

Zu, um, zum, (om) te and correlates in corpora: On sources and variation of control structures in Germanic varieties

Patrick Brandt¹ & Tom Bossuyt²

¹IDS Mannheim, ²University of Freiburg

brandt@ids-mannheim.de, tombossuyt95@gmail.com

The talk presents new ideas concerning the origin and nature of PRO and control that are supported by corpuslinguistic data from different Germanic varieties. The grammatical formative *zu* 'to' in its different manifestations takes center stage in connection with the thesis in (1).

(1) *Zu* marks the reflexivization of a genuinely asymmetric relation.

The proposition in (1) carries a contradiction: If a relation between *x* and *y* is asymmetric, then it follows that not both *xRy* and *yRx*. If *x = y* due to reflexivization, however, then exactly *xRy* and *yRx*. Reflexivized asymmetric relations therefore always denote falsehood, making them apparently unusable. Brandt (2016) argues though that natural language grammars may exploit hidden contradictions in certain domains: the interface suspends interpretation of part of the problematic meaning and leaves it to be interpreted in ensuing syntactic-semantic cycles. Reducing the asymmetry of the relation to "some *x* is *P* and not *P*", we argue "x is not *P*" must be accommodated non-locally. In subject-control structures (*versprechen* 'promise'), it is interpreted in terms of the negatively defined theme theta role, taken by the infinitival complement that as a whole functions as the direct object. In all other control structures (object or anti-control), the theme role is independently taken. The next best way to interpret "x is not *P*" is in terms of the modal semantics of a purpose clause: *x* does not have the property denoted by the purpose clause in the actual world.

Starting from data from the German Reference Corpus DeReKo featuring prepositional adverbs that function as correlates (*dazu*, *darum*), we classify German and corresponding Dutch control verbs. Taking into account as well data from the Dutch Sonar-corpus, we argue that structures where "x is not *P*" cannot be identified with theme role semantics – i.e., all but subject control structures – are in need of correlates and the supposedly optional Dutch element *om* exactly to establish a thematic link on the basis of which "x is not *P*" can be interpreted. We furthermore seek to assess whether German dialectal *zum* in 'nominalized infinitives' should be taken to correspond to *um zu*, the German cousin of *om te*, as opposed to the fusion of *zu* and the definite article *dem*.

References: • Brandt, P. 2016. Fehlkonstruktion und Reparatur in der Bedeutungskomposition. *Linguistische Berichte* 248. 395-433. • Broekhuis, H. & N. Corver. 2015. *Syntax of Dutch*. Vol. 2: *Verbs and verb phrases*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.