

I Object!
**A Corpus-Based Study of the Complementation of the Verb *Object* in
the 18th, 19th, and 20th Centuries**

Elina Seppi
Tampere University
School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
May 2008

Tampereen yliopisto
Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos
Englantilainen filologia

SEPPI, ELINA: I Object! - A Corpus-Based Study on the Complementation of the Verb *Object* in the 18th, 19th, and 20th Centuries

Pro gradu – tutkielma
Toukokuu 2008

Tässä korpuspohjaisessa pro gradu – tutkielmassa tarkastellaan englannin kielen verbiä *object*, sekä sen eri komplementtivariantteja. Tutkimuksessa huomioitiin myös verbin taivutetut muodot *objects*, *objected*, ja *objecting*. Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää mitä eri komplementteja verbin *object* kanssa käytetään ja miten ne ovat muuttuneet tultaessa 1700-luvulta nykypäivään.

Tutkimuksessa käytetyt esimerkkilauseet on kerätty kahdesta elektronisesta korpuksista. Historiallisen osion data saatiin korpuksista nimeltään Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, joka tunnetaan myös nimellä Leuven Corpus. Tämä korpus on jaoteltu kolmeen aikajaksoon 1710–1780, 1780–1850 ja 1850–1920. Tässä tutkimuksessa nämä kaikki kolme osiota käytiin läpi erikseen. Nykypäivän brittiläistä englantia edustaa aineisto joka haettiin korpuksista nimeltään The British National Corpus.

Tutkimukseni teoriaosassa esittelen ensin yleisesti korpuslingvistiikkaa omana kielitieteen alanaan. Molemmat käytetyt korpuksot esitellään myös tarkemmin. Seuraavaksi käsittelen komplementaatiota, sekä tekijöitä jotka vaikuttavat siihen millaisen komplementin verbi valitsee. Käsittelen myös kriteerejä joiden avulla pystytään erottamaan komplementit adjunkteista. Teoriaosiossa esittelen myös lähemmin verbiä *object*. Aluksi käyn läpi hieman verbin etymologiaa ja sitten käsittelen sitä eri kielioppikirjojen valossa. Verbin *object* merkityksien tarkasteluun käytettiin elektronista *Oxford English Dictionary*'a, sekä toista sanakirjaa nimeltään *The New Oxford English Dictionary*.

Empiirisessä osassa käydään eri korpuksot kronologisesti läpi. Corpus of Late Modern English Texts – korpuksen osiot, kuten myös BNC, käsitellään kukin omassa luvussaan. Korpusaineiston perusteella verbin *object* yleisimpiä komplementteja ovat prepositio *to* + nominilauseke, nollakomplementti, *that*-lauseet, sekä *-ing*-lauseet ja suorat lainaukset. Näistä *to* + nominilauseke, nollakomplementti, sekä *that*-lauseet esiintyvät materiaalissa koko kolmen vuosisadan ajalla. *-Ing*-lauseet sekä suorat lainaukset tulevat mukaan kuvioon 1800-luvulla. Preposition *to* ja infinitiivimuotoisen verbin yhdistelmää löytyi materiaalin historiallisesta osasta. Nykykielessä tämä komplementti on hävinnyt kokonaan. Rohdenburgin (2006) ennustuksen mukaisesti *-ing*-lauseiden määrän olisi pitänyt lisääntyä infinitiivi-lauseiden kustannuksella. Vaikka infinitiivi-komplementit poistuivatkin, ei *-ing*-komplementtien määrä lisääntynyt nykyenglannissa. Materiaalissa esiintyi myös muita komplementteja, mutta niiden osuus ei ollut merkittävä.

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Corpus linguistics and the two corpora	6
2.1	Corpus Linguistics in General.....	6
2.2	The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts	8
2.3	The British National Corpus (The BNC)	10
3	Complementation	11
3.1	Complementation in general	11
3.2	Complements vs. adjuncts	15
3.2.1	Licensing	15
3.2.2	Obligatoriness	16
3.2.3	Anaphora.....	16
3.2.4	Category	17
3.2.5	Position	19
3.2.6	Tests for the complement vs. adjunct distinction	19
3.3	Some definitions explained	22
3.3.1	Extractions.....	22
3.3.2	Insertions and the Complexity Principle	23
3.3.3	The horror aequi	24
3.3.4	The Great Complement Shift	25
4	The verb <i>object</i> in dictionaries and grammars.....	26
4.1	Etymology of the verb <i>object</i>	26
4.2	Grammars on the verb <i>object</i>	26
4.3	The <i>OED</i> on the verb <i>object</i>	28
5	Complementation of the verb <i>object</i> in the CLMET	33
5.1	Complementation of the verb <i>object</i> in the first part of the CLMET	34
5.2	Different complements in the CLMET I	34
5.3	Clausal complement of <i>object</i> in the CLMET I	35
5.4	The nominal complements of <i>object</i> in the CLMET I.....	38
5.5	Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the CLMET I	39
5.6	The senses of <i>object</i> in the CLMET I.....	40
6	Complementation of the verb <i>object</i> in the second part of the CLMET.....	41
6.1	Different complements in the CLMET II	41
6.2	Clausal complements of <i>object</i> in the CLMET II.....	42
6.3	Nominal complements of <i>object</i> in the CLMET II	44
6.4	Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the CLMET II	46
6.5	The senses of <i>object</i> in the CLMET II.....	47
7	Complementation of the verb <i>object</i> in the third part of the CLMET.....	48
7.1	Different complements in the CLMET III.....	49
7.2	Clausal complements of <i>object</i> in the CLMET III.....	50
7.3	Nominal complements of <i>object</i> in the CLMET III	53
7.4	Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the CLMET III	54
7.5	The senses of <i>object</i> in the CLMET III	56
8	Complementation of the verb <i>object</i> in the BNC.....	57
8.1	Different complements in the BNC.....	58
8.2	Clausal complements of <i>object</i> in the BNC.....	58
8.3	Nominal complements of <i>object</i> in the BNC	60
8.4	Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the BNC	62
8.5	The senses of <i>object</i> in the BNC	63
9	Conclusion	64
	Bibliography	67

1 Introduction

Consider the following sentences from the British National Corpus:

[1] Those who disliked dogs **objected** to the vast number running around... (ACM)

[2] ‘Aah’d give mi life ti save my brother’, he continued, ‘yet you **objected** ti getting wet ti save yours.’ he sighed deeply. (C98)

[3] The old-fashioned **objected** that it was dangerous to eyesight... (FAE)

In these three sentences above there are already three different kinds of complementation patterns for the verb *object*. In this thesis I will introduce many more.

The aim of the thesis is to investigate the different complementation patterns found for the verb *object* and its inflected forms *objects*, *objected* and *objecting* in the data I will be using. As well as the different patterns also the change in the distribution of these will be concentrated on.

This research will be conducted with a corpus-based method using two corpora; the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (the extended version), also known as the Leuven Corpus, and the British National Corpus which is used to provide data from Present Day English. The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts provides material from the period of time between 1710 and 1920 and acts thus as the historical point of comparison.

In the second chapter the discipline of corpus linguistics is introduced as well as the two corpora used.

In the third chapter the focus is on complementation. First I will be discussing complementation in general and then how to make the difference between complements and adjuncts. Furthermore, some tests to help with distinguishing one from the other will be provided.

In the chapter four I will investigate how *object* is treated in literature. I will consult grammars and dictionaries on the verb *object*.

Chapters five, six and seven deal with the empirical material. In these chapters the complementation patterns of *object* in the data from the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts will

be dealt with. I will introduce all the patterns found in the data and give plenty of illustrations. I will also draw some attention to extractions, insertions, horror aequi principle and the senses of the verb.

In chapter eight the focus is on the data from the other corpus, namely the British National Corpus.

Finally, in the chapter nine, which is the conclusion, the results from the two corpora are gathered together and discussed.

I believe this project is a worthwhile project for at least two reasons. The period of Late Modern English is one of the most neglected ones in the history of English Linguistics. So, I will, for my part, contribute to the study of the English language. The other reason is that I think it is very useful for a future teacher of English as a foreign language to get acquainted with the concept of complementation. In teaching others to use language in a way that is characteristic of this particular language it is essential to know what kinds of patterns go with what words.

2 Corpus linguistics and the two corpora

In this thesis I will examine complementation of the verb *object* in the light of grammars, dictionaries and various articles. In the empirical part I will conduct a study of the complements of *object* as they appear in certain corpora. So, this thesis is a corpus-driven project.

In order to successfully complete a project that is largely based on corpus data it is worthwhile to get acquainted with corpus linguistics first. So, in this chapter I will introduce corpus linguistics in general. After that I will concentrate on the two corpora that are used in the latter parts of this thesis to gather information about the verb *object* and its complements.

2.1 Corpus Linguistics in General

The name corpus linguistics suggests that it must have something to do with corpora. It is important to notice, however, that a corpus is not the object of the study but rather the means to gather information (Johansson 1995, 19). According to Johansson (1995, 19), corpus linguistics is a branch of linguistics that studies language with the help of corpus data. This data gathered from corpora can be used to study grammar, lexis or phraseology, just to name a few.

What is a corpus then? A corpus is not any collection of authentic language. According to Johansson (1995, 19), a corpus is a body of texts that has been sorted by certain set rules. Another definition for a corpus is that of Tognini-Bonelli's (2001, 55): "a computerized collection of authentic texts, amenable to automatic or semiautomatic processing of analysis. The texts are selected according to explicit criteria in order to capture the regularities of a language, a language variety or a sub-language."

Corpora can be used to gather statistical information about a linguistic phenomenon. This is particularly easy using computer corpora. John Sinclair (2003, 9) points out that with the help of a computer it is not only possible to gather together a lot of instances but also to make

analysis on them, in order to see whether certain phenomena can be detected from them. According to Leech (2003, 223), dramatic grammatical changes do not take place over just one generation. By dramatic changes he means for example disappearance or appearance of a whole grammatical category. However, he continues, changes in the frequency of a certain phenomenon are likely to happen in a relatively short period of time. And here, studying these frequencies, corpora come in handy.

Different corpora vary in size. Nowadays they are getting larger and larger thanks to the development of computers. Whereas some older corpora, like Brown and LOB, consisted of about one million words, the BNC (used also in this thesis) consists of about 100 million words. In the future there are unlimited possibilities when it comes to the sizes of the corpora. Adam Kilgarriff (2001, 471) goes as far as to suggest that the whole of the Web could be used as a corpus.

However, the size of the corpus used is not a trivial matter. The phenomena that can be studied using a particular corpus are largely dependent on its size (Aston and Burnard 1998, 21-22). Phenomena that are quite frequent can be investigated using a corpus not that large, whereas rare phenomena require a large corpus that also contains varied material (from different genres, numerous texts).

As well as in size corpora differ also in their construction. Large general corpora aim to represent a language as a whole (like the BNC for British English). Corpora that are specialized on a certain genre on the other hand are to do with a specific area of language (Aston and Burnard 1998, 10-12). Aston and Burnard (1998, 10-12) present a list of different types of corpora of English: Bilingual and even multilingual corpora, corpora for investigating different geographical or historical varieties or learner varieties, written and spoken language corpora and a mix of these two.

2.2 The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts

One of the corpora used in this thesis is the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (the CLMET) or as it is also known the Leuven Corpus. This corpus is used for the historical part of this study. The version of the CLMET used in this thesis is the extended version.

According to Hendrik De Smet (2005, 69-70), the compiler of the CLMET, the corpus was put together on the basis of texts from the *Project Gutenberg* and *the Oxford Text Archive*. This corpus covers the years 1710-1920. It has been further divided into three sub-sections, each of which contains texts from a period of 70 years. The first part covers the period 1710-1780, the second 1780-1850 and the third 1850-1920. The Table below further illustrates the make up of the CLMET (the statistics from the webpage <http://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/>).

Table 1. The make up of the CLMET

Sub period	Number of authors	Number of texts	Number of words
1710-1780	23	32	3,037,607
1780-1850	46	64	5,723,988
1850-1920	51	80	6,251,564
Total	120	176	14,970,622

Also, the writers whose texts are included in a certain part of the corpus, are born within a "correspondingly restricted time span" (De Smet 2005, 70). The writers in the first part are born between 1680 and 1750, the writers in the second part 1750-1820 and the writers in the third part

1820-1890. This, according to De Smet (2005, 70-71), is particularly helpful because now no author is represented in two parts of the corpus.

All the authors included in CLMET are native speakers of English, to be exact native speakers of British English (De Smet 2005, 71). This is advantageous to this thesis project because the other corpus used (the BNC) for comparison also represents British English.

The amount of text per author is restricted to 200,000 words. De Smet (2005, 71) admits that this may seem like a lot, but assures that the problems of idiosyncratic language use are being taken into consideration and counteracted by taking a great number of different authors into this corpus.

