

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF OBJECT-CONTROL IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN*

CHRISTIAN MAIR

University of Innsbruck

1. Introduction

In recent work in generative linguistic theory the terms "control" and "controller" have been used to refer to the "process of determining the co-referentiality of certain types of element in the deep structure of a sentence" (Crystal 1985:74). However, it is not my primary concern in the present paper to contribute to the description of control phenomena within the framework of Government-and-Binding Theory. In what follows, the term "control verb" is merely used as an informal label for a class of matrix verbs embedding infinitival clauses which have no overt subject but whose "implied" or "understood" subject is identical to a specifiable constituent of the matrix clause. The main emphasis will be on "object-control" of the kind illustrated by the following English and German examples:

- (1) I asked him to work faster.
- (2) I appealed to him to work faster.
- (3) Ich bat ihn, schneller zu arbeiten.
- (4) Ich riet ihm, schneller zu arbeiten.
- (5) Ich redete auf ihn ein, schneller zu arbeiten.

In all these cases the object of the matrix clause (common case¹ or prepositional in English; accusative, dative or prepositional in German) is the

* Part of the research for the present paper was undertaken during a stay at the Survey of English Usage (University College London) which was made possible by a grant from the *Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung* (Vienna). I gratefully acknowledge the Fonds' financial support.

¹ I use the term "common case" because the literature differs as to whether the English object is a direct or indirect one in such cases: cf. Huddleston (1984:219) and Chomsky (1981:96) vs. Quirk et al. (1985:96).

understood subject of the infinitival clause ("I asked **him** demanding that he should work faster," etc.). In English, there is superficial similarity, and some overlap, between control-verb structures such as (1) and (2) and 'raising'²-structures such as:

- (6) I believe her to be a very intelligent person.
 (7) Both countries want the fighting to end.

The verb *allow* for example, appears both in "monotransitive" raising-constructions and in "ditransitive" control-constructions, with the linguistic and situational context determining the appropriate structural interpretation in a given utterance:

- (8) She wouldn't allow me to speak.
 (9) How could you allow such a thing to happen?
 (10) We can't allow Smith to get away with such a remark.

Example (8), with its animate object and an infinitive denoting a voluntarily performed action, is semantically trivalent: A participant A allows another participant B to perform an action C. Syntactically, (8) is a control construction because the infinitival clause does not have an overt subject. An analogous interpretation is unlikely for (9). Here, *allow* merely denotes non-prevention in a semantically bivalent predication: A participant A does not prevent a state of affairs B. Although the noun phrase "such a thing" could be considered an object of the verb **allow** in purely structural terms, it is clear that, semantically, the entire embedded predication "such a thing to happen" functions as an object clause. One way of accounting for the ambiguous status of "such a thing" is to regard it as the overt subject of the infinitive "raised" to the rank of object in the matrix. Barring further clues from a wider context, example (10) is indeterminate between the two readings exemplified in (8) and (9).

However, such occasional cases of structural overlap should not disguise the fact that it is normally very easy to distinguish between raising- and control-constructions by means of a variety of syntactic tests.³ Owing to the extreme marginality of raising with *zu*-infinitives⁴ related problems do not arise in German.

² I use the term "raising" as a well-known informal characterization of these structures. By adopting it I do not intend to commit myself to particular formalizations of raising-rules within the generative framework.

³ In raising-structures all semantic ties between the matrix verb and its apparent object have been severed, which means that even existential *there* or empty *it* may appear in "object"-position (cf. "I want there to be more agreement on this point." vs. "*I ask there to be more agreement on this point."). In raising-structures active/passive-pairs such as "I want the doctor to see you." / "I want you to be seen by the doctor." are semantically equivalent, whereas there is no such equivalence in structurally analogous control-constructions (cf. "I asked the doctor to see you." vs. "I asked you to be seen by the doctor.").

⁴ Cf. the near total absence of attested examples since the 18th century in Behaghel (1924:328-29).

Previous contrastive and confrontational treatments of English and German control verbs (Goergens 1973, Hellinger 1977, Thiem 1980) have tended to focus on structural similarities between the two languages, regarding points of structural difference as minor irregularities against a shared background. I will argue that this picture is deceptive because it is based on very small samples of English and German control verbs and that the broadening of the data-base of the contrastive analysis reveals several systematic cross-linguistic contrasts which have gone unnoticed so far.

