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Abstract: The paper offers a semantic analysis of begin and start and their non-finite complementation: the to-infinitive and –ing constructions. The core idea of the paper is that the aspeccual constructions ‘begin + to infinitive’, ‘begin + ing’, ‘start + to infinitive’, and ‘start + ing’ have both a schematic and a prototypical meaning, and that the subtle differences between them are motivated by several factors, like viewing (perfectivity vs. imperfectivity), temporality (future orientation vs. ongoing reading) dynamicity (graduality vs. abruptness), agentivity, etc.
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1. Introduction

The paper aims to analyse the possible complementation forms of the aspectual verbs, begin and start. These two verbs, also mentioned in literature under the name of ‘phase verbs’, ‘aspeccual complement verbs’ (Dowty 1979)) or ‘modality verbs’ (Givón 1993) denoting the first part of a situation are very similar not only syntactically but also semantically. They take similar complement types (to V and V-ing sentential complements as well as simple nominal complements) and express similar meanings (express the beginning of an occurrence). Because they are so similar many authors do not even consider that there are any differences between begin and start and their complement forms (begin+ to-infinitive, begin+ ing, start+ to-infinitive, start+ ing). Hornby i.e. states that ‘no general rule can be given for choosing between gerunds and infinitives as gerunds and infinitives as objects’ or Strang that …certain lexical items invariably or preferentially ‘select’ either the infinitive or the gerund to follow them- (…) though some common threads of meaning may be detected in each group, it is not on the basis of such common meanings that the groups are established, for near-synonymous verbs may pattern differently (enjoy/like) (Wolf 1997).

Contrary to such interpretations, the paper assumes that there are some subtle semantic differences between begin and start and their complements. The difference between begin and start and their complementation is understood to be greatly motivated by the semantics of the verb on one hand, on the other hand by the interaction between the verb and its arguments (as well as the subject of the sentence). After presenting the semantic values of begin and start and the complement forms to-infinitive and –ing the paper presents a possible interpretation of the aspectual verbs and their complement forms.

2. The lexical meaning of begin and start

Begin and start have similar lexical meanings- they are both inchoative, denoting the very first phase of a situation (called ‘onset’ by Freed, 1979). Sentences (1)-(2) are examples of begin and start with to-infinitive and -ing complements, accomplishments and activities, both denoting that the event denoted by the complement has been initiated:

(1) It began to rain / raining. It started to snow. / It started snowing
(2) I began to write/ writing a letter. / I started to write/ writing a letter.

Yet, begin and start are also slightly different in nature, so that there are cases, when start, but not begin is allowed in a sentence, which gives the impression that start has a more
specific use than begin. Sentences (3) and (4) are example of cases where only the use of start is allowed.

One of the most detailed analyses of aspectualizers is that of Freed (1979); she explains this discrepancy by the semantics of these verbs and their relation to the internal structure of an event, onset, nucleus and coda.\(^1\)

According to Freed, begin and start relate to different phases of an event (start to the onset, and begin to the first phase of the nucleus) and this leads to different consequence relations of the two verbs: because start refers only to the onset, it may be possible that the event it refers to is not carried out after all, but cancelled in the meantime; this is not possible for begin, since begin denotes a part of a nucleus, as sentences (3) and (4) show. At the same time, when used with –ing complement, neither begin nor start allow for an interpretation that the action named in the complement is not carried out, since the –ing, viewed as an imperfectivizing operator denotes the ongoing character of the event in question (5) (Freed 1979).

(3) Henry started to sneeze but quickly regained his composure without actually sneezing. (Freed 1979: 72)

(4) *Henry began to sneeze but quickly regained his composure without actually sneezing. (Freed 1979: 72)

(5) *She began/ started sneezing / working, but then she didn’t sneeze/ work.

