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1 Introduction

In English, unlike other European languages and, for the purpose of this paper, especially unlike German, there are three different types of sentential complements: finite clauses, infinitive clauses and clauses with -ing form (Fanego 2004:8). This paper will focus primarily on the two non-finite types, the infinitive and the -ing form, taking finite clauses like that clauses just as a point of reference for the two other constructions where necessary. The difference between infinitival and -ing constructions in sentences like

(1)  a. He remembered to go to the supermarket.
    b. He remembered going to the supermarket.

has been discussed in many linguistic works (e.g., Smith & Escobedo 2001, Duffley 2000, Wood 1957). The semantic difference between these constructions with matrix verbs like remember, stop or begin is also taught in English as a foreign language classes in schools.

The syntactic and semantic differences between the constructions with the infinitive and -ing form after the particle to in sentences like

(2)  a. We consent to join this club.
    b. We consent to joining this club.

are not so clear and also seem to be a problem for German native speakers learning English. I will refer to the first construction as the to infinitive pattern and to the second as the to -ing construction. Other names for the second construction or similar ones, like the gerund or the present participle, will be commented on in chapter 5, which deals with this construction in detail. Surprisingly, this construction has not received much attention in linguistic works (Rudanko 1996:7). Most of the work done on the distinction between these constructions only focuses on the question which matrix verbs select which complements. While Budde (1957) and Ellinger (1910) merely deal with the question by listing the matrix verbs which select one of the constructions in question or both, Rudanko (1996) tries to classify the matrix verbs into different subclasses to find rules explaining which subclass selects which complement. Rudanko (1998) also examines the historic development of several matrix verbs which exhibit
a change in the preference of the complements they select. The most recent article is Duffley & Fisher’s (2005) on the distinction between the two constructions. This article is concerned with the question of differences in control and temporal relations between the two constructions. It focuses on a couple of matrix verbs to test the hypotheses. All these approaches, however, only focus on the semantics of the constructions and lack a detailed syntactic analysis.

The purpose of this paper is to consider the problem as an entity, taking the syntax and semantics of the constructions into account and showing how they interact. The goal will be to find syntactic analyses for the two different constructions and to show how these syntactic differences can account for the slight difference in meaning. The syntactic and semantic analysis is then also used to explain why German students seem to have problems with the to -ing form.

For the analysis the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG) will be adopted. Although linguists still differ in analyzing some basic properties of English sentences, for example in treating English sentences as IP or S, or in the question if, for example, “the dog” is a DP or NP, I will not discuss these alternatives here but apply one analysis consistently.

The paper is structured as follows: in the next chapter, the scope of the study will be presented. As this paper does not attempt a semantic classification for the verbs selecting one pattern or the other, only some matrix verbs will be focused on to discuss the syntactic and semantic analysis.

These matrix verbs have also been used in a questionnaire given to German students. The students were asked to rate sentences with the to infinitive and to -ing form as grammatical or ungrammatical. As a tendency, the German students rated the to infinitive pattern as grammatical even when it was not and, on the other hand, rated the to -ing form as ungrammatical, even if it was a perfectly grammatical sentence.

To be able to explain these difficulties German students have, the semantic and syntactic analyses of the two constructions will be discussed. However, to fully account for the phenomena under consideration, it is necessary to subdivide the problem into smaller problems.
The first problem to address is the different analyses of *to* as infinitive marker, on the one hand, and as preposition on the other. This has been the usual point of view so far. However, the distinction is not as clear as it seems as there is hardly any semantic difference between *to* in the two constructions. For the syntactic analysis, the category of infinitival *to* needs to be discussed. It will be argued that *to* in this case is best analyzed as a complementizer. With this analysis then the conclusion can be drawn that *to* in the two constructions is indeed different as the *to -ing* pattern cannot be a complementizer phrase and thus, *to* cannot be a complementizer.

The analysis of the *to infinitive* construction as a CP is the topic of chapter 4. The standard analysis of the construction in LFG as an equi construction involving anaphoric control will be adopted and therefore discussed only briefly.

The *to -ing* construction is more controversial, as it is not clear how the *-ing* form in this construction should be analyzed. Consequently, this construction will be discussed in more detail and it will also be necessary to look at the diachronic development and similar constructions to gain a full picture of the construction.

After presenting the different syntactic analyses of these constructions, the semantic difference between them will be discussed. The establishment of the theoretical linguistic background of the phenomenon can then help to discuss the problems German native speakers have with the *to -ing* construction. At the end of the paper, a brief outline of how to teach the differences in school will be given.
2 The scope of this study

2.1 The matrix verbs used in the questionnaire

In this paper, constructions with the matrix verbs decide, agree, consent, object, admit, confess and look forward will be discussed. With the exception of decide and look forward, all matrix verbs belong to the subclass of communication which Rudanko (1996:54) specified as one of the verb classes governing to -ing. However, they are not homogenous in their acceptability of the two different patterns to infinitive and to -ing.

The main focus of this work will be on the acceptability of these two constructions, in connection with the matrix verbs named above, for German native speakers learning English. The question which constructions are really possible for English native speakers would be a very interesting point, but beyond the scope of this study. Which constructions are possible will be established with the help of different corpora, the Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner’s English Dictionary, for further reference in this text just Collins Dictionary, and the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, abbreviated Oxford Dictionary. Additionally, Rudanko’s (1996, 1998) examples, which he takes from different corpora like the Old English Dictionary and the LOB and Brown corpora, and Duffley & Fisher’s (2005) examples from the internet will be taken into account.

According to the corpora named above, decide is only acceptable with the to infinitive. It was only included in this study to see if German students would accept the to -ing pattern with verbs they knew as taking the infinitive construction as complement.

As for agree, both, the Collins and the Oxford Dictionary, only give the construction with the to infinitive. However, Rudanko (1996:50), quoting Bridgeman et al. (1965:41f), also lists agree with the to -ing pattern.

In comparison, consent, as a synonym to agree, can be used with either of the constructions according to the Collins and the Oxford Dictionary. Rudanko (1998:11) points out that the to infinitive pattern was the only one possible in earlier stages of English, but that nowadays both constructions are grammatical.

object, according to Rudanko (1998:12), was once possible with both constructions but in Present Day English, which Rudanko (1998:1) classifies as the English of the 20th century of speakers still alive today, strongly prefers the to -ing form. The Collins
Dictionary lists *object* only with either *to* + *noun* or a *that* clause as complement. As will be discussed later, this supports Rudanko’s view of *object* taking the *to*-*ing* construction. The Oxford Dictionary also lists *object* with the *to*-*ing* patterns but not with the infinitive construction. Duffley & Fisher (2005) give some examples of *object* with the *to infinitive* but claim that in these constructions, *object* has the approximate meaning of *refuse*.

As for *admit* and *confess*, the Collins Dictionary only gives the *to*-*ing* and the *that* pattern. Neither does Rudanko (1998) give any example from current nor former English of the *to infinitive* pattern with these two matrix verbs. An interesting point will be the minimal pair *admit* versus *admit to* in sentences like *He admits having stolen the car* versus *He admits to having stolen the car*, as in these patterns the meaning of *to* can be explained.

*Look forward* was included as well to see if German students would know if this matrix verb only governs the *to*-*ing* pattern. Unlike the examples with *admit* and *confess*, there is no alternative construction like the *that* clause complement possible.

This means that there is a scale of possible constructions with the *to infinitive* on the one end and the *to*-ing pattern on the other end. *Decide* is on the one end of this scale whereas *look forward* is on the other. This is illustrated in table (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>only possible with</th>
<th>prefers</th>
<th>prefers</th>
<th>only possible with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the <em>to infinitive</em></td>
<td><em>to infinitive</em></td>
<td><em>to -ing form</em></td>
<td>the <em>to -ing form</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>decide</em></td>
<td><em>agree, consent</em></td>
<td><em>object</em></td>
<td><em>admit, confess, look forward</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of this study is to see if German students will follow this scale. As German does not have the *-ing* pattern as a sentential complement and as *to* is mostly seen as infinitive marker, it is expected that German students will find the *to*-ing construction less acceptable.

All the matrix verbs have also been chosen because it was assumed that German students in their final year at school would be familiar with them and maybe also with some of the possible complement constructions. This and the interesting scale from the possible *to infinitive* to the *to*-*ing* form in matrix verbs very close in meaning led to the decision to look at the subclass of matrix verbs expressing communication
instead of looking at “the core class” of verbs governing to -ing: verbs meaning turn to (Rudanko 1996:68).

2.2 The results of the questionnaire

In this study, German students were asked to rate sentences as grammatical or ungrammatical with the matrix verbs decide, agree, consent, object, admit, confess and look forward and a complement, either to infinitive or to -ing form. 24 German students of English in different stages of their studies at university and 67 students in their final year of school took part in this questionnaire. This means that most of them had learned English at school for at least eight years. Eight of the university students and six students in school had spent at least 2 months abroad.

The students were given sentences with the matrix verbs complemented with the to infinitive and the to -ing form. They were asked to rate these sentences as grammatical or ungrammatical with five stages given to specify their answer. Rating a sentence “1” meant that they thought it to be completely grammatical, “5” completely ungrammatical. They were supposed to use “2” and “4” if they thought they knew, but were not completely sure and “3” meant that they did not know. Thus, the higher the number the more ungrammatical the students thought the sentence to be.

Simple sentences have been chosen so that the results would reflect what the students thought about the two kinds of complementation. However, if the test persons rated a sentence as ungrammatical, there is still the possibility left that this was due to other controversial structures in the sentence. On the other hand, a grammatical rating of a sentence clearly reflects that the students think the complementation pattern to be grammatical.

The initial idea was to look at both groups separately, but as it turned out, the findings were almost identical for both groups, with two or three exceptions. Thus, I will present the results for both groups together, just commenting on the few examples where a significant difference has been observed.

For decide, the findings were expectedly clear. Both groups rated decide with the to infinitive as grammatical and decide with the to -ing pattern as clearly ungrammatical.
While *decide* was clear from the ratings and the dictionary entries, *agree* and *consent* were not as clear. While the dictionaries did not list the *to*-ing form as a possibility with *agree*, they did so for *consent*. As can be seen in (5), this is not mirrored in the findings of this study. The students rated both matrix verbs as clearly grammatical with the *to infinitive* while they were undecided, with a slight tendency to rate it ungrammatical with the *to*-ing form with both matrix verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>grammatical</th>
<th>ungrammatical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>decide to do</em></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>decide to doing</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Especially interesting is the result of *agree* with the *to*-ing form as the range is very wide with 13 persons rating the construction as completely grammatical and 15 more who assigned “2” to this construction. This leads to the fact that *agree* with the *to*-ing form is rated even more grammatical, or less ungrammatical, than *consent* with the *to*-ing form.

*Consent* with the *to*-ing form also shows a significant difference in the rating by university students on the one hand and students still at school on the other hand. The university students rated this construction in average “3” while the other group gave it a “3,7”. This was not the case with *agree* with the *to*-ing form where both groups rated the construction the same. Thus, the university students are slightly more familiar with the *to*-ing form with the matrix verb *consent*, but as unsure as the students in school with the matrix verb *agree*.

---

¹average rating
So far, I have been considering matrix verbs with a strong preference for or even the only possibility of the *to infinitive* as complement. That the *to -ing* construction was not considered grammatical in these sentences does not show how familiar the students are with this construction. The data now following concerning *object, admit, confess* and *look forward* will help to find this out.

*object* has a strong preference for the *to -ing* form with some corpora like the Collins Dictionary not listing it with the *to infinitive* at all, or Rudanko (1998) considering it obsolete. This is not reflected in the data in (6). Although the students are not very sure about the complementation patterns with *object*, the *to infinitive* is still considered rather grammatical while the *to -ing* form is considered rather ungrammatical.

![Data Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>grammatical</th>
<th>ungrammatical</th>
<th>Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>object to do</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>object to doing</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*admit* and *confess* are not possible with the *to infinitive*. This was not reflected in the data of the German students. Generally speaking, they preferred the *to infinitive* with both matrix verbs over the *to -ing* construction. Most of them considered *admit* with the *to infinitive* grammatical while it was considered ungrammatical with the *to -ing* form.

The findings for *confess* are not as clear as the average for *confess* with the *to infinitive* is approximately “3”. This number, though, is the result of a wide range of test persons rating it either as completely grammatical or completely ungrammatical. Additionally, there is a big difference between the university students’ and the students from schools’ rating. While the university students rated *confess* with the *to infinitive* as grammatical in average (2,3), the other group was more undecided (3,2). Thus, in this case the students still in school were the group which was closer to the dictionary results. However, on average they still did not know that *confess* with the *to infinitive* is not possible.

