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Some verbs can take as their complement either to-infinitive or -ing participle. Among those verbs are aspectual verbs like start, begin, continue and cease. These verbs, however, cannot always take the two types of complements. Then we assume that there is a semantic difference between the two types of aspectual verb complements themselves and that the analysis of the difference will provide a semantic solution to the problem of the complement selection of predicates. The present paper concerns itself with the two types of aspectual verb complements which can be distinguished on the analogy of the aspectual distinction of perception verb complements.

1. INTRODUCTION. It is well known that some of the temporal aspectual verbs take as their complement either to-infinitive (to V, henceforth) or -ing participle (V-ing, henceforth) in the sense of Quirk et al. (1972), as can be shown in the following examples:

(1) a. It started to rain/raining.
    b. He began to run/running.
(2) He continued to work/working on it.
(3) We ceased to worry/worrying about being fired.

As to the semantic difference between the same aspectual verbs with a to V complement and with a V-ing complement, Freed (1979) concludes that the to V complement describes an event in general or a "generic" event, while the V-ing complement expresses an unspecified duration of a single

* This paper is an enlarged and thoroughly revised version of the paper read at the 4th National Conference of the English Linguistic Society of Japan at Tsuda College on November 15, 1986. I am most indebted to Prof. Takeo Saito and Prof. Hidekazu Suzuki for their valuable comments and constant encouragement. Gratitude is also due to Wayne Lawrence for his patient work on a boring list of data. All errors of omission and commission are my own.

1 In the present paper we do not distinguish traditional terms “participle” and “gerund” following Quirk et al. (1972, 1985). We refer to the -ing form of complement to perception verbs or aspectual verbs as simply V-ing.
event. Freed's conclusion, however, immediately turns out to be untenable; this is shown by the contrast between the examples in 4 and 5:

(4) a. I began to take a walk before breakfast last month.
   b. She told him not to visit her anymore. At first he ignored her and continued to visit anyway. Finally the visits stopped. (Freed 1979: 153)
   c. Mike ceased to cry wolf. (Fujimoto 1985: 76)

(5) a. He began to say something, but his words broke into a rasping cough. (Konishi 1980: 121)
   b. Juddy continued to hold the money until the bet was decided. (Boertien 1979: 46)

It does not seem that Freed gives a clear definition of "generic" in her sense, but we can suppose, according to her description (p. 74) and her note 6 (p. 87), that she means by "generic" the same as Lawler (1973) means by the same term, i.e. "habitual" or "iterative". Indeed, the examples in 4 may show that to V complements describe "generic" events, but a great number of examples such as in 5 can be given to show that it is not always the case. The to V complement in either sentence in 5 obviously describes a single specific event, not a habitual or repetitive one. Thus we cannot admit that Freed's analysis of aspectual verb complements covers their overall semantic status.

In the present study, semantic functions of aspectual verb complements are reconsidered, and a new alternative way to explain the semantic difference between the to V and V-ing aspectual verb complements is proposed on the basis of their semantic or aspectual similarity to the two types of perception verb complements. In the following section, perception verb complementation will be reviewed first, before the counterpart of aspectual verbs is looked into at the third section.

2. Semantic Difference between the Two Types of Perception Verb Complements. Here we are going to look into semantic or aspectual properties of the perception verb complements.

The selection of perception verb complements, NP V or NP V-ing has often been attributed to the aspectual difference of the events they describe; and the aspectual distinction depends upon whether the perceived event is perfective or non-perfective. This distinction can be illustrated by the following pair of examples:

(6) a. *I saw her drown, but I rescued her.
   b. I saw her drowning, but I rescued her.
According to Kirsner and Thompson (1976), however, the two types of perception verb complements cannot be always distinguished depending on that aspectual difference, as the contrast between 7a and 7b shows:

(7) a. We saw her just sit there.
    b. We saw her just sitting there. (ibid.)

In 7a as well as 7b, “her sitting” is not necessarily completed. For many informants of Kirsner and Thompson, 7a means that “the sitter is actively refusing to do something but sit,” not just sitting around as in 7b. They attribute this semantic difference between 7a and 7b to the “boundedness” of the event described by perception verb complements; that is, the event described by the NP V complement is “bounded in time”, while the NP V-ing complement describes an event which is “unbounded in time”.