Texts in CLMET are mostly written by men, more specifically upper-class men. Texts are also mostly formal in their style. De Smet (2005, 71-72) admits this fact and adds that because of this he has deliberately favoured non-formal, lower-register, female-written texts whenever possible. However, De Smet (2005, 71-72) points out that despite his efforts the corpus still continues to be biased to "literary texts written by higher class male adults".

The CLMET is a corpus that is not tagged. It means that one cannot look for example all the verb forms of *object* in just one search. For this study all the forms of *object* were searched individually, different searches for *object*, *objects*, *objecting* and *objected*. And since it was not possible to choose the part of speech of the word, the result was that I had plenty of examples that were of no use to this particular study because the word *object* in them was not a verb.

[1] ...were only his Mistress. POLLY. Sure, Madam, you cannot think me so happy as to be the **object** of your Jealousy.--A Man is always afraid of a Woman who loves him too well--so that...
(Gay, The Beggar's Opera)

[2] ... best shot must frequently miss by moonlight; there is a silvery glare which renders all **objects** indistinct, and the shot very doubtful; thus two animals out of three fired at will gen ...
(Baker, The Rifle and the Hound in Ceylon)

2.3 The British National Corpus (The BNC)

The other corpus used in this thesis was the British National Corpus (the BNC). This corpus was used to represent Present Day English and to offer a point of comparison to Late Modern English offered in the CLMET.

The purpose of the BNC is to represent British English in its different social and generic uses (Aston and Burnard 1998, 28). According to Aston and Burnard (1998, 29), the BNC is compiled in such way that "the corpus could be regarded as a microcosm of current British English in its entirety, and so that different styles might be compared and contrasted".

Aston and Burnard (1998, 28) state that the size of the BNC is approximately 100 million words. The amount of words per text is between 40,000 and 50,000. However, Aston and Burnard (1998, 28) point out that there is much variation between the sizes of the texts.

In the BNC there are both written and spoken texts. About ninety percent of the texts are written (Aston and Burnard 1998, 29).

Contrary to the CLMET the BNC is a tagged corpus. So the searches were a lot easier to carry out. Here I was able to do a lemma search (meaning that you can specify the part of the speech of the word) for the verb *object*. Only a small amount of irrelevant tokens were included in the result.

3 Complementation

Leech and Svartvik (2002, 271) define the term complement as meaning "something that is necessary to complete a grammatical construction. In her book Rhonwen Bowen (2005, 3) quotes Quirk et al. who give a nice definition to complementation: "the function of a part of a phrase or clause which follows a word, and completes the specification of a meaning relationship which that word implies." My aim here is to further introduce these phenomena.

In section three I will examine complementation in general. I will also focus on the complement versus adjunct difference that is a problematic one. Attention is paid to some special features of complementation too. These include phenomena like the horror aequi, insertions and extractions.

3.1 Complementation in general

According to Herbst et al. (2004, xxiv), the verb in a sentence is the central component since it determines the other elements and how many of them are needed in order to form a grammatically correct sentence. Herbst et al. (2004, xxiv) continue that some verbs like *emerge* only need one other element in a sentence but others like *produce* or *need* require two or more other elements in order to form a sentence (example sentences by Herbst et al. 2004, xxiv):

[1] As new works by younger artists **emerge**, the picture the gallery presents of modern art in the Cornish context will fracture and evolve.

[2] Cornwall this century has **produced** two schools of painting of international renown – Newlyn and St. Ives.

[2a] *Cornwall this century has **produced**.

[3] I **put** paper and kindling by the fire last night.

[3a] *I **put** by the fire.

[3b] *I **put** paper and kindling.

These elements that are required by the matrix verb are called complements, continue Herbst et al (2004, xxiv). They add (2004, xxiv) that "the number of complements a verb takes constitutes its valency". Herbst et al. (2004, xxiv) also argue that since the valency of a verb determines, to a large degree, the sentence structure, the verb is in a central status in the hierarchy of a sentence and thus the complements are seen as licensed by the matrix verb.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 215) comment that subject of the clause can be regarded as a complement too, in the same way obviously Herbst et al think when they comment on the example (1) as having one complement. However, typically the term complement is assigned to non-subject elements because the subject is not internal to the verb phrase. This is also the policy used in this thesis.

Whereas the subject here is not considered a complement the object is. Thus transitivity is very closely linked with complementation. While all grammatical structures in English contain a subject not all of them contain an object. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 216-217) comment that a verb may have an object or it may not have one depending on its nature. As a result verbs are divided into two categories: transitive verbs and intransitive verbs. Transitive verbs have an object or objects whereas intransitive verbs do not get an object. Following illustrations by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 216):

[4] I **fainted**. → S V (intransitive)

[5] They **destroyed** all the evidence. → S V O (transitive)

Furthermore the transitive verbs can be divided into monotransitive verbs that only take one object and ditransitive verbs, that is verbs that take two objects (again illustrations by Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 217):

[6] She **wrote** a novel. → S V O (monotransitive)

[7] She **told** him the truth. → S V O O (ditransitive)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 217) introduce one more subtype of complements namely the predicative complement (PC). This type of complement occurs with verbs that are complex-intransitive or complex-transitive. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 217), these constructions are transitive or intransitive in nature but also "contain further predication" by the predicative object and are thus more complex than 'normal' transitives and intransitives. Examples below, by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 217), further illustrate the matter:

[8] Ed **seemed** quite competent. → S V PC (complex-intransitive)

[9] She **considered** Ed quite competent. →S V O PC (complex-transitive)

Here I think it is useful to introduce also the term valency. Above mentioned categories of intransitive and transitive verbs can also be classified in terms of valency. According to Somers (1987, 4-5), the verb's valency means the number of complements it takes. For example a verb that takes only one complement is monovalent (this complement being the subject of the clause). Illustrations below clarify this fact (examples by Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 219). Note that the complements are underlined.

	Valency
[10] <u>He</u> died.	monovalent
[11] <u>This</u> depends <u>on the price</u> .	bivalent
[12] <u>Ed</u> became <u>angry</u> .	bivalent
[13] <u>He</u> read <u>the paper</u> .	bivalent
[14] <u>He</u> blamed <u>me</u> <u>for the delay</u> .	trivalent
[15] <u>This</u> made <u>Ed</u> <u>angry</u> .	trivalent
[16] <u>She</u> gave <u>him</u> <u>some food</u> .	trivalent
[17] <u>I</u> bet <u>you</u> <u>\$10</u> <u>that it rains</u> .	quadrivalent

According to Bowen (2005, 4), there are restrictions when it comes to the form of the complements that can be licensed by their headword. Indeed the head word does not only determine

the number of the complements but their form as well. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 219) argue that complements in a clause always require the presence of a verb that licenses them. In other words a verb only allows certain complements to accompany it. Compare the following examples (by Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 219):

[18] She **mentioned** the letter. vs. *She **alluded** the letter.

[19] She **thought** him unreliable. vs. *She **said** him unreliable.

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 219-220), this dependence between the head (verb) and its complements can be called subcategorisation. That is that verbs are subcategorised according to what kind of complement they license. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 220) give an example of these subcategories: verbs that take interrogative clauses as complements (*inquire, wonder*).

[20] He **inquired** whether it was ready. vs. *He **believed** whether it was ready.

They (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 220) also point out that many verbs are not restricted to only one allowed pattern of complementation. Like for example *think*:

[21] Let me **think** for a moment.

[22] She was obviously **thinking** uncharitable thoughts.

[23] I was **thinking** of someone else

[24] She **thought** that he was unreliable.

According to Herbst et al. (2004, xxv-xxvi), there are two kinds of complements, namely the phrases (or nominal complements) and the clauses (or clausal complements). Phrases include noun phrases (*the girl, him, the man I saw*), adjective phrases (*old, very old, too good to be true*) and prepositional phrases (*about this topic*). Clauses include *ing*-clauses (*coming home*), *to*-infinitive clauses (*to come, to understand the situation*), *that*-clauses (*that we had to go there*) and *wh*-clauses (*how such gossip annoys him*) (Herbst et al 2004, xxv-xxvi).

3.2 Complements vs. adjuncts

When talking about complementation it is very important that one can make the difference between complements and adjuncts. This is often a difficult task and one regularly comes across borderline cases. Fortunately there are criteria and tests that help to differentiate between these two groups. In this following chapter I will introduce some of these.

3.2.1 Licensing

As already mentioned above, complements are always licensed by their head word. Thus the head determines the form of the complement. Somers (1987, 8-9) comments on this in that if an element (here a complement) is "valency-bound" it is so closely associated with the verb that its form can be predicted from what Somers calls the valency pattern. Adjuncts on the other hand are not licensed by the head verb in a sentence and, consequently, their form is not dependent on the head word.

Herbst et al. (2004, xxiv-xxv) illustrate the fact that the form of the adjuncts is not determined by the head verb with the following examples (different adjuncts underlined):

[25] I put the paper and the kindling by the fire last night.

[26] I put the paper and the kindling by the fire at 5 p.m.

[27] I put the paper and the kindling by the fire then.

[28] I put the paper and the kindling by the fire before I went to bed.

Somers (1987, 8) continues on the difference between complements and adjuncts regarding licensing:

"Both obligatory as well as optional actants [=complements] (both are necessary elements) are bound by valency to the verb, are anchored in the syntactic frame of the verb and thus their number and type can be fixed. The adjuncts on the other hand (as unnecessary elements) are not bound to the verb, are unlimited in number and can for this reason be left out of or added to almost any sentence at will".

3.2.2 Obligatoriness

Complements can be obligatory or optional. Adjuncts, however, are always optional. Compare the following examples by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 221):

[29] She perused the report. vs. *She perused. (obligatory complement)

[30] She read the report. vs. She read. (optional complement)

[31] She left because she was ill. vs. She left. (optional adjunct)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 221) define obligatoriness: "an element is obligatory if it can't be omitted without loss of grammaticality or unsystematic change of meaning". Unsystematic change of meaning is illustrated in one of their (2002, 221) sentences:

[32] She ran the business. vs. She ran.

Here the meaning of *run* is different in both sentences. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 221) argue that this criterion of obligatoriness is a much more weighty one than that of licensing. They justify their claim with the fact that in licensing it is a matter of the verb in question allowing something. Here on the other hand the verb is requiring it.

3.2.3 Anaphora

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 222-223), anaphoric expressions, like *do so*, can be used when making the difference between complements and adjuncts. This is due to the fact that adjuncts are more loosely attached to the verb than complements which are quite closely related to the verb (2002, 222-223). Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 222) clarify that anaphoric expressions are the ones that "derive their interpretation from an antecedent". Following illustrations by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 223) further clarify their point:

[33] *Jill keeps her car in the carage but Pam does so in the road.

vs. Jill washes her car in the carage but Pam does so in the road.

[34] *I didn't read all the reports but I did so most of them.

vs. I didn't cover this topic last time but I shall do so on Tuesday.

[35] *She rode her bicycle and she did so to school.

vs. She performed all the tasks and she did so remarkably well.

The reason for the ungrammaticality of some of the sentences above is, according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 223), that the antecedent for *do so* have to include all the internal complements of the verb. This means that it can't itself be combined with a complement of such type. In the example (33), for example, *Pam does so* has to be interpreted as *Pam keeps her car in the carage*. The reason for this interpretation is that *in the carage* is a complement of *keep*.

So, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 223) argue that this criterion of *do so* can be used to distinguish adjuncts from complements: If a dependent is able to make a combination with *do so* this should prove us that the dependent is an adjunct. However, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 223) continue that if the dependent is not able to combine it is not necessarily a complement, because there are some semantic restrictions as to the kind of VP that can be an antecedent.

3.2.4 Category

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 223-224), complements are often realised as noun phrases. However, they (2002, 224) point out that sometimes adjuncts, too, can take the form of a noun phrase. It is worthwhile to notice, though, that when adjuncts are realised as noun phrases they tend to belong to some restricted semantic types, namely time or manner. Illustrations by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 224):

[36] They saw her this morning. (time adjunct)

[37] You should hold them this way. (manner adjunct)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 224) argue that most often adverb phrases are adjuncts. Nevertheless, they add that adverb phrases rarely also qualify as complements with some verbs like *treat* and *be*. Again illustrations by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 224):

[38] She **writes** exceptionally clearly. (adjunct)

[39] They **treat** us quite abominably. (complement of *treat*)

[40] The only way to do it **is** very, very slowly. (complement of specifying *be*)

Prepositional phrases (especially with noun phrase complements), according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 224), can be both complements and adjuncts. The clearest case of complementation by prepositional phrase is the fixed combination of verb + preposition (for example *rely + on*). In these kinds of combinations the preposition does not usually have its full lexical meaning. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 224), however, point out that sometimes the preposition does have its full lexical content, like in:

[41] He put it underneath the mat.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 224) still add that preposition + declarative clause combination are more often than not adjuncts:

[42] They **left** because the baby was sick.

