an action that might endanger getting the information back to Squadron H.Q.

(www.bbc.co.uk/ww2peopleswar/stories/78/a4589878.shtml)

Regarding control, the picture is somewhat different with this group of verbs. With jeopardize, 67 examples (60% of all occurrences) show non-subject control, i.e. the understood subject of the complement is not the same as that of the main verb. This is the case in (382) above, where the subject of jeopardize is a delay, which cannot be understood to be the realizer of the gerund-participle’s event. The rest of the occurrences show subject control, as in (371) above. As one would expect, there is also a correlation between the ‘put at risk’ sense of jeopardize and non-subject control, and between the ‘face a potential harm’
sense and subject control. The verb *endanger* follows the same control pattern as *jeopardize*. Non-subject control is observed in 56% of all cases, as in (383); subject control readings are obtained for the other examples, as in (375). With *imperil*, all 5 examples show non-subject control.

### 3.9.3 Role of the Complement in the Construction

It is held here that the gerund-participle plays the role of direct object when it is used as complement of the verbs *jeopardize*, *endanger* and *imperil*. Consequently, it corresponds to ‘that which is jeopardized/endangered/imperilled’:

(384) People who miss drill weekends jeopardize getting a good year.  
(articles.latimes.com/2004/sep/27/nation/na-bushguard27)

(385) The OER, Officer Evaluation Reports, was the central focus of an officer’s career. A bad OER could destroy an officer. A mediocre one could condemn him to being average, and maybe even endanger getting the twenty years necessary for retirement.  
(books.google.ca/books?id=QdTUfonI4akC&pg=PA93&lpg=PA93&dq=%22endanger+getting%22&source=web&ots=LfF9GY8zQy&sig=7IVhpdlvooFUVP0KmZQTE6sDLY&hl=fr&sa=X&oi=book_result&resnum=1&ct=result)

(386) As involuntary clients, they might be reluctant to admit abusive behaviours to the therapist, believing that such admissions would imperil maintaining custody of their child.  
(books.google.ca/books?id=eAdbEnyZbcC&pg=PA198&lpg=PA198&dq=%22imperil+maintaining%22&source=web&ots=k9J9zKjQ&sig=Y3QrHYG06Sv3ax2GbVmeePMFMbg&hl=fr&sa=X&oi=book_result&resnum=1&ct=result)

The gerund-participle can also be construed as subject of a corresponding passive construction with these verbs:

(387) Getting a good year is jeopardized by people who miss drill weekends.

(388) Getting the twenty years necessary for retirement could be endangered by a mediocre OER:
(389) Maintaining custody of their child would be imperilled by such admissions.

In addition, pronoun substitution also confirms the *-ing*’s function as a direct object with these verbs:

(390) People who miss drill weekends jeopardize that.

(391) A mediocre OER could endanger it.

(392) Such admissions would imperil that.

Finally, pseudo-cleft constructions yield acceptable results as well:

(393) What people who miss drill weekends jeopardize is getting a good year.

(394) What a mediocre OER could endanger is getting the twenty years necessary for retirement.

(395) Maintaining custody of their child is what such admissions would imperil.

Thus, the semantic criterion and the other standard tests confirm the function of the *-ing* as being that of direct object when it is used as a complement of the verbs *jeopardize*, *endanger* and *imperil*.

**3.9.4 Explanation of Temporality and Control**

We are now in a position to propose an explanation for temporal and control interpretations with the verbs *jeopardize*, *endanger* and *imperil*. With regard to temporality, the constant effect of subsequence felt between these verbs and the gerund-participle is explainable by the three parameters used in this study. The gerund-participle has the function of direct object in the uses observed, identifying ‘that which is jeopardized/endangered/imperilled’. Since the direct object relation to the main verb is basically non-temporal and the *-ing* simply evokes its event in a holistic way, any temporal relationship between the main verb and its complement is due to the meaning of the matrix. In most cases with these three verbs, the gerund-participle evokes a future event seen as a
VALUED OBJECT, i.e. something which is still unrealized. In these cases, the meaning of jeopardize, endanger and imperil is more or less ‘to put the future realization of something in jeopardy/danger/peril’. It is therefore logical, considering the meaning of these verbs and the fact that the -ing represents something which is put in danger, that the latter be felt to be situated at a point in time which is future vis-à-vis the main verb. A similar explanation also applies to the cases where the gerund-participle following jeopardize and endanger evokes a potential harm, as in (372) and (377) above. Since the harmful event is something which has not yet been actualized, it is normal for the -ing to evoke this event as subsequent to the event expresses by the main verb.