Freed’s idea that start refers to the very first moment of the event, begin to the first part has been confirmed by other authors, like Wierzbicka (1988) and Dixon (2005) as well. Duffley (2006), on the other hand contradicts Freed in this respect, saying that in fact start does not refer to any segment of an event, but ‘evokes the notion of breaking out of a state of rest or inactivity or, in its transitive use, initiating an event by breaking out of a state of rest or inactivity’(Duffley 2006: 99). The fact, that start is associated with abruptness and sudden movement has been noticed by Wierzbicka as well, who contrasts begin with start, by saying that while begin tends to express graduality, start is rather associated with abrupt, sudden movement. The examples bellow from Oxford Learner’s Dictionary and Websters Collegiate Dictionary show that start is indeed associated with abrupteness and sudden motion:

(6) The noise made her start (Oxford Learner’s Dictionary)

(7) He started angrily to his feet (Websters Collegiate’s Dictionary)

In these sentences the use of begin would not be appropriate, as begin is not usually associated with suddenness, but rather gradual initiation of a situation. Another feature of start which is closely related to the notion of movement is causality. While it can be said that both begin and start are causative in nature, since they inceptive, initiating a situation, start has an additional causative feature, which is missing from begin. The causality feature of start is shown in (8a) below, as well as in its paraphrase (8b). Begin does not allow for such structures:

---

\(^1\) Freed (1979) defines onset as the temporal segment prior to the nucleus of an event-that is, before the event (or the action) is actually initiated (Freed 1979); the nucleus is the time segment during which the activity is in progress (without reference to its beginning or end); it can consist of sub-phases (initial, middle and final segments). Finally, a coda refers to the final segment of a situation.
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(8a) Joe started me thinking about the problem. / (8b) Joe caused me to start thinking about the problem. (Freed 1979: 80)
(9) * Joe began me thinking about the problem. (Freed 1979: 79)

Because begin does not have this additional causality, sentences with objects that do not express temporality need the specification of the complement verb, otherwise the sentence is ungrammatical; start, on the contrary can appear in contexts where it is not only to the temporality of the sentence that it is referred to but the initiating activity of the event as well. This allows for start to appear also in contexts where the verb is missing but the sentence is not temporal (12 -13):

(10) He began/ started the sermon.
(11) * He began a car. / He began driving a car.
(12) start a fight / ? begin a fight / he started the fire /* he began the fire (Freed 1979: 80)
(13) The flood started our trouble. /*The flood began our trouble. (Freed 1979: 78)

According to Hayakawa & Ehrlich (in Duffley 2006) start places more emphasis than begin on the fact of making a beginning, the mere act of setting out i.e. from a particular point (as on journey, race or a course) after an inaction or waiting.

Another difference which has been noted by Dixon (2005) between begin and start is that start tends to refer to a time, and begin to a place:

(14) The marathon race begins at Santa Monica. (Dixon 2005)
(15) The marathon race start at 3 o’clock. (Dixon 2005)

3. To infinitive vs. -ing complement forms

The question of aspectual complementation has been the concern of linguists for many years; starting from traditional grammarians to generative linguists, functionalists and cognitive linguists there have been many attempts to explain the phenomenon of complementation. Common to all approaches is that they analyze complementation as closely related to the issue of nominalization. Complementation forms are defined as nominalized forms or as representing the transition to nominalized forms.

Besides analyses that discuss complementation from purely syntactic considerations (in early generative-transformational accounts, i.e. Rosenbaum (1967) there are also several approaches that try to explain the phenomenon of complementation as (also) motivated by semantic factors. Semantic factors, with respect to which complementation is discussed are factivity (Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970) implications (Dirven&Radden 1977), mood and modality (Vendler (1968), Bolinger (1968), Verspoor (1990), temporality (Wierzbicka 1988) (Freed 1979). In all these accounts complementation forms are treated as semantically meaningful elements, whose meaning is defined as attributable or closely connected to that of the matrix.

