

Control constructions in British and American English

Abhinan WONGKITTIPORN¹, Nirada CHITRAKARA²

This study investigates different forms of control constructions in British and American English to study their occurrence and their involvement with syntactic and semantic interpretations. The data is from the sports column of The Daily Telegraph for British English and USA Today for American English. Previous studies found that the appearances of most control constructions are determined by semantic interpretation and language variation. Most studies, however, focus only on specific verbs, positions, or types of control constructions. This study investigates all instances of control constructions. As expected, to-infinitives appear the most often, followed by -ing, and bare infinitives in both data sets. The higher frequency of bare infinitives in the American data suggested colonial lag. The appearances of -ing and to- infinitives in both data sets result mainly from semantic interpretations concerning temporality and imaginative and factive events. The high frequency of to- infinitives in both data sets is believed to be due to cognitive reasons, namely, markedness, economy principle, and genre specification.

Keywords: *control constructions, infinitive clauses, syntactic functions, semantic interpretations, markedness, language variation*

1. Introduction

Control constructions in this study refer to infinitive clauses with *to-* infinitive, *-ing* infinitive, and bare infinitive appearing in various positions in a sentence as in (1-5), where the underlined clauses are control constructions:

- (1) Sam likes to wash/washing dishes.
- (2) Washing dishes is relaxing.
- (3) Sam helped Mike wash/to wash the dishes.
- (4) Sam kept on washing the dishes.
- (5) Sam was talking to his friend while washing the dishes.

¹ Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, abhinanwong@gmail.com

² Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, nirada.s@chula.com

Syntactically, a control construction is analyzed to have the null subject, PRO, usually “controlled” by an *antecedent*, an argument in the matrix clause, except (7) where the interpretation of PRO is arbitrary (Radford 2009 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). The analysis of the null subjects is illustrated in (6-10).

- (6) Sam_i likes PRO_i to wash/washing dishes.
 (7) PRO washing dishes is relaxing.
 (8) Sam_i helped Mike PRO_i wash/to wash the dishes.
 (9) Sam_i kept on PRO_i washing the dishes.
 (10) Sam_i was talking to his friend while PRO_i was washing the dishes.

Not all infinitive clauses are control constructions. *To*- infinitive clauses also appear in raising and passive constructions, as in (11), Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) constructions, as in (12), and *for*- phrase construction, as in (13).

- (11) Mike seems/was said to be good at cooking.
 (12) Mike considered Jack to be good at cooking.
 (13) Mike wanted for Jack to cook.

Example (11) shows the raising and passive constructions, where the subject is assumed to be relocated from the lower clause, while (12) is an ECM construction, where *Jack* in (12) is analyzed as both the object of the main clause and the subject of the lower clause. In (13), *John* is the overt subject of the infinitive clause. While *to*- infinitives are predictable in the above non-control clauses, the same cannot be said for control clauses. Only the appearance of the *-ing* clauses is predictable as complements of prepositional phrases (PP) and adverbial phrases (AdvP), as in (9) and (10), respectively. The appearance of the others, however, does not depend solely on their syntactic positions, as in the examples below (14).

<i>Subjects</i>	a) <u>Fixing cars</u> is what Joe likes. b) <u>To make mistakes</u> is what he hates.
<i>VP complements</i>	c) Joe likes <u>fixing/to fix cars</u> . d) John also enjoys <u>fixing cars</u> .
<i>Adjuncts</i>	e) Joe helped John <u>fix/to fix his car</u> . f) John hit his head <u>fixing his car</u> . g) John is the person <u>to fix the car/fixing the car</u> .

Table 1. Different forms of control constructions that appear in the same positions.

Item (14) demonstrates that more than one form of control constructions appear in the above positions; nevertheless, the *to*- infinitive tends to appear more often than

others. Although the use of control constructions is widely discussed in a number of textbooks, clarifications of their occurrences are still required. Swan (2016 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) explains that both forms in (14c) are acceptable because they are complements of the verb *like*. He also says that bare infinitive clauses, as in (14e), only appear as complements of specific verbs, such as *help*, *make*, *let*, and *watch*. The reason for the requirement of the *-ing* form after *enjoy*, as in (14d), however, has not been elaborated (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

Some studies have observed control constructions in VP complement and adjunct positions (Vosberg 2009, Heyvaert and Cuyckens 2010, and Rudanko 2012 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). Vosberg (2009 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) found that in British English, the use of the verb *decline+ing* infinitive, as in (15), is decreasing because it is shifting towards *decline+to-* infinitive.

(15) ...while Cornbury, equaling the Frenchman in politeness, courteously **declined** accepting his weapon...

(Vosberg 2009, 217)

The productivity of *to-* infinitive expands to adjunct clauses of the VP *commit oneself*, as in (16-17).

(16) The task force recommended that the Government **commit itself to keep** HOP going through the end of century at first-year levels or higher.

(17) The U.S., he insisted, **had committed itself to joining him in resuming the war.**

(Rudanko 2012, 270)

Rudanko (2012 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) discovered that *to-* infinitive clause as the adjunct of the VP *commit oneself*, as in (16), is more productive than the use of the preposition *to* with *-ing* infinitive clauses, as in (17). He observed that *commit oneself* with *to-* infinitive clauses is likely to be used with a non-obligatory context which is identified by the matrix verb *recommend*, as in (16) (Rudanko 2012). Conversely, the use of *commit oneself* with the preposition *to* with *-ing* infinitive clauses mostly occurs with an obligatory context, as indicated by the matrix verb *insist*, as in (17). Rudanko also, however, found that *to-* infinitives were less productive in adjunct clauses of the adjective *accustomed* between the periods of 1940 and 1950, as in (18).

(18) Hollywood, **accustomed to making the manager a dummy figure and further** controlling play property.

(19) Not alone were bank clearings missing from important indices by which businesses are **accustomed to gauge the state of business.**

(Rudanko 2010, 11)

Rudanko (2010) states that it is more frequent for *accustomed* to be used with the preposition *to* with the *-ing* infinitive clause. *-ing* infinitives usually express habits, as in the complement of the verb *enjoy*. *To-* infinitive clauses are likely to be used in cases of topicalization and relativization, as in (19) (Rudanko 2010). Rudanko, however, fails to elaborate “topicalization and relativization” because *accustomed* in both (18) and (19) can be considered parts of relativization.

The productivity of *to-* infinitive above agrees with the findings in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara (2017), who, from their British data, confirm that *to-* infinitives appear the most frequently, followed by *-ing* infinitives and bare infinitives respectively.

Despite the low frequency of the *-ing* infinitive, its semantic function is no less significant than that of the *to-* infinitive. Rudanko (1989 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) believes that the selection of a form of control construction as VP complements partly depends on the positive and negative implications of the head verb. Rudanko (1989) stated that a positive volitional head of a complement, such as *like* in (20), and a negative volitional head, such as *dislike* in (21), tend to designate different forms of control constructions.

(20) They like to watch TV.

(21) They dislike watching TV.

The head verbs that present positive intentions, such as *hope* and *want*, usually appear with *to-* infinitives, whereas the head verbs that present negative intentions, such as *avoid* and *postpone*, usually appear with *-ing* infinitives (Morita 2012 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). Rudanko’s (1989) analysis could explain some instances of control constructions, but not all of them because positive verbs, such as *enjoy*, select *-ing* infinitive clauses, while *like*, *love*, and *prefer* can also select *-ing* clauses as their complements (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

Additionally, *-ing* clauses are understood to imply past experience (Wherrity 2001 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017), as demonstrated in (22).