Now that we have a better understanding of temporal relationships with these verbs, we are also better equipped to address the reason why these latter are never found followed by a to-infinitive complement. The preposition to denotes the idea of a movement between the main verb’s event and the infinitive’s, a movement of which the infinitive’s event is the end-point. This movement can be construed as actualized or not, depending on the meaning of the matrix and the context. However, the respective lexical meanings of jeopardize, endanger and imperil are not compatible with the idea of a movement or a desire for a movement leading to actualization. The complement following these verbs is simply ‘that which is put in jeopardy/danger/peril’ or ‘that harm which might occur to the subject if they do x’, i.e. a direct object.

As for the control readings observed with jeopardize, endanger and imperil, they can also be explained by the meaning of these verbs. When a non-subject control reading is observed, the event evoked by the gerund-participle is not felt to be realized by the main verb’s subject. If we consider the meaning of these three verbs, there is nothing to prevent someone or something from jeopardizing/endangering/imperilling the actualization of an event which is not necessarily realized by that same subject. It is perfectly conceivable that someone or something may compromise the future realization of an event by some other agent. On the other hand, as the subject control readings in the corpus show, it is also possible for one to put in jeopardy some future event which the jeopardizer would like to be able to realize. This is the case in (375), where those who endanger being benighted are
also the potential candidates for being benighted. Thus, the respective meanings of
jeopardize, endanger and imperil allow for both subject control and non-subject control
readings with the gerund-participle as complement.
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

"Thus important though it is to approach usage with an all-embracing view, the final word, to determine whether or not the proposed system corresponds to reality, belongs to the observed facts."

(Hirtle 2007: 5)

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Our main goal in this study was to explain the various expressive effects and the principles underlying the use of the structures 'main verb + complement' with the gerund-participle and the to-infinitive as complements of verbs involving the notion of risk. The verbs risk, venture, adventure, hazard, chance, dare, face, jeopardize, endanger and imperil were identified as containing this notion in their semantics and as construable with an -ing or infinitive complement. The expressive effects accounted for in this study concern principally the phenomena of temporality and control, two problems which are posed by all verbal complementation.

The meaning-based approach adopted in this study is based on principles from both Cognitive Linguistics and the Psychomechanics of Language. Our analysis of verbal complementation with verbs of risk was founded on three explanatory parameters: 1) the meaning of the complement, 2) the function of the complement with respect to the main verb, and 3) the lexical meaning of the main verb. We adopted the hypotheses proposed by Duffley (2000; 2006a) for these three general parameters. A semantic analysis was conducted with a view to discerning the components of the meanings of each of the verbs
examined which were relevant to their interaction with the two complement forms under study.

In the present chapter, a summary of the findings pertaining to usage, temporality and control with verbs of risk will be presented, before drawing the discussion to a close.

### 4.2 SUMMARY OF TYPES OF COMPLEMENTATION FOUND IN CORPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Occurrences with the Gerund-Participle</th>
<th>Occurrences with the To-Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venture</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dare</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardize</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endanger</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperil</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4.2 VERBS OF RISK AND THEIR RELATIVE FREQUENCIES WITH THE GERUND-PARTICIPLE AND THE TO-INFINITIVE COMPLEMENTS**