2. Object-control in English and German

An investigation of a corpus of 840 000 words of spoken and written British English I recently conducted at the Survey of English Usage (University College London) yielded the following English object-control verbs. (The rationale for the division into semantic classes will become obvious in the course of the discussion):

TABLE 1: Object-control verbs in the SEU-corpus, arranged in semantic classes

<i>Suasive verbs of communication:</i> (type/token-ratio 32:335, active/passive-ratio 264:71) ADVISE, appeal to, <i>approach</i> , ASK, ask down, ask over, beg, bother, bribe, brief, call, CALL (UP)ON, challenge, charge, convince, ENCOURAGE, forbid, incite, <i>inform</i> , instruct, INVITE, motion, PERSUADE, recommend, remind, REQUEST, <i>speak to</i> , telegraph to, TELL, urge, warn, write to,
<i>Three-place causative predicates:</i> (type/token-ratio 21:107, active/passive-ratio 52:55) <i>arrange with</i> , bind, bring, compel, condition, constrain, doom, FORCE, incline, induce, inspire, LEAD, lead on, move, oblige, pay, possess, press, prompt, <i>show</i> , TEMPT,
<i>Three-place "enabling" predicates:</i> (type/token-ratio 9:63, active/passive-ratio 38:25) authorize, <i>back up</i> , empower, entitle, HELP, LEAVE, <i>strengthen</i> , TEACH, train,
<i>Verbs of designing, planning and using:</i> (type/token-ratio 14:35, active/passive-ratio 11:24) adapt, <i>arrange</i> , build, calculate, construct, convert, design, divert, equip, fit, modify, prepare, schedule, use,
<i>Verbs of choice:</i> (type/token-ratio 10:16, active/passive-ratio 7:9) appoint, choose, depute, employ, engage, enlist, enroll, groom up, hire, invoke,
<i>Verbs of sending/taking:</i> (type/token-ratio 9:30, active/passive-ratio 21:9) bring down, call in, detail, dispatch, SEND, ship off, show in, take, put out,
<i>Other:</i> (type/token-ratio 4:6, active/passive-ratio 5:1) depend on, rely on, <i>sponge on</i> , trust,

NOTE: No matrix verb has been assigned to more than one class although in some cases multiple class membership would clearly have been justified. The lists do not contain the items *allow*, *enable*, *get*, *have*, *order*, *permit*, and *require* because with these verbs it is often not clear whether one is dealing with raising- or control-constructions. All control-uses of the verbs in question could, however, easily be accommodated in the above framework.

Those matrix verbs which appear in control-constructions of the type under investigation more than ten times are given in CAPITALS. Verbs whose control-verb use is considered a syntactic "nonce-formation" are given in *italics*.

A comparison of Table 1 with the results of other corpus-based studies of infinitival complementation in English (e.g. van Ek 1966, Andersson 1985) shows that the list of verbs, while by no means exhaustive, can be considered a representative sample. A comparably rich data-base for the study of object-control in German infinitival complement clauses is provided by Bech (1955 and 1957), who investigates a corpus of written German, and Siebert-Ott (1983).

A comparison of the English and German material immediately reveals two kinds of linguistic contrasts:

- a) specific stylistic, syntactic or idiomatic contrasts between a given English verb and its lexical equivalent(s) in German (or *vice versa*);
- b) generalized and systematic contrasts which hold for large numbers of verbs.

As is to be expected, crosslinguistic contrasts of the former kind are extremely numerous and diverse, and a brief discussion of two illustrative examples will have to suffice here.

Both English *bring* and German *bringen* can take infinitival complement clauses when they are used as causative predicates. In modern English, however, this causative use of *bring* is largely restricted to cases in which the object of the verb is a reflexive pronoun or the verb itself is in the passive:⁵

- (11) I couldn't bring myself to admit that I'd made a mistake.
- (12) She couldn't be brought to admit that she'd made a mistake.

All the active uses of causative *bring* which I collected in the Survey corpus are with reflexive objects, and in Andersson's (1985:88) count the proportion of reflexive objects is ninety per cent. In an elicitation experiment conducted to complement the analysis of the Survey corpus I was able to show that in cases in which the object is not reflexive speakers strongly prefer passive matrix verbs (i.e. structures of the kind illustrated in example (12) above).⁶ No comparable constraints exist for German *jemanden dazu bringen, etwas zu tun*.

⁵ For the present purpose I do not take into consideration occurrences of the idiomatic phrase *bring pressure/etc. to bear on somebody/something*.

⁶ 46 first-year students in the English department of University College London were asked to judge the following pair of sentences:

- (a) I wish I could bring Peter to realize his mistake.
- (b) I wish Peter could be brought to realize his mistake.