(22) I like working here.

(Wherrity 2001, 5)

In (22), the subject *I* has the experience of *working here* and while *I* is working here, *I* also likes it. This use of an *-ing* clause as a complement of the verb *like* is, therefore, interpreted as experience (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

The different forms of control constructions are also seen as expressing temporality. A number of previous studies focus on the temporal implication of VP

complements. Many scholars (Verspoor 1996, Duffley 2000, Wherrity 2001, Wang 2014, Wurmbbrand 2014 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) believe that the temporal implication of *-ing* clauses as VP complements parallel matrix events, whereas *to-* infinitive clauses indicate a (future) sequence of events.

- (23) I enjoyed playing tennis with Mary.
 (24) Ahead was pure blackness; I tried closing my eyes...
 (25) He tried to close them, but the eyelids...
 (26) He managed to open the window.

(Duffley 2000, 221-224)

The *-ing* infinitives in (23-24) have the sameness of time with the matrix events (Duffley 2000 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). On the contrary, the events of *to-* infinitives in (25-26) are interpreted as subsequent events (Duffley 2000). The *to-* clauses with the verb *try* in (27), however, are interpreted differently by Wurmbbrand (2014 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

- (27) Yesterday, John tried to leave.

(Wurmbbrand 2014, 408)

The *to-* infinitive clause in (27), occurring with the verb *tried*, is believed to be coincidental. Wurmbbrand (2014) argued that the subsequent interpretation of *to-* infinitives as VP complements depends on the matrix events. When *to-* infinitives occur with certain matrix verbs, such as *try* and *manage*, episodic (future) interpretation is impossible since the matrix events and the events of control constructions coexist (Wurmbbrand 2014). Wurmbbrand uses the term *simultaneous infinitives* when a control construction cannot be interpreted as having future implication as illustrated in (28) (Wurmbbrand 2014). The future interpretation of a control construction is represented by *irrealis future infinitives* (Wurmbbrand 2014), for example, the *to-* infinitive which co-occurs with verbs *decide* and *plan*, as in (28).

- (28) Yesterday, John decided to leave.

(Wurmbbrand 2014, 408)

Despite having the past tense, the verb *leave*, as in (28), is analyzed as being episodic representing the event not yet happening at the time of utterance. Wurmbbrand (2014) concludes that when the events in non-finite clauses occur at the same time as matrix events, *-ing* infinitives seem to appear as VP complements; however, when the events in non-finite clauses occur as future events, *to-* infinitives tend to appear.

Wurmbrand (2014), however, also expresses the idiosyncrasy of the correlation between temporality and the form of VP complement control constructions. She states that not all actions indicated in the *to*- infinitive clauses imply future; likewise, not all of those indicated in the *-ing* VP complement clauses have temporal simultaneity with the events in the matrix clauses. Wurmbrand's statement is supported by Duffley and Arseneau (2012 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) who agree that the *-ing* clauses as VP complements can be interpreted as being either subsequent or prior events, depending upon the meaning of verbs in the matrix clauses (Duffley and Arseneau 2012) as presented in examples (29) and (30).

- (29) Lucy has lost an eye, lost her father and now she faces losing her dearest friends.
- (30) Please adhere to these parking rules so that you do not jeopardize having your vehicle towed at your expense!

(Duffley and Arseneau 2012, 41-46)

The *-ing* infinitive as in (29) and (30) is interpreted as a future event implied by the matrix verbs. The above events can, however, be analyzed in such a way that the *-ing* infinitive still represents facts that are possible to happen as opposed to the *irrealis* events represented by *to*- infinitive.

The findings on the temporality of *to*- and *-ing* infinitives in the studies above, agree with the Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara (2017) study of control constructions in British English. Their data also show that the events represented with *to*- infinitives are mostly future or *irrealis* events, while the ones with *-ing* infinitives, are simultaneous or factual events.

Bare infinitives, as in *John helped Tom wash the car*, are interpreted as expressing an event simultaneous with the matrix event (Park 2002). Some scholars see them as part of spoken language (Mair 2009, Lohmann 2011, McEnery & Hardie 2012), while Callies (2013) states that bare infinitives are productive in certain text types, such as academic texts. Nevertheless, Trudgill (1999) and Hundt (2009) discovered that they are archaic forms whose usage has been dwindling.

With regard to the productivity of *to*- infinitives, Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara (2017) concluded that it is due its being an unmarked form. Its rare appearance in the subject position is likely due to the fact that the *-ing* infinitive is a one-word form similar to a DP (Conrad 1982, Fonteyn 2016).

The studies above provide useful background information for the analysis of control constructions in this study. They explain the different semantic interpretations of each form of control constructions. However, only certain syntactic positions of certain forms of control constructions were studied, while the

predictable ones are rarely discussed. Only Wongkittporn and Chitrakara (2017) studied all positions of control constructions. Moreover, not many studies were found to compare the use of control constructions across English language variations.

To fill the gap in the above research, this study not only investigates all forms of control constructions at all syntactic positions, but also intends to uncover the differences between the appearance of control constructions in British and American English. It aims to present an in-depth analysis concerning the occurrences of control constructions and how they differ across variations.

2. Data collection

The data representing British and American English are from *The Daily Telegraph* and *USA Today*. Both data sets date from February 14 to 20, 2015. Each comprises 50,000 words. The selection of the newspapers was based on their readership and politically unbiased content, whereas the selection of sports news was based on their high readership (a nationwide sample of adult data available from the PEW Research Center for the People and the Press 2004 as cited in Knoblock-Westercich and Alter 2007).

The control constructions extracted were categorized according to their syntactic functions: subjects and complements of VP, PP, and AdvP, as illustrated in Table 2.

Syntactic functions	Examples
Subjects	(31) <u>Playing with sticks and stones</u> has always been part of Afghan boyhood...
VP complements	(32) We have all enjoyed <u>watching one-day cricket</u> .
Adjuncts ³	(33) He was painfully unlucky <u>not to reach his hundred</u> . (34) The pressure <u>to return as good as new</u> has been exacerbated by doubts over his professionalism... (35) She has lost confidence <u>batting against quick bowlers</u>
AdvP and PP complements	(36) ...the normal rules of superstition when <u>watching TV sport</u> are not applicable...

³ An adjunct is not required syntactically. Two types of adjuncts are included: a *non-obligatory adjunct* which provides additional information and an *obligatory adjunct* which is required to satisfy Grice's *Maxim of quantity* (Cinque 2004, Goldberg and Ackerman 2001).

Syntactic functions	Examples
	(37) ...they had "won the league" after <u>knocking the South Londoners...</u>

Table 2. The syntactic functions of control constructions with examples from *The Daily Telegraph*

Control constructions which are subjects precede and agree with the following elements whether they be auxiliaries, modals, or matrix verbs (Radford 2009), as in (31). The control constructions that are VP complements follow transitive verbs (Crystal 2012) as in (32). Control constructions as adjuncts, as in (33-35), modify any sentential elements. They represent additional information which is generally not required grammatically (Dowty 2000 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). Finally, control constructions can also appear as complements of AdvP or PP as in (36) and (37). These two phrases are grouped together because of their overlapping functions of adverbs and prepositions in heading modifiers. The extraction process is demonstrated as follows:

- (38) Hodgson took time to praise the club's achievements [**ADJUNCT**] in this year's competition insisting Phil Parkinson's side deserved "enormous credit for (39) knocking out Chelsea and Sunderland." [**PP COMPLEMENT**] Although it is not a glamorous reward for their convincing win over Sunderland, the League One club will now feel they have a wonderful chance of (40) reaching the semi-finals [**PP COMPLEMENT**], which would mean a trip to Wembley next month for their supporters. Reading, though, are much improved under new manager Steve Clarke and having eased their relegation concerns, The Royals will also have high hopes of (41) reaching the semi-final [**PP COMPLEMENT**]. The other two ties are derby affairs, with the battle of Lancashire taking place at Anfield between Liverpool and Blackburn Rovers. Liverpool manager Brendan Rodgers will have been pleased (42) to avoid both Manchester United [**ADJUNCT**] and Arsenal who, on paper, are the two strongest teams left in the competition.