*Confess* with the *to -ing* form has the rating with the second highest average (4,14) after *decide* with the *to -ing* form. Both groups rated it approximately the same. Almost as high is the rating for *agree* with the *to -ing* form. Thus, the test
persons rated both matrix verbs as ungrammatical with the *to -ing* form although this construction is grammatical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>grammatical</th>
<th>ungrammatical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>admit to do</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>admit to doing</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>confess to do</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>confess to doing</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was mentioned before, *look forward* was included because it was expected that German students would know that this matrix verb needs a *to -ing* complement. This expectation was not met with the students still rating *look forward* with the *to -ing* form “3,16”. Thus, on average they were still undecided. However, there were actually not many test persons undecided, but most of them were quite clear in either rating the construction as completely grammatical or completely ungrammatical. This was also the case for *look forward* with the *to infinitive*. This gives the impression that most students thought the *to infinitive* grammatical when they rated the *to -ing* form as ungrammatical and vice versa. With *look forward*, the university students rated the *to infinitive* slightly more ungrammatical than the other group did and the *to -ing* form slightly more grammatical. Thus, the university students were more familiar with the complementation patterns for *look forward* than the other group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>grammatical</th>
<th>ungrammatical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>look forward to do</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>look forward to doing</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up: For all the matrix verbs under consideration, the students rated the constructions with the *to infinitive* from “1,7” to “3” in average and the constructions with the *to -ing* form from “3” to “4,6”. This means that they considered the constructions with the *to infinitive* as potentially more grammatical than the constructions involving the *to -ing* form.
Special attention should be paid to the fact that they rated the to-\textit{ing} form with the matrix verbs \textit{admit} and \textit{confess} even more ungrammatical than with the verbs \textit{agree}, \textit{consent} and \textit{object}. With \textit{look forward}, half the test persons rated the to-\textit{ing} form as ungrammatical.

This shows that they probably know the to-\textit{ing} form as a complementation pattern, but are not aware of its syntactic and semantic analysis. On the other hand, half the test persons rated the to \textit{infinitive} with \textit{look forward} grammatical and even more rated \textit{admit} and \textit{confess} with the to \textit{infinitive} grammatical which shows that the semantics of the to \textit{infinitive} are not clear either. It is merely the more common pattern and thus it is used more often and accepted as grammatical even in constructions where it is not.

To explain these results, I will first of all look at the analysis of to in both patterns and then at the syntactic and semantic analysis of the to \textit{infinitive}. I will then contrast the results with the findings of the syntactic and semantic analysis of the to-\textit{ing} form. Then, the differences in the two patterns when translated into German will be considered and from that conclusions will be drawn on why German students prefer the to \textit{infinitive} pattern from a linguistic point of view. The linguistic findings will then be used to make suggestions on how to teach the complementation patterns in school.
3 The analysis of to

Rudanko (1998:7) gives two different analyses for the two different constructions which, applied to our example (2), will give the following bracketing:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(9)} & \quad \text{a. } [[\text{We}]_{NP1} \text{[consent]}_{Verb1} [[\text{PRO}]_{NP2} \text{to [join]}_{Verb2} \text{this club}]]_{S2/S1} \\
& \quad \text{b. } [[\text{We}]_{NP1} \text{[consent]}_{Verb1} \text{[to]}_{PP} [[\text{PRO}]_{NP2} \text{[joining]}_{Verb2} \text{this club}]]_{S2/S1}
\end{align*}
\]

Rudanko (1998:8), following Quirk et al. (1985:1178), claims the first to to be an infinitive marker and the second one to be a preposition. However, this distinction is not as clear as it seems. In this chapter, I will look at the diachronic development of to and then apply some tests to the to infinitive and to -ing form to find out the differences and similarities between the two kinds of to. It will turn out that there is no significant difference between the meaning of infinitival and prepositional to in the constructions under consideration. However, there is a syntactic one which will lead to a different analysis of to in the two constructions.

3.1 The historic development of to

The original meaning of the preposition to most probably was the spatial meaning as either an allative or a locative preposition (Cuyckens & Verspoor 1998:70). The next step seemed to be the dative uses of to in sentences like He gave a book to a friend. From these spatial and dative uses together different abstract meanings developed, including a purposive meaning. The different meanings can be recognized in the following sentences (examples taken from Haspelmath 1989:289)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(10)} & \quad \text{a. } \text{Mary went to Sabina’s apartment.} \\
& \quad \text{b. } \text{Mary went to take photos of Sabina.} \\
& \quad \text{c. } \text{Mary bought a camera to take pictures of Sabina.}
\end{align*}
\]

The development from the allative to the purposive meaning can be explained easily. In the allative meaning, the preposition to “denotes a spatial relationship between a trajector and a landmark”(Cuyckens & Verspoort 1998:57). This means that the person tries to reach the landmark which is marked by to. For the purposive meaning, this landmark needs to become abstract, like taking pictures in the example above.
According to Cuyckens & Verspoort (1998:66) quoting Haspelmath (1989:291), from the purposive meaning then *to* developed to become an infinitive marker.

The question whether the infinitive marker *to* still carries meaning is controversial. Duffley (1992:15) in comparing the *to infinitive* with the bare infinitive claims that *to* should bring some meaning of its own to the construction. Haspelmath (1989:301) believes the infinitive to carry a modality meaning which is strengthened by the infinitive marker *to*. By far the strongest assumption is articulated by Hyde (2000) who analyzes the *to infinitive* as the preposition *to* with a bare infinitive. On the other hand, Cuyckens & Verspoor (1998:69) acknowledge that in some cases it is difficult to still find meaning in the infinitive marker.

This loss of meaning has led to analyzing this development as a grammaticalization process. Grammaticalization is defined as “a process which turns lexemes into grammatical formatives and makes grammatical formatives still more grammatical.” (Lehmann 1985, quoted in Haspelmath 1989:295). Haspelmath (1989) claims this grammaticalization process to be universal for a number of languages and shows it specifically for the development of the German infinitive marker *zu*, ‘to’, which evolved from a spatial preposition as well. However, Fischer (1997) claims that the grammaticalization process of the English infinitive marker has not gone as far as the process of the German one. To go into this discussion in detail is beyond the scope of this paper, but the result that in both languages the infinitive marker evolved from a spatial preposition will probably help in establishing the meaning difference between the two constructions under consideration.

I will therefore assume that the infinitive marker might still carry some of the original meaning of the preposition *to*. As *to* with the *-ing* form is far removed from the original meaning of the preposition *to*, there is actually no difference in the meaning of *to* in the two constructions. There is, however, a syntactic difference in both constructions which will be the topic of the next sections.
3.2 Infinitival versus prepositional *to*

As we have seen in the last section, there is basically no semantic difference between *to* in the two constructions. There might be syntactic differences, though, which will be discussed in this section.

Radford (1997:52) proposes some tests to distinguish between infinitival and prepositional *to*. His first test is the modification by intensifiers like *straight* or *right*. He claims that only the preposition *to* can take these intensifiers and that they are ungrammatical with the infinitival *to*. However, in example (2b), *to* cannot be modified by *straight* or *right*.

(11) *We consent straight/right to joining this club.*

This is not surprising as it was already discussed that there is practically no semantic difference between *to* in the two constructions and the modification by intensifiers is a semantic test.

Radford’s (1997) second test involves the choice of complements. He claims that the preposition takes a noun expression and the infinitive marker a verbal complement. However, this test is not useful in this context as the category of the *-ing* form is not clear yet. This will be discussed in chapter 5.

A final test involves ellipsis. This one is the only test to suggest that *to* in these two constructions might indeed be different.

(12) a. Do you consent to join this club? - No, I don’t really consent to.

b. Do you consent to joining this club? - *No, I don’t really consent to.*

Thus, Radford’s (1997:52) tests suggest that there is a difference in the two constructions and that what is commonly considered the prepositional *to* does not really carry the typical locative or allative meaning in the *to* *-ing* construction.

Pullum (1982), in discussing why the infinitive marker is not a preposition, also lists a number of arguments which can be used to distinguish between prepositional and infinitival *to*. Most of the arguments are concerned with the different distribution of complements of *to* as infinitive marker on the one hand and as preposition on the other. For example, “verbs that take PP complements with *to* do not *ipso facto* take
to + VP” (Pullum 1982:191) and so on. This seems to be different with to in the -ing pattern as most verbs which take to + NP also take the -ing form after to. As will be seen later, this is a remnant of where the -ing form evolved from diachronically.

A further argument is that “prepositional to fails to show the contraction on to verbs that infinitival to exhibits” (Pullum 1982:193) in, for example, wanna constructions. This is not the case in the to -ing construction. However, this might be due to different reasons. For two words to become contracted like want and to to wanna, it is necessary that they are frequently used together as a unit. This is not the case in our examples of matrix verbs with the to -ing form because, mostly, other complement patterns like that clauses are used with these verbs as well.

So far, Pullum’s (1982) tests could not help to decide if to in the to -ing construction is a preposition as the test results could be explained otherwise and where thus not very convincing. However, he also lists a further test which shows that to in the -ing pattern behaves more like the infinitive marker than the preposition.

Quoting Zwicky & Levin (1980), he observes that “infinitival to cannot bear high stress when it is stranded under ellipsis. The preposition to can.” (Pullum 1982:194). As can be seen in (13), to with the -ing form cannot be stressed either.

(13) *Going to Spain, I’m looking forward TO.

To sum up, some tests proposed to decide if to is a preposition do not work with to with the -ing form. The only sign that to with the -ing form might actually be a preposition is that it cannot be stranded under ellipsis.

To be able to decide if to can be considered the same in both constructions, it is necessary to establish which category infinitival to belongs to. In the next section, I argue that infinitival to is best analyzed as a complementizer. As to in the to -ing pattern cannot be a complementizer, I conclude that it has to be a preposition.
3.3 Infinitival to as Complementizer

The traditional term “infinitive marker” does not give specifications as to the category of to. In the literature, different analyses have been proposed for the category of the “infinitive marker” to. It has been either treated as a preposition (Hyde 2000), I (Chomsky 1981, Koster & May 1982), V (Pullum 1982, Pollard & Sag 1994, Dalrymple 2001) or C (Postal & Pullum 1978, Sag & Wasow 1999, Falk 2000). Pullum (1982) also discusses the question if to is an affix or a particle, but rejects both quite quickly.

That the question of the category of to is a difficult one can be seen by the fact that most of the arguments presented by researchers so far are rather indirect and contradictory. I will look at some of the arguments proposed and conclude with Falk (2000) that to is best analyzed as complementizer.

In discussing the differences between infinitival and prepositional to, it was already shown that to with the infinitive cannot be a preposition. Thus, Hyde’s (2000) proposal that the infinitive marker should be analyzed as a preposition can be dismissed already.

The point of view taken by Koster & May (1982) and also Falk (2000) is to look at the whole phrase first to decide if an expression like to sing in He decided to sing is a VP, IP or CP. Koster & May (1982) argue that the construction cannot be a VP but present some arguments that it has to be an IP. However, their arguments might actually be used to show that the construction is a CP rather than an IP.

Their first argument is that an IP “can occur as the focus of a pseudo cleft, while a VP cannot” (Koster & May 1982:132, all examples taken from them) as shown in (14)

(14) a. What he suspected was that Bill saw Monument Valley.
   b. What he wanted was for Bill to see Monument Valley.
   c. What he wanted was to visit Monument Valley.
   d. *What he suspected that Bill was saw Monument Valley.
   e. *What he wanted for Bill was to see Monument Valley.

As can be seen, that clauses and the to infinitive behave similarly under pseudo-clefting.
In the framework of LFG, *that* clauses are analyzed as CPs. This means that this test in our context can be used to prove that the *to infinitive* pattern is a CP.

The same is true for Koster & May’s (1982) next argument: they claim that the *to infinitive* pattern has to be an IP, because it can be coordinated with a *that* clause.

(15) John expected to write a novel but that it would be critical disaster. (Koster & May 1982:133)

The next argument is presented by Koster & May (1982) and also Falk (2000), but they draw different conclusions from it. While Koster & May (1982) claim the introduction of the *to infinitive* by *wh*-operators like in (16) to be a sign for the IP-hood of the construction, Falk (2000) concludes that it is a CP. I will follow Falk (2000) in his suggestion as in LFG, *wh*-operators are usually considered to be in the specifier position of CP.