The interpretations differ with respect to whether they attribute temporal or non-temporal values to the complement constructions after begin and start. The authors that attribute a temporal and modal value to the to-infinitive and –ing constructions are numerous: Wierzbicka (1988) and also Dixon (1995) define to as containing the idea of wanting and future expectation, -ing a durative, ongoing occurrence; Verspoor (1990) sees the difference between the to-infinitive and –ing constructions as between prior intention (to-infinitive and)
and intention in action (-ing), Quirk et al. as between hypothetical meaning (to-infinitive) and actuality (-ing) etc.

There are also interpretations that define the meaning of these constructions in non-temporal terms. Langacker (1991) defines the to-infinitive and –ing constructions as representing the transition to nominalized forms, both constructions expressing summary scanning, characteristic of nominals; also Duffley (2006), following Langacker to a certain extent, defines the to infinitive and –ing constructions primarily in non-temporal terms (the to-infinitive is defined to contain the notion of movement leading up to a point, the –ing as having a direct object value).

Duffley (2006) even defines the value of –ing after begin and start as a totally nominalized form, having the value of a direct object; this, according to him, is shown by the possibility of passive constructions with begin and start (sentence 17), the possibility of pseudo-clefting (sentence 18) and the replacement of –ing by a nominal pronoun (sentence 19). Wierzbicka (1988) demonstrates that such structures are not always possible for begin and start, so that –ing cannot be considered to have simply a direct object value in these constructions. (sentences 20, 21). Cornilescu (2003) also notes that these constructions after begin and start seem to be tenseless so that they cannot establish their own RT separate from the one expressed by the matrix (sentence 22):

(16) All of the countries should start/begin cleaning up water pollution as soon as possible (Duffley 2006: 102)
(17) Cleaning up water pollution should be started/begun as soon as possible. (Duffley 2006: 102)
(18) What they should start/begin is cleaning up water pollution. (Duffley 2006: 102)
(19) They should start/begin that as soon as possible. (Duffley 2006: 102)
(20) It started raining. * It was raining that it started. (Wierzbicka 1988)
(21) John started snoring. *It was snoring that he started. (Wierzbicka 1988)
(22) *Yesterday, John began to solve the problem tomorrow. (Cornilescu 2003: 239)

4. A possible approach to aspectual complementation

Following Kleinke (2002) to a certain extent the to-infinitive and –ing constructions are understood to have both a schematic and a prototypical meaning. The schematic meaning is based on notion of schema that of the prototypical meaning on the notion of prototype as understood by Langacker (1987). In Langacker’s interpretation a prototype is defined as a typical instance of a category; a schema, by contrast, is an abstract categorization of a category and is fully compatible with all members of the category (Langacker 1987) (Taylor 2003: 69).

The two meanings differ from each other in several respects: while the schematic meaning of the complement constructions contains the more general meaning of the constructions, available in all instantiations, the prototypical meaning is construction specific and greatly depends on the semantic value of the matrix. Also, the schematic meaning can be understood to define the meaning of the constructions in aspectual terms (imperfective (-ing) vs. perfective reading (to-infinitive); the prototypical meaning of the constructions after begin and start, on the other hand is closely related to temporality and modality.

4.1 The schematic meaning of the to-infinitive and –ing constructions

The schematic meaning of the to-infinitive and –ing constructions can be defined with respect to viewing, by the relation between to and the bare infinitive on one hand, on the other
hand, between -ing and the bare infinitive. The difference between the two constructions is aspectual and can be defined in opposition: within the ‘begin+to infinitive’ and ‘start+ ing’ construction the function of to is to express an exterior viewpoint of the beginning phase of one occurrence or a series of occurrences (sentences 23) and 24)). By contrast, -ing after begin and start expresses an interior viewpoint of the beginning phase of the occurrence; the event expressed by the complement verb can express one occurrence (as in sentence 25) or a series of occurrences as in 26).