The Daily Telegraph

Michele is obviously the commander-in-chief, and (43) we look forward to doing some good things," [**PP COMPLEMENT**] James said on Saturday. James also said (44) he plans to play an important role [**VP COMPLEMENT**] in (45) helping [**PP COMPLEMENT**] (46) determine [**VP COMPLEMENT**] how the league distributes a massive amount of television money to players...

USA Today

The paragraphs above contain nine tokens of control constructions in different positions in sentences: two adjuncts in (38) and (42), five PP complements in (39-40), (43), and (45) and two VP complements as in (44) and (46). The control constructions obtained were categorized according to their syntactic positions. The following section presents the findings with the data from *The Daily Telegraph* and *USA Today*.

3. Findings and discussion

The quantitative findings are shown in Table 3.

Varieties	<i>to-</i>	<i>-ing</i>	bare	Total number of tokens
British	402 (73.22%)	135 (24.59%)	12 (2.19%)	549
American	463 (65.12%)	225 (31.65%)	23 (3.23%)	711

Table 3. The frequencies and percentages of control constructions

With the data of 50,000 words in each set, 549 tokens were extracted from the British data and 711 from the American data. It is interesting to see that control constructions appear more often in the American data than the British. The total use of *to-* and *-ing* infinitives in both data sets is considerably higher than bare infinitives, which were found more in the American data (3.23%) than in the British data (2.19%). As for the higher frequency control constructions, the appearance of *to-* infinitives is higher in the British data (73.22%) than the American data (65.12%), while the appearance of *-ing* infinitives in the American data (31.65%) is higher than the British data (24.59%). The discussion below compares the appearances of control constructions according to their syntactic positions.

Positions	Varieties	<i>to-</i>	<i>-ing</i>	bare
Subject	British	1 (0.18%)	8 (1.45%)	0 (0.00%)
	American	0 (0.00%)	11 (1.55%)	0 (0.00%)
VP complement	British	125 (22.76%)	5 (0.91%)	11 (2.00%)
	American	135 (18.99%)	11 (1.55%)	8 (1.12%)
Adjuncts	British	276 (50.27%)	17 (3.10%)	1 (0.19%)
	American	328 (46.13%)	52 (7.32%)	15 (2.11%)
PP and AdvP complements	British	0 (0.00%)	105 (19.13%)	0 (0.00%)
	American	0 (0.00%)	151 (21.24%)	0 (0.00%)

Table 4. The frequencies of control constructions in different positions

Table 4 shows that *to*- infinitives dominate the areas of VP complements and adjuncts in both data sets, whereas, *-ing* infinitives, subject, and PP complement positions. Bare infinitives appear only in VP complement and adjunct positions with the higher percentage in the American data than the British data. The two positions are also where all forms appear in both data sets, with *to*- infinitives having the highest frequency and *-ing* infinitives appearing in all positions. A higher frequency of *-ing* infinitives is found in the American data than in the British data. The *-ing* infinitives systematically occupy the PP complements.

Despite the extensive appearance of control constructions in VP complement and adjunct positions, the discussion below starts with the minorities: subjects and PP complements, then moves on to AdvP and VP complements and adjuncts.

3.1. Subjects

Despite the claim by Swan (2016) that both *to*- and *-ing* infinitives can appear as a sentence subject, only one instance of *to*- infinitive in the subject position from the British data appears, as in (47), while none appears in the American data.

- (47) To win from being 10-0 behind so quickly and with umpteen injuries makes it as good a victory as against the All Blacks 2012.

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

The frequent occurrence of *-ing* infinitive clauses as subjects can be due to its DP-like form (Conrad 1982, Fonteyn 2016), as shown in (48-51).

- (48) Cramming two matches into an hour does not leave a lot of room for anything.

- (49) Playing with sticks and stones has always been part of Afghan boyhood...

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

- (50) Helping military members is still one of Tillman's passions...

- (51) Playing in Sunday's showcase should come naturally for the four Atlanta Hawks selected.

(*USA Today*)

In addition to the DP-like form, the *-ing* infinitive clause, traditionally called *gerund*, is generally defined as sharing the function with a noun (Park 2001). It is, thus, reasonable for the form to appear in the above DP positions.

3.2. *-ing* infinitives as PP and AdvP complements

The DP-like form of *-ing* infinitives also applies to its function as the complement of a preposition, as in the examples below.

- (52) They focus on making the best of my ability. (*The Daily Telegraph*)
 (53) And every week, we look forward to going to work and we look forward to who we work with. (*USA Today*)

Rustenburg (1874) states that *-ing* infinitives as complements of the prepositions in English were first used with a preposition in Middle English (ME), as shown in the underlined phrases in (54-55).

- (54) We speken of ... and ter after of herrunge (Ibid. as cited in Rustenberg 1874, 9)
 Woe spoken of ... and earth after of waring.
 'Woe was spoken of...and earth after the war.'
 (55) Hwat vuel beo icumen of totinge (Ibid. as cited in Rustenberg 1874, 9)
 What vow is come of observing
 What promise to God has come out of observing
 (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017)

The underlined ME phrases are interpreted as prepositions with *-ing* complements. The form of preposition + *-ing* infinitive is claimed to be influenced by the contact situation between English and French since the ME period (Rustenberg 1874 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). The occurrence of *-ing* infinitives in the position of PP complements is rooted in the similarity between the French *gérondif* which comprises preposition *en* + V.-*ant* and the English preposition *in* + V. *-ing* (Rustenberg 1874), as demonstrated below.

- (56) Il fait un devoir en écoutant de la musique.
 'He does homework while listening to the music'.
 (57) En faisant le ménage, il est tombé.
 'While doing the housework, he fell'.
 (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017)

Rustenberg (1874), however, did not mention AdvP complements as in *when/while running, my shins hurt*. It could be assumed that such appearance of *-ing* infinitives is also from French as in the examples (56-57) which show that French *en-* is directly translated into English *while*. Nevertheless, the *-ing* infinitive following adverbs *when* and *while* can also be semantically analyzed as having simultaneous reading as discussed earlier (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

3.3. VP complement and adjunct positions

The VP complement and adjunct positions are where the majority and all forms of control construction appear. As in previous studies, the occurrences of most control constructions in these positions are analyzed as following their semantic interpretations. *To-* infinitives indicate subsequent events which have not yet happened at the time of speaking (Wierzbicka 1998, Duffley 2003, Wurmbrand 2014, Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) as shown in (58-61).

(58) I am very focused on making the best of my ability. Everyone is aiming to get to that No. 1 spot.

(59) Tim Sherwood has instantly displayed his ruthless streak by acting as Ashley Westwood as he prepares to begin a new era at Aston Villa.

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

(60) ...Jeff Gordon decides to retire and people are saying...

(61) James also said he plans to play an important role.

