

## The Valency of Noun Phrases for Postverbal Complements in English Grammar

YoungRoung Kim  
(Woosuk University)

**Kim, YoungRoung.** “The Valency of Noun Phrases for Postverbal Complements in English Grammar.” *Studies in English Language & Literature* 44.2 (2018): 279-299. This paper pilots the grammatical functions of the postverbal ‘Noun Phrase’ in the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures in the classes of the three verbs, ‘*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*.’ It investigates whether the structures of the ‘postverbal complement (NP+ *to*-infinitive)’ properly function in English grammar. Though the prototypical structures of these three verbs seem to have the same ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ construction, they are grammatically and meaningfully different in terms of the functions of the ‘postverbal complements (NP + *to*-infinitive).’ Just as the grammatical and semantic functions of the postverbal Noun Phrases are different, so the three verbs’ structures should be handled idiosyncratically. To explore whether these postverbal complements are correctly used in a grammatical, semantical, and logical manner, this paper analyzes the use of the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures of the three verbs employed in English textbooks. (Woosuk University)

**Key Words:** postverbal complements, categorial status of Noun Phrases, valency of ‘*want*, *believe*, *persuade*’ verbs, *to*-infinitive structure, valency

### I. Introduction

The structures of the three verbs—*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*—have a great deal of surface indeterminacy, with no clear distinction among them. It is argued that the

Noun Phrases, which take place between the verbs and *to*-infinitives, are said to function as both the object of the verb of the main clause and the subject of the subordinate clause as well. The grammatical frameworks of these three verbs seem to have the same ‘Verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures. However, their structures are not congenial to each other grammatically, semantically, and logically. That is, the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures of the three verbs get so tangled and ravelled that it is not easy to be knowledgeable enough to be aware of their differences in their grammatical and semantic functions.

Depending on which verb class takes place in the main clause, the grammatical functions of the Noun Phrases in the postverbal complement ‘NP + *to*-infinitive’ constructions are different. Accordingly, therein lies the crux of the problem. While concentrating on the grammatical and semantic realization of the postverbal constructions, this paper analyzes the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures of the three verbs—‘*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*’—by focusing on the grammatical functions of the Noun Phrases in the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures.

In addition, as the three different verbal constructions are most likely to be used in English textbooks, this paper sees into the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures taking place in textbooks, thereby figuring out how their grammatical patterns are different with each other and how effectively we should understand their grammatical properties well. Jacobs (1995) notes that “The noun phrase actually required by a verb is an argument of the verb. The valency of a verb is the number of the so-called complements that the verb requires. We refer to the arguments that require the specification of the participants in the proposition as predicates.”<sup>1</sup> Bas Aarts (2013) explains that “The term verb complementation refers to the description of the complement-taking properties of verbs: i.e. which complements they take, and how these complements are realized.”

This paper sifts the way in which the functions of the postverbal complements of

---

<sup>1</sup> Bas Aarts (2013) says that in English, there are verbs like monadic predicate, dyadic predicate, and triadic predicate.

the three verbs. In school grammar, the postverbal complements are classified into 4 categories.<sup>2</sup> Out of these four categories, this paper explores the grammatical specification of the Noun Phrases in ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ complements.

## II. Previous Literature Research

Even though the surface postverbal complements seem to have the congenial ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ functional structures, the inherent grammatical properties turn out to be quite different. They are grammatically different in the realization of their valency of the three verbs in a distinctive way.

### 2.1 Type 1: *want*-pattern class

As for the verb and the clausal complement, Jacobs (1995) mentions that “constituents of an embedded clause are often shifted into the container clause, so that understanding the semantic relations among the various constituents might sometimes be difficult for non-native speakers.” Let us consider the following sentences:

(1) I wanted the doctor to examine the boy.

(2) a. NP<sub>1</sub> V [NP<sub>2</sub> V NP<sub>3</sub>]

b. NP<sub>1</sub> V NP<sub>2</sub> [(NP<sub>2</sub>) V NP<sub>3</sub>]

As seen in the roughly-labelled bracketings, (2a) and (2b) should be the possible options for the grammatical structure of the verb ‘*want*.’ There are three Noun Phrases, NP<sub>1</sub>, NP<sub>2</sub>, and NP<sub>3</sub>, in sentence (1), the third being the object of the verb

---

<sup>2</sup> The four categories include ‘infinitive complements,’ ‘gerund complements,’ ‘verbs taking both gerund and infinitive complements,’ and ‘verbs taking both gerund and bare infinitive complements.’

of the subordinate clause. The question is whether the second NP<sub>2</sub>—*the doctor*—is the object of ‘*wanted*.’ That is, which of the formulae in (2a-b) is appropriate for verb ‘*want*?’ (2a) should be the formula for verb ‘*want*’ for the following rationale:<sup>3</sup>

First, changing the main clause into a passivized sentence yields an ill-formed sentence like (3). The unavailability of the passivization of the main clause of ‘*want*’ shows that the postverbal NP<sub>2</sub> is not the object of ‘*wanted*.’ An alternative possible option for the passivization with the subordinate clause is shown in (4):

(3) \*The doctor was wanted to examine the boy.