(16) a. Janeway asked how to protect the Ocampa. (Falk 2000:3)
    b. Odo didn’t know who to charge with the crime. (Falk 2000:3)

Falk (2000) proposes additional arguments for the *to infinitive* pattern to be CP. Like CPs, *to infinitives* can function as subjects (17) and arguments to nouns (18), while IPs and VPs cannot.

(17) a. That Kirk defeated a Gorn surprised me. (Falk 2000:2)
    b. To defeat a Gorn would surprise me. (Falk 2000:2)

(18) a. Picard’s intention that the Enterprise would fight the Borg. (Falk 2000:2)
    b. Picard’s intention to fight the Borg. (Falk 2000:3)

Further evidence comes from the fact that VPs cannot function as complements to adjectives whereas CPs, IPs and *to infinitives* can (Falk 2000:3). Thus, *to infinitives* only share the distribution of CPs and should thus be considered CPs.

As Falk (2000) points out, though, this does not immediately lead to the conclusion that *to* is a complementizer as the *to infinitive* pattern could be a CP with an empty complementizer and *to* still being I or V. It is therefore necessary to look at the arguments presented for the category of *to* directly. However, the arguments in earlier
research are not very convincing as most arguments are either theoretically and not empirically motivated or could be questioned on other terms. I will present some of the arguments anyway and then follow Falk’s (2000) suggestion that as there are no convincing arguments for to to be either V or I and no arguments for to not to be C, the easiest solution would be to analyze to as C.

Pullum (1982) suggests a number of arguments in favour of to being a verb. He lists linear order, subcategorization, ellipsis, stress and stranding, negative placement, VP ellipsis and negation, and contraction as arguments for to being a verb. Some of the arguments are grounded in the fact that to behaves like certain verbs in some structures. For example, in the discussion about ellipsis, he argues that to behaves like an auxiliary verb in allowing the following VP to be left out or he argues that to can take what he calls uninflected complements like the verbs make, let, help and the modals. In the discussion about negative placement, it would be easier to consider to a nonfinite verb to form the rule that not can occur either after finite auxiliary verbs or before nonfinite verbs.

Falk (2000) questions this argument as there are other constructions which can be negated by not as well, for example that in sentences like (19). At the same time, though, this is an argument against to being I as not follows inflected verbs.

(19) Not that it matters, but Picard was assimilated by the Borg. (Falk 2000:8)

Falk (2000) also questions Pullum’s (1982) argument about stress and stranding. Pullum (1982) argues that to is resistant to stress and that this is an argument for to being V as words of the category I can be stressed freely. However, Falk (2000) points out that complementizers cannot be stressed either. Thus, this point is again an argument against to being I, but it does not help to decide if to should be analyzed as C or V.

Falk (2000) discusses some other arguments presented in favour of to being V or I by different researchers. However, he dismisses most of them, for example the need for a structural subject position or the carrying of to of a finite feature, as theoretically motivated rather than empirically based claims. He also shows that other arguments presented, for example that the states of affairs expressed by to infinitives are not entailed by the larger sentence (Mittwoch 1990) or the position of adverbials like really or floated quantifiers like all (Mittwoch 1990), do not have anything to do with the
categorization of *to*.

The same is true for the only argument Pullum (1982) gives for *to* not being a complementizer. Pullum (1982) argues that *to*, unlike, for example, *that* or *whether* can be stranded under ellipsis (20) and fronting (21) (all examples from Pullum 1982:190).

(20)  a. It is possible to beat the computer at three-dimensional chess, but it is not easy to Ø.
    b. *It is possible that a computer made an error but it is not likely that Ø.
    c. *It may be true that Spock just beat the computer, but at the moment it is unclear whether Ø.

(21)  a. Proceed, I intent to.
    b. *I can do it, I’m convinced that.
    c. *You can do it, no one knows whether.

As Falk (2000) points out, this has nothing to do with *to* being a complementizer or not. The crucial point in these examples is that only VPs can be freely ellipted. In the examples involving *that* or *whether*, IPs were tried to be ellipted or fronted. Thus, if *to* is analyzed as complementizer and the *to infinitive* as a CP with a VP as complement, this difference can be explained.

To sum up: I have argued that the *to infinitive* pattern behaves like a CP and have shown that there are no valid arguments that *to* should not be a complementizer. Some arguments have been found why *to* should not be I and it was shown that the arguments for *to* being a verb were not convincing enough or could even be used as arguments for *to* being a complementizer as well.

In the next section, I look at *to* in the *to -ing* pattern again and see that the analysis of *to* as a complementizer cannot be applied to this construction. Therefore, *to* in this construction has to be treated as a preposition although there is no semantic difference between *to* in both constructions.
3.4 *to* as preposition

The line of argument of *to* with the infinitive being a complementizer was to show that the *to infinitive* construction was a CP. This does not work for the *to -ing* form.

As was discussed above, the *to infinitive* and other CPs can function as subjects or as arguments to nouns. This is not possible with the *to -ing* form.

(22) a. *To going to Spain was objected.*
    b. *Picard’s intention to fighting the Borg.*

Additionally, the *to -ing* form cannot be the focus of a pseudo-cleft (23a) and cannot be introduced by a *wh-*operator (23b).

(23) a. *What he was looking forward was to going to Spain.*
    b. *He didn’t object whom to joining the club.*

Thus, as the *to -ing* form is not a CP, *to* in this construction cannot be a complementizer. This means that although the meaning of *to* in this construction is far removed from the original meaning of the preposition *to*, it still has to be analyzed as a preposition.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have looked at the different analyses of *to* in the two constructions. I have shown that the difference is not as clear as other researchers (Rudanko 1998, Quirk et al. 1985) propose as most of the traditional tests did not work or could not be applied.

As could be seen by looking at the diachronic development, there is basically no difference in meaning between *to* in the two constructions which leads to the fact that some of the tests proposed for distinguishing between prepositional and infinitival *to* do not work.

I then argued that the infinitival *to* has to be a complementizer as the *to infinitive* is a CP and there are no arguments against *to* being C. Additionally, I have argued that there are no real arguments for *to* being of a different category.

Because the *to -ing* form cannot be a CP, the conclusion was drawn that *to* in this construction cannot be a complementizer and has to be a preposition instead.
4 The *to infinitive* pattern

In this section I will discuss the syntactic and semantic analysis of verbs which allow the *to infinitive* pattern as their complement. From the verbs presented in chapter 2 these are: *decide, agree, consent* and *object* in constructions like:

(24) a. Chris decided to go to Spain.
    b. Liz agreed to work on Wednesday.
    c. Sue consented to marry him.
    d. We object to join this club.

This section is structured as follows: at first, the standard LFG analysis for this construction is revised briefly. Then the semantic properties of the *to infinitive* construction will be considered. This will include looking at the reasons why this construction is not possible with the other verbs under consideration in this study, *admit, confess* and *look forward*.

4.1 Equi verbs and control

English distinguishes between two different *to infinitive* patterns, raising and equi constructions. The examples given in (24) all involve equi constructions, an example of a raising construction is:

(25) David seemed to yawn. (Dalrymple 2001:314)

Although these constructions may seem similar at first glance, there are some major differences between them. Equi verbs, unlike raising verbs, select the controller semantically as well as syntactically (Dalrymple 2001:327). Thus, they are not possible e.g. with the *weather it* or in *there is* constructions.

There are two different types of control relations: functional control, “in which the same argument is both an argument of the matrix verb and the *subj* of the subordinate *open complement* XCOMP” (Dalrymple 2001:314) and anaphoric control. In anaphoric control, the relationship between the controller and the controllee is not functional, that means two grammatical relations are not assigned to a single argument, but rather anaphoric in that the controllee is considered to be a null pronoun (Kroeger
Raising verbs clearly involve functional control while there is no consent as to whether all English equi verbs involve anaphoric control (Dalrymple 2001) or whether some equi verbs actually involve functional control as well (Falk 2001, Bresnan 2001).

Falk (2001) and also Kroeger (2004) propose some tests to distinguish functional from anaphoric control.

Kroeger (2004) argues that as anaphoric control involves a COMP function, an overt subject is possible in an anaphoric but not in a functional control relation which can be seen in (26e) with seem being a typical matrix verb involving functional control.

(26)  a. Mike decided for Chris to go to Spain.
       b. Mike agreed for Liz to work on Wednesday.
       c. Her father consented for Sue to marry him.
       d. Mike objected for them to join the club.
       e. *Mike seemed for them to join the club.

Kroeger (2004) also points out that in anaphoric control, the controllee does not need the controller to be an element of the immediate matrix clause as the controllee is actually a pronoun.

(27)  a. Mike asked his wife to explain to their friends why it was necessary to decide (for him/for her/for them) to go to Spain.
       b. Mike asked his wife to explain to their friends why it was necessary to agree (for him/for her/for them) to work on Wednesday.
       c. Mike asked his wife to explain to their friends why it was necessary to consent (for him/for her/for them) to marry.
       d. Mike asked his wife to explain to their friends why it was necessary to object (for him/for her/for them) to join the club.

Falk (2001) suggests further tests. He points out that in functional control, the controller must be present and has to be a core function, because otherwise the embedded clause would be incomplete as it would lack a subject. This is not the case for anaphoric control as “pronouns need not have antecedents and there is no restriction on the grammatical function of an antecedent of a pronoun” (Falk 2001:142). Thus, pronouns are
not possible in functional control but only in anaphoric control constructions. As they are possible in our examples, this is another sign that all the examples in (24) involve anaphoric control:

(28)  a. It was decided (by Chris) to go to Spain.
    b. It was agreed (by Liz) to work on Wednesdays.
    c. It was consented (by Sue) to marry him.
    d. It was objected (by us) to join the club.

A second test proposed by Falk (2001) involves split antecedents which are only possible in anaphoric control. The following sentences are ambiguous. The first reading, for example for the first sentence, is that Chris will go to Spain. However, there is a second reading which would not be possible in a functional control pattern. This second reading is that Mike and Chris will go to Spain together, that Mike and Liz will work on Wednesday etc. The third example needed to be changed slightly because a verb was needed that allowed two people to take part in the action.

(29)  a. Mike said that Chris decided to go to Spain.
    b. Mike said that Liz agreed to work on Wednesday.
    c. Mike said that Sue consented to get married.
    d. Mike said that they objected to join the club.

This shows that all the verbs under consideration exemplify anaphoric control of the subj of the closed complement comp. To be more precise, they exemplify obligatory anaphoric control as the argument of the matrix clause has to be coreferential with the controlled position in the subordinate clause, except with overt subjects or the split antecedents discussed above. For example in (24a), it is Chris who goes to Spain after he decided to do so. This is not the case in a sentence like

(30) David gestured to follow Chris. (Dalrymple 2001:338)

where it is not clear who needs to follow Chris. This kind of control is called arbitrary anaphoric control.
To sum up, the sentences under consideration all involve equi constructions which are analyzed as obligatory anaphoric control in the LFG framework. *To* is seen as an infinitive marker carrying no meaning of its own but just providing the framework of the embedded sentence. The f-structure for a sentence like (31a) is thus given in (31b)

(31)  a. Chris decided to go to Spain.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED 'decide <SUBJ,COMP>}' \\
\text{SUBJ [PRED 'Chris']} \\
\text{COMP [PRED 'go <SUBJ, OBL_{Goal}>']} \\
\text{OBL_{Goal} [PRED 'to <OBJ>']} \\
\text{OBJ [PRED 'Spain']} \\
\end{array}
\]

For the c-structure of anaphoric control constructions, the discussion of the previous chapter of the position of *to* in the structure tree is needed. I have argued that the *to infinitive* construction is a CP, because it has the same distribution as other typical CPs like, for example, *that* clauses. It was then argued that *to* should be a complementizer as there are no arguments against this and there are no coercive reasons for analyzing *to* as I or V. Thus, analyzing *to* as C leads to the simplest c-structure. This emphasizes the analogy between the *to infinitive* and the *that* clause in sentences like:

(32)  a. Chris decided to go to Spain.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED 'decide <SUBJ,COMP>}' \\
\text{SUBJ [PRED 'Chris']} \\
\text{COMP [PRED 'to <OBJ>']} \\
\text{OBJ [PRED 'Spain']} \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus, I analyze the *to infinitive* as a CP which leads to the following c-structure:
To get a complete picture of the *to infinitive* pattern, it is necessary to look at the construction involving an overt subject like in (34). This will help to explain the different behavior of the *to infinitive* and the *to -ing* construction in the question of
control which will be discussed later.