Table 4.2 above summarizes the occurrences of verbs of risk with the gerund-participle and the to-infinitive in the corpus, all sources included. As illustrated by this table, *risk, chance, face, jeopardize, endanger* and *imperil* are found only with a gerund-
participle as complement and never with an infinitive. Depending on the lexical meaning of the verb, the -ing either evokes a potential harm, a risky deed or a valued object seen as potentially endangered. With the verb risk, which is the most frequent verb of this group according to the data in the BNC, the gerund-participle can evoke either HARM or DEED, depending on the actual meaning of the matrix. Chance, with its special reference to luck, means in most cases ‘to perform a chancy deed’, although it can be described as ‘to take the chance of some harm coming to oneself’. The verb face stands apart from the other verbs studied here, as the idea of risk is not part of its meaning per se. Indeed, the subject can face not only a risk but a challenge, as in Community colleges face doing more with less, in which case there is no notion of risk involved in the message expressed. It is only when the complement following face evokes a potential harm that risk comes into the picture. As regards the verbs jeopardize, endanger and imperil, they also differ from all other verbs considered here in terms of their respective lexical meaning, as in the majority of cases their complement represents a potentially endangered valued object. As table 4.2 illustrates, the verb hazard can occur with both the -ing and the infinitive, although it is more frequent with the latter. When it is construed with a gerund-participle, it behaves similarly to the verb risk, i.e. its complement can evoke either HARM or DEED, with HARM being the most frequent case.

As regards complementation with a to-infinitive, the verbs venture, adventure and dare are only found with this type of complement in the corpus. Our research brought out the fact that some notion of movement is present in the lexical meaning of these three verbs. With venture, there is an impression that the subject hesitantly advances into the unknown, a place where possible unwanted consequences may materialize. With adventure, the subject also goes forward into the unknown, but with a slightly more adventurous state of mind. Dare puts a special emphasis on courage or boldness; its meaning can be described as ‘to bravely go ahead and perform a risky deed’. The verb hazard also shares in this notion of movement, as it was found to mean ‘to go ahead and actualize an hazardous event’. Despite the semantic differences between these four verbs, when they are construed with a to-infinitive the latter always represents DEED. An association between the verbs venture, adventure, hazard and dare and verbs of linguistic expression was discovered
through the search of the corpus data. This is not surprising from a cognitive-linguistic point of view according to which human language reflects basic human experience: here the experience is the fairly common one of feeling some hesitation before saying something, not knowing how it is going to be received.

4.3 **EXPLANATION OF TEMPORALITY**

It has been shown that the gerund-participle complement functions as a direct object with respect to the main verb in all of the uses examined in this study. The *-ing* simply represents its event as ‘VERBed’ in this function: it therefore identifies that which is ‘risked’, ‘chanced’ or ‘jeopardized’. The semantics of the *-ing* itself represents an event holistically without locating it in the past, present or future time-spheres. Any impression of a temporal relation between the gerund-participle’s event and the matrix is thus not due to any inherent temporality in the semantics of direct object function, but rather to the interaction of the *-ing’s* meaning in this function with the semantic content of the main verb. Due to the lexical meaning of the verbs studied in this study, the gerund-participle gives rise to a temporal reading of either simultaneity or subsequence.

In all instances of simultaneity in the corpus, the gerund-participle represents DEED: risking is construed in these cases as performing a risky deed, so that the risking and the actualization of this deed are in reality one and the same external event, and consequently simultaneous. The temporal impression of subsequence is found when the gerund-participle corresponds to HARM or VALUED OBJECT. In the former case, risking is construed as ‘running the risk of incurring some form of harm by doing something risky’: the harm is necessarily understood in this case to be a possible unwanted consequence of the risky action and therefore future with respect to risk. In the latter case, risking is construed as ‘putting some valued object at risk by doing something risky’: here the desired realization of the valued event is put at risk and is consequently understood to be future and non-realized.
Regarding the *to*-infinitive complement, it always produces a temporal effect of subsequence with the verbs *venture, adventure, hazard* and *dare*. The preposition *to* expresses here a kinetic orientation potentially leading to a goal/result, so that the infinitival phrase fulfills the role of an adverbial specifier, with the preposition *to* acting as the bridge between the main verb’s event and that of the infinitive, the latter being seen as the endpoint of the movement evoked by *to*. The event of the matrix thus represents a before-position vis-à-vis the infinitive’s event and the latter is consequently always prospective with respect to the main verb’s event. Almost all uses of the *to*-infinitive with verbs of risk produce this impression of subsequent actualization. The only cases of subsequent potentiality, i.e. cases where the infinitive’s event is non-realized, are those previously discussed with the verb *dare*, as in (327). The temporal impressions with verbs of risk are thus readily accounted for by the explanatory framework adopted in this study.

