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1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The topic of investigation of this book is the rise of the to-infinitive in the history of English. The book was originally prompted by the idea that an investigation of infinitival to might uncover a grammaticalization process ‘at work’, in this case the fascinating change from a lexical category (P₀) to a functional category (say, T₀ for abstract tense). The homophony of infinitival to and the preposition to strongly suggests that the to-infinitive once started out as a prepositional phrase, although it clearly is not a phrase any longer but an infinitival marker. The rise of the to-infinitive, then, could be expected to be a showcase of grammaticalization, especially because the various historical stages of English are so well documented, with texts going back more than a thousand years. These hopes were further supported by the accepted view that infinitival to in Old English (OE) was indeed a preposition.

The story of non-finite complementation patterns in English involves two main changes. The first change is a massive increase in the frequency of the to-infinitive in Middle English (ME), with the bare infinitive restricted more and more to relatively few contexts. This phenomenon has traditionally been interpreted in the literature as evidence that the bare and the to-infinitive are in competition in OE, with the bare infinitive being replaced by the to-infinitive in ME.

The other main change involves the rise of new structural types in ME, none of which have been attested in OE: (i) passive to-infinitives as in the Present-day English (PE) example in (1); (ii) to-infinitives containing perfective have as in (2); (iii) independently negated to-infinitives as in (3); (iv) constructions with to-infinitives as in (4) in which the NP John is an object of the higher verb (believe) but does not get its thematic role from that verb—witness the fact that (4) does not entail They believe John (we will use the label ‘Exceptional Case-Marking’ (ECM) from Government and Binding Theory for this construction); and (v) split infinitive constructions as in (5), in which to and the infinitive are no longer adjacent.
Introduction

(1) These clothes need to be washed.
(2) He expected to have finished last Wednesday.
(3) They motioned to her not to come any further.
(4) They believe John to be a liar.
(5) to boldly go where no one has gone before

It has been claimed that some or all of these changes follow from a change in the categorical status of to (to-) infinitive from noun to verb, as part of the ‘grammaticalization’ process described above. If such a development took place in the transitional period between OE and ME, it would entail that the to-infinitive comes to be analysed as a clause in ME, with a subject position (which explains why the development of the ECM-construction in (4) became possible) and positions for tense and negation (hence the appearance of (2) and (3)). The idea was first proposed by Lightfoot (1979), and built on by other scholars (Jarad 1997; Van Gelderen 1993; Kageyama 1992), in spite of the fact that Fischer and Van der Leek (1981: 318–21) found only scant evidence for the alleged nominal behaviour of the infinitive in OE and ME. As it turned out, much previous work on the subject is based on two assumptions about the situation of the to-infinitive in OE that have never been tested, but have, through constant reiteration, achieved the status of axioms: first, that the categorial status of the to-infinitive in OE is PP; and secondly, that the to-infinitive spread at the expense of the infinitive without to, the bare infinitive (see below, §§1.2 and 1.3). The second assumption was further fuelled by Callaway’s (1913) monograph The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon, in which the data are presented in a way that suggests that the distribution of the two infinitives in OE is chaotic, and that the bare infinitive has suffered massive losses since OE (see below, §1.4). As this monograph has remained the most important source of data for OE infinitives and has been mined by linguists throughout the twentieth century, neither of these two assumptions has ever been challenged. The present volume is an attempt to put the record straight, and to present a systematic investigation into the distribution of the to-infinitive in synchronic OE informed by recent linguistic theory. The results not only refute the two traditional assumptions, but also reveal the most likely scenario for the rise and spread of the to-infinitive (§1.5).

The final section of this chapter briefly discusses some methodological problems with having to rely on corpus data.

1.2 The traditional view of the status of infinitives in Old English

Those who advocate a categorial change to explain the changes in infinitival constructions such as (1)–(5) rely heavily on previous work for the idea that the
infinitive in OE is a noun, or at least exhibits more nominal characteristics than at a later stage. As the quotations below show, however, the various statements on the categorial status of the infinitive in OE, with very few exceptions, turn out to be based ultimately on statements about the etymology of the infinitives rather than their actual behaviour in OE. We will see that the earlier citations make no claims about the situation in OE, but as the century progresses, the etymological statements begin to be construed as just that: statements about the infinitive in OE.

The following citations may serve as a rough chart of this process. The first one is from Wright and Wright’s *Old English Grammar*:

The inf. was originally a nomen actionis, formed by means of various suffixes in the different Indg. languages. The suffix –ono–, to which was added the nom. acc. neuter ending –m, became generalized in prim. Germanic, thus the original form of beran was *bhéronom, the -onom of which regularly became -an in OE. Goth. OS. and OHG. . . . In prim. West Germanic the inf. was inflected in the gen. and dat. like an ordinary noun of the ja-declension . . ., gen. -ennes, dat. -enne. . . . The gen. disappeared in prehistoric OE. The dat. to berenne generally became -anne through the influence of the inf. ending -an. (Wright and Wright 1925 [1908]: 260)

There are three points to note here. First, Wright and Wright do not claim that the OE infinitive is a noun, only that its etymology suggests a nominal origin, in line with the work of early Indo-Europeanists like Bopp (1974 [1816]). The second point is that Wright and Wright refer to ‘the infinitive’, i.e. the bare infinitive, as the form from which the to-infinitive is derived, although they note the affinity of the latter to the ja-declension, which, according to many other scholars (e.g. Grimm 1870–98 [1819–37]; Van Loey 1970 [1959]), argues against such a derivation (see below, §7.2.1). Finally there is the phrase ‘like an ordinary noun’, the sole purpose of which is to explain the etymology of the -ne ending. Note, however, that this phrase does not make any claim about the actual status of the ending in OE.

Wright and Wright’s etymology is quoted in its entirety in Callaway’s influential monograph *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* (Callaway 1913: 1–2), which became a major source for data on OE infinitives, and hence for the dissemination of the notion that ‘the’ OE infinitive is a noun. Although Callaway does not attempt a diagnosis of the categorial status of the infinitive, the way in which he structured his data led him to posit a correlation between case and infinitival form: verbs taking accusative objects were the ones taking a bare infinitive, whereas verbs that took objects in other cases (genitive or dative) or prepositional objects appeared with a to-infinitive. Verbs taking either infinitive did so because they were ‘double regimen verbs’, i.e. they governed two cases at once—presumably the ditransitive or ‘three-place’ verbs, like
the verbs of commanding—or any one of two or even three cases—presumably verbs like *wilnian* ‘desire’ that may be followed by objects in the accusative or genitive case (Callaway 1913: 63). Although this correlation does not work particularly well even on the basis of Callaway’s own classification, leaving him groping to explain away 53 exceptions in a total of 98 verbs that appear with an infinitival complement in a subject control construction as in (1) above (for details, see Los 1999: 35), the identification of infinitives with nominal cases may have done much to establish the notion that infinitives were nouns in OE. Callaway was also responsible for the idea that infinitives could appear in subject position, a nominal function par excellence; this notion was later challenged by Bock (1931), who noted that most of Callaway’s ‘subject infinitives’ appear as arguments of impersonal verbs, which makes them suspect. The idea of infinitives as subjects resurfaced in Jespersen (1940) and Visser (1963–73) and was challenged once again in Mitchell (1985).

Jespersen, in his *Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, repeats the etymology, and adds an interpretation of his own:

As the infinitive originally is a verbal substantive, it is quite natural that it very often has the usual function of a substantive, i.e. is a primary. […] Thus we see that an infinitive [a bare infinitive] is a primary when it is the object of a limited number of [auxiliary] verbs . . . and finally—the most important of them all—when it is the object of the preposition *to*. (Jespersen 1927: 9–10)

Crucially, Jespersen does not date this particular stage in the history of English, although he clearly gives the impression that there is a progressive loss of nominal features: ‘The *to*-inf. is a primary […] as the object of a preposition: he was *about* to retire. *About* is now the only preposition which can take a *to*-infinitive…’ (ibid. 11). It is indeed true that the *to*-infinitive in ME occasionally appears as the complement of prepositions, whereas that position is no longer possible in PE; but as this nominal function of the *to*-infinitive represents an innovation, Jespersen’s point concerning *about* is in fact misleading. Prepositions are not attested with bare or *to*-infinitives as their complement in OE (Mitchell 1985: §921, who also refers to Callaway 1913), apart from, of course, *to* itself. Jespersen’s statement about prepositions appears to indicate that he is extrapolating from the situation in ME, on the assumption that more nominal behaviour in ME than PE must mean that the infinitive in OE was an even more nominal; in other words, that there was a straightforward progressive development from fully nominal infinitives in prehistoric times to fully verbal infinitives in PE.
Mustanoja in his *Middle English Syntax* also repeats the etymology: ‘The infinitive, originally a noun of action, exists in OE in two forms, uninflected and inflected. The uninflected infinitive ends in -an (bindan). The inflected infinitive is a dative ending in -enne (bindenne), inflected according to the jo-declension. It is the form used after the preposition to (to bindenne)…’ (Mustanoja 1960: 512–13); ‘…to- and the infinitive are looked upon as forming an inseparable unit equivalent to a noun and capable of being used, for example, as the subject and object of a verb’ (ibid. 514). The idea that infinitives could be subjects in OE had already been discredited by Bock (1931), which suggests that Mustanoja is actually describing ME syntax, and is basing the claim that the to-infinitive is ‘equivalent to a noun’ on etymological claims and the ‘nominal’ behaviour of the to-infinitive in ME only. Note that Mustanoja explicitly claims that the -enne ending has the status of a dative ending in OE, a claim that goes beyond etymological description.

In Visser’s work, another influential source, the etymology is given in the usual terms: ‘The particle to preceding the infinitive was originally a preposition with the sense of “direction towards” which caused the change of e.g. singan to singenne’ (Visser 1963–73: 947), i.e. the to-infinitive is again regarded as being derived from the bare infinitive. Unfortunately, Visser cannot be drawn on the category of the infinitive in OE, although the fact that he is working from actual OE material would lend considerable weight to his views on the subject. He does note, however, that even by King Alfred’s time (i.e. in early OE prose) ‘the prepositional force of to became weakened’ (ibid. 948)—a first indication that OE to might be different from the common run of prepositions.

Given the weight of the combined scholarship of Callaway, Jespersen, Mustanoja, and Visser, Lightfoot was in a way entirely justified in making the following statement: ‘For ease of exposition I shall simply assume here, uncontroversially and with the traditional grammarians, that the old inflected infinitive was a NP. As the to form was introduced, it retained most of the NP properties, occurring, for example, quite freely after prepositions…’ (Lightfoot 1979: 191). By ‘old inflected infinitive’ Lightfoot means the infinitive in OE, and argues that it underwent a categorial change in the transition to ME. As we have seen, the view that OE infinitives are nouns had indeed become commonplace, although the evidence for that claim is flimsy, consisting of nothing more than the etymological evidence and the fact that ME infinitives behave more nominally than in PE.

Lightfoot’s study has exerted a strong influence on the work of other diachronic generative scholars. As the question of categorial status is particularly important in a generative framework, the categorial status of OE to-infinitives is crucial to their analyses of the infinitival changes illustrated by examples
(1)–(5) above. Compare the following quotation from Van Gelderen (1993: 92): ‘It has often been argued (e.g. Lightfoot 1979: 190f) that Old English infinitives are nouns [...]. They can follow prepositions and have some kind of Case marking. Assuming they are in fact nouns in Old English, they need not indicate tense.’ Van Gelderen claims that it is the introduction of a new functional category (Tense Phrase) that is responsible for the changes in (1)–(5).

Unlike Lightfoot and Van Gelderen, who work from ME data, Kageyama (1992) and Jarad (1997) construct their arguments on the basis of actual OE material. This adds one more piece to the infinitival puzzle and appears to set the idea of nominal status on a firmer footing. OE occasionally allows to-infinitives to be coordinated with a PP, as in the following example (conjoined structures in bold):

(6) ...þæt he [...] mihte [...] undon his muð to wisdomes that he [...] could [...] undo his mouth to wisdom’s spræcum, and to wurðianne God ⟨ÆHom 16, 184⟩¹ speech, and to praise God ‘... so that he [...] could [...] open his mouth to wisdom’s speech, and to praise God’

Kageyama argues that ‘any reasonable theory of coordination’ requires some sort of parallel-structure condition as part of UG (1992: 97), which, if correct, would mean that a structure such as (6) is proof that to-infinitives are indeed PPs in OE; and if to is a preposition, the infinitive in its complement must be a noun. Although Kageyama uses actual OE data, some of his categorical statements (e.g. that to-infinitives are restricted to agentive verbs: ibid. 110) can be dismissed so easily (e.g. Fischer 1996b: 128) that it seems that his survey of the OE situation was actually quite limited.

Kageyama’s only other piece of evidence consists of the following etymology: ‘... to-infinitives, also called “inflected infinitives”, are characterized by the prepositional infinitive marker to and a dative inflection -ne added to a bare infinitive verb ...’ (Kageyama 1992: 95). On the basis of this, and the coordination evidence, a categorial change is, once more, argued to be responsible for the changes in (1)–(5), this time from AgrP to CP.

¹ Throughout this book, a reference to an OE text is enclosed in ⟨⟩ and follows the system of short titles as employed in Healey and Venezky (1985 [1980]) (based in turn on the system of Mitchell et al. 1975, 1979). This reference is identical to the TEI reference in the Toronto Corpus, which means that line numbers refer to the beginning of the sentence rather than the line in which the relevant structure occurs.
Jarad, too, takes the nominal status of the infinitive for granted, again with an appeal to Lightfoot: ‘Since -ne is the only morphological realisation of the inherent case assigned by to, it seems reasonable to take -ne as an indicator of the nominal status of the infinitival verb (cf. Lightfoot (1979))’ (Jarad 1997: 49). Unlike Van Gelderen, Jarad is crucially dependent on that assumption, as it is the basis of his entire analysis: the changes in (1)–(5) are directly related to a categorial change of to-infinitives, from PP to TP. He takes his data from secondary sources, which leads to the indiscriminate use of unreliable examples from glosses to support important arguments (e.g. his use of ⟨Mt Head Gl (Li) 16⟩; see §8.3 below). It is notable, however, that a large-scale study such as Jarad’s, which aims particularly to provide support for the premise that OE infinitives are nouns, fails to come up with any new evidence and has to resort to other languages to prove that infinitives can be nominal (e.g. Modern Dutch; Jarad 1997: 54).

The failure of such advocates of a categorial change to come up with solid evidence of the nominal status of OE infinitives is worrying, and so is the fact that OE specialists (like Mitchell 1985) do not report any typical nominal characteristics of infinitives, such as the use of determiners, infinitives in the complement of prepositions other than to, or infinitives with genitive objects.

Others with a detailed knowledge of OE (e.g. Fischer and van der Leek 1981; van Kemenade 1992) agree that the infinitive must be a V-head because it is able to assign structural case. Fischer (1996b: 131) is willing to conclude—on the basis of coordination facts as in (6), the changing situation of infinitives in ME, and the presence of what looks like a dative inflection on the to-infinitive—that ‘... the best solution may still be to see the infinitives as essentially nominal [...] but with already some verbal features incorporated’. This is, again, the plausible notion of an orderly progression from fully nominal in prehistoric OE to fully verbal in PE, but OE itself is seen as a halfway house, both nominal and verbal, and certainly not fully nominal and the equivalent of a noun. This places the categorial change not in the transitional period of OE to ME, but earlier.

An in-depth investigation of OE could, so I hoped, give more clues about the date of this change; and if it could be shown to have taken place in OE itself, so much the better. If there was no evidence of such a change, the changes in (1)–(5) would have to be accounted for in a different way.

### 1.3 The two infinitives in competition

An investigation of the situation in OE is also needed to assess another long-standing assumption: the notion that the two infinitives are in competition
in OE, with the to-infinitive eventually winning out over the bare infinitive and replacing it in most contexts. Assessing the rise of the to-infinitive, and the degree of competition with the bare infinitive, is impossible without a clear idea of the distribution of the two infinitives. However, no coherent picture emerges from Callaway’s 1913 monograph on OE infinitives (see also Mitchell’s appraisal of Callaway’s work in Mitchell 1985: §§3755ff.), and this in turn has persistently fed the idea that the distribution is so chaotic that it defies analysis. Some OE verbs apparently only occur with the bare infinitive, some only with the to-infinitive, and some with either, without there being any clear indications of why this should be the case.

Some scholars have therefore concluded that the choice of infinitive is simply an idiosyncratic property of the verb in OE (e.g. Molencki 1991: 136) and dismiss the problem to the lexicon. Such an approach precludes a coherent account of verb complementation or of changes in complementation patterns; there is, moreover, enough evidence from cross-linguistic studies to suggest that verb complementation patterns are systematic, and not the product of idiosyncratic properties of individual verbs (e.g. Givón 1980; Noonan 1985). Callaway himself accepts the chaotic OE situation as the inevitable consequence of a change in progress, and we find it echoed in the literature throughout the twentieth century.

The replacement theory (of bare infinitives by to-infinitives) pre-dates Callaway, but he was instrumental in consolidating it further. He quotes Sweet with approval (Callaway 1913: 70):

The substitution of the supine [= inflected infinitive] for the infinitive [= uninflected infinitive] began in Old English itself. Thus the supine of purpose, as in hie comon deet land to sceawienne, ‘they came to spy out the land,’ gradually supplanted the older infinitive with many verbs of desiring, intending, attempting, etc., so that while such a verb as willan, ‘will,’ continued—as it still does in Modern English—to take the infinitive only, other verbs of similar meaning, such as wilnian, ‘desire,’ together with such verbs as onginnan, ‘undertake,’ ‘begin,’ began to take the supine as well as the infinitive. (Sweet 1903: 118)

The context in which this quote appears in Callaway is the account of the onginnan-group, the inchoative verbs that defy the correlation Callaway thought he had found between Case and form of the infinitive. He has recourse to the replacement theory in order to account for the exceptions to his system; but from then on it underlies almost all subsequent scholarship, as the following examples demonstrate:

But gradually an enormous extension of the application of this to-infinitive has taken place: the meaning of the preposition has been weakened and in some cases totally
extinguished, so that now the *to*-infinitive must be considered the normal English infinitive, the naked [i.e. bare] infinitive being reserved for comparatively few employments, which are the solitary survivals of the old use of the infinitive. (Jespersen 1940: 10–11)

In late OE and early ME the use of the infinitive with *to* increases rapidly in comparison with that of the plain [i.e. bare] infinitive; yet the former never succeeds in wholly supplanting the latter, which in some respects has even a wider range of use today than it had in ME. (Mustanoja 1960: 514)

From these beginnings the use of the *to*-infinitive in the place of the bare or plain infinitive increased rapidly during the late Old English and early Middle English periods, with the result that in Modern English the infinitive with *to* is the ordinary form, the bare infinitive surviving only in particular colligations when it is very intimately connected with the accompanying verb. (Visser 1963–73: 948)

[... ] the *to* infinitive gradually replaced the bare infinitive during the late OE and early ME period. (Lightfoot 1979: 190)

[... ] the encroachment of the inflected infinitive upon the domain of the uninflected infinitive[... ] (Jarad 1997: 32)

Sometimes the same idea is expressed implicitly, as in: ‘The infinitival endings in Middle English are being lost, as is well-known. These endings mark an infinitive as [−tense]. The function of the [−tense] marker is taken over by (*for*) *to*’ (van Gelderen 1993: 106); or: ‘the emergence of the regular use of the infinitival marker *to*’ (Guilfoyle 1994).

The replacement theory suggests itself quite naturally, and is not necessarily the result of the statements in Sweet and Callaway. First, the two infinitives are formally very similar, and this similarity increased in ME due to the erosion of the ending on the *to*-infinitive; and second, there is also the obvious increase in *to*-infinitives in ME, whereas the bare infinitive is apparently increasingly restricted to only a few environments (with the modals, and in accusative-and-infinitive constructions after perception and causation verbs). Some figures to illustrate this appear in Fries (1940: 130–1), who shows on the basis of Callaway’s figures for OE and his own PE corpus that the ratio of bare infinitives to *to*-infinitives (excluding the bare infinitive as complement to modals, as they consistently take the bare infinitive both in OE and PE) was 74.7% : 25.3% in OE but 18% : 82% in PE. The fact that the focus in such investigations is always on the two infinitives means that other changes in ME involving finite complements are not usually taken into account, although, as we will see, they have an important part to play in the history of the

---

2 Intimately connected with this notion is the idea that the only difference between a bare infinitive and a *to*-infinitive is just that little word *to*, as is evident from the use of the term ‘*to*-insertion’ (e.g. Nunes 1993: 361) and phrases like ‘*to* can be omitted on the surface if governed by the matrix verb’ (Kageyama 1992: 106).
to-infinitive. Exceptions are Manabe (1989) and Fischer (1996a), but no proper
distributional survey or quantitative study has been done. Manabe’s work,
though quantitative, lumps the figures for bare- and to-infinitival comple-
ments together, so that the decrease he demonstrates in the frequency of finite
complements (both indicative and subjunctive) and the increase in the fre-
quency of non-finite complements (both bare and to) cannot be used to relate
the increase of to-infinitives to any particular finite complement (for these and
other problems, see also Denison 1991).

The replacement theory is further supported by Callaway’s data because they
appear to confirm the idea that bare infinitives once occurred in a larger range
of environments.

1.4 Problems with Callaway’s classification

Callaway’s 1913 monograph fails to yield a coherent picture of the distribution
of the two infinitives in OE, primarily because of the way they are classified:
(i) into very broad semantic groups that do not focus on the specific mean-
ing that the verb in question exhibits when complemented by an infinitive,
(ii) without clear criteria to determine adjunct or argument status, resulting
in the infinitive after one and the same verb being classified as argument in
one chapter (‘objective infinitive’) and as adjunct in another, (iii) on the basis
of surface strings rather than underlying structure, (iv) without any attempt
to filter out possible influence from a Latin Vorlage, so that infinitives taken
from OE transliterations of Latin gospels or other notoriously slavish transla-
tions, where Latin infinitives automatically appear as OE bare infinitives and
Latin gerunds or gerundives as to-infinitives, are accorded the same status in
the data classification as infinitives from original OE texts, and (v) by count-
ing verbs with or without the prefix ge- as separate lexical items, a practice
not followed by lexicographers of OE (Bosworth and Toller 1882, 1921; Hall
1960 [1894]).

Callaway’s classification into semantic groups yields the picture of the distri-
bution of the infinitives in OE seen in Table 1.1. This classification suggests that
the only consistent grouping is that of perception verbs and bare infinitives;
the data in Table 1.1 do not allow any other match between semantic group
and complement type, and the conclusion that the two infinitives are appar-
etly in free variation is inevitable. A closer look reveals that verbs like dencan,
teohhian, and deahtian, glossed by Callaway as ‘think’ and therefore classified
as ‘verbs of mental perception’, occur when complemented with an infinitive
with the senses ‘want’, ‘intend’, ‘plan’, i.e. with basically the same senses as
verbs like giernan ‘desire’, higian ‘strive for’, and tilian ‘strive’, ‘attempt’, which
### Table 1.1. Numbers of verbs with infinitival complements in each semantic group, according to Callaway’s classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Callaway’s labels</th>
<th>number of verbs with bare infinitive</th>
<th>number of verbs with to-infinitive</th>
<th>number of verbs with both infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>commanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causing and permitting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense perception</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental perception</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning, delaying, and ceasing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclination and will</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Callaway (1913: 31, 37, 44).*

Callaway classifies as ‘verbs of inclination and will’. Both groups not only share the same meaning, they also exhibit the same syntactic pattern: monotransitive subject control, just like the verbs *try* and *intend* today. The other verbs making up the ‘mental perception’ class do not belong there either. *Gefrignan* ‘learn by enquiry’ behaves in all syntactic and semantic respects like a verb of sense perception (see Fischer 1990), which is why it occurs exclusively with a bare infinitive. *Swutelian* and *ætiewan*, both glossed by Callaway as ‘show’, only occur with an infinitive in the meaning of ‘warn’ (in Matthew 3.7 and Luke 3.7 respectively; see Chapter 3, note 5) and the infinitive that follows them conforms in all relevant respects to the ditransitive object control verbs, as the verb *warn* does today.

The second point concerns the classification of infinitives as complements or adjuncts. Complements, or arguments, are constituents that are part of the subcategorization of a verb and are assigned a thematic role by that verb; adjuncts are not part of the subcategorization of a verb and do not carry a thematic role assigned by that verb. Callaway criticizes earlier accounts for not making a principled distinction between the two (Callaway 1913: 31), but his own lack of clear criteria leads to some degree of arbitrariness. In his critique of Callaway’s work, Hellmut Bock points out that Callaway classifies (7) as a ‘consecutive’ infinitive, whereas the nearly identical (8) from the same text is labelled ‘final’ (Bock 1931: 157 n. 2):

(7) Syle us flæsc to etanne. ⟨Num 11.13⟩
    Give us meat to eat.
    Lat: *da nobis carnes, ut comedamus*
    ‘Give us meat to eat.’
(8) Hwa sylð us flæsc to etanne? 〈Num 11.4〉
Who gives us meat to eat?
Lat: quis dabit nobis ad vescendum carnes?
Who gives us meat to eat?

There are many more such examples (see Bock 1931: 157). Consecutive and final infinitives can both be classed as adjuncts, and the arbitrary labelling here is at least not affecting the overall picture.

Mislabelling complements as adjuncts or vice versa is a much more serious matter, and this is what we find with the infinitives after verbs of persuading and urging. Callaway classes them as adjuncts (Callaway 1913: 161), although this judgement must be revised in the light of more recent research. There is an objective test to determine adjunct or complement status: wh-extraction. Wh-phrases can only be extracted out of a phrase or clause if that phrase or clause is a complement (Chomsky 1980: 13ff.). This is illustrated by the PE examples in (9) and (10). The subclause in (9a) is a complement of the higher verb think, and so is the NP in (9b), and wh-extraction out of those complements is possible; the CP in (10a) and the NP in (10b) are adjuncts, and extraction is impossible:

(9)  
\[a. \text{What do you think } [\text{CP} \text{John will do t}_i]? \]
\[b. \text{Who did you buy } [\text{NP} \text{pictures of } t_i]? \]

(10)  
\[a. ^* \text{Who did Mary cry } [\text{CP} \text{after John hit } t_i]? \]
\[b. ^* \text{Who are } [\text{NP} \text{pictures of } t_i] \text{ on sale?} \]

Although the likelihood of finding the relevant construction in a finite historical data corpus is small, one such instance has been attested with a verb of persuading and urging:

(11) On hwilcum godum tihst þu us to
In which gods urgseth thou us to
\[\text{gelyfenne? 〈ÆLS (George) 148〉} \]
\[\text{‘Which gods do you urge us to believe in?’} \]

There is no doubt that the extraction site of the wh-constituent is indeed the complement position of the verb believe: the on-PP satisfies the argument structure of gelyfan, not of tyhtan. The matrix verb tihst subcategorizes for both the NP us and the to-infinitival phrase to gelyfenne on hwilcum godum; hence, the to-infinitival phrase is a complement, carries a θ-role assigned by the matrix verb tyhtan, and is subcategorized for by the verb. The verbs of persuading and urging, then, subcategorize for two internal arguments, with the thematic
roles of patient (or theme) and goal. Although the goal-argument can be expressed by the same three constituents as a purpose adjunct, i.e. a PP (with to), a that-clause with subjunctive, or a to-infinitival phrase, it differs crucially from such adjuncts in that it is a complement of the verb. As all the signs point to the to-infinitive having developed out of a goal-adjunct, finding it here as a goal-argument is significant.

The remaining shortcomings of Callaway’s classification—the classification of data on the basis of surface strings rather than underlying structure, his failure to filter out possible influence from a Latin Vorlage, and his decision to regard ge-verbs as separate forms—all contribute to the misleading impression that the distribution of the bare infinitive was once much larger than at present, which, in turn, has nourished the idea that the to-infinitive must have spread at the expense of the bare infinitive. Callaway’s lists of verbs that are exclusively complemented by a bare infinitive are very long, and very suggestive, especially when we take into account that they do not include the modals, to which Callaway devotes a separate chapter. Many verbs appear in the bare-infinitive-only lists solely on the basis of a single attestation in a gloss or slavish translation, where the choice of infinitive is determined by the infinitive in the Latin Vorlage (for details see Los 1999: 43–6). Many of the remainder are misclassified: in his chapter on the ‘objective’ infinitive (Callaway 1913: 29–72), he lumps together, on the basis of surface patterns only, at least five different infinitival constructions: monotransitive subject control, ditransitive subject control, ditransitive object control, Small clause, and bare-infinitival ECM (Aci) in which the infinitival subject has remained implicit. It is the latter that particularly obscures the distribution, as has been noted before (Mitchell 1985: §§375ff.; Warner 1993: 136ff.). AcIs with implicit subjects resemble subject control structures in their surface word order, but require a different analysis, take different verbs (perception and causation as opposed to intention-verbs), and also differ in their subsequent development, most importantly in that they still take the bare infinitive in PE. An example of such an AcI after a perception verb with implicit infinitival subject is (12), with, for comparison, (13) as an example of a full-blown AcI with explicit subject:

(12) in þære stowe wæs gewuna, þæt man hwilum ymb fisc gehyrde sprecan, & þær næs næfre nan gesewen. ⟨GD 1(C) 1.11.16⟩

(13) ‘in that place it was customary that one sometimes heard tell about fish, but none was ever seen.’
(13) Full oft ic frode menn fyrm gehyrde secggan and
Very often I wise men ACC long-ago heard speak INF and
swerian ymb sume wisan... (MSol 426)
tell INF (h.l.) about certain things
‘I have very often heard wise men of old speak and tell about certain things’

In (12), *ymb fisc sprecan* ‘speak about fish’ constitutes the theme argument of *hyrde* ‘heard’; there is no overt element that could serve as the external argument of the infinitive *sprecan* ‘speak’. We can postulate that we are dealing either with an implicit argument here or with a PRO subject, but it would have to be generic or arbitrary PRO, not subject control as in (14) below; the impossibility of subject control in such constructions is shown by the full-blown AcI in (12), where the external argument position of the infinitive is filled by an overt NP, *frode menn* ‘wise men’. Callaway discusses constructions such as that in (13) in a different chapter (‘The predicative infinitive with accusative subject’, Callaway 1913: 107–26), even though they have the same syntactic structure, and appear with the same verbs. The verbs that Callaway lists as occurring with construction (12) constitute a nearly complete subset of the list of verbs that occur with AcIs like (12) in that later chapter. There is only one exception, *abiddan* ‘bid’, which only occurs (once) with the construction in (12) and not with an explicit subject as in (13), but it is an infrequent verb, and the fact that it is not attested with an explicit subject is more likely to be due to chance than to any inherent structural restriction. Its more frequent cognate, *biddan* ‘bid’, is listed as an AcI-verb.

The AcI-construction is still going strong with bare infinitives in PE. The only thing that has happened to it is that it has lost its ability to have implicit infinitival subjects, apart from such fossils as *let slip*. There is no falling off in the distribution of the bare infinitive here.

This is not the case with true ‘objective’ bare infinitives, i.e. infinitives as arguments of verbs meaning ‘intend’, ‘try’ as in (14):

(14) se [...] mynte hine slean ⟨LS 17.2 (martinPet) 182⟩
    he [...] intended him ACC kill INF
    ‘he [...] intended to kill him’

In (14), *hine slean* ‘kill him’ constitutes the theme argument of *mynte* ‘intended’; the accusative *hine* ‘him’ constitutes, in turn, the theme argument of the infinitive *slean* ‘kill’. For the external argument of *slean* we have to postulate an empty category, PRO, which depends for its interpretation on the subject of the matrix verb, *se* ‘that one’; hence the term ‘subject control’ for
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such constructions. It is with these verbs, in this construction, that the bare infinitive has sustained its greatest losses.

Callaway’s presentation of the data baffles all attempts to account for the distribution of bare and to-infinitive. This in turn fuels the idea that the OE situation is in chaos because it reflects a transitional stage in which the two infinitives are in competition. Consequently, little effort has been made to bring the supposedly chaotic situation of the two infinitives in OE into sharper focus. The situation can only be resolved by a fresh investigation.

1.5 The rise of the to-infinitive: an outline

Parts II and III of this volume present an investigation into the distribution of the to-infinitive in OE and the clues this distribution yields about the origin and spread of the construction. The to-infinitive in Old English appears exclusively in control constructions (with an empty category, PRO, as external argument). As such it appears in the same constructions as in PE: (i) monotransitive subject control verbs, (ii) ditransitive object control verbs, and (iii) ditransitive subject control verbs. Each construction matches a particular semantic group: verbs with meanings like ‘intend’, ‘try’ for (i), like ‘persuade’, ‘order’, ‘allow’ for (ii), and like ‘promise’ for (iii). The distinction between the various groups is therefore made on syntactic and semantic grounds.

The rest of this book follows the chronological emergence of the to-infinitive in various functions. It seems likely from our knowledge of earlier stages, most notably Gothic, and from the formal appearance of the to-infinitive, which betrays its origin as a to-PP, that its earliest function was that of the purpose adjunct (Chapter 2). As this was also one of the functions of the bare infinitive, there may well have been some competition at this stage, but it appears that bare infinitives had come to express events that were simultaneous with rather than consecutive to the event expressed by the matrix verb.

Bare infinitives no longer occur as purpose adjuncts in OE, but only as complements to perception and causation verbs (Acl) and as complements to certain verbs that are well on the way to becoming auxiliaries: the modals, which evolve into a periphrasis of the old subjunctive, and the verbs of motion and rest, which are developing into aspectualizers. The distribution of the to-infinitive at first mirrored that of the to-PP. As such it occurred not only as purpose adjunct but also as goal-argument after conative verbs (with meanings like ‘try’) and verbs of persuading and urging (Chapter 3). Here it was in direct competition with the subjunctive clause, which could also appear in these functions, and at some point it seems to have been reanalysed as a non-finite subjunctive. This reanalysis probably accounts for the fact that
we begin to see *to*-infinitives appearing as theme-argument of verbs with meanings like ‘intend’ (Chapter 4) and verbs of commanding and permitting (Chapter 5). In Chapter 6 we discuss the commissives—verbs with meanings like ‘promise’—which resemble the verbs of commanding and permitting with respect to their ditransitive argument structure, but the intention verbs with respect to their control properties. The commissive differs from these other two groups in that its finite complement survives robustly into PE, and we conclude that this is because finite complements allow the presence of modal verbs, which are needed to distinguish between the three different types of promises. This is also the reason why modal verbs most frequently appear after these verbs in OE: the subjunctive ending by itself apparently did not suffice to disambiguate the three types of promises.

Chapter 7 investigates the categorial status of the *to*-infinitive in OE. We find that it does not behave like a PP, in spite of its formal appearance, but like a clause. Once the distribution of the *to*-infinitive has been seen to coincide with that of the subjunctive *that*-clause, and the focus of our attention has shifted from the *to*-infinitive/bare infinitive dichotomy, a number of other facts fall into place. There is evidence from different mss of the same OE text which strongly suggests that the rise of the *to*-infinitive occurred at the expense of the finite subjunctive clause; these findings are confirmed by a quantitative investigation, which reveals that the massive increase in *to*-infinitives in ME is due to a corresponding decrease not in bare infinitives but in subjunctive *that*-clauses.

Analysing the OE *to*-infinitive as a non-finite subjunctive clause has consequences for the status of infinitival *to*. It is not a P, which means that the recategorization from PP to TP must have taken place a good deal earlier than traditionally supposed, i.e. in prehistoric OE or even Primitive Germanic, rather than OE or early ME. Pinpointing the *to*-PP as expression of goal-argument and the purpose adjunct as the origin of the *to*-infinitive allows us to come up with a new hypothesis for this prehistoric recategorization. The N-head contained in such *to*-PPs is invariably a nominalization of a verb, with derivational morphology. Although OE has a variety of nominalizing suffixes, not a single one of these may attach to just any V-stem, a restriction typical of derivational morphology; only inflectional morphology accepts an entire major category as input. The *to*-infinitive contains an N-head built on the nominalizing suffix *-anja* which, although originally derivational, must have competed so successfully with the other nominalizing suffixes that it eventually accepted any V-stem as input. From this point on, learners analysed it as inflectional rather than derivational morphology and hence no longer category-changing. This is how the *to*-infinitive came to be the non-finite
counterpart of the subjunctive clause. The recategorization, then, may well have been abrupt rather than the long-drawn-out process it is usually thought to be (e.g. by Disterheft 1980).

What is the status of infinitival to if is not a P? Chapter 7 further argues that a unified analysis of infinitival to is in fact possible in terms of Determined Time Reference (Noonan 1985), bearing in mind that DTR is not restricted to future-oriented predicates but also includes timeless psychological/evaluative predicates. Syntactically, to has been analysed as a non-finite modal verb in PE (e.g. by Pullum 1982), and this analysis probably also holds for OE and ME. It helps to account for the surprising finding that infinitival to, which is required to be strictly adjacent to the infinitive in OE, develops into a free word in ME (as in the PE example (5) above). The degrammaticalization of infinitival to, from clitic, or perhaps even bound morpheme, to free word was facilitated by the loss of OV orders, but we will suggest that the actual trigger may have been the behaviour of the finite counterpart of to, the finite subjunctive form; this form was increasingly signalled by a modal, i.e. a free morpheme, which raised to T overtly, instead of of a subjunctive inflection bound to the verb which raised to T covertly (Chapter 8).

The only construction found with a to-infinitive in PE but not OE is the ECM-construction as in (4) above; the only construction productively found with a to-infinitive in OE but not PE is the one in the PE fossil He is to blame. Chapter 9 argues that there is a connection between the rise of the ECM-construction and the loss of the he is to blame-construction. In addition to the factors of Latin influence and loss of OV orders adduced by Warner (1982) and Fischer (1989, 1992), the emergence in the fifteenth century of the to-infinitival ECM-construction after the believe-type verbs—i.e. the change exemplified by (4)—was promoted by another important factor: the loss of verb-second (V2). OE is a V2 language (van Kemenade 1987: 42–8) but V2 is gradually lost in the ME period (ibid. 180–4). This process has consequences for the organization of theme/rheme material (i.e. of given versus new information), and the ECM-construction after the believe-verbs—almost invariably passive in both ME and PE—became acceptable for this reason. The many restrictions on the use of such ECM-constructions, not only structural (many verbs only allow it in the passive) but also as regards the genres or registers where they occur, could indicate that this type of ECM has still not been incorporated fully into the speaker’s core grammar and may well have the status of a grammatical virus (For ‘Virus Theory’, see Sobin 1997).

Chapter 10 presents an account of an unexpected victim of both the rise of the to-infinitive and the loss of V2: the ‘ultra-indefinite’ pronoun man which, as the overt counterpart of arbitrary PRO, is outcompeted by its non-overt
counterpart in embedded contexts because of the rise of the to-infinitive, and outcompeted by the passive construction in main-clause contexts because of the loss of V2.

The final chapter summarizes the conclusions of the book.

1.6 Some methodological decisions

One of the reasons why the distribution of the bare and the to-infinitive remains opaque in Callaway’s classification is his failure to filter out suspect data from glosses and slavish translations (§1.3 above). The fact that we lack native speaker judgements does not mean that we have to take every instance of an infinitive in these texts at face value. The material that has survived needs to be sifted and evaluated: the infinitive may occur in a bad translation with heavy interference from the source text (usually Latin); other copies of the same text may have a different reading. It is only then that the distribution of the two infinitives moves into closer focus.

Interpreting the material in this way is of course not without risk. Although it is relatively easy to defend the position that instances in interlinear glosses should be discarded as unreliable guides to actual OE (as they represent word-for-word transliterations of a Latin text, and it is widely recognized that there is a close correspondence of a Latin infinitive to a bare infinitive in the OE gloss, or a Latin gerund or gerundive to a to-infinitive in the OE gloss), it is more controversial to discard instances from texts that are translations rather than transliterations. But there are also such things as bad translations, and if the distribution of the infinitives in OE presents a coherent picture but for a handful of attestations in translations which are already suspected of being over-literal (e.g. the OE translation of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica; see e.g. Raith 1951; Clement 1978), we should at least investigate this possibility, and consider discarding such suspect instances.

The present investigation reveals that such a coherent picture emerges if three translations are used with care, i.e. if infinitival constructions that follow the wording of the Latin original are not taken into account: the translation of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica, the West-Saxon Gospels, and the Saint’s Life of Mary of Egypt (Skeat 1966 [1881–1900]).

Another methodological point is also the result of having to work with ‘performance data’, and involves the question of unattested structures. The OE text corpus is sufficiently large to allow at times categorial statements of the type only NPs with accusative case can passivize (cf. Russom 1983) or ‘to’ is part of the infinitival phrase and cannot be moved (cf. Fischer 1996b), especially if these phenomena are further confirmed by evidence from related, living
languages. The fact that dative NPs subsequently allow passivization, or that *to*-infinitives may be split, represents ME innovations and can be considered as evidence of structural changes. But unattested structures cannot always serve as evidence of a diachronic change. Mittwoch (1990: 107–8) discusses the difficulties of assessing the status of negation in accusative-and-infinitive constructions, e.g. in ‘laboratory’ examples like (15) (Mittwoch’s example (33), slightly adapted):

(15) John saw Mary not leave

She makes the point that such examples are at best ‘borderline denizens of some limbo region between the grammatical and the deviant’ and adds that, in five years of looking out for real-life utterances of such sentences, she has never encountered a single example, ‘not even one meant ironically’ (Mittwoch 1990: 108). Such examples illustrate the gap between corpora with performance data and sentences constructed under laboratory conditions. Both have their own valuable contribution to make: the corpus will yield information about usage that might not surface in the laboratory, whereas the laboratory will yield information about structure that might not surface in a corpus study. (Whether they complement each other completely is a different matter; the extra information produced by each probably does not fully compensate for the other’s blind spot.) A similar point could be made about the ECM with *to*-infinitives, where scholars can construct grammatical examples like *I believe them to have a dog* (e.g. Miller 2002: 149) but also need to account in some way for the fact that such sentences never show up in performance corpora, where the construction occurs overwhelmingly in the passive, and is restricted to quite formal registers (see e.g. Mair 1990). There is a risk, however, that too much is made of the fact that a certain structure is not attested in performance corpora. I will give an example from Old English.