(*USA Today*)

To- infinitives in the VP complements in (58-61) denote a sequence (future) in relation to the meaning of the matrix verbs, such as *aim*, *prepare*, *plan*, and *decide*.

In relation to events not yet happening, *to-* infinitives also refer to imagined events (Wierzbicka 1998). The *to-* infinitive referring to an unreal situation is used often with matrix verbs in *desiderative domains*, referring to expressions of wants and desires (Crystal 2013), such as *want*, *would like*, and *hope*, as in (62-65).

(62) ...so now you even want to win it more.

(63) I would like to be in the Champions League next year with Southampton.

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

(64) Suh wants to be the highest-paid defensive player in the NFL.

(65) That's a source of immense pride for the three, who McReynolds said would hope to be viewed as the John Madden...

(*USA Today*)

To- infinitive complements, as in (62-65), are interpreted as being unreal events as they are the controllers' expectations or anticipation communicated by different degrees of verbs in desiderative domains.

It is assumed that such future interpretation of *to-* infinitives also expands to purpose clauses as in (66-70).

(66) ...we need someone to play boundary shots...

(67) Afghanistan needs tours abroad to play against English counties...

(68) He tried twice to get onto the train but was pushed backwards...

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

(69) Baylor heads to Lubbock to face Texas Tech on Tuesday night.

(70) He already was making plans to play new tournaments.

(*USA Today*)

Purpose clauses, which are adjuncts, are sequential because actions, as stated by *to-* infinitives, have not yet been accomplished. These clauses can be introduced by not only *to-* infinitives, but also *so as* or *in order*, such as (71-72).

(71) ...was he rushed back by Monaco **in order/so as** to be sold...

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

(72) "**In order** to better the situation, education was always the best vehicle.

(*USA Today*)

In addition to the purpose clauses, other *to-* infinitive adjuncts also share similar interpretations.

(73) He was painfully unlucky not to reach his hundred.

(74) What a rubbish way to get out.

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

(75) The club has averaged 91 wins over the last three seasons and reached the postseason twice but failed to reach the World Series.

(76) Davis wants to put everything behind him but will have to miss opening day as a reminder to complete his suspension.

(*USA Today*)

The events expressed by *to-* infinitives above can be interpreted as not yet happening or irrealis events.

In the case of *like* with *to-/-ing* infinitive as complements, *like + to-* infinitive refers to habits (De Smet and Cuyckens 2007 cited in Kaleta 2014) as in (77-80).

(77) The Tour and its sponsors and TV partner (Sky) like to unveil the captain live on air with a drum-roll.

(78) Wales know how they like to play and they aren't...

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

(79) "Kids like to play games. I think they'd rather play than practice."

(80) ...that Manziel liked to party.

(USA Today)

In (77), showing the captain live on air is regularly broadcasted by Sky. In (78), Wales can predict how the other team will play as it is the other team's usual style of playing. *To play games* in (79) is children's habit in general. In (80), it is Manziel's habit to enjoy partying. On the contrary, the use of *do not like + -ing* infinitives is interpreted as repugnance (Wierzbicka, 1988). *I don't like playing golf* is a softer version of *I detest playing golf*. However, *like + -ing* infinitive was not found in the British data, but was found in the American data as in (81-84).

(81) I don't like playing golf.

(82) ... who doesn't like starring in the world's most famous arena?

(83) He didn't like being Mr. Irrelevant.

(84) I don't even like considering myself a celebrity.

(USA Today)

The above are all the *like + -ing* instances from the American data. They confirm Wierzbicka's (1988) analysis on the appearance of *do not like* with *-ing* infinitives above.

In the case of *verb + to-/-ing* infinitive, Beukema and Verspoor (1991) state that when more than one form can appear as a complement of the same verb, the concept of *synonym* applies. The word *like* is a synonym of *enjoy* and *want*. Being a synonym can lead to analogy when *like* with the meaning of *enjoy* is followed by an *-ing* infinitive control complement like *enjoy*, as in *Sam likes/enjoys having cake in the morning*, while *like* with the meaning of *want* is followed by a *to-* infinitive, as in *Sam likes/wants to have cake in the morning* (Beukema and Verspoor 1991, 151). Temporality still holds as *like* referring to *enjoy* is followed by a simultaneous event or past action expressed by the *-ing* infinitive, while *like* referring to *want* is followed by a future event expressed via the *to-* infinitive.

While most appearances of *to-* infinitives as VP complements are sequential, most appearances of *-ing* infinitives as VP complements are interpreted as referring to factive and simultaneous events (Fanego 2004) as in complements of the verbs *relish*, *enjoy*, and *like*, as follows:

(85) I would tell him to go away over the next few days, hit some balls and rediscover that free spirit we have all **enjoyed** watching one-day cricket.

(86) A predator of Falcao's ilk would **relish** playing alongside Fellaini in a 'big man, little man' combination.

(The Daily Telegraph)

- (87) The Thunder need these kinds of efforts from their point guard to **avoid** saying the same about that playoff bid.
- (88) Jenkins doesn't **allow** talking at the pre-game meals; the commotion irked the head coach, Alcutt said.

(USA Today)

The *-ing* infinitive control constructions as underlined in (85-88) can be interpreted as having temporal overlaps with the matrix verbs. The examples of *-ing* infinitives as VP complements in the American data above in (87-88) also confirm Ide and Macleod's (2001) analysis that *-ing* infinitive VP complements appear in unfavorable expressions.

Similarly, *-ing* infinitives in adjunct positions are likely to imply facts and simultaneity.

- (89) I am on the bench, being mentally in the game, trying to see what I would be doing...
- (90) it's hard finding time to work...
- (91) ...he has lost confidence batting against quick bowlers...

(The Daily Telegraph)

- (92) They are three points out of the final wild-card spot in the Western Conference, having won three consecutive games.
- (93) It's a matter of our guys being healthy.
- (94) the driver should be suspended, beginning with Sunday's season-opener, the Daytona 500.

(USA Today)

Bare infinitives, as in (95-101), are also seen as expressing simultaneity (Park 2002). The same interpretation could be possible for the bare infinitives in the examples below. Only the verb *help* appears with bare infinitive in the British data, while *help*, *make*, *let*, and *see* were found with bare infinitives in the American data.

- (95) Roy Hodgson helped make the draw with the aid of the son of former Preston...
- (96) It all helps develop our strength-in-depth...
- (97) Pelle was farmed out to Sampdoria, helping them regain promotion to Serie A

(The Daily Telegraph)

- (98) The Orioles have placed an innings limit on him that they hope will help him reach the majors this season.

- (99) You just give him the ball and let him go.
 (100) Klay would get a spot that he made his nephew promise to go to church with him Sunday morning..
 (101) So to see him [leave], to see the situation where it's at right now, I know what he wants...

(USA Today)

The claim that bare infinitives have a simultaneity interpretation, however, becomes debatable when *help* and *let* were also found to co-occur with *to*-infinitives as in (102-103) below.

- (102) ...world class players at one time have helped to move us through the rankings..
 (103) ...we don't let anyone to break our relationship...

(The Daily Telegraph)

Notice that *help* and *let* in the American data have bare infinitive complements, whereas *help* in the British data have both bare and *to*- infinitives as complements, and *let*, which is in only one instance in the British data, appear with the *to*-infinitive.

The discussion above shows that each control form is likely to appear according to its semantic interpretation. The examples (102-103) above, however, lead to the doubt if a specific form is an interpretation as it seems that *to*-infinitives appear productively.