31 of them considered (b) to be more natural, which is significant since normally the passive is almost always a marked structural option. It is interesting to see how such idiomatic constraints are handled in some widely used dictionaries. The Longman *Dictionary of Contemporary English* implicitly recognizes the constraint since it only gives examples with reflexive objects (cf. entry for *bring*, p. 179). So does the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* (p. 114). The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, on the other hand, has "bring somebody/oneself to do something" and exemplifies the former with "I wish I could bring you to see the situation from my point of view." The *OED* (*bring* 9, p. 1108) also glosses: "cause (a person or oneself) to come (to a certain course of action, etc.)." Significantly, though, all citations given either have a reflexive object or a passive matrix verb.

The "suasive" (Quirk et al. 1985:1179-1180) use of *tell* ("tell somebody to do something") has a lexical and structural German equivalent in "jemandem befahlen, etwas zu tun." However, a closer look at authentic examples from a corpus shows that at the "performance"-level this relation of equivalence is largely theoretical. German *befehlen* has connotations which rule it out as an equivalent of suasive *tell* in most informal contexts, as is shown by the following example:

- (13) A: /well# /is Maureen with you#
B: /yes# shall I tell her to ring
A: /well
B: and get a taxi# to /take her home#
A: /yes /get a /do that#
(S.7.2e.2)⁷

Here, as in many similar cases, the only idiomatic rendering in German is by means of a finite-clause complement ("Soll ich ihr sagen, daß sie ein Taxi bestellen soll?").

It should be clear, however, that such verb-specific divergences between German and English norms of usage cannot be central in a contrastive analysis of the syntactic systems of the two languages. After all, they do not differ in kind from similarly arbitrary restrictions found within one and the same language (cf., e.g., *support*, which, though similar in meaning to *help*, does not normally occur with infinitival complement clauses).

In the remainder of the present paper I will therefore concentrate on three major systematic contrasts between English and German control verbs, viz.:

- a) differences in the semantics of verbs admitting object-control structures in English and German;
- b) differences in the temporal relation between the matrix clause and the embedded infinitive; and
- c) differences with regard to the relative importance of syntactic/ configurational and pragmatic/ contextual factors in determining control-relations in English and German.

3. Differences in the semantics of verbs admitting object-control structures in English and German

German and English resemble one another rather closely as far as suasive verbs of communication, causative and enabling predicates are concerned. Most of the German equivalents of the English matrix verbs listed in these groups in Table 1 allow object-controlled infinitival complement clauses, as well:

⁷ The example is from the spoken corpus of the Survey of English Usage. The transcription has been simplified drastically. "/" marks onsets in tone-groups, and "#" stands for the close of tone-groups.

a) suasive verbs of communication:

jemanden bitten/ anflehen/ (dazu) ermutigen/ überzeugen/ überreden/
einladen/ drängen/ (dazu) herausfordern/ ...

jemandem raten/ befehlen/ auftragen/...

auf jemanden einwirken/ von jemandem fordern/ verlangen/...

etwas zu tun;

b) causative predicates:

jemanden (dazu) zwingen/ bringen/ verdammen/ verurteilen/ anleiten/
inspirieren/ verpflichten/...

etwas zu tun;

c) enabling predicates:

jemanden ermächtigen/ lehren/ berechtigen/ (dazu) ausbilden/...

jemandem helfen/ erlauben/...

etwas zu tun.

As for the remaining three groups, though, there is far less structural correspondence between the two languages, as is evidenced by the following examples:

a) Verbs of designing, planning and using:

(14) They	}	adapted	the engine to stand up to arctic weather conditions.
		built	
		constructed	
		designed	
		...	

(15) * Sie	}	adaptierten	den Motor, (um) arktischen Witterungsbedingungen zu widerstehen.
		bauten	
		konstruierten	
		entwarfen	
		...	

Note that the *um zu*-variants of some of the examples given in (15) are considered marginally acceptable by some native speakers. Acceptability also increases if the matrix clause contains the particles *dafür* or *dazu* (cf. e.g. “?Sie entwarfen den Motor dazu/ dafür, arktischen Witterungsbedingungen zu widerstehen”). In natural and idiomatic German, however, infinitival complement clauses are generally avoided altogether in favour of finite adverbial clauses or various other paraphrases: “Sie entwarfen den Motor so, daß er arktischen Witterungsbedingungen widerstehen konnte.”/ “Sie adaptierten den Motor für den Gebrauch in arktischem Wetter.”/ “Sie bauten einen Motor, der arktischen Witterungsbedingungen widerstehen konnte.”

b) Verbs of choice:

(16) They	}	chose him	to be their front man.
		groomed him up	
		...	

(17) * Sie	}	suchten ihn au	(um) ihr Vorzeigmann zu sein.
		richteten ihn her	
		...	