The *to*-infinitive in OE is not attested with perfective *have* (*to have V*), overt passives (*to be V-ed*), or independent negation (*not to V*). Such structures (comparable to the PE examples (1)–(3) above) have been attested From ME onwards, and it has consequently been argued that this points to a structural change—usually couched in terms of a lack of particular functional projections like AgrSP or TP. In this particular case, however, it should be remembered that the *to*-infinitival ECM-construction is unknown in OE, and that OE *to*-infinitives all appear in (subject and object) control constructions

---

3 The latter is not quite true—purpose adjuncts of the type *I come to do... not to do...* do exist, e.g. *to habbenne & to brucenne & na of tham mynstre to sellanne* (CH 1533), ‘to have and to use, and not to sell it give it away from the monastery.’
which are invariably about non-actuated Acts that are intended, promised, permitted, or ordered by the Speaker, and for this reason alone tend to be affirmative and active.

This is demonstrated by the fact that negation and passives are extremely rare in the case of the finite counterparts of such control constructions in OE, even though these finite clauses contain the functional projections argued to be absent from OE to-infinitives, so that there is no structural constraint that can account for the small numbers of passives and negatives here. A closer look reveals that these finite constructions are as much ‘controlled’ as their non-finite, to-infinitival counterparts: the contents of AgrSP and TP depend on material in the higher clause, and these finite clauses, too, encode non-actuated Acts intended, promised, permitted, or ordered by the Speaker, which is why they, too, tend to be affirmative and active. As to-infinitival constructions are still marginal in numerical terms compared to finite control complements, the likelihood of finding passive and negative attestations here is even smaller than with their finite counterparts. In sum, there is no reason to assume that passives and negatives are structurally impossible in OE (in the sense that a speaker would not be able to construct ‘laboratory’ examples). They are not attested because of the nature of the controlled complement itself. This means that one must always be aware of the strengths, and the limitations, of a corpus of performance data.

The corpus used most frequently in this book is the Toronto Corpus, a spin-off to the Dictionary of Old English Project (see Healey and Venezky 1985 [1980]), specifically the first nineteen segments, which represent some two million words of running text. A list of the corpora used is given in Appendix I.

This study has been loosely cast in the formal framework of Government & Binding Theory with some excursions into the feature-checking mechanisms of its successor, the Minimalist Programme—‘loosely’, because I have tried to stick to traditional terminology (‘NP’ rather than ‘DP’, ‘deep structure’ rather than ‘D-structure’ or ‘Numeration’, etc.) in order to keep the material presented here accessible to a wider audience, especially because many of the findings in this study are not theory-dependent.

One of the reasons for using this framework is its ability to accommodate the fact that languages may encode the same functional information as either free forms (function words, closed classes, e.g. articles, conjunctions, pronouns) or bound forms (inflection on a lexical head). Lexical information is base-generated in lexical heads (A, N, V, and P), which themselves are the kernels of phrases (AP, NP, VP, or PP). These lexical ‘projections’ may have ‘functional’ projections above them, with functional heads. It is these functional heads that
accommodate grammatical information, whether free or bound; examples are T for tense, Agr for agreement, M for mood, C for complementizer. Free functional forms are base-generated in these heads or move there, ‘overtly’; bound functional forms also establish a relationship with these heads by ‘covert’ movement. Grammaticalization processes in this framework may translate as lexical material moving to a functional head, first occasionally, then invariably, which may result in a generation of learners analysing that lexical material as functional and base-generating it in that functional head (reanalysis; see also Roberts and Roussou 2003). The grammaticalization of modals from lexical Vs to functional auxiliaries, for instance, translates in this framework as a subset of V that is no longer base-generated in V but in a functional head, say T or M. The modal content of this functional head had previously been expressed by subjunctive morphology, i.e. by covert movement. After the loss of this verbal inflection, modal verbs, originally introduced to explicate certain semantic nuances, took over this subjunctive function, first by overt movement (being base-generated in V like ordinary lexical verbs but moving to the functional head to express its modality) and then by being base-generated in the functional head from the start.

This approach assumes that the abstract model of the language that the language learner constructs on the basis of the Primary Linguistic Data has a role to play in syntactic change, because each new generation of learners may analyse and classify data slightly differently. Reanalysis in language acquisition may account for facts that do not have any obvious explanation. One such mystery is the degrammaticalization of infinitival to from affix to free word which took place in ME. If we accept that the to-infinitive comes to be analysed as a non-finite alternative to the subjunctive clause, to then comes to be analysed as subjunctive inflection. When modals—free forms—take over the function of subjunctive inflection in ME, to, also analysed as subjunctive, follows suit and is reanalysed as a free form. A similar level of abstractness is standardly assumed for phonological change, where the phones that constitute natural classes (of plosives, fricatives etc.) may undergo similar changes (e.g. Grimm’s Law) even though language users are not consciously aware that these sounds have anything to do with each other; they are similarly unaware of the relationship between infinitival to and the modal verbs, although their language output shows that they are treating infinitival to as a non-finite modal verb to all intents and purposes (e.g. Pullum 1982 and §8.4 below). The scenario proposed here for the degrammaticalization of infinitival to in terms of functional projections is no more abstract or implausible than Grimm’s Law.

One final note about my use of the term ‘subjunctive clause’. This book will mainly be concerned with this type of clause in the function of purpose adjunct
and complement to ‘control’ verbs (commanding, persuading, promising, and intending). These clauses are putative rather than factual and therefore usually require one of the following modal verbs in PE: can, could, may, might, should, would (e.g. Quirk et al. 1985: 1108). The difference between putative and factual clauses was expressed in earlier times by verb morphology rather than modals: subjunctive for the former and indicative for the latter. The use of modals increased in OE as an alternative expression of the subjunctive, although full equivalence was not reached until c. 1350 (see e.g. Lopez Couso and Mendez Naya 1996). Modals were occasionally themselves in the subjunctive form, and the erosion of the subjunctive endings led to many ‘neutralized’ forms which were ambiguous between subjunctive and indicative. My use of the term ‘subjunctive clause’ is broad and includes actual subjunctives, ‘neutralized’ subjunctives that can be expected to be subjunctive because of the putative nature of the clause, and clauses with modals, indicative or subjunctive.
Part II

The *to*-infinitive as *GOAL*
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The expression of purpose in Old English

2.1 Introduction

The original function of the to-infinitive is traditionally supposed to have been that of purpose adjunct: a constituent that is an adverbial rather than a complement (i.e. it is not an argument of the matrix verb) and expresses the intended result of the action of that main verb. In PE, the commonest expression of purpose adjuncts is a non-finite clause with a to-infinitive (1a), a PP with for (1b), or a finite clause introduced by in order that or so (that) (1c) (Quirk et al. 1985: 564, 1107–8; purpose adjuncts appear in bold):

(1) a. I left early to catch the train. (ibid. 1107)
   b. How many actors will you need for this production? (ibid. 564)
   c. The school closes earlier so (that) the children can get home before dark. (ibid. 1108)

We find the same three constituents (finite and non-finite clause and PP) in earlier times, but the formal similarity between them was closer; all three could be introduced by in order to (eModE) as in (2), or by to alone (OE), as in (6)–(8) below, or by du ‘to’ alone in Gothic, as in (3)–(5) below.

(2) a. In order to support the roof a second row of columns was introduced. (OED 1868 Chambers’ Encycl. III. 142/1)
   b. In order to the existence of love between two parties, there must be a secret affinity between them. (OED 1869 Goulburn Purs. Holiness viii. 67)
   c. I have come to you now, in order that you may speak to him. (OED 1875 Jowett Plato I. 123)

The evidence that the purpose adjunct was the earliest function in which the to-infinitive appeared is, first, that its Gothic parallel, the du-infinitive, appears exclusively as purpose adjunct (Köhler 1867), never as verb complement; and
secondly, the form of the *to*-infinitive points to it having started out as a *to*-PP, and one of the main functions of the *to*-PP in OE is that of purpose adjunct. We will see at the end of this chapter that the purpose adjunct is also the function where the *to*-infinitive first begins to oust the subjunctive *that*-clause.

If the function in which the *to*-infinitive first appeared was that of purpose adjunct, the question of what earlier structures of that function it may have replaced, or competed with, becomes relevant. It has often been claimed that this was the area in which the *to*-infinitive first started to replace the bare infinitive (see also the quote from Sweet 1903: 118 in §1.3 above). Although the bare infinitive did once express purpose, we will show that by the time of the first OE records it had developed an aspectual meaning which was no longer compatible with prospective intention. If the two infinitives ever competed in the function of purpose adjunct it must have been at a stage prior to OE. Its formal and functional similarity to a *to*-PP suggests that the *to*-infinitive probably competed with the *to*-PP at its initial appearance. Its later spread, however, appears to have been at the expense of that third expression of purpose, the subjunctive clause.

2.2 Purpose adjuncts in Gothic and Old English

The earliest extant text in a Germanic language—apart from isolated runic inscriptions on spears, stones, or other artefacts—is Wulfila’s translation of the Greek Bible into Gothic, which dates from the middle of the fourth century AD. The extant texts comprise a fragment from the Old Testament (from Nehemiah) and about three-quarters of the New Testament.

Two important points need to be taken into account when we use data from Gothic to reconstruct the situation of the infinitives in prehistoric English. First, Gothic is a representative of East Germanic, a branch of Germanic of which no descendant has survived, whereas Old English belongs to another branch altogether (West Germanic). It should be kept in mind that there is no direct relationship between the two languages.

Secondly, the only surviving Gothic texts are translations from Greek. Interference from Greek syntax makes it extremely difficult to extract syntactic function from Gothic texts; Greek abounds in non-finite forms and constructions which do not appear to have been available in Gothic, and the general consensus appears to be that the translator’s efforts to follow the original text as closely as possible have probably resulted in many un-Gothic non-finite
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The Gothic syntax also shows some interference from Latin (Harbert 1978: 203–7).

The Gothic texts contain some fifty occurrences of a structure resembling the OE to-infinitive; it is composed of a particle *du*, identical in form to the preposition *du* ‘to’, and an infinitive in -an which is identical in form to the bare infinitive and does not appear to carry an inflection. Interference from the Vorlage makes it difficult to interpret the status of the bare infinitive as purpose adjunct. The translator appears to have used a bare infinitive whenever Greek uses one, but there are significant exceptions. Purpose adjuncts after adjectives like *azetizo* ‘easy’ and *þaurfts* ‘needful’ and nouns like *waldufní* ‘power’ occur with either infinitive, although the Vorlage has the bare infinitive here. These environments only allow the to-infinitive in OE. We have no way of knowing whether this indicates that bare infinitives were once possible and were subsequently lost, or the du-infinitive is actually the preferred complement of such adjectives in Gothic, and that the instances of the bare infinitives in this position are due to interference from Greek. This means that the frequency of the du-infinitive may have been higher in ‘genuine’ Gothic, as opposed to the artificial Gothic of the extant ‘transliterations’. The only thing we can say of the du-infinitive in the texts as they stand is that both its frequency and its function were far more restricted than in OE.

Its lower frequency is immediately evident when we compare the incidence of to-infinitives in the Gothic and OE Gospels. For example, the Gothic text of the Gospel of Mark contains 4 du-infinitives, whereas the OE translation of the same text contains 20.

Its more restricted function can be gauged from the fact that there are no unequivocal instances of the du-infinitive as argument in Gothic: the

1 Van der Wal (1992: 64) gives the following example of a Greek participial construction with a literal translation:

(i)  *at sunnin þan urrinnandin ufbrann* (Mark 4.6)
    *but sun then rising burned [it]*
    ‘but when the sun rose, it [the young corn] was scorched’

As a rule, none of the Germanic languages (old or modern) allows such constructions. Other constructions that are possible in Latin but, as a rule, not in the Germanic languages are accusative-and-infinitive constructions with believe-type verbs (i.e. the verbs of thinking and declaring). The question of whether they were acceptable in Gothic is extremely relevant in this context. The extent of interference has been the subject of a long debate; see e.g. Bernhardt 1877a, b; Curme 1911; and Harbert 1978, who argues that the accusative-and-infinitive construction found after some intention verbs is unlikely to reflect actual Gothic usage.
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du-infinitive does not occur, as it does in OE, as GOAL-argument of con- 
atives or verbs of persuading and urging, or as THEME-argument of INTENTION 
verbs and verbs of commanding and permitting, but exclusively as purpose 
adjunct. The differences in frequency and function fit the available evidence 
that the to-/du-infinitive represents a relative innovation in the Germanic 
languages, and that its original function must have been that of purpose 
adjunct.

Purpose adjuncts in Gothic can be expressed by du-PPs, by subjunctive 
clauses with ei (corresponding to OE δεῖ) or ὑπὲρ ei (corresponding to OE 
to δῶν δεῖ/to ὕψος δεῖ), occasionally by genitive NPs (cf. Wright 1968 [1954]: 
185), but also by bare and du-infinitives, which usually translate a Greek (bare) 
infinite. Köhler notes that the du-PP (purposive rather than spatial, as it con-
tains a nominalization of a verb) in (3) could equally well have been expressed 
by a du-infinitive, which would have looked like (4), or a subjunctive ei-clause 
(which would have looked like (5)), which implies that he regards these three 
constituents as the typical expression of the purpose adjunct (examples from 
Köhler 1867: 451):

(3) þata waurkjaiþ ... du meinai gamunai (1 Cor. 11.24–5) du-PP 
this do ... to my remembrance 
‘do this as a memorial to me’

(4) du gamunan meina du-infinitive 
to remember me 
‘to remember me’

(5) ei meina gamunaiþ subjunctive ei-clause 
that me rememberSUBJ-2SG 
’so that you may remember me’

Note that Köhler does not mention the bare infinite as an alternative to (3). 
This is significant because the other categories are the same three that express 
purpose in OE: the purposive to-PP in (6), which typically contains a nominal-
alization of a verb (browung in this case), the to-infinitive as in (7), and the 
subjunctive clause introduced by δεῖ, as in (8) (relevant structures appear in 
bold type):

(6) he sende hine to browunge for manna 
he sent himACC to tormentDAT for men’s 
alyssednysse (ÆCHom I, 16 232.2) 
redemption 
‘he sent him into torment for the redemption of mankind’
(7) [he] is ure hælend crist. se ðe com to gehælennæ
he is our saviour Christ he who came to heal
ure wunda \(\langle\text{ÆCHom I, 9 142.30}\rangle\)
our wounds
‘He is our saviour, Christ, he who came to heal our wounds’

(8) he com to mannum to ðy. þæt he wolde. beon
he came to men to that instr that he wanted be
gehrysum his fæder oð deαð \(\langle\text{ÆCHom I, 14.1 214.32}\rangle\)
obedient his father until death
‘he came to men to that end, that he wanted to be obedient to his father
until death’

The subjunctive ðæt-clause may occasionally have its purposive meaning
strengthened by a cataphoric pronoun to ðon ðæt or to ðy ðæt—as in example
(8)—exactly corresponding to Gothic duþþe ei.

There are instances in which bare infinitives seem to occur as adjuncts, i.e.
as constituents that are not subcategorized for by the matrix verb, particularly
in OE poetry. An example is (9), in which the verb cuman is followed by a bare
infinitive:

(9) Com þa wigena hleo þegna þreatæ
Came then of-warriors defender of-followers band
þryðbold secan, beadurof cyning burga
mighty-dwelling seek, battle-renowned king cities
neosan. \(\langle\text{El 150–2}\rangle\)
visit.
‘Then the defender of warriors, the king renowned in battle, with his
band of followers came to seek his mighty dwelling and to visit his cities.’

The bare infinitive in examples like (9) does not express purpose or goal,
however, but simultaneity, much like the present participle or the progressive
in PE. In this function it does not compete with the to-infinitive. As all other
bare infinitives appear in texts that are heavily influenced by Latin, i.e. glosses
or over-literal translations, our conclusion must be that the bare infinitive
could not express purpose in OE, or no longer did so.

2.3 Bare ‘final’ infinitives in the literature

Callaway discusses the purposive infinitive under two headings: that of the
‘final infinitive’ (Callaway 1913: 132–48) and that of the ‘other adverbial uses’
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(Callaway 1913: 161–8). His data appear to indicate that both bare and to-infinitives are found in these uses; it is, however, clear from the discussion in his chapter on the ‘origin’ (i.e. native versus foreign) of the various constructions that many of the verbs appear in his lists of ‘only the uninflected final infinitive’ or ‘both uninflected and inflected’ (ibid. 133–5) on the basis of dubious examples, usually in an over-literal Old English translation of a Latin text in which the choice of infinitive reflects that in the source, and tells us little about its acceptability in native OE.

Callaway lists the following groups of verbs as occurring with the final infinitive in OE:

1. verbs of motion
2. verbs of rest
3. verbs of commanding, giving, and requesting
4. other verbs (ibid. 134–5)

We will see in the next section that the bare infinitive after groups 1 and 2 does not express purpose. The infinitives after the other two groups, 3 and 4, either occur in suspicious circumstances, i.e. glosses and transliterations (group 4), or do not express purpose either (group 3). We will start with the third group.

The diagnosis ‘purpose adjunct’ is extremely suspect in the case of this third group. Thirty of Callaway’s 32 examples of the final bare infinitive with this group contain as their infinitive etan ‘eat’, drincan or ondrincan ‘drink’, ðicgan ‘consume’, or supan ‘sip, swallow’. An example is:

(10) Se *deofol cwæð thæt he wolde beran drincan
    The devil said that he would bear drinkINF
    his gebroðrum (ÆCHom II, 11 134.435)
    his brothersDAT
    ‘The devil said that he would bear something to drink to his brothers’

Callaway notes that the Læceboc contains 27 instances of etan and 170 instances of drincan (ibid. 313). At times the form drincan is used to translate the Latin noun potum, suggesting that it is not an infinitive at all, but a noun (ibid. 148 n. 6).² It seems that these bare infinitives have become part of an idiom; they cannot be adduced as evidence that the bare infinitive still productively expresses a purpose adjunct in OE. There are seven to-infinitives of eating and

² Note that the same construction appears in Modern Dutch, which otherwise does not allow bare infinitival adjuncts. The originally infinitival forms eten and drinken in expressions like Ik heb de hond al eten gegeven ‘I gave the dog his dinner’, lit. ‘I have the dog already eat given’, are analysed as nouns, not infinitives.
drinking in this same group. Callaway notes that a large proportion (‘about two-thirds’, ibid. 215) of these bare and to-infinitives of eating and drinking appear in translations and simply reflect the choice of non-finite form in the original (ibid.). The remaining two infinitives, *cyssan* ‘kiss’ and *wundigean* ‘injure’, appear in translations from Latin (ibid. 141).³

Apart from these bare infinitives of eating and drinking, verbs in the group of commanding, giving, and requesting also appear with to-infinitives. Numerically, they are marginal (for *sellan*, the most frequent verb, we find 76 to-infinitives versus 257 bare infinitives; ibid. 313). Apart from the seven to-infinitives of eating and drinking, their meanings cannot be assigned to any particular semantic group. Because we would not expect genuine purpose adjuncts to be subcategorized for by particular verbs—they are adjuncts, not arguments—this marked difference between the two infinitives—the bare infinitive mainly restricted to *etan* and *drincan* and the to-infinitive not showing any restrictions at all—is a first indication that only to-infinitives can be purpose adjuncts. This further supports our hypothesis that the ‘eating and drinking’ infinitives are a special case and do not constitute evidence that the bare infinitive is still used as an adjunct of purpose in OE.

The fourth group, ‘other verbs’, occurs overwhelmingly with to-infinitives. It is significant that Callaway does not even attempt to classify verbs that are followed by a to-infinitival purpose adjunct into semantic groups: ‘the inflected final infinitive only is found with a very large number of verbs of such varied significations that it seems unwise to attempt to classify them’ (ibid. 143). Adjuncts are by definition not subcategorized for by the verb, so that the fact that these to-infinitives appear after such a wide range of verbs confirms their adjunct status. There are few bare infinitives, and they are all suspect. The single bare-infinitive examples of *gewyrcan* ‘make’ and *scieppan* ‘create’ are both labelled as dubious by Callaway, and he suggests plausibly that the *gewyrcan*-example might be an AcI (so not an adjunct of purpose), and gives the other example (⟨Max I, 125⟩) a question mark (ibid. 134–5). A third

³ The latter, oddly enough, translates a Latin gerundive, *vulnerandos*, not a Latin infinitive:

(ii) *to mergen ic hig* sylle on dïsre ylcan tide ealle gewundigean on Israela
tomorrow I them'acc grant in this same time all injureINF in Israel’s
gesihđe (Josh. 11.6)
sight
Lat: *cras enim hac eadem hora ego tradam omnes istos vulnerandos in conspectu Israel*
‘At this time tomorrow I shall deliver all of them injured to Israel’s sight’

So *gewundigean* is an adjunct, but the sense is not purposive.
verb, *aliesan* ‘release’, reflects a bare infinitive in the Latin original (Callaway 1913: 143), a text from the West-Saxon Gospels which, as a translation, is of uneven quality (cf. Callaway’s comments, ibid. 147).

Once these examples are discarded, as well as those of eating and drinking and those where the purpose adjunct after verbs like *sendan* ‘send’ reflects an over-literal translation (in Bede, ibid. 135, 313), we are left with a handful of examples of bare infinitives after verbs like *fundian* ‘strive’, which are more likely to be arguments than adjuncts (see Chapter 3 below). This leaves us one more group to investigate: the ‘verbs of motion and rest’.

### 2.4 Bare infinitives after verbs of motion and rest

The verbs of motion and rest comprise the following set:


Callaway discusses the bare infinitive after these verbs under two separate headings in two different chapters of his book. This becomes apparent when we compare his list of ‘final infinitives’ (i.e. the verbs in (11)) with the verbs listed under his heading ‘predicative infinitive with verbs of motion and rest’ (ibid. 89–92): the verbs occurring with what he calls the ‘predicative infinitive’ turn out to be a subset of (11), with the exception of two single examples, one with *fleon* ‘fly’, ‘flee’ in ⟨Judge 240⟩ and one with *dælan* ‘distribute’, ‘diffuse’ in ⟨Gen 2919⟩. Both examples are discussed in Los (1999: 224), where it is concluded that they are adjuncts, but not purpose adjuncts. Callaway himself notes that ‘at times it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide whether we have the predicative or the final use of the infinitive’ (ibid. 90; see also the discussion at 194–9). The term ‘predicative’ is not defined any further, but appears to refer to a complement expressing an event that is simultaneous to the action of the matrix verb, unlike purposive infinitives, which refer to events that are prospective, subsequent to the action of the matrix verb. Callaway gives the following as an example of a predicative infinitive:

(12) *syððan* Higelac cwom faran *flotherge* on Fresna
when Hygelac came travel**INF** sea-army into Frisians’
land (Beo 2915)
land
‘when Hygelac came journeying with a sea-borne army into the land of the Frisians’ (transl Swanton 1978: 173)
Even if some examples still retain a purposive sense in OE, as Callaway claims, they cannot be taken as evidence that bare infinitives could still be purpose *adjuncts* in OE. The fact that these infinitives occur after a restricted set of verbs, in marked contrast to the verbs that are followed by a ‘final’ *to*-infinitive, which are of ‘such varied significations that it seems unwise to attempt to classify them’ (ibid. 143), suggests that the bare infinitive is not an adjunct but an argument of the verbs of motion and rest. Adjuncts are by definition not subcategorized for by the verb, so the restricted range of verbs in (11) indicates that the bare infinitive after these verbs is an argument, or perhaps that these verbs are auxiliaries. Callaway’s conclusions suggest the latter.

If the bare infinitives in set (11) do not express purpose, what do they express? Callaway, and others before him, observed that the verbs of (11) could also be followed by a present participle. The phenomenon is well illustrated by Callaway’s examples; two of them occur in the same text, in consecutive sentences (relevant phrases in bold):

(13) *ÆLS (Martin) 1038–43*

Eft on sumne sæl þær Martinus siðode midegæfterum, þa com þær færlice yrnan an þearle his companions, then came there suddenly *run* one very wod cu, and þa þe hyre fyligdon clypodon to þam mad cow, and those who her followed called to the halgan were þæt he hine warnian sceolde, forþanþe heo holy man that he him *acc* guard should, because she hnat yfele ælcné þe heo gemette. Heo com þa gored badly each whom she met. She came then *yrnende* mid egeslicum eagum, ac se halga wer running *prespart* with fearsome eyes, but the holy man *sona* het hi ætstandan, and heo þærrihte at-once bade her *at-call* and she immediately gehyrsumode his hæse and stod.

‘On one particular occasion, when Martin was travelling with his companions, there suddenly came running a very mad cow, and those who followed her called to the holy man to watch out, because she would gore badly anyone she met. She then came running with fearsome eyes, but the holy man straightaway bade her stand still, and she immediately obeyed his command and stood still.’
Callaway provides quantitative evidence that in the course of the OE period the present participle competed with, and ultimately ousted, the bare infinitive after the verbs of motion and rest (Los 1999: 222–4). The form of *be* plus present participle does exist in Old English, but it is not the exact equivalent of the modern progressive, although it appears to be its ancestor (Mitchell 1985: 271–80). Richardson notes that ‘the participle is often adjectival rather than verbal, although it may imply continuing action’ (Richardson 1994: 316). Its influence may therefore not have been very significant at this stage.

More promising is another of Callaway’s remarks: ‘Slight, if not inappreciable at first, this influence [of the periphrastic construction with *to be*] would become the stronger as the principal verb of motion paled more and more into an auxiliary’ (Callaway 1913: 221). Purposive meaning is not particularly compatible with the meanings of the present participle constructions as presented by Callaway’s examples; but if the original purposive meaning of the bare infinitive after the verbs of set (11) was lost at some stage, it could well have been because the bare infinitive had developed a new meaning that converged with the ‘predicative’ meaning of the present participle.

Callaway devotes an entire section to the difficulty of teasing apart the ‘predicative’ and ‘final’ meanings of the various attestations of the bare infinitive after these verbs, and illustrates it with a number of interesting quotes from the literature (ibid. 193–9). Most commentators describe the difference between the two meanings in terms of simultaneity versus consecutivity: the choice between the two interpretations depends on whether the action expressed by the matrix verb is perceived to be simultaneous to the one expressed by the infinitive (this is the ‘predicative’ meaning, which approaches that of the present participle), or consecutive (the ‘final’ meaning). Another recurrent theme is the semantic bleaching of the motion verbs themselves in such constructions; this loss of lexical meaning is variously described as ‘pleonastic’ (*pleonastisch*) by Steig (1884), Shearin (1903), Riggert (1909), and Wülfing (1894), ‘phraseological’ (*phraseologisch*) by Pratje (1886), ‘modal’ by Smith (1896), ‘auxiliary’ (*auxiliarisch*) by Grimm (1870–98).

The use of terms like ‘auxiliary’, ‘modal’, and ‘pleonastic’ suggests a loss of lexical meaning, and a corresponding gain in the functional domain. Richardson notes that many of the instances of bare infinitives after the verbs in (11) are best translated by a PE progressive; he cites the following two examples (relevant bare infinitives and their governing verbs in bold):

(14) […] Guðbyrne *scan*  
Warmail *shone*
The expression of purpose in Old English

heard hondlocen, hringiren scir
hard handlocked, ring-iron bright
song in searwum, þa hie to sele furðum
sang on armour, when they to hall first
in hyra gryregeatwum gangan cwomon (Beo 321b–4)
in their grim-gear come
‘The war-mail shone, hard with hand-forged links; the bright iron rings sang on their armour, when they first arrived, striding up to the hall in their grim gear’ (trans. Swanton 1978: 48)

(15) Gewat ða byrnende gebogen scriðan, to gescipe departed then burning bent glide to fate
scyndan. (Beo 2569–70a)
hasten.
‘Then burning, coiled, it went gliding out, hastened to its fate.’ (trans. ibid. 156)

Richardson observes that ‘It would be ungrammatical to translate these constructions with modern English bare stem infinitives (*came walk, *went glide), and either odd or ungrammatical to gloss them with modern to-infinitives (?came to walk, ?departed to glide [...]’ (Richardson 1994: 318). The present participle seems to be the best choice, as has also been observed of the same construction in Chaucer (Burnley 1983: 30–1, quoted by Richardson, ibid.). He concludes that Old English relied on motion (and perception) verbs followed by infinitives to indicate ongoing action, whereas this function is taken over by the progressive form in PE (ibid.).

The imperfect/progressive aspect conveyed by the combination motion verb + infinitive is consciously exploited in Beowulf to organize the narrative into segments: ‘these imperfective constructions seem to signal the beginning of new and significant episodes, while the individual events within these episodes tend to be narrated perfectly’ (ibid. 319). One of Richardson’s examples is this (relevant verbs in bold):

(16) Gewat ða neosian, syþðan niht becom,
Departed then visit, after night came,
hean huses, hu hit Hringdene
high houses, how it Ring-Danes

Richardson’s article links the infinitive/present participle variation after the motion verbs to a similar variation after the perception verbs, i.e. between AcI and NP + present participle.
The to-infinitive as GOAL

æfter beorþge gebun hæfdon.
after beertaking settled had.

Fand þa ðær inne æþelinga gedriht
Found then there in of-nobles band

swefan æfter symble; sorge ne cuðon,
sleeping after feast; sorrow not knew3pl,

wonsceat wera. Wiht unhælo,

misery of-men. Creature evil,
grim ond grædig, gearo sona wæs,
grim and fierce, ready at-once was

reoc ond reþe, ond on ræste genam
savage and cruel, and in rest took

þritig þegna. Þanon eft gewat
thirty thanes. Thence again departed

huðe hremig to ham faran,
booty proud to home go3nf,

mid þære wælþylle wica neosan. ⟨Beo 115–25⟩
with the slaughter-fill dwelling visit3nf.

‘Then after night came, [Grendel] went inspecting the tall house—how
the Ring-Danes had settled in after the beer-drinking. Then he found
therein a band of nobles sleeping after the feast; they had no thought
of sorrow, of the misery in store for men. The creature of evil, grim
and fierce, was quickly ready, savage and cruel, and seized thirty thanes
from their rest. From there he went travelling back to his home, proud
of his plunder, seeking his dwelling with that fill of slaughter.’ (trans.
from Richardson 1994: 319, 324 and Swanton 1978: 38–40)

The description of Grendel’s first approach is narrated with imperfective con-
structions: a motion verb + infinitive, gewat neosian, in l. 115, and an AcI, fand
æþelinga gedriht swefan, in l. 117. The attack itself, however, is narrated perfect-
ively with a simple past tense: genam in l. 119. Similar examples can be found
throughout the poem; another of Richardson’s examples is ⟨Beo 702–27⟩, in
which the motion verb com + infinitive is repeated at intervals, describing
Grendel’s second approach; the dramatic effect of com . . . scrīdan (ll. 702–3),
com . . . gongan (ll. 710–11), and com . . . siðian (l. 720) has been noted by many
critics (Richardson 1994: 323).

Remarkable in all these instances, and not commented on by Richardson, is
the fact that the cuman + infinitive construction favours verb-first order: com
(and fand) in (14) are also in clause-initial position, as are two of the three
instances of \( \text{com} + \) infinitive in \( \langle \text{Beo 702–27} \rangle \). Verb-first orders are used in OE as a discontinuous episode boundary marker that specifically announces or anticipates a dramatic turn in the plot (see below, §4.4; also Los 1999: 118–20; Los 2000). The feeling of dramatic build-up observed in (16) and in \( \langle \text{Beo 702–27} \rangle \) is more likely to be due to this verb-first device than to the bare infinitive, but its co-occurrence with specifically these imperfect constructions (i.e. motion verb + infinitive, and AcI) is not accidental.

The verb-first device only works with events that are non-punctual and temporally segmentable, because these events need to be ‘ongoing’ in order for the dramatic happening to interrupt them. The bare infinitive in such instances conveys imperfect, progressive aspect, as is evident from Richardson’s comment about the AcI \( \text{fand æþelinga gedriht swefan} \) in (16): ‘We do not suppose that Grendel saw the men sleep in the hall, but rather that he perceived them in what our military leaders might call an ongoing dormative situation’ (Richardson 1994: 317). Their sleeping is interrupted by the drama of Grendel’s attack. The very fact that these two constructions (motion verb + infinitive and AcI) are compatible with the verb-first construction testifies to their imperfect, progressive aspect, as does the subsequent competition between the bare infinitive and the progressive -\( \text{ing} \) form in both these functions.

### 2.5 Syntactic options for the analysis of the bare infinitive

As verbs of motion and rest are generally one-place unaccusatives, there is no room for an additional argument, and this makes an argument (instead of an adjunct) analysis unlikely for the bare infinitive after these verbs, as the single argument position is already filled by the surface subject. If the bare infinitive is analysed as adjunct, it calls for a clausal analysis (a CP if one assumes the PRO-theorem, according to which the PRO subject needs to be shielded from outside government).

If, on the other hand, the verbs in (11) have lost some of their lexical meaning and are aspectual rather than fully lexical when followed by a bare infinitive, they could require an analysis similar to that of the bare infinitival complements of the modals in Old English. Although the status of the modals themselves is far from clear, the available evidence argues against a CP analysis for their bare-infinitival complements. The data appear to allow two alternative analyses: the modals could be either auxiliaries base-generated in \( \text{I}^0 \) (in which case the following infinitive would be a VP), or one-place raising verbs (verbs with subjectless syntax like PE \( \text{seem} \)), in which case the syntactic status of the infinitive would be IP (for discussion see Denison 1990b; Warner 1990, 1992;
van Kemenade 1992). Old English does not provide much evidence that could be used to decide between these options, however—not for the modals, nor for the motion verbs of set (11), nor for onginnan/beginnan ‘begin’ (see also §4.4 below).

There is a further pointer to IP/VP status of the bare infinitive in the case of onginnan/beginnan, in that these verbs show signs of being subjectless, a state that becomes evident when the infinitive happens to be an impersonal verb with an EXPERIENCER argument in the dative. Impersonal bare infinitives are not attested, as far as I have been able to make out, with the verbs of motion and rest, so the question cannot be settled by such examples. It seems clear, however, that the verbs of set (11) when followed by a bare infinitive have also acquired an aspectual meaning, like onginnan/beginnan.

2.6 The emergence of the to-infinitive as purpose phrase

The notion that the bare infinitives after verbs of set (11) once expressed purpose but lost this meaning (became ‘predicative’) is important for the development of the to-infinitive, as it provides a motivation for the introduction of the to-infinitive in the function of purpose phrase. This scenario is alluded to by Callaway, who writes:

Personally I believe that the predicative infinitive after verbs of motion was originally final in sense in Anglo-Saxon . . . Later the principal verbs of motion paled down to a mere auxiliary . . ., and the infinitive after this verb of motion came to complete the sense of this verb of incomplete sense when used as an auxiliary . . . (ibid. 197–8)

Bock’s account explicitly links this loss of lexical meaning with the rise of the to-infinitive. He also goes further than Sweet (see the quote in §1.3) in that he argues that the original function of the bare infinitive was that of adjunct, implying that the to-infinitive in Sweet’s example above also represented an encroachment. He goes on to say that if the matrix verb expresses a ‘complete idea’ (‘völlig in sich abgeschlossen’, Bock 1931: 122) then it will not need further elaboration by a (bare) infinitive, but if the semantic content of the matrix verb weakens, the infinitive becomes obligatory. This fits the story of the bare infinitive after the verbs of motion and rest: originally it was a purpose adjunct, but the meaning change of the verb made the infinitive into a complement that no longer expressed purpose but simultaneity or imperfect/progressive aspect. This type of grammaticalization—of fully lexical verbs becoming auxiliaries—is extremely common (see e.g. Kuteva 2001). In the case of OE, the grammaticalization of the verbs of motion and rest have the effect that bare infinitives, once exclusively adjuncts, begin to appear increasingly as
arguments of verbs or even as the complements of auxiliaries. At this point Bock envisages a kind of syntactic split, with the bare infinitive being reserved for the argument position and the to-infinitive stepping in, as it were, to replace the bare infinitive in adjunct position (Bock 1931: 122). The distribution of the two infinitives that Bock assumes for this prehistoric period is compatible with a number of modern accounts in which OE to is analysed as a ‘last resort’ (in Minimalist terms) to license infinitives in adjunct position (e.g. Nunes 1993). However, such accounts are no longer adequate if it comes to describing the synchronic situation in historical OE; if to is called in to license the infinitive in adjunct position, one would expect the process of ‘to-insertion’ to stop once the two roles of the infinitives are clearly defined, with bare infinitives in argument position, and to-infinitives in adjunct position. Apart from the fact that the term ‘to-insertion’ is misleading in that it suggests an etymological connection between the two infinitives, as if the to-infinitive is constructed by adding to to a bare infinitive, which is not how to-infinitives came about (more about this in Chapter 8 below), this account fails to explain why ‘to-insertion’ did not stop once the to-infinitive had become the only non-finite category to express purpose. Instead, the to-infinitive came to express goal-arguments and even theme-arguments in OE (see Chapters 3–6). If to is a last resort to license OE infinitives, why does to also appear, redundantly, when the infinitive is already licensed by being subcategorized for by the matrix verb? An adjunct-licensing account, then, cannot explain the distribution of the to-infinitive in OE. The distribution only becomes clear if we look at other categories that may express purpose in OE (e.g. (6)–(8) above) or Gothic (see (3)–(5)).

The relative particle ei ‘that’ in Gothic, which also functions as a complementizer, is clearly associated with the subjunctive (indicative complement clauses were introduced by patei/pammei ‘that’; see Klinghardt 1877: 170, 175, 179). Its most important function was to express purpose, but as it extended its use outside this original domain, there was a need to reinforce the purpose function by adding dyppe ‘to the end that’ (lit. ‘to that’), just as to ðon (OE), as in (17), and in order/on purpose (eModE), as in (18), reinforced purposive subjunctive clauses in English:

(17) Theophile, to thon ðath þu ðe george, sege
Theophilus, to that INSTR that you yourself save, say
hluddre stæfne hwa ðe hete me ofslean. ⟨ApT 50.21⟩
loud voice who you ordered me kill.
‘Theophilus, in order that you may save yourself, say in a loud voice
who ordered you to kill me.’
We are under a cursed necessity of studying selfishness, in order that we may exist.

(OED 1790 Burns Let. to P. Hill 2 Mar.)

The formal characteristics of the to-infinitive indicate that it is in origin a to-PP, although we will see in Chapter 7 that its categorial status is no longer PP in historical OE. An important grammatical function of the to-PP was that of adjunct of purpose, a function that it shared of old with the subjunctive clause. The distribution in OE no longer matches the distribution of the to-PP, however, but that of the subjunctive clause, as we will see in Chapter 4. Just as the subjunctive clause spread beyond its original function of purpose adjunct to that of goal- and theme-argument, necessitating the purposive reinforcements in (17)–(18), the to-infinitive spread beyond this original function to become goal- or theme-argument.

2.7 Conclusions

We have seen in this chapter that there is no evidence that the bare infinitive still occurs as a purpose adjunct in OE. The many attestations of bare infinitives in that function are mainly due to slavish translation practices in which the choice of infinitive depends on the choice of infinitive in the source text. Many others are only possible with infinitives of eating and drinking; they may be due to Latin influence, as Callaway holds, or they may represent an idiomatic expression, possibly a fossilized relic from a pre-OE period in which bare infinitives could still function as purpose adjuncts.

The remaining bare infinitives from Callaway’s chapter on purpose adverbials are restricted to a particular set of verbs: motion verbs, and, occasionally, verbs of rest (set (11) above). The bare infinitive after these verbs does not express purpose but imperfect or progressive aspect, and should probably be analysed as a VP or IP rather than a CP. This may mean that the only thematic role left for bare infinitives is that of theme; there is no evidence that they can be goal.

When bare infinitives acquired an aspectual meaning, and lost their earlier purposive meaning, their place may have been taken by the to-infinitive, which already occurred as a purpose adjunct due to its PP-origins. There was a third category that occurred in this function: the subjunctive clause. Once the to-infinitive was established as the only non-finite purpose phrase, it started to follow the distribution of this finite clause. The finite clause could appear as (goal-)argument of a number of verbs—and so could the to-infinitive.
It could be argued that the *to*-infinitive was not overstepping the boundaries of its original domain, as *to*-PPs could also occur in this function, as we will see in the next chapter. When the *to*-infinitive starts to appear as theme-argument, however, it has left its original territory, as *to*-PPs do not occur as themes (see Chapter 4).
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The *to*-infinitive as **goal**-argument

3.1 Introduction

Although the original environment of the *to*-infinitive must have been the purpose adjunct, it is not restricted to this function in synchronic OE. It occurs widely as argument, as in the following PE examples:

(1) I tried to keep it secret.
(2) He persuaded me to keep it secret.
(3) I wanted to keep it secret.
(4) He ordered me to keep it secret.
(5) I promised him to keep it secret.