Consider the two following sentences (by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 225) :

[43] I hadn't **noticed** that she was looking so worried. (complement)

[44] What had **happened**, that she was looking so worried? (adjunct)

In the first sentence (43) *that she was looking so worried* is a complement, because it is licensed by its head *notice*. In the second sentence (44) *that she was looking so worried* is, on the other hand an adjunct. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 225), finite subordinate clauses are often complements even though they can sometimes function as adjuncts, too, as seen above.

Non-finite clauses can be both, complements and adjuncts, state Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 225):

[45] He **tried** to please his mother. (complement)

[46] He **did** it to please his mother. (adjunct)

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 225), adjective phrases can also function both as complements and as adjuncts:

[47] She **was** disgusted at his betrayal. (complement)

[48] Disgusted at his betrayal, she went back to Paris. (adjunct)

3.2.5 Position

According to Herbst et al. (2004, xxvi), the order in which complements can appear in a sentence is fairly fixed, unless some special case, like *topicalization*, is introduced. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 225) state that adjuncts are less restricted in this respect. They continue that, generally, a certain kind of complement has a predetermined position, although, it can take another position under “a limited set of conditions”:

[49] He **gave** the beer to Kim.

[50] To Kim he **gave** the beer.

3.2.6 Tests for the complement vs. adjunct distinction

Making the distinction between complements and adjuncts is sometimes very difficult. Fortunately, besides the criteria, there are some tests to make it a little easier. Here I will introduce some tests that are listed by Somers (1987) in his article Valency and Case in Computational Linguistics.

The first test is called **the elimination test**. This test is used to distinguish obligatory elements from optional ones. Somers (1987, 509) describes the test as follows:

“We eliminate an element from the sentence and observe whether the remaining sentence is still grammatical or thereby ungrammatical. If it is still grammatical, then the eliminated element is not obligatory; if, however, it is ungrammatical, then the eliminated element is syntactically obligatory for the sentence to endure.”

Below are some examples that Somers (1987, 509) gives to illustrate the elimination test:

[51] He **put** *the book under the table*.

*He **put** the book.

*He **put** under the table.

*He **put**.

[52] We **expect** *him* next Sunday at 12 o'clock at the station.

*We **expect** next Sunday.

*We **expect** at the station.

*We **expect** at 12 o'clock.

It follows that the italicized elements are obligatory complements in these sentences.

It is worthwhile to notice that this test only shows the difference between obligatory and optional elements. If an element turns out not to be obligatory that is not to say that it is not a complement, it may very well still be an optional complement. Thus, additional tests are needed.

The next test introduced is **the extraction test**. This test, according to Somers (1987, 510) is designed to distinguish complements, both obligatory and optional, from adjuncts. Therefore the aim here is to figure out whether the element in question is closely associated with the verb and is, thus, a complement. Somers (1987, 510) gives as an example the following sentence:

[53] The farmer **ploughs** *his field* ~~in the early morning~~.

Because the element *in the early morning* can be deleted without a change in the basic meaning of *plough*, it is not a complement but an adjunct. *His field*, however, can not be deleted without a change in the meaning of *plough*, even though the sentence would still be completely grammatical. This means that *his field* is a complement of *plough*.

The difference between the elimination tests and extraction test is that in the extraction test we take into account the syntactic level also, not just the grammatical point of view.

The third test introduced by Somers (1987, 510-511) is **the backformation test**. This test divides optional elements into complements and adjuncts. According to Somers (1987, 510-511), in this test we reformulate the element into a relative clause. If the new sentence now is still grammatical and there is no change in the basic meaning the back-formed element is an adjunct. The following examples are by Somers (1987, 510):

[54] He **visited** her *in Berlin*.

He visited her when she was staying in Berlin.

[55] He **ate** his sandwich *in the school*.

He ate his sandwich when he was in the school

[56] My friend **lives** *in Dresden*.

*My friend lives when he is in Dresden.

In the sentence (54) *in Berlin* is an adjunct because it can easily be back-formed without the loss of grammaticality or change in the meaning. The same is true with *in the school* in the sentence (55). *In Dresden*, on the other hand in the sentence (56) is a complement since the back-formation is not successful.

Consider the following sentences (Somers 1987, 512-513):

[57] I have been **waiting** for my friend for two hours.

[58] *I have been **expecting** for my friend for two hours.

[59] I have been **expecting** my friend for two hours.

In the sentences (58) and (59) the verb *wait* from the first sentence (57) has been replaced with a near synonym *expect*. It is clear that *expect* does not license the same pattern as its complement as *wait* (that is *for* + NP). Nevertheless the adjunct, *for two hours*, remains the same in both sentences. That is, according to Somers (1984, 512-513), a proof of the fact that *for two hours* is an adjunct since it stays the same even though the governing verb is changed. *For my friend* on the other hand is a complement since it is not unaffected by the change of the head verb. This fourth test,

introduced by Somers (1984, 513), is called **the substitution test**. Of course, this test (like the other tests, too) is not infallible. Sometimes near synonyms license same complement patterns and many verbs have “multiple valency patterns” (Somers 1987, 513):

[60] I was **looking** for that book yesterday.

[61] I was **searching** for that book yesterday.

3.3 Some definitions explained

In this chapter I shall introduce some essential phenomena that are dealt with when analysing the data. These phenomena are *extractions*, *insertions*, *the horror aequi principle*, *the Great Complement Shift* and *the complexity principle*. According to Rohdenburg (2006, 160), these phenomena play a significant role when there is rivalry between two possible complements. Each of the above mentioned phenomena determines environments that are either preferred or dispreferred for “recessive structures and those replacing them” (Rohdenburg 2006, 160). Rohdenburg (2006, 160) points out that the new constructions at first become customary in contexts that are favourable while at the same time their establishment is delayed in environments that are dispreferred. And vice versa with recessive constructions.

3.3.1 Extractions

Vosberg (2003b, 201) defines extractions (in transformational grammar) as “deviations from the canonical sentence structure”. Basically this means that something in a clause has been moved to a place that is, perhaps, not so natural to it. There are different types of extractions: *relativization*, *topicalization*, *clefting*, *pseudo-clefting*, *comparativization*, and *interrogation*. Relativization and interrogation are perhaps the most common types to be met. Illustrations below further clarify the types of extraction mentioned above (all examples are by Vosberg 2003b, 201-202):

Topicalization: Even her acquaintance with the Belfield’s she remembered not ever mentioning.

Relativization: It is the worthy Spencer, whom I'm sure you remember to have often heard me mention in the relation of my private misfortunes.

Clefting: It was the bangle that she remembered having seen on Francie's wrist.

Comparativization: 'Twas her Charming Face and modest Look, that represented to him a thousand more Beauties and taking Graces than she remembered ever to have seen in this Unconstant and Faithless Mistress.

Interrogation: Now, how many do you remember to have heard named?

Now, when it comes to extractions and how they affect the choice of the complement, Vosberg (2003a, 308) suggests that extractions favour the *to*-infinitive structures over gerundial complements. Vosberg (2003a, 308) has even formulated an Extraction principle:

In the case of infinitival or gerundial complement options, the infinitival will end to be favoured in environments where a complement of the subordinate clause is extracted ... from its original position and crosses clause boundaries.

3.3.2 Insertions and the Complexity Principle

Consider sentence (62) by Vosberg 2003b, 211:

[62] I **recollect**, as I passed by one of the pier-glasses, that I saw in it his clenched hand offered in wrath to his forehead.

In the sentence above there is structural discontinuity because something has been inserted between the main clause and the subordinate clause. According to Vosberg (2003b, 210) these kinds of insertions mainly appear "between the matrix verb and the non-finite verb form of the subordinate clause; or between the matrix verb and the subject of the finite complements clause". What is noteworthy about insertions is that they can affect the choice of the complement. According to Rohdenburg's (2006, 147) *Complexity Principle*:

In the case of more or less explicit constructional options the more explicit one(s) will tend to be preferred in cognitively more complex environments.

The kinds of constructions as the above mentioned insertions, according to Vosberg (2003b, 210) create a more complex environment. Thus the more explicit options, like *that*-clause in sentence (1), are favoured. Rohdenburg (2006, 148) gives two examples about the choice of the complement affected by insertions:

[63] He hesitated for a very long time about whether he should do it/whether to do it.

[64] He promised his friends when he was challenged about it that he would return immediately/to return immediately.

According to Rohdenburg (2006, 148), the complexity principle tells us that insertions above should affect so that the more explicit finite complements are preferred to the non-finite ones. So, the inserted elements delay the change from finite interrogatives to *to*-infinitives and also intervening elements may hasten the process from infinitives to finite complements.

3.3.3 The horror aequi

Another factor that has its effect on the selection of complements is the *horror aequi*. Günter Rohdenburg (2006, 156) has defined the *horror aequi* as follows:

... , the *horror aequi* principle involves the widespread (and presumably universal) tendency to avoid the use of formally (near)identical and (near-) adjacent grammatical elements or structures...

So, this tendency affects the choice of the complement so that for example two *to*-infinitives or two *-ing*-forms do not normally appear one after another. One might formulate the rule as follows:

<i>to</i> -infinitive	+	V- <i>ing</i>
V- <i>ing</i>	+	<i>to</i> -infinitive.

However, *horror aequi* principle is sometimes violated. Christian Mair (2002, 125) studied the use of the verb *help* in his article and noticed that there were several cases in which the constructions *to help* + *to*-infinitive was present.

3.3.4 The Great Complement Shift

The term Great Complement Shift is introduced by Rohdenburg in his article *The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System* (2006). Rohdenburg (2006, 143) points out that during the past few centuries the English language has gone through a “massive restructuring of its system of sentential complementation”. It is this restructuring that Rohdenburg refers to as the Great Complement Shift. The most important thing about this shift is that the gerundial complements (both prepositional and directly linked ones) are advancing at the expense of the infinitival complements (Rohdenburg 2006, 143). Rohdenburg (2006, 143-4) gives examples of these changes:

[65] She **delighted** to do it. → She **delighted** in doing it.

[66] She **was used/accustomed** to do it. → She **was used/accustomed** to doing it.

[67] She **avoided/dreaded** to go there. → She **avoided/dreaded** going there.

According to this prediction by Rohdenburg I now expect to see this shift in progress in the data from the two corpora.

4 The verb *object* in dictionaries and grammars

In this section I will be discussing the verb *object* in the light of some dictionaries and grammars. A short introduction of the etymology of the word will be given as well as a more detailed introduction of the senses that the *OED* gives to *object*.

4.1 Etymology of the verb *object*

According to the *OED*, the verb *object* is derived from the Latin *obiect-*, which is a past participial stem of the verb *obiicere*. *Obiicere* has the meanings ‘to put forward, to put forward as a ground for disapproval, to bring as a charge against, to accuse a person of, to place before the eyes, to expose to danger, to put in the way as a barrier or defense, interpose’. *Obiicere* is formed from two parts, *ob* and *iacere*. *Ob* is a prefix and *iacere* means *to throw*.

Klein (1971) points out that *object* used to mean ‘to put before’. He also makes the point that *object* can be used as both transitive and intransitive verb.

4.2 Grammars on the verb *object*

I consulted several grammar books available in the university library. Most of the information given in the grammar books was irrelevant to this project because they handled *object* as an object of something, not as a verb.

Poutsma (1904, 675) mentions two constructions of the verb *object*. One is the construction *to + -ing* and the other is *to+ infinitive*:

[1] He **objects** to learning arithmetic. (News from nowh., chX, 71)

[2] We **object** to join with men who do not wear our badges and utter our shibboleths. (Good words)

Jespersen (1961, 243-244) mentions the verb *object* as a verb that can have both infinitival and gerundial complements (Examples also by Jespersen 1961, 243-244):

[3] I would object to give the ladies the benefit of my assistance.

[4] ...as a two-footed creature I object to being constantly referred to insects and four-footed creatures.

Quirk et al. (1985, 1177-78) mention the verb *object* to belong to verbs that take a noun phrase as a prepositional object as their complement (= *to* + NP). Quirk et al. (1985, 1180-81) also state that *object* can take a *that*-clause as a complement, too. According to them (1985, 1180) *object* belongs to “speech act verbs introducing indirect statements”.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 959) introduce *object* as a verb that can appear with the pattern (*to* + NP) *that*-clause as its complement. Here the *to* + NP in brackets means that it is an optional complement that indicates “the recipient of some act of communication” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 959).

Svartvik and Sager (1980, 371) claim that *object* belongs to verbs that always (or at least normally) take the gerundial complement.

Herbst et al. (2004, 557) mention the verb *object* in their *Valency Dictionary*. They give eight possible complementation patterns for the verb:

zero-complement, *that*-clause, quote/sentence, *against*+NP, *to*+NP, *to*+*-ing*, *to*+NP+*-ing*, *to*+*wh*-clause. About the *zero*-complement they point out that it is only used in situations where the object of opposition is clear from the context.