(23) I started/ began to walk towards the door. (Freed 1979: 77)  
(24) The emptiness and silence began to get on his nerves. (Rericha 1987: 130)  
(25) The engine started (or began) smoking. (Duffley 2006: 98)  
(26) I started making telephone calls. (Rericha 1987: 131)

The different schematic meaning of the two constructions can be explained to a certain extent by the different profile of the two constructions (source-path-goal schema of the to-infinitive and ‘container’ schema of the –ing (Lakoff 1987)). The to-infinitive construction has a relational profile: this function of the to-infinitive construction is greatly motivated by the origin of this construction. Before the preposition to turned into a tense/modal marker its original meaning was to express a ‘direction’/’goal’/ or ‘purpose’ (Cornilescu 2003). 2

-ing, on the other hand, has a regional profile; it suspends the ‘temporally bound’ reading of the bare infinitive, imposing on it a profile without endpoints. The profiled entity is seen as being stativized, so that no parts can be identified that would bring the event further on (beginning and closing phase). This is well illustrated by the difference between sentences 31) and 32). While in sentence 31) the rocket is only seen in flight, in sentence 32) the preparation before lunch as well as take off itself is also put in profile.

(31) Come on in! We are seeing Apollo 19 taking off (Kleinke 2002: 103)  
(32) Come on in! We are seeing Apollo 19 take off (Kleinke 2002: 103)

### 4.2 The prototypical meaning of the to-infinitive and –ing constructions

Although the complement constructions after aspectual verbs will be defined primarily in non-temporal terms, it will be argued that there is a certain time relation between the main clause and the complement clause. The situation denoted by the complement clause can be considered to develop out of the situation denoted by the main clause (Cornilescu 2003: 243). The tenseless constructions, to-infinitive and –ing will be temporalized after they are embedded into the aspectual construction as a whole; the situation they express can be

---

2 Kleinke brings up several reasons to show the more relational character of to-infinitives as compared to –ing constructions. One reason is the appearance of –ing constructions with possessives, which is not possible by to-infinitives, sentences 28-29)

(27) The children’s singing amused us. (Kleinke 2002:115)  
(28) * I taught John’s to play the fute. (Kleinke 2002: 115)

Also, there is difference in the way the subject of complementation forms is expressed. While in the case of to-infinitives, the preposition ‘for’ is inserted, gerunds express their own subject by the possessive forms, which also points to the more relational character of the to-infinitive as compared to the –ing (Kleinke 2002: 116).

(29) For Susan to get married surprised mom. (Kleinke 2002: 57)  
(30) Susan’s getting married surprised mom. (Kleinke 2002: 57)
considered a continuation of the temporality (RT- reference time) of the main clause. Described in more formal terms, it can be said that T1 (the time expressed by the main clause) begins T2 (the time expressed by the complement construction) (Dinsmore 1991).

Freed’s (1979) defines the meaning of the to-infinitive and –ing after begin and start in opposition (the to-infinitive expressing a generic (or serial) reading, the –ing a single, durative occurrence) (in sentence 33 the use of the to-infinitive is more appropriate since it expresses a serial reading); although this opposition holds in many cases, there are also cases when the opposite is true (the to-infinitive expressing an ongoing event, -ing expressing a set of events. Thus, sentence 34) with the to-infinitive expresses a single event, sentence 35) with –ing a series of events (habitual reading):

(33) I had hardly slept for two nights, but the excitement of the move plus my nervous energy kept me going. By the third day I began to feel/? feeling drugged and every time I sat down I started to fall asleep/ ? falling asleep (Freed 1979: 75)
(34) All of a sudden she started to run towards the car. (Duffley 2006: 93)
(35) He started smoking when he was 13. (Duffley 2006: 93)

A difference between the to-infinitive and –ing construction in this respect is not between a series or a generic vs. one durative occurrence, but rather in terms of duration. While in the case of the to-infinitive there is no expectancy to duration, in the case of –ing the event is expected to last. That –ing is related to duration has been noted by several linguists (i.e. Dixon (2005) defines –ing as expressing an activity taking place over a period of time).