Monotransitive verbs like *try* in (1) and *want* in (3) are usually analysed in PE as having a similar thematic structure, say *agent* and *theme*; ditransitive verbs like *persuade* in (2) and *order* in (4) also tend to be analysed as thematically identical, with, say, an *agent*, a *recipient*, and a *theme*. The same goes for the ditransitive *promise* in (5), although it is recognized that (5) differs in one important respect from the other ditransitives in exhibiting subject control rather than object control: the understood subject of *keep* is identical in reference to the object of the higher clause in (2) and (4) (‘object control’) but to the subject of the higher clause in (5) (‘subject control’). Verbs like *promise* resemble the monotransitive verbs in (1) and (3) in this respect.

Various facts in OE allow us to make a finer-grained distinction for the OE counterparts of (1)–(5). They each represent, syntactically and semantically, a separate group. The *to*-infinitive in the OE counterparts of (1) and (2) must be analysed as a **goal** rather than a **theme** argument. In the case of (1), monotransitive verbs with a ‘conative’ meaning (‘strive’, ‘try’), we find that the second thematic role must be a **goal** because we find it expressed not only by a *to*-infinitive but also by a *to*-PP and by a subjunctive *that*-clause—in other words, as the same three constituents that are found as purpose adjuncts (see previous chapter). The *to*-infinitive after these verbs, then, appears to follow the distribution of the *to*-PP, the constituent that must originally have had the same syntactic status. The *to*-infinitive after verbs with meanings like *persuade*
in (2) must be analysed as a goal rather than a theme for the same reason: here, too, we find to-PPs and subjunctive clauses as alternative expressions of this thematic role. There is a second reason why the label theme cannot be appropriate for the to-infinitive with these verbs: the case of the object (i.e. the me constituent in (2)) is invariably accusative, rather than dative. Many of these verbs etymologically derive from verbs of spatial manipulation (‘propel something into a certain position’) where that something is a theme rather than an animate addressee. Although the mapping of morphological case to thematic role is far from straightforward in OE, it is tempting to translate the systematic case differences into a different thematic structure for the verbs of persuading and urging: agent (nom), theme (acc), and goal (clause or PP) versus agent (nom), recipient (dat), and theme (acc or clause) for the verbs of commanding and promising. The theme label for the accusative NP of the verbs of persuading and urging also seems more appropriate because their third argument, unlike the third argument of verbs of commanding and promising, can be expressed by a to-PP, which makes goal seem a more likely label for that argument than theme.

The clear connection of the to-infinitive in (1) and (2) with purpose in OE, as well as the fact that it follows the distribution of the to-PP here, suggests strongly that its appearance after these verbs pre-dates its appearance in other contexts, notably as theme in (3)–(5), where there is no connection with the distribution of the to-PP and no connection with purpose. Its appearance as theme in OE will be discussed in Part III of this book.

How can we be sure that the to-infinitive after the monotransitive conatives and the ditransitive verbs of persuading and urging is a goal-argument rather than simply another manifestation of the purpose adjunct? Apart from intuitive notions of the thematic roles of a given verb, there is a diagnostic test. Wh-phrases can only be extracted out of arguments, not out of adjuncts. We will discuss OE attestations of such extractions out of to-infinitival phrases and conclude that the to-infinitive must be an argument of the verb rather than an adjunct. As the earliest manifestation of the to-infinitive appears to have been restricted to the function of purpose adjunct, as seems likely from the Gothic data we discussed in the previous chapter, this broadening of its functions represents an important step in its diachronic development.

3.2 The conatives

There is a small set of conatives whose internal argument is probably best analysed as a goal rather than a theme because it can be expressed by the
same three constituents as the purpose adjunct: the to-PP, the to-infinitive, and the subjunctive that-clause (see examples (4)–(6) in Chapter 2). They are as follows:

\[ (6) \text{ fundian ‘hasten’; ‘try’, hyhtan ‘trust’, ‘hope’; tilian ‘exert oneself’, ‘strive’, ‘try’} \]

They are very close in meaning to the monotransitive subject control verbs discussed in the next chapter as ‘intention verbs’ in that they, too, refer to a non-actuated event that may or may not be in the future; they warrant a separate discussion, however, because they are the only ones of all the intention verbs that also occur with to-PPs. As to-PPs are the most likely model for the original distribution of the to-infinitive, these verbs may have been the first intention verbs to appear with to-infinitival complements. The analysis of the thematic structure of the set in (6) is complicated by the fact that these verbs are also attested with nominal (dative or accusative) objects, which means that we could also be dealing, in some instances of these verbs, with a thematic structure of agent and theme rather than agent and goal. Tilian ‘try’, for instance, does not mean ‘try’ when followed by an accusative object, but only when followed by a to-infinitival or subjunctive clause. Genitive objects are less problematic, as genitives are attested as an expression of purpose adjuncts in Gothic (cf. Wright 1968 [1954]: 185) and as goal arguments in Old Norse (e.g. of the conatives fysask ‘long for’, girnask ‘want’, missa ‘miss’, purfa ‘need’, vána ‘hope for’, vilnask ‘want’, and æskja ‘want’, and the verbs of persuading and urging eggja ‘incite’, fysa ‘incite’, hvetja ‘incite’, õesa ‘incite’, spyrja ‘ask’, frétta ‘ask’, fregnna ‘ask’, and bîðja ‘ask’; Kristofferson 1996: 51, 53).

Unlike the verbs of persuading and urging, the meaning of these conatives changes when the goal argument is a to-PP; these PPs cannot be described as purposive, only as spatial, and do not contain a nominalization of a verb, unlike the unequivocal goal argument of the verbs of persuading and urging which we will discuss below. Unlike the verbs of persuading and urging, their thematic structure can be argued to be ambiguous between one-place (agent) and two-place (agent and theme, or agent and goal). The semantics of the verb, naturally, changes accordingly: fundian and tilian can be interpreted as ‘do one’s best’ in the one-place variant, with the to-infinitive as a true purpose adjunct, and as ‘try’ in the two-place variant, with the to-infinitive as argument. It is the two-place variant of these verbs that exhibits intention meanings (i.e. ‘try’, ‘hope’, etc.); the phenomenon holds for both subjunctive that-clauses (example (7)) and to-infinitives (examples (8) and (9)). The verbs and the alternative interpretations in (a) and (b) appear
in bold:

(7) þonne biþ from feower endum þære eorthan eall then will-be from four ends of-the earth all middangeard awergdum gastum gefylled, þa fundiþ þæt middle-earth with-accursed spirits filled, those strive that hie willon genimon myccle herehyþ manna saula swa they want take great booty of-men’s souls as Antecrist ær beforean dyde. (HomS 26 206) Antichrist earlier before did.

a. ‘then the whole world will be filled with accursed spirits from the four corners of the Earth, who make haste so that they take great booty of human souls, as Antichrist did earlier.’

b. ‘then the whole world will be filled with accursed spirits from the four corners of the Earth, who strive to take great booty of human souls, as Antichrist did earlier.’

(8) & blodig regn & fyren fundiþ þas eorþan to forswylgenne and bloody rain and fire strive the Earth to devour & to forbærnenne. (HomS 26 172) and to consume.

a. ‘and bloody rain and fire make haste in order to devour and consume the earth.’

b. ‘and bloody rain and fire strive to devour and consume the earth.’

(9) Se ðonne se ðe fundige wislice to sprecanne, ondæde he He then he who strives wisely to talk fear he him suiðlice, ðylæs his spræc gescynde ða anmodnesse him much, lest his speech corrupts the steadfastness ðara ðe ðærto hlystað. (CP 15.93.23) of-those who thereto listen.

a. ‘He then who makes haste to talk wisely should be very wary that his speech does not corrupt the steadfastness of those who listen to it.’

b. ‘He then who strives to talk wisely should be very wary that his speech does not corrupt the steadfastness of those who listen to it.’

The semantic interpretations of the subjunctive that-clause and to-infinitival phrase as argument rather than adjunct in (7b), (8b), and (9b) are further supported by occasional examples of extraction out of the finite clause or infinitival phrase. Wh-phrases—or any other material—can only be
extracted out of a maximal projection if the maximal projection is an argument (an L-marked complement, i.e. part of the subcategorization of a major lexical category; see Chomsky 1980: 13ff.); witness the PE examples in (10) with extraction out of complements and (11) with extractions out of adjuncts:

(10)  
\[a. \text{What do you think [CP John will do t_i]?} \]
\[b. \text{Who did you buy [NP pictures of t_i]'?} \]

(11)  
\[a. \text{*Who did Mary cry [CP after John hit t_i]?} \]
\[b. \text{*Who are [NP pictures of t_i] on sale?} \]

A possible example of wh-movement with tilian ‘exert oneself’, ‘strive’, ‘try’ is (12), in an early (Alfredian) prose translation; the extracted constituent is hlisa ‘fame’ (in bold):

(12)  
\[\text{Hu ne ongite ge nu hu nearo se eower hlisa} \]
\[\text{How not perceive you now how narrow the your fame} \]
\[\text{bion wile þe ge þær ymb swincað and unrihtlice} \]
\[\text{beINF will which you there about toil and unrighteously} \]
\[\text{tioliað to gebrædenne? (Bo 18.43.13)} \]
\[\text{strive to spread?} \]
\[\text{‘How now, do you not perceive how narrow this fame of yours will be} \]
\[\text{which you take pains about, and unrighteously strive to spread?’} \]

The extraction site of the wh-constituent in the second conjunct is not in doubt: it could only be the empty object position of the to-infinitive to gebrædenne ‘to spread’; the internal argument of tilian in the sense of ‘strive’ cannot be expressed by an NP, and tilian in the sense ‘exert oneself’ does not have an internal argument at all, so there is no other argument position available apart from the object position of to gebrædenne. If we assume that such an extraction is only possible if the relevant XP (here, the to-infinitival phrase) is an argument, (12) constitutes evidence that, even in early OE, at least some of the to-infinitives after tilian were no longer adjuncts. The extraction facts of example (12) are not as unequivocal as we would wish because of the presence of þær ‘there’, which, if analysed as a resumptive pronoun, complicates a straightforward analysis of wh-movement. Although there is a relative marker þe, there is no corresponding gap in the relative clause, because of the resumptive pronoun; so we cannot be sure that the argument structure of tilian in (12) is not already satisfied by this pronoun. There are examples with other
types of A’-movement, e.g. Topicalization, as in (13), where of δysum tintregum ‘from these torments’ is topicalized:

(13) Of δysum tintregum men Ḟa leofestan tiligen we us to
From these torments men the dearest strive we us to
gescildenne and us to gewarnigenne Ḟa hwile Ḟe we lifes
shield and us to guard the while that we life’s
leoht habban ⟨HomS 44 158⟩
light have
‘From these torments, dearest people, we should try to shield ourselves, and guard ourselves, while we have the light of life’

The only possible extraction site of the topicalized PP of δysum tintregum is the complement position of to gescildenne; tillian as an intention verb is not attested with an argument PP with of ‘from’. If we assume that material can only be extracted from an XP that is an argument, example (13) is another indication that the to-infinitive, originally a purpose adjunct, has been reanalysed as an argument of the verb, in tandem with a semantic change from ‘exert oneself’ to ‘try’.

There is evidence that the third category to express the goal-argument, the subjunctive that-clause, probably underwent a similar reanalysis. It, too, originally occurred primarily as purpose adjunct (Bernhardt 1877a). A relevant example with the intention verb hihtan ‘hope,’ ‘expect’ might be (14); pet god ‘the good’ is the antecedent of a relative clause that contains a subjunctive clause, out of which the wh-constituent has been extracted:

(14) Eac us is to geþencanne, Petrus, & to gehycganne betweoh
Also us is to remember, Peter, and to consider between
þisum wisum, þæt se weg is mycele gesundlicra, & þæt
these ways, that that road is much safer, and that
is myccele gehylde licra lif, þæt þæt god, þe gehwylc
is much safer life, that the good, which each
man gehyhtep, þæt sy gedon æfter his deade þurh oþre
man intends, that be done after his death through other
men for hine, þæt he sylfa gedo þa hwile þe he
men for him, that he himself do them while that he
lifige. ⟨GD Pref and 4(C) 60.348.9⟩
lives.
‘We should also remember, Peter, and consider with respect to these
methods, that it is a far safer road, and a much safer life, that the good
deeds which each man intends that should be done after his death by other people in his name, should be done by himself while he is still alive.’

Here we have a relative clause: ‘the good [deeds] which each man intends that should be done’, with a trace in the subject position of the lowest embedded clause forming a chain with the antecedent þæt god ‘the good [deeds’], i.e. long movement. There are no that-trace effects in OE. The analysis is as follows:

\[(15) \text{the good deeds } \left[ \text{CP which}_1 \left[ \text{IP each man intends } \left[ \text{CP } t'_1 [\text{CP that } t_1 \text{ should be done}] ] \right] \right] \right] \]

Such extractions appear to indicate that the subjunctive that-clause following gehyhteb ‘hopes’, ‘intends’ is an argument of that verb, and not a purpose adjunct.

This fuzziness—argument or adjunct?—shows how purpose adjuncts may have come to be reanalysed as goal arguments. The fact that we see parallel developments in to-infinitives and subjunctive that-clauses is important for the subsequent spread of the to-infinitive beyond its original range as to-PP. We now turn our attention to a second group of verbs in which the to-PP and the to-infinitive show greater affinity than they do within the conatives: the verbs of persuading and urging.

3.3 The verbs of persuading and urging

3.3.1 Introduction

The core meaning of verbs of persuading and urging has been described variously as ‘manipulative’ (e.g. Givón 1980: 333; Rohdenburg 1995, following Searle), ‘directive’ (Searle 1969), or ‘influence’: ‘NP₁ influences NP₀ toward, or away from, realizing S₂’ (Rudanko 1989: 112). The latter term is also used by Sag and Pollard (1991: 66). It appears that ‘volition’ or ‘intention’ is also involved, much like the monotransitive verbs: the speaker intends that the hearer perform the act described in the infinitival complement.

Consider the following two PE sentences:

\[(16) \text{Susan persuaded Antonia to go to the party.} \]
\[(17) \text{Susan ordered Antonia to go to the party.} \]

Traditional analyses label the NP Antonia as an indirect object and the rest of the sentence as a direct object (e.g. Quirk and Greenbaum 1973: 374) or,

\(^1\) The subject trace is of course itself the product of NP-movement (passivization) but for ease of exposition this chain has not been shown.
alternatively, *Antonia* as a direct object and the rest of the sentence as a ‘Predicate Complement’ (Aarts and Aarts 1982: 142–3). More recent frameworks, e.g. Government and Binding Theory, basically follow the traditional analysis in that *Antonia* and *to go to the party* constitute two separate arguments of the matrix verb. The clause *to go to the party* is accordingly analysed as a full sentence with its own subject position; this subject position is assumed to be filled by a non-overt NP (‘PRO’) which is ‘controlled’ by (i.e. identical in reference to) the object NP *Antonia*. The constructions in (16) and (17) are therefore both referred to as ‘object control’. The case of the NP is held to be ‘structural’ in PE, i.e. accusative, in both cases.

Although the *to*-infinitival clause in (16) (after a verb of persuading and urging) and (17) (after a verb of commanding and permitting) is generally accorded the same analysis in PE, there are clear differences between the two constructions in OE. We will briefly list these differences in §3.3.2, to show that the separate treatment of these verbs is warranted.

The appearance of the *to*-infinitive after each group must similarly be ascribed to different processes; the distribution of the *to*-infinitive after the ditransitive verbs cannot be accounted for if no distinction is made between the two groups.

### 3.3.2 Persuading versus commanding in Old English

The main difference between the two groups is in the number of their arguments (always three for the persuade-type, whereas the command-type has a two-place and a three-place variant) and in the identity of the thematic roles of these arguments: agent, theme, and goal for the verbs of persuading and urging on the one hand, and agent, recipient, and theme for the three-place variant of the verbs of commanding and permitting on the other (and agent and theme in the case of the two-place variant of these verbs). The thematic roles and their expression for verbs of persuading and urging are as follows:

```
(18) theme       goal                      persuading and urging
        [NPacc] [to-PP]
        [NPacc] [subjunctive clause]
        [NPacc] [to-VP]
```

Examples of (18) with the verb *tyhtan* ‘urge’, ‘force’ are given in (19)–(21); goal arguments appear in bold:

```
(19) þis com þa to earan þam æðelborenan cnihte þe
    this came then to ears the noble-born youth who
    awogode Lucian, se wæs geciged Pascasius, arleas hæðengilda,
    courted Lucy, he was called Pascasius, wicked idolator,
```
and tihte þæt halige mæden ACC to þæra deofla and urged the holy maiden to theGEN demons GEN
offrungum. ⟨ÆLS (Lucy) 57⟩ sacrificed DAT.
‘This came then to the ears of the youth of noble birth who was courting Lucy; he was called Pascasius, a wicked idolater, and urged the holy maiden to sacrifice to demons.’

(20) [Antiochus] bæd eac þa modor þæt heo hire bearn asked also the mother that she her child ACC tihte, þæt he huru ana abuge ⟨ÆLS (Maccabees) 166⟩ urged, that he at-least alone subj subj ‘[Antiochus] also asked the mother to urge her child that he at least, as the only one, should submit’

(21) On hwilcum godum tihte þu us to in which gods urgest thou us ACC to

gelyfenne? ⟨ÆLS (George) 148⟩ believetO-INF?
‘Which Gods do you urge us to believe in?’

The label ‘subjunctive’ includes not only subjunctives as in (20) but also peri-phrases with modal verb + bare infinitives; sceolde, however, could itself be a subjunctive form:

(22) þa coman þa Cristenan and ðone cempan tihton þæt then came the Christians and the warrior ACC urged that

he faran sceolde feor fram ðære byrig. ⟨ÆLS (Sebastian) 435⟩ he go should far from that town.
‘Then the Christians came and urged the warrior to go far away from that town.’

In contrast to the verbs of persuading and urging, the verbs of commanding and permitting have objects in the dative case, warranting the label RECIPIENT rather than THEME, also because there may be a second object in the accusative for which the label THEME seems far more appropriate. There is no to-PP. In view of these two facts, the subjunctive clause and the to-infinitive that may appear as the third argument with these verbs is better labelled THEME rather than GOAL:

(23) RECIPIENT THEME commanding and permitting,
[NP dat] [NP acc]
[NP dat] [subjunctive clause]
[NP dat] [to-VP]
Examples of these frames are (24–26), all with the verb *bebeodan* ‘order’, ‘recommend’. Themes appear in bold:

(24) Seocum mannum, and cildum, we ne bebeodað nan Sick mendat, and children dat, we not order no faesten. (HomM 7 23) fast.

‘We do not order sick people and children to fast.’

(25) Astih eft adune. and bebeod ðam folce ðæt Go afterwards down and order the people dat that heora nan ðam munte ne of-them none the mountain not genealæce (ÆCHom II, 12.1 113.130) approach subj ‘Now go down and order the people not to approach the mountain’

(26) ða ðincg ðe ic bebeode eow to those things that I order you dat to gehealdenne (ÆCHom II, 21 181.47) hold

‘those things that I order you to hold’

Verbs of commanding and permitting differ further from the verbs of persuading and urging in that they may appear with what looks like a monotransitive complement: an accusative-and-infinitive construction, with bare infinitive, and a Small Clause. Bare infinitives are only possible with verbs of commanding and permitting. Goal-arguments, in contrast, cannot be expressed by a bare infinitive in OE. All attestations of bare infinitives as goals of persuading and urging verbs occur in suspicious circumstances, i.e. transliterations and glosses, following the infinitive of the Latin *Vorlage* (see §3.3.3). This tallies with our findings in the previous chapter, where we saw that purpose adjuncts, too, occur exclusively in suspicious circumstances, and cannot be expressed by bare infinitives in native OE either. The complements of the two-place variant of verbs of commanding and permitting, then, can be represented as follows:

(27) theme commanding and permitting,
    [NP<acc> VP] two-place
    [NP<acc> Pred]3

2 The ambiguity of the *to*-infinitive in such examples is discussed in Chapter 5.

3 The subjunctive clause and the accusative NP could in theory be added to the themes in (27) for completeness’ sake, but there is no way of telling whether a verb of commanding and permitting with
Examples are (28) and (29), with the relevant complement in bold:

(28)  
\[
\text{Nu ic bebeode beacen ætywan, wundor geweorðan on wera gemange (And 727)} \\
\text{‘Now I order a portent to appear, a miracle to happen among men’}
\]

(29)  
\[
\text{Fæder ic bebeode minne gast on thinre hands (LK (WSCp) 23.46)} \\
\text{‘Father I commend my spirit into your hands’}
\]

The presence of both two-place and three-place variants follows from the semantics of these particular verbs; the two-place verbs represent meanings that can be summarized as \textit{command/permit/cause something}, whereas those of the three-place variant can be summarized as \textit{command/permit someone to do something}. This matter will be discussed in Chapter 5. The fact that only one of the two groups has two-place variants is important for the later development of the \textit{to}-infinitival ECM-construction as in \textit{he ordered the bridge to be blown up}. This construction represents a Middle English innovation which has been argued to have arisen through a reanalysis of the object control constructions after \textit{persuade}-verbs (e.g. Fischer 1992). We will argue in Chapter 9 that this notion can be refined further, as it is the object control construction after the verbs of commanding and permitting that underwent such a reanalysis, and not that construction after the verbs of persuading and urging (which do not allow ECM in PE, either).

\textbf{Recipients} are usually restricted to human beings, or at least animate entities, which argues against assigning this label to the accusative NP of the verbs of persuading and urging, since these may be inanimate, as we will see below. The argument structures of the two groups lead to further differences between them when they occur with a \textit{to}-infinitival complement in OE, even though the surface strings are the same (cf. the PE examples (16) and (17) above). The most notable fact is that the first internal argument may passivize a subjunctive clause or an accusative NP as its only internal argument is genuinely two-place, or a case of the three-place variant in which the \textbf{recipient} has remained implicit (\textbf{recipients} may remain implicit as a general rule). The other two expressions of the \textbf{theme} in (27) cannot be argued to be cases of the three-place variant with implicit \textbf{recipient}, as \textbf{recipients} are unattested with such structures in OE, positively avoided in Gothic translations even if they occur in the Greek source (see Los 1999: 140), and impossible with the two-place variants (e.g. \textit{to}-infinitival ECMs) in PE.
in OE in the case of the verbs of persuading and urging, but not in the case of the verbs of commanding and permitting, as only accusatives passivize in OE. The second difference is that this NP may be absent in the case of the verbs of commanding and permitting, as recipients may remain implicit, whereas this is not possible in the case of the verbs of persuading and urging. The verbs of commanding and permitting will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Because of the relationship between purpose adjuncts and goal-arguments, the verbs of persuading and urging constitute one of the environments in which the distribution of the to-infinitive shows almost perfect overlap with that of the to-PP, which indicates that its appearance after the verbs of persuading and urging is probably of long standing, dating back to a prehistoric stage in which it was still a PP.

3.3.3 Membership and subcategorization

As we saw in §3.3.2, the verbs of persuading typically subcategorize for an accusative NP and a second constituent, be it a purposive to-PP, a subjunctive that-clause, or a to-infinitive, i.e. the frames given in (18), here repeated as (30) for convenience:

(30) Theme GOAL persuading and urging

[NP\text{acc}] [to-PP]
[NP\text{acc}] [subjunctive clause]
[NP\text{acc}] [to-VP]

The label ‘purposive’ distinguishes this type of to-PP, which denotes an event as goal, from the ‘spatial’ type that denotes a goal in space rather than time. Unlike spatial to-PPs, purposive to-PPs contain a nominalization of a verb, such as to þæra deofla offrungum ‘to the sacrifice to demons’ in (19) above; this is the type that may also serve as purpose adjunct, and it is also this type of to-PP that functioned as an early model of the to-infinitive.

The verbs that are attested in OE with a to-infinitive in such a configuration are these:


Many of these verbs appear in this list on the basis of only a single attestation.
Two of the verbs of set (31), *afysan* ‘impel’ and *onstyrian* ‘stir’, appear in an NP to VP-construction in which the case of the NP is a pronoun, and ambiguous in form between dative and accusative. These two verbs have been included in set (31) because the simplex of one of them, *afysan*, is attested with an accusative (e.g. (Hell 33), ⟨HomU 49.12⟩), and the other verb, *onstyrian*, is attested with an accusative NP and a to-PP in ⟨GDPref and 4 (C)43.331.16⟩. Since purposive to-PPs as goal-argument are otherwise found only with this group of manipulatives, *onstyrian* has been included here on this basis.

Note that the extraction facts of example (21), here repeated as (32), constitute clear evidence that the second internal argument of these verbs is indeed an argument, not an adjunct:

\[
(32) \text{On } \text{hwilcum godum tihs } \text{pu us to} \\
\text{gelyfenne?} \langle \text{ÆLS (George) 148} \rangle \\
\text{believe} \text{TO-INF?} \\
\text{‘Which gods do you urge us to believe in?’}
\]

We noted above (§3.2) that *wh*-phrases can only be extracted out of a maximal projection if that projection is an argument. There is no doubt that the extraction site of the *wh*-constituent in (32) is indeed the complement position of the verb *gelyfan* ‘believe’: the on-PP satisfies the argument structure of *gelyfan*, not of *tyhtan*. The matrix verb *tihs* subcategorizes for both the NP *us* and the to-infinitival phrase *to gelyfenne on hwilcum godum*; hence, the to-infinitival phrase is a complement, carries a θ-role assigned by the matrix verb *tyhtan*, and is subcategorized for by the verb.

As we noted in §3.3.2, the case of the NP is always accusative and appears to denote the theme, in contrast to the dative recipient of the verbs of commanding and permitting. As it is the theme, it may occasionally be inanimate or abstract, again in contrast to recipients which are invariably animate, ‘mind-possessing entities’ (Postal 1974: 152). One example of an inanimate theme is given in (33) (if *fet* ‘feet’ is not personified, in which case it would also be mind-possessing); another example appears in (34). Themes are in bold:

\[
(33) \text{he } \ldots \text{ ne mihte na } \text{onstyrian his fet to} \\
\text{he not could not persuade his feet } \text{to} \\
\text{ganne.} \langle \text{GDPref and 3 (C) 22.224.21} \rangle \\
\text{go.} \\
\text{Lat: gressum movere non potuit} \\
\text{‘he could not persuade his feet to go’}
\]
Twelve of the verbs in (31) are etymologically related to verbs of spatial manipulation with core meanings of ‘propel something to a certain position’ or ‘manipulate something into a certain position’, e.g. ‘bend’ for *biegan*, ‘turn’ for *cierran*, ‘arrange’ for *afysan*, ‘pull’ for *spanan*, ‘draw’ for *tyhtan*, ‘move’ for *onstyrian*. The *to*-PP denotes a spatial goal in many cases, and could be described as a ‘locative phrase’ or a ‘motion phrase’ (see e.g. Baker 1989: 151–4), as in (34) (cf. also (35) with *niedan* ‘urge’, ‘force’). Note that the theme, *his scip* ‘his ship’, is again inanimate:

(34) þa he eft ferde to Langbeardum, *his scip* wearð bedrifen when he again went to Longobards, *his ship* was pursued & genyded to þam ealande, þe is nemnedne and forced to the island, which is called Paris. 〈GD Pref and 4(C) 31.305.26〉

‘and when he again went to [the] Longobards, his ship was pursued and forced to the island that is called Paris’

When the goal is expressed by a *to*-PP it may be located in either time or space; but when the goal-argument is expressed by a *that*-clause or a *to*-infinitive, the goal is invariably located in time, and denotes purpose: ‘manipulate somebody into doing a certain act’. Not all verbs represent a semantic extension from a spatial goal to a temporal goal; *onælan* ‘incite’ and *ontendan* ‘incite’, for instance, have a core meaning of ‘set fire to’, ‘inflame’.

The verbs of urging and persuading, then, form a coherent group in that they share a core meaning of ‘manipulate somebody/something (the theme) into a certain act (the goal)’. These thematic roles are consistent with the subcategorization frames that are found with these verbs: the theme is expressed by an accusative NP, and the goal by the three categories that are used to express purpose in general: the purposive *to*-PP, the *to*-infinitive, and the subjunctive *that*-clause.

There are isolated attestations of bare infinitives after verbs of persuading and urging, but a closer look reveals that they are either glosses or based on a Latin Vorlage (i.e. after *medemian* and *eadmedan/eadmodian* ‘deign’, both of which appear to have been invented specifically to translate the Latin deponens *dignor*, which, active in sense and passive in form, is a source of confusion to OE scribes; Los 1999: 148–52). The one example of a bare infinitive with *niedan* ‘urge’, ‘force’ is also closely modelled on an infinitive in the
Latin original:

(35) ða sona he nydde his leorningcnihtas on scyp then at once he urged his disciples in ship stigan (Mk (WSCp) 6.45) 

ascend\textsuperscript{\textsc{inf}}

Lat: *et statim coegit discipulos suos ascendere navim* (Vulgate)  
‘then at once he urged his disciples to board the ship’

The text of the West-Saxon Gospels is fairly heavily influenced by its Latin example, and it contains other examples of bare infinitives after verbs that are otherwise only attested with a *to*-infinitive, e.g. *aliefan* ‘allow’ (Los 1999: 179–80). The sequence ‘verb of persuading and urging + bare infinitive’ in the source text appears with a subjunctive *that*-clause elsewhere in the text ((Lk (WSCp) 14.23), also with *niedan*). Careful translations appear to avoid a bare infinitive after *niedan*. In (Exod 22.10) and (Exod 22.14), near-parallels of one another, the *goal* argument is expressed by a *to*-PP (in (36)) and a subjunctive *that*-clause (in (37)), although the Vulgate (the source text) has a bare infinitive (*goal* arguments in bold):

(36) Gyf hwa befæste his nyxtan ænig nyten & hit bið If anyone entrusts his neighbour any animal and it is dead oþþe gelewed oþþe ætbroden, & hit nan man ne dead or injured or carried-off, and it no man not gesyhð, Sylle him aþ & ne nyde hine to sees, give him oath and not force him\textsuperscript{acc} to gylde.  

(Exod 22.10) repayment.  

Lat: [...]et ille reddere non cogetur (Vulgate)  
‘If anyone entrusts any animal to his neighbour and it dies or is injured or is carried off, and no one saw it, let him swear an oath and do not force him to repay.’

(37) Se þe æt his nextan hwæt to læne abit, gif hit He who from his neighbour something as loan asks, if it bið gelewed oððe dead bæftan þam hlæforde, nyde man is injured or dead after the lord, force one hine   þæt he hit gylde.  

(Exod 22.14) him\textsuperscript{acc} that he it repay.  

Lat: ... *reddere compelletur* (Vulgate)
The to-infinitive as GOAL

‘He who borrows something from his neighbour, if it is injured or dead in the absence of its lord, should be forced to repay it.’

The fact that the translator twice avoids translating an infinitival goal-argument in the source text by a bare infinitive confirms that goal-arguments cannot be expressed by bare infinitives, in spite of (35), which must be a slip of the translator.

The three expressions of the goal-argument, then, are completely parallel to the three expressions of the purpose adjunct: to-PP, to-VP, and subjunctive clause.

3.3.4 The distribution of the three frames

Various corpora supply the information about the distribution of the three frames given in Table 3.1. Callaway’s lists, combined with searches in the Toronto Corpus, yield those verbs that appear with the object-controlled [NP-to VP] frame, in which the NP has accusative case (a crucial characteristic of the verbs of persuading and urging). Once these verbs are identified, it is easy enough to check the other frames they are attested with.

As the frequencies of to-infinitives were still marginal compared to those of the subjunctive clause, the odds were that there were more members of this class of verbs than could be established by a search for the to-infinitival complement alone. To get an idea of the entire class, the Brooklyn–Geneva–Amsterdam–Helsinki Annotated Corpus of OE Prose Texts (henceforth BGAH) was searched for occurrences of the NP + that-clause frame (with accusative NP). The BGAH, though not as extensive as the Toronto Corpus, has the advantage of being tagged with complementation patterns, which allows a relatively quick search for all verbs that appear with a particular frame.

A final search was carried out in the Toronto Corpus, in order to find verbs of persuading and urging that had been missed by the previous searches because they are only attested with the prepositional frame.

The result of these activities is set out in Table 3.1. The notation ‘case?’ in the table indicates that the case of the NP could not be positively identified, usually because the NP is a pronoun like us or me that does not have formally distinct forms for the dative and accusative. Passivized NPs occurring in these frames were considered to be good evidence of the NP in the frame being accusative, as only accusative NPs can passivize in OE.

With respect to relative frequency—as distinct from its distribution—the position of the to-infinitive, though considerably more frequent than in Gothic, is still marginal compared to the other two goal expressions. The relative proportion of subjunctive clauses, to-PPs, and to-infinitives is about 6:6:1.
### Table 3.1. The verbs of persuading and urging and their complements in Old English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Acc + <em>to</em>-VP</th>
<th>Acc + <em>ðæt</em></th>
<th>Acc + <em>to</em>-PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abisgan <em>engage in</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afysan <em>impel</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aweccan <em>incite</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beadan <em>urge</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biddan <em>ask, urge</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biegan <em>compel</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bisenian <em>instruct by example</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cierran <em>turn, persuade</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drefan <em>excite</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forspanan <em>seduce, entice</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fultuman <em>help</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fysan <em>incite</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gremian <em>provoke</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halsian <em>entreat, adjure</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatan <em>summon</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwierfan <em>turn, persuade</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laeran <em>teach, advise</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laðian <em>summon, invite</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manian <em>admonish</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medemian <em>humble (oneself)</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mynegian <em>remind</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nedian <em>compel</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niedan <em>urge, force</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onælan <em>incite</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onbryrdan <em>excite</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onstyrian <em>stir, bestir</em></td>
<td>case?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onwendan <em>inflame, incite</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scyhtan <em>impel, prompt, urge</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settan <em>set, appoint</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spanan <em>persuade</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spryttan <em>incite</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stieran <em>guide, direct</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyhtan <em>induce, urge</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trymman <em>encourage</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dřeátian <em>force&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underdıeodon <em>subject, force</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weman <em>persuade</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wissian <em>instruct</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>4</sup> The verb *dřeátian* occurs once with a *to*-infinitival complement (in ⟨Bo 40.138.1⟩), but in a subject control construction (‘the invisible fortune which often threatens to punish the wicked’) which is not readily comparable to the occurrences in the ditransitive frames.
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(an estimate based on a sample of the most frequent persuading-and-urging verbs).

The three frames are distributed fairly evenly, although to-infinitives tend to be attested only if the verb is also attested with a reasonable number of that-clauses. Most of the verbs that are not attested with a to-infinitive are rare, e.g. bisenian ‘instruct by example’, scyhtan ‘impel’, ‘prompt’, ‘urge’ and stieran ‘guide’, ‘direct’. The BGAH corpus yields only one or two examples of the [_ NP that-clause] frame for each verb. The verb fultuman is rare in the sense of ‘persuade’, ‘urge’, which might explain why it is not attested with the other two frames at all.

There are two exceptions to this rule: halsian ‘entreat’ and wissian ‘instruct’. These verbs are frequently attested (c. 150 times in the Toronto Corpus) and very often with a subjunctive clause, but nevertheless not with a to-infinitive. To-infinitives are found after these verbs in Middle English, however; halsian in (Jos.Arim.400; MED) and wissian in (Julia 106.187; PPCME corpus). With 11 attestations of the [_ NP that-clause] frame and 32 of the [_ NP to-PP] frame, one would expect that the [_ NP to VP] frame should also be possible with wissian, but it simply has not been attested, although we noted above that it appears with a to-infinitive in ME.

The link between the to-PP and the to-infinitive is more tenuous. A number of verbs are attested with reasonable frequency with the [_ NP to-PP] frame, but not with that-clause or to-infinitive. Examples are:

Laðian ‘summon’; there are 11 attestations of the prepositional frame after this verb in the Toronto Corpus, but only one with the [_ NP that-clause] frame (in ⟨ÆLS (Swithun) 368⟩).

Forspanan ‘entice’ occurs four times in the Toronto Corpus, twice with the [_NP to-PP] frame (⟨WHom 5, 81⟩ and ⟨ECHom I, 21 306.7⟩), but not with the subjunctive clause.

Onbryrdan ‘excite’ occurs frequently with the [_ NP to-PP] frame (14 times in the Toronto corpus), but does not occur with the [_ NP subj that-clause] frame at all, only with a swa...ðæt construction (a resultative or ‘consecutive’ clause; 4 times), and twice with a to ðam/ðon + ðæt-clause (‘in order that’, ‘to the purpose that’) construction.

Ontendan, lit. ‘inflame’, occurs 11 times in the metaphorically extended meaning of ‘incite’, six times with the [_ NP to-PP] frame. It does not occur with the [_ NP subj that-clause] frame.

The last verb, spryttan ‘incite’, occurs 14 times, usually in the literal meaning of ‘sprout’, ‘produce’. Twice it occurs in the extended meaning of ‘incite’, ‘prompt’, with the [_ NP to-PP] frame. It does not occur with the subjunctive clause.
The more restricted distribution of the prepositional frame could be due to the fact that PPs offer only limited scope as to the amount of information they can convey. Perhaps rather surprisingly, this is not because *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitives are structurally more complex (although they are). Purposive *to*-PPs contain nominalizations of verbs and are derived from verbal stems by means of derivational affixes, as for instance *offrung* ‘sacrifice’ in (19) above, from the stem of *offrian* ‘to sacrifice’, or *gylde* ‘repayment’ in (36) from the stem of *gyldan* ‘(re)pay’, or *begang* ‘practice’ from the stem of *began* ‘practise’. Although N-heads cannot occur with proper accusative objects, the object ‘inherited’ from the underlying V, as in *deofolgyld begun* ‘practise demon-worship’, may appear in the genitive in OE, or as an *of*-phrase in PE: *to deofolgylda begonge* ‘to the practice of demon-worship’ (⟨Mart 5 756⟩). As Tense is inherited from the matrix clause, and the embedded subject is always identical in reference to the matrix object, the full clause does not have an edge over the purposive *to*-PP with respect to the amount of information it can convey, in spite of the fact that full clauses have more structure. The significant edge of the clause over the *to*-PP is that it contains a V-head, not an N-head, and as such is not restricted to a subset of the category V, whereas the nominalizing affixes on the corresponding N-head, -*ung/-e/-ø* in our examples, do not attach to just any V but only to restricted subsets of the members of the category V. This means that any such *to*-PP can be replaced by a *to*-infinitive or a subjunctive clause, but not necessarily vice versa. It is in this respect that *to*-PPs are more limited and less versatile than the other two goal-expressions, and it is probably this fact that more than anything else contributed to the development of the *to*-infinitive as a non-finite alternative to the subjunctive clause. We will come back to this point in Chapter 8.

Its more restricted distribution may also indicate that the *to*-infinitive has expanded well beyond its original distribution, and follows the distribution of the subjunctive clause. Perhaps there is some support for the latter position in the fact that there are four verbs which are attested with *to*-PP goals only, and not with subjunctive clauses or *to*-infinitives, suggesting that the appearance of the *to*-infinitive is linked to that of the subjunctive clause. It would appear, then, that by and large, those verbs that are frequently attested with a subjunctive clause as goal-argument also appear with the *to*-infinitive. Seven verbs are attested with the former frame but not with the latter, and the same number are attested with the latter but not with the former (see Table 3.1). Although it is likely that the original model of the *to*-infinitive was the *to*-PP, it is the distribution of the subjunctive *that*-clause, not the *to*-PP, that provides the best match.
The PPs that accompany verbs of spatial manipulation (as in the drawer in I stuck the wallet in the drawer, Quirk et al. 1985: 731) are traditionally analysed as adjuncts (‘direction adjuncts’, e.g. Quirk and Greenbaum 1973: 352) or ‘obligatory adverbials’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 731) because they cannot be analysed as objects, object complements, or subject complements, although Quirk et al. (ibid.) implicitly acknowledge their relationship to the latter two functions by labelling them ‘subject or object related’. The traditional adjunct status may be why Callaway refers to the to-infinitive after the verbs of persuading and urging as an ‘infinitive of specification’ (1913: 161) or a ‘consecutive infinitive’ (1913: 164), i.e. adverbial functions, whereas the to-infinitive with verbs of the other two groups is discussed in a different chapter as verb complement (1913: 28–72). The fact that such adjuncts may be obligatory elements is often noted (e.g. Quirk and Greenbaum 1973: 352; Quirk et al. 1985: 731) and hence optionality in itself does not constitute a diagnostic test for adjuncthood in this tradition.

A more recent analysis of such verbs of spatial manipulation when followed by an accusative theme and a prepositional goal involves analysing the entire complement, the accusative NP and the motion phrase, as one constituent, i.e. a small clause, with the accusative NP as the small clause subject and the motion phrase as the predicate, as in Bennis and Hoekstra (1989b: 93). The deep structure of I stuck the wallet in the drawer would then be something like this:

```
(38)
      VP
       
      V'
       
      V    AgrP
       
struck    

      NP   Agr'
       
the wallet  
Agr

  PP
in the drawer
```

Small clause predicates are prototypically APs, but these motion predicates are restricted to adverbs or PPs, which do not always respond well to the diagnostic test for small clausehood, which is that there is a copular relationship between small clause subject and predicate, witness the wallet is in the drawer in (38). Of a range of possible motion predicates for force as in (39), based on the OE example with niedan in (34), only one meets the diagnostic, as his ship is back
where it came from is fine:

(39) they forced his ship back where it came from/to the island/into the
    bank/away from the shore

When a verb of spatial manipulation, like PE force, urge or OE niedan, is used as a verb of persuading and urging, as in (19)–(21) above, the thematic role of goal is restricted in its expression to three categories, i.e. a purposive to-PP, a to-infinitive, or a subjunctive that-clause, instead of showing the wider range usual for Small Clause predicates. It is also difficult to construct a copular relationship. For a sentence like (21) above, You urge us to believe in these gods, we get the uninterpretable the gods are to believe in and (19)–(20) or (22) are no better. The goal-argument of verbs of persuading and urging, then, is apparently subcategorized for by the verb, and does not constitute a Small clause predicate.