Against this aspectual distinction, “bounded” vs. “unbounded”, Declerck (1981) gives the following examples to show apparent “incompleteness” of the event perceived in 8a:

(8) a. I saw John walk towards the beach.
    b. I saw John walking towards the beach.

(Declerck 1981: 95)

Declerck argues that since the complement in 8a cannot be said to describe a “bounded” event and is virtually the same as that in 8b in its aspectual property, the “boundedness” of a perceived event does not necessarily depend upon the form of complement. Indeed he might be right in pointing out that in 8a the perceived event is not completed, but that cannot immediately nullify Kirsner and Thompson’s analysis. Declerck, confusing bounded and unbounded distinction with his own “telic” and “atelic” contrast (see Declerck 1979), forgets the other boundary of the event, that is, the point where the event starts. In 8a the perceived event is bounded at its initial point, whereas no such boundary is intended in 8b where the V-ing form is used. Thus the complement in 8a can describe the event of “John’s starting to walk and his ongoing towards the beach”, but not in 8b.

Another set of examples below will illustrate such a bounded and unbounded contrast between the V-ing and plain V complements:

(9) a. I saw John getting out of the hotel and walking towards the beach.
    b. *I saw John get out of the hotel and walking towards the beach.
c. I saw John get out of the hotel and walk towards the beach.

In each sentence above, the event perceived consists of two kinds of activities. The couple of activities obviously cannot be done simultaneously, but is supposed to be done separately and consecutively; immediately after “getting out of the hotel” is completed, “walking towards the beach” is started. Between the first event and the second one, therefore, there is expected to be a “boundary” where the first activity terminates and the second one is initiated. To describe this inherently bounded event, the bare infinitive complement can be used as 9c shows, but not the V-ing complement as in 9a or the coordinated V and V-ing complement as in 9b. 9a is only acceptable when the event perceived is interpreted as repetitive; that is, “John repeatedly gets out of the hotel and walks towards the beach.” 9b, where bounded plain V and unbounded V-ing are coordinated, is always unacceptable probably because of the bounded vs. unbounded aspectual contradiction between the two types of complements.

2 Declerck, who is only paying attention to the “completeness” of the event perceived and thus claims that the two types of perception verb complements such as those in 8 are indistinguishable in terms of their own aspectual properties, cannot explain the difference in acceptability among the examples in 9.

Let us see another pair of examples showing how plausible it is to distinguish the two types of perception verb complements according to their aspectual properties, i.e. “boundedness”.

(10) a. I saw Mary drink three bottles of wine.
    b. ?I saw Mary drinking three bottles of wine.

The activity of “drinking three bottles of wine” is inherently bounded itself; the activity composes a bounded event. The event of Mary’s drinking three bottles of wine in total is described by the infinitival com-

---

2 Declerck (1982: 3) admits such conjoined plain V and V-ing perception verb complements as follows:

(i) I heard someone coming and open the door.
(ii) Tom heard a door open and someone approaching.

In either of the examples above, the event described by the conjoined complements is not so strictly bounded in the middle of the two sorts of events as that in 9c. This difference in the boundedness of the twofold event seems to be relevant to the acceptability of the coordinated perception verb complements. Thus it turns down the claim that the unacceptability of 9b is attributed to the coordinated construction of different types of syntactic constituents.
plement as in 10a, but not by $V$-ing. 10b is only acceptable when it is intended to describe rather an odd situation where “Mary was drinking three bottles of wine at the same time.” This shows that the $V$-ing complement does not allow even the inherently bounded event perceived to be interpreted as bounded. Only the infinitival complement allows the interpretation that “Mary drank wine bottle by bottle and finally finished drinking the third and last bottle of wine.” Here again, the different two types of perception verb complements can be adequately distinguished according to their distinctive aspectual properties: bounded vs. unbounded. Declerck’s mere distinction of “complete vs. incomplete”, therefore, cannot explain the contrast illustrated above in 10, either. Declerck’s fault lies in having his attention caught only by one end and forgetting the other.

Through the preceding analyses, it has become clear that Kirsner and Thompson’s “boundedness” of the event perceived is relevant to the distinction between the two types of perception verb complements, and that Declerck’s “completeness” is unsatisfactory. To sum, the plain $V$ form describes an event which is bounded in time either at its initial point or at its terminal point; the $V$-ing form describes an event which is unbounded in time anywhere.