(34) Chris decided for Tom to go to Spain.

As Falk (2000) points out, _for_ in constructions like (34) has traditionally been treated as a complementizer. However, there is evidence that _for_ can be analyzed as a “preposition Case-marking the subject of the infinitive” (Falk 2000:9) as well. For example, _for_ + _NP_ can be coordinated (35a) while this does not generally work with other complementizers and subject constructions (35b).

(35)  
   a. Chris decided for Tom and for David to go to Spain.  
   b. *Chris decided that Tom and that David should go to Spain.

Additionally, analyzing _for_ as a preposition draws “a connection between English and languages that mark the subjects of infinitives dative” (Falk 2000:9). Thus, the following c-structure is the analysis for the embedded clause in (34).

\[
\text{(36)} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{PP} \quad CP \quad C' \quad P \quad NP \quad C \quad VP \\
\text{for} \quad \text{Tom} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{go to Spain}
\]

### 4.2 The semantics of the _to_ infinitive

The semantics of the _to infinitive_ have been explored by many authors and all findings involve some kind of “future” (Wierzbicka 1988:188) or “potentiality” (Quirk et al. 1972:835) notion of the _to infinitive_. Dixon (1991:220) distinguishes between modal and judgement _to infinitive_ complementation patterns. All the examples above belong to the modal _to infinitive_ pattern for which he notes that a modal _to_ clause “refers to (the potentiality of) the subject’s getting involved into some activity” (Dixon 1991:233). He also states that the modal _to_ constructions are usually close in meaning to a _that_ clause with a modal. This can be seen in (37) although there is a slight semantic difference between the two, more precisely, with the _to infinitive_ construction, the decision is more definite and planned out already.
(37)  a. Chris decided to go to Spain.
       b. Chris decided that he should/would go to Spain.

The different explanations of the to infinitive involving a “future”, “modal” or “poten-
tiality” notion, though, do not account for sentences like

(38)  a. He managed to get free. (Duffley 1992:19)
       b. I forced him to tell the truth. (Duffley 1992:19)

In (38a), the semantics of the matrix verb manage clearly do not allow a “potential-
ity” or “future” reading of the construction. In (38b), force contrasts with the notion
of “potentiality” as well. Duffley (1992:19) suggests two different meanings of the to
infinitive: the first one that the to infinitive “evokes an event as non-realized or yet to
be realized” (Duffley 1992:19), which corresponds to the other explanations above. The
second one refers to the event as actually already realized. He explains this with the
infinitive marker to still having some of the meaning of the preposition left which can
be semantically represented as a path towards a landmark. The two different meanings
of the to infinitive then just differ at the point when the event takes place.

That to should bring some meaning into the to infinitive construction is also discussed
by Smith & Escobedo (2001). They propose a distinction of four different stages of
meaning for the to in the to infinitive which can be seen in the following examples (all
examples taken from Smith & Escobedo 2001:553f):

(39)  a. Jethro went (out) to feed the pigs. (quoted from Langacker 1992)
       b. He does things to annoy his mother.
       c. They want to start a new job.
       d. I forgot to pay the bill.

In the first stage, to is still very close in meaning to the preposition to whereas in the
last stage, the meaning is “far removed from its prototypical path-like sense” (Smith
& Escobedo 2001:554). They list decide and also agree and consent under their third
group of verbs taking to infinitive complementation, which they call verbs of “future-
orientated volition” (Smith & Escobedo 2001:553). With these verbs, to still has some
of its path-like meaning, although this meaning is now just metaphorically directional.

In our context, an explanation is needed not only to account for the possibility of the to infinitive with the verbs decide, agree, consent and object but also to explain why it is not possible with the verbs admit and confess. The question why look forward cannot be used in the to infinitive pattern is concerned with other principles. I will return to it later.

With the exception of Duffley’s analysis, all the above explanations can account for the ungrammaticality of examples like

(40)  a. *Judy confessed to have stolen the money.
    b. *Dave admits to be frightened.

With verbs like confess or admit, there is no future or potentiality notion possible as what the person admits or confesses to has to have happened already. This is clear in (40a) where the imperfect shows that the event, stealing money, has already happened and is clearly over now. It is not so clear in (40b) because Dave can still be frightened when he admits it. The important point here is, though, that Dave needed to start to feel frightened before he could admit it.

As one has seen though, the different explanations did not work for sentences like (38) which led Duffley (1992) to propose his theory. However, his theory cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (40) as there, both landmarks, stealing money and being frightened, are realized already. Therefore, a different analysis is needed.

My proposal is to alter Duffley’s analysis by introducing a different temporal point of reference. Duffley uses the time of the sentences being produced as the time reference. That means that at the time sentence (40a) is produced the event is realized. This is the case in the sentences in (38) as well. If this time is not used as point of reference, but the time of the matrix sentence verb, there is a difference in both sentences. In (38a), there is no temporal difference between the matrix verb and the embedded verb. Manage actually evokes this temporal overlap as the moment he manages is also the moment when he gets free.

With admit and confess, there is a temporal difference between the event of the embedded clause and the matrix clause. Whether the event of the embedded clause
is finished like in (40a) or still going on like in (40b), the important point is that it started before the temporal point of reference of the matrix clause. This means that in (40a), Judy stole the money before she confessed to doing this and in (40b) Dave started to be frightened before he admits to being frightened. Thus, one can say that the *to infinitive* can be used if the event of the embedded clause is yet to be realized or is actually being realized at the time of the main clause.

The problem of *look forward* does seem puzzling at first glance as all the explanations above involved some kind of future or potentiality notion. So *look forward* should fit into the pattern of the *to infinitive*. There is, however, a second notion of the *to infinitive* which has not been discussed so far.

Above, I talked about “events” without actually discussing the implications of this. “Event” refers to an activity or situation in its entity without taking the different notions of the activity or situation into account. Dixon (1991:218), in contrasting the *that* complement and the *-ing* form, suggests that a *that* complement “refers to some activity or state as a single unit, without any reference to its inherent constitution or time duration.” As there is a close semantic relation between *that* clauses and the *to infinitive* construction, the same can be said for the complement of the *to infinitive*. In the examples considered above which were possible with the *to infinitive*, there is no development or change in the events of the embedded clauses. The difference can be seen in sentences like

(41)  a. Chris decided to go to Spain.

        b. Chris is looking forward to going to Spain.

Sentence (41a) treats the embedded clause as a complete unit without paying attention to the details. On the other hand, in (41b), the details of the trip to Spain are important as these details are the reasons why he is looking forward to it.
4.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have offered an analysis for the *to infinitive*. The matrix verbs *decide, agree, consent* and *object* are equi verbs which establish an anaphoric control relation to their embedded clauses. The embedded clause itself has been treated as a CP to account for the similarities between *to infinitives* and *that clauses*.

The possibility of an overt subject with the *to infinitive* in *for...to* constructions has been discussed as well. As *to* is analyzed as a complementizer, *for* in this construction could be analyzed as a preposition marking the subject of the embedded clause.

The semantics of the *to infinitive* has been discussed in the second section of this chapter. It was established that although the *to infinitive* does not have a pure ‘future’ or ‘potentiality’ meaning, it still cannot be used with matrix verbs that denote the fact that the action of the embedded clause started before the action of the matrix clause. This was the reason why the *to infinitive* could not be used with the matrix verbs *admit* or *confess*.

Another property of the *to infinitive* was that it treats events as a whole unit which was the reason why it could not be used with the matrix verb *look forward*. 


5 The to -ing Pattern

The analysis of the to -ing pattern is more controversial as the one of the to infinitive pattern, as it is not clear how the -ing form should be analyzed in this construction. While the infinitive is clearly a verbal form, it is often claimed that the -ing form displays a mixture of verbal and nominal features. There is indeed not even a consent on how to call this form. The -ing form is often also called gerund (e.g. Fanego 2004) or participle (e.g. Dalton-Puffer 1996). Some researchers have now even taken to calling it the “gerund-participle” (Duffley & Fisher) in order to not have to choose between the two names. I chose to call the constructions to -ing as some researchers are reluctant to use gerund as name for this construction because of its “misleading associations with a particular verbal form in Latin” (van der Wurff 1991:364). There is no consent either on what to call the gerund in particular: only the verb in -ing or the whole embedded construction. For example, van der Wurff (1991) distinguishes between the nominal gerund in (42a) and the verbal gerund, which is what he calls constructions as in (42b).

(42) a. the writing of this book (van der Wurff 1991:363)
    b. writing this book (van der Wurff 1991:363)

To get a clear picture of the phenomena in question, I will at first look at the historic development and the properties of the -ing form. It will turn out that there are four subtypes which display differences in their syntactic behavior. I will then briefly revise some previous analyses of the -ing form and then offer an LFG analysis for this construction. I will then continue and consider the semantics of the constructions, especially in contrast to the to infinitive construction already discussed.

5.1 The historic development of the -ing pattern

The -ing form derived from an “abstract noun of action formed by the addition of the suffixes -ung or -ing to a verb stem” in Old English which could “take nominal dependents such as determiners, adjectives or genitive phrases” (Fanego 2004:7). In the Middle English period, -ung died out and at the same time -ing nominals “began to acquire verbal properties” (Fanego 2004:7). These properties include the ability to govern an object as opposed to a genitive phrase as in (43a), or the modification
by adverbs as in (43b). The construction also became able to show tense or voice distinctions (43c) and to be negated by not as opposed to non (43d). They started to take subjects in a non-genitive case (43e), too.

(43) a. We object to joining this club.
   b. We object to immediately joining this club.
   c. We objected to having joined this club.
   d. We object to not joining this club.
   e. We object to him joining this club.

There are a lot of different explanations on why the -ing form started to acquire all these verbal properties again as none of the other nominalized verb forms, for example nouns in -ation or -ness, did this in English or in any other European language. Fanego (2004) lists and discusses some of the factors proposed by other researchers which might have led to the development. These include the merging of the -ing form with the present participle or the morphological productivity of the -ing form. Another factor might have been the co-occurrence of the construction with a genitive phrase not overtly marked as genitive which could have been the case in certain periods of English. Other factors are French influence and the resistance of the infinitive to be used after prepositions. Fanego concludes that most of these factors might have played a role in the acquisition of verbal features of constructions with the -ing form.

However, she sees the development mainly as an instance of reanalysis, “the formulation of a novel set of underlying relationships and rules” (Timberlake 1977:141). According to Harris & Campbell (1995), the only prerequisite to reanalysis is “the possibility of more than one analysis” (Harris & Campbell 1995: 51) for the structure in question. Fanego (2004) shows that this possibility of more than one analysis was given in some of the -ing constructions, for example, where a determiner was not possible or where there was no difference in form between an adverb and an adjective.

It would lead too far away from the current topic to discuss these details. What should be kept in mind, though, is that the -ing pattern developed from a nominalized verb which then acquired certain verbal features again. Until around 1900, it was possible for the -ing form to have mixed properties as in (44b) and (44d) (van der Wurff 1991:367).
(44) a. the writing of this book
   b. the writing this book
   c. writing this book
   d. writing of this book

After 1900, however, the only two possibilities were either with determiner and of clause (44a) or without determiner and direct object as shown in (44c). This coincides with a “sharp rise in the frequency of gerunds” (Fanego 1996) which started in the first decades of the 18th century and, according to Rudanko (1998:18), still continues.

5.2 Properties of the -ing form

I will only consider examples of the verbal gerund construction here, as only this construction is similar to the to infinitive pattern. Thus, I will focus on the verbal gerund construction after to. As throughout history, the gerund appears to have been used commonly after prepositions, this is a reasonable point to focus on. In detail, I will consider the matrix verbs object, confess, admit and look forward in constructions such as

(45) a. Mary objected to playing the piano.
   b. She confessed to telling lies.
   c. The government admits to having influenced the media.
   d. They were looking forward to going to Spain.