We saw in §3.3.3 that at least some of the to-infinitives after verbs of persuading and urging are arguments rather than adjuncts, although it is clear from Chapter 2 that the to-infinitive must have started out as a purpose adjunct. The adjunctive origins of these goal-arguments surface for example in the occurrence of instances in which the that-clause is preceded by an anticipatory to-PP containing a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun; such constructions are not uncommon in OE (cf. Molencki 1991: 57). An example with niedan is this:

(40) þa he wæs fiftene wintre, þa nyddon hine hys
    when he was fifteen winters, then urged himACC his
    yldræm þæt he sceolde woroldlicum
    parentsnom to-thatDAT that he should worldly
    wæpnum onfon 〈LS 17.1 (MartinMor) 21〉
    weaponsDAT receive
    ‘when he was fifteen years old, his parents urged him to take up worldly
    weapons’

The same general phenomenon is also found in Modern Dutch, with both finite and non-finite complements:

(41) Zij dwong hem (ertoe) . . .
    She forced him (thereto) . . .
    a. dat hij zijn haar liet knippen
        that he his hair let cut

See ANS (1984: 1177) for more examples.
b. zijn haar te laten knippen
   his hair to let\text{INF} cut
   ‘She forced him to have his hair cut’

In the case of Dutch it has been noted that extraction is only possible if there
is no cataphoric device:

\begin{align*}
(42) & \text{Wat dwong zij hem (\text{*ertoe}) dat hij liet knippen/te laten} \\
& \text{What forced she him thereto that he let cut/to let} \\
& \text{knippen?} \\
& \text{cut?} \\
& \text{‘What did she force him (\text{*to it})to have cut?’}
\end{align*}

Bennis (1986: 104–5) argues that the pronoun contained in this to-PP is
not a dummy, but a referential expression with a \textit{theta}-role; this means that
there is no thematic role available for the following \textit{dat}-clause, or \textit{te}-infinitive,
which are, consequently, adjuncts and occupy A’-positions. When there is
no cataphoric to-PP, there is a thematic role available for the \textit{dat}-clause, or
\textit{te}-infinitive; they then receive a \textit{theta}-role and occupy an A-position, hence
\textit{wh}-extraction is possible. If the same is true for OE (we cannot be sure in
view of the paucity of extraction examples), this would mean that clauses
with anticipatory to-PPs like (40) should be analysed as instances in which
the \textit{goal}-argument is realized by a to-PP rather than a subjunctive clause.
It is unlikely, however, that such hybrids represent an earlier stage in the
development of the subjunctive \textit{that}-clause as the expression of the \textit{goal}-
argument. The cataphoric device is a late development, indicating that the
purposive force of \textit{that} had begun to decline and needed an additional device
to restore this meaning. The cataphoric additions of \textit{in pizei, duppe}, or \textit{dupe}
before a purposive \textit{ei}-clause in Gothic have been argued to have been similarly
motivated (van Moerkerken 1888: 54), and more recent parallels are the emerg-
ence of phrases like \textit{for} (ME) or \textit{in order/on purpose} (eModE, see examples
\(2a–c\) in Chapter 2) to boost the purposive force of the to-infinitive and the
\textit{that}-clause.

It is an interesting point that the choice between adjunct and argument
immediately comes down on the side of the adjunct interpretation if the subject
of the embedded clause cannot be identified as identical in reference to the
\textit{theme} of the matrix verb; this probably means that the NP denoting the \textit{theme}
is required to c-command the subject of the lower clause (whether this is the
overt subject of the subjunctive clause or the PRO-subject of the to-infinitive).

When this requirement is not met, the verb is in effect no longer a verb of persuading and urging. In (43) (taken from the OE Bede), the *that*-clause appears to be the *theme*, and *niedan* has become a monotransitive verb with the meaning ‘necessitate’:

(43) forðon seo feanis nedde þara sacerda, þætte aan bispoc
because the paucity forced of-the priests, that one bishop
sceolde beon ofer tuu folc. (Bede 3 15.222.29)
should be over two nations.
Lat: *Paucitas enim sacerdotum cogebat unum antistitem duobus populis praefici.* (Colgrave and Mynors 280)
‘because the paucity of the priests necessitated that one bishop should be [set] over two nations.’

A similar construction with a Gothic verb of commanding and permitting prompted Köhler to label the *ei*-clause as ‘ganz offenbar rein final’ (‘obviously purely final’, Köhler 1867: 446), i.e. as a purpose adjunct. His judgement, though not made explicit, is undoubtedly based on the fact that the recipient of *anabiudan* and the subject of the embedded *ei*-clause do not have identical reference:

(44) jah anabauþ im filu ei manna ni funþi
and ordered3sg themDAT strictly that one not learnssubj
þata (Mark 5.43)
that
‘and he ordered them strictly that no one should hear of it’

The fact that verbs of persuading and urging require a controlled embedded subject may have promoted the reanalysis of purpose adjunct to *goal*-argument.

The *to*-infinitive and subjunctive clause with the verbs of persuading and urging, then, are both ambiguous between *goal*-argument and purpose adjunct, a situation reminiscent of the *to*-infinitive and subjunctive clause with the small group of monotransitive conatives we discussed in §3.2. The difference with these verbs (e.g. *fundian* ‘try’, *hycgan* ‘hope’, ‘trust’ and *tilian* ‘try’) is, however, that although they may appear with the same three constituents (*to-PP, to*-infinitive, and subjunctive clause), only the latter two exhibit the same ambiguity between purpose adjunct and *goal*-argument of the matrix verb; the *to-PP* found after such instances is invariably spatial rather than purposive (i.e. it does not contain a nominalization of a
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verb), and such spatial to-PPs invariably promote an adjunct and/or predicate reading.

3.4 Competition between the three frames

If the to-infinitive represents an innovation, as a comparison of the relative numbers of du-infinitives in Gothic and to-infinitives in OE suggests (§2.2), the question is how this expansion came about.

We have seen that, distributionally, the OE to-infinitive shows an affinity with the subjunctive that-clause—witness the subcategorization frames in (18) and (24) above, and Table 3.1. Functionally, the three goal-expressions show a great deal of overlap, as is clear from many instances of parallel wording (e.g. (36) and (37) above), and from the fact that there is occasional scribal variation between the three. It is significant that such instances, as far as I have been able to ascertain, are invariably one-way, always involving to-infinitives that replace to-PPs or, more frequently, subjunctive clauses.

An example of the former can be found in the Old English Martyrology: þu me nedest to utgonge, ‘you force me to departure’ (⟨Mart 5, 2314⟩). This has been replaced in a later copy, ms C, dated to the beginning of the tenth century (Herzfeld 1981 [1900]: p. xii), by a to-infinitive: þu me nydest ut to ganne ‘you force me to depart’ (ibid. 193). Herzfeld notes that the scribe of C also makes quite a lot of alterations in the word order (ibid. pp. xiv–xv).

Examples of the latter involve Bible translations in which the goal-argument, a bare infinitive in the Latin source, cannot be translated by a bare infinitive in OE. In the West-Saxon Gospels the translator opts for that-clauses, whereas Ælfric, translating the same passage, opts for a to-infinitive, with niedan ‘force’, ‘urge’:

(45) Ga geond δas wesgas and hegas and nyd hig δæt hig
Go along the roads and hedges and urge themACC that they
in ⟨Lk (WSCp) 14.23⟩ ⟨Vulgate, Luke 14.23⟩
gosUBJ in
Lat: Exi in vias et sepes, et compelle intrare
‘Go along the roads and hedges and urge them that they go in’

(46) Ga geond wesgas and hegas, and nyd hi inn to
Go along roads and hedges, and urge themACC in to
come
farenne ⟨ÆHom II 376⟩
‘Go along roads and hedges, and urge them to come in’
A similar case is presented by (47)–(48), with æteowan, translating ostendere (‘show’, but here with the special meaning of ‘warn’) + infinitive. The goal-argument appears as a subjunctive clause in the West-Saxon Gospels, but as a to-infinitive in an anonymous homily from a later date:

(47) eala næddrena cynn hwa ætywde eow thæt ge fleon fram alas vipers’ tribe who warned you that you flee from tham toweardan yrre? (Lk (WSCp) 3.7) the future wrath?
Lat: Genimina viperarum, quis ostendit vobis fugere a ventura ira? (Vulgate, Luke 3:7) ‘alas tribe of vipers, who warned you that you should flee from the imminent wrath?’

(48) Ge næddrena cynn, hwylc æteowde eow to fleonne fram ðon You vipers’ tribe, who warned you to flee from the toweardan Godes erre? (LS 12 (NatJnBapt) 144) future God’s wrath?
‘You tribe of vipers, who warned you to flee from the imminent wrath of God?’

The sense ‘warn’ appears to identify æteowan as a verb of persuading and urging; eow can be either a dative or an accusative (the verb is not attested with the meaning of ‘warn’ anywhere else). The related passage in the Gospel of Matthew has monstrare ‘show’, translated by swutelian in the West-Saxon Gospels:

(i) La næddrena cyn, hwa geswutelode eow to fleonne
Lo vipers’ tribe, who warned you dat/acc to flee
dram þan toweardan yrre? (Mt (WSCp) 3.7)
from the imminent wrath?
Cf. Lat: quis monstravit vobis fugere a ventura ira? (Vulgate)
‘Lo, tribe of vipers, who warned you to flee from the imminent wrath?’

Latin ostendere and monstrare have additional directive meanings (‘prescribe’, ‘order’, ‘teach’, and ‘exhort’; Muller and Renkema 1963: OSTENDO, MONSTRO). The OE translators were either not aware of these meanings, so that the meaning of ‘warn’ is due to a mistranslation of monstrare and ostendere, or geswutelian and æteowan also possessed these additional directive meanings in OE. When used with the meaning ‘show’, both verbs occur with two NP objects (dative recipient and accusative theme), NP + that-clause (with dative NP, e.g. in (LS 4 (Christoph) 94) for æteowan and (LS 8 (Eust) 40) for swutelian), and with Acls, complements which are more typical of the verbs of commanding and permitting. The position of æteowan and swutelian, then, is somewhat anomalous: in meaning they are verbs of persuading and urging, but they are not attested with the subcategorization frames of the verbs of persuading and urging other than the equivocal (i) and (46)–(47).
3.5 Conclusions

In this chapter we have identified two groups of verbs that take the *to*-infinitive as a *goal*-argument. The most important of these form a coherent group as regards both their meaning of ‘persuade’, ‘urge’ and their argument structure: *agent*, *theme*, and *goal*. The fact that the case of the NP is accusative in all three subcategorization frames suggests, first, that its role is that of *theme*, and secondly, that the three categories which can express the second internal argument, i.e. the *to*-PP, the *to*-infinitival phrase, and the subjunctive *that*-clause, fill the same syntactic/semantic slot (the *goal*), which creates the right conditions for competition between them.

The first emergence of the *to*-infinitive as the expression of the *goal*-argument was probably modelled on the *to*-PP, but its distribution has gone beyond that of its original model, not just as regards the verbs in Table 3.1 but especially as regards the verbs where the *to*-infinitive appears as *theme*-argument rather than *goal*: the monotransitive *intention* verbs (Chapter 4) and the ditransitive verbs of commanding and permitting (Chapter 5). There is no evidence that these verbs ever occurred with a *to*-PP, which makes the spread of the *to*-infinitive to the complement of these verbs more mysterious.
Part III

The *to*-infinitive as **theme**
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Intention

4.1 Introduction

This chapter investigates the occurrence of the to-infinitive as argument of monotransitive subject control verbs with meanings like ‘intend’, ‘want’ or their negative counterparts ‘refuse’, ‘fear’, ‘avoid’. Such verbs are collectively known in the literature as ‘modality-verbs’ (Givón 1980: 333), ‘volition-verbs’ (Rudanko 1989: 22–9), or ‘control verbs of commitment’ (Sag and Pollard 1991). What these verbs all share is that they may take as their theme a proposition which refers to a situation that is non-actuated, because it is either still in the future (as with conatives or desideratives) or a hypothetical situation that the speaker wishes not to come true (as with the verbs with negative meanings like ‘refuse’, ‘fear’, or ‘avoid’). I will refer to this group as a whole as intention verbs. One subset of these monotransitive subject control verbs, the conatives, has already been discussed in the previous chapter; their single object appears to be a goal rather than a theme. Since the to-infinitive as goal appears to follow its original distribution, i.e. that of the purposive to-PP, its appearance with these verbs is less remarkable than its occurrence as theme with the other intention verbs.

When the intention verbs are followed by an infinitival complement, the unexpressed subject (PRO) of the infinitive is to be interpreted as identical in reference to the subject of the matrix verb. The following are examples of the intention verb wilnian ‘desire’; in (1) it is followed by a to-infinitive and in (2) by a bare infinitival complement:

(1) ðis heo cwæð mid wope, and gewilnode to ðrowigenne for this she said with weeping, and desired to suffer for Cristes naman þa cwealmbær san wita ... ⟨ÆLS (Agatha) 22⟩

Christ’s name the deadly tortures

‘This she said weeping, and she desired to suffer the deadly tortures in the name of Christ’
As these verbs do not occur with the *to*-PP in OE, where does the *to*-infinitive come from? Several models for the spread of this new construction have been suggested in the literature: the prepositional phrase, nominal objects with inherent case (dative or genitive), the bare infinitive itself, or a combination of these. Bock (1931: 158–9) suggests reanalysis from adjunct to argument as an additional factor: he observes that a sentence like (3) is structurally ambiguous. The two interpretations that he proposes, translated into modern terms, are shown in (3a) and (3b):

(3) þæt Herodes secð þæt cild to
    a. that Herod seeks [NP the child][CP [PP to forspillenne (Mt (WSCp) 2.13) destroy]]
       ‘that Herod seeks the child in order to destroy it’
    b. that Herod seeks [CP [NP the child] to destroy]
       ‘that Herod seeks to destroy the child’

In interpretation (a) the *to*-infinitive is a purpose adjunct; the NP *þæt cild* ‘the child’ is governed by the higher verb *secð* ‘seeks’ and receives the thematic role of the **Theme**. In interpretation (b), on the other hand, the infinitival phrase *þæt cild to forspillenne* ‘the child to destroy’ is interpreted in its entirety as the complement (and the **Theme**-argument) of the higher verb. In this interpretation, the NP *þæt cild* ‘the child’ is governed by the lower verb, *to forspillenne*.

We will see in this chapter that no single model was responsible for the extension of the *to*-infinitive as complement of **intention** verbs. The fact that the *to*-infinitive had started to appear as (goal-)argument of conatives, a subset of the **intention** verbs, must have been an important factor. We noted in § 3.2 that the identification of the internal argument as **goal** rather than **Theme** is not as straightforward with these verbs as it is with verbs of persuading and urging. The *to*-infinitival **goal** of the conatives may have been reanalysed as **Theme**, and may subsequently have spread as an expression of the **Theme** of other **intention** verbs that never occurred with a *to*-PP. Reanalysis as in (3), too, may have played a significant role. Where I disagree with the traditional accounts is in concluding that the role played by...
bare-infinitival complements in this process was small, and that the same holds for the influence of prepositional phrases other than those with the preposition *to*, or of objects with inherent case; the role of finite complements, however, in particular the subjunctive *that*-clause, which until very recently has always been ignored, will turn out to be much more important than is usually assumed.

4.2 The distribution of the *to*-infinitive in Old English

The following verbs are attested with both a bare and a *to*-infinitive in Old English in a subject control construction. In such constructions they have the typical intention meanings discussed in the previous section:


The next set consists of those intention verbs that are only attested with a *to*-infinitive:

(5) *adrædan* ‘fear’; *aforhtian* ‘fear’; *anbidian* ‘expect’; *anðracian* ‘fear’; *aðencan* ‘intend’; *beatian* ‘threaten’; *besorgian* ‘regret’; *ceosan* ‘choose’; *cunnian* ‘try’; *deman* ‘condemn’; *dystlæcan* ‘undertake’; *fleon* ‘shun’; *forgieman* ‘neglect’; *fogiemeleasian* ‘neglect’; *forhtian* ‘fear’; *forlætan* ‘abstain from’; *forsacan* ‘refuse’; *forseamian* ‘be ashamed’; *forseon* ‘despise’; *fundian* ‘strive’; *geliefan* ‘believe’; *higian* ‘strive’; *hyhtan* ‘hope’; *ieldan* ‘delay’; *murnan* ‘care’; *mynnian* ‘intend’; *oferhogian* ‘despise’; *ondrædan* ‘fear’; *ongietan* ‘understand’; *onscunian* ‘shun’; *recan* ‘care’; *sirwan* ‘plot’; *slawian* ‘be slow’; *smeagan* ‘intend’; *swerian* ‘swear’; *tacan* ‘undertake’; *ðeahtian* ‘intend’; *ðeowan* ‘threaten’; *ðwærian* ‘agree’; *underfon* ‘attempt’; *understandan* ‘manage’; *unlustian* ‘loathe’; *wandian* ‘hesitate’; *warnian* ‘shun’; *weddian* ‘agree’; *witan* ‘know how’, ‘manage’; *widcwædan* ‘refuse’; *wiðsacan* ‘refuse’ (48 verbs)

Some of these verbs have been classified differently by Callaway (1913) on the basis of a single ambiguous attestation that should be reconsidered in

---

1 Only attested with such a complement in Bede (330.25). As the *to*-infinitive in this single instance translates a Latin gerundive (see also Callaway 1913: 38), it cannot be taken as evidence of OE usage.

2 The single instance of a *to*-infinitive after *ongietan* could well be a purpose adjunct rather than an argument of this verb; see Callaway (1913: 39).
the light of what is known about the argument structure of that verb, and
the various subcategorization frames it exhibits. Electronic text corpora—to
which Callaway of course had no access—are invaluable in this respect, as they
allow instantaneous listings of all occurrences of any one verb, which reveals
the most frequent patterns fairly quickly, and helps us to interpret and evaluate
alleged instances of infinitival complements. Consider for instance Callaway’s
single attestation of *cunnian*:

> (6) uton cunnian, gif we magon, þone reþan wiðersacan on his
> let-us try if we may the cruel enemyACC on his
> geancyrre gegladian \(ÆCHom\ I, 30 \ 450.18\) (Callaway 1913: 36)
> return appeaseINF
> a. ‘let us try, if we can, to appease the cruel enemy on his return’
> b. ‘let us see whether we can appease the cruel enemy on his return’

Callaway follows Thorpe’s punctuation (Thorpe 1844–6), and takes *gif we
magon* as a complete clause with ‘comment’ status—an embedded interruption
(translation *a*). He takes the complement of *cunnian* to be the bare infinitive
*gegladian* and classifies *cunnian* as a verb that takes only a bare infinitive, on
the basis of this single example. However, (6) allows another interpretation,
especially if we do not follow Thorpe’s punctuation—the ms has no punctu-
ation at all here (Clemoes 1955–6, cited in Healey and Venezky 1985 [1980]). *Gif*
could also introduce an indirect question as the complement of *cunnian*. This
is the interpretation given as translation (*b*). It is possible to make an informed
choice between the two interpretations on the basis of the complementation
patterns usually found after this verb. About 75 per cent of all occurrences of
*cunnian* in the Toronto Corpus are followed by an indirect question with *gif*
or *hwæðer* ‘whether’. In the absence of any other bare-infinitival attestations,
example (6) is best interpreted as yet another indirect question (i.e. interpreta-
tion *b*). *Cunnian* does in fact occur elsewhere with an infinitival complement,
but in a manuscript which was not available to Callaway; and this complement
is a to-infinitive:

> (7) Georne cunnie ælc man to befleonne
> Gladly trySUBJ each man to flee
> hellewite \(HomM\ 9, 15\)
> hell’s-torments
> ‘Let each man gladly try to flee the torments of hell’

*Ondrædan* ‘fear’ appears in Callaway as taking either infinitive; as the one
occurrence of this verb with a bare infinitive is in \(LS\ 23\ (Mary\ of\ Egypt)),
intention
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a notoriously corrupt text which is also a very literal translation (see Skeat 1966 [1881–1900]: 446), this single example cannot be taken as evidence that the verb really allowed a bare infinitive. Two other verbs are included by Callaway in his to-infinitive-only list, anforlætan ‘abandon’ and teon ‘acuse’. Readings in other mss suggest that the single attestations of these verbs with to-infinitives are suspect (Los 1999: 62), which is why they have not been included in set (5).

Apart from these two groups, there are a number of intention verbs that are only attested with a bare infinitive; with the exception of blinnan ‘stop’, ‘cease’, which is an aspectualizer rather than an intention verb, they are all represented either by isolated occurrences in text types which favour bare-infinitival complements (glosses, OE poetry) or by occurrences in a very literal translation from a Latin source in which they invariably reflect a Latin infinitive in the original, i.e. the OE translation of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica (note that lystan and tweogan appear here in their personal uses, not as impersonal verbs):

(8) behealdan ‘take care’; blinnan ‘cease’; eaðmodian ‘deign’; forefon ‘undertake’; forieldan ‘delay’; lystan ‘desire’; onmedan ‘undertake’; teon ‘determine’; tweogan ‘doubt’; ðyrstian ‘undertake’

These single attestations are discussed in Los (1999: 68–70). The verbs in the three sets differ greatly in frequency: the to-infinitive-only verbs of set (5) average some 40 occurrences each (this estimate is based on a sample); the verbs of set (4), those that take either infinitive, are far more frequent, averaging over 400 occurrences each; whereas those of set (8) are infrequent, averaging six attestations or fewer in the entire Toronto Corpus. Taken together, these observations suggest that the only thing we can say about the verbs in set (8) is that they are attested once with an infinitival complement, and that this complement happens to be the bare infinitive because of the text types they occur in (poetry, translations). The fact that they are all rare means that they are not attested with their full range of possible complements; unlike the modal verbs, there is nothing about this group to suggest that they should be accorded the special status (like the modals) that a to-infinitive was impossible. The inevitable conclusion is that even in Old English the only verbs that really did not allow a to-infinitival complement were the modals.

As the du-infinitive does not occur as the argument of intention verbs in Gothic but exclusively as purpose adjunct, and the to-/du-infinitive represents a relative innovation in the Germanic languages, the question is how it managed to spread to other verbs. If there was analogical extension of some kind—if the to-infinitive spread from verb to verb, or from verb group to verb group (as observed, for instance, in the ful/tu shift in Bushlot Guyanan Creole
which affected purpose adjuncts first, then conatives, and finally the rest of the intention verbs; Bickerton (1971)—we would expect this to be reflected to some extent in the distribution of the to-infinitive as we find it in OE. We will examine three structures that have been suggested in the literature as possible models for this expansion: the dative or genitive NP, PPs, and bare infinitives.

4.3 Models for the distribution of the to-infinitive

4.3.1 The dative or genitive noun phrase

One explanation for the distribution of the to-infinitive in Old English is suggested in Callaway (1913). Callaway argues that there is a correlation between case and infinitive: verbs taking accusative objects are more likely to be followed by bare infinitives, and verbs taking objects in the dative or genitive, or prepositional objects, are more likely to occur with a to-infinitive.

We noted in §1.3 that this correlation suggested itself to Callaway because of the way he classified his data: he includes AcI-verbs of perception and causation with monotransitive subject control verbs. Perception verbs take accusative objects and bare-infinitival AcIs (AcIs always have bare infinitives in original OE prose; see Callaway 1913: 119–20; Fischer 1989; Mitchell 1985: §§3749–51). The correlation ‘accusative : bare infinitive’ breaks down when it comes to explaining the distribution of the infinitives after intention verbs.

The connection between to-infinitives and inherent case is in itself quite reasonable as a first hypothesis. The opposition between nominative and accusative on the one hand and the other cases on the other (genitive, dative, instrumental, locative, etc.) is an old one, variously referred to in the literature as core/oblique, primary/secondary, nuclear/peripheral, direct/indirect, structural/inherent, or abstract/concrete. If the to-infinitive only appeared as purpose adjunct in OE and not as argument, Callaway’s correlation would make sense: the bare infinitive would be reserved for arguments (core, primary, nuclear, direct, structural) and the to-infinitive for adjuncts (oblique, secondary, peripheral, indirect, inherent).

The problem for Callaway is that this hypothetical division is no longer valid in OE because the to-infinitive is abundantly attested as the theme—both of intention verbs and of the ditransitive verbs of commanding and permitting, which we will discuss in Chapter 5. This explains the overwhelming number of to-infinitive-only verbs that are also attested with accusative objects (the typical nominal expression of theme arguments): 38 of the 48 verbs of set (5), contra Callaway’s correlation, as we can see in Table 1 of Appendix II. This table shows that the great majority of intention verbs typically occur with either a to-infinitive, a subjunctive that-clause, or
an accusative object, and this is completely at odds with what Callaway’s correlation would lead us to expect. We are forced to conclude that the distribution of the *to*-infinitive after these *intention* verbs cannot be explained by an account based on case. This has consequences for any account of the distribution of the two infinitives after these *intention* verbs in OE that relies to any extent on Callaway’s statements (e.g. Fischer 1997a: 109, 117; Nunes 1993; Jarad 1997: 28).

4.3.2 *The prepositional phrase*

A second proposal to account for the distribution of the *to*-infinitive is made by Bock, who suggests a link between prepositional objects and *to*-infinitives (Bock 1931: 119). According to Bock, the *to*-infinitive was originally totally indistinguishable from an ‘ordinary’ prepositional phrase with *to*; its distribution (Bock speaks of *Gebrauch*, i.e. its use) must therefore have followed the same lines as the PP, and its use was at first purely adverbial; the *to*-infinitive as verb complement developed later, out of these adverbial uses. It was in this area that the *to*-infinitive first started to encroach on the territory of the bare infinitive (ibid. 120). This would bring us to the situation as we find it in the extant Old English texts.

Bock’s suggestion of a link between the distribution of prepositional objects and the *to*-infinitive is a priori plausible: the form of the *to*-infinitive suggests its probable origin as a prepositional phrase, and it has the dative ending one would expect after the preposition *to*, as this preposition governs the dative. However, if the original ‘source’ for the distribution of a *to*-infinitival complement was the PP, this would have to be the PP with *to* and not just any PP (as both Callaway and Bock seem to imply). PPs can certainly be arguments in OE, but P is selected in the subcategorization frame; to my knowledge no verb subcategorizes for just any PP.

As noted in §4.2, there are 48 OE verbs that appear exclusively with a *to*-infinitive after *intention* verbs (set (5)). Ten of these verbs are also attested with an argument PP with *to* (see Appendix II, Table 1); this includes the conatives discussed in §4.2, where the *to*-PP, and therefore possibly the *to*-infinitive, occurs as goal-argument. Bock’s hypothesis of the origin of the *to*-infinitive would account for the appearance of the *to*-infinitive in roughly one-fifth of the verbs of set (5). As regards the seventeen verbs that are attested with either infinitive (set (4), also including conatives), only four are attested with an argument PP with *to* (see Appendix II, Table 2). Although it seems reasonable to suppose that the PP with *to* was the original source for the appearance of the *to*-infinitive, the distribution of the *to*-infinitive as we find it in OE has gone far beyond this original model.
Bock is well aware of this; his claim is simply that any account of the development of the *to*-infinitive must necessarily start with the PP, as the logic of the situation demands that it is the ultimate source from which the *to*-infinitive started its expansion: ‘Für eine Betrachtung der Weiterentwicklung des *to*-Infinitivs kann nur dieser ursprüngliche Gebrauch der Ausgangspunkt sein’ (‘Any account of the subsequent development of the *to*-infinitive must take this original use as its starting point’, ibid. 119). For Bock, the subsequent history of the *to*-infinitive is shaped by two additional factors. One is its steady encroachment on the domain of the bare infinitive, with the ‘force’ of the ‘preposition’ *to* showing a steady decline, so that the *to*-infinitive starts to occur in environments where the sense of goal or purpose is weak or absent. This claim will be discussed in §4.3.4. The second factor is that some verbs acquired a *to*-infinitive through reanalysis. We will examine this claim straight away.

4.3.3 Reanalysis of adjunct to argument

Bock notes that the *to*-infinitive is ambiguous in many cases; in (9), for instance, it can be interpreted either as a *to*-infinitival adjunct or as a theme-argument of the matrix verb *secan* ‘seek’, in which case the NP *þæt Cild* ‘the child’ is interpreted as the object of the *to*-infinitive, not as the object of the matrix verb. This ambiguity is demonstrated by Bock’s German gloss of (9): ‘H. sucht das Kind zum Verderben/zu verderben’, i.e. ‘Herod seeks the child for destruction/Herod seeks to destroy the child’ (ibid. 158). Translated in modern terms, the ambiguity is indicated by the bracketing in (a) for the adjunct interpretation (based on Epstein (1984), quoted in Haegeman (1994: 468–70)), and in (b) for the argument interpretation:

(9) *towearð ys þæt Herodes secð þæt Cild*
future is that Herod seeks that childACC

to *forspillenne* (Mt (WSCp) 2.13)
to destroy
Lat: *futurum esse enim ut Herodes quaerat puerum ad perdendum eum*

*a. Herodes secð \[NP\þæt Cild\] [\[CP\ Op\[IP\ PRO to \[IP\ PRO t\] to forspillenne]]
‘Herod seeks the child in order to destroy [it]’*
b. Herodes secð [\[CP\ PRO [\[NP\þæt Cild\] to forspillenne]
‘Herod seeks to destroy the child’*

The interpretation of the *to*-infinitive as verb complement, i.e. (b), is the usual interpretation of (9); the adjunct interpretation, i.e. of (a), on the other hand, may seem far-fetched at first, but its validity is clear from the use of the gerund
Intention

in an *ad*-phrase in the Latin source, which can only be an adjunct. The NP *þæt Cild* is the object of *secð* and carries the thematic role of *theme*; the argument structure and thematic roles of the infinitive *to forspillenne* is satisfied by the empty category PRO (external argument and *agent*) and by the trace *t* (internal argument and *theme*). This trace is part of an *A’*-chain which is headed by an empty operator; at LF, an interpretative mechanism similar to that which allows overt *wh*-elements in a relative clause to be interpreted correctly links this empty operator with the NP *þæt Cild*.

In (*b*), on the other hand, the object, and *theme*-argument, of *secð* is the infinitival phrase *þæt cild to forspillenne* in its entirety, while the thematic roles and the argument structure of *to forspillenne* are satisfied by the covert NP PRO (external argument and *agent*) and the NP *þæt Cild* (internal argument and *theme*). As the OE verb may assign case to the left, the fact that the object *þæt Cild* precedes its governing verb is unproblematic.

If the *to*-infinitive in (*a*) is an adjunct, what is it adjoined to? Bock interprets it as an adjunct to the object of the matrix verb (witness his use of phrases like ‘[der] *to*-Infinitiv in adnominaler Stellung’ (ibid. 128) or ‘der Infinitiv [hängt ab] von den Nomen’ (ibid. 129)), as if it is some kind of relative clause. It is equally likely that the *to*-infinitive as adjunct in (*g*), and in many similar cases, is adjoined to a higher node, e.g. V’, and is a clausal, not a nominal, adjunct. The adjunction site is not relevant to the ambiguity of sentences like (*g*), as the ambiguity remains, whatever the adjunction site.

The surface order of such a structurally ambiguous clause can be parsed by the learner in two different ways. Reanalysis occurs when subsequent generations systematically opt for the simpler structure of (*b*) when parsing such data. Bock rightly attaches great importance to such a reanalysis as it is the trigger which enables the *to*-infinitive to occur in argument positions (ibid. 160), and goes some way towards explaining the distribution of the *to*-infinitive after INTENTION verbs. It means that in theory any INTENTION verb that is attested with an accusative *theme* could have developed a *to*-infinitival complement out of a *to*-infinitival purpose adverbial; and the tables in Appendix II show that the great majority of INTENTION verbs are attested with such accusative THEMES.

There are a number of other, more frequently attested environments in which the *to*-infinitive can only be interpreted as an argument: when the *to*-infinitive is intransitive; when the ambiguous NP follows instead of precedes the *to*-infinitive; when the status of the NP is disambiguated by its case (if the matrix verb governs a different case to that of the non-finite verb); and when there has been extraction of any material out of the *to*-infinitival complement and the extraction site is not in doubt, as such extractions should not be possible out of adjuncts (see §3.2 above). Such unambiguous instances are
attested even in early, Alfredian, OE prose, for instance the following example, with an intransitive infinitive:

(10) ðeah ðe hi næfre learningcnihtas næren, wilniað though that they never students not-were, want ðeah lareowas to beonne (CP 0.25.7) though teachers to be Lat: . . . docere concupiscunt (Bock 1931: 169) ‘Although they have never been students, they still want to be teachers’

Another example is (11), also Alfredian, with teohhian ‘intend’, where hwider is extracted out of the infinitival phrase to lædenne, which means that to lædenne is a complement, not an adjunct (taken from example (151) in Allen 1980: 124):

(11) Ac þær ðu ongeate hwider ic ðe nu tiohige But there you perceive whither I you now intend to lædenne (Bo 22.51.6) to lead ‘But when you perceive where I intend to lead you now’

Many of the more frequent INTENTION verbs are well attested with both transitive and intransitive to-infinitives throughout the OE period. With respect to the verbs of set (4), which allow both infinitives, it is interesting to note that there is no difference here between the type of infinitive (bare or to-): in both cases, the infinitives are just as likely to be transitive, unergative, or unaccusative. This suggests that an argument interpretation of the to-infinitival phrase after these verbs has become possible already in early OE, which in turn suggests that the reanalysis, if it did take place, was considerably earlier than Bock suggests.

4.3.4 The bare infinitive

The second structure that has been argued to have served as a possible model for the to-infinitive is the bare infinitive. The idea that the rise of the to-infinitive occurred at the expense of the bare infinitive has been the received wisdom at least since the publication of Henry Sweet’s A New English Grammar in 1903. Callaway quotes with approval Sweet’s scenario of the replacement of one infinitive by the other (Callaway 1913: 70; see §1.3 above) and Bock, too, embraces the idea:

In der ersten [Stufe], die bis um Ende der ae. Zeit gesetzt wurden kann, dringt der to-Infinitiv in alle diejenigen Verwendungen ein, in denen der reine Infinitiv der noch lebendig gefühlten Grundbedeutung nicht mehr völlig angemessen erscheint, ohne hier jedoch ganz zu verschwinden. (‘At the first [stage], which can be placed at the end
of the OE period, the *to*-infinitive encroaches on all those functions in which the bare infinitive no longer seems to fit the basic meaning—still very much present at that time—completely, without, however, disappearing altogether in these functions; Bock 1931: 120)

We saw in Chapter 2 that there are grounds to assume competition between the two structures at a very early stage, when the *to*-infinitive first appeared as a purpose adjunct. As soon as we reach recorded OE, however, we find the *to*-infinitive in theme- and goal-argument positions. If bare infinitives were systematically replaced by *to*-infinitives, we would expect to find verbs that occur with a bare infinitive theme or goal at one stage occurring with a *to*-infinitive at a later stage—and the only verbs that fit this profile are, possibly, the verbs *onginnan* and *beginnan* ‘begin’, where the bare-infinitival complement came to be reserved for perfective, non-ingressive, non-segmentable events whereas the earlier ingressive function came to be expressed by the *to*-infinitive (see below, §4.4). Conversely, the only verbs that occur consistently and exclusively with a bare infinitive in OE are the modals—but this bare infinitive has not been replaced by the *to*-infinitive.

It is true that the bare infinitive eventually disappeared after the intention verbs, but this did not happen until ME, and was part of the general restructuring of the verb system which ultimately resulted in modals no longer being base-generated in V but in T. More importantly, there is no evidence that the 48 verbs of set (5) ever occurred with a bare infinitive, or that there was ever a group larger than set (4) to appear with a bare infinitive. Set (4) has the same size as the set of intention verbs that appear with bare infinitives in Gothic (based on Bernhardt 1877a: 12–14, 18–22; Köhler 1867: 425–32, 435–50; Klinghardt 1877: 171–6; and Van Moerkerken 1888: 43):


Information on cognates from Lehmann (1986). Potential intention verbs that are only found with a bare infinitive in an accusative-and-infinitive construction have not been included. Although Ferraresi (1997: 225) takes them at face value, Harbert (1978: 203–7) argues convincingly that such AclS are due to Greek interference and are therefore no reliable guide to actual usage.

*Laisjan* in the sense of ‘make known’ is a verb of declaring (Klinghardt 1877: 172) and as such is attested with a *pateil/pammei*-clause.

As (12) contains a number of verbs that later develop into modals and have been left out of set (4) for that reason, the number of bare-infinitive-only intention verbs in Gothic is even smaller than in OE. If we separate set (12) out into verbs that are also found with an ei-clause, the Gothic counterpart of the OE subjunctive that-clause (set (14)), and verbs that are not (set (13)), we find that the more ‘modal’ of the verbs in (12) are not attested with finite complements:

(13) anananþjan ‘dare’, ‘venture’; domjan ‘judge’; gadaursan ‘dare’; gairnjan ‘desire’; ganiman ‘learn’; lais ‘I know’; magan ‘may’; skulan ‘must’; usbidan ‘wish’; usdaudjan ‘strive’

(14) munan ‘strive’; sokjan ‘seek’; trauan ‘trust’; þaurban ‘need’; þugkjan ‘believe’, ‘seem’; wenjan ‘hope’; wiljan ‘want’, ‘wish’

Although the OE forerunners of the PE modal verbs exhibit more lexical properties than at a subsequent stage, it has also been recognized that their behaviour is exceptional enough to warrant their inclusion in a separate group: they are morphologically isolated in that they are preterite-present verbs (apart from willan/wolde) and hence lack the usual -eþ ending of the third person singular, and they are syntactically exceptional in being transparent to the argument structure of the lower verb (Denison 1990b; van Kemenade 1992; Warner 1990). They do not occur with a to-infinitive in OE (Callaway 1913: 82–3; Warner 1993: 136–9). With respect to sets (13) and (14), the relevant observation is that the typically lexical properties are not in evidence with all OE modals to the same degree: mæg/mihte and sceal are very rarely found with a subjunctive clause, for instance, only with a bare infinitive or, in the case of cann, with a nominal object, whereas willan/wolde and dearr are quite frequently found with such complements; in this respect the OE data tally with the Gothic data, as the Gothic cognates of mæg/mihte and sceal, magan and skulan, are only found with a bare infinitive, and not with a subjunctive clause, unlike the Gothic cognates of willan/wolde and dearr.

5 Another verb listed by Köhler is gaumjan ‘observe’, not an intention verb, although its OE cognate gieman ‘take care’ is. Gaumjan is attested with both an infinitival and a clausal (þatei/þammei + indicative) complement, which fits Klinghardt’s observation that apart from the ditransitive verbs of ordering, permitting, urging, and persuading, the subjunctive ei-clause is most typical of the monotransitive intention verbs (‘verba des wollens, befehlens, verbietens, aufforderns, erstrebens, hoffens’: Klinghardt 1877: 174); gaumjan ‘observe’, on the other hand, belongs to the group of verbs of saying and declaring, and mental or sense perception, which most typically take þatei/þammei + indicative as complement (ibid.).
There is a third group of intention verbs that are only attested with an *ei*-clause, not with an infinitival complement:

(15) afargaggan ‘strive’; gataujan (OE gedon) ‘make’, ‘see to it’; hwotjan ‘threaten’; kunnan (OE cunnan) ‘cann’; saihvan (OE seon) ‘make an effort’, ‘see to it’; sifan ‘look forward to’

Some meanings are conative, so that the *ei*-clause with its sense of purpose is not surprising, but others simply refer to non-actuated future events (*hwotjan, kunnan, sifan*). This tallies with the finding that there are many examples in which the sense of purpose of *ei* is weakened, even though all sources (Bernhardt 1877a; Gabelentz and Löbe 1846: 272ff.; Klinghardt 1877; Van Moerkerken 1888: 55) agree that the primary function of the subjunctive *ei*-clause is the expression of purpose. It is tempting to link the failure of *magan* and *skulan* to appear with *ei*-clauses to the failure of the PE modals to occur with *to*-infinitives: *to*-infinitives follow the distribution of the subjunctive, and the failure of the PE modals to occur with *to*-infinitives is accounted for by the fact that they did not occur with the subjunctive clause—modal meanings are apparently incompatible with the ‘optative’ semantics of subjunctive clauses and *to*-infinitives.

We now turn to the subjunctive clause as a model for the distribution on the *to*-infinitive.

### 4.3.5 The subjunctive clause

The average intention verb in OE can express its theme in three ways: by an accusative NP, by a subjunctive *that*-clause, or by a *to*-infinitive. We have seen that the verbs of set (4) appear with a fourth category, the bare infinitive, so that a verb like *earnian* ‘deserve’, ‘earn’ illustrates all four possible themes (in bold).

With an NP theme:

(16) þæt we geearnion æt Criste sylfum ece that we earn*subj* from Christ himself eternal *mede* ⟨ByrM 1 124.19⟩ reward

‘so that we may earn an eternal reward from Christ himself’

---

6 The few verbs of saying and declaring that, exceptionally, appear both with *ei* + subjunctive and *þatei*/*þamei* + indicative (e.g. *andhafjan* ‘reply’) have not been included; see also n. 5 above.

7 Van Moerkerken (1888: 8) observes that in many cases *ei* appears simply to be equivalent to Dutch *dat*, i.e. it is a subordinating conjunction like PE *that*.
With a subjunctive clause as theme:

(17) þæt he þurh þæt geearnige, þæt he onfo þære
that he through that earnsUBJ, that he receivesUBJ the
ecan mede on heofonan rice. (HomS 16 154)
eternal reward in heavenly kingdom.
‘so that he in this way may earn, that he may receive the eternal reward in the heavenly kingdom.’

