

- 6.24 complex transitive verbs with direct object and non-finite complement clause

For the discussion of this complementation type we refer to 2.37.

Examples:

His remark *set* me thinking.

I'll *have* you punished for this.

He *challenged* his adversary to come to the door.

I won't simply *let* things take their course.

- 6.25 survey of complex transitive verbs with a direct object and a second complement in the form of a non-finite clause

In the following sections (6.26–29) we group together all the complex transitive verbs which frequently occur with a second complement in the form of a non-finite clause, whether the second complement functions as object attribute, predicator complement or – in most cases – as non-finite complement clause. The survey is subdivided on the basis of the formal type of non-finite clause (bare infinitive clause, *to*-infinitive clause, *-ing* participle clause, *-ed* participle clause) commonly taken by the various verbs.

- 6.26 direct object + bare infinitive clause

Complex transitive verbs commonly found with a bare infinitive clause as second complement are:

have

help

let

make

Note that we may distinguish four senses of *have* as used with this complementation type:

a *have* = to cause:

The newspaper *had* its legal expert attend the trial.

**b** *have* = to experience:

Surely you wouldn't like to *have* my dog walk all over your papers.

**c** *have* = to permit:

The company would not *have* its employees consume alcoholic liquor during working hours.

**d** *have* = to want:

The author would *have* us believe that he himself was not involved in the scandal.

In senses **c** and **d** – volition – *have* is usually premodified by *would*, in sense **d** the infinitive is often *believe*. In senses **a**, **b** and **c** the bare infinitive clause alternates with an *-ing* participle clause, which, with *have* in sense **b**, is by far the more frequently used structure, cf. 6.28:

You wouldn't like to *have* people walking all over your lawn, would you?

With the verb *help* the bare infinitive clause alternates with a *to*-infinitive clause:

Will you *help* me do this, please?

Will you *help* me to do this, please?

Although both (50) and (51) are fully acceptable sentences, (50) is more likely to occur than (51), especially in informal contexts. On the other hand, we would hardly expect to find a bare infinitive instead of a *to*-infinitive in:

Writing out a poem will *help* you to learn it.

F. T. Wood in his *Current English Usage* (London 1963), from which the last example was taken, suggests that 'it is never wrong to insert *to*; it can be omitted only when the "helper" does some of the work, of shares in the activity jointly with the person that is helped.'

*Let* is used with this complementation type in various senses, the most important of which are illustrated in the following examples:

I won't *let* you go. (52)

In order to preclude any misunderstandings,

the royal visitor *let* it be known that he would not meet with members of the proscribed opposition party. (53)

*Let's* try and see him tonight. (54)

*Let* no one assume that we shall overcome our difficulties without making sacrifices. (55)

In (52) *let* corresponds to *allow*, in (53) it denotes *causation*, in (54) and (55) it denotes *exhortation*. These last two examples illustrate the so-called LET-IMPERATIVE, in which *let* is regarded as 'imperative-marker'. It is especially common with first person subjects. See 5.24 for further information.

### 6.27 direct object + *to*-infinitive clause

Complex transitive verbs frequently found with a *to*-infinitive clause as second complement – practically all denoting volition or causation – include:

appoint	lead
bring	leave
compel	persuade
enable	set
force	take
get	tell
help	trust
instruct	urge
invite	

*Bring* taking this complementation type normally has a direct object in the form of a noun phrase with either a reflexive pronoun as head or a noun with abstract meaning. In the latter case the infinitive is usually *to bear*:

I somehow cannot *bring* myself to believe that he is sincere.

The greatest experts have *brought* their experience and intellect to bear on the problem.

With *set* the function of direct object is normally fulfilled by a noun phrase with a reflexive pronoun as head:

With a great effort he *set* himself to play the overture a second time.

*Take* often has (intensive) *to be* as infinitive:

I *took* her to be the ambassador's wife.

### 6.28 direct object + *-ing* participle clause

Complex transitive verbs commonly taking an *-ing* participle clause as second complement are:

have
get
keep
leave

*Have* with this complementation type often denotes 'experience' (cf. the less frequent alternative with bare infinitive clause, 6.26b).