(4) I wanted the boy to be examined by the doctor.

It is not easy to have a semantic distinction concerning the meaning, yet we should make a distinction. As for the meaning preserving, sentence (4) is clearly related to the original sentence with the passivization of the subordinate clause.<sup>4</sup> Sentence (4) evidences that the Noun Phrase *the doctor* is not the object of ‘*wanted*,’ but it instead functions as the subject of the subordinate clause. This becomes clear when the formula is spelled out like (5), in conformity with (2a) ‘NP<sub>1</sub> V [NP<sub>2</sub> V NP<sub>3</sub>].’

(5) I wanted [the doctor to examine the boy].

Second, a semantic relationship should exist differently, depending on whether the NP, *the doctor*, is a direct object of verb ‘*want*,’ or it is the subject of the subordinate clause in the, ‘*the doctor to examine the boy*.’ In case the Noun Phrase ‘*the doctor*’ is a direct object of the verb ‘*want*,’ a semantic relationship should hold

<sup>3</sup> The examples cited below are mainly excerpted from Aarts (2008, 2013) and Jacobs (1995).

<sup>4</sup> We are generally far more aware of the general meaning of a sentence than we are of the details of transformation. The Katz-Postal Hypothesis is recited in Akmajian (1975: 237): “Transformations are meaning preserving, in the following sense: if two surface structures derive from the exactly same underlying structure and if their derivations differ only in that an optional transformation has applied in one but not the other, then they must have the same meaning.”

between the verb ‘*want*’ and the NP ‘*the doctor*.’ This possibility is not acceptable because ‘*what I wanted*’ is not the NP, *the doctor*, but a proposition, i.e. a subordinate clause: NP2 + *to*-infinitive + NP3, ‘*the doctor to examine the boy*.’ Thus, it is natural that a semantic relationship should hold between the verb ‘*want*’ and a proposition, that is, a nonfinite subordinate clause, which takes the NP, *the doctor*, as its subject in ‘*the doctor to examine the boy*.’

Third, another claim that the postverbal Noun Phrase be a subject is evidenced in terms of subject idiom chunks and dummy/existential elements—‘*it*’ and ‘*there*’--which must take place in the only subject positions, to connote a particular meaning as shown in (6):

- (6) a. I want *the coast* to be clear.  
       b. I do not want *the fat* to be in the fire.  
       c. I do not want *the cat* to be out of the bag.  
       d. I do not want *the fur* to fly.  
       e. I do not want *the shit* to hit the fan.  
       f. I do not want *it* to be raining in Seoul.  
       g. I do not want *there* to be a turncoat in the club.

Sentences (6a-e) relate with the subject idiom chunks. It is well known that, in order to denote the intended meanings, the positions of the Noun Phrases in the subject idiom chunks—‘*the coast*, *the fat*, *the cat*, *the fur*, and *the shit*’---are restricted to the occurrences in the only subject positions of the ‘*to*-infinitive’ phrases, in ‘*to be clear*,’ ‘*to be in the fire*,’ ‘*to be out of the bag*,’ ‘*to fly*,’ and ‘*to hit the fan*.’ In other words, as noted in Bas Aarts (2013), these Noun Phrases cannot be replaced by different noun phrases without the particular meanings associated with the full expressions being lost.

Sentences (6f-g) have bearing on the meaningless dummy/existential elements—‘*it*’ and ‘*there*’--which also must occur in the only subject position. This clearly evidences that they cannot function as direct object Noun Phrases. Instead, they

behave as the subjects of the subordinate clauses, as the semantic relationship holds between the verb ‘*want*’ and propositions, i.e. subordinate clauses.<sup>56</sup>

## 2.2 Type 2: *believe*-pattern class

When the ‘*believe*’-class verb takes a nonfinite clausal complement, it can be paraphrased into a finite clausal complement, without the meaning lost between them. Let us consider some typical structures of the verb ‘*believe*.’

- (7) a. Tom believes *the doctor*.
- b. Tom believes that *the doctor* is reliable.
- c. Tom believes *the doctor* to be reliable.
- d. Tom believe that *the doctor* examined John.
- e. Tom believe *the doctor* to have examined John.
- f. *The doctor* is believed to have examined John.