With a to-infinitive as theme:

(18) Ac forlæte se man nu þa hwilwendlice scylde, to þan þæt
But leave the man now the transitory sin, to that that
he geearnige to onfone þæt ece god. (Alc 137)
he earnsUBJ to receive that eternal good.
‘But let the man now leave off the transitory sin, so that he may earn the eternal good, to receive it.’

With a bare infinitive as theme:

(19) heo geearnode habban brydgyman on
she deserved haveINF bridegroom in
heofonum (GD Pref and 3(C) 14.199.18)
heavens
‘she deserved to have a bridegroom in heaven’

We saw that, in addition, a very small subset of intention verbs—the conatives—can also express their internal argument as a to-PP. It is this proliferation of theme-expressions that has led to so many different suggestions in the literature as to which structure could have served as a possible model for the expansion of the to-infinitive. The distribution of the to-infinitive is matched particularly closely by that of the subjunctive that-clause (in equal first place with the accusative NP: see Appendix II). We will now present the case for the subjunctive clause as a possible model.

The subjunctive that-clause vies with the accusative object as the best predictor for the distribution of the to-infinitive after intention verbs: of the 48 verbs in set (5), the set which is only attested with a to-infinitival complement, 38 occur with an object in the accusative, and the same number (albeit not exactly the same verbs) occur with a subjunctive that-clause (see Appendix II, Table 1); both are far better predictors than the PP with to or the bare infinitive, which were discussed earlier.

Although the importance of subjunctive that-clauses in the history of the spread of the to-infinitive has not, to my knowledge, been discussed before
Los (1998a, 1999), it has been observed (Manabe 1989) that there is a vast increase in the frequency of infinitives as the complement of verbs at the beginning of the Middle English period, while the frequency of finite clauses in the same environment shows a sharp decline. Manabe, however, does not distinguish between subjunctive or indicative clauses, or between bare and to-infinitival complements. Fischer (1996a), prompted by Manabe’s study and by her own observations that finite clauses and to-infinitives share features not shared by bare infinitives, suggested that the general decrease in finite complements was probably due to an increase in to-infinitives only, as there does not appear to be an increase in bare infinitival complements; but she does not distinguish between subjunctive and indicative either, although this distinction is important: it is specifically the subjunctive clause that is in competition with the to-infinitive.

There are various bits of evidence that point in this direction. The first one is the distributional overlap between subjunctive clause and to-infinitive after these verbs. The importance of the role of the subjunctive that-clause for the account of the distribution of the to-infinitive becomes even clearer if we look at the converse situation, i.e. verbs that appear with a subjunctive that-clause but not with a to-infinitive. The Brooklyn–Geneva–Amsterdam–Helsinki Annotated Corpus of OE Prose Texts (BGAH), though not as extensive as the Toronto Corpus, has the enormous advantage of being tagged with complementation patterns, which allows a relatively quick search for all verbs that appear with subjunctive that-clauses. Those verbs that are attested with subjunctive that-clauses but not with to-infinitives turn out to fall into a number of distinct groups.

Among the monotransitives found with a subjunctive that-clause in this corpus, there is a small number of verbs that do not appear with a to-infinitive. Most of these do not express intention (i.e. perception verbs and verbs like witan ‘know’, ‘be aware of’, fægnian ‘rejoice’, and begietan ‘get’, ‘obtain’). Such perception and cognition verbs typically take þatei/þammei-clauses with indicative in Gothic, but they also appear occasionally with an ei-clause with subjunctive (Klinghardt 1877: 170–9). The same situation is reflected in the OE data: although here there is only one complementizer, þæt ‘that’, the indicative/subjunctive distribution is similar, with perception and cognition verbs typically appearing with an indicative clause, and very occasionally with a subjunctive. It is these exceptional subjunctives that have been thrown up by this corpus search.

This leaves four intention verbs which theoretically could also have been expected to occur with a to-infinitive, but are not attested with this complement. The obvious reason for this is that they are all fairly rare (gestihtan ‘arrange’, hedan ‘take heed’, licettan ‘feign’, and treowsian ‘commit oneself’
average 15 occurrences each in the Toronto Corpus), which may explain why a to-infinitival complement, though not inherently unlikely after these verbs, is not attested.

A possible objection to the notion that to-infinitives may be functionally equivalent to a subjunctive clause is that subjunctive clauses, unlike to-infinitives and to-PPs, have positions for overt subjects (AgrSP) and for tense (TP). In practice, however, the overt material in the T and AgrS nodes of a subjunctive clause in the complement of an intention verb has no independent meaning: both are controlled by the tense and AgrS of the matrix clause. This matter will be discussed more fully in Chapter 8. The spread of the to-infinitive to theme-arguments, then, may well be due to this equivalence.

4.4 The ginnan-verbs

There do not appear to be any semantic or syntactic differences between themes expressed by the bare and by the to-infinitive after intention verbs (cf. (18)–(19) above). There is one group of monotransitive subject control verbs, however, where we do find differences. This is a small group of three related verbs, onginnan, (a)ginnan, and beginnan, all meaning ‘begin’. The bare infinitive after these verbs could well have been replaced by a to-infinitive in late OE; there are clear signs that, when these verbs were complemented by a bare infinitive, the original ingressive meaning ‘begin’ was no longer possible in late OE, almost as if the bare infinitive could no longer refer to a temporally segmentable event. To-infinitives become more frequent towards the end of the OE period and appear to restore the earlier ingressive meanings to these verbs. We will present the bare bones of the argument in this section. The full story can be found in Los (1999: 93–127, 2000).

The ginnan-group shows affinities with the intention verbs: they are monotransitive subject control verbs, and the complement typically refers to a future, non-actuated event. It differs from the intention group in two crucial respects. The first difference is that they are only very occasionally found with a subjunctive clause; an example is:

(20) gif we be sumum dæle nyllað onginnan ðæt we
     if we to some extent not-want begin that we
     onhyrigen ðæm ðeawum þe us on oðrum monnum
     imitate the virtues that us in other men
     liciað (CP 230,2)
     likes
Lat: si ea quae diligimus, in quantum possumus non imitamur (Rommel
1992: 308)
‘if we do not want to begin to imitate to some extent the virtues that we like in other men’

Note that the appearance of onginnan or its subjunctive complement is not due to anything in the Latin text, which translates as ‘if we do not imitate, as much as is in our power, that which we admire’. Another example occurs in (Bede 3 9.184.33). Unlike the intention verbs, which favour such finite (subjunctive) complements, the ginnan-group occurs most frequently with an infinitival complement, both bare and to-. The second difference is that there are semantic and syntactic differences between the two infinitival complements here which cannot be discerned in those verbs of the intention group that are also found with both complements (i.e. set (4) above).

The syntactic difference is that the ginnan-group is transparent for the argument structure of the higher verb, like the modals, but only when followed by a bare infinitive. This means that, like the modals, they have little or no argument structure of their own. The transparency shows up most clearly when the infinitive is an impersonal verb: these verbs have dative experiencers rather than nominative agents, and the experiencer argument remains dative when the higher verb is a ginnan-verb or a modal. Because the ginnan-verbs and the modals do not occur with an impersonal argument structure in the absence of an impersonal verb, this must mean that they are transparent to the argument structure of the infinitive, as in the following example:

(21) ða ongan me langian for minre
    Then began me dài langian for minre
    me langian for minre
    me langian for minre
    me langian for minre
    ‘Then I began to grieve because of my imprisonment’

Here we have the impersonal infinitive langian ‘grieve’, which takes a dative experiencer, me ‘me’. The form ongan can be either first or third person, so we do not know what it agrees with; however, the nominative subject found with onginnan/beginnan when followed by the infinitive of a personal verb is absent. The phenomenon that a verb is transparent to the argument structure of the higher verb is otherwise only found with modals in OE, which are invariably followed by bare infinitives (Denison 1990b: 148; Warner 1993: 186, 194–5). There are more such examples with onginnan/beginnan, but never with to-infinitives. Examples like (21) present the first piece of evidence that onginnan/beginnan with the bare infinitive behaves at times like an auxiliary, with no argument structure of its own.
The semantic difference suggested in the literature is that the *ginnan*-verbs are not always truly ingressive when followed by a bare infinitive, and appear to be ‘semantically bleached’, to use a term from the literature on grammaticalization (see e.g. Einenkel 1891: 89; Funke 1922; Mossé 1938: §238; Brinton 1988: 85ff.); an example is the following, in which there is little or no focus on the beginning of the action:

(22) Saul se cyning wolde witan [...] hu him sceolde
Saul the king wanted know [...] how him should
gelimpan [...] þa he feohtan ongan wið āa
happen [...] when he fight began against the
philisteos ⟨ÆHom 30, 36⟩
Philistines
‘King Saul wanted to know how he would fare if he fought against the Philistines’

It is clear from the context of this sentence that there is no special emphasis on the beginning of the fighting, or on who starts the fight (see also the original Bible story in 1 Samuel 28). Saul has seen the Philistines muster their army and wants to know whether he will win the battle or not. There is no inchoative sense here. Other clear cases are instances like (23), where there is a durative adverbial (*ofer twelf monað ‘for twelve months’) which makes an ingressive reading impossible:

(23) þa ongann se apostol hi ealle læran ofer twelf
then began the apostle them all teach for twelve
monað. āa deopan lære be drihtnes tocyme. to ðyssere
months the deep lore about lordgen coming to this
world ⟨ÆCHom II, 18 170.27⟩
world
‘Then the apostle taught [not *“began to teach’] them all for twelve months the profound doctrine of the Lord’s coming to this world’

It has been suggested that what is expressed by *onginnan* in such examples is perfectivity (see e.g. Mitchell’s discussion in Mitchell 1985: §676). Riggert (1909) points out that the Latin perfective *persecuti sunt* ‘were persecuted’ shows up in the OE translation as *ehtan ongunnon*, lit. ‘begin to persecute’ ⟨(PPs 118.161)⟩.

In the next example, by contrast, there is a very clear inchoative sense. Such clear cases in which the focus is on the beginning of an event invariably have
the to-infinitive:

(24) Sume men onginnan god to donne, ac hi hit endiað
Some men begin good to do, but they it end
yfle, swa Iudas dyde and sume men onginnanð yfel to donne,
badly, as Judas did and some men begin evil to do,
ac hi hit geendiað wel, swa Paulus dyde. ⟨HomS 16, 143–6⟩
but they it end well, as Paul did.
‘Some people start out doing good but end up doing bad, as Judas
did; and some people start out doing bad but end up doing good, as
Paul did.’

On the basis of such data alone, it is impossible to argue that the ginnan-verbs
in late OE never express ingression when followed by a bare infinitive. There
are plenty of instances where there is no durative adverbial to force a non-
ingressive reading, so that one cannot be certain that an ingressive reading
was wholly impossible with bare infinitives, or that these verbs when followed
by a to-infinitive always express ingestion. There are, however, other ways
to confirm this hypothesis, even in the absence of native speaker judgements.
There are clues in the type of construction in which the ginnan-verbs and their
two infinitival complements are found.

The co-occurrence of both infinitives after onginnan/beginnan is particu-
larly noticeable in the works of Ælfric (late OE narrative prose). Onginnan
is complemented by the bare infinitive 44 times in this corpus, and by the
to-infinitive 22 times. Beginnan is complemented 13 times by a bare infinitive,
and 46 times by a to-infinitive. The intriguing finding is that each infinitive
turns out to be associated with a particular construction.

The first of these constructions is exemplified in (25), i.e. the adverb þa
followed by the finite verb and the subject (the þa V pattern, in bold):

(25) þa ongunnon þa Iudei. hine eft torfian. mid heardum
then began the Jews him again stone with hard
stanum. and heora an hine sloh mid ormætum stencge,
stones and of-them one him struck with enormous cudgel
inn oð þæt bragen ⟨ÆCHom II0, 18 172.100⟩
in to the brain
‘then the Jews began to stone him again with hard stones and one
of them struck him a blow with an enormous cudgel that crushed
his skull’

8 The single counterexample to this generalization in Brinton (1988: 160) is only apparent: see Los
9 Note that these figures are lower than those quoted by Callaway (1913: 67). The reason is that fewer
texts are attributed to Ælfric today than in Callaway’s time.
Table 4.1. Frequencies of þa V- and V1-constructions with onginnan and beginnan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>þa V with bare infinitive</th>
<th>V1 with bare infinitive</th>
<th>þa V with to-infinitive</th>
<th>V1 with to-infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>onginnan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginnan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern is, at least for the more frequent verb onginnan, associated with the bare infinitive (see Table 4.1). A second frequent pattern is verb-first (V1), illustrated by the following example, where we find a to-infinitive with onginnan, and with the matrix verb sentence-initial:

(26) Ongann þa Augustinus mid his munecum to Began then Augustine with his monks to geefenlæcenne þære apostola lif mid singalum emulate the apostles’ life with continuous gebedum ⟨ÆCHom II, 9 78.205⟩ prayers ‘Augustine then began with his monks to emulate the lives of the apostles with continuous prayers’

This pattern is most common with the to-infinitive.

Statistical tests are possible even with such small numbers (Siegel and Castellan 1988: 103). A Fisher–Yates Test reveals that the bare infinitive exhibits a significant preference for the þa V construction, whereas V1-constructions tend to occur with to-infinitives (p < .01). The most striking figures are those in the second column of Table 4.1: the combination of onginnan/beginnan with bare infinitive hardly ever occurs with V1.

The clue to these skewed figures lies in the discourse-function of the two constructions. þa V in narrative texts describes a punctual, and foregrounded, action. It does not set the scene but carries the action forward (Enkvist 1986: 305). V1 is also associated with foregrounding, and though it has been associated with þa V at a deeper level, in the sense that the verbs are in C in both cases, with þa in Spec,CP in one case and a non-overt counterpart in Spec,CP in the other case (cf. Stockwell 1977; Hopper 1979; Diesing 1990), there is a clear discourse difference between the two by Ælfric’s time. V1 in the Germanic languages has been described as indicating ‘lively narrative’ (e.g. Kiparsky 1995: 163; Thráinsson 1985: 172), ‘vividness of action’
(Stockwell 1977: 291), a turning-point in the narrative, a transition, or a change of pace, ‘just as a new paragraph does in MnE prose’ (Mitchell 1985: §3933). This explains why $V_1$ often heads paragraphs in edited texts, as it does in (26) above. Every single occurrence of the $V_1$-pattern with $onginnan/beginnan + to$-infinitive in the work of Ælfric can be argued not only to signal an episode boundary of this kind, but also to announce a discontinuity in the progression of the narrative events. There is a certain dramatic quality to all these instances.

Consider for example (27), describing an event in the life of St Martin. Martin has been brutally captured by a band of brigands, one of whom is assigned to rob and guard him. As soon as he is left alone with this man, the force of Martin’s personality and his faith in God makes such an impression on his guard that he becomes a convert to the Christian faith, and frees his captive. The description of Martin’s persuasive preaching uses $beginn an + to$-infinitive:

(27) Begann $\delta a$ to $secgenne$ $\bar{p}am$ sceadgan geleafan. and mid $boclicere$ lare $hine$ læran $ongann$; $Hwæt \delta a$ se sceadga $scriptural$ doctrine him teach began; $lo$ then the ruffian $sona$ gelyfde. on $\bar{d}one$ lifigendan god. and tolysde $\delta a$ at-once believed in the living god and released the bonds $\langle \ÆCHom \text{II, 39.1 290.70–1} \rangle$

‘[He] began then to explain the faith to the ruffian and began to teach him scriptural doctrine; lo, then the ruffian at once believed in the living god and untied his bonds . . .’

A similar $V_1$-pattern is found in another version of the same story ($\langle \ÆLS (Martin) 165 \rangle$), at precisely the same point.

We have in (27) a sudden turn in the plot, in which Martin, outnumbered by his enemies, wounded and bound, manages completely to reverse his hopeless position. It seems that $V_1$ signals that such a dramatic turn is imminent in a way that would not have been possible with the more pedestrian $pa$ $V$ pattern: the latter signals thematic continuity, i.e. the simple sequencing of events without any of these events being singled out for special emphasis, while the former signals thematic discontinuity, in which one event is highlighted. The function of $V_1$ could in this respect be compared to PE $just$ as in (28a–f), which may signal a similar dramatic reversal:

(28) a. A crap game was started. $Just$ when you would start to reach for the money, after seeing ‘7’ or ‘11’ on the dice, the boat would give
another roll and ‘craps’ would appear. (OED 1916 D. C. Thompson In Russia (1918) i. 3)

b. **Just** when I was all set to really start stashing it away, they had to manufacture fascism and start a war. (OED 1962 J. Heller Catch-22 vi. 51)

c. This kid asked me, ‘Do you ever scratch?’ . . . I said, ‘I ain’t never scratched in my life.’ . . . **Just** then, I took this shot and the cue ball went right in the pocket. He said, ‘Well, you’ve scratched now.’ (OED 1977 New Yorker 4 July 24/2)

d. **Just** when the promised land seemed to be within their grasp, the Greeks . . . suffered ignominious defeat. (OED 1972 D. Dakin Unification of Greece 268)

e. **Just** when she had started to feel safe and protected they switched the scene on her again. (<www.adimra.100megs6.com/fanfiction/oneshots/runfromit.html>)

f. Even in the final set his form still wavered. **Just** when he had started to dismiss the recurring gremlins from his forehand and improved his first serve percentage by breaking in the first game and reaching 40–0 in the second, he handed the break back to his opponent. (<www.sport.telegraph.co.uk/sport/main.jhtml>, 13 June 2003)

It is at this point that the connection between the V1-pattern and the to-infinitive after ginnan-verbs becomes clear. The V1-pattern sets the stage for a dramatic event. When the stage-setting event itself is interrupted by the dramatic event, and this is signalled by the ginnan-verb, the stage-setting event must be interruptible, and this limits the options for the infinitival complement that may express it. Bare infinitives as the complement of ginnan focus on the completion of the event rather than on the beginning; the event is not interruptible. The fact that the V1-construction prefers the to-infinitive in these cases means that only to-infinitives can express interruptible, temporally segmentable events. It is this segmentability that is the key to the compatibility of clause-initial ginnan-verbs and the to-infinitive. Here we have evidence that the ginnan-verbs only express ingression when followed by a to-infinitive, and cannot express ingression when followed by a bare infinitive.

We will illustrate the contrast between segmentable and unsegmentable events by comparing two passages which tell the same story, one in ⟨ÆCHom I, 3⟩ and the other in ⟨ÆCHom II, 18⟩. Both passages can be divided into three narrative units: (i) the crowd decide to stone a saint (St James in ⟨ÆCHom II. 18⟩; St Stephen in ⟨ÆCHom I, 3⟩); (ii) the stoning is interrupted by the saint asking God to forgive the sins of the people stoning him;
(iii) the stoning is resumed and brought to a close without a hitch. Units (i) and (ii) are given below as (29) (James) and (30) (Stephen); unit (iii) is presented in (31) (James) and (32) (Stephen).

It is the second unit in examples (29)–(30) below that is particularly illustrative of the way in which the ingressive aspect of *onginnan/beginnan* + *to*-infinitive and *V₁* word order interact, as it is the unit that contains a thematic discontinuity—the interruption of the stoning event. The James narrative in (29) employs the open-ended verb *torfian* ‘to stone’, ‘to throw stones at’, which by itself does not imply ‘to the death’. For this reason, the interruption of the stoning event itself need not be strongly marked—only by *ac* ‘but’.

In the Stephen narrative in (30), however, the ‘resultative’ or ‘perfective’ sense of *oftorfian* ‘stone to death’, in contrast to the open-ended *torfian* ‘stone’ in (29), forces the selection of a *to*-infinitive after *ongunnon* (in bold), as a sign that the action is going to be interrupted: a bare infinitive would have created the impression that Stephen was killed off at this point, and *he cleopode* in the next clause would then have come as a bit of a surprise to the audience. The discontinuity in the action is more strongly marked than in the James fragment, as it is introduced by the *V₁*-pattern. One reason might be that the interruption of the narrative is a long one, and interrupts not only the stoning itself, but also the narrative: the saint’s last words are followed by an authorial exposition explaining the crucial importance of these last words, as they led to Saul’s conversion (cf. ‘change in possible worlds’, Brinton 1993: 74).

(29) Hi *ða* upastigon. and hine underbæc scufon. and mid stanum torfodon þone soðfæstan Iacob; *Ac* he *næs* stones stoned the steadfast James; but he not-was acweald *ðurh* ðam healican fylle. ac gebigde his cneowu on killed by the high fall but bent his knees in gebedum sona. and bæd þone ælmihtigan for ðam prayers at-once and asked the Almighty for the arleasum cwellerum. þæt he him forgeafe þa fyrnlican cruel killers that he them forgave the earlier synne ⟨ÆCHom II, 18 172.95–7⟩
sins
‘They then climbed up and pushed him from behind and stoned the righteous James with stones; but he was not killed by the long Fall, but bent his knees in prayer at once and prayed to the Almighty that he would forgive the cruel assassins their previous sins’
The to-infinitive as THEME

(30) **ongunnon dā to oftorfigenne** mid heardum stanum þone began then to stone-to-death with hard stones the eadigian stephanum and he cleopode and cwæð: […] min blessed Stephen and he called-out and said: […] my drihten: ne sete ðu þas dæda him to Lord: not hold you those deeds them as synne […] ⟨ÆCHom I, 3 48.2–5⟩

‘[they] began then to stone to death with hard stones the blessed Stephen and he called out and said: “[…] my Lord, do not lay those deeds to their charge as a sin”.

In the third unit the stoning is resumed. The transition to this unit is marked in the Stephen narrative (32) by þa, which indicates a new narrative unit; the James narrative in (31), however, uses **onginna** this time. As there is no second interruption, a bare infinitive is now possible (**onginna** + infinitive in bold):

(31) þa **ongunnon dā Iudei. hine eft torfian.** mid heardum then began the Jews him again stone with hard stanum. and heora an hine sloh. mid ormætum stencge. stones and of-them one him struck with enormous cudgel inn oð þæt bragen; þus wearð gemartirod se mæra in to the brain; thus was martyred the famous apostol ⟨ÆCHom II, 18 172.100–2⟩

apostle

‘then the Jews began to stone him again with hard stones and one of them killed him with an enormous cudgel that crushed his skull; thus was martyred the famous apostle. . .’

(32) and he mid þam worde þa gewat to þam ælmihtigum and he with this word then departed to the Almighty hælende þe he on heofenum healicne standende Saviour the he in heavens high standing geseah ⟨ÆCHom I, 3 48.5⟩

saw

‘and with those words he then departed to the Almighty Saviour, whom he had seen standing high in the heavens’

To summarize, then, in both cases the stoning is interrupted by the martyr’s last words. The Stephen fragment of (30) uses **onginna** + to-infinitive to describe the first abortive attempt to stone Stephen; this event is then interrupted by
Stephen’s last words. In contrast, the James fragment of (31) uses onginnan + bare infinitive to indicate that the procedure is resumed and brought to a close without a hitch.

The other examples of clause-initial onginnan/beginnan also tend to present events that are interrupted. In ⟨ÆLS (St Peter’s Chair) 154⟩ St Peter starts to tell the story of Christ (ongan þa to segenne þone soþan geleafan ‘[he] began then to recount the true faith’) to ‘a heathen servant’, but his words are interrupted by a miracle (betwux þysum wordum ‘during these words’): the Holy Spirit enters into the assembled heathens and they start speaking ‘in tongues’. In cases like (27) above, on the other hand, there is no interruption of the actual event, although it could be argued that the impression created by the use of the to-infinitive is that the reprobate is converted to the Christian faith before the saint has finished speaking. It seems, then, that to-infinitives are compatible with V1 because they present the event not as a completed whole, but as one that is unbounded: it unfolds gradually, and is either interrupted by a discontinuity, or presented as ongoing; the coda is never reached. This is how the use of a to-infinitive in this position contributes to the suspense created by the V1-configuration. It also explains why the to-infinitive is preferred to the bare infinitive with clause-initial ginnan-verbs: the latter is no longer temporally segmentable in Ælfric, and focuses the attention too exclusively on the coda of the event, implying its completion.

With these facts in mind, I think we can go further than the remarks of Funke (1922) and Mossé (1938) that the ginnan-verbs are ‘not always’ truly ingressive (see example (22) above). We might perhaps go so far as to say that by the time of Ælfric the bare infinitive is no longer capable of expressing ingestion at all. As soon as the focus of the action is on the beginning rather than on the action as a whole, we find the to-infinitive, not the bare infinitive. This explains the preference for a to-infinitive in V1-configurations. The important point to emerge from this is that the two infinitives are not in free variation after the ginnan-verbs, and that their distribution is not random.

Ingressive aspectualizers are prone to grammaticalization (Allen 1995; Bechtel 1902; Beer 1974). These verbs are particularly frequent in narrative texts, and it is conceivable that they tend to acquire a particular discourse function of their own because focusing the attention of the audience on the onset of an event creates suspense. The life of discourse markers is usually brief (Stein 1985: 300). Any element used as a device to arouse the interest of an audience by creating suspense in some way could well be prone to rapid devaluation through overuse; and this may also have been the case with ginnan-verbs + bare infinitive. They originally expressed ingression but became bleached, at times expressing perfective rather than ingressive aspect. The ingression was renewed
by *ginnan* + *to*-infinitive. It appears that *ginnan* + *to*-infinitive degraded in its turn into an aspectualizer taking a non-segmentable complement (Brinton 1988, 1990, 1996: 68–9; Ogura 1997). Some early evidence for the auxiliary status of *beginnan* with *to*-infinitive is possibly (33), a late OE homily with the *to*-infinitive preceding the matrix verb, which is extremely rare (for frequencies, see Table 7.2 below, §7.2.7):

(33) þæt wæs sona on þam fyrmestan dagan þe Decius se that was at-once in the first days that Decius the casere to rixianne begann ⟨LS 34 (SevenSleepers) 1.699⟩
emperor to reign began
‘that was then in the first days that the emperor Decius began to reign’

Firmer evidence of aspectual *to*-infinitival complements appears in ME:

(34) And in my barm ther lith to wepe | Thi child and myn
(Gower, Conf. Am. III 302; from Fischer 2000: 156)
‘And in my bosom there lies weeping thy | Child and mine’

The important contribution of the *ginnan*-verbs to the story of the rise of the *to*-infinitive in English is that they represent the only environment in which the *to*-infinitive can be said to have encroached upon the domain of the bare infinitive in OE: the *ginnan*-verbs originally occurred with the bare infinitive when still fully inchoative, but when this ingressive sense was bleached, and the sense because closer to that of a perfective auxiliary, the *to*-infinitive, originally the non-finite alternant of the subjunctive clause that was also a possible complement to the *ginnan*-verbs, stepped in to revive the ingressive meaning. As with the bare infinitive after the verbs of motion and rest discussed in Chapter 2, the bare infinitive after the *ginnan*-verbs had also become incapable of expressing prospective time. Syntactically, the evidence suggests that both the *ginnan*-verbs and the verbs of motion and rest with bare infinitives had either deficient argument structures (i.e. lacked an external argument) or no argument structure at all. As such they are an integral part both of the long-term development of the auxiliary into a separate syntactic category, and of the expression of tense, mood, and aspect as free forms in a verbal periphrasis rather than as affixes on the verb. The bare infinitive was in effect becoming the counterpart of a bare verb-stem.

4.5 Conclusions

The occurrence of the *to*-infinitive as goal-argument in the complement of the conatives and the verbs of persuading and urging is clearly linked to its
occurrence as purpose adjunct, as we saw in the previous chapters. Its occurrence as theme-argument after intention-verbs is not as easy to explain. We have argued in this chapter that the most probable explanation is the functional equivalence of the to-infinitive with the subjunctive clause. Both structures were equally affected by the process of reanalysis from adjunct to goal-argument after a subset of intention verbs, i.e. the conative verbs like tilian that we discussed in Chapter 3. As a result of this reanalysis, both subjunctive clauses and to-infinitives could express the internal argument of the verbs of the tilian-group. The to-infinitive as complement subsequently may have spread to other intention verbs by two processes: a process of reanalysis as proposed by Bock (1931), in which to-infinitival adjuncts after nominal objects are reanalysed as the theme-argument of the verb; and, more directly, by analogy with the subjunctive that-clause, which could already appear as theme after these verbs.

Some intention verbs could of old be complemented by a bare infinitive (the subset outlined in (4) and the ginnan-verbs discussed in §4.4). The spread of the to-infinitive as expression of the theme of intention verbs resulted in a situation in which both infinitives occurred side by side; an example is wilnian ‘desire’ in (1) and (2). The only intention verbs to develop auxiliary-like syntax and semantics when complemented by a bare infinitive were the ginnan-verbs (originally meaning ‘to begin’). The other intention verbs did not develop auxiliary-like meanings which would have entailed a loss of or reduction in argument structure but remained fully lexical verbs, and the bare infinitive that follows subset (4) consequently must be analysed as a clause with a controlled PRO subject. As a result of the reanalysis of the modals—a long-drawn-out process that appears to have reached a significant turning point in ME (e.g. Warner 1993)—the only lexical verbs still followed by a bare-infinitival complement in ME were the intention verbs.

An important factor in this shake-up of the verb system was the massive increase of the to-infinitives in early Middle English; we will see in Chapter 7 that this was the result of competition, not between bare and to-infinitives as is traditionally assumed, but between to-infinitives and subjunctive clauses. There may have been some competition between bare and to-infinitives as purpose adjuncts in prehistoric times, as we argued in Chapter 2, and as complement to intention verbs in Middle English; in the OE period, however, the only direct competition between to and bare infinitive appears to have been as complement of the ginnan-verbs. They were not in free variation in this group, however: the bare infinitive was reserved for their bleached, non-ingressive variants whereas the to-infinitive was used to restore ingressive meaning.
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Commanding and permitting

5.1 Introduction

The second group of ditransitive verbs consists of the verbs of commanding and permitting. Unlike the verbs of persuading and urging discussed in Chapter 3, which have a thematic structure of agent, theme, and goal, the verbs of commanding and permitting have a thematic structure of agent, recipient, and theme. We assigned them different thematic structures in §3.1 because the second and third role show systematic differences in expression. The second role of verbs of persuading and urging is expressed by an accusative NP whereas that of the verbs of commanding and permitting is expressed by a dative NP; with the latter verbs it may remain implicit, but not with the former; and the third role may be expressed by a to-PP with verbs of persuading and urging but not by an NP, whereas that of the verbs of commanding and permitting may be expressed by an (accusative) NP but not by a to-PP.

The verbs of commanding and permitting differ from the verbs of persuading and urging in one further respect: unlike the latter, which are invariably three-place, the verbs of commanding and permitting alternate between three-place and two-place. It is not just that the recipient role can remain implicit (which is a typical characteristic of recipients): when the theme is expressed by a bare-infinitival ECM-construction (an AcI), or by a Small Clause, there is never an overt recipient, which suggests both that the recipient is structurally absent in such configurations, not simply left implicit as is possible in the three-role configuration, and that the verb has a two-place argument structure when followed by bare-infinitival ECM or Small Clause.

The fact that verbs of commanding and permitting appear to have two ‘variants’, a three-place and a two-place one, is not an accidental, idiosyncratic lexical property of these verbs, but a structural feature connected with the basic meanings of this group, commanding and permitting. A speaker may command or permit a hearer to do a certain act (three-place), but he may also command or permit a certain state of affairs (two-place). In the latter case, there is no recipient or addressee to whom the command or permission is given and the focus is on the achievement of a state of affairs. In this respect, these
two-place variants of ‘command’ or ‘permit’ are very similar to causative verbs, and like them, appear with a bare-infinitival ECM. The ambiguity between being two or three-place is a structural result of the meaning of the verb, and of the speech act it represents. Even the verb don ‘do’, the prototypical two-place causative in ME, appears as a three-place manipulative in the majority of cases in OE; and the diachrony of Dutch doen ‘do’ as discussed in Verhagen (1998) appears to present a similar case.

The second consideration is that it is precisely this structural feature of the verbs of commanding and permitting that is responsible for the appearance of the first to-infinitival ECMs in early ME, as we will show in Chapter 9. Such ECM constructions cannot be accounted for if the tendency towards developing two-place argument structures is simply regarded as a quirky lexical property of a few stray verbs that happen to have ‘dual membership’, instead of as a structural property of an entire class.

5.2 The verbs of commanding and permitting

5.2.1 Membership and subcategorization frames

The group of commanding and permitting comprises the following OE verbs:


The thematic structure of these verbs, when three-place, includes an agent, recipient, and theme. The last two roles may be expressed by the following constituents:

(2) \[ \text{recipient} \quad \text{theme} \]
\[ [\text{NP}_{\text{dat}}] \quad [\text{NP}_{\text{acc}}] \]
\[ [\text{NP}_{\text{dat}}] \quad [\text{subjunctive clause}] \]
\[ [\text{NP}_{\text{dat}}] \quad [\text{to-VP}] \]

Examples of the first three subcategorization frames, \[ _{\text{NP} \text{NP}} \], \[ _{\text{NP} \text{that-clause}} \], and \[ _{\text{NP} \text{to VP}} \], are (3)–(5), with theme in bold:

(3) Ŝecum mannum, and cildum, we ne bebeodað nan
Sick mendat, and childrendat, we not order no
fæsten. (HomM 7 23)
fast.
‘we do not order sick people and children to fast.’
(4) Astih eft adune. and bebeod ðam folce
Go afterwards down and order the peopleDAT
þæt heora nan ðam munte ne
that of-them none the mountain not
genealæce 〈ÆCHom II, 12.1 113.130〉
approachSUBJ
‘Go down afterwards and order the people not to approach the mountain’

(5) ða ðincg ðe ic bebeode eow to
those things that I order youDAT to
gehealdenne 〈ÆCHom II, 21 181.47〉
hold
‘those things that I order you to hold’

The interesting thing about this group of verbs is that they also allow two
different two-place frames:

(6) THEME
[NP<acc> VP]
[NP<acc> Pred]

Examples are (7) and (8), with the relevant complement in bold:

(7) Nu ic bebeode beacen ætywan, wundor geweorðan
Now I order portent<acc> appear<inf>, miracle<acc> happen<inf>
on wera gemange 〈And 727〉
on men among
‘now I order a portent to appear, a miracle to happen among men’

(8) Fæder ic bebeode minne gast on þinre
Father I order my spirit<acc> in your
hands 〈Lk (WSCp) 23.46〉
‘Father, into your hands I commend my spirit’

The AcI encodes a situation in which the verb is used as a causative; more about
this below, in §5.4. The infinitival subject may remain implicit if the identity
of the agent of the infinitival verb is irrelevant (see above, §1.4).

It has been claimed that there is a fourth frame, [ _ NP<dat> VP], either as
a theme in a two-place construction akin to the AcI or as a recipient and
theme in a three-place construction, which would mean that bare infinitives

¹ The ambiguity of the to-infinitive in examples like this is discussed below (§5.3).
can still occur as theme-argument after other verbs apart from the intention verbs of the previous chapter. None of the attestations put forward stand up to scrutiny, however. Callaway lists some examples but calls them ‘doubtful’ (1913: 130–1). They either occur in late texts, in which the dative form him/hym had already started to replace the accusative hine, or they are adjuncts and do not encode or control the infinitival subject; in the following example, for instance, the dative hym refers to the unfortunate saint and not to the person carrying out the order:

(9) þa het he hym gebyndan anne ancran on hys then ordered he himDAT bind an anchor on his sweoran ond hyne forsendan on sæ. (Mart 2.1 225)
neck and himACC send-away into sea.
‘He then ordered [someone] to bind an anchor on his neck and drop him into the sea.’

The function of hym is similar to that of him in the early construction he cut him off the head which, although it still persists in the continental Germanic languages, has been replaced in PE by the internal possessor construction he cut off his head (Vennemann 2001). It is not a genuine instance of the [_NP dat VP] frame, but of the [_NP acc VP] frame (AcI) with an implicit infinitival subject. Callaway’s remaining datives are similar cases (e.g. heom ‘her’ in ⟨LS 14 (Margaret-Ass) 279⟩, ⟨GDPref and 3 (C) 14.202.13⟩). Denison (1993: 179) offers this instance with hatan from Ælfric as possibly genuine. The emendation in square brackets is Callaway’s, from whose lists the instance was taken.

(10) Ða faerlice het he his gesihum [for gesiðum?]
Then suddenly ordered he his companionsDAT
ðone biscoþ mid his preostum samod
the bishopACC with his priests together
geandwerdian (ÆCHom I 29.416.4)
oppose
‘Then he suddenly ordered his companions to oppose the bishop together with his priests’

As Ælfric is usually a reliable guide to authentic OE, it might be tempting to include this as a genuine pattern, but a closer look reveals that the emendation to gesiðum ‘companions’ cannot be right. The facsimile of the manuscript in fact has gesihðum, which, as it stands, makes perfect sense and does not require any emendation: literally, ‘in his presence’ (from gesihð ‘face’) (Eliason and Clemoes 1966): ‘then he suddenly ordered to bring [andweardian ‘present’,
'bring before’] the bishop together with his priests into his presence’, which makes far better sense in the context of the story. This interpretation is supported by a faint on scratched before gesihđum in the facsimile text. Example (10), then, is yet another instance of an AcI, with an implicit infinitival subject. This complement is in fact the most common complement of hatan.

Not every verb in set (1) is attested with all three complements in OE. The case of the recipient, which acts as the controller of a following to-infinitive, is dative. Not all verbs are attested with unequivocal datives. The case of the NP us ‘us’ in the single attestation of an NP to VP-construction after reccan ‘direct’ is ambiguous in form between a dative and an accusative:

(11) Se abbot him to cwað, God [...] dæ and us The abbot him to said, God [...] you and us on his godcundum bebodum gestrangige, and us in his divine commands strengthen, and us/dat/acc gercce þa weorc to begangenne þe him direct the works to perform that him licige. ⟨LS 23 (Mary of Egypt) 2.73⟩ please.
‘The abbot said to him, God [...] will strengthen you and us in his divine commands, and direct us to perform those works which please him.’

Reccan occurs elsewhere with a dative NP and a that-clause, as in the next example, suggesting that the case of the NP in the NP to VP-construction in (11) is probably also dative:

(12) þonne him gereaht bið dæt he oðrum mæg nytt bion when him/dat directed is that he others may useful be on ðam ðe him mon þonne bebeodeð, mid his mode he in that which him one then offer, with his spirit he hit sceal fleon & ðeah for hiersumnesse he hit sceal it must avoid and still out-of obedience he it must underfon. ⟨CP 6.47.16⟩ accept.
‘When he is directed that he may be useful to others in that [position] which people then offer to him, he should avoid it in spirit, and still accept it out of obedience.’
A second indication of the case of the NP comes from double object constructions attested as complements of these verbs, as in this example for *recan*:

(13) And he oðbærst to wuda, and man hine aflymde
And he escaped to woods, and one him banished ða, and man gerehte æðelrede cyninge ðæt land and then, and one awardedÆthelred kingDAT the land and æhta. ⟨CH 886 5⟩
goodsACC.
‘And he escaped to the woods, and then he was active voice unnatural here banished, and KingÆthelred was awarded the land and goods.’

In the case of one verb, *dihtan* ‘direct’, neither its single attestation of an *NP to VP*-construction in (14), nor its *NP + that*-clause complement in (15), provide any clues as to the case of its NP:

(14) þæt wæs þæt an scyp þe Godd sylf gedihte Noe to
that was that one ship that God self directed Noah to
wyrcanne 〈WHom 6, 62⟩
make
‘that was that one ship that God himself directed Noah to make’

(15) and ic eow dihte, swa min fæder me
and I youDAT/ACC appoints as my father medAT/ACC
rice dihte, þæt ge eton & drincon ofer mine mysan
kingship gave, that you eat and drink at my table
on minum rice 〈Lk (WSCp) 22.28⟩
in my kingdom

cf. Lat.: *et ego dispono vobis, sicut disposit mihi Pater meus regnum, ut edatis et bibatis super mesam meam in regno meo* (Vulgate, Luke 22.28)
‘I give you the right, as my father gave me the right to reign, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom’

*Dihtan* (from Lat *dictare*) is here used to translate the Latin verb *disponere* ‘dispose’, ‘arrange’, and like *disponere* it occurs here with two objects, in the clause *swa min fæder me rice dihte*. As the majority of such double object constructions consist of a dative and an accusative, *me* and *eow* in (15), and *Noe* in (14), are probably datives, and *dihtan* has been provisionally included in set (1) on this basis.

A search of the BGAH Corpus reveals that there are a few verbs which are attested with the [NP NP] frame and the [NP that-clause] frame, but not
with the [\_ NP to VP] frame. The case of the recipient is dative in all cases, although hatan is also attested with accusative NPs in this frame in the Toronto Corpus (more about these accusative NPs below). The fact that to-infinitives are not attested with these verbs could well be related to the fact that the [\_ NP that-clause] frame is particularly rare after these verbs; the relevant figures from the BGAH Corpus are three instances of this frame after hatan ‘order’, two after beteon ‘bestow’, ‘bequeath’, one after onteon ‘release’, and one after tīðian ‘grant’, ‘permit’. Hatan conforms to the other verbs of commanding and permitting in occurring with a bare infinitive in an AcI; this is in fact its most frequent complement.