It was a terrible thing to *have* the enemy marching about the streets of our town.

*Have* may also be used in a much vaguer sense in sentences that correspond in meaning to sentences with 'existential *there*' (see 9.29):

He *had* several people watching him. (56)

There were several people watching him. (56a)

*Leave* with an *-ing* participle clause is to be distinguished semantically from the same verb with a *to*-infinitive clause as complement. In the former case the subclause denotes something contemporaneous with the 'leaving', in the latter case something that is still to come:

You can't *leave* the patient lying on the floor like that.

I *left* my opponent to make the first move.

The use of an *-ing* participle clause with *get* and *keep* is illustrated in the following examples:

How can we *get* the engine going again?

He *kept* me waiting for half an hour.

#### 6.29 direct object + *-ed* participle clause

Complex transitive verbs commonly taking an *-ed* participle clause as second complement are:

have  
get  
keep  
leave  
make

Again we may distinguish at least four senses of *have* as used with this complementation type:

a *Have* = to cause:

I'll *have* it done as soon as possible.

b *Have* = to experience:

I've *had* this explained to me several times now. (57)

c *Have* = to permit:

I refused to *have* my diary used as evidence in the trial. (58)

d *Have* = to hold, to possess:

I *have* no money left. (59)

The enemy troops *had* the fortress completely surrounded. (60)

Note that in (59) and (60) the *-ed* participles denote *state* and can be unambiguously identified as object attributes.

Particularly in senses b and d a sentence containing *have* with this complementation type may be practically equivalent to a sentence in the passive voice or to one containing existential *there*. Compare (57) and (59) with:

This has been explained to me several times now. (57a)

There is no money left. (59a)

With *leave* the *-ed* participle is frequently preceded by *un-*, in which case its verbal character is doubtful:

We *left* too much unsaid during our last meeting.

With *make* this complementation type seems to be limited to collocations denoting the exercise and recognition of influence in the widest sense:

He could hardly *make* himself heard.

The main problem is how to *make* your intention understood by the public at large.

The use of this complementation type with *get* and *keep* is illustrated in the following examples:

He *got* himself arrested for drug peddling.

*Keep* your mouth shut!

The remark made above with regard to (59) and (60) applies to *-ed* participles after *keep* as well: they denote *state* and more specifically function as object attributes.

#### 6.30 Verb phrase complementation in passive clauses

The majority of the monotransitive, ditransitive and complex transitive verbs dealt with in 6.7–29 may occur as heads of passive verb phrases. The subject of a passive clause may be regarded as playing the same semantic role as a complement – especially direct object and indirect

## Non-finite complement clauses

In 2.28, 2.29, 2.30, 2.31, 2.35 and 2.36 we discussed the occurrence of various formal types of non-finite clauses as complements to transitive verbs. In 2.28, 2.29, 2.30 and 2.31 the function of these clauses was identified as direct object, in 2.35 as object attribute, and in 2.36 as predicator complement. In addition, we gave examples of sentences that were superficially similar in form but whose analysis could not be accommodated within the functional categories set up so far.

The formal similarity of the structures we shall deal with here will be apparent from the following lists of examples selected from the above sections:

### Analysed in:

- 2.28: (48)  
I hate *people reading my private notes.* (59)  
I saw *him coming.* (61)  
How can we prevent *such a tragedy occurring again?*
- 2.29: (49)  
You don't want *this reported to the authorities.* (66)  
I actually saw *the prisoner beaten.*
- 2.30: (51)  
He wanted *me to leave at once.* (72)  
Experience has shown *the scheme to contain defects.* (75)  
He taught *his son to drive.*
- 2.31: (52)  
Have you ever watched *somebody die?*  
Nigel noticed *the couple enter the house.*
- 2.35: (98)  
I wouldn't call *that playing the game.* (99)  
We kept *the bottle locked up.*
- 2.36: (100)  
We must remind *him to see the Minister about it.*

### Left unanalysed in:

- 2.28: (63)  
You won't have *people putting out flags for you.* (65)  
His remark set *me thinking.*

2.29: (68)  
I'll have you punished for this.  
(69)  
How can we get this car repaired?