3. Aspectual Properties of Aspectual Verb Complements. Here we make a hypothesis that the “boundedness in time” which distinguishes the two types of perception verb complements also distinguishes the two types of aspectual verb complements; in the case of aspectual verbs, the to $V$ complement describes an event “bounded in time”, while the $V$-ing an unbounded event. This hypothesis is based on the semantic assumption that the complements of both perception verbs and aspectual verbs describe “events”. Infinitival complements of aspectual verbs do not take the form of plain $V$ but to $V$. This difference in form between

3 See Mourelatos (1981) for a rigid definition of “events”, or “occurrences” in his own notation. In Menzel (1975) “events” are distinguished from activities or actions based on the presence of the “surface subject”. Our event, however, includes all of Menzel’s event, activity and action. “States”, the other of the two subcategories of the “second-order-entities” (see Lyons 1977: 442-43), are usually contrasted with “events” on account of its distinctive aspectual property. But in the course of discussion, states with the potential of change will turn out to show a similar aspectual property to “events”.


these two cases results from their semantic properties. The event of perception itself and the perceived event must be always simultaneous; on the other hand, the event expressed by an aspectual verb and that by its complement do not have to be simultaneous. The present section is concerned with the semantic difference between the \textit{V-ing} and \textit{to V} aspectual verb complements; first of all, inchoative \textit{start} and \textit{begin}; second, consecutive or resumptive \textit{continue}; and finally, terminative \textit{cease}.

3.1. Inchoative Verbs \textit{Start} and \textit{Begin}. Aspectual verbs \textit{start} and \textit{begin}, which mean inception of events, can take both \textit{to V} and \textit{V-ing} complements. We will show that \textit{to V} complements describe the events which are bounded in time, whereas \textit{V-ing} complements those which are unbounded in time.

When the verb \textit{begin} takes a complement which describes the same event as in 9 above, only the \textit{to V} form is possible, as is clear from the following examples:

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. John began \textit{getting} out of the hotel and \textit{walking} towards the beach.
\item b. *John began \textit{to get} out of the hotel and \textit{walking} towards the beach.
\item c. John began \textit{to get} out of the hotel and \textit{to walk} towards the beach.
\end{enumerate}

The judgements of these examples are parallel to those in 9. As we have already seen in 9, the event inchoated in 11 is inherently bounded between the pair of activities, “getting out of the hotel” and “walking towards the beach.” The form \textit{to V} is appropriate for the description of this kind of inherently bounded specific event, as in 11c, but not the form \textit{V-ing} as in 11a. The total unacceptability of 11b results from the inconsistency of the boundedness in time expressed in each of the coordinated complements; the \textit{to V} complement of the first conjunct describes a bounded event and the \textit{V-ing} complement of the second conjunct an unbounded event, as in 9b.

Let us see another contrastive pair of examples which illustrate the

\footnote{See Fukaya (1987) for the relevance of the temporal relation between the matrix verb and its complement to the complement type selection. Besides the difference in the infinitival form, aspectual verb complements are different from the counterpart of perception verbs in not allowing the occurrence of their surface subject independent of the matrix subject. But that makes no difference for the present problem.}
aspectual difference between the two types of aspectual verb complements.

(12) a. They finally began/started to reach their destination.

(Freed 1979: 83)

b. ?They finally began/started reaching their destination.

The event described in the complement above, “reaching their destination” is a sort of “achievement” in the sense of Vendler (1967). The event is momentaneous and thus “bounded” in itself. To show the inception of this inherently bounded event, only the to V complement form is available, as 12a shows, but not V-ing. 12b is only acceptable when the subject “they” is interpreted as “distributive”; it only means that each of them began or started to reach his destination individually. On that interpretation, the event started is no longer momentaneous aspectually and thus no longer bounded.

As a third exemplification, let us see the verb remember following inchoative start:

(13) a. I started to remember the date I saw her for the first time.

b. *I started remembering the date I saw her for the first time.

The verb remember, like understand, has a distinctive aspectual property that Vendler fails to capture. Those verbs do not belong to any single class of Vendler’s fourfold aspects: activity, accomplishment, state and achievement. But they show aspectual properties of both “achievement” and “state” after the achievement. See the following pair of examples:

(14) a. When I see the picture, I always remember my father.

b. He remembers every detail of that occurrence as though it happened yesterday.