An overview of the three types of three-place complementation with the verbs of commanding and permitting is given in Table 5.1. The annotation ‘case?’ indicates that it was impossible to ascertain the case of the NP in the attestations, usually because they were expressed by the pronouns me and us, for which OE has no separate forms for dative and accusative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>dat + to-VP</th>
<th>dat + ðæt</th>
<th>dat + acc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aliefan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bebeodan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beodan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beteon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dihtan</td>
<td>case?</td>
<td>case?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forbeodan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>læran</td>
<td>case?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lætan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liefan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lofian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onteon</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reccan</td>
<td>case?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sellan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tæcan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tīðian</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðafian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnan</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wissian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The core meaning of most of these verbs appears to be ‘give’; in some cases, like *sellan*, that meaning is still very much in evidence in OE and even in PE *to sell* ‘give in exchange for money’. In other cases things are not quite as clear-cut as this: for proto-Germanic *beuð*-, the reconstructed ancestor of the core lexeme underlying *bebeodan*, *beodan*, and *forbeodan*, a semantic development has been assumed of PIE ‘awake’, ‘observe’ to Germanic and Celtic ‘point out’, ‘warn’ and then ‘order’ (Lehmann 1986: 30); but note that ‘offer’ is one of the meanings given for *bebeodan* and *beodan* in Bosworth and Toller (1882, 1921) and is still the core meaning of their cognates *bieten* in Modern German and *bieden* in Modern Dutch.

Meanings of commanding may develop quite naturally from such meanings: the thing given is a command, or, more probably, a suggestion. Politeness mechanisms often create cycles in which there is a continual search for new euphemisms to express obligation or commands, which are potential ‘Face Threatening Acts’ (Brown and Levinson 1988). Such euphemisms often take the form of requests or suggestions, which will be felt—at least initially—to be more polite, in that the felicity conditions originally attached to them allow the addressee (the recipient) greater freedom to reject or ignore the obligation. If used frequently, the assumptions underlying these expressions will in time become those of commands (see also Traugott 1972: 100; Los 1998b), and new euphemisms will have to be found. These politeness mechanisms may at least partially explain why these verbs occur with both two- and three-place constructions.

The verbs in Table 5.1 occur with double object constructions not only in the meaning of giving (in the case of those verbs that still preserve that meaning, like *sellan* ‘give’, ‘grant’), but also in the derived meanings of commanding and permitting; some examples occur in §5.2.2. Meanings of giving do not appear to be compatible with the two other three-place patterns, the (object controlled) NP to VP-construction and NP + *that*-clause. When the verbs of Table 5.1 occur with these two patterns, their meanings are unambiguously those of commanding or permitting. NP + *that*-clause patterns can usually be analysed straightforwardly as three-place, with the NP in the role of recipient and the *that*-clause as theme. In the case of the NP to VP-pattern, matters are not so simple. Again, the NP constitutes the recipient; but it is often unclear whether the to-infinitival phrase constitutes the theme, or that role is filled by another NP, with the to-infinitive functioning as an adjunct. This dilemma was discussed in the previous chapter (§4.3.3) in the context of the theme-argument of the monotransitive intention verbs, but it is also relevant for the theme-argument of ditransitive verbs of commanding and persuading.
5.2.2 Dual membership

There are four verbs that have been attested with a bewildering range of subcategorization frames—*biddan* ‘ask’, ‘pray’, *hatan* ‘command’, ‘summon’, *lærar* ‘teach’, ‘instruct’, and *wissian* ‘guide’, ‘direct’—which casts doubt on the claim outlined previously that the manipulative verbs fall into two coherent groups, verbs of commanding and permitting versus verbs of persuading and urging. A closer investigation reveals, however, that some of the frames found with these verbs conform to those of the verbs of persuading and urging (e.g. those in (19) in Chapter 3, here repeated as (16)) while others conform to those of the verbs of commanding and permitting, i.e. frames (2) and (6) in this chapter, repeated here as (17) and (18).

(16) **THEME** | **GOAL** | persuading and urging
--- | --- | ---
[NP<sub>acc</sub>] | [to-PP] | 
[NP<sub>acc</sub>] | [subjunctive clause] | 
[NP<sub>acc</sub>] | [to-VP] | 

(17) **RECIPIENT** | **THEME** | commanding and permitting, three-place
--- | --- | ---
[NP<sub>dat</sub>] | [NP<sub>acc</sub>] | 
[NP<sub>dat</sub>] | [subjunctive clause] | 
[NP<sub>dat</sub>] | [to-VP] | 

(18) **THEME** | commanding and permitting, two-place
--- | ---
[NP<sub>acc</sub>] | [NP<sub>acc</sub> VP] | 
[NP<sub>acc</sub>] | [NP<sub>acc</sub> Pred] | 

This dual membership stems from their wide range of meanings. An example is *lærar*, for which Bosworth and Toller’s Old English dictionary gives the following meanings: ‘teach, instruct, educate, preach, exhort, admonish, advise, persuade, suggest, enjoin, urge’.

The correspondence between thematic role and case (*themes* are accusative, *recipients* dative) is robust, and the most likely analysis of this situation is that these four verbs have dual membership: they belong to both the verbs of commanding and permitting, and the verbs of persuading and urging. This is confirmed by the fact that these verbs typically exhibit a variety of meanings, some of which correspond to meanings of commanding-and-permitting, and others with meanings of persuading-and-urging, with these meanings matching the syntactic frame.

*Hatana* is of course primarily attested as a verb of commanding and permitting with the meaning ‘order’, and occurs with some of the frames typical of this group, i.e. the ones in (19)–(20) (cf. (17)–(18) above). The *to*-infinitive is not attested at all.
The to-infinitive as THEME

(19) Recipient Theme ‘command’
    [NP_{dat}] [NP_{acc}]
    [NP_{dat}] [subjunctive clause]

(20) Theme ‘command’
    [NP_{acc} VP]
    [NP_{acc} Pred]

It also occurs with another frame more typical of the verbs of persuading and urging (13 attestations):

(21) Theme Goal ‘urge’
    [NP_{acc}] [subjunctive clause]

Although most of the subjunctive clauses appear after dative NPs (a commanding-and-permitting frame), there are a few instances of accusative NPs. At least one of these, example (22), shows hatan with a meaning other than ‘order’, which suggests that the selection of an accusative instead of a dative is motivated. The felicity conditions appear to tell against a straightforward command, as the speakers do not have the authority to order the saint about, and are trying to persuade him to leave by harassing him and threatening him; heton is best translated by ‘urged’. Hatan here appears to conform to the verbs of persuading and urging. The relevant frame appears in bold:

(22) Mid þyhi þa lange on þære þystrunge hine swa swencan, After they then long in that darkness him so tormented, þa leton hi hine ane hwile abidan and gestandan; heton then let they him a while wait and stand; urged hine þa, þæt he of þam westene gewite, o þe gif himacc then, that he from the waste depart_{subj}, or if he þæt nolde, þonne woldon hi hine mid maran he that not-wanted, then would they him with greater bysmerum swencan and costian. ⟨LS 10.1 (Guþ) 5.150⟩
    indignities torment and tempt.

‘After they had long tormented him like this in the darkness, they left him to stand and wait for a while; they then urged him to leave the desert, or else they would torment and tempt him with greater indignities.’

Similar interpretations are compatible with the other occurrences of this frame, e.g. ⟨ÆLS (Swithun) 368⟩, ⟨HomU 36, 41⟩ (especially because of the addition of the adverb eornostlice ‘I urge you earnestly’), and ⟨LS 10 (Guth) 4.103⟩. There are 10 occurrences of the [NP that-clause] frame (with accusative NP) in the Toronto Corpus, and in all cases the matrix object is identical in reference.
to the embedded subject; a to-infinitive should be possible, but is simply not attested in OE. We find the first examples of the [\_ NP to VP] Frame in eME (see §9.4.3 below).

The [\_ NP_{acc} to-PP] frame has also been attested after hatan, but the to-PP does not contain a nominalization and cannot be paraphrased by a to-infinitive; an example is the following:

(23) æfter þæm he wearð on micelre untrumnesse, and him to after that he fell into great infirmity, and him to gehet monigne læce. (Or 6 30.148.23)

‘afterwards he became very ill, and summoned many-a doctor_{acc}.

Such cases are probably best classified as a two-place pattern, in which the theme-argument is expressed by a Small Clause, i.e. the frame given in (20) as [NP_{acc} Pred], rather than the three-place persuading-and-urging frame [\_ NP_{acc} to-PP] of (21).

Læran, ‘teach, instruct, educate, preach, exhort, admonish, advise, persuade, suggest, enjoin, urge’ (Bosworth and Toller), is attested with the following frames:

(24) Theme GOAL
    [NP_{acc}] [to-PP]
    [NP_{acc}] [subjunctive clause]
    [NP_{acc}] [to-VP]
    [NP_{acc}] [NP_{acc}]

(25) Recipient Theme
    [NP_{dat}] [NP_{acc}]
    [NP_{dat}] [subjunctive clause]

(26) Theme
    [NP_{acc} VP]
    [NP_{acc} Pred]

These frames show virtually the full range possible for dual membership verbs in (16)–(18). The only gap is the absence of the [\_ NP_{dat} to-VP] frame, and there is one additional frame, i.e. the Accusative + Accusative (accusative of person and accusative of the thing taught), which is an ancient pattern already evident in Gothic and peculiar to this verb.

The meanings correlate with the frames. The frames typical of the verbs of persuading and urging, i.e. those in (24), all with accusative NPs, are used in the meanings typical of verbs of persuading and urging, and are indeed occasionally found as one of the halves of a pair of doublets with other such
verbs, as in (27), with *tyhtan* ‘urge’ and the [*NP to-PP*] frame:

(27) Forðy on ælcne timan mon ah to læranne & to tihtanne folc to bereowsunge ⟨Scrib 1, 1.1⟩

‘Therefore at every hour one ought to exhort and to urge people to repentance’

and in (28), with *myndgian* ‘remind’, ‘exhort’ and [*NP subj that-clause*]:

(28) Men ða leofostan, hwæt nu anra manna gehwylcne ic myngie & lære, ge weras ge wif, ge exhort and admonish, both *menACC* and *womensACC*, both geonge ge ealde, ge snotre ge unwise, ge þa welegan young and old, both wise and unwise, both the rich ge þa þearfan, þæt anra gehwylc hine sylfne sceawige and the poor, that one every him self examine *subj* & understand *subj*

‘Dearest people, now I exhort and admonish every one, both men and women, both young and old, both wise and foolish, both the wealthy and the poor, that each one examine and understand himself’

There are two unequivocal accusatives with the [*NP to VP*] frame, one of which occurs in the OE Bede (in bold):

(29) In þæm he gesomonode micel weorod Cristes in these he gathered-together great multitude of-Christ’s þeowa, & *heo* lærdæ to healddanne regollices liifes servants, and the *mACC* taught to observe regulated life’s þeodscipe, swa swiðe swa þa neowan Cristnan þa get discipline, so far as those new Christians then yet hit neoman meahte (Bede 3 16.226.26)

it receive might

Lat: *In quibus, collecto examine famularum Christi, disciplinam vitae regularis, in quantum rudes adhuc capere poterant, custodire docuit* (Colgrave and Mynors 1969: 284)

‘In these places he gathered together a multitude of Christ’s servants and taught them to observe the discipline of a regulated life, so far as those new Christians were capable of receiving it’
In such a slavish translation, any departure from the grammar of the source text is significant. The OE text has a to-infinitive, which usually corresponds to a gerund or gerundive in the original, but not in this case: the source text has an infinitive, custodire, and Latin infinitives are usually translated by an OE bare infinitive in Bede. Note, too, that the to-infinitive is followed by its object, the VO order which disambiguates the [_ NP to VP] frame from the [_ NP NP] frame, and which is rare after verbs of commanding and permitting. Apparently, læran in (27)–(29) is a verb of the persuading and urging class.

Two other frames attested with this verb are more typical of the verbs of commanding and permitting: [_ NP that-clause] and [_ NP NP], with the (first) NP in the dative. Example (30) is an illustration of the former, and (31) of the latter (datives in bold):

(30) Se halga apostol Paulus læreð ælcum mæssepœste þe
The holy apostle Paul teaches every clergymandAT who
godes folce to lareowe bið gesett, þæt heora nan
God’s peopleDAT as teacher is appointed, that of-them none
ne wandige for nanes mannes ege ne for lufe ne for
not hesitatessUBJ for of-no man’s fear nor for love nor for
scæme ne for nanum sceatte, þæt hy ne bodian
shame nor for no money, that they not preachSUBJ
ælcon men hwæt him sy to donne & hwæt to
each mandAT what him is to do and what to
forganne ⟨Conf 3.1.1 3.15⟩
forgo
‘The holy apostle Paul teaches every clergymen who has been
appointed teacher of God’s people that they should never hesi-
itate out of fear for anyone, or out of love or shame or for
the sake of money, to tell anyone what they should and should
not do’

(31) Ure drihten bebead his discipulum þæt hi sceoldon
Our Lord commanded his disciples that they should
læran. and tæcan eallum þeodum ða ðing þe he sylf
preach and teach allDAT nationsDAT the things which he self
him tæhte ⟨ÆCHom I (Pref) 6.20⟩
them taught
‘Our Lord commanded his disciples that they should preach and teach
all nations those things that he taught them himself’
The dative is not due to the conjunction with *tæcan*; Ælfric uses *læran* on its own with the same frame in other places, e.g. ⟨ÆCHom I, 38 592.21⟩ and ⟨ÆCHom I, 27 388.15⟩. *Læran* is also frequently found conjoined with another verb of commanding and permitting in Bede, namely *bodian* ‘preach’ in ⟨Bede 1 14.58.27⟩, translating a single verb, *praedicare* ‘preach’.

A further indication that *læran* is a verb of dual membership is that it is occasionally found with bare infinitives, some of them in Latin contexts (e.g. ⟨Lk (WSCp) 11.1⟩) and therefore suspect, but also in homilies (⟨HomM 14.2 79, 81⟩ and ⟨HomS 6 104, 108⟩) or in passages that differ from the Latin source text, as here in Bede, where the verb *dogmatizabant* is translated by *bodedon & lærdon . . . beon* (conjoined verbs in bold):

(32) On þa sylfan tid se ylca papa Agatþon gesomnade sinoð on Rome byrig fif & hund twelftig bysceopa wið in Rome city five and hundred twenty bishops against þam gedwolmannum, þa dē bodedon & lærdon the heretics, those who proclaimed and preached ænne willan & ane wyrcnesse beon on Dryhtne one will and one purpose beinF in Lord Hælende. ⟨Bede 5 17.460.1⟩

We conclude that this verb has dual membership: it belongs to both the verbs of commanding and permitting and the verbs of persuading and urging, and hence appears with the subcategorization frames characteristic of either group.}

The verb *biddan* ‘ask’, ‘pray’ is also attested with a variety of frames, but they do not point to dual membership as consistently as do *læran* and *hatan*. The three frames so characteristic of the verbs of persuading and urging, i.e. [NP to-PP], [NP to VP], and [NP that-clause], all with accusative NPs, are all attested. The remaining frames, however, do not conform to those of the verbs of commanding and permitting. At first sight we do appear to find the [NP NP] frame so typical of the verbs of commanding and permitting, as in this
example (relevant frame in bold):

(33) Ond ða oðre dæge onleat he wepende to ðæs abbodes
And then second day fell he weeping to the abbot’s
fotum ond him bæd forgifnesse ⟨Mart 5 2426⟩
feet and himDAT asked forgiveness
‘And on the second day he fell down weeping at the abbot’s feet and asked to be forgiven’

The dative NP, however, is not the recipient of the request (biddan) but of the forgiveness; other instances of the same frame express that role in an æt-PP ‘from/to somebody; the dative NP is identical in reference to the matrix subject and should be translated as ‘for himself’. When biddan means ‘to pray’ the dative similarly appears to be reflexive:

(34) þa nolde he him gebiddan to þæm ælmihtigum
then not-want he himDAT pray to the Almighty
Gode ⟨Or 6 1.134.2⟩
God
‘Then he refused to pray to Almighty God’

The same dative appears when biddan is complemented by an AcI. AcIs are not attested in OE as the theme in a double object construction, and (35) is not an exception. The dative him again refers to the matrix subject, and is an argument of openian ‘open’ and not a recipient of biddan:

(35) bæd him engla weard geopenigean uncuðe
asked himDAT of-angelsGEN guardianACC unknown
wyrd ⟨Elene 1095⟩
fateACC
‘he asked the guardian of angels to reveal the unknown future for him’

When the dative NP occurs in the [ _ NP that-clause] frame, however, it does appear to denote the recipient (dative NP in bold):

(36) Eac he bæd him swiðe georne þæt he næfre ne
Also he asked himDAT very urgently that he never not
sceolde hit nanum menn cyðan hwæt he him
should it no mandAT show what he him
gedon hæfde ⟨LS 29 (Nicholas) 101⟩
done had
‘He also asked him with great urgency not to reveal to anyone what he had done for him’
The situation of *biddan*, then, is more complicated than that of e.g. *læran* or *wissian*. It certainly conforms to the verbs of persuading and urging as regards its complementation patterns and its meaning (‘urge’); it appears with some of the frames that are characteristic of the verbs of commanding and permitting, e.g. the AcI and the dative NP + subjunctive clause, but it does not occur with a double object construction.

Finally, *wissian* ‘guide’, ‘direct’ is attested with all the frames in (16)–(18), with the exception of the [_ NP to VP] frame. With 11 attestations of the [_ NP + that-clause] frame and 32 of the [_ NP to-PP] frame in the Toronto Corpus, one would expect that the [_ NP to VP] frame should also be possible with *wissian*, but it simply has not been attested, although it appears with a to-infinitive in ME (in Julia 106.187, PPCME corpus).

We conclude that *hatan*, *læran*, *wissian*, and *biddan* do not constitute counterexamples to our position that the two groups constitute two distinct systems, more specifically our claim that the bare infinitive (in an AcI-construction) occurs exclusively after the verbs of commanding and permitting. The extent to which there is overlap between bare and to-infinitive after the ditransitive verbs is accordingly very limited; and their distribution does not suggest that they are in a state of competition in OE. We will see in §5.4 that AcIs and NP to VP-constructions are too dissimilar, both semantically and syntactically, to make it likely that there was a straightforward process of replacement of one by the other.

5.2.3 Dative + genitive verbs

*Tiðian* ‘grant’ and *unnan* ‘grant’ differ from the other verbs of commanding and permitting in that they do not occur with dative + accusative double objects, but with dative + genitive: their theme in a double object construction has genitive case. There is a connection with the dative + genitive verbs in Old Norse, with similar meanings (from Kristoffersen 1996: 52):

(37)  
afla ‘get’; leita ‘get’; ljá ‘lend’; unna ‘permit’; væna ‘promise’

The last three have cognates in OE: *leon*, *unnan*, and *wenan*. *Wenan*/væna is best analysed as a monotransitive INTENTION verb meaning ‘expect’, ‘hope for’ with genitive theme; a dative of the person can be added for whom something is expected, but this is an adjunct rather than a proper argument. OE *leon* is a dative + accusative verb; so of this list only *unnan* ‘grant’ has the same frame in OE. Why are the themes of *tiðian* and *unnan* genitive? Are they perhaps goals rather than themes? The genitive occasionally occurs as purpose adjunct in Gothic (Wright and Wright 1968 [1954]: 185) and as goal-argument of verbs
of persuading and urging in Old Norse (Kristoffersen 1996: 53). We must leave this group to future research.

5.3 Reanalysis from adjunct to argument

We saw in Chapter 3 that the appearance of the to-infinitive as goal-argument after the verbs of persuading and urging could be accounted for in a straightforward way. Goal-arguments resemble purpose adjuncts and, like them, can be expressed by a purposive to-PP or by a subjunctive clause. The to-infinitive (probably itself a purposive to-PP in origin) first followed the distribution of the to-PP, but became a non-finite alternative to the subjunctive clause at some stage in prehistoric OE.

The appearance of the to-infinitive as an argument of the verbs of commanding and permitting is less straightforward. These verbs do not take a to-PP as theme- or goal-argument which could be argued to have served as its original model—a situation reminiscent of that of many of the monotransitive intention verbs discussed in the previous chapter.

Bock (1931: 157–60) suggests that the appearance of the to-infinitive as the theme after some of the monotransitive intention verbs is due to a reanalysis, with the original theme of the matrix verb, an NP, reanalysed as the object of a to-infinitive. This to-infinitive originally functioned as adjunct, but is reanalysed as theme. We will argue in this section, with Bock, that the same process may have been responsible for the appearance of the to-infinitive as theme after the verbs of commanding and permitting.

However, a reanalysis of the kind envisaged by Bock cannot be the only source of the to-infinitive as theme, because such a reanalysis requires a precedent for analysing to-infinitives as argument. If there is no precedent, with the to-infinitive only occurring as adjunct, such structures could not become ambiguous in the first place. In the case of the intention verbs, such a precedent had been set by some of the conatives (the tilian group) that started to take the to-PP, the to-infinitive, and the subjunctive that-clause as goal- or perhaps even as theme-argument. It was only then that to-infinitives in other positions could become ambiguous. Their reanalysis to theme was reinforced by the fact that the to-infinitive had come to represent a non-finite alternative to the subjunctive that-clause—and as such clauses could express the theme of these monotransitive verbs, the to-infinitive also began to be used to express the theme. A similar scenario holds for the emergence of the to-infinitive as theme of the verbs of commanding and permitting.

The fact that there is structural ambiguity with respect to the to-infinitive after the verbs of commanding and permitting is evident from Callaway.
Callaway classifies most occurrences of the *to*-infinitive after *beođan* ‘order’ as complement, and lists them accordingly in his chapter on ‘the objective infinitive’; but some of his examples are followed by the comment: ‘or final?’ (i.e. a purposive adjunct; Callaway 1913: 45). In his critique of Callaway’s work, Bock goes into this interpretational dilemma in some detail, with examples of both monotransitive and ditransitive verbs (Bock 1931: 161–4). His ditransitive example is the following, of which there are two alternative analyses, (a) and (b):

\[(38) \text{behealdað þone halgan sunnandæg and þa fæstendagas, ðe keep the holy Sunday and the fast-days, that men eow beođað to healdenne} (\text{HomU 36, 148})\]

\[a. \text{þa fæstendagas, } [\text{CP O}_{i}[C(\text{ðe men eow beodað [NP} t_i [\text{CP O}_{j}[\text{IP PRO to healdenne} t_j])]])]]\]

the fast days that people offer to you to keep

\[b. \text{þa fæstendagas, } [\text{CP O}_{i}[C(\text{ðe men eow beodað [CP} t_i'[\text{IP PRO to healdenne} t_j])]])]]\]

the fast days that people order you to keep

From Bock’s German gloss, ‘…welche euch die Leute zum Halten darboten ‘…which people offer to you to keep’, we can infer that he regards *beođan* ‘order’ as ambiguous between an exhortation (‘offer’, ‘entrust’; cf. its German cognate *bieten* or Dutch *bieden*), as in (a), and a command (‘order’, cf. Dutch *gebieden*) as in (b). The argument structure of *beođan* is the same in both interpretations, and consists of an agent, a recipient, and a theme. In analysis (a), the theme is expressed by an NP, which has been relativized (wh-moved; the antecedent is *fæstendagas*), leaving a trace; the *to*-infinitive is a gapped adjunct, either adjoined to the extraction site of the NP, as a non-finite relative clause, or to a higher position in the structure, e.g. VP; the exact adjunction position is not immediately relevant to the discussion. In analysis (b), the theme of *beođan* is expressed by a *to*-infinitival phrase. The relativized NP has been extracted from the internal argument position of the *to*-infinitive *to healdenne*, leaving an intermediate trace (*t_i’*) in the SpecCP of the *to*-infinitival phrase. The *to*-infinitives in both analyses have to be CPs in order to provide a position for the operator in (a) and the intermediate trace in (b). A PE phrase like *the fast days that I order you to observe* is usually analysed as in (b).

An instance like (38) is hard to disambiguate because it involves wh-extraction. But the ambiguity remains even when there is no wh-extraction.
Consider for example the NP to VP-construction after *alyfde*, from *aliefan* ‘allow’ in this example:

(39) Þær wæron binnan þære byrig seofan gebroðra cristena, There were within the town seven brothers Christian, þæs caseres cynnes, and heora fæder wæs Cristen, of-the emperor’s kin, and their father was Christian, þam alyfde se casere heora cristendom to thosëDAT allowed the emperor their ChristianityACC to healdenne butan ælcere ehtnysse ⟨ÆLS (Julian and Basilissa) 225⟩ hold without any persecution

a. ‘[. . .] the emperor allowed them their Christianity, to keep free from persecution’

b. ‘[. . .] the emperor allowed them to keep their Christianity, free from persecution’

What do we take to be the complement of *alyfde* ‘allow’ here? The dative object *þam* is the recipient, but there are, once more, two candidates for the theta-role of theme: the accusative object *heora cristendom*, which would give us the same interpretation in (35a), with *to healdenne* as a gapped adjunct; or the *to*-infinitival phrase *heora cristendom to healdenne* (similar to the interpretation in (35b)), *heora cristendom* then being the internal (theme-) argument of the *to*-infinitive *to healdenne*, which is perfectly acceptable in OE, as objects of verbs may either follow or precede their verbs. Interpretation (a) is equally acceptable, because *aliefan*, like most of the verbs of commanding and permitting, is robustly attested with a double object construction, witness:

(40) Hwi wæs mancynne fleascmettes alyfed æfter þam flode Why was mankind permitted fleshmeatACC allowed after the flood & na ðær? ⟨ÆIntSig 51.344⟩ and not earlier?

‘Why was mankind allowed meat after the flood and not earlier?’

Bock’s view is that the *to*-infinitive in the great majority of NP to VP-structures after these verbs should be analysed as in (38a) or (39a), i.e. as adjuncts.

The question arises, then, how valid it is to consider [- NP to VP] a separate frame. If Bock is right, many instances of this frame in Table 5.1 are
actually instances of [NP NP]. Is there any independent evidence for the frame [NP to VP]? Instances of intransitive or unaccusative to-infinitives disambiguate the two frames, because there is no accusative object that could be interpreted as the theme-argument of both the to-infinitive and the verb of commanding and permitting itself. When the to-infinitive is intransitive, it is unlikely that we are dealing with the [NP NP] frame. Aliefan is found with intransitive to-infinitives; an example like (41) offers independent evidence of the reality of the [NP to VP] frame:

(41) Ne beo ðu afæred forðan ðe ic aras of deaðe; me is not be thou afraid because I arose from death; meDAT is alyfed eft to libbenne mid mannum. na swa þeah allowed again to live with men not although swylcum life swa ic ær leofode ⟨ÆCHom II, 23 199.11⟩ such life as I before lived ‘Do not be afraid because I arose from death; I am allowed to live among men again, although not such a life as I lived before’

Further evidence is provided by instances in which the object follows the to-infinitive. Again, this order is attested with aliefan:

(42) On ðam dagum wæs alyfed to alecgenne his fynd ⟨ÆLS (Maccabees) 684⟩ enemy ‘In those days it was granted to overcome his enemy’

His fynd in (42) cannot be interpreted as anything other than the theme of to alecgenne, and the to-infinitival phrase to alecgenne his fynd as an argument (in this case, a passivized theme) of alyfed.

The fact that the [NP to VP] frame is independently attested confirms the ambiguity of a sentence like (38). However, only a minority of the verbs of commanding and permitting are attested with one, or both, of such disambiguating structures (intransitive to-infinitives or to-infinitives followed by their objects). Many verbs appear in Table 5.1 on the basis of just a single example with a to-infinitival complement, and none of these single attestations contain intransitive to-infinitives or exhibit surface VO order in the to-infinitival complement; and of those verbs that are attested with to-infinitives in greater numbers (i.e. aliefan, bebeodan, beodan, forbeodan, ðæcan, and ðafian), only aliefan and its opposite forbeodan are attested with to-infinitives that are
definitely arguments. *Daftian* is found with the disambiguating VO order in ⟨ÆCHom I (Pref) 4.29⟩.

It might be expected that Latin originals could be of use to resolve such ambiguities, but this is rarely the case. In the OE translation of Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*, for instance, we find *beodan* translating Latin *credidere* ‘entrust’:

(43) Godes eowde [...] ðætte he him bead to God’s herd [...] , that he him entrusted/ordered to healdanne ⟨Bede 2 6.114.18⟩ guard  
Lat: *gregem quem sibi ipse crediderat* (‘the herd which he entrusted to him’, Colgrave and Mynors 1969: 154)  
‘God’s herd, which he entrusted to him to guard’

(43) hardly constitutes unequivocal evidence, however, because the OE translator may well have meant ‘ordered to hold’ as an adequate translation of ‘entrust’. (44) presents us with a similar dilemma:

(44) Be þam wyrтwearde, hu he bebead þære næddran þa About the gardener, how he ordered the adder the wyrta to healdenne. ⟨GD 1 (H) 3.23.4⟩  
‘About the gardener, how he ordered the adder to guard the vegetables’ or ‘[…] how he entrusted the vegetables to the adder to guard.’

There is no Latin original available for this heading, but a passage in the text of the corresponding chapter, with the use of the verb *praecipere* in the Latin original, suggests that the intended meaning must be ‘command’ rather than ‘entrust’; the OE text again uses *bebeodan*, but this time with a subjunctive clause, an unequivocal theme:

(45) on þæs hælendes naman ic þe bebeode, þæt þu gehealde in of-the Saviour’s name I you order, that you guard þas stigole ⟨GD 1 (H) 3.24.8⟩  
the stile  
Lat. *in nomine Iesu praecipio tibi ut aditum istum custodias* (de Vogüé II)  
‘in the name of the Saviour I command you to guard the stile’

---

2 At least not in de Vogüé’s edition; Yerkes does mention the Latin mss Cl (= Clare College, Cambridge 30; Worcester, late 11th c.) and Hf (= Hereford Cathedral O.i.10; Cirencester, c. 12th c.) as sharing the 35 chapter titles for Book I with the H ms (1982: p. xix). These chapter titles could possibly disambiguate the *to*-infinitive in the OE heading.
The least ambiguous of the *beodan* and *bebeodan* examples is:

(46) ac [...] gemune well georne, þæt ic æfre but [...] remember well zealously, that I ever fram frymðe beead þone drihtenlican dæg to from beginning ordered the Lord’s day to healdenne. ⟨HomU 46 134⟩

observe.

‘but [...] do your utmost to remember that I have always from the beginning ordered [you] to observe the Lord’s day.’

Even here, however, it is possible, at a pinch, to postulate a meaning like ‘recommend’ for *bebeodan* (‘remember that I have always recommended the Lord’s day [to you], in order to observe it’), in which case (46) could also be an example of the [ _ NP NP] frame.

The question remains of how the *to*-infinitival phrase in a sentence like (38) came to be ambiguous in the first place, and how the *to*-infinitive came to be analysed as the *theme*. Unlike the verbs of persuading and urging, the verbs of commanding and permitting do not take a *to*-PP as their argument, so it is difficult to see how the appearance of the *to*-infinitive in argument position can be accounted for. The most straightforward solution is that the *to*-infinitive came to be analysed as the non-finite alternative to the subjunctive *that*-clause. This may have happened first with the purpose adjunct, which could be expressed by the *to*-PP, the *to*-infinitive, and the subjunctive *that*-clause; the same three constituents came to express the goal-argument after monotransitive verbs of the *tilian* group and the ditransitive verbs of persuading and urging. The verbs of commanding and permitting did not originally appear with *to*-PPs or *to*-infinitives, but their *theme*-argument could be expressed by a subjunctive clause, witness the following with *aliefan*:

(47) Nis nu nanum men. alyfed þæt he healde þa Not-is now to-no men allowed that he hold[subj] the ealdan æ. lichomlice: ac healde gehwa hi old law physically: but hold everyone her gastlice ⟨ÆCHom I, 9 142.6⟩ spiritually ‘No one is now allowed to observe the old law in a physical sense, but people should observe it in a spiritual sense’

It is true that subjunctive *that*-clauses may also at times be ambiguous between *theme* and adjunct, but in the majority of cases they are best analysed as
Commanding and permitting

themes, and remain unambiguous even in cases of the type of \(wh\)-extraction that is such a problem for the interpretation of the \(to\)-infinitival phrase in (38). In (48), for instance, there is no ambiguity about the extraction site of the \(wh\)-phrase; the lowest trace (the extraction site) is in the object position of the finite verb (subjunctive plural) \(don\) ‘do’; there has been long movement which necessitates postulating an intermediate trace in the specifier position of the lower CP. Both traces are properly governed and form a single \(A’\)-chain with the empty operator in the specifier of the higher CP.

(48) \(\delta a \ldots \) domas, \(\delta e \langle ic \ldots \rangle \) bebeode \(\delta æt \) ge \(don^3\)

the judgements, that I order that you do
\(\delta a \) domas \([CP\)Op\(i \) \(\delta e \) \([IP\)ic bebeode \([CP\)t’ \(\delta æt \) \([IP \)ge \(t_i \) don\)])\] \(\langle\)Deut 7.11\rangle

‘the judgements that I order that you do’

A non-finite version of (48) would be \(\delta a \) domas, \(\delta e \) ic bebeode (\(eow\) \(to\) donne)

‘the judgements which I order you to do’, of which close analogues abound, e.g.:

(49) þis sindan \(\delta a \) domas þe se ælmihtega God \(\ldots\) him

these are the laws which the almighty God \(\ldots\) him
bebead to healdanne. \(\langle\)LawAfEl 49\rangle

ordered to hold.

‘these are the laws which the almighty God \(\ldots\) ordered him to keep’

Here we have the ambiguous structure of (38) again.

It seems likely, then, that the \(to\)-infinitive, once it had developed into a non-finite alternative of the subjunctive clause, spread to positions other than that of goal. The verbs of commanding and permitting took a subjunctive clause as theme, and the \(to\)-infinitive started to appear in the same position by analogy with the finite clause. It may have been this first emergence as theme that made sentences like (38) and (39) ambiguous. The \(to\)-infinitive was no longer an unequivocal adjunct in such sentences. The ambiguity may then have been resolved through reanalysis of adjunct to argument, probably assisted by the increasing loss of OV-orders.

Unlike the verbs of persuading and urging, the verbs of commanding and permitting may occur in a bare-infinitival AcI, which prompts the question whether this bare infinitive may have served as a model for the spread of the \(to\)-infinitive. We will discuss this question in the next section.

3 A shortened version of \(\delta a \ldots \) domas, \(\delta e \) [ic] eow [sylle] todaeg [e/] bebeode \(\delta æt \) ge \(don\) (Deut 7.11)

(Lat: \(iudica, quae ego mando tibi hodie ut facias\)). The square brackets indicate early corrections to the original text which occur in the ms (Crawford 1922).
5.4 The status of the AcI

A subset of the verbs of commanding and permitting is attested with both a bare and a to-infinitive in reliable texts:

(50)  *beodan, bebeodan* ‘command’; *biddan* ‘ask’; *don* ‘cause’; *ðafian* ‘allow’; *sellan* ‘grant’, ‘give’

The bare infinitive is part of a larger construction which appears to be a bare-infinitival ECM-construction (AcI). Half these verbs are attested in Gothic with an AcI, which suggests that this complement is of long standing at least after the verbs of commanding. *Aliefan* ‘allow’ and *forbeodan* ‘forbid’, mentioned in Callaway’s lists, have been excluded from set (50) as all attestations of AcIs after these verbs occur either in glosses or from texts in which Latin influence is particularly noticeable, e.g. Bede (*inter alia* ⟨Bede 1 16.70.6⟩; see Colgrave and Mynors 1969: 84 for the original text). The bare infinitives in such examples invariably reflect an infinitive in the Latin original, and represent an automatic response on the part of the translator or writer of the gloss, just as Latin gerunds, gerundives, and future participles are automatically translated by OE to-infinitives. Two further examples occur in the West Saxon Gospels ⟨⟨Lk (WSCp) 9.59⟩⟩ and ⟨⟨Mt (WSCp) 19.14⟩⟩, a text in which we find many instances of infinitival complements that do not conform to the complementation patterns we find in original OE texts (see e.g. §3.3.3 above). This conclusion is supported by the fact that the Gothic cognate of *aliefan*, i.e. *uslaubjan*, only appears with a dativus-cum-infinitivo (DcI) in Gothic, not with an AcI, and *faurbiudan*, the Gothic cognate of *forbid*, actively resists an AcI, as AcIs in the Greek original are invariably translated by a finite complement clause (Harbert 1978: 230; Köhler 1867: 446).

There are two other verbs of commanding and permitting that appear with this complement, i.e. *hatan* ‘command’ and *lætan* ‘let’; these verbs are like other verbs of commanding and permitting in that they occur with the [NP NP] frame (i.e. they can be three-place), but they do not occur with the three-place [NP to VP] frame, and while *hatan* does occur with the [NP that-clause] frame (albeit not very frequently), *lætan* as a verb of causation or permitting does not occur with this frame at all.

The accusative subject of the bare infinitive in an AcI-construction may remain implicit. Callaway discusses the various examples of AcIs with verbs of permitting and commanding in two different sections on the assumption that they are different constructions (Callaway 1913: 44–7, 108–12). However, the
Commanding and permitting

The AcI after the verbs of commanding and permitting resembles the construction found after the verbs of perception. The AcI after perception verbs represents a single constituent; perception verbs are two-place verbs and there is only one theta-role available for the AcI. Verbs of commanding and permitting are three-place verbs, however, and there are two theta-roles available for internal arguments: recipient and theme. On closer inspection the AcI turns out to function as a single constituent with the thematic role of theme. The accusative does not appear to be a recipient of the higher verb. This is supported by the situation of the verbs of commanding and permitting in Gothic, which, when complemented by an AcI, always show two-place behaviour. There is never a recipient present when the theme is expressed by an AcI, and if such a construction (recipient followed by AcI) appears in the source text, it is not reflected in the Gothic translation (Los 1999: 140–1). Old English AcIs never allow recipients either. As verbs of commanding and permitting, unlike the perception and causation verbs, have three-place variants, it is theoretically possible to explain this ban on recipients occurring with AcIs—in other words, the non-occurrence of the frame \[ _NP_{dat} \ NP_{acc} \ VP \]—by assuming that the AcI after the verbs of commanding and permitting consists of two constituents rather than one: an accusative recipient followed by a (bare-) infinitival theme. This would mean that AcIs and \( NP \to VP \)-constructions after these verbs are very similar in structure, and that the \( to \)-infinitival ECM construction, an ME innovation, came about through replacement of bare by \( to \)-infinitive. The literature on the rise of \( to \)-infinitival
The to-infinitive as THEME

ECM—the construction found in PE sentences like *I believe him to be a liar* or *The general ordered the bridge to be blown up*—focuses primarily on the question whether the construction is of native or foreign origin, and those who argue for the former assume, often tacitly, that there were no hard and fast rules regarding the selection of bare or *to*-infinitive before ME—this is one of the traditional assumptions about the supposedly chaotic distribution of the two infinitives in OE that we noted in §§1.2 and 1.3 above. This assumption allows it to be argued that the *to*-infinitival ECM in ME is an extension of the bare-infinitival AcI (e.g. Zeitlin 1908; Bock 1931: 220f.). We have seen in the preceding chapters that the distribution of the infinitives is not at all chaotic, and that there is only one environment in which the two occur side by side: as theme to a subset of the intention verbs (Chapter 4). The exact status of the OE AcI after verbs of commanding and permitting is important, because if this AcI should be analysed as a three-place rather than a two-place construction, we have identified a second environment in which *to*-infinitives and bare infinitives occur side by side as themes, which would lend support to the view that the ME *to*-infinitival ECM is simply the OE AcI with its bare infinitive replaced by a *to*-infinitive. If the construction turns out to be firmly two-place, however, it is less likely to have been the source of the new ME construction, especially if there is no evidence of wholesale replacement of one infinitive by another.

The criteria traditionally used to distinguish three-place from two-place infinitival constructions are best illustrated by the literature on the ECM in PE (e.g. Chomsky 1965: 22). The traditional examples are (53) and (54):

(53) I persuaded a specialist to examine John.
(54) I expected a specialist to examine John.

Although sentences like (53) and (54) are superficially similar, the infinitival construction in (53) is three-place, a direct continuation of the [ _ NP_{acc} to VP] frame of the OE verbs of persuading and urging with theme and goal, whereas the ECM-construction in (54) is two-place, i.e. just theme. These structural differences can be brought out by a number of tests which all hinge on the status of the NP in these *NP to VP*- strings, i.e. whether it is subcategorized for by the matrix verb or by the infinitive (Chomsky 1965: 22; Huddleston 1971: 154; Warner 1982: 33–4; Radford 1988: 320ff.). Some of these tests require native speaker judgements, and hence are not readily applicable to OE data; an example is the test of whether there is a paraphrase relation between OE data; other tests rely on ‘laboratory’ examples that do not readily occur in corpora of performance data, for instance the question of
whether ‘dummy’ elements like *there* and *it* are possible, an indication that the NP is not subject to selectional restrictions. *Expect* in the PE examples of (55) and (56) does not impose selectional restrictions on the NP, whereas *persuade* does. This test shows that the NP in an ECM-construction, as with *expect*, functions exclusively as the subject of the embedded non-finite clause, which is why we may even find elements in this position that do not have a theta-role, i.e. dummy *there* or *it*:

(55) John expected/*persuaded there to be a crowd.
(56) John expected/*persuaded it to be crowded.

Such ‘dummy’ NPs are not attested in OE AcI-constructions with verbs of commanding and permitting, but the numbers of these AcI-constructions are not large enough to deduce with any confidence that dummy NPs are not possible in this position, or that the bare infinitive constructions found with these verbs are not ECMs.

There is another test that in theory could be answered on the basis of a corpus: does the matrix verb occur with three-place or two-place complements in other contexts? This test usually boils down to the question whether the NP to VP-string can be paraphrased by NP + *that*-clause. The occurrence of three-place NP + *that*-clause complement after a verb like *persuade* contrasts with its non-occurrence after a verb like *expect*, as in:

(57) I ⋆expected/persuaded John that he should see a specialist.