(7a) takes the Noun Phrase, *the doctor*, which seems to function like a direct object of the verb ‘*believe*,’ and that (7b) takes a finite-clause string, ‘*the doctor is reliable*.’ We may well wonder about the grammatical role that the Noun Phrases

---

<sup>5</sup> Aarts (2013) includes such verbs as ‘*demand, hate, hope, love, prefer, wish,*’ etc., into the class of verb ‘*want*’.<sup>5</sup> Ron Cowan (2008) describes that some ‘*want*’-class verbs, including *arrange, like, love, plan,* and *prefer*, complementizer ‘*for*’ can take place at the beginning of the complements:

- i) We will arrange for your group to have access to the conference room.
- ii) I won’t plan (for) you to be back in time to go with us.

‘*Promise*,’ which belongs to the ‘*want*’-verb class, is somewhat of an exception. When ‘*promise*’ occurs without a following NP, it is clearly like the other ‘*want*’ verbs, since the meaning of (iii) is construed as (iv), in which the bracketed complement means that ‘*he (Bill)*’ *would write a letter to the mayor*.

- iii) Bill promised to write a letter to the mayor.
- iv) Bill promised [(Bill) to write a letter to the mayor].

<sup>6</sup> Jacobs (1995) claims that verbs, including ‘*want, persuade, and eager*’ are forward oriented. Clauses embedded after them refer to a potential situation rather than an existing one. Since nonfinite clauses are so often understood to refer to a potential situation, they are the forms normally selected by forward-oriented verbs.

'*the doctor*' plays in (7a) and (7b), respectively. It seems that, in (7a), '*Tom believes a person*,' i.e. '*the doctor*.' However, actually what '*Tom believes*' is not a just Noun Phrase, *the doctor*, but a proposition '*The doctor is reliable*.' The grammatical status of the Noun Phrase that the verb '*believe*' has is as follows: in (7a), '*believe*' takes a following Noun Phrase, while, in (7b), '*believe*' takes a clausal direct object in which the Noun Phrase—'*the doctor*'—functions as a subject. Thus, the Noun Phrase—*the doctor*—is not an object of '*believe*.' Instead, it is the subject Noun Phrase of '*be reliable*,' as the verb '*believe*' requires the two places for the Noun Phrases: 'the believer' and 'the belief.' So (7b) can be paraphrased into a nonfinite clause like (7c). For this reason, regarding the NP—*the doctor*—as a direct object poses a serious problem.

Second, let us examine the sentences (7d, e, f), which look plausibly similar to the sentences (7a, b, c). In the sentence (7d), the verb '*believe*' takes a finite subordinate clause as a complement. This is quite similar to that of (7b), except that the subordinate clause contains a transitive verb '*examine*' in (7d). There would be no difference in meaning between (7d) and (7e): The '*that*-clausal complement' in (7d) is paraphrased into a nonfinite complement clause in (7e). In (7f), the Noun Phrase, '*the doctor*,' is fronted for passivization. It is clear that the Noun Phrase--'*the doctor*'--has the grammatical function as a subject in (7a-e), irrespective of whether the Noun Phrase takes place either in a finite clause or in a nonfinite clause.

In view of traditional grammar, regarding the grammatical function of the Noun Phrases—*the doctor*—in (7a-f) as a subject might reach an impasse.<sup>7</sup> In (7f), the Noun Phrase, *the doctor*, is fronted as a subject, not as an object, in terms of a raising rule. To provide more evidence showing that the position of the Noun Phrase in the 'believe + NP + *to*-infinitive' structure functions as a subject position, I

---

<sup>7</sup> Bas Aarts (2013) notes that "It is true that, in traditional grammar, the possibility of fronting a phrase under passivization has always been a hallmark of objects." He adds that "There is nothing God-given about the generalization that only objects can be fronted under passivization. Both subjects and objects can be fronted, the former under Raising, the latter under Passivization."

employ some sentences with subject idiom chunks and dummy/existential elements, ‘*it*’ and ‘*there*’ as follows<sup>8</sup>:

- (8) a. Tom believes *the coast* to be clear.  
 b. Tom does not believe *the fat* to be in the fire.  
 c. Tom does not believe *the cat* to be out of the bag.  
 d. Tom does not believe *the fur* to fly.  
 e. Tom does not believe *the shit* to hit the fan.  
 f. Tom does not believe *it* to be raining in Seoul.  
 g. Tom does not believe *there* to be a turncoat in the club.