Herbst et al. (2004, 557) illustrate these complementation patterns with the following examples:

zero-complement: But two of Canada’s ten provinces – Manitoba and Newfoundland – have **objected**.

that-clause: Some may **object** that we have overstated the failures of modern health care and psychiatry.

quote/sentence: “But I’ve heard the lot already, and so must you have,” I **objected**.

against+NP: Cassidy deliberated for some moments before electing not to **object** against the winner.

to+NP: Most creative people **object** to the notion that the work they do comes easily.

to+-ing: I **objected** to being treated as a stupid peasant.

to+NP+-ing: President Gorbachev has said he no longer **objects** to unified Germany being a member of NATO.

to+wh-clause: I'd have to be a very picky self-criticizer to **object** to how I'm playing at the moment.

4.3 The OED on the verb *object*

The *OED* gives three main meaning groups to the verb *object*:

I To oppose or disapprove (containing the sub senses 1-4)

II To charge and related senses (containing the sub senses 5-6)

III To bring before (containing the sub senses 7-9)

All of the above mentioned sense groups also have several subcategories which further specify the meaning. According to the *OED* only the first sense group is still in use. It is claimed that the sense groups II and III are obsolete in Present Day English. However, I will introduce also the obsolete senses (Table 3. below) since part of the data is from the period of Late Modern English. All the senses and illustrations below are from the *OED*.

Sense	Complements
1. a. <i>intr.</i> Originally: to dissent; to state an objection or an adverse or dissenting reason. Later (freq.): to express or feel disapproval or reluctance; to disapprove; to disagree.	zero
1. b. <i>intr.</i> Now usu. with <i>to</i> ; formerly also with <i>against</i> . To bring forward a reason against something (or someone); to state and maintain disagreement or disapproval. In later use: to express disapproval, opposition, or reluctance; to have an objection to or disapprove of something (or someone). Also extended use.	<i>to</i> + NP + <i>-ing</i> <i>to</i> + <i>-ing</i> <i>to</i> + NP <i>against</i> + NP zero <i>to</i> + NP + <i>as</i>
1. c. <i>trans.</i> With infinitive. Now rare.	<i>to</i> + infinitive
2. b. <i>trans.</i> To bring forward or state in opposition or as a counterargument; to adduce as a reason against something; to urge as an objection. With clause or direct speech as object. Freq. In passive, with clause as complement of a dummy subject.	<i>direct speech</i> <i>that</i> -clause

Table 2. The modern senses and complements of the verb *object* according to the OED

Examples of the modern senses:

1. a. As the alterations would render the house unlistable we **objected** strongly. (1998)
Then it is the lady as formerly **objected**? (1865)
1. b. ... I have a feeling that my colleagues **object** to my persistent eco-preaching. (2000)
He **objected** to this as a harsh measure. (1839)
The doctor **objected** against fifteen, and the council for the crown against three.(1758)
Would the Lady **object** to my lighting the pair of candles. (1865)
They, being withered and undesirable, do not, under certain circumstances, **object** to unveiling. (1901)
1. c. ... when I **objected** to go on. (1904)
I...fancied I saw her extended, pale, and apparently dying on the bed, which I had **objected** to go into. (1837)
2. b. ‘We don’t keep records that way’, I **objected**. (1993)
It has been **objected** that oxen are not proper for all work. (1767)

The obsolete senses are included in this paper as well because they are from the same period as the data from the CLMET. However, some of them were omitted because all of the examples given in the OED were from much earlier period of time than our data.

Sense	Complement
2. a. <i>trans.</i> To bring forward or state in opposition or as a counterargument; to adduce as a reason against something; to urge as an objection. With simple object.	NP NP + <i>as</i>
4. <i>trans.</i> To present or offer in support of an argument; to bring forward as a reason, ground, or instance, or as a proof of something.	NP
5. a. To bring as a charge <i>against</i> (or <i>upon</i>) a person; to attribute <i>to</i> a person as a fault or crime; to accuse a person of, reproach a person with. <i>trans.</i> With simple object.	NP + <i>against</i> + NP NP + <i>to</i> + NP
5. b. To bring as a charge <i>against</i> (or <i>upon</i>) a person; to attribute <i>to</i> a person as a fault or crime; to accuse a person of, reproach a person with. <i>trans.</i> With clause (formerly also infinitive) as object. Also in passive, with clause as complement of dummy subject.	<i>that</i> - clause <i>against</i> + NP + <i>that</i> <i>to</i> + NP + <i>that</i> <i>upon</i> + NP + <i>that</i>
6. <i>trans.</i> To impute, attribute (a quality, characteristic, etc.) to a person.	NP + (<i>un</i>) <i>to</i> + NP
7. <i>trans.</i> To place before the eyes or other senses; to present or offer to the sight, perception, understanding, etc. Usu. with <i>to</i> or <i>unto</i> .	NP + (<i>un</i>) <i>to</i> + NP
9. a. <i>trans.</i> To put or place (a person or thing) so that it abuts, meets, or intercepts something, or so that it is exposed or subjected to a material object, physical phenomenon, etc.	NP NP + (<i>un</i>) <i>to</i> + NP
9. b. To place so as to interrupt or hinder the course of a person or thing; to put in the way or interpose, as an obstacle or hindrance to progress, or a defense from attack. <i>Obs.</i>	NP NP + <i>to</i> + NP

Table 3. The obsolete senses and complements of the verb *object* according to the OED

Examples of the obsolete senses:

2. a. You, of course, **object** the teaching of Christianity. (1892)
...but still some difficulty or other came in the way, which he **objected** as not safe. (1722)
He has never yet found it in that Discourse, nor has heard it **objected** by any body else. (1710)
5. a. This subtlety, which has been frequently **objected** to Charles. (1761-1762)
They were committed to diuers Prisons, for Crimes **objected** against them. (1648)
... that Tutchin should attend a committee to answer what might be **objected** against him. (1899)
- 5.b. It is sometimes **objected** to Mr. A. Fripp's peasant children that they are more gentle than simple. (1864)
That which afflicts the Defendresse much more, is that the Complainants **object** against her, that she loued not her child (1611)
It was obviously **objected** upon Christians, that they condemned the practice of burning. (1658)
6. Do you **object** my care of your Reputation to want of Fondness? (1735)
... Homer, who celebrates the Greeks for their long hair, and Achilles for his skill on the harp, makes Hector in this place **object** them both to Paris. (1776)
7. ... convinces man that there are other things in heaven and earth besides those which are **objected** to his senses. (1829)
- 9.a. From what point the wind his course On the tower directeth, To that point the cock his head Manfully **objecteth**. (1850)
This body stands..**objected**, i.e. cast before, that other body which moves. (1813-21)
- 9.b. The Goth **objects** His shield, and on its rim received the edge. (1814)
Pallas to their eyes The mist objected. (1725)

For the purposes of this thesis only the main senses are used when analysing the data.

I also took a look at the *New Oxford Dictionary of English* (1998, 1277-78) to see what it had to say about the verb *object*. They (1998, 1277-78) say that *object* is a *reporting verb* that means “say something to express one’s disapproval of or disagreement with something. According to the *New Oxford Dictionary of English* this verb can be used without a direct object:
[5] ...residents **object** to the volume of traffic.

Or with a clause as a complement:

[6] ...the boy's father **objected** that the police had arrested him unlawfully.

The *New Oxford Dictionary of English* (1998, 1277-78) also mentions a meaning that it calls archaic. This is the sense “adduce as a reason against something”:

[7] Bryant **objects** this very circumstance to the authenticity of Iliad.

5 Complementation of the verb *object* in the CLMET

In this and the following two chapters I will investigate the complementation patterns that can be found in the CLMET for the verb *object*. I will introduce all three parts of the corpus separately, in their own chapters. In all of these chapters I will at first go through what complements can be found for *object* and then look more closely at them. I will also take a look at possible extraction constructions and see if there are any insertions to be found. *Horror aequi* principle is also borne in mind in case there are violations to that rule in the data. Some attention is paid to the relationship between the pattern and the meaning, because according to Bolinger (1968, 127): “a difference in syntactic form always spells a difference in meaning”.

The total number of words in the CLMET is 14,970,622. Because there was no possibility of a lemma search I had to simply look for words *object*, *objects*, *objected*, *objecting*. All in all I got 4,886 tokens of the word *object* in all inflected forms. However, most of the tokens were not verbs, but nouns:

[1] ... nt you detect. Yet more; the difference is as great between The optics seeing, as the **object** seen. All manners take a tincture from our own; Or come discoloured through our passion ... (Pope 1733-4, An essay on man)

[2] ... ry death-bed of him who has been taken from us, and looked around upon all the familiar **objects** and scenes within our own ground, where your common amusements were going on with your c... (Hughes 1857, Tom Brown’s school days)

So, most of the tokens were irrelevant to this study since I am examining *object* as a verb. After a careful read through and plenty of deleting I had 458 tokens of *object* as a verb.

In the following chapters (as well as in the chapter about the BNC) all the findings are presented as a raw frequency, a percentage and also as a normalized frequency figure. Using the normalized frequency makes it easier to compare the findings from different corpora that all contain different amount of words. The pattern for the frequency is calculated as follows (based on the examples by Biber et al. 1998, 263):

(number of occurrences/the size of the corpus) × 1,000,000 = occurrences per million words.

5.1 Complementation of the verb *object* in the first part of the CLMET

The first part of the CLMET consists of 3,037,607 words and all the texts in it are from the period of time between 1710 and 1780. The number of authors in this part is 23 and the number of texts 32.

In the first part there were 1,687 tokens of *object* (and the inflected forms *objects*, *objected*, *objecting*). Only 53 of them were verbs. So, the normalized frequency of *object* as a verb is 17.4 per million words.

5.2 Different complements in the CLMET I

In the first part of the CLMET there were nine different complementation patterns for the verb *object*. The table (4) illustrates the distribution of these patterns:

Complement	Number of the complements in CLMET I	Percentage of the complements in CLMET I	Frequency per million words in CLMET I
<i>that</i> -clause	16	29.6	5.3
<i>to</i> + NP	15	27.8	4.9
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>that</i> -clause	9	16.7	2.9
zero-complement	4	7.5	1.3
NP + <i>as</i>	3	5.5	1.0
against + NP	2	3.7	0.7
NP	2	3.7	0.7
against + NP + <i>-ing</i>	1	1.9	0.3
<i>to</i> + <i>-ing</i>	1	1.9	0.3
	=53	~100%	

Table 4. Complements of *object* in the first part of the CLMET

5.3 Clausal complement of *object* in the CLMET I

There were three complements in the first part of the CLMET that were much more frequent than others (*that*-clause, *to* + NP and *to* + NP + *that*). One of them was *that*-clause. This pattern appeared in 16 sentences altogether, its percentage being 29.6 and normalized frequency 5.3.

Most often (in 15 cases out of the 16) *that*-clause complement was found in sentences where the main clause had a passive structure with a dummy subject *it*:

[3] ... occasion should require them, in the service of their country. It will, doubtless, be **objected**, that the officers of this body of men, many of whom are persons of the highest merit, a ... (Johnson 1740-1: Parliamentary debates)

[4]... lly prevail. To the examples which he has produced in favour of his opinion, it has been **objected**, that victories equally wonderful have been gained with fewer officers, and, by the hon ... (Johnson 1740-41: Parliamentary debates)

[5] ... so signal a weakness? SECT. IV. OF THE MODERN PHILOSOPHY. But here it may be **objected**, that the imagination, according to my own confession, being the ultimate judge of all s... (Hume 1739-40: Treatise of human nature)

This structure is called extraposition. Quirk et al. (1985, 1391) define extraposition as “postponement which involves the replacement of the postponed element by a substitute from”. This means that the clausal subject of the sentence is moved towards the end of the sentence and consequently the default position of the subject is filled by what is called the anticipatory pronoun *it* (Quirk et al. 1985, 1391). Furthermore Quirk et al. (1985, 1392) want to emphasize that this extraposed structure is more frequent for clausal subjects than the default position before the verb.