4.4 EXPLANATION OF CONTROL

It was observed in our corpus that the *to*-infinitive always produces an impression of subject control with verbs of risk. This effect can be explained by the function of the *to*-infinitive and the meaning of the preposition *to*. In a use such as *I venture to suggest that we adjourn*, the infinitive’s event is represented as the actualized result of the subject’s venturing. The verb *venture* involves a notion of moving into unknown territory and the preposition *to* explicitly represents this notion, with the infinitive *suggest* being construed as the term to which this movement leads. Since venturing is conceived as a movement of the venturer to the actualization of the suggesting, the realizers of both events are understood to be one and the same entity. These findings are consistent with what has been observed previously with other verbs in infinitival complement constructions (cf. Duffley 1992; 2006a) and so constitute further confirmation of the semantic contribution of the preposition *to* to the control readings observed in infinitival complement constructions.

With the gerund-participle, both subject and non-subject control readings were observed in the corpus. These readings have been explained by the interaction between the
meaning of the -ing, its function as direct object and the semantic content of the main verb. An event which is represented as a risky deed risked, hazarded, or chanced by someone is necessarily seen as something which that person performs himself. When the gerund-participle following these three verbs evokes a potential harm, coreferentiality between the subjects of the matrix and the complement is usually understood, as the harm is something that the main verb’s subject brings upon himself by performing the risky deed (we will see in a moment however that it is also conceivable that the harmful event not be realized by the subject of the matrix). When the gerund-participle corresponds to a valued object, on the other hand, non-subject control readings are relatively frequent: here the valued object can be something that the jeopardizer wishes to do, as in (371), but it is often the case that a jeopardizer puts at risk the future realization of an event that someone else wants to perform, as in (383).

An interesting relationship between animacy and control was also observed in the corpus, as a correlation between inanimate subjects and non-subject control was discovered. This correlation can be seen in Table 4.4 below:
Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Occurrences with Inanimate Subjects</th>
<th>Occurrences with Animate Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>Subject Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venture</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dare</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardize</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endanger</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperil</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows firstly that the verbs risk, venture, adventure, hazard, chance, dare and face occur almost exclusively with animate subjects. In such cases, subject control is always observed. Interestingly, jeopardize, endanger and imperil - the verbs in our corpus which most often produce non-subject control - occur with inanimate subjects in the majority of cases. This is the case for example in (382) above, where the main verb’s subject is a delay. In all such cases with jeopardize, the subject of the main verb and that of the gerund-participle complement are not the same. On the other hand, when jeopardize has an animate subject, a subject control reading is almost always observed. This is also the case for the verb endanger which shows non-subject control whenever it is predicated of an inanimate subject. When it occurs with an animate subject, however, the latter is always felt to be the same as that of the complement (subject control). Imperil, for its part, occurs only with inanimate subjects in the corpus and shows only non-subject control. With the
exception of *risk*, all the other verbs which were found with inanimate subjects show subject control. These are relatively rare in the corpus; a few cases are presented below:

(396) It was realized that such a policy risked leaving Soviet Russia as the dominant force in a post-nazi Europe. (BNC: CE7 1587)

(397) A major dredging programme, which would have risked drying out much of Botswana’s Okavango Delta, has been cancelled. (BNC: J37 121)

(398) Non-lethal guns have to be accurate, other they risk killing people rather than merely incapacitating them (CPI.Q: *New Scientist*).