3.4. Productivity of *to*- infinitive

When each form acquires its own semantic interpretation, that is, *to*- infinitives mainly representing future or irrealis events, and *-ing* and, perhaps, bare infinitives, factive or simultaneous events, a question can be raised regarding the especially high frequency of *to*- infinitives. This is despite the fact that its occurrence avoids prepositional and adverbial complements and is less likely to be in the subject position, while *-ing* infinitives do not have such limitations. The high visibility of *to*-infinitives as control constructions could come the fact that they are context specific and can fulfill the Economy Principle.

Regarding the context, the data limitation of sports news can lead to the assumption that the findings are data driven. Liška (2010 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) discovered that the appearance of *to*- infinitives, as in (104) and (108), are genre (context) specific. They were found in sports news more often than other sources (Liška 2010).

- (104) Sexton was knocked out trying to tackle the 19-stone centre.
 (105) We have moved forward after the disappointment of last week to try to get back in the league and try to win against Tottenham...
 (106) To win from being 10-0 behind so quickly and with umpteen injuries makes it as good a victory as against the All Blacks 2012.

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

- (107) ...we were just trying to find a way to win the game...
 (108) A poor shooting day -- U of L shot 32.8 percent and 29 percent in the second half -- paired with an opponent, like NC State on Saturday, that limits its turnovers and finds ways to score in the paint.

(*USA Today*)

Liška (2010 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) claims that *to tackle* in (104), *to win* in (105-106), and *to score* in (108) are technical terms expressing certain meanings relating to sports. The terms are obligatory with *to-* infinitives for specific meanings. Considered to be sports jargon, the *to-* infinitives above, nevertheless, still represent future or unreal events. Aside from the above tokens of *to-* infinitives, Liška (2010) also found other sports expressions manifested in *to-* infinitives including *to trade punches*, *to storm out*, *to roll in*, *to bury something*, *to hang around*, *to let one's game slip*, *to pound somebody*, and *to tangle*.

The appearance of *to-* infinitives in sports language explains its only appearance in the subject position in this study in (106). From the vast majority of *-ing* infinitives in the subject position in this study, it is likely that if the verb were not *to win*, the form would have been *-ing*.

Adding to the frequency of *to-* infinitives in the British data, *to-*, but not *-ing* infinitives, appears as a complement of the verbs *try* and *like*, although scholars (Murphy 2012, Swan 2016 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) indicate that *to-* and *-ing* infinitives are acceptable as complements of the verbs *try* and *like*. Similarly, the American data also show that only *to-* infinitive appear as the complement of the verb *try*.

- (109) He tries to hook his sixth ball...
 (110) ...we obviously tried to improve the run rate...
 (111) The tour and its sponsors and TV partners (Sky) like to unveil the captain live on air...

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

- (112) I was trying to help him.
 (113) We talk about what we're trying to do this year....

(*USA Today*)

As for the verb *like* in the American data, both forms appear, with 4 instances of *like + to-* infinitives and 4 instances of *like + -ing* infinitives.

The choice of *to-* infinitives as complements of the verb *try* is preferred in both data sets. The findings above agree with the previous corpus-based studies by Krajčová (2016 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) whose findings are from the British National Corpus (BNC). Krajčová (2016) found only 4.54% of *try + -ing* infinitives, but 95.56% of *try + to-* infinitives. As for the verb *like*, Eriksson (2006) used COBUILD*DIRECT* and found that only 7.7% of *-ing* infinitives were reported as complements of the verb *like*. The previous findings from the two corpora show that *-ing* infinitives are not preferred with *try* and *like* in British English.

The final reason for the productivity of *to-* infinitives concerns its ability to fulfill the *Economy Principle*. Fischer (1999), Kaatari (2010), and van Linden (2010) found that the occurrences of *to-* infinitives in lower clauses result from the competition between *to-* infinitive and *that*-clauses in the cases where finite and non-finite clauses share the interpretation (Fischer 1999; Kaatari 2010; van Linden 2010 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017), as in (114-115). All examples (a) are from the data in this study, while examples (b) are modified versions with the competing *that-* clauses.

(114) a. To win from being 10-0 quickly and with umpteen injuries makes it as good a victory as against the all Blacks 2012.

b. That the team won from being 10-0 quickly and with umpteen injuries makes it as good a victory as against the all Blacks 2012.

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

(115) a. After a disastrous season plagued by injury and capped with a 25-game suspension, Davis hopes to rebound.

b. After a disastrous season plagued by injury and capped with a 25-game suspension, Davis hopes that he could rebound.

(*USA Today*)

The above phenomenon can be explained by the Economy Principle. The *to-* infinitive is more economical because it reduces the work of the brain as the subject and the tense in the lower clauses do not need to be spelled out. To conform to the Economy Principle, when two clauses are semantically identical, the one with less effort is preferred. In such a case, *to-* infinitives do not need subject and tense repetitions (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

Historically, Fischer (1999 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) found that in Middle English (ME) *that-* clauses appeared as object control clauses before the arrival of *to-* infinitives. Before ME, the function of object control clauses was fulfilled by *that-* clauses (Fischer 1999), as in (116). In (119), Fischer (1999)

demonstrated that object control constructions with *that*- clauses in ME is unacceptable in Present-Day English (PDE).

- (116) ... and bebead þam cwellerum þæt hi hine mid wiððum, handum and fotum on þære rode gebundon
...and ordered the torturers that they tie him with cords, to-hands and feet on the cross bound (Fischer 1999, 10)
- (117) *We commanded them that they should tie him up.
- (118) And whan he had used hit he ded hys crowne and commaunded the crowne to be sett on the awter...
- (119) ...he did off his crown and commanded the crown to be set on the altar.
He commanded him to set the crown on the altar

(Fischer 1999, 22)

The unacceptability of (117) is due to the occurrence of the *that*- clause as an adjunct of the head verbs *command* and *order*, whereas in PDE such VP's are only acceptable with *to*- infinitive object control clauses (Fischer 1999). The use of object control constructions has developed into *to*- infinitives since ME when they first emerged (Fischer 1999). The occurrence of *to*-infinitives were later found with command-type verbs, such as *order* and *command* as illustrated in (118). Its PDE equivalence is in (119) (Fischer 1999 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

With the evidence obtained from this study, it can be concluded that the high frequency of *to*- infinitives in the data is partly due to the fact that they appear as the sports jargon, and can replace *that*- clauses as VP complements for economic reasons. As a language develops, the spread of an unarguably productive form, such as *to*- infinitives, is certain to cause changes.

3.5. Markedness theory

The preference of *to*- infinitive over other forms in the British and American data can be the result of *Markedness*. *Markedness Theory* states that *marked* features are irregular, while *unmarked* features are regular or common; as a result, the number of unmarked features is greater than marked ones (Andersen 2001). *Markedness Theory* predicts that the productivity of an unmarked form could lower the frequency of a marked form.

To in English is unmarked, representing both a preposition and an infinitive. Being an infinitive, *to*- appears in control, raising, passive, ECM, and *for*- clause constructions. In the case of control, the unmarkedness of *to*- infinitives could affect the more marked forms, *-ing* and bare infinitives. This could result in the decrease of frequencies or even the elimination of the more marked forms. Seliger and Vago (1991 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) state that the less frequent control constructions, especially bare infinitives, can potentially be replaced by *to*-

infinitives. Vosberg's findings (2009 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) support the above theory as Vosberg found that the use of the verb *decline+ -ing* infinitive in British English is decreasing because it is shifting towards *decline + to-* infinitive.