As already clarified in (6a-e) above, in order to connote a particular intended idiomatic construal, the idiomatic chunk Noun Phrases—*the coast*, *the fat*, *the cat*, *the fur*, and *the shit*---are restricted to occurring only in the subject positions of the specific ‘*to*-infinitive’ constructions, like ‘*to be clear*,’ ‘*to be in the fire*,’ ‘*to be out of the bag*,’ ‘*to fly*,’ and ‘*to hit the fan*.’ To this end, the Noun Phrases cannot be construed otherwise than as functioning as subjects in the ‘*believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ constructions. For this reason, the Noun Phrase in the ‘*believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ must be a subject position in the subordinate clause of ‘*to*-infinitive’ constructions.

In addition, the dummy/existential elements occur in the same position in (8f-g) as in (8a-e). This firmly proves again that the positions of the Noun Phrases must be the subject position. This is because the meaningless dummy/existential elements—‘*it*’ and ‘*there*’--must take place only in the subject position. They cannot function in the direct object position. In (8f-g), the dummy and existential elements—‘*it*’ and ‘*there*’--behave as the subjects of the subordinate clauses, holding the semantic relationship between the verb ‘*believe*’ and propositions, i.e. subordinate clauses. I have shown that the postverbal Noun Phrase in the ‘*believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structure is analyzed as the subject of a nonfinite clausal complement.<sup>9</sup> Thus, the

<sup>8</sup> The same examples were applicable in the ‘*want* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ constructions in example (6).



simple labelled-bracketing configurations for the verb ‘*believe*’ are as follows:

- (9) a. [VP [V’ believe [CP [C’ [IP Subj [I’ to [VP [V’ [V...]  
 b. [VP [V’ believe [IP Subj [I’ to [VP [V’ [V...]

### 2.3. Type 3: *persuade*-pattern class

Jacobs (2005) describes that, for a complement clause, the verb ‘*persuade*’ can have either a nonfinite or a finite clause, with the meaning that ‘cause someone to intend to take some action.’ Like verbs ‘*want*’ and ‘*believe*,’ the verb ‘*persuade*’ contains the same framework: ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive.’ Let us consider the grammatical function of the Noun Phrase in verb ‘*persuade*.’

- (10) a. Alice persuaded *John* to help *Einstein*.  
 b. Alice persuaded *Einstein* to be helped by *John*.

(10a) changes into a passive sentence in (10b). In terms of the general meaning of a sentence, we must keep an eye on the meaning holding between a grammatical structure and its meaning. In (10a) and (10b), a semantic relationship exists with the verb ‘*persuade*’ and the two postverbal Noun Phrases, ‘*John* and *Einstein*.’ That is to say, unlike the verbs ‘*want*’ and ‘*believe*,’ a semantic relationship does not exist between the verb ‘*persuade*’ and ‘*a proposition*.’<sup>10</sup> In other words, there exists a meaning relationship between the verb ‘*persuade*’ and the following postverbal Noun Phrases, i.e. each individual – *John* and *Einstein* – in (10a) and (10b). It follows that a meaning difference is triggered between sentence (10a) and its passivized version (10b).

<sup>9</sup> A number of verbs, including *consider*, *expect*, *intend*, *know*, *suppose*, *understand*, *acknowledge*, *judge*, *discover*, *think*, *prove*, *assume*, *fancy*, etc., belong to the class of the verb ‘*believe*.’

<sup>10</sup> This is different from the structures of the verbs ‘*want*’ and ‘*believe*.’ As for the verbs ‘*want*’ and ‘*believe*,’ the NP position in the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structure behaves as the subject of the subordinate clause; a semantic relationship should hold between the verb ‘*want*’ and a proposition (i.e., subordinate clause), not between the verb ‘*want*’ and the following Noun Phrase.

As for the differences in meaning relationships in the three verbs of ‘*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*,’ the two verbs—‘*want*’ and ‘*believe*’—establish a meaning relationship between the verb and a proposition: verb and following postverbal nonfinite subordinate clause ‘NP + *to*-infinitive’ construction. This clearly shows that, in the grammatical constructions of both ‘*want*’ and ‘*believe*,’ no meaning relationship exists between the verb and the just following Noun Phrases. However, unlike the verbs ‘*want*’ and ‘*believe*,’ the verb ‘*persuade*’ has the different grammatical structure. Grammatically, the verb ‘*persuade*’ requires the three places for the positions of Noun Phrases. This entails that a meaning relationship holds between the verb ‘*persuade*’ and two following different individuals, i.e. Noun Phrases. For this reason, (10a) and (10b) must trigger a different construal.