In the last section, I discussed the verbal traits of the -ing form. The fact that gerunds can appear in subject and object positions, that they can be coordinated with a nominal phrase and that they can be complements to prepositions has lead many researchers to conclude that the external distribution of gerunds is the same as that of nominal phrases and that therefore, they should be nominal at some level (Hudson 2003). However, Kim (2003) challenges this view by pointing out that constructions involving CPs like that clauses or to infinitives can also occur as subjects (46) and objects (47). Additionally, clauses with wh-words (48) and embedded clauses introduced by whether or if (49) can function as complements of prepositions.
(46)  a. To see is to believe. (Kim 2003:128)
       b. That he arrived very early surprised everyone. (Kim 2003:128)

(47)  a. I like to play tennis. (Kim 2003:128)
       b. No one remembered that he arrived very early. (Kim 2003:128)

(48)  Let me think about what the consequences will be. (Kim 2003:129)

(49)  a. It depends on whether you have the intention to do it or not. (Kim 2003:128)
       b. We are not talking about if they get married but when. (Kim 2003:128)

Kim (2003) does not discuss any further tests to decide on the external category of
erund constructions. However, throughout the literature, many other tests have been
proposed, which I will now continue to test for the hypothesis that verbal gerund
constructions do not have to be nominal at some level but that they can be sentential
as well.

Hudson (2003) lists coordination of the -ing construction with “normal” nominal
phrases as a test. This, however, also works with that clauses which can be coordinated
with NPs just like the -ing form.

(50)  a. Me going to Spain and my decision to do so quickly upset my family.
       b. That I would go to Spain and my decision to do so quickly upset my family.

Bresnan (2001:287ff) proposes some tests to distinguish between what she calls gerundive
and participial VPs where she concludes that the gerundive VP, the -ing form
under consideration in this paper, behaves like a nominal phrase. In the following, I
will examine the constructions in (45) under Bresnan’s tests. I will also check if these
tests work for either that clauses or to infinitives to find out if the results of the tests
really display the nominal character of the -ing form.

The possibility of replacing the gerundial construction in (45) with it at first
 glance seems to show the nominal character of the gerundial construction, but the
replacement works for that clauses or to infinitives as well, which can be seen in (51e)
and (51f) where it replaces the that clause and the to infinitive.

(51)  a. We object to it.
b. She confessed to it.
c. The government admitted to it.
d. They were looking forward to it.
e. I decided that I should go to Spain although it upset my family.
f. I decided to go to Spain although it upset my family.

Bresnan also proposes “tough-movement” (52) and topicalization (53) as tests for the nominal character of verbal gerunds. However, these two tests work with that clauses or to infinitives, too.

(52)  
a. Joining this club is hard for us to object to.
b. Telling lies was hard for her to confess to.
c. Having influenced the media was hard for the government to admit to.
d. Going to Spain was hard for them to look forward to.
e. That I should go to Spain was hard for me to decide.
f. To go to Spain was hard for me to decide.

(53)  
a. Joining this club, we don’t want to object to.
b. Telling lies, she does not want to confess to.
c. Having influenced the media, the government does not want to admit to.
d. Going to Spain, they do not look forward to.
e. That I should go to Spain, I decided.
f. To go to Spain, I decided.

Pseudo-clefting (54) works with all three constructions, the to -ing construction, that clauses and to infinitives. In contrast, clefting (55) seems strange with that clauses.

(54)  
a. What we objected to was joining the club.
b. What she confessed to was telling lies.
c. What the government admitted to was having influenced the media.
d. What they were looking forward to was going to Spain.
e. What I decided was that I should go to Spain.

f. What I decided was to go to Spain.

(55)  
a. It was joining this club that we objected to.

b. It was telling lies that she confessed to.

c. It was having influenced the media that the government admits to.

d. It was going to Spain that they were looking forward to.

e. *It was that I should go to Spain that I decided.

f. It was to go to Spain that I decided.

So far, all the tests proposed did not actually show the nominal character of the verbal gerund construction, but they could also lead to the conclusion that one is dealing with a clausal construction. The possibility of genitive subjects of the embedded clause (56) on the other hand is not possible with either that clauses or to infinitive constructions. Consequently, the fronting of the -ing form in questions when asked for the subject (57) is not possible with these two constructions, either.

(56)  
a. We object to his joining the club.

b. She confessed to their telling lies.

c. The government admits to the president’s trying to influence the media.

d. They looked forward to their parents’ going to Spain.

e. I decided for him/*his to go to Spain.

f. I decided that he/*his should go to Spain.

(57)  
a. Whose joining the club did they object to?

b. Whose telling lies did she confess to?

c. Whose influencing the media did the government admit to?

d. Whose going to Spain were they looking forward to?

Hudson (2003) points out another property verbal gerunds have in common with nominal phrases exclusively. There are some cases where a determiner like no or any is possible with verbal gerunds. This can be used in constructions with main-clause prohibitions (58) or in there is constructions (59).
(58)  a. No playing loud music! (Hudson 2003:581)
b. No eating sweets in lectures! (Hudson 2003:581)

(59)  a. There’s no mistaking that voice. (Hudson 2003:582)
b. There isn’t any telling what they will do. (Hudson 2003:582)

To sum up, the claim that verbal gerunds in general have an external nominal distribution and are ordinary clauses as far as their internal structure is concerned (Hudson 2003:583) has to be altered. In the examples above, only two constructions could be found where the external distribution was similar to a nominal phrase exclusively. This was the case in constructions with a genitive subject and the negative determiners no and any. In the other constructions, the external distribution does not need to be nominal. This means that there are different subclasses of -ing form constructions which have to be considered separately.

5.3 Different subclasses of the -ing form and their properties

A distinction between three different subclasses of verbal gerund constructions, called POSS-ing, ACC-ing and PRO-ing has been proposed by Malouf (2000). POSS-ing constructions are verbal gerunds with a genitive subject (60a) whereas ACC-ing constructions have a subject in accusative case (60b). The PRO-ing constructions (60c) are the constructions I have been dealing with so far. I suggest to establish a fourth subtype, DET-ing, (60d), to accommodate the cases of the verbal gerund with the negative determiners.

(60)  a. We object to his joining the club.
b. We object to him joining the club.
c. We object to joining the club.
d. No joining this club without health insurance!

It will prove useful to group the POSS-ing and DET-ing constructions together as they have the external nominal distribution in common. The case of PRO-ing is controversial in the literature so far with Bresnan (2001) treating it as a subclass of POSS-ing and Malouf (2000:31ff) stating similarities between this construction and ACC-ing.
Thus, I will look at some of the properties that the ACC-ing and POSS-ing constructions do not share and see how the PRO-ing construction fits in.

That the POSS-ing and ACC-ing constructions cannot have the exact same syntactic analysis can be seen from the fact that they cannot be conjoined.

(61) *John’s joining the club and Peter quitting was not a good idea.

As Horn (1975) pointed out (cited in Malouf 2000), the two constructions also behave differently in the triggering of number agreement on the verb in conjoined constructions. While the ACC-ing construction triggers singular number agreement, POSS-ing constructions normally trigger plural number agreement. In this respect, the PRO-ing construction behaves like the ACC-ing construction:

(62) a. Me joining the club and him quitting was / *were not a good idea.
    b. My joining the club and his quitting ?was / were not a good idea.
    c. Joining the club and quitting shortly after was /*were not a good idea.

In these conjoined constructions, the ACC-ing pattern behaves like a clause while the POSS-ing pattern behaves like an NP.

Another distinction between POSS-ing and ACC-ing constructions involves extraction. Malouf (2000) following Horn (1975) suggests that it is possible to extract a complement out of an ACC-ing and PRO-ing construction, but not out of a POSS-ing construction.

(63) a. Which city do you remember him describing? (Malouf 2000:38)
    b. Which city do you remember describing?
    c. *Which city do you remember his describing? (Malouf 2000:38)

Malouf (2000), however, argues that the examples involving coordination and extraction might be ungrammatical due to other reasons in the grammar. This challenges the view that the distinction between ACC-ing as clause-like and POSS-ing as nominal-like is not as clear as these examples suggest. It still states, though, that the PRO-ing construction is similar to the ACC-ing construction. As for the distinction between
ACC-ing and POSS-ing, Malouf (2000) lists further evidence for the phrasal respectively nominal distribution of the two constructions.

He discusses the fronting of the -ing form with wh-subjects under pied piping in restricted relative clauses. While this is possible with POSS-ing constructions, it is not with ACC-ing constructions. This again shows the similarity of the ACC-ing construction with clauses and the POSS-ing construction with NPs.

(64) a. The person whose being late every day Pat didn’t like got promoted anyway. (Malouf 2000:39)
   b. *The person who(m) being late every day Pat didn’t like got promoted anyway. (Malouf 2000:39)

Pied piping with the PRO-ing construction does not work as in the PRO-ing pattern, the subject of the gerund construction is coreferential with the subject of the main clause. In the example above, Pat would be the same as person. Thus, no conclusion can be drawn on how PRO-ing behaves from this argument.

Another difference between the two constructions can be seen in quantifier scope. While a quantified subject of a POSS-ing constructions can have wide scope, it cannot in ACC-ing constructions (Malouf 2000:33). Here again the distribution corresponds to nominal and clausal phrases.

(65) a. Someone talked about every team’s appearing on television.
   \[ \exists x \forall y \text{talk-about’} (x, \text{appear-on-tv’}(y)) \]
   \[ \forall y \exists x \text{talk-about’} (x, \text{appear-on-tv’}(y)) \]
   (Malouf 2000:33)
   b. Someone talked about every team appearing on television.
   \[ \exists x \forall y \text{talk-about’} (x, \text{appear-on-tv’}(y)) \]
   (Malouf 2000:34)

As in the pied piping example above, the test does not work with the PRO-ing construction as the subject of the -ing form is coreferential with the subject of the main clause. Consequently, (66) only has one reading.
(66) Everyone talked about appearing on television.
\[ \forall x \text{ talk-about}'(x, \text{ appear-on-tv}'(x)) \]

Considering all the differences discussed above and the fact that, at least in British English, the \textit{POSS-ing} construction is old-fashioned (Quirk et al. 1985) and very rare with under 10% of all constructions involving the -\textit{ing} form being \textit{POSS-ing} (Biber et al. 1999), a different analysis for the two constructions might be justified. This has not been the case in previous analyses, for example Malouf (2000) claims that “any approach which is unable to give them a uniform analysis will be missing important generalizations” (Malouf 2000:42f). In the following section, I outline some of the previous analyses of these constructions and discuss the problems they display.

**5.4 Previous analyses**

The problems of analyzing the verbal gerund constructions lie in the properties outlined above, the external nominal distribution for the \textit{POSS-ing} and \textit{DET-ing} constructions and their internal verbal structure. Many attempts have been made to find analyses for this problem, not only for gerundial constructions but for mixed categories in general as well. As Bresnan (1997) points out, mixed categories challenge grammar theories in two ways. First, they question phrasal endocentricity as to whether every category has to have a head and second, they raise the problem if morphemes can belong to separate categories in the syntax and then be joined together into a single surface word, thus challenging lexical integrity.

Two different paths have been taken to solve these problems: one solution were theories within the framework of the already established lexical categories of the respective grammar theory. However, they often ran into the two problems mentioned above. The other path was to propose theories introducing a new indeterminate category for constructions with the -\textit{ing} form. In the following, I outline some of the previous analyses and discuss some of the problems of these analyses.

Within a transformational grammar framework, the lexical categories noun, verb, adjective and preposition are established quite firmly throughout a feature system \([\pm \text{N}, \pm \text{V}]\) (Radford 1997:66). In this system, adjectives are considered \([+\text{N},+\text{V}]\), which rules out the only possibility to fit -\textit{ing} forms into the system.
Within LFG, there is also a feature system with two features, *predicative* categories “which cannot stand alone as arguments but require an external subject of predication” (Bresnan 2001:120) and *transitive* categories which “may take an object or direct complement function” (Bresnan 2001:120). In this feature system, the following feature distribution can be assigned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>+predicative</th>
<th>-predicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+transitive</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-transitive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I have shown in the previous section, constructions with the *-ing* form take direct objects and do not need an external subject of predication. In this respect, the *-ing* form would be [-predicative, +transitive] which is already taken on by prepositions. However, some researchers consider adverbs a major lexical category as well, which does not fit into this system either. Thus, the establishment of an additional category would probably be possible but, as will be seen below, not appropriate to the problem.

Within other grammar theories, there are a lot of different approaches to this problem. For example, Blevins (2005) uses a feature system with the features ± N, ± V and ± A in conjunction with the use of underspecified entries. Baker’s (2005) approach is similar to the LFG system as he claims that the “distinctive property of verbs is that they license a specifier” and that nouns “bear a referential index in the syntax” (Baker 2005:2). He then concludes that the *-ing* form is a “purely nominal projection that exceptionally dominates a purely verbal projection” (Baker 2005:7).