Cognitively, Evans and Green (2006 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) assume that the more a frequent linguistic unit is entrenched and established in an individual's cognition, the more likely it becomes a pattern or a routine as stated below.

...the relative frequency with which particular words or other kinds of constructions are encountered by the speaker will affect the nature of a language system. This is because cognitive linguists assume that linguistic units that are more frequently encountered become more entrenched (that is, established as a cognitive pattern or routine) in language systems...the most entrenched linguistic units tend to shape the language system in terms of use at the expense of less frequent and thus well-entrenched words or constructions.

(Evans and Green 2006, 114)

Such assumption supports the high frequency of *to-* infinitives in the data. Because they appear frequently in control and other constructions, they become "entrenched" and "established" in an individual's cognition and eventually become a pattern or a routine (Evans and Green 2006, 114).

Such a pattern or routine is related to the concept of *colligation* which refers to the frequent co-occurrence of content and functional words, such as *want to*, *in order to*, and *according to* (Biber and Conrad 1999, Farrokh, Mahmoodzadeh and Rajabali 2012, McEnery and Hardies 2012). This co-occurrence has been so repetitive that it has become formulaic.

The unmarkedness of *to-* infinitives in English is assumed to be shared by other Germanic languages (Seliger and Vago 1991 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017), such as *zu* in German, *te* in Dutch, and *att* in Swedish.

(120) German

Ene	Owned	hot	en	arme	mann	en
one	evening	has	a	poor	man	a
schupkarrich	g'numme		fer	zu	eme	nochba
wheel-barrow	taken		for	to	a	neighbor
blatz	geh	fer	riewe	holle.		
place	go	for	tunips	fetch		

One evening a poor man took a wheel barrow **to** go to a neighbouring farm to fetch turnips.

(Börjars and Burridge 2011, 393)

(121) Dutch

Jan	beweer-t	[rijk	te	zijn]
John	claim-2/3SG	rich	to	be: INF

John claims to be rich.

(Zwart 2007, 7)

(122) Swedish

det	är	dags	att	knorra	iväg	till	sang-s
it	is	time	to	grumble	off	to	bed

It is time to grumble off to bed.

(Olofsson 2014, 13)

The above cross-linguistic examples illustrate the *to*-infinitive and its equivalences in other Germanic languages.

Being unmarked, *to*-infinitives are most likely to affect the most marked form: bare infinitives. A question could be raised regarding the eventual elimination of bare infinitives caused by the productivity of the *to*-infinitive.

3.6. *To*-infinitives vs. bare infinitives

Bare infinitives are seen as traces of archaic forms (Fischer 1999, Trudgill 1999, Hundt 2009) representing simultaneity (Park 2002). Their rare occurrence could result from Markedness. Their function as representing simultaneity can be taken over by the more productive simultaneity *-ing* infinitives, while their other semantic functions, by the modern and highly productive *to*-infinitives.

Fischer (1999), Trudgill (1999), and Hundt (2009) state that the bare infinitive is an archaic form of Old English, as in example (123).

(123) Genoh bið munece twa tunecan **habban**... (OE)Enough is for-monk two tunics **have**'It is not enough for a monk **to possess** two habits...' (PDE)

(Fischer 1999, 13)

The infinitive suffix *-an* in OE, from *-en* in Middle English (ME), eventually disappeared like many suffixes in OE because it contains little information (Lass 2006 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) and is in the unstressed position of a word (Fennell 2001). The elimination started at the change from *-an* to *-en* and later, to zero. In present-day English, the verbs that retain bare infinitive complements are *make*, *help*, *see*, *watch*, and *let* (Swan 2016). However, Taeymans

(2004) and this study found that the VP head *let* occurs with *to*- infinitives, as in (124).

(124) ...we don't let anyone to break our relationship...

(The Daily Telegraph)

Callies (2013) stated that the use of *let* + *to*- infinitive could result from its synonymy with *allow* and *permit* (in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) as in (125).

(125) we don't let/allow/permit anyone to break our relationship...

With the three verbs sharing meanings while only one has a different form of complement, it is likely that the majority could become influential. Such phenomenon conforms to Markedness Theory. Drobnak (2004) indicated that bare infinitives in the position of VP complement have been syntactically substituted by *to*- infinitives since the Middle English period (Drobnak 2004 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

The verb *help* is another verb that frequently appears with bare infinitives. Mair (2009 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) claims that *help* + bare infinitives mostly appears in spoken language. On the contrary, this study found that *help* appears with either *to*- or *bare* infinitives in the British data but only with bare infinitives in the American data, as in the instances below.

(126) ...world class players at one time have **helped** to move us through therankings...

(127) ...they would be losing a lot of their money **to help** subsidise domestic players...

(128) Hazard has Chelsea manager Joes Mourinho **to help** protect him....

(The Daily Telegraph)

(129) Lopping off a handful of early games would certainly **help** reduce the overlap period.

(130) Though Raye never realized his dream of becoming an NFL head coach, he **helped** pave the way for others.

(131) This **helped** prepare him for what he faced as he pursued a career in coaching – the ultimate leadership role.

(USA Today)

As none of the instances are in quotation marks, it is assumed that they are not direct quotations from spoken language.

Lohmann (2011) and Ahola's claim (2011) that when *help* is in the form of *to help*, they are followed by bare infinitives. This explains the British data, but not the American one. The consistency in the American English *help* + bare infinitive as in (126-131) is said to result from *colonial lag* (Trudgill 1999), a phenomenon where an old form is retained in a (former) colony. Colonial lag also explains the higher frequency of *-ing* infinitives in the American data when compared to that of the British where many *-ing* infinitives are replaced by *to-* infinitives, as in *try* and *like* + *to-* infinitives (Krajčová 2016 and Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

3.7. *Horror aequi* principle

The appearance of *to help* + bare infinitive in the British data is seen as resulting from an attempt to avoid repetition of *to* in *to help* + *to-* infinitive. Such avoidance is stated in the *horror aequi* principle (Ross 2003).

the *horror aequi* principle involves the widespread (and presumably universal) tendency to avoid the use of formally (near-) identical and (near-) adjacent (non-coordinate) grammatical elements or structure...

(Rohdenburg 2003, 236)

The avoidance tactic that gave rise to the bare infinitive is also found in the appearance of *to try and* + bare infinitive in the British data, as in (132-134), which is regarded as a variation of *to try* + *to-* infinitive. Like *to help* + bare infinitive, *to try and* + bare infinitive is believed to be caused by the *horror aequi* principle (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017).

- (132) "I know it's an obvious statement but none of them want to get relegated. It's all right saying it, they just have to show it. We need to try and do that this season and then try to look forward. First things first, we need to stay in the division."
- (133) "If I'm the one to fly the flag for young English managers, I'll guarantee those young coaches and budding managers out there that I'll give everything to try and make it a success. But I want to do that for me and for the football club and if they benefit from that then brilliant."
- (134) ...with James Anderson and Steven Finn the first bowlers to try and bowl the ball underneath it.

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

In this study, *to try and* + bare infinitives, were found only in the British data, all of which can be replaced by *to try* + *to-* infinitive. Stamper (2015 in Wongkittiporn

and Chitrakara 2017) claims that the two are different in terms of register. *To try and* + bare infinitive clauses is preferred in an informal register, whereas *to try + to-* infinitive is preferred in a formal register. In (132-133), most *to try and* + bare infinitive instances appear in double quotations reflecting the fact that they are spoken variations of *to try + to-* infinitives in the spoken register (Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). Tsuchida (2011) states that *to try and* + bare infinitive is productive in British English. The same could also happen in spoken American English. More American data is required for the generalization. At least one instance is widely heard, as in (135) below.