The acceptability of the examples in (17) again increases if the matrix contains the particles *dafür* or *dazu*, but generally speaking the infinitival complement clause would be avoided in idiomatic speech and writing.

c) Verbs of sending and taking:

(18) They	}	sent	her (to the theatre) to see <i>King Lear</i>
		took	
		...	

(19) ??Sie	}	schickten sie ⁸	(ins Theater), (um) <i>König Lear</i> zu sehen.
		nahmen sie mit	
		...	

It is quite obvious that after most verbs belonging to the semantic classes discussed in a) to c) above, English admits object-controlled infinitival clauses much more readily than German. The reason for this is not far to seek. After verbs of designing, planning and using, verbs of choice and verbs of sending and taking the infinitival clause is transitional between a complement of the verb and an adverbial of the clause. It resembles a complement because, unlike most adverbial infinitives, it has object-control and cannot be prefixed by *in order to*. With the possible exception of the verbs of sending and taking, which exhibit some other peculiarities as well,⁹ the inclusion of *in order to* produces an immediate shift to subject-control with mostly nonsensical semantic interpretations:

⁸ Of course, the perfectly acceptable subject-control interpretation of this sentence is not at issue here. German *schicken* occasionally takes bare infinitival complements although this option is usually confined to very short construction (“Ich schicke ihn die Zeitung holen.”). Also, the object-controlled *um zu*-infinitive is somewhat less likely to be rejected after *schicken* than after the verbs discussed so far (“?? Ich schicke ihn, um die Zeitung zu holen.”).

⁹ Unlike, say, “We will have to design a better car,” the SVO-pattern in “They sent him” is acceptable only if understood as contextually supported ellipsis. Verbs of sending and taking need an obligatory constituent in addition to the object. This additional slot may be filled by an adverbial of place, by an infinitival clause, or by an adverbial of place and an infinitival clause. A sentence such as (22) below is thus on a par with exceptional five-element clause patterns such as “A bets B a sum of money that ...” Note, however, that *send* behaves exactly as predicted in the regular four-element pattern:

They sent their daughter (* in order) to study law.

- (20) * They adapted the engine in order to stand up to arctic weather conditions.
 (21) * They chose him in order to be their front man.
 (22) ? They sent their daughter to Cambridge in order to study law.

In some cases, moreover, the infinitives after verbs of designing, etc. can be shown to be in variation with noun-phrase complements of these verbs (cf., e.g., *design something for use in high temperatures* — *design something to stand up to high temperatures*).

However, these infinitival clauses, more so than most other types of infinitival complements, resemble optional adverbial clauses semantically, because they usually express such typically adverbial notions as purpose, result, or manner (*design something so that it will last forever/ in such a way that it will last forever* + *design something to last forever*). Arguably, infinitival clauses of the type under discussion could even be placed in a transitional category of their own and treated as object-controlled adverbial infinitives.

Clearly, such transitional structures are difficult to accommodate in the German system, where — in all but the most elevated varieties of the language — there is today a clear-cut distinction between *zu*-infinitives, functioning as complements of verbs, and *um zu*-infinitives, functioning as adverbial adjuncts of clauses. *Um zu* is unlike English *in order to* in that it is obligatory, but like *in order to* it strongly suggests a subject-control interpretation of the infinitival clause it precedes. In other words, it is the obligatory marking of all adverbial infinitives with *um zu* that relegates object-controlled adverbial infinitives to a grammatically marginal status in German. Prescriptive grammarians of German acknowledge this fact by outlawing the object-controlled *um zu*-infinitive altogether, whereas descriptive work (Bech (1955:97); Langhoff (1980:318-19)) explores the conditions necessary for a marked control-relation to prevail.

If — in the unmarked case — *um zu* is incompatible with object-control, then the German structures should be acceptable if the matrix verb is in the passive, and this is, in fact, what happens:

- (23) * Sie entwickelten den Motor, um arktischen Witterungsbedingungen zu widerstehen.
 (24) Der Motor wurde entwickelt, um arktischen Witterungsbedingungen zu widerstehen.

In (23) there is a potential conflict between object-control (suggested by the meaning of the sentence) and subject-control (suggested by *um zu*). This conflict is resolved in (24) because passivization eliminates one of the two rival controllers.