Remember in 14a means “call back to mind the memory of” and that in 14b “have or keep in the memory”; the former is a sort of achievement and the latter is a state following the achievement. The verb can describe both the event achieved and at the same time the state after the achievement in the same simple present form. Thus the event or state described by remember or understand likewise is characterized by its “boundedness” only at its initial point. It does not have the other end, since man’s memory or knowledge is supposed to last so long, unless some accident or oblivion prevents it, that there is no telling when it stops or ends. Then let us see the examples above in 13 again. Needless to say, the verb start focuses the inception of an event.5 Within the event

---

5 Freed (1979: 71) gives a clear definition of start. It refers to the “onset” of an
described by *remember*, therefore, only the initial achievement point which is inherently bounded is relevant when preceded by inchoative *start*. To describe this bounded initial achievement point, *to V* can be properly used as in 13a, but *V-ing* cannot, as in 13b.

We have seen above the boundedness of a *single specific* event described by the infinitival complement. Then let us see the case of events interpreted as “generic”, or habitual and repetitive, which Freed claims is the only possible aspectual property of events described by *to V* complements. According to Freed, only the *to V* form occurs after *start* or *begin* when the generic nature of events is relevant, as is clear from the examples below:

(15) a. I hardly slept for two nights, but the excitement of the move plus my nervous energy kept me going. By the third day I began to feel drugged and every time I sat down I started to *fall*/*falling* asleep.

b. Leon and Ruth’s marriage had been in trouble for years. Despite numerous tense situations, their friends supported them both and did what they could to keep the two together. Last month they finally split up—they say that it is a trial separation. Yet just as soon as they separated, their friends began *to take*/*taking* up sides.

(Freed 1979: 75)

The contexts of these examples will make clear that each event started or begun is naturally interpreted as habitual or repetitive. The *to V* form sounds more natural for the description for this kind of “generic” event.

Next, to explore another semantic property of aspectual verb complements, let us examine the case of “stative” verbs which occur in the complement of inchoative *start* or *begin*. See the following examples:

(16) a. She started to *be*/*being* a woman. 6

b. They started to *own*/*owning* a house.

event, which is contrastive to *begin* referring to the initial temporal segment of the “nucleus” of an event. Hence the different distribution between *start* and *begin* as follows.

( i ) She *started* to sneeze but then she didn’t sneeze.

(ii) *She began* to sneeze but then she didn’t sneeze. (Freed 1979: 72)

6 *Being* is possible when “be a woman” is interpreted not as state but as process. That is, “She started being a woman,” is only acceptable when interpreted as “She started growing up as a woman out of her girlhood.” Under that interpretation, *be* is no longer stative, and thus supports our claim that only non-stative verbs can occur in the *V-ing* form in the aspectual verb complement position.
c. Information retrieval has begun to be/*being done by computers.

d. Anything began to seem/*seeming possible.

These examples show that stative verbs can only occur as complements to inchoative verbs in the form of to V. Thus, stative verbs and nonstative verbs interpreted as "generic" can be said to have common syntactic properties in that they both occur only in the to-infinitive form after begin or start. Then what is their common semantic or aspectual properties parallel to the common syntactic distribution? The notion of "state" is distinguished from the notion of event in that no kind of state can be located in time; or more exactly, a state cannot be recognized as located in the sequence of time because of its homogeneity within its any period of time. Notice, however, that complements to aspectual verbs are supposed to describe events as we have assumed at the beginning of this section. It is quite important to note that a state can be an event if it has the potential of change (see footnote 3), and that the point of change is a "boundary"; in other words, a state is bounded at the point of its change. In fact, a state which is inherently unbounded in time is required to be bounded at its initial point when it is started or begun. To describe bounded states of this kind, the to V complement can be used, but not V-ing. The to V complement functions as a sort of "cutter" which cuts out a period of state from the unknown length of or possibly everlasting state. The cut-out piece of state is now locatable in time like an event and thus "bounded" at least at the cut end.

Then how should we treat the function of the to V complement as those above in 15, where the events started or begun are interpreted as "generic"? There are two possible ways of solution. One is to regard a generic event as a sort of state. A habitual activity or a repeatedly occurring event can be thought of as attributes of someone or something, which is a temporally unbounded state with respect to aspect. Then we

7 In the following construction, the to V infinitival form is able to occur only when it describes a state as in (i) or a generic event as in (iii).