(399) Any vines that dare to lean against this tree risk being vigorously chewed. (BNC: EFF 323)

(400) Hot and spicy, this room (right) dares to be different with bold, rich colours. (BNC: BPF 1607)

Examples (396)-(398) are all of the same type: as is the case with all uses of verbs of risk predicated of an inanimate subject and having a gerund-participle complement whose subject is someone or something else, the inanimate subject is always something which can be conceived as potentially causing harm. In most cases, these inanimates can also be argued to involve some kind of manpower. The subjects of the main verb in (399) and (400) also seem to have been personified; a subject control reading thus poses no problem. Despite this handful of examples where the matrix’s inanimate subject is not the same as that of the complement, the general tendency remains nonetheless that verbs of risk occurring with inanimate subjects show non-subject while those with animate subjects have subject control. This correlation of subject control with animates is obviously connected to their higher degree of agentivity (cf. Valin 1994).

Finally, the two examples below are the only ones in the corpus where non-subject control was found with the verb *risk*:

(401) The board accepted my proposal that Bogcaster Council should seek to appoint a strategic ICT partner. My report was full of modernizing jargon, so no one was going to challenge its conclusions. To do so would have
risked being regarded as old-fashioned and that would never do. (CPI.Q: Computer Weekly)

(402) Clinton and Al Gore are still rockers at heart. The day before the forest conference in Portland, Oregon, Clinton and Gore hoped to attend an environmental rock concert featuring Neil Young, Kenny Loggins and Carole King. But political instincts won out: Bill and Al decided that attending the concert risked incurring the wrath of loggers. (CPI.Q: Time)

These ‘exceptional’ cases of non-subject control with the verb risk are connected to the fact that the subject of the matrix is itself a verbal form, in one case a to-infinitive and in the other a gerund-participle. The subjects of the main verbs thus themselves contain an implicit subject (cf. Duffley 2006a: 161 ff.; 1992: 118 ff.). It is this implicit subject and not the event expressed by the infinitive or the gerund-participle which is understood to be the possible realizer of the -ing complement’s event: in (401), the subject is understood to be anyone on the board, while in (402) it is Bill Clinton and Al Gore. In both cases, the actualization of the first event by the implicit subject risks bringing down upon this person or persons the actualization of the event expressed by the complement. This type of use is rare, but it is fascinating for the insight it gives into the presence of a ‘generalized person’ or ‘event-originator’ in non-finite verb forms such as the gerund-participle and the infinitive.¹ The presence of this representation of implicit person poses the problem of control with the gerund-participle and the to-infinitive complements, as the implicit subject potentially calls for specification and can be tagged as either identical or distinct from the subject of the main verb. The use of non-finite verb forms as inanimate subjects promises to be an exciting avenue for future research into control.

4.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The meaning-based approach chosen for this study has been shown to be successful in explaining temporal and control effects with verbs of risk. The three parameters proposed by Duffley (2000; 2006a) have stood for the test of usage with the set of verbs examined here. It was our contention that the semantics of the matrix verb needed to be taken into account in order to provide a complete explanation of usage with the gerund-participle and the to-infinitive complement. In our view, temporality and control in constructions of the type 'main verb + complement' cannot be explained with such abstract categories as tense or thematic roles, or by only taking into account the syntactic configuration of these constructions. Rather, the problems of temporality and control can only be accounted for adequately by the semantic interaction between the meanings and the functions of the elements involved in these constructions.

The conclusions of this study are limited to cases where verbs of risk are followed directly by a non-finite complement. Uses where there is another element between the matrix and the gerund-participle or infinitive, as in She risked her life to save her daughter, are more complex and open up a whole new vista for investigation. The role of animacy in control, which is new and uncharted territory, also seems to be a very promising avenue for future research. It would be interesting to see whether animacy plays a role with other types of verbs as well, and if so, how it does so. Finally, the role of non-finite verb forms as subjects also needs to be explored further. Such constructions represent a complex and intriguing semantic configuration in which you have a subject within a subject! But pursuing this question would unfortunately take us beyond the subject...of this thesis.
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