Diametrically different from the structures of ‘*want/believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive,’ the Noun Phrase in ‘*persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ construction is analyzed as the position for a direct object: The Noun Phrase is an object of ‘*persuade*,’ and a semantic relationship exists between the verb ‘*persuade*’ and the postverbal Noun Phrase. Accordingly, neither the subject idiom chunks nor dummy/existential elements are applicable to the Noun Phrase positions in ‘*persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ construction:

- (11) a. \*Alice persuaded *the coast* to be clear.
- b. \*Alice persuaded *the fat* to be in the fire.
- c. \*Alice persuaded *the cat* to be out of the bag.
- d. \*Alice persuaded *the fur* to fly.
- e. \*Alice persuaded *the shit* to hit the fan.
- f. \*Alice persuaded *it* to be raining in Seoul.
- g. \*Alice persuaded *there* to be a turncoat in the club.

The ungrammaticality in (11) shows that it is not possible for the subject idiom chunks and dummy/existential elements—*it* and *there*---to take place in the postverbal Noun Phrase positions at all. This clearly evidences that the postverbal Noun Phrase

position in the structure of the ‘*persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ is not a subject position but a direct object.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the verb ‘*persuade*’ has the following labelled bracketings:

- (12) a. NP1 V NP2 [(NP2) V NP3]  
 b. NP1 V NP2 [∅<sub>2</sub> to V NP3]

### III. Use of Prototypical Structures of Three Verbs

To explore to what extent the classes of the three verb--‘*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*’—are grammatically used and how frequently they occur in English textbooks, this paper scrutinizes five English textbooks: two textbooks for the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students of middle school, and three textbooks for the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students of high school.<sup>1213</sup> Table 1 below capsulizes the occurrences and uses of the three verbs in the English textbooks.

<sup>11</sup> The implied subject of the string ‘*to*-infinitive’ is the same referent as the direct object of the matrix clause. Other verbs which belong to the class of the ‘*persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ class are ‘*advise*, *convince*, *notify*, *authorize*, *cause*, *compel*, *convince*, *order*, *tell*,’ etc.

<sup>12</sup> They are usually composed of 7 or 8 chapters, with one special chapter.

<sup>13</sup> The textbooks for high school are entitled, each ‘English Reading Comprehension and Composition,’ ‘Advanced-Level English Reading Comprehension and Composition,’ and ‘Practical English Reading Comprehension and Composition.’

Table 1. Occurrences and uses of three verbs 'want, believe, persuade'

	Books	Contents	Verbs		
			want	believe	persuade
MS	Book 1	LS:10 SL: 2	80 (V) (96.3%)	3 (3.6%)	None (0%)
	Book 2	LS:10 SL: 2	83 (V:76, N:7) (97.6%)	2 (2.4%)	None (0%)
HS	Book 3	Chap:7 SC:1	39 (V:38, N:1) (78%)	9 (18%)	2 (4%)
	Book 4	Chap:8	12 (V) (80%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (6.6%)
	Book 5	Chap:7	28 (V) (75.6%)	9 (24.3%)	None (0%)

Legend. MS: middle school, HS: high school, LS: lesson, SL: special lesson, Chap: chapter, SC: special chapter

In Book 1 for the students of the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade of middle school, the number of the occurrences of the 'want'-verb structures stands at as many as 80 throughout the textbook which consists of 10 lessons and 2 extra special lessons. The typical 'want + to-infinitive' constructions reach 54, such as "*The writer wants to sleep more.*" "*I want to stay at the party.*" In the meantime, the number of the 'want + NP' constructions without the following 'to-infinitive' phrase foots up to 26, such as "*I wanted a black one.*" "*That is exactly what I wanted.*"

As for the number of the occurrences of the 'believe'-verb structure, the verb 'believe' is used for the three types as follows: First, it is used as an idiomatic expression, 'make believe,' like "*I make believe that you are here.*"<sup>14</sup> Second, it is used for an idiomatic expression, 'believe in,' like "*The future is for those who believe in their future.*" Third, it is the precisely one used for the 'believe + NP' construction in a dialogue context described in (13) below:

- (13) a. Village boy: (steps forward and points to Maui) MAUI IS CRAZY!  
He set fire to the corn field! I SAW him!

<sup>14</sup> This is a line of a quoted song, entitled 'Every Time' by Britney Spears.

- b. Maui's mother: I do not believe a word of it. Not my Maui. Son, tell them this is not true!"

(Cited from a middle school textbook)

In the dialogue in (13), the underlined sentence "*I do not believe a word of it*" is not a complete sentence, because, in order to be a perfect sentence, the verb '*believe*' requires not just a Noun Phrase but a proposition as its postverbal complement. Consider that the postverbal Noun Phrase is a subject position in '*believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive' structure, and that a semantic relationship should exist between the verb '*believe*' and a proposition. For this reason, the Noun Phrase---*a word of it*---cannot function as a proposition of the verb '*believe*' in (13b), and the underlined sentence alone does not satisfy such a grammatical requirement for the '*believe* + NP+ *to*-infinitive' construction.