2.30: (76)  
He persuaded his adversary to come to the door.  
(78)  
He enabled me to come.  
(80)  
The rebels chose their leader to be the new president.

2.31: (83)  
I won't simply let things take their course.  
(84)  
This will help you see things in the right way.

What all these examples have in common is that the lexical verb of the superordinate clause has a complementation consisting of a noun phrase followed by a non-finite verb phrase – with or without its own complement(s) and/or adverbial(s) – and that the noun phrase stands in a subject-relation to the sequence following it.

In spite of this similarity, however, there are important functional differences.

The first difference is that in all the 'analysed' examples from 2.28, 2.29, 2.30 and 2.31, except (75), the whole sequence following the lexical verb of the superordinate clause constitutes *one single sentence element*, whereas this is not the case in any of the other examples. Where the sequence constitutes one single sentence element it is a noun phrase equivalent (replaceable by a noun phrase pro-form such as *something or this*) functioning as direct object.

In all the other cases the italicized sequences must be regarded as consisting of two separate sentence elements, the first of which is the noun phrase immediately following the lexical verb of the superordinate clause and the second being whatever follows this noun phrase. Example (75) differs from the others in this group in that the non-finite sequence following the first complement is itself a noun phrase equivalent:

He taught his son to drive.  
He taught his son something.

In this example, then, the main lexical verb (*taught*) takes two complements, the first a noun phrase and the second a noun phrase equivalent, to which we must assign the functions of indirect object and direct object respectively (see also 2.30).

None of the examples in which the complementation of the lexical verb of the superordinate clause consists of two separate sentence elements, except (75), allows the substitution of *something, this*, or another noun phrase pro-form, for the non-finite sequence following the first complement. This first complement is invariably a noun phrase following an extensive verb, which means that in these examples its function is that of direct object.

Consequently, all the examples in the above lists from (98) downwards contain a direct object and a following non-finite complement clause. On the basis of its intensive relation to the direct object this complement clause was further identified as an object attribute clause in (98) and (99). In (100) it was identified as a predicator complement clause because of the possibility of replacing it by a preposition phrase containing a noun phrase as complement:

We must remind him to see the Minister about it.  
We must remind him of something.

Functionally, the examples listed as 'left unanalysed' form a highly heterogeneous group. In some of them – notably (76), (80) and (84) – the non-finite clause may be omitted without making the sentence ungrammatical, whereas in the other examples this is not the case. Some of them may be passivized – e.g. (76) and (78); others have no corresponding passive sentence – e.g. (63) and (68). In (69) the function of the non-finite clause bears some resemblance to an object attribute, in (80) to an adverbial of purpose. In other cases – e.g. (83) – the non-finite clause bears no resemblance whatsoever to any of the functional categories we have distinguished so far, apart from the fact that it belongs to the general category of complements.

In principle, there are two possibilities open to us. Either we set up new subcategories of complements in order to accommodate the structures under discussion, or we refrain from indicating their functions more specifically than by means of the general term of complements. In this introductory grammar we prefer the latter option. The problems of this analysis offered by the present structures are confined to sentences such as the ones we have listed as 'left unanalysed'. Setting up new functional subcategories especially in order to deal with these problems would mean an increase in the complexity of our grammatical apparatus without any significant increase in its descriptive power. We shall, therefore, simply refer to the function of the non-finite clauses in the sentences 'left unanalysed' as complements and to the clauses themselves as NON-FINITE COMPLEMENT CLAUSES. It should be recognized, of course, that strictly speaking this term would apply just as well to the non-finite clauses in the first part of our list, whose functions we identified more specifically as direct object, object attribute or predicator complement. We propose to assign the more specific labels wherever this is possible and to reserve the term non-finite complement clause only for those clauses whose function cannot be more specifically indicated within the present system of categories.

2.38

The discussion in 2.37 of complementary non-finite subclauses was based on a list of sentences that were all in the active voice. With certain modifications corresponding to the regular structural differences between active sentences and passive sentences it will apply to sentences in the passive voice as well.