This test works for the verbs of persuading and urging, in PE as well as OE, because they are invariably three-place; it is more difficult to apply the test to verbs of commanding and permitting in PE because NP + *that*-clause is no longer fully acceptable after these verbs. Despite its marginal status, however, NP + *that*-clause is a more reasonable alternative for the object-control construction in (58) than for the ECM-construction in (59), where it is completely unacceptable because ‘the bridge’ cannot be interpreted as the addressee or recipient of the command.

(58) The general ordered his soldiers to blow up the bridge →
    The general ordered his soldiers that they should blow up the bridge
(59) The general ordered the bridge to be blown up →
    ⋆The general ordered the bridge that it should be blown up

The absence of such judgements in OE invalidate this test as a diagnostic for the Old English AcI. It works for the persuading-and-urging verbs in OE, because
they are invariably three-place, as we saw in Chapter 3; but it does not work for the verbs of commanding and permitting, precisely because they exhibit both two-place and three-place behaviour (both in OE and PE). It cannot be used to decide whether the accusative + bare infinitive after the verbs of commanding and permitting is also an ECM-construction. However, the fact that to-infinitive and subjunctive clause occur optionally with a (dative) recipient whereas recipients are never found with bare-infinitival AcIs after these verbs argues in favour of the former being part of a three-place construction and the latter of a two-place construction. PE verbs of commanding and permitting with two-place constructions (e.g. when they are followed by an ECM or a Small Clause) similarly resist recipients: we cannot add an extra argument, witness the ungrammaticality of a sentence like *The general ordered his troops the bridge to be blown up, and we saw that this is also true of the AcI-construction after the verbs of commanding and permitting in OE and Gothic.

A number of other tests are proposed in the literature on Latin accusative-and-infinitive constructions (e.g. Pinkster 1990: 126). Most tests cannot be applied to OE, apart from the animacy test.

The animacy test derives from the same principle that underlies the first and second tests above, i.e. the test involving truth values and passivization and the test involving selectional restrictions. Both tests ‘work’ because they bring out the thematic status of the NP. If this NP does not receive its theta-role from the matrix verb but from the infinitive, passivization of that infinitive will not affect that role; passivization promotes an argument from object to subject position without affecting its thematic role. Again, if the NP does not receive its theta-role from the matrix verb but functions primarily as subject of the infinitive, dummy NPs like it and there are possible. Conversely, if the NP does receive its theta-role from the verb of commanding and permitting, it needs to be animate, as the dative recipients of these verbs in the regular three-place constructions (the [NP + NP], the [NP to VP], and the [NP + that-clause] frames) are invariably [+human], or, more accurately, ‘mind Possessing entities’ (Postal 1974: 152). Commands or permission can only be properly given to individuals that have ‘mind’ enough to carry out the order or to require the permission, in order to act as agents in the embedded predicate.

Animacy is, as a test, slightly cruder in that the fact that the NP in a particular instance happens to be animate does not in itself force a three-place analysis; but the fact that inanimate NPs are only found in the AcI-construction after the verbs of commanding and permitting, and not in the NP to VP-construction
after the same verbs (apart from one exception4), suggests strongly that this AcI is a single constituent in a two-place construction, just like the AcI after the verbs of perception and causation. An example of an AcI with an inanimate NP is:

(60) Nu ic bebeode beacen ætywan, wundor geweorðan
     Now I order portentacc appearinf, omenacc happeninf
     on wera gemange ⟨And 773⟩
     in men’s among
‘Now I order a portent to appear, an omen to occur among men’

There is a striking difference in this respect between AcIs after the verbs of causation (including hatan ‘order’, which often appears to be used in a purely causative sense; see also Royster 1918) and the occurrences of the three-place [NP to VP] frame after the verbs of commanding, permitting, persuading, and urging; only 5 of the 133 instances of the NP to VP-construction have an inanimate NP (4 of them with verbs of persuading and urging), whereas the same is true in the case of 25 out of 86 instances of AcIs after verbs of causation; see Table 5.2. This difference is statistically significant (p < .001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>NP animate</th>
<th>NP inanimate</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AcI verbs: hatan ‘order’, lætan, aætan, forlætan ‘cause’, ‘let’</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP to VP-verbs (persuading and urging, and commanding and permitting)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(96%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2. Animate and inanimate NPs in AcI- and ditransitive NP to VP-verbs


4 The exception is this, with aliefan ‘allow’:

(i) ne mylnum nis alyfed to eornenne ne on huntað to ridenne
    not millsdat not-is allowed to run nor on hunting to ride
    ne nan unalyfedlic weorc to wyrccenne ⟨HomU 36, 29⟩
    nor no disallowed workacc to work
‘mills are not allowed to turn nor is anyone allowed to go out hunting or to do anything that is not allowed’

Datives cannot be promoted to subject when passivized (see e.g. Russom 1983) and recipient NPs in passive constructions retain their dative case, as mylnum ‘mills’ does in (i). Note that the control relations of the three to-infinities are unclear: mylnum is conceivably the controller of to eornenne, but cannot be the controller of to ridene or to wyrccenne. The fact that eornan might well be a member of the set of verbs that exhibit causative/ergative pairs (in the sense of Haegeman 1994) complicates the analysis of (i) still further: does it represent a case of the mills run or of someone runs the mills? Instance (i) is an exceptional case on all counts.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3. Implicit and explicit NPs in AcI- and ditransitive NP to VP-verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI verbs: hatan ‘order’, lætan, aletan, forlætan ‘cause’, ‘let’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP to VP-verbs (persuading and urging, commanding and permitting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.4. Animate and inanimate NPs in AcIs and NP to VP after verbs of commanding and permitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bebeodan, beodan, biddan, don, ðafian, sellan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP to VP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.5. Implicit and explicit NPs in AcI- and NP to VP-constructions after verbs of commanding and permitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bebeodan, beodan, biddan, don, ðafian, sellan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP to VP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is striking that the NP which is part of an AcI after the verbs of causation is left implicit nearly half the time, whereas the recipient NP is left out in only 14% of all occurrences of the [_ NP to VP] frame (after both verbs of commanding and of permitting, and of persuading and urging); see Table 5.3. The same tendencies are present in the AcIs after the verbs of set (50) when compared to the instances of the [_ NP to VP] frame after these same verbs (Tables 5.4 and 5.5).
The NP in the [NP to VP] frame is almost invariably animate, which points to it being selected by the higher verb as its recipient-argument. This supports a three-place analysis of the to-infinitival construction. The NP in the [NP VP] construction—the bare-infinitival AcI—may be either animate or inanimate, which makes it unlikely that it is an argument of the higher verb rather than the infinitival subject.

The figures in Table 5.5 show that the NP in an [NP VP] construction is more often implicit. As implicit infinitival subjects are a feature of the ‘regular’ AcI found with perception and causation verbs, this supports an AcI-analysis for this construction. The evidence, then, points to the [NP VP] construction with verbs of commanding and of permitting as constituting a single theme rather than an accusative recipient followed by a bare-infinitival theme, i.e. a two-place rather than a three-place construction.

Finally, some further support for the assumption that verbs of commanding and permitting can have a two-place variant is provided by the fact that bare-infinitival ECM-constructions in OE (i.e. AcIs) and to-infinitival ECM-constructions in PE are not the only two-place constructions found after these verbs. As with the verbs of perception and causation, verbs of permitting and commanding may occur with small clauses in both OE (the relevant verb in example (61) is beodan) and PE (the verb in (62) is order). When they occur in the complement of perception verbs, small clauses represent a single argument (the theme), as perception verbs have only a single position for an internal argument, and the same appears to be the case with the verbs of causation. If small clauses of this type also represent a single argument in (61) and (62), beodan/order should be analysed as two-place verbs in these examples.

(61) eal swa se casere þis geherde þa het he just as the emperor this heard then commanded he beodan ut micel scopferda ⟨LS 29 (Nicholas) 290⟩ order out great fleet ‘when the emperor heard this, he commanded a great fleet to be ordered out’

(62) He ordered John out of the room.

5 Examples of actual attestations are:

(ii) it is likely that the Home Office will order out hundreds more of the 3,500 Kurds who arrived in May and June. (MicroConcord corpus, MCA_IND4,HOM)

(iii) By one of those extraordinary displays of compassion for which he was noted […] Henry VI ordered them pardoned (R. A. Griffiths, The Reign of King Henry VI, 1981: 498).
Bare-infinitival ECM-constructions (AcIs) and Small Clauses follow the same distribution in OE, and the same appears to be true of to-infinitival ECM-constructions and Small Clauses in PE, so it should not be surprising to find the two occurring together after the verbs of commanding and permitting. This matter will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 9.

We conclude that the AcI after the verbs of commanding and permitting is a single constituent, and differs in this respect from the NP to VP-construction after the same verbs; the latter consists of two arguments (recipient and theme) whereas the former consists of just a theme.

5.5 AcIs and NP to VP-constructions

In the previous section we concluded that the two non-finite constructions found after a handful of verbs of commanding and permitting differ in structure: one is an AcI with the role of theme in a two-place construction, and the other is a three-place NP to VP-construction, with the NP in the role of recipient and the to-VP in the role of theme. The situation is summarized in (63) and (64):

(63)   \[ \text{theme} \]
        \[ \text{[NP}_{\text{acc}} \text{ VP}] \]

(64)   \[ \text{recipient} \]
        \[ \text{theme} \]
        \[ \text{[NP}_{\text{dat}}] \]
        \[ \text{[NP}_{\text{acc}}] \]
        \[ \text{[that]-clause (subjunctive)]} \]
        \[ \text{[NP}_{\text{dat}}] \]
        \[ \text{[to-VP]} \]

With respect to underlying structure, the to-infinitive expresses the theme in a three-place construction; this theme can also be expressed by an accusative NP and by a subjunctive clause (see (64)). Note that this is also clear from the case of the NP in the \[ \text{[NP}_{\text{to VP}} \text{ frame: it is invariably dative and a recipient.} \]

The bare infinitive, however, expresses the theme in a two-place AcI construction (see (63)); the accusative NP in this construction does not receive a theta-role from the matrix verb, but from the infinitive. One of the consequences of the alignment of two- versus three-place complements in (63)–(64) is that the first appearance of the to-infinitive as theme after the verbs of commanding and permitting cannot be ascribed to a process in which it replaces the bare infinitive.

A semantic difference between the role of the NPs in an AcI and an NP to VP-construction is that the ‘addressee’, the recipient NP in such an object-controlled NP to VP-construction, has greater freedom of action in that he or she may choose not to carry out the order. By contrast, one of the things that
has been noted about the AcI-construction after verbs of commanding and permitting (most notably the extremely frequent hatan ‘command’) is that it often appears to be used in a purely causative sense. The accusative NP is simply the executor of the command, and there is no sense of it being an ‘addressee’ at all; in these causative patterns, the identity of the actual ‘addressee’ of the permission or order (i.e. the entity to which the permission or order was issued) is irrelevant. There is a tendency for predicates with the meaning of ordering to develop meanings of causing, as is noted by Royster (1918: 83–4): the act that is ordered may not be carried out, depending on the authority of the person who gives the order: ‘The verb of ordering is an imperfective verb; it does not necessarily produce an effect; it makes no promise that an act will result from a command, or has resulted from a command’ (ibid.)

There is a similar relation between causing and permitting:

Causation may be euphemistically concealed in permission: it is represented by the allowing-causing verb that a desire to do something arises in the consciousness of the secondary actor, and that someone who has authority over him grants him permission to do the thing he wants to do; as a matter of fact, the desire to have something done originates with the one who has power over the will and act of the performer. The performer's attitude toward the act is, in reality, as vague and uncertain as it is represented to be by the causative verb; but it is formally and politely represented as being desirous of bringing about the act. (ibid. 88)

These formulations come close to later ideas of speech acts and felicity conditions (Searle 1969), Politeness Theory and face-threatening acts (Brown and Levinson 1988). It would seem that the AcI in OE typically expresses the more ‘causative’ end of the scale, the ‘peremptory’ command. Royster notes that the use of the AcI after such verbs often, though not invariably, implies an entailment relation. The ditransitive \textit{NP to VP}-construction or \textit{NP + that}-clause complement, on the other hand, expresses an underlying performative, or (reported) speech act, i.e. a directive act. For the directive to be appropriate, a number of felicity conditions have to be met concerning the authority of the speaker and the ability of the hearer to do what is required, but there is no automatic guarantee that the command will be executed.

The AcI is not found with the verbs of persuading and urging, but only with those of commanding and permitting, as it is only the latter that allow a range of interpretations, depending mainly on the perceived authority of the speaker and the freedom of action, or lack of it, of the referent of the dative or accusative NP. The verb of commanding hatan ‘order’ is not attested with the \textit{NP to VP}-construction at all, which supports Royster's position that hatan is often used in a purely causative sense; the ditransitive pattern
NP + *that*-clause is rare with this verb (three occurrences in the BGAH Corpus) in contrast with the frequency of the AcI (over a thousand attestations in the Toronto Corpus). Note, by the way, that the position of *hatan* argues against the AcI and the *NP to VP*-construction being in direct competition; if they were, the large number of AcI-attestations after *hatan*, higher than after any other verb of commanding or permitting, would lead us to expect to find its alleged rival, the *NP to VP*-construction, after *hatan* as well, which we do not. If we assume that the *to*-infinitive is in competition with the subjunctive clause, however, for which we have found extensive evidence in the case of the *intention* verbs and the verbs of persuading and urging, the absence of the [*NP-to VP*] frame after this verb can be accounted for by the low number of attestations of its rival, the *NP + subjunctive that*-clause, which is in turn accounted for by the fact that *hatan* is used to express peremptory, not ‘polite’, commands.

The situation of another verb of commanding and permitting is also relevant in this discussion, as it is a verb that appears to develop into a verb of causing later on, in ME, although it is a verb of permitting in OE. This verb is *don* ‘do’, which I have glossed in Table 5.1 as ‘make’, ‘see to it’, as the translation ‘do’ might be misleading (it might suggest that this verb always functions as a verb of causation in the strictest sense, whereas it only does so when followed by an AcI). A (monotransitive) [*_ that*-clause] frame is far more frequent than an infinitival complement, and—significantly— often used to translate an AcI after a Latin verb such as *facere* ‘do’; an example is:

(65) ic gedo δæt hyra gemynd geswicð of eallum
    I will-see-to-it that their memory vanishes from all
    mannnum 〈Deut 32.26〉
    men
Lat: *cessare faciam ex hominibus memoriam eorum!* (Vulgate)
    ‘I will see to it that the memory of them is blotted out from among all
    men’

---

6 A single but not unequivocal attestation in OE occurs in ⟨LS 13 (Machutus) 29v.3⟩ (see example (30) in Ch. 9). In Middle English we find examples of unambiguous [*_ NP to VP*], as, for example:

(iv) Þis word hat ous to yelde þonkes myd al oure
    herten of þise grace þet he ous heþ ydo 〈...〉
    ‘This word/These words command/s us to give thanks
    with all our hearts for this grace that he has shown to us’
    (Ayenbite of Inwyt, I,102,60, c.1300)
There are, in all, a dozen such examples, suggesting strongly that *don* tends to resist an AcI, and is seldom used as a causative—a surprising finding, perhaps, in view of the fact that its ME reflex is used in just that sense with great frequency (see also Chapter 9), but not in view of our earlier discussion of the felicity conditions of the verbs of commanding and permitting. The development from polite request in OE to causative in ME has parallels and precedents with other verbs in this class. That the meaning of the verb must have been different in OE is confirmed by the fact that the verb is also used in supplications—hardly indicative of a peremptory request, or causation in the strictest sense:

(66) þa feol he to þæs apostoles fotum. and cwæð: Ic halsige þe þæt þu me do miltsunge. [...] and implore you that you me grant pardon [... ] and do þæt ic beo dælnimend on drihtnes halan do that I will-be sharing of Lord’s holy name. ⟨ECHom II, 31–2 246.157⟩

‘then he fell to the apostle’s feet, and said: I implore you to pardon me [...] and make me to share in the Lord’s holy name’

Note that the verb appears to be two-place in this meaning, although it may be three-place in the sense of ‘give’, ‘grant’ (*pæt þæt þu me do miltsunge* ‘that you grant me pardon’, also in (66), is an example; cf. PE expressions like *do someone a favour*), and it is in this meaning that it appears to have acquired a *to*-infinitive in (67), a set phrase, showing the characteristic interpretational dilemma of the *to*-infinitive after the verbs of commanding and permitting which we discussed earlier:

(67) Do me þæt to understande ⟨Eluc 1 99⟩

‘Give me to understand that’

There are no unequivocal instantiations of the [*NP that*-clause] frame from which the idiom in (67) might have developed, so we have to assume that it derives from a reanalysis of the [*NP NP*] frame. The case of the recipient NP should therefore be dative. Although most instances of this idiom happen to contain a personal pronoun that does not show a formal distinction between dative and accusative case, e.g. *me* ‘me’, *us* ‘us’, there is one instance of a full
NP, and this NP is clearly in the dative (ðam geongum ‘the young’; see Callaway 1913: 118).\(^7\)

AcIs are also attested with this verb (five occurrences). Four of these appear in Latinate contexts; and the attestation of inanimate NPs only with this frame and not with the \(_{NP \text{ to } VP}\) frame, as in the following example, conforms to our earlier findings as regards the structural differences between AcIs and \(_{NP \text{ to } VP}\)-constructions:

\[(68) \text{ and } \text{treowa } \text{he deð færlice blowan and eft raðe and treesacc}^{8} \text{he does suddenly bloom and again quickly asearian } \langle\text{HomU 34, 109}\rangle \]

\[ \text{‘and he [God] makes the trees bloom suddenly and just as suddenly wither again’} \]

The felicity conditions involved in the causative act of (68) sanction an AcI: the ‘causer’ is God; the trees are acted upon rather than acting and have no say in the matter. The selection of the AcI emphasizes the omnipotence of God, and there is no need, I think, to regard the AcI after don in such examples of original OE prose as ultimately due to Latin influence, as Callaway does (1913: 205). The position of this verb, then, is slightly anomalous compared to the other verbs of commanding and permitting in that there are no unequivocal instantiations of the \(_{NP \text{ that}-\text{clause}}\) frame, although we do find ditransitive \(_{NP \text{ to } VP}\); but we can apparently generalize that it expresses causation when occurring with an AcI, and polite requests when occurring with a that-clause.

In brief, the case for assuming that the bare infinitive (i.e. the AcI) and the \(_{NP \text{ to } VP}\)-construction are in competition in OE after the verbs of commanding and permitting is weak. There is no evidence to suggest that the \(_{NP \text{ to } VP}\)-construction, whether the three-place OE construction or the two-place ECM-construction that emerges in ME, is simply an AcI with the bare infinitive replaced by a to-infinitive. The complements are too distinct for this, both semantically and syntactically. We will see in Chapter 9 that the animacy test described above still holds in ME for those verbs of commanding and permitting that survive the extensive relexification of that period, which means that these verbs keep the distinction between two-place AcI (used in a causative context) and the three-place \(_{NP \text{ to } VP}\)-construction (used in the context

\(^7\) In lOE/eME (Peterborough Chronicle) the situation becomes more complicated as we start to find this idiom with accusative NPs (or rather, with N-heads that are preceded by the masculine accusative singular article ðone); but by that time, the distinctive case-forms of the article are being lost.

\(^8\) The expected form of the accusative plural of treow is treo or treowu (Wright and Wright 1925 [1908]: §365) but the final -\(u\) often appears as -\(a\) in IOE (ibid. §215 n.).
of issuing permission or a polite command or request). This in turn argues against the two complements being in direct competition. The distribution of bare versus to-infinitives after the verbs of commanding and permitting in OE, then, does not suggest a chaotic transitional period, as has been suggested (see §1.3), but represents a coherent system.

5.6 Conclusions

We have identified a second group of three-place verbs in this chapter, i.e. the verbs of commanding and permitting. They are associated with the thematic roles of agent, recipient, and theme. Like the verbs of persuading and urging, the subcategorization frames that express these roles, although quite varied, show a consistency in the case of the first NP, which is always dative. This suggests that the role of that NP is recipient, and that the following constituent, whether accusative NP, subjunctive clause, bare infinitive, or to-infinitive, is the theme. Again we find the subjunctive clause and the to-infinitive filling the same syntactic/semantic slot, as in the case of the verbs of persuading and urging.

The emergence of the to-infinitive is not as easily recoverable as in the case of the latter verbs, however, since the verbs of commanding and permitting do not occur with a to-PP. The bare infinitive as theme is rare (it is only attested after beodan ‘order’ and ðafian ‘allow’), and is therefore not a likely model for the appearance of the to-infinitive in this role. The subjunctive that-clause is a better candidate, especially in light of the evidence of competition between the two structures.

There is also a third possibility which might account for the appearance of the to-infinitive here, first suggested by Bock (1931): that the to-infinitive which followed an accusative theme as purpose adjunct is itself reanalysed as theme, with the ‘original’ theme being analysed as object of the to-infinitive (rather than object of the matrix verb). We have argued in §5.3 that such a reanalysis could only have taken place if there was a precedent for to-infinitives being analysed as themes; and we proposed that this precedent was set by the fact that to-infinitives, once they were identified as non-finite subjunctive clauses—a process that originated with the juxtaposition of to-infinitives and finite subjunctive clauses as goal-argument after the verbs of persuading and urging—appeared as theme after verbs of commanding and permitting by analogy with the finite subjunctive clause.

A fourth possibility, i.e. that the sequence ‘dative recipient + to-infinitival theme’ (the NP to VP-construction) was due to the bare infinitive in an AcI-construction being replaced by a to-infinitive, was dismissed on the grounds
that AcI and the NP to VP-construction do not fill the same syntactic/semantic slot and are, consequently, not suitable candidates for competition. AcIs, i.e. bare-infinitival ECM-constructions, form a single constituent with the thematic role of theme, whereas the NP to VP-string is best analysed as consisting of two constituents, a dative recipient followed by a to-infinitival theme. The fact that the verbs of commanding and permitting allow AcIs sets them apart from the verbs of persuading and urging, which do not allow bare infinitives at all, as we saw in Chapter 3.

The verbs of commanding and permitting not only differ from the verbs of persuading and urging, then, in that they are associated with different thematic roles, and accordingly different subcategorization frames, but also in that they have two-place variants. It is not just that the recipient role may remain implicit (which accounts for the fact that the verbs of urging and persuading, which do not assign this role, are always accompanied by their full thematic complement of theme and goal, unlike the verbs of commanding and permitting), but also that the recipient role may be lacking from the thematic structure of the verb altogether. This is most evident when the verbs appear with complements like Small clauses or AcIs, which form a single constituent with the thematic role of theme; none of these cases ever appears with an NP that could serve as recipient. This difference between the two groups of verbs is still in evidence in PE.
Commissives

6.1 Introduction

The last group of verbs that may take a *to*-infinitive as theme-argument are verbs of commitment, the ‘commissives’, i.e. verbs with meanings like *promise*. We will see in this chapter that a promise can be of three types in OE (and presumably also in PE), and that the possible complements of a commissive verb correlate with each of these types.

The first type, in which what is promised is an intended act on the part of the speaker, occurs mostly with a finite clause with the modal *will* and rarely with a true subjunctive form. The second type, in which what is promised is permission, occurs with a subjunctive clause or a clause with the modals *mæg/mihte* ‘may’ or *moton/moste* ‘may’. The phenomenon of ‘control shift’—commissives showing object control rather than subject control—correlates with the second type. The third type, in which what is promised is a certain state of affairs, occurs with an indicative rather than a subjunctive clause.

The commissives are interesting in that finite clauses are still their preferred complement in PE, unlike the other subject-controlled verbs (the intention verbs), where finite clauses have been ousted completely by the *to*-infinitive. Closer investigation suggests that this survival is due to the fact that co-reference of the subject of the subclause and an argument of the main clause is less usual than with the verbs we discussed in the previous chapters, i.e. the embedded subject is not ‘controlled’. As it is only subjunctive *that*-clauses with controlled subjects that can be replaced by *to*-infinitives, this accounts for the lower number of *to*-infinitives in PE. If a finite complement clause expresses a certain ‘state of affairs’ that is promised, rather than an action on the part of the speaker or a permission granted to the addressee, the embedded subject will not be identical in reference to the matrix subject or object, which means that a ‘controlled’ *to*-infinitive will not be possible here.
A second reason could be that the to-infinitive, like the subjunctive form it competes with, is not informative enough to disambiguate the various types of commissive. The ratio of modals to simple form is far higher in OE after the commissives than after other ‘control’ verbs, which suggests that there is a need to distinguish between these types by using different modals for different types.

6.2 Membership and subcategorization frame

The following verbs appear to have commissive meanings:


Four of these verbs—behatan, gehatan, swerian, and weddian—conform to the subcategorization frames of the verbs of commanding and permitting (see Chapter 5) in that they may occur with the [_.NP_dat NP_acc] frame and the [_.NP_dat that-clause] frame. Of the remaining verbs, beotian ‘boast’, ‘threaten’, ‘promise’, shows the same patterns as the others: although there is evidence of it being a three-place verb, it does not occur with the [_.NP that-clause] or the [_.NP to VP] frames, but only with [_.that-clause] as in (2) or [_.to VP], with the latter often ambiguous between argument and adjunct, as in (3):

(2) ful oft wit beotedan þæt unc ne very often we-twoDual vowed that us-twoACC-ONeDual not gedælde nemne deað ana owiht elles ⟨Wife 21⟩ partedSUBj except death alone anything else ‘very often we vowed that nothing would part us except death alone’

(3) þeah hine deofol mid his lymum wyle gedreccan, & though himACC devil with his snares wants afflict, and mid barspere beotige to ofsticianne. ⟨ByrM 1, 144.4⟩ with bearspear threatens to spear-to-death. ‘though the devil wants to afflict him with his snares, and threatens him with a bearspear, to spear him to death’ or ‘. . . threatens to spear him to death with a bearspear.’

1 Green (1989) argues that the difference between behatan and gehatan is that the former is generally used for a Christian promise, whereas the latter is used for a pagan promise or oath. There may well be similar subtle distinctions in usage between the other commissives.
There is one intriguing instance of the \[_ NP\text{acc} \text{ to-PP}\] frame with *gehatan*, a frame typical of persuading and urging, as we saw in Chapter 3:

(4) ofer þæt deofolgeldum ne þeowode, seoðpan he hine over the demon-worship not served, after he him\text{acc} to Cristes þeowdome gehatenne hæfde. ⟨Bede 2.8.124.13⟩ to Christ’s service promised had. Lat. *nec idolis ultra seruiuit, ex quo se Christo serviturum esse promiserat* (Colgrave and Mynors 1969: 166) ‘he no longer worshipped demons after he had promised himself to Christ’s service.’

Note that the PP contains a nominalization and could be paraphrased by a *to*-infinitive.

There are other verbs in set (1) that have persuading-and-urging properties. *Dreatian* ‘threaten’ conforms to the verbs of persuading and urging in its argument structure and meaning (‘force’) when occurring with the \[_ NP\text{that-clause}\] frame, and as such it was included in the discussion of these verbs in Chapter 3. As a commissive, it occurs with a *to*-infinitive in a monotransitive subject control structure:

(5) Hwæt wenst þu be þære unwenlicran wyrde þe oft What think you of the more-invisible fortune which often þreatað þa yflan to witnianne? ⟨Bo 40.138.1⟩ threatens the wicked to afflict? ‘What do you think of the less visible fate which often threatens to afflict the wicked?’

*Deowan* ‘threaten’, too, has other meanings that suggest (spatial) manipulation (‘drive’, ‘press’, ‘urge on’) and it is found with these meanings with the \[_ NP\text{to-PP}\] frame (e.g. ⟨Rid 3,17⟩); this suggests that it is, at least potentially, a verb of persuading and urging. As a commissive, it is found with \[_ \text{to VP}\] and \[_ \text{that-clause}\]; examples of each are given in (6) and (7):

(6) þeah he […] hine þeowde to ofsleanne mid þam though he […] him threatened to kill amidst the folce ⟨ÆHomM 15 338⟩ people ‘though he […] threatened to kill him in the presence of the people’
(7) And he [...] pywde mid μυθε þ he Martinum
And he [...] threatened with mouth that he Martin
abite (ÆLS (Martin) 537)
tear-to-pieceesubj
‘And he [...] threatened with his mouth to tear Martin to pieces’

In their commissive meanings, however, beotian, ðeowan, and ðreatian do not conform to either the verbs of commanding or those of persuading in that they do not occur with the [\_ NP to VP] frame, but only with the [\_ to VP] frame, with subject control, like the monotransitive intention verbs.

The same holds for commissives in PE. When PE commissives occur with non-finite complements they only realize two arguments, not three; the recipient remains implicit—that is, in an analysis in which promise is always three-place. Unlike the intention verbs and the verbs of commanding and permitting, the finite complement clause after commissives has survived robustly into PE. Of the some 125 occurrences of the verb promise in the PE MicroConcord corpus, [\_ to VP] is most frequent (45 instances), [\_ NP] (expressing the theme) is runner-up (34 instances), while [\_ that-clause] comes third (17 instances). Three-place complements are ranked as follows: [\_ NP NP] 7 instances, [\_ NP that-clause] 4 instances, [\_ NP to NP] 2 instances. [\_ NP to VP] is not attested at all. The paucity of [\_ NP to VP] frames after promise in PE has also been observed by Mair (1990). Many PE speakers do not allow it (e.g. R. L. Allen 1966: 271 n.; Rohdenburg 1992: 202), although it was frequent until fairly recently:

(8) If you will promise me to kepe that close, whiche I shall disclose unto you. (OED, s.v. disclose, 1551 T. Wilson Logike (1580) 77 b)

(9) I have promised the children to write something for them about their favourite story-teller, Juliana Horatia Ewing. (OED, s.v. story-teller, 1885 Miss Gatty Jul. H. Ewing i. 3)

AcIs, too, are either not attested at all in OE, as in the case of behatan, or only attested under suspicious circumstances, as in the case of gehatan, which is attested with this complement only in Bede, translating a Latin AcI. The absence of AcI-complements is not surprising, as the semantics of a promise are not compatible with causation in the strictest sense, which is the semantic content associated with OE AcIs (Chapter 5): one cannot normally make promises on someone else’s behalf, except for rare instances in which someone may assume complete authority over another person. The felicity conditions of a promise entail that ‘a future act must be predicated of the speaker himself; he
cannot promise to have done something nor promise that someone else will do something’ (Searle 1969: 57–63).

This group differs, then, from the other three-place verbs in that the to-infinitive appears to have made the same progress until fairly recently but has since retreated and no longer allows the [ _ NP to VP] frame, but only the [ _ to VP] frame (Rohdenburg 1992). The second difference is that the finite clause has survived robustly after PE commissives, but not after intention verbs or verbs of commanding and permitting.

6.3 Three types of promises

Although promise may occur with two objects and is therefore usually classed as a ditransitive, it exhibits subject rather than object control. The recipient of a promise, unlike recipients of a command or a permission, has not been charged with a commission; his or her role is that of a witness or addressee, not a participant in the action, and comparable in this respect to the recipient of verbs with meanings like ‘show’. Because the semantics associated with commissives entail that one can only commit oneself to a future action on one’s own behalf—if this condition does not obtain, we are not dealing with a promise—commissives necessarily involve intention, and the to-infinitival construction after such commissives exhibits overwhelmingly the type of control associated with intention verbs, i.e. subject control.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, commissives in both OE and PE can be of three different types, depending on whether the thing promised—the theme-argument—can be described as:

I. an intended action on the part of the speaker,
II. a permission, or
III. a certain state of affairs.

Each type of embedded clause can be characterized according to its choice of subject and auxiliary.

The first, most frequent type is the one in which the theme involves an intended action by the speaker. Matrix subject and embedded subject are identical, and the modal used is willan and its past tense wolde. An example is:

(10) gif þu wilt me behaten þæt þu heora gastlice fæder beon
    if you want me promise that you will be their spiritual father
    wille (LS 9 (Giles) 275)
    want
    ‘if you will promise me that you will be their spiritual father’
It is this type which occasionally allows a subjunctive form, but only in a minority of cases. Attestations of the prototypical *behatan* ‘promise’ in the Toronto Corpus, for instance, have a periphrasis with *willan/wolde* in 32 instances against three actual subjunctive forms. This is also the type that has *to-*infinitival counterparts in OE, as we saw above, but this may simply be due to the fact that it also happens to be the most frequent type.

In the second type, the one in which what is promised is permission, the embedded subject is identical in reference to the matrix object. The modals used are *maeg/mihte* or *moton/moste* ‘may’. This type is marginal in terms of frequency (5 out of a total of 46 finite clauses after *behatan*). An example is:

(11) and Crist him sona behet þæt he cuman moste and Christ himDAT at-once promised that he come may ðæs ylcan dæges mid him to ðam ecan that same day with him to the eternal wuldre. ⟨ÆHom 20, 246⟩

‘and Christ promised him at once that he would be allowed that very day to enter into eternal glory with him.’

It is the permissive meaning of the modal *moste* that immediately disambiguates the reference of the various pronouns in (11). This second type is apparently also occasionally attested with a *to-*infinitive in PE (e.g. Rohdenburg 1992: 203), although a search in the *OED* quotations (c. 1,600 examples) failed to yield an example; the examples given above as (8) and (9) are both of the first (subject control) type. As type II is rare anyway, and its non-finite version even rarer, instances of such *to-*infinitives are usually described as ‘control shift’, because they evince object control, and not the more usual, and therefore expected, subject control of type I. It may lead to occasional ambiguity (when a sentence is lifted out of its context) as in:

(12) Grandma promised the children to stay up late. (Farkas 1988; cited in Petter 1998: 216)

a. Grandmai promised the childreni [PROi to stay up late].

b. Grandma promised the childreni [PROi to stay up late].

The PRO subject of the *to-*infinitive has two interpretations: it is controlled either by *Grandma* or by *the children*. The former interpretation is an instance of type I (what is promised is an intended act), the latter of type II (what is promised is permission). The permission reading—and the object control interpretation—is reinforced by the difference in authority we assume between
the role of ‘grandma’ and that of ‘the children’, which becomes immediately apparent if we substitute proper names like ‘John’ or ‘Peter’ for these NPs.

The third type is the one which promises a certain state of affairs (with the presupposition that the ‘speaker’, the matrix subject, controls this state of affairs). The embedded subject refers neither to the matrix object nor the matrix subject, and the modality of the clause appears to be indicative rather than subjunctive; the auxiliary expresses futurity, usually *sceal*, but also *bið* (a present indicative form of the OE verb for ‘to be’ that is often used to express future tense) and a form of *weorðan* ‘become’. There are five instances of this type of clause after *behatan*. An example is:

(13) swa swa wæs Abraham and his gebedda Sarra. Seo wæs as was Abraham and his wife Sara. She was untymende oð ðæt hundnigontoeðe gear, and God him barren until the ninetieth year, and God him/them þa behet, þæt hi habban sceoldon sunu, Isaac then promised, that she have should son, Isaac gehaten. ⟨ÆLet 4 (SigeweardZ) 330⟩ called.

‘... as were Abrahami and his wife Sarahi. Shej had been barren until her ninetieth year, and God then promised himi [or themi,j] that shej would have a son, called Isaac.’

It is not surprising that this type is not attested with an infinitival complement in OE, as *to*-infinitives are only possible in control structures, and the *to*-infinitival counterpart of type III would have to be an ECM-construction. Such ECMs occasionally do turn up in ME, but no longer appear to be possible in PE.²

The only construction in OE that comes at all close to a non-finite version of type III is the Small clause, but this immediately affects the meaning in that it is no longer a promise to do something, but an assurance that something will be the case; Bosworth and Toller (1882, 1921) accordingly gloss the instance of such a complement with *behatan* in ⟨LawSwer 7⟩ as ‘to give assurance, certify’.³

² An example is:

(i) but I haue promyseid yow to be hyr knyght (PL, Davis 1971: 356, ll. 21/22)

   but I have promised you OBL to be her knight

   ‘I have promised that you will be her knight’

³ This is the instance in question (with preposed or inverted predicate):

(ii) þu me behete hal & clæne þæt, þæt þu me sealdest ⟨LawSwer 7⟩

   you me promise whole and intact that, that you me sell

   ‘you promise me that what you are selling me is intact and without defect’
A search in the MicroConcord Corpus shows that the same three types can be distinguished for PE promise, but the literature on commissives distinguishes two types at most. Huddleston (1971: 296) notes that the (finite) embedded complement invariably requires will in PE, which he calls ‘future tense’, but he makes no further distinctions as to types. Aijmer distinguishes at least two types: she describes will in such clauses as ambiguous between expressing either ‘the subject’s intention to perform the activity’ or something else (Aijmer 1972: 98–9). This is the type in which ‘Equi-NP deletion’, i.e. a subject-controlled to-infinitival complement, is possible, and must be our type I. The alternative, which Aijmer does not discuss in any further detail, is presumably future tense, our type III.

6.4 Modals and subjunctives

Commissives are the only type of ‘control’ verb that still robustly occurs with finite clause complements and relatively infrequently—compared to the other ‘control’ verbs discussed in this book—with a to-infinitive. One reason for this is probably that co-reference of embedded subject and an argument from the main clause is less usual (the type III ‘state of affairs’ promises). A second reason may be that a modal is required to help identify a type I or type II promise, as in example (11) above. A to-infinitive is just as uninformative as a subjunctive form when it comes to distinguishing between a promise to perform an action (type I) and a promise of permission (type II); note in this respect also the interesting observation in Aijmer (1972: 95) that the subjunctive (the ‘modern’, reinvented subjunctive particularly frequent in American English) is not possible with promise in PE, witness the ungrammaticality of a sentence like *I promise that I do it. The hypothesis that the subjunctive, and hence the to-infinitive, which competes with it, is not informative enough is supported by the fact that the ratio of modals to subjunctives is far higher with commissives in Old English than with any other type of ‘control’ verb.

Before we go on to the actual figures, we will first briefly discuss the rise of the modal verbs in the complement of ‘control’ verbs. So far we have subsumed under the term ‘subjunctive clause’ not only clauses in which the verb has distinct subjunctive morphology, but also those where subjunctives would be expected (because the clause depends on a desire or command) but where the actual form is indistinguishable from an indicative because subjunctive and indicative endings have fallen together (‘neutralized forms’ in López Couso and Mendez Naya 1996). The use of modals is on the increase in OE as an alternative expression of the subjunctive, but modals are still used in their own right in OE rather than as a substitute for eroded subjunctive endings (ibid.).
Modal verbs are primarily used for clearer and more concrete expression of the required nuance of volition, permission, or obligation that the situation demands (cf. Standop 1957: 169: ‘ein Bestreben zur “Verdeutlichung”; ‘a striving for clarification’).

This explains why there are great differences between individual verbs in the ratio of subjunctives to modal verbs. Ogawa (1989) notes that the wider the range of meanings a verb allows, the greater the need for modals. Bebeodan with its many meanings requires motan in the subclause to bring out the meaning ‘offer’ rather than ‘command’. Verbs like deman and scirian, which also admit of a variety of nuances, similarly show a greater incidence of modals (Ogawa 1989: 155). Biddan appears to require motan to identify its specialized meaning of ‘pray’ in 〈Mald 87, 262〉 (ibid. 163). The complement clause after three-place verbs like aliefan, where the ratio of modal periphrasis to simple form is fifty–fifty (28 versus 27 instances respectively in Ogawa’s corpus) and the modal of choice is motan, appears to show a modal when the subject is animate (or at least felt to be animate, e.g. sawol, mod) and a simple form when it is inanimate, e.g. 〈GuthA 407〉 (ibid. 158). Ogawa suggests that this points to the strongly permissive sense of the modal and points out the contrast between verbs like polian and pafian, which are never followed by a modal ‘presumably because these verbs have to do with suffering and assenting rather than permitting as such’, and aliefan, which is never followed by a simple form (ibid. 157). Sculan in the bebeodan-group is restricted in poetry and prose to God’s commandments; other commandments are expressed by the simple form (ibid. 170, 175). There are marked differences between genres and also between individual writers; sculan is a particular favourite of Ælfric’s and its high incidence after the bebeodan-group in his homiletic writings (58 out of a total of 63 modals after bebeodan-verbs) may be due to the tendency in both the early and the later prose to use sculan to express general announcements of Christian duties, whereas he seems to reserve motan after these same verbs for ecclesiastical ordinances and for commands issued by secular powers (ibid. 202–4). In all, full equivalence between subjunctive form and modal periphrasis appears not to be reached until c. 1350 (see e.g. López Couso and Mendez Naya 1996).

Ogawa’s figures for the overall incidence of modals in what he calls ‘dependent desires’, i.e. finite complements after ‘control’ verbs, appear in Table 6.1.

The ‘simple form’ includes indicative, subjunctive, and ambiguous forms. In contrast, his figures for the commissives beotian, behatan, gehatan, and swerian in his corpus are given in Table 6.2. My own figures for behatan in the first 19 segments of the Toronto corpus are similar (see Table 6.3).
The higher figure for *behatan* could be due to the fact that this verb appears to be a later substitute for *gehatan* and only becomes frequent in late OE, when the overall figures become higher, although Ogawa’s careful teasing apart of the figures in the various genres shows that there is not that much difference between earlier and later prose.