(i) I believe him to be honest.
(ii) *I believe him to come and see me tomorrow.
(iii) I believe him to come and see me every weekend.

This is another supporting evidence for the validity of our analysis of complements in terms of their aspectual status. In the above examples as well, to V complements describing states and generic events show the same distribution.
can consider the function of *to V* describing generic events to be the same as that of the state described by *to V* complements.

The other solution is to positively differentiate generic events from states. A generic event is expected to occur *continually* in the real world, and thus a number of concrete occurrences of events are linearly located in the sequence of time as the following figure shows:

\[(17) \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \\]

Every occurrence of an event intermittently located as shown in 17 can be naturally thought to be bounded.

In whichever way of the analyses we may take on the aspectual status of “generic events”, we can safely conclude that they are “bounded” in time and thus share the same aspectual property of boundedness with “states” which are also solely described by *to V* and “specific bounded events”. The occurrence of the *to V* form following verbs *start* and *begin* proves to be, therefore, only predictable through our aspectual concept of temporal “boundedness”. Notice, incidentally, that Freed, who claims that *to V* aspectual verb complements simply describe generic events, fails to explain occurrences of *to V* complements which are clearly interpreted as describing “states” like those in 16 or as describing “single specific events” like those in 11c, 12a, and 13a.

### 3.2. Consecutive and Resumptive Continue

Like inchoative *start* and *begin*, the verb *continue* can take as its complement either *to V* or *V-ing*, as seen above in 2. Then a question arises: Is there any semantic difference between the two types of complements to the verb *continue*? If there is, can the difference be explained in the same way as that between the *to V* and *V-ing* complements to *start* or *begin*?

As the following examples illustrate, one of the two types of complements is sometimes more natural. In 18 *V-ing* is more natural and in 19 *to V*.

\[(18) \]

a. While the man held a gun on her, she continued *to count/counting* out hundred-dollar bills.

b. When the bell rings, ignore it and continue *to read/reading*.

c. He smiled when he heard his children playing. He looked outside and there they were building a snowman; he continued *to smile/smiling* when he saw them.

\[(19) \]

a. If they stop now, they won’t continue *to work/work* later.
b. The band began to play at 9:00. They continued to play/playing until 1 a.m. stopping for 5-minute breaks every half hour.

(Freed 1979: 93-5)

Each example in 18 describes a single event which is being done consecutively and continuously; there is supposed to be no pause or intermission, or no insertion of a different kind of event. The continuity without intermission is clearest in 18c. The first sentence guarantees that he was in the activity of “smiling” just before the next scene described in the second sentence. In that second stage, the activity in which he was involved is the same as that in the first one, i.e. “smiling”. Thus 18c clearly describes the continuance of a homogeneous event. In 19, on the other hand, there exists a different sort of event just before the continuation, or more precisely, “resumption” of the event described by the to V complement. The heterogeneous event is “a stopping of working” in 19a and “a 5-minute break before the band’s performance” in 19b. Therefore, the aspectual concept of “boundedness” turns out to be true of this case, too. The V-ing form which describes unbounded events is more naturally used in 18, where the simple continuation of a homogeneous event is described. In contrast, the to V form which describes bounded events is more readily used in 19, where the resumption of an event after intermission is described.

See the examples below, as a further illustration of the difference mentioned above.

(20) a. Mary continued to drink three bottles of wine.
   b. ?Mary continued drinking three bottles of wine.

20b is only acceptable if “drinking three bottles of wine at a time” was continuously performed (see 10) or “drinking three bottles of wine” was habitually continued.\(^8\) If what is intended in 20 is the situation that after

\(^8\) 20b restores its perfect acceptability with the addition of such a temporal adverbial as below which guarantees “habitual” interpretation.

(i) Mary continued drinking three bottles of wine every night.