Some of the approaches to analyzing the *-ing* form as a new indeterminate category use a multiple inheritance hierarchy of categories (Malouf 2000, Chung et al. 2002, Hudson 2003). There are some differences between these proposals in placing the *-ing* form construction under either nouns and verbs on the one hand (Hudson 2003) or under nouns and relational categories, which, for example, also contain verbs and adjectives, on the other (Malouf 2000).

Bresnan (1997) lists two potential problems with what she calls indeterminate category projection theories. The first one is that in most cases the syntactic category of the
The form in question is morphologically clear. This is not the case with the -ing form as -ing can be used to form either a noun (68a) or an adjective (68b).

(68)  
   a. the singing of the song
   b. the singing star

A second problem is “that phrasal coherence constrains the mixing of categories” (Bresnan 1997:4). This means that an indeterminate or underdeterminate analysis does not pay attention to the fact that the -ing constructions, more precisely the POSS-ing and DET-ing constructions, are verbal up to a certain stage and then have an external nominal distribution.

Theories which take the established categories for granted usually either assume no head or a shared head for the -ing construction. Approaches with no head were the very first proposals, for example (69) which is modeled on Jackendoff’s (1977) theory, where the -ing “lowers onto the verb via some variation of Affix Hopping” (Malouf 2000), but they clearly violate both integrity and endocentricity principles.

(69)

To avoid this problem, it was suggested that either ing (e.g. Baker 1985, Abney 1987) or the whole -ing form (e.g. Pullum 1991, Lapointe 1993) should be the head of the construction. The first kind of theory builds on morphological derivation in syntax and therefore violates the principle. The analyses with the whole -ing form as head on the other hand violate the endocentricity principle.
Within the LFG framework, different articles (Bresnan 1997, Bresnan 2001, Bresnan & Mugane 2006) have been written to offer an analysis for the -ing form. As these articles basically put forward the same idea on how to analyze the construction, I only present Bresnan’s (2001) analysis in detail.

Bresnan (2001) calls the -ing constructions I was dealing with so far gerundive VPs (70a) and contrasts them with what she calls participial VPs (70b).

(70)   a. Susan discussed **visiting Fred**. (Bresnan 2001:287)
   
   b. Susan kept **visiting Fred**. (Bresnan 2001: 287)

She uses these two different constructions to explain the difference between functional and anaphoric control. She claims that the gerundive VP has an external nominal distribution and that the *POSS-ing* construction is the basic form of it.

She proposes to analyze the *POSS-ing* form as a VP embedded inside a DP. This way, she creates a structure for the verbal gerund construction (71a) which is similar to the nominal gerund construction in (71b).

(71)   a. Roseanne’s clownishly singing the national anthem.
   
   b. Roseanne’s clownish singing of the national anthem.

(72)   a. 

```
   DP
      NP  D'  VP
         Roseanne's
          AdvP  VP
             clownishly  V  DP
                singing  the national anthem
```

42
Embedding the VP inside a DP rather than an NP avoids some problems previous analyses have had. First, a DP is a functional category and it is generally more accepted that functional categories do not need to have a head.

Second, if the VP is embedded inside an NP, it should be possible for the -ing form to be modified by adjectives or nominal negative prefixes (Bresnan 2001). Thus, (73b) would be a coherent analysis for the ungrammatical sentence in (73a).

(73)  

a. *Roseanne’s clownish singing the national anthem.

b. However, constructions like (73a) were once possible so that an analysis of the -ing form should at least try to incorporate the problem.

The genitive NP Roseanne’s is analyzed as being in the specifier position of DP, thus exploiting again the structural similarities between (71a) and (71b), and, as Bresnan (2001) points out and as was discussed in the previous section, there is also evidence
from quantifier scope that the genitive NP in the *POSS-ing* construction has the same properties as possessive NPs of nouns.

The theoretical background of how to embed the VP inside a DP is discussed by Bresnan (2001) afterwards. She uses what Bresnan & Mugane (2006) call the ‘CAT’ function to do this.

\[(74)\ V\ (\text{gerundive}) \Rightarrow n \varepsilon \text{CAT}((\text{PRED} \uparrow))\]

The ‘CAT’ function ensures that there is a constraint that a nominal category \( n \) is “among the c-structure categories of the nodes in the inverse image of the \( \phi \) mapping from the f-structure containing the PRED” (Bresnan & Mugane 2006:227). This means that the -ing form *singing*, for example, shares the categorization of the verb *sing*, but also has to occur in a nominal f-structure. Thus, the -ing form has the lexical entry in (75).

\[(75)\ \text{singing}: V:\ ‘singing<(<\uparrow\text{SUBJ})(\uparrow\text{OBJ})>_v>_n’ \ (\text{Bresnan & Mugane 2006:230})\]

As the POSS function is restricted to the f-structure of nominal categories and thus cannot be linked to the subject of the -ing form directly, a lexical rule is needed to identify POSS with the subject of the -ing form.

\[(76)\ \textbf{Possessor Subject of Gerundive Verbs}\]
\[V\ (\text{gerundive}) \Rightarrow (\uparrow\text{POSS}) = (\uparrow\text{SUBJ})\]

If there is no overt subject, a null subject is introduced into this structure. This means that in Bresnan’s (2001) analysis, the *PRO-ing* construction is a subtype of the *POSS-ing* construction. The *DET-ing* construction could be analyzed in the same way.

The problem lies in incorporating the *ACC-ing* construction into the theory. As Bresnan (2001) claims that all -ing constructions have an external nominal distribution, she needs a DP which incorporates a sentence because the accusative subject cannot be in the specifier position of the DP. Thus, she suggests a c-structure as in (77b) for the embedded clause in (77a)
(77) a. Mary objected to him joining the club.

b. 

```
  DP
     |
     S
      |
     NP      VP
       ↓ ↓
     him  joining the club
```

To account for the subject having accusative case instead of genitive case, Bresnan (2001) has to alter the lexical rule in (76) to incorporate the alternative with the accusative as well.

(78) **Subject of Gerundive Verbs**

\[
V \text{ (gerundive)} \Rightarrow (↑\text{poss}) = (↑\text{subj} \lor (↑\text{subj case}) = \text{acc}
\]

The problem with this account is that as was shown in section 5.3, the *PRO-ing* construction has much more in common with the *ACC-ing* than with the *POSS-ing* construction. This problem is not a major one as the *PRO-ing* construction could be analyzed in the scheme of the *ACC-ing* construction as well.

However, as was discussed in section 5.3, the *ACC-ing* construction behaves much more like a clause in coordination, pied-piping and quantifier scope. If this clause is embedded inside a DP, though, it is not clear why the DP should still behave like a clause. It might be that embedding S inside a DP is unnecessary. As this embedding also results in an exocentric phrase structure again, ways of how this could be avoided should be discussed.

Thus, an analysis is needed that avoids the problems presented above. The analysis should also treat the *ACC-ing* and *PRO-ing* constructions alike. As was shown in section two and three of this chapter, these two constructions do not need to be analyzed as having an external nominal distribution.
5.5 The syntactic analysis of the to -ing pattern

As was discussed in chapter 5.2 and 5.3, the ACC-ing and PRO-ing forms do not have to have a nominal structure as their distribution can be clausal as well. As there is no finite verb form contained, I assume that the embedded clause is a VP which is headed by the -ing form.

The problem thus remains of how to include the subject of the embedded clause into the structure as the “normal” position of the subject in (spec, IP) is not available. There, the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Koopman & Sportiche 1991, Carnie 2002) can help. According to this hypothesis, subjects are generated in the specifier position of the VP. With this hypothesis, the claim that theta roles can be assigned within the VP can be upheld.

Thus, the embedded clauses of the sentences in (79) has the c-structures in (80)

(79)  a. We consent to joining the club.
    b. We consent to him joining the club.

(80)  a. 

```
    VP
   /\  
  /   \ 
V    DP
    ↙   ↙
  joining the club
```

b. 

```
    VP
   /\  
  /   \ 
NP V' DP
   ↙   ↘
  him joining the club
```

I follow Bresnan’s (2001) proposal in that the ACC-ing form is a verbal form which requires a subject in the accusative case and possibly an object. Thus, the lexical entry for the -ing form in the ACC-ing construction is given in (81).

(81) `joining`: V

```
(↑PRED)= 'joining <(↑SUBJ)(↑OBJ)>'
(↑SUBJ CASE)=ACC
```
As discussed in Chapter 3, *to* cannot be analyzed as a complementizer in this case. It needs to be a preposition then as this is the only possibility left. Normally, VPs cannot be complements of prepositions. However, as was shown before, IPs can be complements of prepositions so it should not be impossible for other clausal phrases to function as complements of prepositions as well.

Thus, with VP as complement to P, the f- and c-structures of sentence (79b) are given in (82) and (83).

\[
(82) \begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED} \quad \text{''CONSENT} \quad \text{<SUBJ, OBL>}' \\
\text{SUBJ} \quad \left[ \text{PRED} \quad \text{''WE'} \right]
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED} \quad \text{''TO} \quad \text{<COMP>}' \\
\text{OBL} \quad \text{COMP}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED} \quad \text{''JOINING} \quad \text{<SUBJ,OBJ>}' \\
\text{SUBJ} \quad \left[ \text{PRED} \quad \text{''HIM'} \right]
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{OBJ} \quad \left[ \text{PRED} \quad \text{''CLUB'} \right]
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DEF} \quad +
\end{array}\]
A PRO-ing construction like in (79a) exemplifies anaphoric control and will thus have a very similar f-structure. The only difference will be that the subject of the embedded clause has the predicate 'pro'.
The problem thus remains of how to analyze the *POSS-ing* and *DET-ing* constructions. As was shown above, the external distribution was that of a nominal phrase with a sentential internal structure. The analysis I propose will follow Bresnan’s suggestions with the ‘CAT’ function.

Thus, we analyze the *POSS-ing* construction as a DP with an embedded VP inside with the possessive NP in the specifier position of the DP. This means that the subject has to be identified with *POSS* like in (76). The preposition *to* in this case takes a nominal complement as is typically the case. The analysis of a sentence like (84a) is thus given in (84b) and (c).

(84) a. We consent to his joining the club.

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED} & \left('CONSENT <\text{SUBJ, OBL}>\right) \\
\text{SUBJ} & \left[\text{PRED} \ '\text{WE}' \right] \\
 & \left[\text{PRED} \ '\text{TO <OBJ>}' \right] \\
\text{OBL} & \left[\text{PRED} \ '\text{JOINING <SUBJ,OBJ>}' \right] \\
 & \left[\text{SUBJ} \left[\text{PRED} \ '\text{HIS}' \right] \right] \\
 & \left[\text{OBJ} \left[\text{PRED} \ '\text{CLUB}' \right] \right] \\
 & \left[\text{DEF} \ '+' \right] \\
\end{array}
\]
DET-ing constructions like the ones discussed above can be analyzed the same way. However, the possible determiners in the specifier position of the DP have to be limited to no, any and possessive pronouns. A sentence like (85a) will then have the
representation in (84b).

(85)  a. No playing football in the school yard!

b. 

```
  DP
     /\   \\
    D   VP
    /\   /\   \\
   No V'  PP
     /\    /\   \\
    V  NP in the schoolyard
```

Analyzing the POSS-ing and ACC-ing constructions in different ways can also account for the second problem Hudson (2003) notes. He points out that there is at least one verb which allows only the -ing form and not a noun as its complement: prevent from. Prevent from only occurs in the PRO-ing construction like in sentence (86), as the subject of the embedded clause has to be coreferential with the object of the matrix clause and therefore is not repeated again. Thus, as the PRO-ing construction is analyzed as a VP in our analysis, this is an explanation why prevent from cannot take nouns as complements.

(86) They prevented him from (*him/*his) finishing it.

