

Anti-control verbs, arbitrary control and argument-structural inertia

Irene Rapp¹ & Ekaterina Laptieva²

¹University of Tübingen, ²IDS Mannheim

irene.rapp@uni-tuebingen.de, laptieva@ids-mannheim.de

In this talk, we investigate quantitative and qualitative aspects of the alternation between *zu* 'to'+infinitive constructions and finite *dass* 'that' clauses in object function. We focus on the so-called anti-control verbs like *anzweifeln* 'doubt', *begrüßen* 'appreciate' (cf. Wöllstein 2015). Due to their syntacto-semantic properties they do not allow infinitival complements in the unmarked case: subject control is excluded semantically while object control is excluded due to the lack of an – explicit or implicit – nominal object argument. There are however two kind of exceptions. Firstly, we will show that verbs like *protestieren* 'protest' quite often select an infinitival complement with arbitrary control. We suppose that this possibility is due to the fact that their infinitival complement corresponds to a prepositional clause. Secondly, a subject controlled infinitive complement would be possible with anti-control verbs if there is a control shift – like a passive in the complement clause. Based on a corpus study we will, however, show that even in the case of a passivized complement the *dass* 'that' clause is highly preferred to the infinitive. We will discuss the question of whether this is due to a general tendency of control structures to avoid specific, 'complicated' constellations (for a similar approach cf. Brandt in prep.) or to a general tendency of lexical items to retain their normal argument structure patterns (called *argument-structural inertia* in Rapp, Laptieva, Kopenig & Engelberg 2017). To decide upon this question we conduct a second corpus study whose aim is to find out whether control structures with a passivized infinitival complement are generally avoided (which would be an argument for a structure based account) or whether they are only avoided with anti-control verbs (which would be an argument for the significance of argument-structural inertia).

References: • Brandt, P. in prep. Alternation von *zu*- und *dass*-Komplementen. In E. Fuß, M. Konopka & A. Wöllstein (Hg.), *Grammatik im Korpus*. Tübingen: Narr. • Rapp, I., E. Laptieva, A. Kopenig & S. Engelberg. 2017. Lexikalisch-semantische Passung und argumentstrukturelle Trägheit – eine korpusbasierte Analyse zur Alternation zwischen *dass*-Sätzen und *zu*-Infinitiven in Objektfunktion. *Deutsche Sprache* 3(17). 193–221. • Wöllstein, A. 2015. Grammatik – explorativ. Hypothesengeleitete und -generierende Exploration variierender Satzkomplementationsmuster im standardnahen Deutsch. In L. M. Eichinger (Hg.), *Sprachwissenschaft im Fokus. Positionsbestimmungen und Perspektiven*, 93–120. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.