4. Differences in the temporal relation between the infinitive and the matrix clause

The analysis so far has shown that, with regard to object-controlled adverbial infinitives, German is more restrictive than English. In other respects, however, the converse is true. As Table 1 shows, all English object-control verbs are “forward-looking” predicates, that is the action or state referred to in the infinitive cannot precede the action or state referred to in the matrix clause. No such restriction exists in German, and this means that all of the following are acceptable in German but not in English:

- (25) Man beschuldigt ihn, gestohlen zu haben.
 (26) Sie klagten ihn an, gestohlen zu haben.
 (27) Sie wollten mir einreden, einen Fehler gemacht zu haben.
 (28) * They accuse him to have stolen something.
 (29) * They wanted to convince me to have made a mistake.

In addition to the object-control interpretation (“Sie wollten mir einreden, daß ich einen Fehler gemacht hätte.”), sentence (27) also allows a subject-control reading (“Sie wollten mir einreden, daß sie einen Fehler gemacht hätten.”). The intended interpretation would, of course, be inferred from the context. I will return to such cases in the discussion on “pragmatic” control below. This discussion will also make clear why in German, but not in English, object-controlled infinitival complement clauses can be anterior to the matrix.

5. The varying scope for “pragmatic” control in English and German

The control properties of English verbs can largely be accounted for configurationally:

- (30) I asked to go.
 (31) I asked him to go.

In (30), there is subject-control, presumably because in this sentence the subject of the matrix clause is the closest potential controller. In (31), an object intervenes, and the result usually is that the infinitive is interpreted as being controlled by the object.

As research has shown, a totally configurational account of control in English meets with certain difficulties. The most well-rehearsed exception is, of course, provided by *promise* and a small number of synonyms, after which the infinitive exhibits subject-control regardless of whether an object intervenes or not. Occasionally, there is a shift in control if the infinitive

contains *be allowed to*. The relevant examples discussed in Radford (1985:381) are:¹⁰

- (32) John pleaded with me to go (i.e. that I should go).
 (33) John pleaded with me to be allowed to go (i.e. that he might be allowed to go).

Unmarked object-control interpretations can also be overridden if they are extremely unlikely in a given context. Thus:

- (34) He asked his boss to have an afternoon off.

would normally receive a subject-control interpretation in spite of the overtly present object.

Even in English, then, control sometimes cannot be explained without having recourse to semantics and pragmatics. However, there should not be any doubts about the marginal status of such phenomena in English. This even goes for the “promise somebody to do something”-construction, despite its prominent status in the linguistic debate. In the elicitation experiment referred to above, I asked students to indicate which of the following sentences they considered more natural:

- (35) I promise you that I will pay back the money.
 (36) I promise you to pay back the money.

38 out of a total of 46 students preferred (35) with its *that*-clause. As for the few other members of the *promise*-class, the situation is even more clear-cut. Thiem (1980:391) has: “The tyrant offered (to) his allies to declare war on their enemies.” and accepts this as grammatical (on a subject-control interpretation). However, all English and American informants I informally consulted on this sentence regarded it not only as stylistically inferior but as downright unacceptable and argued that the infinitival complement should be replaced by a *that*-clause. As for pragmatics overriding syntax (cf. example (34) above), this seems to be a rather remote possibility, as well. Again, the results of the elicitation experiment mentioned above are instructive. Presented with the sentence: “The two prisoners asked the guard to see their families,” 24 of the 46 informants gave it the rather unlikely object-control interpretation, and only four assumed subject-control. (The remaining 18 ticked the “don’t know”-box.) Presumably, the syntactically “regular” interpretation would have been even more dominant if the two alternatives had not been explicitly mentioned in the instructions.

¹⁰ Consider also the “infamous problem of control in passive *promise*” dealt with in Jackendoff (1985:457):

* Bill promised Harry to be allowed to leave.
 Harry was promised to be allowed to leave.

Even if one acknowledges the existence of pragmatic control in exceptional cases, it is nevertheless true to say that control in English is for the most part anchored in surface syntax. If an object is inserted between the subject of the matrix clause and the infinitival complement clause, it is very likely to become the controller. If, on the other hand, the object is dropped from the sentence, control shifts back to the subject.¹¹ This, incidentally, may be one of the reasons why the scope for object-control in the semi-adverbial infinitives following verbs of designing, planning and using, verbs of choice and verbs of sending and taking is so much greater in English than in German.

The relative importance of configurational and pragmatic factors in determining control is reversed in German. The configurational factor, which is so important in English, normally does not play any role, at all:

- (37) Ich bat sie, zu gehen.
 (38) Ich bat, zu gehen.

In (38) the object continues to be the controller even though it is absent from the sentence. In the absence of more precise specifications from the context, the sentence would be interpreted as: “I asked that some unspecified agent should go.”

Similarly, no configurational principle helps to resolve the ambiguity of German sentences such as:

- (39) Sie bot uns an, selbst nach dem Rechten zu sehen.