Therefore, to be a grammatically complete sentence, a properly corresponding '[to + verb]' phrase should follow the Noun Phrase. Granted that I can infer that '[to be true]' might be omitted for convenience's sake in the above-dialogue context '*Maui's mother*' said "*Son, tell them this is not true!*" However, the underlined sentence, "*I do not believe a word of it*" should change into a sentence like (13b') as below:

- (13) b': I do not believe a word of it [to be true.]

In Book 2 for middle school English textbook, the number of the occurrences of verb '*want*' comes to 83. Out of them, the typical '*want* + *to*-infinitive' structures stand at 68; '*want* + NP' structures without following '*to*-infinitive' construction come up to 8. It is noteworthy that, though it is not easy for middle school students to understand the use of '*want*' as a noun, the number of constructions using '*want*' as a noun appears as many as 7, as shown in the examples below:

- (14) a. Saving money for your *wants*.  
 b. Separating your needs and *wants*.  
 c. Separating your needs and *wants* will help you spend money more wisely. But I don't know what my needs and *wants* are.  
 d. I really needed a cap and headphones at that time. But now I guess they were *wants*.  
 e. That's right. Why don't you make a list of items you're going to buy? Then mark each item as a need or a *want*.  
 f. Good. Remember, you have to pay for your own *wants* with your allowance.

With regard to the appearance of the verb '*believe*' structure, only two constructions come out, like "*I still can't believe that we lost. They believe that people are free of bad spirits only during this week.*" These sentences are concerned with the '*believe* + *that*-clausal finite complement,' and the '*that*-clausal finite complement' following the verb '*believe*' does not give rise to any problem. Other than the sentences with the '*believe* + *that*-clausal finite complement,' the '*believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive' sentences, in which the Noun Phrase is analyzed as a subject position, do not take place at all in Book 2. Besides, the grammatical structure using verb '*persuade*' does not appear in Book 2, as well.

In Book 3 for high school<sup>15</sup>, the number of the occurrences of the grammatical structures of verb '*want*' comes to 39 as follows: 32 for the typical grammatical structure '*want* + *to*-infinitive' constructions; 6 for '*want* + NP' constructions without the following '*to*-infinitive'; and 1 for a noun, as in "*In other words, not all students are motivated by the same needs, desires, or wants.*" Given that in terms of the hierarchy of difficulty and discriminability, '*want*' is usually used more commonly as a verb than as a noun, it is worth mentioning that the number of using '*want*' as a noun comes to 7 in Book 2 even for middle school, while it comes to just once in a textbook for high school.

Speaking of the occurrences of the verb '*believe*' structure, the number of its use

---

<sup>15</sup> This book is entitled 'English Reading Comprehension and Composition.'

stands at 9 as follows: 5 for ‘believe’ taking a ‘that-clausal finite complement’; 1 for an idiomatic expression with ‘believe in’; 2 for passive constructions, such as “*This bowl of porridge was believed to scare away ghosts. Patjuk was believed to chase away ghosts on the winter solstice.*” There appears a ‘believe + NP + to-infinitive’ structure, as in “*What she said I cannot believe at all.*” This sentence is repeated in (15a) below for explanation’s sake:

- (15) a. What she said I cannot believe at all. (repeated)  
 b. What she said I cannot believe **[to be true]** at all.

It is clear that this sentence (15a) does not satisfy the grammatical requirement for the ‘believe + NP+ to-infinitive’ construction. To be a grammatically complete sentence, a properly corresponding ‘**[to + verb]**’ phrase should follow the Noun Phrase. So, the sentence (15a), “*What she said I cannot believe at all*” should change into a sentence like (15b), “*What she said I cannot believe **[to be true]** at all.*” Only when the Noun Phrase functions as a subject position, there exists a semantic relationship between the verb ‘believe’ and the following proposition. Thus, I can presuppose that a nonfinite to-infinitive construction like ‘**[to be true]**’ following the Noun Phrase is left out just for convenience’s sake. However, considering that the grammatical structure in any English textbook should be correct in every detail, the sentence should have been revised as “What she said I cannot believe **[to be true]** at all.”

The number of the occurrence of the ‘persuade + NP + to-infinitive’ structure foots up to 2 as follows: “*The salesperson tried to persuade me to buy the product. It is one effective way to persuade businesses to go greener by promising them a large number of new customers.*” It is revealed that the ‘persuade + NP + to-infinitive’ structures are prototypically used well. In Book 4 for high school<sup>16</sup>, the number of the occurrences of the structures of the verb ‘want’ reaches 12 as

<sup>16</sup> This book is entitled ‘Advanced-Level English Reading Comprehension and Composition.’

follows: 6 for ‘*want* + *to* infinitive’ structures and 6 for ‘*want* + NP’ constructions. As they are all typically grammatical constructions, a particular attention need not be paid to the structures.