There was only one case in the data from the first part of the CLMET that contained *that*-clause complement in an active sentence:

[6] ... ned by 30,000 deities, who arose from the unknown powers of nature: you would naturally **object**, CLEANTHES, that nothing is gained by this hypothesis; and that it is as easy to suppose... (Hume 1779: Dialogues concerning natural religion)

Another complement which contained *that*-clause was of the form *to* + NP + *that*-clause. This pattern was found nine times in the data from the first part of the CLMET. It had the percentage of 16.7 and its normalized frequency was 2.9. In some of the cases *to* + NP was used to express the person who was charged with something:

[7] ...bounding over-much with gall, tho' he has been blamed for it by the critics: It has been **objected** to him, that he was too hasty in his productions; but by such only who are admirers of s... (Cibber 1753: The lives of poets)

[8] ...ly, though I do not stay long, but "leave the dead to bury their dead," said that it was **objected** to the sheriff, that he was related to the sitting member; but, indeed, in that country... (Walpole 1735-48: Letters 1735-48)

In other cases *to* + NP expressed the object of opposition:

[9] ...he day must remain equal, and that the contest would continue undecided. It cannot be **objected** to this supposition, sir, that no such event is recorded in history, because in war many... (Johnson 1740-1: Parliamentary debates)

[10] ...sible for inanimate matter to become virtuous or vicious. Now it may, in like manner, be **objected** to the present system, that if virtue and vice be determined by pleasure and pain, these... (Hume 1711: Treatise of human nature)

From this we might formulate a rule that if *to* + NP in a pattern *to* + NP + *that* is a human the meaning of the verb is *to charge* (sense II) and if it is not a human then the meaning is *to oppose or disapprove* (sense I).

If these nine cases were calculated together with those 16 cases of *that*-clauses it can be seen that *that*-clause is by far the most common complement for the verb *object* in the 18th century.

The following two complementation patterns of *object* occurred only once in the first part of the CLMET: *against* + NP + *-ing* (11), and *to* + *-ing* (12). They each represent 1.9 % of the tokens and their normalized frequencies are 0.3.

[11] ...emorial he had before refused to receive. This I sent by a petty Officer, as I had never **objected** against a Guard being put into any of my Boats wherein was no Commissioned Officer. He... (Cook 1768-71: Captain Cook's Journal)

[12] ...al; Lord Fitz-Owen remained silent, but shewed no marks of disapprobation. Sir Philip **objected** to parting with his friend; but Zadisky assured him he had particular reasons for return... (Reeve 1777: The old English Baron)

Contrary to my expectations there were no examples of a *to*-infinitive used as a complement of the verb *object* in the first part of the CLMET. According to the Great Complement Shift by Rohdenburg (2006, 159) the tendency is that gerundial complements are advancing at the expense of infinitival complements. So I would have expected to find some infinitival complements in this first and the oldest part of the CLMET. However, the total amount of the tokens of *object* was quite small and that may have had its effect on the fact that no infinitival complements were found.

5.4 The nominal complements of *object* in the CLMET I

The second most common complement pattern was *to* + NP. There were 15 instances of this complement (percentage 27.8, normalized frequency 4.9):

[13] ...d to accompany her thither immediately; but the governante, who had hitherto sat silent, **objected** to this proposal; telling them, in broken English, that as the lady was under her care, ... (Smollett 1751: The adventures of peregrine pickle)

[14] ...qualifications of a critic, which I have touched on elsewhere, I think I may very boldly **object** to the censures of any one past upon works which he hath not himself read. Such censure... (Fielding 1749: Tom Jones)

Zero-complement occurred four times in the data. It covered 7.5 % of the tokens, its normalized frequency being 1.3 per million words.

[15] ... you please, for the future, Mrs. Atkinson, proposed to call in her husband; but Amelia **objected**. She said she should be glad to see him any other time, but was then in the utmost hurry... (Fielding 1751: Amelia)

A complement that was not mentioned in the *OED* is a direct noun phrase followed by a prepositional phrase with the preposition *as*. This pattern was found three times in the data (5.5%, normalized frequency 1.0):

[16] ... face as a man--' 'Is it possible, Sir,' interrupted his nephew, 'that my uncle could **object** that as a crime which his repeated instructions alone have persuaded me to avoid.' 'Y... (Goldsmith 1766: The vicar of Wakefield)

There were two patterns that both came up twice in the data. One is *against* + NP (example 17) and the other direct NP complement (example 18). They covered 3.7 % of the tokens each and their normalized frequencies were 0.7 per million words.

[17] ...O how I trembled! but not with grief, you may believe--What says my girl? Have you to **object** against any day of the next fourteen: because my affairs require me to go to my other h... (Richardson 1740: Pamela)

[18] ...e boy acting under the direction of another. To their commander-in-chief, my lords, I **object** nothing but his inexperience, which is by no means to be imputed to his negligence, but ... (Johnson 1740-1: Parliamentary debates)

5.5 Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the CLMET I

There were five cases of extraction in the first part of the CLMET. The normalized frequency of the extractions is therefore 1.6 per one million words. Four of the five cases were extractions out of *to* + NP constructions (examples 19 and 20) and one out of *to* + NP + *as* complement (example 21). Two of the extractions were of the relativization type (example 19) and three of the topicalization type (examples 20 and 21). All of these extractions are of the type where the extraction is within the clause. So, they are not extractions in the sense that Vosberg (2003b, 201) meant. Vosberg (2003b, 201) meant the kinds of extractions where the extracted element crosses clause boundaries.

Examples below represent the extractions found:

[19]...y me by the most gentle means. He swore the phrase in the letter to which I principally **objected** was not his, nor had he ever written any such. He owned, indeed, the having mentioned hi... (Fielding 1749: Tom Jones)

[20]d me to accept of his hand without further hesitation. But to such a precipitate step I **objected**, as a measure repugnant to my decency, as well as to that duty which I owed to my father... (Smollett 1751: The adventures of peregrine pickle)

[21] ...obert WALPOLE then said:--Sir, it has been already admitted, that the motion can only be **objected** to as superfluous, and, therefore, all farther debate is mere waste of time, without any... (Johnson 1740-1: Parliamentary debates)

There were six cases of insertion, the normalized frequency thereby being 2.0 per million.

In most cases the insertions were very short (example 22), but there were two instances where the inserted element was a clause (example 23):

[22] ...lf by the example of those who have been in the army longer than themselves. If it be **objected**, my lords, that the number of officers will not then bear a just proportion to that of t... (Johnson 1740-1: Parliamentary debates)

[23] ...tions. Our approbation is implied in the immediate pleasure they convey to us. I have **objected** to the system, which establishes eternal rational measures of right and wrong, that it i... (Hume 1739-40: Treatise of human nature)

In five instances the insertions had been made in sentences where the verb *object* was complemented by *that*-clause (both with and without *to* + NP complement). Only once was the complement of *object to* + NP + *as*:

[24] ... supplied by an entire new system of battering of his own,--without which, this had been **objected** to by military critics, to the end of the world, as one of the great desiderata of my u... (Sterne 1759-67: Life and opinions of Tristram Shandy)

The horror aequi principle was not violated in this data from the first part of the CLMET.

5.6 The senses of *object* in the CLMET I

The *OED* stated that *object* has three main senses (I to oppose or disapprove, II to charge and related senses, III to bring before). It also mentioned that only the sense I is in use, and that the senses II and III are obsolete. As I already mentioned earlier I will only concentrate on the main senses and leave the sub senses, since it is very difficult to make the difference between them.

The claim that the *OED* made about the senses II and III being obsolete seems to be true regarding my data from the first part of the CLMET. I found only three tokens in which the meaning of *object* was *to charge*. All the other tokens had *object* in its *oppose* or *disapprove* sense.

All the tokens that had the *OED*'s sense II were of the form *to* + NP + *that* (see also examples 7 and 8 above).

[25] ...gislature of their own country, whom foreigners trust without hesitation. It has been **objected** to them with great warmth, and urged with much rhetorical exaggeration, that they assist... (Johnson 1740-1: Parliamentary debates)

6 Complementation of the verb *object* in the second part of the CLMET

The second part of the CLMET consists of 5,723,988 words and all the texts in it are from the period between 1780 and 1850. The number of authors in this part is 46 and the number of texts 64.

In the second part I, again, looked for the word forms *object*, *objects*, *objected* and *objecting*. The search resulted in 2,104 tokens. Out of these 2,104, however, only 153 turned out to be verbs. Therefore the normalized frequency for *object* as a verb in CLMET II is 26.7 per million words, which is clearly more than in the first part of the CLMET (that was 17.4).

6.1 Different complements in the CLMET II

There were eleven different complementation patterns for the verb *object* in the data from the second part of the CLMET. The table (5) below illustrates the distribution of these patterns.

Complement	Number of the complements in CLMET II	Percentage of the complements in CLMET II	Frequency per million words in CLMET II
<i>to</i> + NP	84	55.0	14.7
zero-complement	23	15.0	4.0
<i>that</i> -clause	14	9.2	2.4
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>-ing</i>	9	5.9	1.6
<i>to</i> + <i>-ing</i>	5	3.3	0.9
<i>to</i> + infinitive	4	2.6	0.7
<i>direct speech</i>	4	2.6	0.7
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>that</i>	4	2.6	0.7
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>as</i>	3	2.0	0.5
NP	2	1.3	0.3
<i>against</i> + NP	1	0.7	0.2
	= 153	~100%	

Table 5. Complements of *object* in the second part of the CLMET

6.2 Clausal complements of *object* in the CLMET II

That-clauses were again among the commonest complementation patterns found. Plain *that*-clause occurred 14 times in the data. It covered 8.7% of the tokens and its normalized frequency was 2.4. This means that the normalized frequency of *that*-clause complement has gone down a little (it was 5.3 in CLMET I). Another *that*-clause complement found in the data was *to* + NP + *that* which had only four instances altogether (2.6%, normalized frequency 0.7). This pattern has also lost ground (normalized frequency in CLMET I 2.9). If counted together the normalized frequency for *that*-

clause constructions as complements of *object* in CLMET II is 3.1, whereas in the first part it was 8.2. So *that*-clauses have had quite a fall from the eighteenth century till the nineteenth century.

Sentences (1)-(4) below illustrate these two patterns:

[1] ...be induced to cease a war for security, in order to procure corn for subsistence. I do **object**, that there is unfairness both in these arguments in themselves, and in the spirit wh... (Gillman 1838: The life of Samuel Taylor)

[2] ...Edwards on Prayer, on this subject, lately re-printed by Mr. Sutcliffe.] It has been **objected** that there are multitudes in our own nation, and within our immediate spheres of action,... (Carey 1792: An enquiry into the obligations of Christians)

[3] ...he saw it only, for a short time, a few days previous to its publication. It has been **objected** to me, that I have exposed too freely the secrets of trade. The only real secrets of tra... (Babbage 1832: The economy of machinery and manufactures)

[4] ...st meritorious instances of self-denial for the benefit of others. It may be **objected** to this plan, that virtue ought to be its own reward, and that honours and rewards adju... (Ellis 1839: The women of England)

Next complementation pattern is *to* + NP + *-ing* with its nine occurrences. It has a normalized frequency of almost 1.6 and it accounts for 5.9 % of all the tokens. In the data there were two kinds of patterns of this kind. In some of them the NP was in its accusative form (example 5), whereas in others the NP was a pronoun in its possessive form (example 6):

[5] ...en women, or their minds will never gain strength or modesty. On this account also, I **object** to many females being shut up together in nurseries, schools, or convents. I cannot rec... (Wollstonecraft 1792: Vindication of the rights of woman)

[6] ...e to visit him, because he was sick and couldn't come to the Grange, and how papa would **object** to my going; and then I negotiated with him about the pony. He is fond of reading, and h... (Bronte 1847: Wuthering heights)

In some cases it was hard to say whether the pronoun in question is in nominative or possessive form since they are one and the same:

[7] ...uld serve her. She told him she had present occasion for L600, and hoped he would not **object** to her taking up that sum. "Six hundred pounds," said he, after some deliberation, "is... (Burney 1782: Cecilia 1-2)

There were five instances of *to* + *-ing* pattern without the NP in the middle. These five instances cover 3.3 % of the data and have normalized frequency of 0.9:

[8] ... ed in your hands a manuscript poem written by me in Greece, which he tells me you do not **object** to publishing. But he also informed me in London that you wished to send the MS. to Mr... (Byron 1810-3: Letters 1810-3)

[9] ...dquo;I'm sure, John Barton, if yo are taking messages to the Parliament folk, yo'll not **object** to telling 'em what a sore trial it is, this law o' theirs, keeping childer fra' factor... (Gaskell 1848: Mary Barton)

If put together the both *-ing* patterns (with their 14 occurrences) cover 9.2% of the tokens and their normalized frequency is 2.4 per million words. This is much more than in the first part of the CLMET, where the two instances of *-ing* pattern put together only have normalized frequency of 0.7). So it seems, at least at this point, that gerund is advancing, as predicted by Rohdenburg (2006, 159).

The following two patterns (*to* + infinitive and *direct speech*) both occurred four times in the data (2.6%, 0.7 per million words):

[10] ...also, who, though they were not so much impressed by the considerations mentioned, yet **objected** to give their public testimony. Those whose livelihood, or promotion, or expectations, w... (Clarkson 1839: The history of the abolition of the African slave trade)

[11] ...we are three to one, sir, against any force Boney can bring into the field," Mr. Sedley **objected**; "the Austrians and the Russians are on their march. He must, he shall be crushed," Jos... (Thackeray 1847-8: Vanity fair)

Neither of these patterns occurred in the data from the first part of the CLMET

6.3 Nominal complements of *object* in the CLMET II

By far the most common complementation pattern found in the second part of CLMET is *to* + NP. It covers 52.1 % of the tokens and its normalized frequency is 14.7 per million words.