Out of context it is impossible to determine whether the subject of the matrix clause (“Sie”) or its object (“uns”) is the implied subject of the infinitival clause. Below I give one example in which the context suggests the former interpretation, and one in which it suggests the latter:

- (40) Da sie gerade Zeit hatte, bot sie uns an, selbst nach dem Rechten zu sehen.
 (41) Sie bot uns an, selbst nach dem Rechten zu sehen, falls wir ihr nicht glaubten.

In the case of *anbieten*, the configurational aspect comes into play if the object of the matrix verb is dropped:

- (42) Sie bot an, selbst an, selbst nach dem Rechten zu sehen.

¹¹ In addition to the above-mentioned examples, there are, of course, constructions such as “He said to stop at the traffic lights” or “She motioned to remain seated,” which superficially resemble German “Er bat, den Raum zu verlassen.” However, such English sentences are probably shortened variants of corresponding *for*-clauses (“He said for them to stop at the traffic lights.”) and hence not directly relevant to a discussion of object-control.

Here, unlike in the *bitten*-example given above, the object-control interpretation of the infinitive usually disappears together with the object. In German, therefore, *anbieten* represents a type of control verb different from *bitten*, a fact which will be explored in greater depth below.

It has been shown that the configurational mechanism normally determining control in English need not apply if the infinitive contains the modal paraphrase *to be allowed to*. In German, with its much stronger tendency towards pragmatic control, modal verbs are, of course, used much more widely and systematically in order to bring about shifts in control. In English, the addition of *to be allowed to* in: "He asked (to be allowed) to go." is redundant additional marking of an interpretation which is clear on configurational grounds alone. In German, on the other hand, the use of *dürfen* is the only way of eliminating object-control in the infinitive:

- (43) Ich bat, den Raum zu verlassen. (i.e. "I asked for somebody else to leave the room.")
 (44) Ich bat, den Raum verlassen zu dürfen. (i.e. "I asked to leave the room.")

Even the passive auxiliary *werden* triggers this shift in control in German, which again produces an interesting linguistic contrast:

- (45) Paul asked Mary to go to the company doctor.
 Paul asked Mary to be examined by the company doctor.
 (46) Paul bat Maria, zum Firmenarzt zu gehen.
 Paul bat Maria, vom Firmenarzt untersucht zu werden.

The two English sentences in (45) are largely synonymous. In both cases it is Mary who will see the company doctor. This is not so in the German sentences in (46). Here there is object-control for the active infinitive but subject-control for the passive infinitive ("Paul asked that he might be examined."). The shift in control also produces the expected consequences for the passivization of the matrix verb:

- (47) Mary was asked to be examined by the company doctor.
 (48) *Maria wurde gebeten, vom Firmenarzt untersucht zu werden.

Unlike (47), (48) is ungrammatical because the passivization of the matrix clause eliminates the controller of the infinitive in German.

To sum up, then, the English mechanism of control is mainly rooted in configurational constellations at the level of syntactic surface structure. "Pragmatic" control-relations, which must be inferred from the meaning of an utterance and the context of situation, persist in some marginal areas. In German, by way of contrast, syntactic surface structure hardly ever influences

control-relations, and pragmatic control is fundamental. What remains to be done is to sketch the determinants underlying this pragmatic system of control.

In this connection, it is necessary to realize that, as has already been mentioned, there are two slightly different types of control-verbs in German. The first, exemplified by *bitten* below, is closer to English, whereas the second, illustrated by *einreden*, is without parallel. The following array of examples will bring out the most salient differences between the two types:

- (49a) Er bat uns, das Haus zu verkaufen.
 (49b) Er bat uns, das Haus verkaufen zu dürfen.
 (49c) * Er bat uns, das Haus verkaufen zu müssen.
 (49d) * Er bat uns, ein guter Freund zu sein.
 (49e) * Er bat uns, das Haus verkauft zu haben.
 (50a) Er redete uns ein, das Haus zu verkaufen.
 (50b) Er redete uns ein, das Haus verkaufen zu dürfen.
 (50c) Er redete uns ein, das Haus verkaufen zu müssen.
 (50d) Er redete uns ein, ein guter Freund zu sein.
 (50e) Er redete uns ein, das Haus verkauft zu haben.