The number of the occurrences of the structures of the verb ‘*believe*’ stands at only 2 constructions as follows: 1 for an idiomatic expression like ‘*believe in*’ and 1 for the ‘*believe* + *that*-clausal finite complement.’ However, the ‘*believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structure does not take place at all in Book 4. Because the ‘*believe* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structure does not take place, it is not available to judge whether the grammatical and semantical status of the Noun Phrase is correct. However, there appears a typical ‘*persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structure, like “*He tries to persuade them to be happy the way they are.*”

In Book 5 for high school<sup>17</sup>, the total number of the occurrences of the verb ‘*want*’ constructions comes to 28: the typical structure ‘*want* + *to*-infinitive’ stands at 27. There is only one construction ‘*want* +NP’ structure without following ‘*to*-infinitive’ as in “*We don’t want an injury to a person or a seal.*” It should be definitely noted that such a sentence--‘*We don’t want an injury to a person or a seal*’—is not fully complete grammatically, semantically, and logically. Thus, in view of the grammaticality for the verb ‘*want* + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structure, a ‘*to*-infinitive’ phrase is missing following the Noun Phrase ‘*an injury to a person or a seal.*’ To be a more grammatically complete meaning, a properly corresponding ‘[*to verb*]’ should follow the Noun Phrase. Therefore, this sentence should change into ‘*We don’t want an injury to a person or a seal [to be inflicted]*’ as shown in (16b):

- (16) a. We don’t want an injury to a person or a seal. (repeated)  
 b. We don’t want an injury to a person or a seal [*to be inflicted*].

Using ‘*want*’ as a noun does not take place in this book. Interestingly, out of the

<sup>17</sup> This book is entitled ‘Practical English Reading Comprehension and Composition.’



'want + to infinitive' constructions, a negation sentence takes place as in "*The speaker will most likely not want to speak any further.*" The sentence is worth mentioning in that the negative particle '*not*' takes place before the verb '*want*' in order to express an intended meaning in particular.

Speaking of the number of the use of the verb '*believe*' structures in Book 5, it reaches 9 as follows: 3 for '*believe* + NP' constructions; 4 for '*believe* + that-clausal finite complement' construction; and 2 for an idiomatic expression like '*believe in*' constructions. The 3 sentences with the '*believe* + NP' construction are used as follows:

- (17) "Now, Suzie doesn't **believe** me anymore. Julie's worry Suzie does not **believe** me because of Mary's lie. Irene thinks that real friends always **believe** each other."

I can find that, in these sentences, the use of the '*believe* + NP' structure is not complete and awkward in a grammatical, semantical, and logical manner, because only Noun Phrases—'*me*' and '*each other*'—come without the following '*to*-infinitive' structures in (17).

As pointed out, in the verb '*believe*' structure, a semantic relationship should exist between the verb '*believe*' and following proposition, not between the verb '*believe*' and the following Noun Phrase. Therefore, the sentences in (17) should change into those in (18), for example:

- (18) Now, Suzie doesn't **believe** me [TO BE TRUE] anymore. Julie's worry Suzie does not **believe** me [TO BE HONEST] because of Mary's lie. Irene thinks that real friends always **believe** each other [TO BE HONEST].

## IV. Conclusion

This paper reconfirms that the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures in the three main verbs—*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*—have idiosyncratic properties, grammatically, semantically, and logically. Precisely, the crux in the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures lies in the grammatical functions of the postverbal ‘Noun Phrases’ before the ‘*to*-infinitive’ phrase.

Through previous literature research, this paper shows again that the postverbal nonfinite complements within the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures of the three verbs decide whether their structures are correctly realized in terms of the valency of the three verbs. On the surface, the grammatical frameworks of these three verbs seem to have the same ‘Verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ constructions. However, their structures are not congenial to each other grammatically, semantically, and logically. That is, the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures of the three verbs—*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*—are tangled up and complicated. Thus, we need to be knowledgeable enough to be aware of and familiar with their differences in the grammatical and semantic functions. Depending on the class of a verb, the grammatical/semantic status of the Noun Phrases in the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures should be different.