On the other hand, the analysis of the POSS-ing construction as a VP which is embedded inside a DP can account for some now obsolete forms of the -ing construction which showed mixed nominal and verbal properties without a distinction of external distribution and internal structure. Some examples are given in (87) (examples taken from van der Wurff 1991)

(87)  a. 1759-67 L.Sterne, Tristr. Shandy (Everym.) 245

  the purchasing this tract of ground

b. 1711 Budgell, Spectator no. 197

  the managing an argument handsomely


  the due placing them adapts the rhyme to it
In these examples, there are no restrictions on possible determiners and they also display a mixture of adjectival and adverbal modifiers. (87a) has the determiner *the*, thus an external nominal distribution, but a direct object which shows that the construction needs to be a VP at some level as well. This can be analyzed with the proposed analysis as follows:

(87a) *the* the VP  

(87b) and (87c) also have the determiner *the* but while (87b) is additionally modified by an adverbial phrase, in (87c) the *-ing* form is modified by an adjective. While the proposed analysis can be applied directly to the example with the adverbial modifier (87b), it needs to be altered for the example with the adjective (87c). The f-structures for (87b) is given in (89)

(87b) *the* the VP  

As (87c) involves an adjectival modifier, an NP is needed at some level. Thus, one has to assume that at least at some stage of English, it was possible for a VP to be embedded inside an NP.
To sum up, my analysis differs from most accounts in that it does not attempt to give a uniform analysis for the \textit{POSS-ing} and \textit{ACC-ing} constructions. This is justified by the fact that the constructions behave quite differently and because the \textit{POSS-ing} construction is old-fashioned, at least in British English. Thus, while the \textit{POSS-ing} construction really displays a mixture of nominal and verbal features and therefore forms a problem for the syntactic analysis, the \textit{ACC-ing} construction is completely clausal and can thus be analyzed as a VP. This conclusion was not only drawn because the \textit{ACC-ing} construction could be both, nominal or clausal, but because there is clear evidence from quantifier scope or pied piping that the \textit{ACC-ing} construction behaves like a clause.

One can thus see a development from the very early -\textit{ing} form which was purely nominal over stages of mixed categories which allowed different combinations of verbal and nominal properties to pure clauses. These stages need different analyses as they differ significantly in their functions. The differences in the semantics of the constructions as well as the difference between the \textit{to infinitive} and these constructions will be analyzed in the following section.
5.6 The semantics of the -ing form

In this section, I first look at the semantic analysis of the -ing form and then contrast it with the infinitive. The meaning of to in these constructions will be discussed as well as some minor semantic differences between the different -ing forms, POSS-ing, ACC-ing and PRO-ing.

The formal equality of the -ing form in the constructions under consideration and the present progressive has lead some researchers (Wierzbicka 1988, Langacker 1991, Smith & Escobedo) to analyze the -ing form as evoking some kind of “sameness of time” or at least a temporal overlap of some kind. Considering that the -ing form can express temporal priority (91a), contemporaneity (91b) or posterity (91c), these analyses do not seem to approach the problem from the right angle.

(91) a. She confessed to having stolen the money.
    b. They admit to influencing the media.
    c. They were looking forward to going to Spain.

Thus, the temporal relation between the matrix verb and the embedded sentence is not due to the -ing form but is evoked by the lexical meaning of the matrix verb (Duffley 2000).

Duffley (2000) suggests a less strong, but more applicable definition for the meaning of the -ing form as “evoking the interiority of its event holistically” (Duffley 2000: 223f). Dixon (1991) takes a similar stance in claiming that the complement with the -ing form “refers to an activity or state as extended in time, perhaps noting the way in which it unfolds” (Dixon 1991: 218).

This definition of the meaning of the -ing form can be best tested in comparing the to -ing constructions with the to infinitive constructions where possible in sentences like

(92) a. Liz agreed to work on Wednesday.
    b. Liz agreed to working on Wednesday.

(93) a. Andrew consented to pay the bill.
    b. Andrew consented to paying the bill.
a. Mary objected to play the piano.

b. Mary objected to playing the piano.

Rudanko (1996), commenting on the examples with *agree* and *confess*, describes the infinitive constructions as being more direct. In his opinion, the -ing forms “suggest more distance between the matrix subject and matrix verb, on the one hand, and the lower predicate, on the other” (Rudanko 1996:62). This can be seen from the fact that (92b) and (93b) can be paraphrased with “the idea of” as in *Liz agreed to the idea of working on Wednesday* or *Andrew consented to the idea of paying the bill*. The paraphrasing with “the idea of” shows that the interior of the event is important, that the “way in which it unfolds” (Dixon 1991: 218) is significant. The corresponding examples with the infinitive on the other hand imply a more straightforward prospect of the events of the embedded clauses.

Duffley & Fisher (2005) point out that in sentences like (92b) and (93b), it is not as clear as in the corresponding examples involving the infinitive that PRO is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause. This fits into our analysis as the to -ing is a special case of the ACC-ing construction with a null pronoun in subject position. With the to infinitive on the other hand, an overt subject is not as common and also needs to be specially marked by for. Thus, the to infinitive and the to -ing construction differ in that they do not display the exact same control relations.

Rudanko (1996) does not comment on constructions with object as he considers the infinitive with object as old-fashioned and obsolete. However, Duffley & Fisher (2005) note that examples with object with the infinitive can still be found. While object with the -ing form has the meaning of “express[ing] (...) dislike or disapproval” (Collins Dictionary), they claim that in sentences with the infinitive, object has the approximate meaning of refuse. This is also in line with the above definition as with the -ing form, object can be read as having the meaning of the process of deciding to refuse while with the infinitive, it is the more straightforward meaning of just refusing.

Dixon (1991) notes that while constructions with the infinitive are best paraphrased with a that clause involving should, in the case of the -ing form, should is not possible. The that clause corresponding to the -ing form, however, lacks the focus on the interiority of the action. Thus, the sentences in (95) are only similar in meaning to the sentences in (92), (93) and (94).
(95) a. She confessed that she had stolen money.
b. They admit that they influence the media.
c. Liz agreed that she would work on Wednesday.

The meaning of to in the constructions above can be best analyzed when the minimal pair in (96) is considered.

(96) a. The government admits to influencing the media.
b. The government admits influencing the media.

(96a) gives the impression that the government has been accused of influencing the media and had to admit it, maybe because the indices were too strong to deny it. Generally speaking, it seems as if the matter of the embedded clause has been brought up by someone else. This is also true in the constructions with the other matrix verbs. For example, in (92), the person was probably accused of stealing money before she confessed it or in (93), someone proposed for Liz to work on Wednesday before she agreed to it. In (96b) on the other hand, the matter could have been undiscussed so far and the government itself might have brought it up. Thus, to does not have its typical function expressing goal or purpose in this case. It is rather used to indicate what the matrix subject confesses/admits/agrees... to.

The impossibility of the infinitive with admit, confess and look forward could be explained through the semantics of the infinitive. However, this is not so clear with the -ing form as the -ing form does not represent a singular, narrow meaning. In this paragraph, an explanation is offered for the impossibility of the -ing form with decide and the preference of agree and consent to take the infinitive as complement over the -ing form.

Verbs like agree or consent prefer the to infinitive as their complement as it is usually not the interiority of the action of the embedded clause which is important. In the phrase I agreed to this, of course I agree to all the points under discussion, but it is more the entity of the controversy that I agree to. This might have set the preference of the infinitive with these verbs and, in becoming the usual construction, it might have been used even if the -ing form would have been more appropriate.

decide is impossible with the to -ing form as decide is not used with the preposition to. Instead, decide is used with the preposition on, which is also a “preposition
of path and orientation” (Lindstromberg 1998:53). The difference between *to* and *on* is that the preposition *to* only denotes a movement towards a landmark, but this landmark does not need to be reached. On the other hand, with *on*, the landmark is reached (Lingstromberg 1998). The difference in meaning can be exemplified with *agree* which takes both prepositions, *to* and *on* in sentences like

(97)  a. They agreed to her marrying him.
     b. They agreed on her marrying him.

In (97b), the meaning of *agree* is almost this of *decide* in that they decide that she should marry him. In (97a) on the other hand, they were only asked about their opinion on the subject of marriage and they consented to the idea. That the landmark “marriage” will be reached is much more certain in (97b). This, then, explains why *decide* is used with *on* instead of *to* as *decide* already denotes that the landmark should be reached.

As different syntactic analyses have been applied to the *POSS-ing* and *ACC-ing* constructions, a difference in meaning is expected as well. Quirk et al. (1985) consider the construction with genitive subject as a formal alternative to the *ACC-ing* construction whereas Huddleston & Pullum (2002) treat the *POSS-ing* as the normal case and the *ACC-ing* version as an informal alternative. Thus, they agree that the *POSS-ing* construction is generally more formal than the *ACC-ing* construction. This fits into our analysis of the *ACC-ing* construction as clause-like and the *POSS-ing* construction as nominal-like as often, nominalizations are considered to be more formal than embedded clauses.

They also agree on the fact that the use of the genitive subject is more likely if the subject of the embedded clause is a pronoun and if the embedded clause is in subject position. This fits into our theory of distinguishing between clausal and nominal phrases for the *ACC-ing* and *POSS-ing* constructions as a clause may be the subject of a sentence, but it is not very common. Thus, it is much more likely to have the construction involving the nominal phrase in subject position.

In other cases, the *ACC-ing* construction is the only one possible. This is the case if there is no genitive form of the subject of the embedded clause like in *there, this, all of us or both of them* or in cases with a very complicated or long subject (Huddleston &
Quirk et al. (1985:1194) consider examples like (98) rare, even awkward or stilted.

(98)  
   a. I dislike his driving my car.
   b. We look forward to your becoming our neighbour.
   c. ?Peter stopped the vehicle’s crashing into the fence.
   d. ?I look forward to its getting warmer in spring.

Quirk et al. (1985:1065) also discuss another semantic difference apart from style between the POSS-ing and ACC-ing construction. It is claimed that a nominal -ing clause, meaning an -ing form without internal verbal structure, for example without direct objects like in (99a), can have a factive or action reading, with a slight bias for the mode interpretation.

(99)  
   a. They liked our singing. (Quirk et al. 1985:1065)
   b. They liked us singing (while they worked). (Quirk et al. 1985:1065)
   c. They liked our singing folk songs. (Quirk et al. 1985:1065)

In contrast, (99b) does not allow a mode but only the action interpretation which again justifies our interpretation of the ACC-ing construction as a clause. Quirk et al. (1985) claim that in sentences like (99c), through adding the direct object, the mode interpretation is lost and only the action reading is left. In my opinion, though, (99c) can still be considered a more general statement than (99b). Thus, (99c) still carries some of the mode interpretation which also justifies the interpretation as a nominal phrase of the POSS-ing construction.
5.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have looked at the *to-ing* form in detail. The properties of the construction and its diachronic development have been considered. From this I concluded that there are different subtypes of the *-ing* form, which were called *ACC-ing*, *PRO-ing*, *POSS-ing* and *DET-ing*.

From these subtypes, only the *POSS-ing* and *DET-ing* forms display a mixture of verbal and nominal properties which are problematic for a linguistic analysis. It was shown that the other two constructions shared the properties of other clausal complement constructions and thus did not need a nominal analysis. This means that the different subtypes have been analyzed quite differently. This is justified through their different syntactic behavior, although they might look very similar at first glance. The analysis of the *POSS-ing* and *DET-ing* constructions could also be used to analyze constructions which are now ungrammatical but were once possible.

After the syntactic analysis was established, the semantics of the *to-ing* form was explored. It was established that the use of the *-ing* form draws attention to the interiority of the action of the embedded clause but that, in contrast to the *to infinitive*, the *-ing* form can be used with every temporal point of reference. This could explain why the *to-ing* form is rarely used with *agree* or *consent*. It was argued that the reason why the *to-ing* form is impossible with *decide* is due to the preposition *to*. Finally, the difference in style and meaning between the *POSS-ing* and *ACC-ing* construction were discussed as well.
6 Applying the linguistic results to the outcome of the questionnaire

The analyses of the to infinitive and the to -ing form of the previous chapters can now help to explain the problems German native speakers have with these two constructions. As could be seen in chapter 2, German native speakers tend to believe the to infinitive to be more grammatical than the to -ing form, even if the to infinitive is ungrammatical with the matrix verb. On the other hand, the to -ing form is rated as ungrammatical even if the matrix verb requires a complement with the to -ing form. In this chapter, the results of the previous chapters are used to explain the problems German native speakers have and some techniques will be proposed on how to teach these two constructions in school.

6.1 Differences between English and German

There are three main linguistic reasons why German native speakers have problems with these constructions. The first reason is that in German, the infinitive does not have a “future” or “potentiality” meaning for itself. The fact that German does not have a sentential complement corresponding to the English to -ing form is another reason. The German gerund is a purely nominalized verb that cannot take subjects or direct objects. The last reason is that, at least for the matrix verbs in question in this paper, other prepositions than zu, ‘to’ are needed with the gerund.