(135) Don't go changing to try and please me.

(Billy Joel, *Just the Way You Are*)

To try and + bare infinitive is said to be a formulaic expression to avoid the repetition of *to* in *to try + to-* infinitive. *And* is not a conjunction for *to try* and another *to-* infinitive, but a replacement of another *to*. It is ungrammatical for *to try and* + bare infinitive to be inverted, as in **and repair his strength he tried*. In addition, splitting *to try and* + bare infinitive by an adverb or negation results in ungrammaticality such as **to try always and be polite* vs. *to try always to be polite* and **try not and do that* vs. *try not to do that* (Stamper 2015).

Ross (2013 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017) adds that the appearance of *to try* + bare infinitive clauses in African American, Jamaican English, and Irish English could be due to the *horror aequi* principle as well, as in (136).

(136) I am going to try find one for her right now.

(Ross 2013, 126)

The *horror aequi principle* in the case of *to try and* + bare infinitive is found only with the infinitive *to try* in the British data, but not other forms of *try*, such as *tried* or *trying*. Examples (137-140), when compared to (141), proves that *to try and* + bare infinitives arose to avoid the repetition of *to-* infinitives.

(137) Afghanistan's batmen do not try to hit every ball...

(138) ...he is trying to play a technical game...

(139) we obviously tried to improve the run rate...

(140) ...we are trying to play...

(141) We need to try and do that this season and then try to look forward...

(*The Daily Telegraph*)

Example (141) is evidence for the analysis that *to try* and + bare infinitive appears to avoid the repetition of *to* in *to try + to* infinitive because the *to try and + bare* infinitives and *try + to-* infinitives co-occur in the same sentence.

Both the claims of Stamper (2015) and Ross (2013) imply that bare infinitives can result from repetition avoidance. Such phenomenon reveals that in spite of the productivity of *to-* infinitives, the rare bare infinitives are not likely to disappear into oblivion. The appearance of the bare infinitives can be both discouraged and encouraged by the highly frequent *to-* infinitives.

5. Conclusion

Different forms of control constructions lead to a question as to why one form is preferred over the other and another question regarding the difference between variations. The data from *The Daily Telegraph* and *USA Today* shows that *to-* infinitives occur the highest in both data sets, followed by *-ing* and bare infinitives, respectively. All forms were found in the VP complement and adjunct positions. Semantic interpretations were found to play a major role in the selection of different forms of control construction in the VP complement and adjunct positions with *to-* infinitives representing future and irrealis events and *-ing* infinitives simultaneity and facts. The supporting factors are cognitive factors, lexical factors, and language variation. The high frequency of *to-* infinitives as a control construction in both data sets is caused by its unmarkedness, its being stylistically preferred in sports language, and its economical appearance as an infinitival lower clause when competing with the *that-* clause (Fischer 1999, Kaatari 2010, van Linden 2010 in Wongkittiporn and Chitrakara 2017). A slightly higher frequency of *to-* infinitives in the British data is mainly a consequence of Markedness Theory in British English and colonial lag in American English. The productivity of *to-* infinitives influences the less frequent forms by overriding the *-ing* and bare infinitival VP complements. However, it can also induce the appearance of bare infinitives to avoid repetition stated in the *horror aequi* principle.

As for the competing forms, as in *like + to/-ing* infinitive and *let + to/-bare* infinitive, they are analyzed as coming from synonymity and analogy. *Like*, sharing the meaning with *enjoy*, can take the *-ing* infinitive complement, whereas *let*, sharing the meaning with *allow* and *permit*, can take the *to-* infinitive complement. The productivity of *to-* infinitives can, however, only partly affect the *-ing* infinitive because in addition to the *-ing* representing simultaneity, its similarity to the French *-ant* makes it easy to inherit the form and function of the French *gérondif* for the PPs and the AdvPs. Its DP-like form also makes it suitable for the PPs and the subject position.

The above discussion explains the reasons for the occurrences of the three forms of control constructions in both British and American data. It confirms that semantic interpretation plays an influential role and *to*- infinitive has the highest frequency. The frequent appearance of *to*- infinitive control constructions adds up to the overall frequency of the *to*- infinitives in English which contributes to its unmarkedness. This, in turn, affects the occurrence and non-occurrence of bare infinitives and some *-ing* infinitives. The productivity of *to*- infinitives is, however, not always a threat to the other forms, especially the minority bare infinitive, as long as the *horror aequi* principle still operates. As for *-ing* infinitives, the analysis shows that it is nearly impossible for the tyrant *to*- infinitive to replace the French supported *-ing* infinitive which is unlikely to decrease because it is not only meaningful, but it is also superficially similar to a noun. The *-ing* infinitive's productivity in the subject position even overrides the *to*- infinitives. Moreover, the effect of colonial lag also helps slow down the development as more traditional forms are still preserved in not only American English, but also other varieties of English.

The findings of this study are aligned with many previous studies and theories and could partially explain the overall occurrence of control constructions in English; they, however, can be generalized only to British and American English for media. Generalizing the finding of this study to other types of texts, such as novels, and other varieties of English, such as Australian English, may not be applicable to the optimal level. For future research in this scope of study, investigating control constructions in other genres and varieties of English will lead to greater in-depth knowledge of control constructions and language variations.

References

- Ahola, Jussi. 2011. "A corpus-driven approach to the infinitival complementation patterns of the verb HELP in recent centuries". *TamPub* 1-94.
- Andersen, Henning. 2001. "Markedness and the theory of linguistic change". In *Actualization: Linguistic Change in Progress*, ed. by Henning Andersen, 21-57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Beukema, Frits and Marjolijn Verspoor. 1999. "Semantic triggering of sentential complement selection: The case of *to-ing* non-finite clauses". In *Language Usage and Description*, ed. by Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade and John Frankis, 149-158. Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Biber, Douglas and Susan Conrad. 1999. "Lexical bundles in conversation and academic prose". In *Out of Corpora: Studies in Honour of Stig Johansson*, ed.

- by Hilde Hassegard and Signe Oksefjell, 181-190. Amsterdam / Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Börjars, Kersti and Kate Burridge. 2011. "From preposition to purposive to infinitive Marker". In *Studies on German-Language Islands*, ed. by Michael T. Putnum, 385-411. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Callies, Marcus. 2013. "Bare infinitival complements in present-day English". In *The verb phrase in English: Investigating Recent Language Change with Corpora*, ed. by Bas Aarts, Joanne Close, Geoffrey Leech, Sean Wallies, 239-255. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. "Issues in adverbial syntax". *Lingua* 114: 683-710.
- Conrad, Bent. 1982. *Referring and Non-referring Phrases*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Akademisk Forlag.
- Crystal, David. 2012. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Malden, MA/ Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dowty, David. 2000. "The dual analysis of adjuncts/complements in categorical grammar". In *Approaching the Grammar of Adjuncts*, ed. by Ewald Lang, David Holsinger, Kerstin Schwabe and Oliver Teuber, 53-78. ZAS Papers in Linguistics.
- Drobnak, Franciska T. 2004. "Linguistic variation and change: Middle English Infinitive". *Acta Neophilologica* 37: 103-114.
- Duffley, Patrick J. 2000. "Gerund versus infinitive as complement of transitive verbs in English: The problems of 'tense' and 'control'". *Journal of English Linguistics* 28(3): 221-248.
- Duffley, Patrick J. 2003. "The gerund and the *to*- infinitive as subject". *Journal of English Linguistics* 31: 324-352.
- Duffley, Patrick and Maryse Arseneau. 2012. "Tense and control interpretations in gerund-participle and *to*- infinitive complement constructions with verbs of risk". *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique* 57(1): 31-50.
- Eriksson, Louise. 2006. *She Likes Doing what he Likes to Do - A Corpus Study of Like and its Complementation*. Vaxjo University dissertation.
- Evans, Vyvyan and Melanie Green. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fanego, Teresa. 2004. "Drift and the development of sentential complements in British and American English from 1700 to the present day". *Studies in Language* 28: 321-361.
- Fanego, Teresa. 2004. "Is cognitive grammar a usage-based model? Towards a realistic account of English sentential complements". *A Journal of English and American Studies* 29: 23-58.