Through the analyses of the ‘verb + NP + *to*-infinitive’ structures in the five English textbooks, this paper finds that the use of the ‘*want*’-verb structure is overwhelmingly predominant out of the three verbs ‘*want*, *believe*, and *persuade*.’ This paper finds a few real problems in the English textbooks: There were not complete sentences using both ‘*want* + NP’ and ‘*believe* + NP’ structures without the following ‘*to*-infinitive’ phrases. This may get non-native speakers to think that only the ‘*want/believe* + NP’ structures without the following ‘*to*-infinitive’ phrase suffice for a grammatical sentence. There should not be mistakes or errors in the grammatical structures in any English textbooks. For a correct meaning, both the ‘*want* + NP’ and ‘*believe* + NP’ structures should come with ‘[*to*-infinitive]’

phrases. In other words, the prototypical structure of 'want + NP + *to*-infinitive' and 'believe + NP + *to*-infinitive' framework should take place. This is because the Noun Phrases in the 'want + NP + *to*-infinitive' and 'believe + NP + *to*-infinitive' structures are the subject position and, then, there exists a semantic relationship between the 'verb (*want/believe*)' and the 'NP+ *to*-infinitive (*proposition*)' structures: a nonfinite '*to*-infinitive' phrase should take place following 'want + NP' and 'believe + NP' constructions.

The bottom line is that the occurrence of the only 'want + NP' and 'believe + NP' constructions without the following nonfinite '*to*-infinitive' phrase are incomplete and awkward grammatically, semantically, and logically. A nonfinite *to*-infinitive construction like the ['**to be true**'] following the Noun Phrase might be left out just for convenience's sake. However, the grammatical structure in any English textbook should be correct in every detail. Thus, those awkward sentences found and pointed out in the English textbooks in Section 3 should be redressed. Usually, it is not easy for junior students to understand the constructions in which 'want' is used as a noun. This nonetheless, the use of 'want' as a noun occurs more frequently in the middle school textbooks than in the high school textbooks. Another thing that should be noted is that, even though passivization is available in the 'want'-verb structure, there is not a passivized sentence both in the middle and in high schools English textbooks. In addition, there is not a passivized 'believe'-verb sentence in the middle school English textbook. However, passivized sentences takes place in the high school English textbooks.

The verb '*persuade*' structures do not appear at all in the middle school textbooks. However, the number of the verb '*persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive' prototypical structures come to 3 in the high school textbooks.

## Works Cited

- Aarts, B. *English Syntax and Argumentation*. New York: Palgrave. 2008. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *English Syntax and Argumentation*. New York: Palgrave. 2013. Print.
- Akmajian, A. and Frank Heny. *An Introduction to the Principles of Transformational Syntax*. Massachusetts: MIT Press. 1975. Print.
- Adger, D. *Core Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2013. Print.
- Azar, B.S. and Stacy A. Hagen. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. New York: Longman. 2009. Print.
- Barkley, L. and S. Christine. *Grammar and Usage, Naturally*. Stamford: Cengage Learning. 2015. Print.
- Brown, H.D. *Teaching by Principle*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 2007. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 2007. Print.
- Brown, H.D. and Abeywickrama, P. *Language Assessment, Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education. 2010. Print.
- Cowan, R. *The Teacher's Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008. Print.
- Goldstein, B., Waugh, J., and Linsky, K. *Grammar To Go: How It Works and How to Use It*. New York: Houghton Mifflin. 2007. Print.
- Haegeman, L. *Thinking syntactically: A Guide to Argumentation and Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher. 2006. Print.
- Huddleston, R. *An Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1984. Print.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullman, G. K. et al. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002. Print.
- Jacobs, R. *English Syntax, A Grammar for English Language Professionals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1995. Print.
- Jeong, S.-Y. *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Chunjae. 2009. Print.
- Kim, J.-W. *Middle School English 3*. Seoul: Chunjae. 2009. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *English Reading Comprehension and Composition*. Seoul: Chunjae. 2009. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Practical English Reading Comprehension and Composition*. Seoul: Chunjae. 2009. Print.
- Kim, Y.-R. "Improvement of EFL Learners' Reading Proficiency and Constitutions of Genres in Textbooks." *Studies in Modern Grammar* 63 (2011): 197-215. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Need to Explore and Construe Quantification in a High School English

- Textbook.” *Studies in Modern Grammar* 77 (2014): 117-133. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “A Study of Curricular Components of English/Korean-Language Textbooks.” *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 24.2 (2016): 57-71. Print.
- Oh, J.-Y. *Advanced-Level English Reading Comprehension and Composition*. Seoul: Chunjae. 2009. Print.
- Palmer, F.R. *The English Verb*. New York: Longman. 1987. Print.
- Quirk, R. et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman. 1985. Print.
- Radford, A. *Transformational Grammar: A First Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1988. Print.
- Soames, S. & Perlmutter, D.M. *Syntactic Argumentation and the Structure of English*. California: University of California Press. 1979. Print.

Kim, YoungRoung

Address: Department of English Education Woosuk University

Wanju-Gun, Jeonbuk 55338, Korea

Email: ykmrourng@hanmail.net

Received: March 30, 2018 / Revised: May 04, 2018 / Accepted: May 10, 2018