The duration expressed by the –ing construction is not a property of –ing alone but it is a property of the entire aspectual construction and is activated after the complement construction is embedded into the aspectual construction as a whole. When followed by –ing the aspectual construction expresses an unbounded temporal progress. This means that the duration of the construction cannot be divided into segments (no beginning or ending phase can be separated within the progress of the construction). As a temporal property the duration can be defined as evolving simultaneously with an axis of orientation (the RT (reference time) expressed by the matrix verb).3

The –ing construction after begin and start often expresses the repetition of short term processes or habitual repetition over a limited period of time (Rericha 1987: 131) (sentence 36); in some cases the event governed by –ing may even be understood to be fully developed in its initial phase (Rericha 1987) (sentence 37):

(36) As soon as we sat down, three hoods leaned into our booth and began making vulgar cracks. (Rericha 1987: 131)
(37) I started reading a section called ‘Tests and Sperm’ and was astonished to discover that (…) (Rericha 1987: 131)

An important difference between the to-infinitive and –ing construction after begin and start can be defined with respect to modality. The to-infinitive in aspectual complementation refers to potential events (Cornilescu 2003: 471); it expresses dispositional properties of the subject, that is, what the subject can do, not what the subject is doing at some point in time.

3 In his study on duration, Hollósy (1980) differentiates between two types of duration: in its first sense, duration can be defined as referring to unbounded temporal progress; in its other sense, duration expresses an extent of time that can be divided into segments (Hollósy 1980: 30). It is the first type of duration that is expressed by the progressive form –ing.
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This, according to Cornilescu (2003) is also shown by the frequent occurrence of the to-infinitives with statives, habitual predicates or psychological verbs (sentences 38, 39)). Begin and start are forward-looking constructions; after them the to-infinitive also implies a sense of futurity in itself:

(38) Edward began to miss his friends. (Cornilescu 2003: 471)
(39) Man is beginning to understand himself better. (Cornilescu 2003: 471)

Unlike the to-infinitive, the –ing construction after aspectual verbs makes reference to a specific event or series of events that are locatable in space and time (Cornilescu 2003: 471). The –ing construction does not express potentiality; rather, it expresses the actuality of the event that gets started by the time phase expressed by the matrix verb. The entity profiled by the –ing construction can be defined to be simultaneous with the time phrase expressed by the matrix verb; the moment referred to by the main verb can be presented as identical with the beginning of the stretch of time referred to by the complement (i.e. I began/ started talking to her) (Wierzbicka 1988).

A question that remains is the more frequent occurrence of start with –ing, that of begin with the to-infinitive construction.

The investigation of several corpora (Brown corpora, Flob, Frown, Lob corpora) reveals that although the two verbs allow for both complementation forms, begin appears much more often with to-infinitives than with –ing (begin to = 130 entries, beginning to = 179 entries, began to = 627 entries, begun to = 111 entries/ begin + ing = 16 entries, began + ing = 125 entries); on the contrary, start prefers –ing to to-infinitives (start to = 48 entries, starting to = 33 entries, started to = 152 entries/ start + ing = 82 entries, started + ing = 126 entries). These findings are in accordance with Bailey (1993), who states a more frequent occurrence of to-infinitives with begin than with start (begin to = 254 entries/ begin + ing = 74 entries, and also a more frequent occurrence of the –ing with start than with begin (start + ing = 154 entries, start to = 63 entries).

While the differences between begin and start are quite apparent in the present, with past forms the difference between begin and start regarding complementation forms is more reduced (i.e. began + ing has 125, start + ing 126 matches).

The fact that begin with to-infinitives is more frequently encountered can be accounted for in semantic terms. It can be related to the interrelation which exists between the semantics of the matrix, the complement construction and the subject of the sentence. The more frequent occurrence of begin with to-infinitives can be partially motivated by the semantic value of begin (its gradual character) and of the to-infinitive construction (which refers to the potential occurrence of an event). As compared to begin, start is more dynamic and abrupt in nature; its frequent appearance with –ing can be explained by the fact that both constructions focus on the on the actuality of the initial phase expressed by the complement verb; the coming into being of the activity or event is often seen as abrupt.
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