[12] ...ions, which, on account of the lowness of his voice, could not be heard, he concluded by **objecting** to the motion. Mr. William Smith rose. He wondered how the last speaker could have had... (Clarkson 1839: The history of the abolition of the African slave-trade)

[13] ...`However,' thought I, `I ought not to marry Eliza since my mother so strongly **objects** to it, and I ought not to delude the girl with the idea that I intended to do so. Now ... (Bronte 1848: The tenant of Wildfell Hall)

The pattern *to* + NP has gained considerably more ground since the first part of the CLMET. Its percentage has almost doubled (from 27.8 to 52.1) and its normalized frequency has actually tripled (from 4.9 to 14.7).

The second commonest complement in this part of the CLMET was zero-complement. It, too, has increased in number. In the first part it had normalized frequency of 1.3 and now it is 4.0. It used to be the fourth most common pattern in the CLMET I and now it has risen to number two.

[14] ...put him to the test, and request him to perform that sacred duty in name of us both. He **objected** boldly; saying there were very few people indeed with whom he could join in prayer, and... (Hogg 1824: Private memoirs and confessions of a justified sinner)

[15] ...dging anything," answered the housekeeper, with offended majesty. "Then why should he **object**?" asked the Prince. "Mr. Beckendorff is the best judge, sir, of the propriety of his o... (Disraeli 1826: Vivian Grey)

The pattern *to* + NP + *as* had three instances in this part (percentage 2.0 and frequency 0.5 per million words):

[16] ... looking at a picture of the historic (more properly of the poetic or heroic) class, he **objects** to a particular figure as being too much of a portrait; and this interruption of his com... (Coleridge 1817: Biographia litteraria)

Direct NP complement occurred twice in the data, as it did in the data from the first part of the CLMET. It covers 1.3% of the tokens and its normalized frequency is 0.3 per million.

[17] This was an extraordinary instance of her great prudence and policy; having had this end in view from the first, and entertaining a secret misgiving that the locksmith (who was bold when Dolly was in question) would **object**, she had backed Miss Miggs up to this point, in order that she might have him at a disadvantage. (Dickens 1841: Barbaby Rudge)

The last complement, *against* + NP, occurred only once (0.7%, frequency 0.2 per million).

This pattern did not occur in the first part at all.

[18] ...itten in such an affected style, that were it only on that account, and had I nothing to **object** against his MELLIFLUOUS precepts, I should not allow girls to peruse them, unless I des... (Wollstonecraft 1792: Vindication of the rights of woman)

6.4 Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the CLMET II

There were 25 instances of extraction in the data from the second part of the CLMET. So, the normalized frequency for extractions is 4.4 per million which is considerably higher than the normalized frequency for extractions in the first part (1.6).

The types of extractions that could be found in this part were topicalizations (example 19) and relativizations (example 20), like in the first part as well. There were 15 cases of relativization and 10 cases of topicalization.

22 out of 25 were of the type where the extraction was out of a *to* + NP construction (example 21). Among the remaining three cases there was one out of a *to* + infinitive construction (example 22) and two out of direct NP (example 17 above). Example (22) is now the kind of extractions that Vosberg (2003b, 201) was talking about. Here the complement of the verb *know* in the subordinate clause is fronted and there is a gap after the word *of* in the clause. Consequently the complement of *object* here is a *to* + infinitive since these extractions structures favour this pattern over the gerundial pattern.

[19] ... he general merits of the question. This humane interference he thought no member would **object** to. Indeed, those for Liverpool had both of them admitted, on the ninth of May, that reg... (Clarkson 1839: The history of the abolition of the African slave-trade)

[20] ...attachment, which brought the parties together, without legal formalities, to which she **objected** on account of some family embarrassments, in which he would thereby become involved. Th... (Wollstonecraft 1792: Vindication of the rights of woman)

[21] ...reparatory to his taking a lease. To so reasonable a request the honest Welshman stoutly **objected**; and on this slight occurrence, depended whether the Laurent should take up, perhaps, h... (Cottle 1847: Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southley)

[22] ...ed her and liked her, and pronounced her to be a sweet girl, and one whom they would not **object** to know more of. Miss Bennet was therefore established as a sweet girl, and their broth... (Austen 1813: Pride and prejudice)

When it comes to the insertions there were five instances of them (0.9 per million words).

Two of the insertions were adverbials of time:

[23] ...ual, that he should employ the faculties of his mind in spontaneous exertions. I do not **object**, especially during the period of nonage, to a considerable degree of dependence and con... (Godwin 1831: Thoughts on man)

[24] ...ential difference:" it is against these exclusively that my opposition is directed. I **object**, in the very first instance, to an equivocation in the use of the word "real." Every man... (Coleridge 1817: Biographia literaria)

In one case the insertion was just two words:

[25] ... respecting his troublesome and eccentric conduct. It was then that I learnt his wish. I **objected**, of course, to engaging a servant of whose previous character I was ignorant, and of wh... (Disraeli 1826: Vivian Grey)

One of the insertions was an addition in parenthesis (see example 17 above). The remaining one was an insertion in the form of a prepositional phrase:

[26] ...ay between the gravity of Johnson and the lightness of Chesterfield; but it may often be **objected** to them, as to the moral writings of Johnson, that they present life to us under a gloo...

In two of the instances where insertions occurred they were made in clauses that had *to* + NP complements (examples 23 and 24). In one case the clause that contained an inserted element was had a direct NP complement (example 17). In example (25) the complementation pattern seems to be *to* + *-ing*. The insertion in example (26) is done in a clause that has the complementation pattern of the form of *to* + NP + *that*.

There was one case (normalized frequency 0.2 per million words) in the data where the horror aequi principle was violated. This particular case is, however, open to doubt since one can not be totally and utterly sure whether the word form in question is a verb or a noun:

[27] ...n of character, to respectable people, can have any evil tendency; and I am so far from **objecting** to dancing myself, that I shall hope to be honoured with the hands of all my fair cousin... (Austen 1813: Pride and prejudice)

6.5 The senses of *object* in the CLMET II

In this second part of the CLMET, like in the first part, I was able to find only few tokens where the meaning of the verb *object* was something else than that of the *OED*'s sense I. All in all there were

only three instances of the sense II (see examples 28, 29 and also 26 above). Sense III was again absent from the data.

[28] ...n this, we may forgive him, for his successful vindication of Shak[e]speare from the faults **objected** to him by the French critics. It is in his biographical works that Johnson is most pl... (Cary 1846: Lives of the English poets)

[29]...he saw it only, for a short time, a few days previous to its publication. It has been **objected** to me, that I have exposed too freely the secrets of trade. The only real secrets of tra... (Babbage 1832: The economy of machinery and manufactures)

7 Complementation of the verb *object* in the third part of the CLMET

In the third part of the CLMET there were 6,251,564 words altogether. All the texts included in this part of the corpus date back to the period between 1850 and 1920. The number of authors in this part is 51 and the number of different texts is 80.

As was the case with the earlier parts of the CLMET also in this part the search for words *object*, *objects*, *objected* and *objecting* resulted in many tokens that were irrelevant to this study. Alongside with the nouns (from *object* and *objects*) there were now some adjectives that were of the form *objecting*:

[1]...her ears. But the children held her hands. She crackled and made various oppressive and **objecting** sounds, but the song poured into her in spite of all her efforts. Her feet began to move .. (Blackwood 1915: The extra day)

[2] ..uld that all the Lord's people had more of this ambition. Well, but, say our **objecting** friends, how is it that these whose names you mention, and many others, should venture... (Booth 1879: Papers on practical religion)

At first I had 1,095 tokens and after deleting the nouns and the adjectives from the lot there were 249 relevant tokens, which means that the normalized frequency for *object* as a verb in the CLMET III is 39.8 per million words. This frequency is much higher than the frequency of *object* in the previous parts (CLMET I 17.8 and CLMET II 26.7).

7.1 Different complements in the CLMET III

There were seven different complementation patterns for the verb *object* in the third part of the CLMET. The table (6) below illustrates the distribution of these patterns.

Complement	Number of the complements in CLMET III	Percentage of the complements in CLMET III	Frequency per million words in CLMET III
<i>to</i> + NP	97	39.0	15.5
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>-ing</i>	43	17.3	6.9
zero-complement	39	15.7	6.2
<i>that</i> -clause	26	10.4	4.1
<i>direct speech</i>	23	9.2	3.7
<i>to</i> + infinitive	11	4.4	1.8
<i>to</i> + <i>-ing</i>	10	4.0	1.6
	249	~100%	

Table 6. Complements of *object* in the third part of the CLMET

7.2 Clausal complements of *object* in the CLMET III

In this third part of the corpus the *-ing* complement has multiplied its presence in the data. *To* + NP + *-ing* pattern, with its 43 occurrences, now covers 17.3% of the tokens, its normalized frequency being 6.9 per million whereas it was 1.6 in the second part of the CLMET. In this part, as well as in the second, there were again two kinds of *to* + NP + *-ing* patterns. Those that had an accusative NP and those that had a possessive pronoun/genitive NP in the place of an NP. This genitive form pattern is sometimes called the *poss-ing*-pattern. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1192-93) this alteration between genitive and non-genitive subjects occurs only when the NP is functioning as a subject of a gerund-participial clause. There are other restrictions to the appearance of this *poss-ing* pattern as well. The style in which it is used is normally formal rather than informal (Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1192), also the type of the NP is a determining factor.

In the data from the third part of the CLMET the *poss-ing* pattern was present in eight cases:

[3] ...w all about that--Good old Bill!" and helped himself to a third glass of port. Carrie **objected** strongly to my saying "Good old," but she made no remark when Willie used the double adj... (Grossmith 1894: The diary of a nobody)

[4] ...ly flushed; he patted it caressingly. "What's the matter, my dear?" he asked. "She **objects** to my doing nothing and having red hair," said I, in an injured tone. "Oh! of course ... (Hope 1894: The prisoner of Zenda)

So there were still 35 cases where the NP in this pattern was in nominative form:

[5] ...al defects of my wife's character as a mistress were not at the first visible. Though I **objected** to the children amusing themselves by carving fancy arabesques on the side-board, playi... (Linton 1885: The autobiography of Christopher Kirkland)

[6] ...n and stand up for his own house and his own school? You know you wouldn't. Then don't **object** to me cracking up the old School house, Rugby. Haven't I a right to do it, when I'm taki... (Hughes 1857: Tom Brown's school days)

Besides the pattern *to* + NP + *-ing* there was also the pattern *to* + *-ing*. It was found in the data ten times (percentage 4.0 and normalized frequency 1.6):

[7] ...not too pleasant.' 'If I had thought much of them, what would our relations be? They **object** to dicing, and I to leading strings.' She turned to a brighter subject, of no visible... (Meredith 1895: The amazing marriage)

[8] ...-English gibberish on the spot. "Why not look into it?" he said, as if I had personally **objected** to looking into it. "Why the devil lose your patience, Betteredge, when patience is all... (Collins 1868: The moonstone)

If put together these both *-ing* patterns (53 instances) cover 21.3% of the tokens and their normalized frequency is 8.5 per million. It can thus be said that the *-ing* patterns have increased quite significantly since in the second part of the CLMET their normalized frequency (when put together) was 2.4. So again it can be said that the gerundial complement seems to follow the Great Complement Shift suggested by Rohdenburg (2006, 159).

The normalized frequency for *that*-clause complement in the third part of the CLMET was 4.1. There were 26 cases of *that*-clause pattern as a complement of *object* and its percentage was 10.4. There were no dramatic changes when it comes to the frequency of plain *that*-clause.