In the *bitten*-examples in (49), the controller of the infinitival clause is specified, presumably in the lexical entry of the verb. It is the object in the unmarked case (cf. (49a)), and the subject if the infinitival clause contains an appropriate modal or auxiliary verb (cf. (49b), (49c)). (49c) is asterisked because in this particular sentence the modal verb *müssen* is incompatible with a subject-control interpretation. (49d) is unacceptable because, as in (49a), the syntactic structure requires an object-control interpretation, while facts of concord ("Er" — singular; "uns" — plural; "ein Freund" — singular) demand subject-control. (49e) is not acceptable because *bitten* is a forward-looking predicate (unless, of course, the perfect infinitive can be understood as a reference to future perfect in context). In the *einreden*-examples in (50), on the other hand, both the subject and the object are available as controllers throughout. Also, *einreden* is not always a forward-looking predicate, and this means that there is at least one meaningful interpretation for each of the five sentences. To be precise, (50a) would normally receive an object-control interpretation. Note, however, that the chief argument against subject-control is not syntactic but merely unlikelihood in real-world terms. In (50b), (50c) and (50e), subject-control and object-control are equally likely, and the intended interpretation would have to be inferred from the context. In (50d), where object-control is ruled out on grounds of number concord, there still remains a subject-control interpretation to make the sentence acceptable.

Why does German have this twofold system of control in *Verb + object + zu-infinitive*-structures? Explanations which suggest themselves as obvious at first sight do not stand up to scrutiny. Thus, the contrast has nothing to do with the fact that *bitten* takes an accusative object whereas *einreden* takes a dative or a prepositional object. *Helfen*, *raten* and *befehlen* largely behave like *bitten*, and nevertheless these verbs all take dative objects. On the other hand, *überzeugen* and *warnen* take accusative objects and still have the same control-properties as *einreden*. It seems that in determining control, German speakers refer to finite paraphrases of a given infinitival clause or, where possible, to underlying speech acts. The following table schematically illustrates this process. It clearly shows that the ultimate reason for the different control-properties of the *bitten* and *einreden*-classes of verbs is that only the latter can be used to introduce statements. *Bitten*-verbs introduce only “forward-looking” speech-acts such as commands or requests.

TABLE 2: Interpretive mechanisms determining control in German

infinitival clause	finite paraphrase(s)	underlying speech-act(s)	control
Er bat uns, das Haus zu verkaufen.	... daß WIR ... sollten * ... ob ER ... sollte	imperative “Verkauft!” * question (“Soll ich ...?”)	OBJECT * SUBJECT
Er bat uns, das Haus verkaufen zu dürfen.	* ... daß WIR ... durften ... ob ER ... dürfe	* imperative (“Dürft!”) question (“Darf ich?”)	* OBJECT SUBJECT
Er bat uns, angestellt zu werden.	* ... daß WIR ... würden ... ob ER ... würde	* imp. (“Werdet angest.!”) question (“Werde ich?”)	* OBJECT SUBJECT
Er redete uns ein, das Haus zu verkaufen.	... daß WIR ... sollten ... daß ER ... würde	imperative (“Verkauft!”) statement (“Ich werde.”)	OBJECT SUBJECT
Er redete uns ein, das Haus verkaufen zu dürfen.	... daß WIR ... dürften ... daß ER ... dürfe	statement (“Ihr dürft.”) statement (“Ich darf.”)	OBJECT SUBJECT
Er redete uns ein, angestellt zu werden.	... daß WIR ... würden ... daß ER ... würde	statement (“Ihr werdet.”) statement (“Ich werde.”)	OBJECT SUBJECT

If there is a relationship between control in infinitival clauses and underlying speech acts in German, then it is understandable why English-German language contrasts take the form they do. Unlike English “He asked to leave the room,” German “Er bat, den Raum zu verlassen” cannot have subject-control for the infinitive because there is no match with an appropriate speech act. (In English, where control is largely determined configurationally, no such match is necessary):

- (51) * Er bat: “Soll ich den Raum verlassen?”
* Er bat, ob er den Raum verlassen sollte.

On the other hand, the combination of *bitten* with an imperative is possible, and this means that object-control is assumed even though there is no overt object in the sentence:

- (52) Er bat: “Verlaßt den Raum!”

Er bat, daß man/ die Anwesenden/ etc. den Raum verlassen sollte(n).

Given the pragmatic, speech-act based mechanism of control dominant in German, not even the notorious *promise*-class of verbs is an exception. German *versprechen* normally exhibits subject-control, but indeterminate control if the infinitival complement clause contains a modal verb. This is what is to be expected in view of the possible underlying speech acts. Compare:

- (53a) Ich verspreche dir, das Buch zurückzugeben.
(... daß **ich** das Buch zurückgeben werde.)
(... * daß **du** das Buch zurückgeben wirst.)
(53b) Ich verspreche dir: “Ich werde das Buch zurückgeben.”
* Ich verspreche dir: “Du wirst das Buch zurückgeben.”
(54a) Ich verspreche dir, teilnehmen zu dürfen.
(... daß **ich** teilnehmen darf.)
(daß **du** teilnehmen darfst.)
(54b) Ich verspreche dir: “Ich darf teilnehmen.”
Ich verspreche dir: “Du darfst teilnehmen.”