This example shows that V-ing complements do occur when aspectual verb complements are obviously interpreted as describing habitual activities. The fact makes Freed’s analysis far less tenable. In our own framework, to V habitual and V-ing habitual can be distinguished as “bounded habitual” and “unbounded habitual” respectively, on the basis of the observation by Leech (1971: 27-8) that a habit expressed by a progressive form is supposed to exist over a limited period of time. A habitual event described by V-ing is regarded as an unbounded specific event; the
some intermission, e.g. after some drinking of another sort of alcohol
than wine or after some other activity than drinking itself, Mary started
again to drink wine and her drinking amounts to three bottles, the to V
form is naturally used as complement to the verb continue like 20a.
Therefore, the continued event in 20b is of unbounded nature in the
same way as in 10, while that of 20a is bounded.

Then let us see generic (or habitual) events and states described by
complements to continue. See the following examples:

(21) a. She told him not to visit her anymore. At first he ignored
her and continued to visit/?visiting anyway. Finally the
visits stopped. (=4b)
b. Geologists continued to make/?making new advances and
discoveries in 1975.
c. He continued to fight/?fighting this battle all his life.
d. The tower continued to lean and to lean/?leaning and
leaning.

(22) a. Inflation continued to be/*being a major problem for con-
sumers.
b. Nora continued to know/?knowing right from wrong
despite her association with common criminals.
c. Can the oil-producing nations continue to hold/?holding
together as a cartel?

As is the case with start and begin, complements to continue can take only
the to V form to describe generic events, as shown in 21; stative verbs can
occur in the complements to continue solely in the to-infinitive form, as
in 22. Note that in 21d a coordinated to V complement occurs as in 11c.
The V-ing complement could only be used in 21d if the tower is visibly
leaning so that the time to fall down seems to be coming close; and this
situation is obviously unbounded.

Thus we can explain the occurrence of the to V form and the non-
occurrence of the V-ing form as a complement to continue when it de-
scribes a generic event or a state, in the same way as in the cases of com-
plements to start and begin. That is, states and generic events can only
be described in the to V form since both of them are “bounded in time”.

habit which should be inherently intermittent and thus bounded is described as if it
were a single continuous and thus unbounded event as a whole. Thus our “bounded-
ness” proves to have an explanatory power on this subtle semantic distinction.
To summarize, to V complements describe the three cases of essentially the same nature: first, bounded specific events; second, states, which must be bounded in time when they appear in aspectual verb complements; third, generic events, which can be regarded as entities similar to states or as a series of intermittent and thus “bounded” concrete events.

3.3. Terminative Cease. Finally, let us look into the relation between the verb cease and its complement. When some event, including activity or process, is stopped or ended, it must necessarily be ongoing, and thus “unbounded” in our sense, just before the stopping or ending. Thus verbs like stop, finish and quit are only followed by the V-ing complement form which describes an unbounded ongoing event. The to V complement to describe a bounded event, which is supposed to have a clear-cut end at its initial or terminal point in itself, is incompatible with those verbs which mean interruption or completion. It is those aspectual verbs with the meaning of putting an end or a pause to an ongoing event that give a boundary to an unbounded event.

Among these aspectual verbs, however, only the verb cease can take as its complement the to V form as well as the V-ing form, as illustrated by the examples below:

(23)  
   a. Poland ceased to exist/*existing as a nation for 120 years.  
   b. Money ceased to have/*having any value.  
   c. Speech which is incomprehensible ceases to be/*being language.  
   d. After the accident, John ceased to know/*knowing his own name.

In all the examples above, each ceased event is of stative nature. The above examples show that the state to be ceased cannot be described by the V-ing complement but the to V infinitive.

Note, however, those verbs which occur in the to V complement to the verb cease are not always stative. Nonstative verbs may also occur in the to V form following the verb cease. See the pair of examples below:

(24)  
   a. Mike ceased crying wolf.  
   b. Mike ceased to cry wolf. (=4c)

24a presupposes that Mike was really “crying for help” before he stopped it. 24b, in contrast, can be true even if Mike was not really “crying for help” at the time of the cessation. 24a means the cessation of a single specific ongoing event; in 24b, on the other hand, that interpretation is no longer possible. “To cry” in 24b implies Mike’s habit of “giving a
false warning of danger or crying unnecessarily for help"; 24b as a whole means that this habit of Mike's was gotten rid of or shaken off. Thus we can conclude that the to V complement to the verb cease, if the V is non-stative, is interpreted as describing habitual or generic events, which have already been proved to show aspectual properties similar to those of states in the preceding two subsections.