However, what is noteworthy is that the pattern *to* + NP + *that* has completely disappeared. There were no tokens that contained this particular pattern. It may be due to the fact that the pattern *to* + NP + *that* was quite often associated with the *OED*'s sense II (*to charge*). And since this sense is nowadays obsolete it may be that there are no longer any tokens that might contain this meaning and, consequently, no complements of the form *to* + NP + *that*. It is interesting to see if this pattern appears in the data from the BNC. Below illustrations of the pattern *that*-clause:

[9] ...on. You object--see, sir, how my sympathies look straight down into your thoughts!--you **object** that Lady Glyde is not in health and not in spirits to take the long journey, from Hamps... (Collins 1859-60: The woman in white)

[10] ...opinions at which he has arrived will be stated with some diffidence." [58:1] My critic **objects** that I express my opinions with decision. I shall hereafter justify this decision, but I... (Cassels 1889: A reply to dr. Lightfoot's essay)

Complementation pattern *direct speech* was almost as common as *that*-clause. It appeared in 23 tokens covering 9.2% of them (normalized frequency 3.7 per million words). This complementation pattern has also steadily risen from the eighteenth century to the early twentieth century in this corpus data. In the first part there were no occurrences of the *direct speech* complement. In the second part it had a normalised frequency of 0.7 and now it is 3.7. Perhaps the fact that pattern has increased is because *object* in the *OED*'s sense 2.b. (*To bring forward or state in opposition or as a counterargument...*) might be quite resent. That is also the only sense that appears with this pattern. Again, it is interesting to see whether this complement will still continue to increase in the material from the BNC. Below illustrations of the pattern *direct speech*:

[11] ...he inventory of her linen complete." "What proves that it was Rosanna's nightgown?" I **objected**. "The material she bought for making the substitute dress," answered the Sergeant."... (Collins 1868: The moonstone)

[12]...m yesterday--but never jam to-day.' 'It MUST come sometimes to "jam to-day,'" Alice **objected**. 'No, it can't,' said the Queen. 'It's jam every OTHER day: to-day isn't any OTHER...' (Carrol 1871: Through the looking glass)

I was a little surprised to find 11 *to*-infinitive patterns as complement of *object* (4.4% of the tokens, normalized frequency 1.8 per million). I thought that it would have decreased since the

second part but quite on the contrary it has increased in number (normalized frequency in the 2nd part 0.7). However this slight increase in the frequency of *to*-infinitive pattern is not that drastic. We will see what happens to it in the data containing Present Day English.

[13] ...ch to put an end to, the English sovereignty or dominion. The obstinacy of the Dutch in **objecting** to pay the old-established mark of respect to the English flag was quite reason enough i... (Bridge 1899-1902: Sea-power and other studies)

[14] ...estimation. About £500 would put up a tidy little industrial school, and you might not **object** to have a scholarship or two for some of our little -th Highlander lassies whose father... (Younge 1865: The clever woman of the family)

7.3 Nominal complements of *object* in the CLMET III

Again, as in the second part too, clearly the most common complementation pattern for the verb *object* was *to* + NP (97). It covers 39 % of the tokens and its normalized frequency per million words is 15.5. Thus the normalized frequency has remained almost the same that it was in the second part (14.7).

[15] ...a goodly store on the back shelves of the bric-à-brac shops. As her husband **objected** to this crazy application of their income, and would not give her an allowance to cover... (Linton 1885: The autobiography of Christopher Kirkland 1-3)

[16] ...large bore, any more than he would have a heavy carriage for a small horse. If the man **objects** to the weight of the rifle, let him content himself with a smaller bore, but do not rob .. (Baker 1855: Eight years' wandering in Ceylon)

The third most common complementation pattern in the CLMET III was zero-complement. It occurred in the data 39 times and covers 15.7% of the tokens. Its normalized frequency is 6.2 per million. Compared to the previous parts of the corpus the zero complement has been rising steadily (frequencies in the first and the second part were 1.3 and 4.0).

[17] ...her's cottage, and still shading her eyes from the unaccustomed light. To her Mr. Eager **objected**, saying that here was the thin edge of the wedge, and one must guard against imposition... (Forster 1908: A room with a view)

[18] ...a man, showing the circulation, and this he had hung in his bedroom, his mother-in-law **objecting** most strongly on the ground that its effect on his wife was injurious. He had a notion... (Rutherford 1896: Clara Hopgood)

Some of the complements that were found in the data from the previous parts of the CLMET were not present in this data from the last part. These patterns include NP + *as*, *against* + NP, NP, *against* + NP + *-ing*, *to* + NP + *that* and *to* + NP + *as*. All of these patterns, except for the pattern *to* + NP + *that*, were not among the most common ones in neither of the earlier corpora. In fact they were quite marginal.

7.4 Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the CLMET III

Extractions were not very common in the data from the third and last part of the CLMET. There were only 12 of them, the normalized frequency being 1.9 per million words. It is almost the same as in the first part (1.6) and smaller than in the second part (4.4). Extractions involved, again, topicalizations and relativization. This time also one case of clefting was present in the data.

Illustrations below represent above mentioned types:

[19] ...hat it means, though it would take an essay to limit it and define it. To this the Lords **object**; wherever it is concerned, they are not impartial revisers, but biassed revisers. Thi... (Bagehot 1867: The English constitution)

[20] ...interfere with the marriages of his nobles, at any rate to forbid a marriage to which he **objected** on grounds of policy. Under Randolf Flambard this became a regular claim, which of cours... (Freeman 1888: William the conqueror)

[21] ...ad of wasting your life in that wilderness." John drew himself up. "It's not London I **object** to," he said; "that was inevitable, I dare say." "What then?" "The profession she ... (Caine 1897: The Christian)

Eleven out of these 12 cases of extractions were out of *to* + NP complementation patterns:

[22] ..."God manifest in the flesh." A formal, ceremonious, respectable religion they do not **object** to; but a living, burning, enthusiastic Christianity is still Beelzebub! to them... (Booth 1879: Papers on practical religion)

One of the extractions was out of a clause where the complement of the preposition *to* was moved:

[23] ...Englishmen what we are. Being murdered in one's bed about once a week is what I should **object** to." "Do they do much of that sort of thing down there?" the good woman would enquire... (Jerome 1909: They and I)

Insertions occurred in 12 tokens in the data from the CLMET III (normalized frequency being 1.9), which is slightly more than in the second part (0.9) and about the same as in the first part (2.0). In eleven of the twelve cases the inserted element was an adverbial of manner:

[24] ...after what you have told me I can't imagine he is the sort of person who is likely to **object very much** to an arrangement by which he would benefit, at least indirectly. As for the... (Malet 1901: The history of Sir Richard Calmady)

[25] ...ful. On the physical side, I owe her an endless debt of gratitude. Her relations, who **objected strongly** to her marriage, had told her, among other pleasant prophecies, that 'the first... (Gosse 1907: Father and son)

In one of the cases the insertion made was a noun phrase:

[26]...like the average man of the world, to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, do I **object** to Julius, or any other man, being your guest during my absence, unless you have some w... (Malet 1901: The history of Sir Richard Calmady)

In six of the insertion cases the inserted element had been placed in a clause with an NP complement:

[27] ...into more and more painful contrast with the unbroken servitude of Sunday. My Father **objected very strongly** to the expression Sabbath-day, as it is commonly used by Presbyterians and... (Gosse 1907: Father and son)

Twice did the inserted element occur in a clause with a to + NP + -ing complement:

[28] ...w all about that--Good old Bill!" and helped himself to a third glass of port. Carrie **objected strongly** to my saying "Good old," but she made no remark when Willie used the double adj... (Grossmith 1894: The diary of a nobody)

Inserted element was placed twice in a clause with the complementation pattern of *that*-clause:

[29]...that no difference can be perceived between one germ and another; it cannot, however, be **objected on this account** that the determining cause of its ulterior development must be somethin... (Butler 1880: Unconscious memory)

Only once the insertion had been made in a clause with *to*-infinitive pattern as a complement:

[30] ...been made for the care of the sick and wounded. There are further charges of obstinately **objecting, out of mere stinginess**, to take proper measures for the naval defence of the country... (Bridge 1899-1902: Sea-power and other studies)

There were no violations to the horror aequi principle in this data from the third part of the CLMET.

7.5 The senses of *object* in the CLMET III

It seems to be the case that the prediction in the *OED* was right in that the senses II and III are obsolete. I could not find any tokens that would have had the verb *object* in either of those meanings.

What is noteworthy about the senses is that the subsense 2.b. (*To bring forward or state in opposition or as a counterargument etc.*) has become much more frequent than in previous parts. It is used in speech acts to report the person who makes the utterance and, thus, it appears only in past tense:

[31] ..."To-morrow morning?" "At dawn to-morrow morning." "But to-morrow's Sunday," they **objected**. "To-morrow's--an Extra Day," he said amazingly. They hesitated a moment, stared, f... (Blackwood 1915: The extra day)

8 Complementation of the verb *object* in the BNC

In the British National Corpus there are 111,244,375 words. It is a corpus that is aimed to represent the British English of the later part of the twentieth century. There are texts from all kinds of genres, styles and varieties and the texts are both written and spoken. The composition of the BNC is not completely equivalent to that of the CLMET, since the CLMET is a corpus of written material only and the texts were mainly "literary texts written by higher class male adults" (DeSmet 2005, 71-72). However, I think that despite certain differences in the composition of these corpora, the results from the two sources can be compared.

All in all there were 1,943 tokens of the verb *object*. For the purposes of this thesis I took a random sample of 600 tokens out of the whole. 600 is about 30 % of all of the tokens of the verb *object*. Since there is a possibility for a lemma search in the BNC (the corpus was accessed through the sketchengine, www.sketchengine.co.uk) the number of irrelevant tokens was far smaller than when using the CLMET. Despite this, among the 600 tokens there were 109 that included *object* as a noun (interestingly enough the adjective *objecting* did not occur once):

[1] ...intentionally, by occupying the place immediately after the verb, as **objects** normally do (see section 5.3). In other words, we have another instance... (HPY)

[2] ...vertical configuration for such systems; instead you have a sleek sculptural **object** you can hang on the wall. (ABS)

So, after eliminating the irrelevant tokens I had 491 relevant ones. The normalized frequency for *object* as a verb is thus 14.7. The normalized frequency has gone down quite a bit compared to the figures from the CLMET II and the CLMET III (26.7 and 39.8), but is almost the same as in the first part of the CLMET (17.8).

8.1 Different complements in the BNC

There were nine different complementation patterns to be found in the data from the BNC. The table (7) below illustrates the distribution of different complements and also the figures:

Complement	Number of the complements in the BNC	Percentage of the complements the BNC	Frequency per million words in the BNC
<i>to</i> + NP	257	52.3	7.7
zero-complement	122	24.8	3.7
<i>that</i> -clause	30	6.1	0.9
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>-ing</i>	30	6.1	0.9
<i>to</i> + <i>-ing</i>	24	4.9	0.72
direct speech	22	4.5	0.66
NP	3	0.6	0.09
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>that</i>	2	0.4	0.06
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>as</i>	1	0.2	0.03
	491	~100%	

Table 7. Complements of *object* in the BNC.

8.2 Clausal complements of *object* in the BNC

That-clause as a complement of *object* occurred 30 times. Its percentage was 6.1 and the normalized frequency 0.9 per million words. The normalized frequency of this pattern is lower than it was in the CLMET (CLMET I 5.3, CLMET II 2.4, CLMET III 4.1).

[3] ...to his identification of mental ideas with real things, ` it will be **objected** that we see things actually without or at a distance from us, and which... (ABM)

[4] ...Conservative back-benchers and from the Prime Minister herself. The Tory critics **object** that the Church is peddling left-wing politics as a religious message... (A6F)

In the BNC data the pattern *to* + NP + *that*-clause appeared again. However there were only two instances (percentage 0.4 and normalized frequency 0.06).

[5] Money, it is said, makes the sinews of war. </p><p>` To this it may be **objected** that although it is necessary to tax in order to wage war, it is not... (FRA)

[6] ...to do what gives most pleasure. There is something decidedly odd about **objecting** to it that the mere psychological fact that one alternative is more pleasant... (CB1)

If put together these *that*-clause complements make 32 occurrences and they cover 6.5 per cent of the tokens, their normalized frequency being 0.96.

Another complement that occurred 30 times in the data was *to* + NP + *-ing*. It had the percentage of 6.1 and the normalized frequency of 0.9 per million words. This pattern has come down both as a percentage (CLMET III 17.3) and as a normalized frequency (CLMET III 6.9). Its figures now resemble those it had in the second part of the CLMET (5.9% and 1.6). In this modern data the *poss-ing* structure occurred four times (example 9). The small number of these *poss-ing* patterns is not a surprise since it is often associated with formal language. In the BNC not all the texts are formal in their style and thus the amount of *poss-ing* patterns is lower.

[7] ...those 'Lloyd George malcontents', such as Austen Chamberlain, who **objected** to the Conservative Party removing Lloyd George from office in 1922. (ACH)

[8] Bruce has a claim to the Scottish throne. Why should Edward now **object** to his old friend and comrade-in-arms seizing the Scottish crown?' (BMN)

[9] I honestly don't think they would **object** to my marrying Madeleine on the grounds of my birth. (FS1)

There was another gerundial complement in the data from the BNC, namely the *to* + *-ing* complement. This complement occurred 24 times and its percentage was 4.9 and the normalized frequency 0.72 per million. The normalized frequency has gone down since the third part of the CLMET (1.6) but it is about the same as in the second part (0.9).