- Farrokh, Parisa, Mahmoodzadeh Kambiz, and Rajabali Aolfaz. 2012. "Corpus-based application for translation of English grammatical collocation in Azeri". *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences* 3(11): 2262-2267.
- Fennell, Barbara A. 2001. *A History of English: A Sociolinguistic Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fischer, Olga. 1999. "Changes in infinitival constructions in English. In *Anglistentag*, ed. by Sabine Schülting and Frits-Wilhelm Neumann, 7-27. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Fonteyn, Lauren. 2016. "From nominal to verbal gerunds: a referential typology." *Function of Language* 23(1): 60-83.
- Goldberg, Adele E. and Farrell Ackerman. 2001. "The pragmatics of obligatory adjuncts". *Language* 77: 798-814.
- Heyvaert, Liesbet and Hubert Cuyckens. 2010. "Finite and gerundive complementation in modern and present-day English: Semantic, variation and change". In *Historical Cognitive Linguistics*, ed. by Margaret E. Winters, Heli Tissari and Kathryn Allan, 132-159. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hundt, Marianne. 2009. "Colonial lag, colonial innovation or simple language change". In *One Language Two Grammars?: Differences between British and American*, ed. by Gunter Rohdenburg and Julia Schluer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ide, Nancy and Catherine Macleod. 2001. "The American national corpus: A standardized resource for American English". *Proceedings of Corpus Linguistics* 3: 831-836.
- Kaatari, Henrik. 2010. *Complementation of Adjectives: A Corpus-based Study of Adjectival Complementation by that- and to- Clauses*. Uppsala University, MA thesis.
- Kaleta, Agnieszka. 2014. *English Sentential Complementation: A Usage-based Approach*. Piotrkow Trybunalski: Naukowe Wydawnictwo Piotrkowskie.
- Knobloch-Westerwich, Silvia and Scott Alter. 2007. "The gender news use divide: Americans' sex-typed selective exposure to online news topic". *Journal of Communication* 57(4): 739-758.
- Krajčová, Yvonne. 2016. *Non-finite Verb Phrases as Verb Complements*. Zlín: Tomas University thesis.
- Lass, Roger. 2006. "Phonology and morphology". In *A history of English Language*, ed. by Richard Hogg and David Denison, 80-81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linden, Ann van. 2010. "The rise of the to- infinitive: Evidence from adjectival complementation". *English Language and Linguistics* 14 (1):19-51.

- Liška, Martin. 2010. *Lexical and Stylistic Features of the Language of Sport*. Charles University of Prague thesis.
- Lohmann, Arne. 2011. "Help vs help to: a multifactorial, mixed-effects account of infinitive marker omission". *English Language and Linguistics* 15(3): 499-521.
- Mair, Christian. 2009. "Infinitival and gerundial complements". In *Comparative Studies in Australia and New Zealand English: Grammar and beyond*, ed. by Pam Peters, Peter Collins, Adam Smith, 261-275. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McEnery, Tony and Andrew Hardie. 2012. *Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mittwoch, Anita. 1990. "On the distribution of bare infinitive complement in English". *Journal of Linguistics* 26(1): 103-131.
- Morita, Hisashi. 2012. "Unification of the semantics of the infinitive in English". *A Journal of English and American Studies* 45: 31-52.
- Murphy, Raymond. 2012. *English Grammar in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, Elçin. 2017. "A corpus-based study on 'regret' as a factive verb and its complements". *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 2(2): 88-108.
- Olofsson, Jole. 2014. "Argument structure constructions and syntactic productivity: The case of Swedish motion constructions". *Constructions* 1: 1-17.
- Park, Byulg-Soo. 2001. "Gerundive complement in English: a constraint-based analysis". *Proceeding of the 15th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 193-304.
- Park, Sang-soo. 2002. "Diachronic approach to bare infinitive". *Studies in Modern Grammar* 28: 129-150.
- Trudgil, Peter. 1999. "A window on the past: "Colonial lag" and New Zealand evidence for the phonology of nineteenth-century English". *American Speech* 734(3): 227-239.
- Radford, Andrew. 2009. *An introduction to English Sentence Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 1989. *Complementation and Case Grammar: A Syntactic and Semantic Study of Selected Patterns of Complementation in Present-day English*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 2010. "Explaining grammatical variation and change: A case study of complementation in American English over three decades". *English Linguistics* 38(1): 4-24.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 2012. "On the profiles of *to*-infinitives and *to-ing* complements at a time of grammatical variation, with evidence from current American English". *UK-CLA Meetings* 1: 262-276.

- Rohdenburg, Günter. 2003. "Cognitive complexity and *horror aequi* as factors determining the use of interrogative clause linkers in English". In *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*, ed. by Günter Rohdenburg and Britta Mondorf, 205-249. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ross, Daniel. 2013. "Dialectal variation and diachronic development of *try-Complementation*". *Studies in Linguistic Sciences: Illinois Working Papers 2013*: 108-147.
- Rustenberg, F. G. A. 1874. *Historical development of the gerund in the English Language*. Göttingen: Druck der Dieterichschen Universitäts-Buchdruckerei.
- Seliger, Herbert W., Robert M. Vago. 1991. "The study of first language attrition: an overview". In *First Language Attrition*, ed. by Herbert W. Seliger and Robert M. Vago, 3-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stamper, Kory. 2015. "'Try and' vs. 'try to': When you're not sure which is right, try to remember to use 'try to'". Available at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/video/try-and-vs-try-to>. Accessed on January 16, 2018.
- Swan, Michael. 2016. *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taeymans, Martine. 2004. "An investigation into the marginal modals dare and need in British present-day English: a corpus approach". In *Up and Down the Cline. The Nature of Grammaticalization*, ed. by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Perridon, 97-114. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Verspoor, Marjolijn. 1996. "The story of *-ing*: a subjective perspective". In *The Construal of Space in Language and Thought*, ed. by Martin Pütz and René Dirven, 417-454. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Vosberg, Uwe. 2009. "Non-finite complements". In *Differences between British and American English*, ed. by Günter Rohdenburg and Julia Schlüter, 212-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, Deliang. 2014. "Verbs taking "to+v" or "v+ing" as their complements: A cognitive grammar account". *International Journal of Linguistics* 6(5): 143-153.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2014. "Tense and aspect in English infinitives". *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(3): 403-447.
- Wherrity, Michael. 2001. *The Gerund/Infinitive Contrast in English Verb Complementation*. Rutgers University dissertation.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1988. *The Semantics of Grammar*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wongkittiporn, Abhinan and Nirada Chitrakara. 2017. *Control Constructions in British Newspapers*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2007. *On the Tense of Infinitives in Dutch*. Manuscript, University of Groningen.