In the first of the two sentences in (54b) *versprechen* has the rather specific sense of “to vouch for the truth of the fact that (I will be allowed to take part).”

6. Conclusion

The contrastive analysis of object-control in English and German has pointed out major differences between the two languages. First, the sets of matrix verbs embedding object-controlled infinitives are only partially co-extensive in English and German. English freely allows what I have termed “object-controlled adverbial infinitives” after verbs of designing, planning and using, verbs of choice, and verbs of sending and taking – a grammatical structure whose status in German is marginal at best. In German, though, object-control is not restricted to “forward-looking” predicates, as it is in English. Secondly, control in English is generally expressed by syntactic configurations in surface structure, whereas a speech-act based pragmatic framework is necessary to account for control in German. Ultimately, the reason for the greater importance of pragmatic control in German is word order. A configurational definition of control is very difficult to carry through if, as is the case in German, the object/ controller does not have a fixed position in the sentence “Seiner Frau boten wir an, mitzukommen.”/ “Wir boten seiner Frau an, mitzukommen.”).

One question which remains to be answered is how the findings of the present study tie in with recent work in the comparative typology of English and German. Summarising the results of his comparison of major aspects of English and German syntax, Hawkins (1985:215), for example, claims that

"... there is a unity underlying [English-German language contrasts], involving a realignment in the mapping between surface form and meaning. The morphological and syntactic structures of German are regularly in closer correspondence with their associated semantic representations than those of English. English tolerates greater collapsing of distinct meanings onto common surface forms (whence greater ambiguity and vagueness), and permits more raising, extraction and deletion of semantic arguments than does German."

Hawkins advances this generalization after carefully studying individual syntactic contrasts between the two languages, and its general validity is beyond doubt. In one respect, the present paper provides additional support for his thesis: As has been shown, there is obligatory formal marking for the distinction between adverbial infinitives (*um zu*) and infinitival complements (*zu*) in German, whereas in English the *to*-infinitive can perform both functions. On the other hand, however, it is worth mentioning that the control-phenomena investigated here do not quite fit into the general picture. Pragmatic control of infinitival complement clauses, with all the syntactic ambiguity it engenders, is pervasive in German, but very rare in English. Also, there is greater scope for the deletion of controllers in German than in English.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, E. 1985. *Verb complementation in written English*. Stockholm: Studies in English 24. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Bech, G. 1955, 1957. *Studien über das deutsche Verbum infinitum*. 2 vols. Copenhagen. 2nd ed. 1983. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Behaghel, O. 1924. *Deutsche Syntax II*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Studies in Generative Grammar 9. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Crystal, D. 1985. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford and London: Basil Blackwell and André Deutsch.
- Fisiak, J. (ed.). 1980. *Theoretical issues in contrastive linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Goergens, H. 1973. "'Ncl' und 'Acl' – Die englischen Konstruktionen *He is believed to be honest* und *They believe him to be honest*." in Nickel, G., (ed.). 1980. 13-88.
- Hellinger, M. 1977. *Kontrastive Linguistik deutsch-englisch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Jackendoff, R. 1985. "Believing and intending: two sides of the same coin." *Linguistic inquiry* 16 445-460.

- Hawkins, J. 1985. *A comparative typology of English and German unifying the contrasts*. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Huddleston, R. 1984. *Introduction to the grammar of English*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Langhoff, S. 1980. *Gestaltlinguistik: Eine ganzheitliche Beschreibung syntaktisch-semantischer Sprachfunktionen am Beispiel modaler Infinitivkonstruktionen des Deutschen und Englischen*. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Nickel, G. (ed.). 1973. *Projekt für angewandte kontrastive Sprachwissenschaft, Arbeitsbericht 7*. Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvik, J. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Radford, A. 1985. *Transformational syntax: A student's guide to Chomsky's Extended Standard Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Siebert-Ott, G. M. 1983. *Kontrollprobleme in infiniten Komplementkonstruktionen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Thiem, R. 1980. "Towards an erasure principle for German and English infinitive complements." In Fisiak, J., (ed.). 1980. 389-401.
- Van Ek, J. 1966. *Four complementary structures of predication in contemporary British English: An inventory*. Groningen: Wolters.