[10] ...in a market the owner of which demanded tolls from him. The plaintiff **objected** to paying the tolls, and on the first occasion when he did so the owner... (FCL)

[11] ...I had no engagements for the weekend in question. </p><p>` Would Luke **object** to being dog-sat ? 'I asked. </p><p>`Object?' she replied.' (ACM)

Counted together, both the gerundial complements (54 instances) make up for 11.0 per cent of the tokens, their normalized frequency being 1.6 per million. All in all it seems, oddly enough, that the normalized frequency for the gerundial patterns has decreased (CLMET III 8.5, CLMET II 2.4, CLMET I 0.3).

The complementation pattern *direct speech* has 22 instances in the BNC. Thus its percentage is 4.5 and the normalized frequency 0.66. Also this pattern has decreased in number; the normalized frequency for *direct speech* in the CLMET II was 3.7. In the second part of the CLMET it was about the same as now (0.7). Again, this complement occurred only in past tense.

[12] ...Australia,' Gareth said. </p><p>`We're not in Australia, ' Coconut **objected**. He looked at his watch and around him. `That way is north,' he... (ADY)

[13] ...belladonna it was. </p><p>`Anyone could have dropped poison into his food ' **objected** James stolidly. `It's not fair we should be blamed. It could have... (H8A)

The pattern *to* + infinitive was not present in this present day data. This was to be expected, since according to Rohdenburg's Great Complement Shift (2006, 159) it is to become less frequent. Also the *OED* mentions it as rare today. I did another search for this pattern in the whole of the BNC and again got no matches. So, with relative certainty I may say that the verb *object* no longer in Present Day English is complemented by the pattern *to* + infinitive.

8.3 Nominal complements of *object* in the BNC

Once again, the most common complementation pattern for the verb *object* was *to* + NP. It covered 52.3 per cent of the tokens and its normalized frequency was 7.7. *To* + NP pattern has become so frequent that it complements more than half of the tokens found in the BNC data. However, it is noteworthy that the normalized frequency of this pattern has come down significantly being now

7.7 (in CLMET I 4.9, CLMET II 14.7 and CLMET III 15.4). But also the frequency of *object* as a verb has come down.

[14] ...olution. It's under way and this is the way to go with it. Does anybody **object** to this strategy of violence? I think it's I 'm not convinced about... (KGN)

[15] ...spreading fast. Public-service workers in such unions as NUPE and NALGO **objected** to the effects of the 5 per cent pay norm on low-paid workers, and on... (A66)

The second most common complement for *object* was zero-complement. In the data there were 122 occurrences of this type of complement and it covered 24.8% of the tokens (normalized frequency 3.7 per million). If you look at the percentages this complement has gained more ground in relation to the other patterns. However, its normalized frequency has gone down by about a half from the CLMET III (6.2)

[16] ...it, laughing at her as he did so, then played a chord. She did not **object**, so he broke into a piece by Debussy and she listened attentively. (CDN)

[17] ...foot the bill. </p><p>He says they're bound by the law and if someone **objects**, there has to be a public inquiry, even if it costs £50,000... (K1C)

Together the two most common complementation patterns (to + NP and zero-complement) cover more than 77 per cent of the tokens.

Direct NP complement was found three times. It covered 0.6 per cent of the tokens and it had a normalized frequency of 0.09. Since this complement pattern has through the whole material been among the least frequent patterns it is not surprising to see that it only has three occurrences in the BNC as well. The example (18) below is open to doubt about whether the word *object* is a verb or not, since it might also be a noun.

[18] By contrast, Freud (1920) describes homosexuality as a matter of physical and mental sexual characteristics, and **object** choice, which often vary independently of each other... (CMR)

[19] March has **objected** five B status, Chairman, we were delighted to hear this before Christmas, that the European Union had recommended that the March's bid for five B status be approved (HYX)

Complement *to* + NP + *as* occurred once in the data, its percentage being 0.2 and the normalized frequency 0.03 per million words.

[20] Costs in litigation to be taxed on standard basis -- Mortgagor **objecting** to items in account as being unreasonable – Whether... (FDA)

8.4 Extractions, insertions and the horror aequi in the BNC

There were 33 cases of extraction in the data from the BNC. Thus the normalized frequency for extractions is 1.0 per million words. That is a little less than in the data from the CLMET (CLMET III 1.9, CLMET II 4.4, CLMET I 1.6).

All the extractions were of the type where the extraction was out of a *to* + NP complement (example 21). 27 were relativizations (example 21) and out of the remaining six two were topicalizations (example 22), two interrogations (example 23) and one was clefting (example 24).

[21] What is not clear, however, is the nature of the abnormality which is being **objected** to. (CBR)

[22] ...which has not prejudiced other interested parties in the election, and, under s.2(6),the grant of a new licence is not to be **objected** to on the ground that any of the members of the board granting it were not qualified to grant the licence. (G3J)

[23] Clearly, what is needed is a control structure where the plausibility checker either is allowed to say what part of a logical form it **objects** to, or... (B2X)

[24] 'It is not the price Scottish members **object** to, but the spelling of `whiskey'. (CEK)

The amount of insertions in the BNC data was 11, which means that the normalized frequency for insertions is 0.3 per million. The frequency is smaller than when investigating the CLMET (CLMET III 1.9, CLMET II 0.9, CLMET I 2.0). In all of the cases the insertion made was an adverbial of manner (strongly, strenuously etc.). Mostly (8 times) insertions were made in clauses where the complementation pattern was *to* + NP (example 25). In three occasions the inserted element had been placed in a clause with gerundial complement (examples 26 and 27). Although this violates the Complexity Principle by Rohdenburg (2006, 147) it is not a great revelation because all the insertions were very short (one or two words) and thus the sentences were still easy to process.

[25] In the extreme, of course, local people may **object** strongly to a project (eg on environmental grounds), and force a design change or even... (J53)

[26] Trained nurses, in general, **object** strongly to being taught their jobs either by their juniors or by doctors. (CK0)

[27] ...mixed schools by male teachers: most Libyan parents would have **objected** strongly to laws compelling mixed education. (ADW)

No violations to the horror aequi rule were found in the data from the BNC.

8.5 The senses of *object* in the BNC

In the BNC there were no tokens that would have contained some other sense than the *OED*'s sense

I. Therefore the prediction that the *OED* made about the other sense groups being obsolete is correct.

9 Conclusion

As I mentioned in the introduction the aim of this thesis was to find out what different complementation patterns the verb *object* licenses in the historical data as well as in the modern data. I was interested to find out whether the complementation of *object* has changed over the past three centuries. Some attention was also paid to the meanings of *object* as well as to the relationship between the sense and the form.

The verb *object* has, according to the data, become less frequent in the past couple of centuries. In the present day data it had the normalized frequency of 14.7. Whereas in the CLMET III it was much more frequent with 39.8 occurrences per million and in the CLMET II it occurred 26.7 times per million words. Even in the first part of the CLMET its normalized frequency was 17.4 per million. This is quite interesting since I have not detected any significant changes for example in the senses, so that some of them would have disappeared totally. As a matter of fact the meanings of *object* have remained quite unaffected by time. In the first and second parts of the CLMET there were a few tokens that contained the sense II (*to charge and related senses*). By contrast in the CLMET III and the BNC there were no examples of any other senses besides I (*to oppose or disapprove*). The sense III (*To bring before*) was not found once in the data.

Accordingly since hardly any differences in the senses of *object* were detected, there is not much to say about the relationship between the pattern and the meaning. However, all the tokens that contained the sense II seemed to be of the form *to* + NP + *that*-clause. Thus it can be said that some kind of tendency is found here. If the senses had been examined in more detail, that is to say that all the sub senses were included in the study, there might have been some more rules to be found.

Be that as it may, it seems that the claim the *OED* makes about the senses II and III being obsolete is true.

The complementation pattern *to* + NP has remained the most frequent complement for the verb *object* (except in the CLMET I where it was 2nd). In all parts except for the first part of the CLMET *to* + NP has been by far the most common pattern.

Also the zero-complement has been steadily in the top four of the patterns. In the Present Day English data from the BNC it covered almost 25 per cent of the tokens. Together the *to* + NP and zero-complement covered almost 77 % of the tokens from the BNC.

That-clause complements have also been among the most common ones through all three centuries. This type appeared in two patterns: *that*-clause and *to* + NP + *that*-clause. As a matter of fact this *to* + NP + *that*-clause was the only pattern that contained the sense II. In the data from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries this pattern, at times, had the meaning *to charge*. When the NP had a human realization it contained this sense II. When the NP was not a human the sense was that of the *OED*'s I. *That*-clause complement was interesting also in the sense that it appeared frequently in passive structures with dummy *it* as its subject. This pattern is called extraposition.

The gerundial complements (*to* + *-ing* and *to* + NP + *-ing*) appeared in the picture in the second part of the CLMET. In the third part they became more frequent and covered 21.3 per cent of the tokens their normalized frequency being 8.5 per million. In the data from the BNC the gerundial complements covered 11.0 per cent and the normalized frequency was 1.6 per million. It seems that the gerunds as complements of the verb *object* have undergone a reduction in the Present Day English. This is strange since I anticipated to have found even more gerunds in the BNC than what I found in the latter part of the CLMET. Regardless of the decrease in the frequency of gerundial complements the *to*-infinitive has completely disappeared. Thus the prediction by Rohdenburg (2006, 159) that the gerund is advancing at the expense of the infinitival complements seems to hold to some extent. Nevertheless, it seems that the gerund has had to take the second place to complementation patterns *to* + NP and zero.

The following two complementation constructions were mentioned in the literature but were not present in the present day data (*wh*-clause appeared once in the CLMET II): *against* + NP and *to* + *wh*-clause. I did another search in the whole of the BNC and found exactly one token that had *against* + NP as its complement:

[1] It has been **objected** against this kind of reasoning that it really misses the point the sceptic is trying to make . (FTV)

The patterns *to* + *wh*-clause had nine occurrences as a complement for *object* in the BNC:

[2] ...the Minister withdrew the statutory instrument and introduced the new one only when more than 50 voluntary organisations and others vehemently **objected** to what he was trying to do. (HHW)

Direct NP complement was found three times in the BNC even though it is not mentioned in the *OED* nor in the grammar books consulted.

As a final conclusion I might say that it seems that complementation patterns *to* + NP and zero are dominant in Present Day English with the verb *object*. Other significant patterns are *that*-clause, *to* + NP + *-ing*, *to* + *-ing* and *direct speech*.

Bibliography

Primary sources:

The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts	The CLMET
The British National Corpus	The BNC

Secondary sources:

Aston, G. & Burnard, G. 1998. *The BNC Handbook*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., Reppen, R. 1998. *Corpus Linguistics – Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bolinger, D. 1968. Entailment and the Meaning of Structures. *Glossa* 2:2.

Bowen, Rhonwen. 2005. *Noun Complementation in English*. Goteborg University: Department of English

de Smet, H. 2005. "A corpus of Late Modern English Texts." *ICAME Journal* 29, 69-82.

Herbst, T. et al. 2004. *A Valency Dictionary of English: A Corpus Based Analysis of the Complementation patterns of English Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum G. K. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jespersen, O. 1961. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Part 5. London: George Allen & Unwin ltd.

Johansson, S. 1995. "Mens sana in corpore sano: On the Role of Corpora in Linguistic Research." *The European English Messenger* 4, 2, 19-25.

Kilgarriff, A. 2001. "Web as corpus"

Klein, E. 1971. *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company.

Leech, G. 2003. "Modality on the move: The English modal auxiliaries 1961-1992." *Modality in Contemporary English*. Ed. Facchinetti, R. & Krug, M. & Palmer, F. 223-240. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.

Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. 2002. 3rd ed. *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman

Mair, C. 2002. Three changing patterns of verb complementation in Late Modern English: a real-time study based on matching text corpora. *English Language and Linguistics* 6.1. Cambridge University Press

The New Oxford Dictionary of English. 1998. Ed. Pearsall, J. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (the *OED*), accessed through the English Department website, www.oed.com

Poutsma H., 1904. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*. Groningen: Noordhoof.

Rohdenburg, G. 2006. "The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System" *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms*. Bern: Peter Lang

Sinclair, J. 2003. *Reading Concordances*. London: Pearson Education.

Somers, Harold L. 1984. On the validity of the complement-adjunct distinction in valency grammar. *Linguistics* 22:507-530.

Somers, Harold L. 1987. *Valency and Case in Computational Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Svartvik, J. & Sager, O. 1980. *Engelsk universitets Grammatik*. Nacka: Esselte Herzog

Vosberg, U. 2003a. "The role of extractions and *horror aequi* in the evolution of *-ing* complements in Modern English" *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vosberg, U. 2003b. "Cognitive Complexity and the Establishment of *-ing* Constructions with Retrospective Verbs in Modern English" *Insights into Late Modern English*. Bern: Peter Lang

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Essex: Longman Group.

Internet sources:

<http://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/>

www.sketchengine.co.uk