I will now look at the translations of the sentences which have been considered so far and discuss the three problems in detail.

The to infinitive could not be used with the matrix verbs admit and confess because with the English infinitive, the action of the embedded clause could not have started before the temporal point of reference of the main clause. This was called the “future” or “potentiality” meaning of the English infinitive by other researchers. However, the German infinitive is not restricted in its temporal references. This can be seen in sentences (100b) and (101b) which are translations of (100a) and (101a). In the English examples, the infinitive would not be possible. However, the German sentences involve infinitives. They are at the same time the most straightforward translations which correspond to the English sentences in style and structure as they
involve sentential complements as well.

(100)  

a. She confesses to telling lies.

b. Sie gesteht, Lügen zu erzählen.

c. Sie gesteht das Erzählen von Lügen.

(101)  

a. The government admitted to having influenced the media.

b. Die Regierung gestand, die Medien beeinflusst zu haben.

c. Die Regierung gestand das Beeinflussen der Medien.

(100c) and (101c) are translations involving the German gerund which corresponds to the English nominal -ing form. In (100c), the gerund cannot have a direct object as the German gerund is a noun. It therefore needs the preposition von, ‘of’, to form a complement of the gerund. The English sentence which corresponds to (100c) in style and structure would thus be She confesses to the telling of lies.

In (101c), the special temporal reference is lost as the German gerund, being a pure nominal phrase, cannot reflect the imperfect of the English example. Additionally, although the translation is grammatical, it sounds slightly awkward. This is also due to the gerund Beinflussen as there is a much more common expression, Beeinflussung, in German, which would fit much better into the sentence structure.

This is even clearer in example (102c) which would not be produced by a German native speaker. Instead, die Fahrt nach Spanien would be used. On the other hand, the translation with the infinitive (102b) is perfectly fine.

(102)  

a. They were looking forward to going to Spain.

b. Sie freuten sich, nach Spanien zu fahren.

c. ?Sie freuten sich auf das Fahren nach Spanien.

The same problem is displayed by (103) with the additional problem of how the direct object should be included. If the gerund das Heiraten is used, the complement mit ihm, ‘with him’, sounds very awkward. With the more common noun Heirat, though, Sie willigte in die Heirat mit ihm ein sounds fine. The problem with replacing the gerund with other similar nouns is that such nouns exist in English as well. For example, if translated back into English, Sue consented to the marriage with him is a grammatical sentence as well.
(103)  a. Sue consented to marrying him.
       b. Sue willigte ein, ihn zu heiraten.
       c. *Sue willigte in das (*ihn) Heiraten ein.

Another problem arises in accommodating the subjects of the embedded clauses. It is possible to have a genitive subject just like in the English POSS-ing constructions although it might sound slightly awkward like in (104c). In this case, the infinitive is not possible as with the German infinitive, the subject of the embedded clause is controlled by the subject of the main clause. Therefore, the only possibility to include the subject properly is in a dass, ‘that’, clause like (104d).

(104)  a. She confessed to his telling lies.
       b. *Sie gab zu, er/sein Lügen zu erzählen.
       c. ?Sie gab sein Erzählen von Lügen zu.
       d. Sie gab zu, dass er Lügen erzählt.

A similar problem is displayed in (105) where the meaning of (105a) is best reflected in (105b), an infinitive clause with a modal would. This meaning cannot be reflected in constructions with the gerund. Thus, while (105c) is a grammatical German sentence, it does not reflect the control relation as in this case, Mary objects to the playing of the piano in general.

(105)  a. Mary objected to playing the piano.
       b. Mary wendete ein, nicht Klavier spielen zu wollen.
       c. Mary hatte Einwände gegen das/ihr Klavierspielen.

While there was no preposition corresponding to to in (100) and (101), the other sentences all involved a preposition. However, it was not zu which corresponds to the English to as it is a preposition and infinitive marker as well. The German matrix verbs all required other prepositions like auf, in, gegen in constructions such as sich freuen auf, ‘looking forward to’, einwilligen in, ‘consent to’, or Einwände haben gegen, ‘object to’. Among the examples discussed in this paper, sich bereit erklären, ‘agree’, is the only matrix verb which is used with zu with the gerund.
Zum derived from zu dem, ‘to the’, and thus (106c) is a grammatical sentence and corresponds to the English original in structure. However, it is still seldom used and German native speakers would probably prefer the infinitive construction in (106b).

To sum up, The German gerund is not used as often as the English -ing form. This is probably due to the fact that the German gerund is not a sentential complement but a purely nominal one. Thus, it competes with many other nouns which are often more commonly used.

From this data it seems that the German preposition zu with the gerund is not as common as the English to in constructions with the -ing form. Thus, German native speakers are not aware of the similarities of to and zu as, in traditional terms, infinitive markers and prepositions.

The German infinitive does not have the same notion of “future” or “potentiality” meaning as the English one. With the German infinitive, embedded clauses which happened before the time reference of the matrix clause are possible. This means that in almost every meaning the infinitive is possible in German sentences. This is probably why the German test persons rated the constructions with the infinitive usually as grammatical although the constructions in English were clearly ungrammatical.

6.2 Implications for the Classroom

The results of the previous chapter suggest some measures for teaching English as a foreign language in German schools. For the students to understand the -ing form and use it correctly, different problems have to be addressed.

The first step will be to raise an awareness of the syntactic and semantic structure of the to infinitive construction. to in these constructions should not be called infinitive marker as this might lead to confusions. Instead, the structural similarities between to infinitive constructions and, for example, that clauses should be discussed
and thus concluded that to is a complementizer like that. As the German infinitive does not have a special temporal reference, it should be made clear that the English infinitive has one. The students should understand that in English, the infinitive can only be used if an event is still to be realized or in the process of being realized. It cannot be used if the event has started before the time reference of the matrix clause. This then explains why the to infinitive is not possible with verbs like admit or confess.

After having established the to infinitive, the to -ing form can be considered. The need to have this construction evolves from the fact that the to infinitive is used only in a “future” or “potentiality” context. Thus, a more neutral construction is needed. The to -ing form can then be introduced as a possibility to reflect all temporal references as long as the interiority of an action is the focus of the embedded clause. Thus, the two constructions are considered to be quite similar with the only difference being the meaning of the infinitive on the one hand and of the -ing form on the other hand.

In this context it should also be made clear that there is a difference between the English -ing form and the German gerund. The students should be aware of the fact that the German gerund is a purely nominal construction while the English -ing form is sentential and can therefore take direct objects or be modified by adverbs. To explain the historic development of the -ing form might go too far but if there was time, it would certainly help the students to understand the -ing construction better.

The different possibilities of overt subjects should be taught after both constructions are understood and accepted by the students. The detailed semantic differences would probably confuse the students but it would make sense to at least state that with the infinitive, a for to construction is needed and that with the to -ing form, an accusative or genitive subject is possible but that the genitive subject is, at least in British English, old-fashioned.
7 Conclusion

This paper was concerned with the *to infinitive* and *to -ing* form and the problems German native speakers have in distinguishing the two.

The results of a questionnaire about the two different constructions showed that German students, both at school and at university, strongly prefer the *to infinitive* and tend to rate it as grammatical even if it is not possible, for example, as complements of the matrix verbs *admit, confess* or *look forward*. On the other hand, the students rated the *-ing* form as ungrammatical in most cases.

To be able to explain these results, I looked at the syntactic and semantic analysis of the two constructions. As a first step, the different analyses of *to* as preposition on the one hand and as complementizer on the other needed to be explored. This difference was not very obvious as there is no semantic difference between *to* in the two constructions and it was not clear how *to* with the *infinitive* should be analyzed. After establishing that *to* needs to be a complementizer in this construction, I analyzed *to* with the *-ing* form as a preposition as the whole *to -ing* construction cannot be a complementizer phrase.

After having established the analysis of *to*, the syntactic analysis of the *to infinitive* construction was then quite uncontroversial. Thus, the standard LFG analysis of an equi verb involving anaphoric control was presented. The semantic analysis could then explain why the *to infinitive* is not possible with certain matrix verbs. As the infinitive can only be used to refer to an event as not yet realized or just about to be realized, it cannot be used with matrix verbs like *admit* or *confess* where the event of the embedded clause has to have at least started before the temporal reference of the matrix clause.

To be able to analyze the *to -ing* form, it was necessary to look at the historic development and the different properties of the *-ing* form. It is often claimed that the *-ing* form has an external nominal distribution and an internal verbal one. This claim could only be justified for two subclasses of the *-ing* form, which were called *POSS-ing* and *DET-ing*. Two other subclasses, *ACC-ing* and *PRO-ing*, could share the external distribution of clauses and actually behaved clause-like and not nominal-like in some
tests. Thus, two different analyses for the two sets of subclasses have been proposed.

The semantics of the -ing form as drawing the attention to the interiority of an event together with the semantics of to could then explain why the infinitive is preferred with matrix verbs like agree and consent and why the to -ing form is not possible with decide.

The linguistic analyses were then used to explain the problems of German native speakers in the questionnaire. The problems were due to the different semantics of the English and German infinitive as the German infinitive can be used with all temporal references, and the different syntax of the German gerund and the English -ing form. While the English -ing form is a sentential complement, the German gerund is a purely nominal one and is therefore differently and not so often used as the English -ing form.

At the end of the paper, some suggestions have been made on how to apply the results of this study to teach German students these two constructions.
A The Questionnaire

This is a test done in preparation for my thesis in English linguistics. Please indicate by ticking the box if you think the sentences below are grammatical, ungrammatical or somewhere in between, for example, if you are not sure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>grammatical</th>
<th>ungrammatical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroline said that she won’t go out this evening.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris decided to go to Spain.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The news on television yesterday were boring.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone who said that they do not vote is not a responsible part of society.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was too tired to think straightly.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz agreed to work on Wednesday.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland cattle is famous for being small, sturdy and hairy.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She confessed to telling lies about her friend.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lifted Jack the box with the tools for repairing the roof</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parliament agreed to revising the bill.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the weather had been fine on the weekend, I would have gone to the swimming pool.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems like they really started to like each other.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack couldn’t give a break to his sister who always thought that he did not like her.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John smiled and waved to her shy.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew consented to paying the bill.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah told me that she was going to marry John.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry lost some books of us.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary objected to playing the piano for her friend’s wedding.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My parents won’t allow me to go out if I don’t do my work.

Judy confessed to have stolen the money.

I do not like people who’s dogs bark all the time.

The house’s windows are painted in a shiny green colour.

Rachel read the book from cover to cover over the weekend.

The community decided to building a playground.

The woman in the green hat’s husband is snoring.

Sue consented to marry him.

The ice-hockey team of Germany have never played well.

Dave admits to be frightened.

If I don’t get this job, I would have to move.

The printing press was an invention of Gutenberg’s.

The pupils are looking forward to going to Spain.

We did not tell anybody that the party is postponed.

The government admitted to having influenced the media.

There will be a problem if I could have done it differently.

We object to join this club because it is too expensive.

You are looking forward to get a pay raise.

The student gave to the teacher the folder with the maths class tests.

Working hard gave Liz, the very tall blond girl from my office, a really bad headache.

There seems like there is a really bad problem with the boiler.

This is the golf club which I hit a burglar trying to enter the house with.

The United States is a country many people want to visit.
Thank you for participating in this test. To be able to make full use of the data I still need some more information:

1. Are you: male □ female □

2. Is your first language German? yes □ no □

3. How long have you been learning English at school for? ________________
   And at university? ________________

4. Have you lived in an English speaking country for more than 2 months?
   yes □ no □
   If yes, where and for how long? ________________
## B  Questionnaire Results

### B.1 University students’ results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>grammatical</th>
<th>ungrammatical</th>
<th>Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>decide to do</em></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>decide to doing</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>agree to do</em></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>agree to doing</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>consent to do</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>consent to doing</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>object to do</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>object to doing</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>admit to do</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>admit to doing</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>confess to do</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>confess to doing</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>look forward to do</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>look forward to doing</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.2 Results from final year of school students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>grammatical</th>
<th>ungrammatical</th>
<th>Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decide to do</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decide to doing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree to do</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree to doing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent to do</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent to doing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object to do</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object to doing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admit to do</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admit to doing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confess to do</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confess to doing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look forward to do</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look forward to doing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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