The above contrast between the to V and V-ing complements to cease turns out to be far clearer if more contexts are supplied as in the following pair of examples:

(25) a. Lacey ceased crying when she heard her parents come in the door.

b. ?Lacey ceased to cry when she heard her parents come in the door.

(Freed 1979: 123)

The presence of the temporal adverbial clause introduced by when will suggest that the main clause states the cessation of a specific event in the past; the expected past specific event can be naturally described in the V-ing form, but not the to V form. In 25b the to V (nonstative) complement to cease does not allow an interpretation other than a generic one, as we have seen in 24. Thus a generic interpretation of to cry is incompatible with the specificity suggested by when-clause. Hence the oddity of 25b.

Interestingly enough, 25b restores perfect acceptability with a different temporal adverbial as in 26:

(26) Lacey ceased to cry whenever she heard her parents come in the door. (ibid.)

Notice, however, that 26 is ambiguous between the following two possible interpretations:

(27) a. Lacey stopped crying every time she heard her parents come in the door.

b. Lacey's habit of crying when she heard her parents come in the door ceased.

In either interpretation, there is no difference in the function of the infinitival complement in 26; that is, it describes a generic event.

It is because the verb cease primarily means to put an end to a state or a habit which is supposed to last a long period of time that it can take as its complement the to V form. Other terminative verbs, stop, quit, and finish, which only mean to put an end to an ongoing specific event, cannot take the to V complement but V-ing. We can then conclude that the to V form of complement to the verb cease only describes a state or a
generic event, both of which can be treated as a sort of bounded event. Differently from other aspectual verbs *start*, *begin*, or *continue*, a terminative verb *cease* seems to be unable to take the *to V* complement as describing a single specific event. Therefore, we can conclude as to the two types of complements to *cease* that the *V-ing* complement describes an unbounded event, while the *to V* complement a bounded one.

The hypothesis built up at the beginning of the present section has now proved to be tenable. Through a close semantic analysis of either type of complement to each type of aspectual verbs, it has been clarified that the *to V* form of complement to any type of aspectual verbs functions as describing a "bounded" event, while the *V-ing* complement describes an "unbounded" event. Hence our aspectual concept "boundedness" can distinguish the two types of complements to aspectual verbs as well as those to perception verbs.

4. Conclusion. In the present study, it has been made clear that the *to V* complement to aspectual verbs and the plain *V* infinitive of the perception verb complement share a common property in aspect; both describe an event which is "bounded in time". On the other hand, the *V-ing* form of complement to either aspectual verbs or perception verbs describes an unbounded event. Thus the aspectual concept of "boundedness" provides a high predictability of the complement type selection of those two types of verbs at least.

There is still another construction which suggests that the aspectual properties of complement verbs have an effect on the complement form selection.

(28) a. I regret for you to be in this fix.
   (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970: 169)
   b. *We regretted for her to do it.
   (Stockwell et al. 1973: 545)

Kiparsky and Kiparsky judge 28a as quite acceptable where one of the "factive-emotive" predicates *regret* is followed by the *for-to* complement. 28b of the same construction, on the other hand, is judged unacceptable by Stockwell et al. Note, however, a difference in an aspectual property of complement verbs. The complement verb in 28a is stative, while the one in 28b is not. The difference in judgement between the pair of ex-

---

9 Note, also, the difference in tense between 28a and 28b. The simple past tense,
amples may be due to this aspectual difference between the verbs in the complements. In fact, 28b restores some extent of acceptability when supplied as in 29 with some contexts guaranteeing the interpretation as "habitual" which has been proved to have a similar aspectual status to "stative".

(29) ?We regret for her to do things by halves all the time.

Thus our claim that the aspectual property of complement predicates plays a crucial role is supported by another independent predicate complement construction.

Moreover, according to Esau (1973), derived nominals in German can be semantically distinguished between "infinitival nominals" and "ung-nominals". The former, which might correspond to "infinitival nominals" in English, describes an event the duration of which is taken into consideration. The latter, which might correspond to "nominal gerunds" in English, describes an event as that which has already been completed and thus with no duration. This is another fact which seems to support our claim.

The couple of facts pointed to above show that our framework possesses an explanatory power on the complement type selection of predicates.
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canceling the otherwise possible "habitual" interpretation of the nonstative verb phrase "do it", may also be concerned with the unacceptability of 28b. Compare 28b with 29 below.