A further indication that the modals are needed expressly to disambiguate the three commissive types is the fact that one commissive, *(a)*swerian, is a notable exception to the general trend in that it occurs robustly with the simple form. Ogawa speculates that this is because *(a)*swerian only allows one type of commissive, ‘to undertake to do (or refrain from) an action’ (Ogawa 1989: 167, quoting Bosworth and Toller 1882), i.e. our type I. The preference for

---

**Table 6.1. Overall incidence of modals in dependent desires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>genre</th>
<th>modal verb</th>
<th>simple form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poetry</td>
<td>95 (27.5%)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prose pre-900</td>
<td>242 (17.5%)</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prose post-900</td>
<td>386 (19.6%)</td>
<td>1,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ogawa (1989: 150, 171, 199, 232).*

**Table 6.2. Incidence of modals after commissives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>genre</th>
<th>modal verb</th>
<th>simple form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poetry</td>
<td>14 (45%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prose pre-900</td>
<td>47 (73%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prose post-900</td>
<td>69 (69%)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Table 6.3. Incidence of modals after *behatan* in the Toronto Corpus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of promise</th>
<th>modal verb</th>
<th>simple form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (subject control)</td>
<td>30 <em>(willan)</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (object control)</td>
<td>5 <em>(motan, sculan)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III (state of affairs)</td>
<td>5 <em>(beon, weordan, sculan)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>40 (89%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
the simple form after this verb can then be explained by the fact that this verb only allows commissives of type I so that there is no need for disambiguation.

We conclude, then, that the *to*-infinitive may not have made as much headway after commissives for the same reason that the simple subjunctive is found so rarely with these verbs: neither structure offers enough information to disambiguate the various commissive types.

6.5 Conclusions

The position of the commissives differs from that of other verbs in that they are ditransitive, i.e. they occur with a recipient and a theme, but they do not (in OE) or rarely (in PE) occur with object control constructions. *To*-infinitival complements after these verbs as a rule evince subject control, because of the inherent meaning of commissives: one can make a recipient a promise, but the felicity conditions obtaining with commissives rarely allow for any actions promised on behalf of someone other than the speaker. The recipient will only figure as the executor of the promise if what is promised is a permission, and it is this type that occasionally shows up as an object-controlled infinitive in PE.

The OE material further shows that there are three types of finite complements after these verbs, the third type occurring with an indicative rather than a subjunctive form, and with a subject that cannot be identified as referring to the subject or object of the matrix clause; for these reasons a *to*-infinitive is disallowed as an alternative to this type of clause.

A second reason for the robust survival of the finite clause is that using a *to*-infinitive here would not sufficiently disambiguate the three types. The incidence of modals is far higher in OE after commissives than after other ‘control’ verbs, and the neat patterning of modal selection and the type of commissive suggests that modals add essential semantics to the clause that could not be expressed by a simple subjunctive or a *to*-infinitive.
Part IV
Syntactic Status
The category of the *to*-infinitive

7.1 Introduction

The infinitival marker *to* is homophonous with the preposition *to* and points to a *to*-PP as the most likely origin of the *to*-infinitive. The distribution of the *to*-infinitive originally followed that of the *to*-PP, which is why we find it as purpose adjunct and as goal-argument; we have argued in the previous chapters that its emergence as theme-argument represents an innovation in that the *to*-infinitive in this function no longer follows the *to*-PP but the subjunctive *that*-clause. The *to*-infinitive has an ending in -e in Old English, which can only have been a dative inflection. As the preposition *to* takes a dative in Old English, this is another argument for taking the PP to be the original category of the *to*-infinitive.

We saw in §1.2 that early observations on this etymological origin led to a number of assumptions about the categorial status of the *to*-infinitive in Old English which have surfaced again in more recent works, which argue that if the categorial status of the *to*-infinitive was PP in Old English, there must have been a subsequent category change to IP or CP in Middle English which would explain a number of new developments in the syntax of *to*-infinitives: (i) the emergence of passive *to*-infinitives as in (1), (ii) the emergence of *to*-infinitives containing tense, or perhaps better, aspect (primarily perfective *have*) as in (2), (iii) the emergence of *to*-infinitives with independent negation as in (3), and (iv) the emergence of Exceptional Case-Marking constructions with *to*-infinitives, as in (4). All of these developments are first attested in Middle English:

(1) Hwi ne hihi we forte beon ifulhet? (Kathe, 35.256)

‘Why don’t we hasten to be baptized?’

(2) Efter þt he wende forte habben idon al þt he wilnede. (Julia, 98.42)

‘After that he intended to have done all that he desired.’
Y say to ȝou, to nat swere on al manere (Wyclif, Matthew 5, 34, Van der Gaaf 1933: 15) ‘I say to you, do not swear at all’

hi makeþ ham-zelue to by hyealde foles (Ayenbi, I, 259.477) lit. ‘they make themselves to be considered fools’

These changes have been claimed to follow from a change in the categorial status of the (to-)infinitive from nominal to verbal by Jarad (1997), Kageyama (1992), and Lightfoot (1979): the infinitive in Old English was a noun, to was still a preposition, not simply a semantically-empty infinitival marker, and belonged to a lexical, not a functional, category, and the categorial status of the to-infinitive was that of a prepositional phrase. The claim is that the categorial change from noun to verb meant that the to-infinitive was reanalysed as a clause, with a subject position (hence the development of the ECM-construction) and positions for tense and negation (hence the appearance of perfective have and independent negation in the to-infinitival complement).

The fascinating change from a lexical category (P⁰) to a functional category (say, T⁰ for abstract tense) could be a showcase of grammaticalization, especially because the various historical stages of English are so well documented, with texts going back more than a thousand years. There is an immense amount of running text in Old English, c. two million words, with productive peaks in two periods: the textual output generated by the efforts of King Alfred the Great and the texts of the great homilists, Wulfstan and Ælfric, more than a century later. Comparing the situation of the to-infinitive in these two periods should bring out any ongoing developments in grammaticalization, if there were any. These hopes were further supported by the accepted view that infinitival to in Old English is indeed a preposition.

This chapter examines the evidence in Old English texts for infinitival to being a P. The evidence cited in the literature never includes actual Old English data. Instead, the superficial plausibility of a categorial change from OE to ME is suggested by three different pieces of information. The first of these concerns the etymology of the two infinitives, which we will discuss in §7.2.1; the second concerns evidence from coordinated structures in OE, which rests on the mistaken assumption that only phrases of the same category can be conjoined. This may be a stylistic requirement urged by manuals on text writing, but it is certainly not a UG requirement. The last piece of information concerns evidence from ME rather than OE. ME infinitives exhibit more nominal behaviour than infinitives do today, and this phenomenon has been used to argue that they must have been more nominal still in OE. The problem here is that we do not actually find evidence for this nominal behaviour in OE. In
fact, infinitival to behaves in a markedly different way from prepositional to in OE, and OE learners cannot have analysed it as a P.

The conclusion of this chapter is that the traditional assumption is untenable. The categorial status of OE infinitival to cannot be P; to is already a functional element in Old English. From this it follows that its grammaticalization must be dated before the Old English period, much earlier than is generally assumed in the literature. This means that a change in category cannot be responsible for the changes exemplified in (1)–(4).

7.2 The Old English to-infinitive is not a prepositional phrase

7.2.1 The evidence from etymology

The etymological origin of the infinitival form is usually given as follows:\(^1\)

\[(5)\]

\[
\text{PIE: } ^*\text{bher-o-no-m}
\]

\[
\text{bher- (verb root) } + \text{-o- (thematic vowel) } -\text{no- (nominalizing, derivational affix) } + \text{-m (nom/acc neuter)}
\]

OE form beran 'bear'

The homophony of infinitival to and the preposition to strongly suggests that the to-infinitive once started out as a PP. This PP is usually analysed as consisting of the preposition to, which takes as its complement a bare infinitive to which a dative inflection has been added, as for example in Campbell 1959: 299, §731(f): ‘In West Gmc. other cases (gen., dat., inst.) can be formed from the inf. according to the -ia- declension: of these OE has only the dat. in -enne, used after to’. This analysis is represented by:

\[(6)\]

\[
\text{to berenne}
\]

\[
\text{to (preposition) } + \text{beran (infinitive) } + ^*\text{-ja-}
\]

PG: *to beranjōī

This analysis derives the to-infinitival form from the bare infinitive by the addition of an inflectional suffix, leading to the inescapable conclusion that the categorial status of the two forms is necessarily identical, at least as long as the suffix was still analysed by the language users as inflectional.

There are problems with this account, however. The gemination of -nn- in the infinitival ending points to an earlier *-nj-, i.e. a proto-form belonging to the nominal ja-stems. Jolly observes that it is precisely the presence of

---

\(^1\) I am indebted to the late Dirk Boutkan, then of the Department of Comparative Linguistics of Leiden University, for these etymological data.
an earlier *-nj- that makes a straightforward derivation from the bare infinitive difficult, and this has led many scholars to reject derivation (6) (Jolly 1873: 150–4, quoting Grimm (1870–98 [1819–37], iv. 105) and others). A similar view is expressed by Van Loey, who also regards the to-infinitive as unrelated to the bare infinitive and the result of a separate development:

In t wgm. staat naast de infin. het zgn. gerundium, dat zich voordoet als een verbogen vorm van de infinitief; vgl. b.v. mnl. te vaerne, te lesen(e), te singen(e) (dat.); in oorsprong is het echter een oude já-stam, welks j geminatie van de voorafgaande n veroorzaakte; vandaar misschien dat in ’t mnl. nog meermalen nn geschreven wordt (te lesenne etc.). (’In West Germanic we find in addition to the infinitive the so-called gerund, which at first sight appears to be an inflected form of the infinitive; cf. Middle Dutch te vaerne, te lesen(e), te singen(e) (dat.); in origin, however, it is an old já-stem, the j of which caused gemination of the preceding n, which would explain why we often find forms with nn in Middle Dutch (te lesenne etc.).’) (Van Loey 1970 [1959]: 158)

This analysis of the to-infinitive boils down to the following:

(7) to berenne
    to (preposition) + ber- (verb stem) + -*anja- (derivational suffix) + -*i (dat sg inflection)
    PG: *to beranjōi

On this view, the ja-element is a derivational suffix, which creates a nominalization from a verbal stem; such a derivation is completely on a par with the older development in (5) that resulted in the bare infinitive, and action nouns are in fact the major source of infinitives in IE languages (Beekes 1995: 251). The nominalization takes a dative inflection when in the complement of the preposition to. The nominalization does not necessarily reflect the categorial status of the verb stem from which it derives, since derivational, as opposed to inflectional, processes usually involve a change in category, in this case a change of V to N. The nominative form of this noun would regularly have developed into beren (from *berann, with simplification of the final geminate and fronting of the vowel (umlaut)), which is not attested as an infinitival form.

The etymology suggests two things. (i) The bare infinitive and the to-infinitive are etymologically unrelated. This is important information,

---

2 Jolly’s own hypothesis is that the bare infinitive is derived from the to-infinitive: ‘Mit anderen Worten, das ganze Verhältnis, in welches die bisherige Annahme aus rein chronologische Gründen […] die beiden Hauptformationen des deutschen Infinitivs zu einander setzte, muss umgekehrt werden’ (’In other words, the relationship which has always been assumed to exist between the two main formations of the German infinitive on purely chronological grounds has to be reversed completely.’) (Jolly 1873: 154)
because the assertion of the PP-status of the OE to-infinitive is often, wrongly, based on the status of the bare infinitive, leading to the following vicious circle: the bare infinitive must be of the category N because it occurs as the complement of the preposition to in the to-infinitive; the to-infinitive must be a PP because to takes as its complement the bare infinitive, which is an N. (ii) The to-infinitive was once a PP containing a nominalization of a verb. We have seen that such nominalizations are particularly frequent with OE to-PPs as purpose adjunct (Chapter 2) or goal-argument (Chapter 3), which we have argued to be the two functions which could be expressed by a to-infinitive from its earliest emergence. The etymological evidence, then, makes excellent sense in that it points to the to-infinitive having started out as just such a purposive to-PP. The etymological evidence in itself does not suggest that the to-infinitive was still a PP in OE—for this we need evidence from OE itself, not from its unattested prehistoric stage.

7.2.2 Evidence from conjoined structures
The second piece of evidence traditionally adduced by those who argue for a PP analysis for the to-infinitive is that to-infinitives are occasionally found conjoined with a PP, as in (8) (relevant phrases in bold):

(8) þæt he [...] mihte [...] undon his muð to wisdomes
that he [...] might [...] undo his mouth to wisdom’s
spræcum, and to wurðianne God ⟨ÆHom 16, 184⟩
speech, and to praise God
‘so that he [...] might [...] open his mouth to wisdom’s speech, and to praise God’

It is often assumed that, to quote Kageyama (1992: 97), ‘any reasonable theory of coordination’ requires some sort of parallel structure condition as part of UG. Under that assumption, the conjuncts in (8) point to the to-infinitive being a PP. However, we often find NPs conjoined to CPs in Old English, as in (9) (two NPs conjoined with a CP, relevant constituents in bold), and again in (10), an NP and a CP (also in bold):

(9) þa heafodleahtras sind. mansliht. cyrcbræce. and þæt man
the cardinal-sins are manslaughter sacrilege and that one
oðres mannes wif hæbbe. and leas gewitnys.
other man’s wife has subj and false witness
accessory-to-theft plunder covetousness idle boast pride
anda. and singal oferdrenc. hæðengylp.
envy and perpetual drunkenness idolatry
drycræft (ÆCHom II 45, 344.279)
witchcraft
‘the cardinal sins are manslaughter, sacrilege, and that one has another
man’s wife, and false witness; accessory to theft, plunder, covetousness,
idle boasting; pride, envy, and perpetual drunkenness, idolatry,
witchcraft’

(10) Symle þu tæhtest milðeortnyssæ and þæt man oðrum
always you teach mercy and that one to-others
milsode (ÆCHom I 4, 68.23)
sows-mercy
‘You always teach mercy, and that one should show mercy to others’

Such examples, and others like it, are often cited as evidence that that-clauses
were more nominal in OE than in later periods; but we know that position-
ally they do not pattern like NPs: they always appear clause-finally, unlike NP
objects. Functionally, too, they do not match the range of NPs: they do not
occur in initial subject position, or in the complement of a preposition, func-
tions typically reserved for NPs. Indeed, these supposedly nominal properties
do not develop until ME. Assuming an NP analysis for CPs on the basis of (9)
or (10) is clearly undesirable, given the very different behaviour of NPs and CPs
in synchronic OE. Conjuncts are apparently not required to be identical in cat-
egory; by itself, instances like (8) cannot be taken as evidence that to-infinitives
were PPs. The solution to such coordinated structures should be found in the
fact that NPs and CPs are each acceptable complements of the matrix verbs in
(9) and (10), just as PPs and to-infinitives are acceptable purpose adjuncts to
the matrix clause in (8).

Consider again example (9). It involves a list, all members of which are NPs,
with one exception: þæt man oðres mannes wif hæbbe ‘that one has another
man’s wife’, which is a description of the mortal sin æwbryce ‘adultery’, an NP
which the writer could easily have used in its stead. In this instance, both the
that-clause in (9) and the NP mansliht ‘manslaughter’ are acceptable comple-
ments to the phrase se heafodleahter is ‘the cardinal sin is’. That-clauses can
indeed appear as subject complement in constructions that explain the mean-
ing of a term, as in Temperantia, þæt is, þæt . . . (ÆLS (Memory of Saints)
314) ‘temperance, that is, that . . . ’ etc. In other words, the fact that the relevant
part of example (9) can be broken down into (11a–b) is apparently sufficient
to make the coordination of CP and NP in (9) well-formed.
(11) a. se heafodleahter is þæt man oðres mannes wif hæbbe
the cardinal-sin is that one another man’s wife has
‘the cardinal sin is that one has another man’s wife’

b. se heafodleahter is mansliht
the cardinal-sin is manslaughter
‘the cardinal sin is manslaughter’

The same is true of examples in which to-infinitives are found coordinated with CPs (e.g. in ⟨GD 1 (H) 4.37.8⟩ and ⟨Or 3 5.59.14⟩): they always occur after verbs that are independently attested with these two structures as their complement. On the basis of such examples, and the one in (8) above, one might perhaps like to argue that the status of the to-infinitive obviously wavers between PP and CP, but such a conclusion inevitably raises more questions than it answers, as the to-infinitive does not behave as a PP in any other respect. A far more reasonable solution is that what is coordinated in such examples, and in (8) and (9), is two CPs, with ellipsis of subject and verb of the second CP under identity. This allows us to maintain the sort of ‘parallel structure condition’ envisaged by Kageyama while at the same time rejecting instances like (8) or (9) as evidence for the categorial structure of CPs or to-infinitives.

Support for such an analysis of coordinated structures can be found in PE. The ‘loose’ coordination of ‘naive’ PE writers, who often produce sentences like (12)–(15), is suspiciously like OE coordination:

(12) Shirley likes to play tennis and watching basketball.
(13) Our personalities are shaped both by heredity and what type of environment we have.
(14) He told me the trip would be delayed but to be ready to start on Friday.
(15) He was quiet and in a serious mood after the talk.

Sentences (12)–(15) have been taken from various writing handbooks in which they are presented as based on genuine student errors in need of correction. If such ‘loose’ coordination apparently has to be educated out of us, (12)–(15) can hardly be described as violations against UG; at most, they violate stylistic conventions. Instances such as (12)–(15) can be accounted for by the analysis outlined above for such coordinations in OE: two conjoined CPs, with subject and verb of the second CP ellipted:

(16) [CP Shirley likes to play tennis] and [CP Shirley likes watching basketball]
Support for this view is provided by the fact that there is a significant difference with respect to the various judgements in normative and descriptive grammars on sentences like (12)–(15). The former urge the writer to make sure both conjoins are identical in form—i.e. category—and function (‘parallelism’, cf. Aaron 1993: 48–9; Dupré 1995: 346; Barnet and Stubbs 1995: 129), whereas the latter note that they may be different in form, as long as they are similar in function. Greenbaum and Quirk, for instance, give the following examples:

(17) The enemy attacked quickly and with great force.
(18) You can wash them manually or by using a machine.
(19) They can call this week or whenever you wish.
(20) Dennis was carefree and in good health. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 278)

Examples (17) and (18) coordinate an adverb and a PP, (19) an NP and a CP, and (20) an adjective and a PP. The function of the coordinated conjuncts is the same, however: adverbial in (17)–(19); predicate in (20). As long as both conjuncts are each well-formed complements with respect to the matrix verb, that seems to be enough to make such a coordination work, both in OE and ‘naive’ PE. I would therefore like to suggest a similar analysis for example (8) above, i.e.:

(21) [CP þæt he mihte undon his muð to wisdomes spræcum] and [CP þæt he mihte undon his muð to wurðianne God]

What is coordinated in (8), then, is not a PP and a to-infinitive, but a pair of clauses, with part of the second conjunct deleted under identity. When to-infinitives are found conjoined with PPs, or that-clauses, or NPs, or bare infinitives in OE, there is, as far as I have been able to make out, almost invariably independent evidence available that the governing verb subcategorizes both for to-infinitives and PPs, or for to-infinitives and that-clauses, or for to-infinitives and NPs, etc. The fact that to-infinitives are found coordinated with PPs cannot be taken as serious evidence that the categorial status of Old English to-infinitives is that of a PP.

Cf. also Booij (1985), who reports similar instances of coordinated morphemes, as in Dutch wis-en natuurkunde ‘mathematics and physics’, lit. ‘certain and nature-knowledge’. The conjuncts do not have the same syntactic status: wis can only be an adjective, whereas natuur is a noun. Such instances should not be analysed as the coordination of parallel structure, but as ‘gapping’, a process similar to my analysis (21): wis kunde en natuurkunde.
7.2.3 Evidence from nominal behaviour of Middle English infinitives

The last piece of information that adds to the superficial plausibility of the idea of a categorial change is the fact that the to-infinitive is seen to behave more like a noun in Middle English than in later periods, when the gerund comes to be used exclusively for many of the functions that were earlier performed by to-infinitives. In (22), for instance, we find the to-infinitive used as predicate:

(22) þe zeuend stape is to loki mesure ine mete and ine
the seventh step is to maintain moderation in food and in
drine (Ayenbi I 260.486)
drink
‘the seventh step is to maintain moderation in food and in drink’

This use has often been taken as evidence of nominal behaviour (although predicates can be expressed by categories other than NP).

To-infinitives are found in the complement of prepositions, as in (23):

(23) Hit seið in Vitæ patrum ðat at sume sal waren ðe hali
faderes to-gedere igadered, and waren spekinde betwen hem
on hwiliche wise me mihte rihtist and sikerest to gode
cumen. Sum sade: þurh fasten, sum: þurh wacchen, […] sum
sade: ðurh seke menn to lokin (Vices and Virtues, Holthausen
1921 [1967]: 93; c. 1200)
‘It says in Vitæ Patrum that the holy fathers were gathered together in a
hall, and were talking amongst themselves about what way one would
be most likely and certain to come to God. Some said: through fasting,
some: through sleep-deprivation, […] some said: through looking
after sick people’

Other examples of nominal behaviour in ME to-infinitives can be found in

It was observed in §1.2 that most authors assume a direct link between
nominal behaviour in Middle English and the etymological origins of both
the inflected and the uninflected infinitive, as if there is a straightforward
progression from fully nominal in prehistoric times to fully verbal in
Present-day English. Although the idea of a categorial change in ME has
obvious attractions, the facts do not support such an account in any obvi-
ous way. The only behaviour of the OE bare infinitive that can be argued to be
nominal is its position with respect to its governing verb. Bare infinitives may
both follow or precede their governing verb, much like a governed object NP,
and at much the same rate (see below, Tables 7.2 and 7.4). In all other respects it is fully verbal: it does not appear in typically nominal functions like subject or object of a preposition, not even of the preposition to; we saw in §7.2.1 that the verbal form inside a to-infinitive is not a bare infinitive but represents a separate development.

We will see in the rest of §7.2 that infinitival to does not behave like a preposition.

7.2.4 Infinitival to inseparable from the infinitive

Although infinitival to has its origins in the preposition with which it is homophonous, it differs from a genuine preposition in two respects by the time of historical OE. The first one is that genuine prepositions are not required to be immediately adjacent to the heads of their complements, witness the to-PP in (24) in which P is separated from the head of its complement by the ‘inherited’ object þæs hælendes ‘of the Saviour’, which is presumably situated in the specifier of NP (or perhaps DP, following Abney 1987):

(24) Ac se deofol forwyrhte hine sylfne þa ða he tihte þæt
    But the devil ruined him self when he urged the
    folc to þæs hælendes slege ⟨ÆCHom I, 20 292.5⟩
    people to thegen Saviour’sgen murder
    ‘But the devil ruined himself when he urged the people to murder the Saviour’

To-infinitival objects, in contrast, either precede to or follow the infinitive; they cannot intervene between to and the infinitive, and neither can any other material, although this situation will change in ME. Objects are still not allowed to intervene, however.

Any analysis of the English to-infinitive as a PP (e.g. Jarad 1997 for OE, Hyde 2000 for PE) must resort to some sort of stipulation to block objects in that position, in addition to the problem of stipulating that it is only the preposition to that takes an infinitive as complement. Such stipulations would be acceptable if they were offset by generalizations in other areas, e.g. by being able to capture the generation of to-infinitival and dative endings in a single analysis for OE, or the distribution of the to-infinitive for all periods. Such payoffs are difficult to achieve without further stipulations, however, because the infinitival ending does not behave like any other case ending, and neither does the distribution of the to-PP predict that of the to-infinitive. We saw in Chapters 3–6 that the to-infinitive has moved beyond its original distribution even in OE.
7.2.5 The behaviour of the infinitival inflection

The only possible advantage of analysing to-infinitives in OE would be that it allows a generalization with respect to dative endings, as the to-infinitival ending would then be generated by the same mechanism that generates dative endings on regular N-heads in the complements of genuine prepositions. This generalization also obviates the necessity of accommodating two different categories for the preposition to and infinitival to respectively, as it is able to subsume the latter under the same analysis as the former.

This advantage is, however, completely offset by the problem that the infinitival ending behaves very differently from the productive inflection on genuine N-heads. Genuine prepositions may or may not drop the preposition in a second conjunct; for example, of all 222 instances of conjoined PPs with mid ‘with’ in the works of Ælfric, 117 show pattern (25a), and 105 pattern (25b). Genuine prepositions can assign case to two conjoined Ns:

(25) a. to N + e and N + e  
    b. to N + e and to N + e

Two conjoined to-infinitives, however, always need to repeat the to-element:

(26) a. *to V + e and V + e 
    b. to V + e and to V + e

The two exceptions offered by Jarad which look like an example of (26a) have been taken straight from Visser. One of them occurs in a Bede ms (⟨Bede 1 15.62.5⟩) where the other mss all have a second to (Miller 1963 [1898]: 457) and is therefore most likely to be a scribal error, or an instance similar to the second exception, (27), where to cyðenne & secgenne translates a single Latin verb, referre ‘report’:

(27) þa þæt þa ða broðor gesawon, þa wæron hie swiðe when that then the brothers saw, then were they very forhte gewordne, & ða efestton ðæm biscope to afraid become, and then hastened to-the bishop to

---

4 Instances of conjoined mid-PPs are far more frequent than instances of conjoined to-PPs, which is why I give figures for mid rather than to. With conjoined to-PPs the absolute figures are much lower, but the proportion is the same (50–50).
The practice of glossing a single word twice is typical of OE glosses, but even glosses rarely drop to in the second conjunct while leaving the -ne ending intact; only 5 out of a total of 31 coordinations in glosses in the Toronto Corpus drop the second to. Examples (26) and (27) are too similar to glossing practices to be taken as representative of genuine OE.

The question arises how the OE language learner could acquire a grammar in which a to-infinitive is a to-PP. What clues were actually available to him? There are no clues that the verb form inside the to-infinitival structure is a noun, as the rest of the paradigm (i.e. nominative, genitive, accusative case) is missing, and even if the learner reanalyses this verb form as a bare infinitive, this offers no further clues to a nominal analysis: neither bare nor to-infinitives show any nominal features.

7.2.6 Evidence from internal structure

Both bare and to-infinitives are V-heads and assign accusative case to their objects, and do not occur with ‘inherited’ objects in the genitive or in an of-phrase, like the N-head within the to-PP in (24), or with determiners, demonstrative pronouns, or any other typical modifiers of N-heads. The objects of both bare and to-infinitives are invariably proper objects with the case assigned by the verb, which is most often accusative—a V-head characteristic. The difference between the nominal complement of the preposition to and the infinitival complement of the to element is illustrated in (28) and (29); (28) is an example of a genuine purposive to-PP complementing an adjective in the C ms of Gregory’s Dialogues, whereas (29) is the revised
version of (28) in the later H ms (for more details on these mss see §7.4.1 below). The PP contains a nominalization, *gereordunge*, of the verb *gereordan* ‘nourish’, ‘rear’ with an ‘inherited’ object *þæs lichaman* ‘of the body’ in the genitive. The same object appears as structural object of the *to*-infinitive with accusative case in (28): *þone lichaman* ‘the body *acc*’. The relevant structures appear in bold.

(28) eall swa hwæt swa mihton beon gesewene lustfullice *to þæs lichaman gereordunge* (GD 13.129.5, C)  
body nourishment  
‘everything which might appear desirable for the body’s nourishment’

(29) eall swa hwæt swa mihton beon gesewene lustfullice *þone lichaman mid to gereordianne* (GD 13.129.5, H)  
body with to nourish  
‘everything which might appear desirable to nourish the body with’

Note that the requirement of strict adjacency of *to* and the following infinitive is very evident in (29): in the finite counterpart of the relative clause, the stranded preposition *mid* ‘with’ would be required to be immediately adjacent to the verb (*pe man þone lichaman mid gereorde*), and the same is true for the verb in non-finite relative clauses; but *to* is such an integral part of the verb that *mid* cannot intervene, and the strict adjacency of *mid* and verb means in this case that *mid* appears to the left of *to* (the same facts hold in Dutch; see Bennis 1986: 280).

The same difference between V-heads and N-heads shows up with PE- *ing*-forms, where we find a nominal type with a determiner and an ‘inherited’ object in an *of*-phrase, and a verbal type without determiner but with a proper object (both of the following examples from Wasow and Roeper 1972: 45):

(30) The killing of his dog upset John. (noun)
(31) Killing his dog upset John. (verb)

We do not even find any mixed forms in OE, on a par with the following Modern Dutch example where the bare infinitive is an N-head—there is a determiner—but with preservation of much of its internal V-structure, including an adjunct and an argument which are also in the positions they
would be in with unambiguous V-heads, i.e. to the left of V:

(32) het drie keer per dag de hond moeten uitlaten
    the three times a day the dog must-INF out-let-INF
    ‘having to let out the dog three times a day’

Modern Dutch shows that interesting hybrids are possible in which the inherited object may appear in an of-phrase, leaving the rest of the verbal syntax intact (examples from Hoekstra 1997):

(33) a. (hij zag dat) ik de aardappelen met een mesje schilde (verb)
    (he saw that) I the potatoes with a knife peeled

   b. het de aardappelen met een mesje schillen (nominalization)
      the the potatoes with a knife peeling

   c. het met een mesje schillen van de aardappels (hybrid)
      the with a knife peeling of the potatoes

An N-head is not a ‘structural governor’ (in Kayne’s terminology; Kayne 1981) and cannot assign structural (accusative) case; this explains why arguments of N appear either in the genitive or in an of-phrase (as in (33c)). Instances like (32) and (33) are not easy to analyse—we are dealing with a V-head, but at what level of the analysis? If the internal syntax could be argued to survive by means of some sort of incorporation mechanism, such incorporations could either have taken place at the level of the verb stem, or at a later stage of the derivation. The first hypothesis is unlikely because such incorporations are not possible with other suffixes apart from -en. The second hypothesis, i.e. that the -en ending, as an inflectional suffix, first builds an infinitive that is still a V-head (as inflection it may attach to any verb stem and will not be category-changing), and as such is able to build a clause; then incorporation takes place, after which the entire complex slots into the complement of a determiner (a D-head; term due to Abney 1987), as if it has acquired an N-shell. The alternative, hybrid [+V, +N]-heads (as proposed in Zubizaretta and van Haaften 1988) probably leads to more problems than it solves.⁶

⁵ There is cross-linguistic variation here, even among closely related languages. The evidence from Gaeta (1997) indicates that a structure like (32) is not possible in German, which only allows incorporations in the strictest sense: Das Gewald Anwenden ‘using violence’. For German, see also Abraham (1989).

Whatever the analysis of these mixed forms may be, not a trace of them is found in OE, where both infinitives, bare and to-, fail to occur with determiners or ‘inherited objects’, and must be analysed as V-heads.

7.2.7 Positional evidence against a PP-analysis

The position of the to-infinitive in the clause is also not comparable to that of an ordinary PP. Argument-PPs, like argument-NPs, may either precede or follow the matrix verb in OE. Table 7.1 shows the position of to-infinitives and to-PPs as the complement of the verbs of persuading and urging, the environment in which the to-infinitive shows the greatest distributional overlap with the PP with to, as we saw in Chapter 3. The to-PP occurs freely to the left (as in (34)) and to the right (as in (35)) of the matrix verb. The to-infinitive, however, invariably occurs to the right (as in (36)). The governing verb is the same in all three examples: niedan ‘urge’, ‘force’, and the relevant structures are in bold type:

(34) Gif hwa to hwædrum þissa genied sie
    if anyone to either of-these forced be
    on woh (LawAf 1, 1-1.1)
    unjustly
    ‘If anyone is forced to either of these unjustly’

(35) On þæm dagum Valentinianus geniedde eft þa Seaxan to
    On those days Valentinianus forced again the Saxons to
    hiera agnum lande (Or 6 33.152.1)
    their own land
    ‘In those days Valentinian forced the Saxons back again to their own
    country’

(36) ða eaðmodan […] weorðen geniedde hiera unðeawas to
    the humble […] besubj forced their faults to
    herianne (CP 41.302.18)
    praise
    ‘the humble […] would be forced to praise their faults’

The single case of a pre-verbal to-infinitive in Table 7.1 occurs in ⟨LS 23 (Mary of Egypt)⟩, a slavish translation of which Skeat comments: ‘The text generally is extremely corrupt, and abounds with grammatical errors’ (Skeat 1966 [1881–1900]: 446). The text has other examples of strange uses of infinitives that are not found in more reliable translations but directly reflect the Latin original (Los 1999: 151). The attestation in Table 7.1 is no different in that the order of finite verb and to-infinitive is exactly that of the Latin original,
Table 7.1. Position of *to*-PPs (spatial and purposive) and *to*-infinitives as goal-arguments in the Toronto Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>complement</th>
<th>$V_{\text{fin}} - to X$</th>
<th>$to X - V_{\text{fin}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>to</em>-PP</td>
<td>373 (59%)</td>
<td>259 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>to</em>-infinitive</td>
<td>50 (98%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and therefore says nothing about genuine OE syntax. It seems, then, that *to*-infinitives are obligatorily clause-final.

These results are not at all what we would expect if the categorial status of the *to*-infinitive in OE is that of a PP. Nor can the difference in position between the two infinitives be accounted for by adopting the position that the *to*-infinitive can remain in situ because it is already case-marked by the ‘preposition’ *to*. The hypothesis that the distribution of *to* can be explained on the basis of case crops up again and again in the literature (e.g. Nunes 1993) but is untenable because *to*-infinitives, as we have seen throughout Chapters 3–6, occur as object and theme-argument. If *to*-infinitives remain in situ because they are already case-marked by *to*, we would also expect genuine *to*-PP arguments to remain in situ. Table 7.1 shows that they do not.

Jarad suggests that ‘[t]he OE *to*-infinitive has more internal structure than typical PPs (and NPs which also appear in either pre-verbal or post-verbal position (cf. Pintzuk 1996)). The heavier the complement, i.e. the more internal structure it has, the more likely it is to appear post-verbally’ (Jarad 1997: 51). But work done so far on heavy constituent shift in OE does not suggest that it is motivated by more extensive internal structure, but by syllable length, or possibly by extra-syntactic (discourse) factors (e.g. Pintzuk and Kroch 1989 and Pintzuk 1996). The findings of Table 7.1 are not compatible with a motivation that is captured by varying degrees of probability, as appears to be the case with heavy constituent shift; the *to*-infinitive categorically appears in clause-final position, not only after the verbs of persuading and urging, but also as we will see in Table 7.2 after the intention verbs. This clearly suggests a syntactic trigger, not a motivation depending on surface or discourse factors.

The positional contrast between genuine PPs and *to*-infinitives is confirmed by the position of *to*-infinitives in the complement of verbs other than those of persuading and urging. We saw in Chapter 4 that both infinitives may appear as theme-argument after a subset of the intention verbs. There is, however, a significant contrast between the bare and the *to*-infinitive after these verbs in that the bare infinitive frequently precedes its governing verb, as in (37),
The category of the to-infinitive

Table 7.2. The order $V_{\text{INF}} - V_{\text{fin}}$ with intention verbs in the Toronto Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>complement</th>
<th>$V_{\text{fin}} - V_{\text{INF}}$</th>
<th>$V_{\text{INF}} - V_{\text{fin}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bare infinitive</td>
<td>144 (63%)</td>
<td>85 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-infinitive</td>
<td>297 (99.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whereas this is extremely rare in the case of to-infinitives, where the canonical word order is, again, clause-final (e.g. (38)). The infinitives are given in bold:

(37) he him næfre forlætan ne þenceð ⟨Boeth 35.103.17⟩
    he them never leave not thinks
    ‘he intends never to leave them’

(38) Esau ᵈin broðor þe δencð to ofsleanė ⟨Gen 27.42⟩
    Esau thy brother thee intends to kill
    ‘Your brother Esau intends to kill you’

The relevant figures appear in Table 7.2.

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 clearly show that the to-infinitive almost invariably appears in clause-final position. It is not only as argument, but also as adjunct that we find the to-infinitive in this position; the few exceptions reflect, in most cases, the word order in a Latin source. The only example of a preposed (adjunct) to-infinitive in the works of Ælfric is ⟨ÆCHom II, 35 264.149⟩.

There is one function in which preposed to-infinitives are more frequent, and that is as predicate (i.e. as complement of wesan ‘to be’). As this to-infinitive differs from the to-infinitive after all other verbs in a number of significant respects, and therefore requires a different analysis, we will devote a separate section to it (see §9.4.5).

The proportion of preposed versus postposed bare infinitives is reminiscent of that of NP objects in OE which may follow or precede the verb. The same contrast as in Table 7.2 has been noted for Modern Dutch by e.g. Koster (1984: 443). In that language, bare-infinitival complements are also found patterning like NP-objects, whereas Dutch om te-infinitives (lit. for to-infinitives) are always extraposed; as they are generally analysed as CPs in Modern Dutch (for the same reasons as are PE to-infinitives in controlled complements), this clause-final position is only to be expected. According to which framework

7 This is particularly evident in the OE Bede. Bede’s own Latin is quite strictly verb-final, so that (adjunct) ad + gerund constructions invariably precede the matrix verb in the Latin text. I found that the OE translation changes c. 75% of these cases into clause-final to-infinitives, which must surely mean that the order to-infinitive–finite verb is marked even in the case of adjuncts. The remaining 25% are left in the original order.
is adopted, CPs are either analysed as being subject to obligatory extraposition (GB) or are not case-marked, and therefore do not require checking and may remain in situ (in an anti-symmetric/minimalist approach in which all languages are analysed as underlyingly VO).

Similar positional findings are reported for Modern Dutch in Van Haaften et al. (1985), who investigated the position of NPs and CPs as subjects of finite clauses and Small Clauses: Dutch nominal bare infinitives can only occur in case-positions and cannot be extraposed, whereas CPs with om te are obligatorily extraposed. CPs, whether finite or non-finite, cannot occur as subjects in OE, so that Van Haaften et al.’s investigation cannot be repeated for OE.

Koster (1984: 445) relates the ability of Dutch infinitival verb complements to receive case despite being V-heads to their morphological shape, and perhaps this is also the most plausible analysis for OE bare infinitives. Bare infinitives would then be V-heads but with some nominal morphological characteristics. This means that their behaviour is more ‘nominal’ than that of to-infinitives, even though they do not exhibit the typical characteristics of a full-blown N-head—i.e. premodification by articles and adjectives—nor ‘inherited’ objects in the genitive or in an of-phrase; neither do they appear in subject position or as the complement of a preposition. As V-heads, they are clausal.

7.2.8 Conclusions
We have seen that the dative inflection, the strict adjacency of to and infinitive, and the internal structure of the to-infinitive all point away from its category being a PP. Neither to- nor bare infinitives show any of the typical features of nominalizations of verbs; they do not occur with determiners or with ‘inherited’ objects in the genitive or in an of-phrase. In a corpus of some 2 million words of running text, containing many thousands of infinitives, we surely should encounter inherited objects with genitive case, if they are possible. In brief, the evidence of the internal structure of both bare and to-infinitives does not point to them being anything other than V-heads.

It is of course theoretically possible to analyse infinitival to as a prepositional clitic and account for the facts presented in §7.2 in this way. My own position is that in the absence of any other prepositional clitics in the language, it is difficult to see how an OE learner could arrive at such an analysis. The dative inflection does not behave like ordinary dative inflections. Neither of the infinitives behaves as N-heads although a positional difference between the two infinitives in Old English could perhaps indicate that bare infinitives pattern positionally like NP-objects. This could mean
that bare infinitives have, at least in this respect, some nominal qualities after all.

Positionally, too, to-infinitives do not pattern like to-PPs. Even when they express the same argument (the goal-argument after verbs of persuading and urging), to-PPs and to-infinitives appear in different positions. To-PPs may precede or follow the final verb, but to-infinitives always follow it. We will suggest in the next chapter that the reason for this difference is that to-infinitives are CPs, i.e. full-blown clauses.

7.3 The Old English to-infinitive is a clause

7.3.1 Introduction

It is clear from the evidence in the previous chapter that the to-infinitive, though originally a purposive to-PP, is no longer a PP in Old English. If it is not a PP, what is its category? We will argue in this section that its category is that of a full-blown clause, a CP. The evidence is distributional, positional, and syntactic. We conclude this section with qualitative and quantitative evidence that the to-infinitive starts to compete with the subjunctive clause in late OE, which shows that these structures have become functionally equivalent, as if the to-infinitive has become a non-finite alternative to the subjunctive clause.

7.3.2 The distribution of the to-infinitive

The to-infinitive must originally have been a special case of a purposive PP, a to-PP in which the preposition to takes a nominalization of a verb as its complement. Such non-spatial, purposive to-PPs occur in the following contexts in Old English:

(i) as purpose phrase
(ii) as the complement of a limited number of nouns (e.g. anweald ‘power’, tima ‘time’) and adjectives
(iii) as goal-argument of verbs of urging and persuading

The purposive to-PP is one of three categories that are regularly found as the expression of purpose adjuncts and goal-arguments; the other two are the to-infinitive and the subjunctive that-clause. Examples of the three complements in environments (i) and (iii) were presented in the previous chapters; examples of (ii) are illustrated in (39), with the adjective gearu ‘ready’; a purposive to-PP in (39a) (campe ‘battle’ is related to the verb campian ‘fight’), a subjunctive that-clause in (39b), and a to-infinitive in (39c); the relevant structures appear
in bold:

(39) a. he wæs anræd ellenweorces, [!] gearo [!] to Godes
campe.  ⟨And 230⟩
he was resolute brave-deedgen, [!] ready [!] to God’s
battle
‘he was resolute for the brave deed, ready for God’s battle’

b. ic eom sona  gearo þæt ic gange to minum
I am at-once ready that I goSUBJ to my
discipulum  ⟨LS 1.1(Andrew Bright) 306⟩
disciples
‘I am now ready to go to my disciples’

Ic beo sona  gearu to adreoganne þæt ðu [. . .] deman
I am at-once ready to bear what you [. . .] decide
wille  ⟨And 70⟩
will
‘I am now ready to bear what you will decide’

Although these environments must represent the original distribution of the to-infinitive in earlier times, it has spread in Old English to contexts that never occurred with a purposive to-PP, i.e. THEME-argument of the INTENTION verbs (Chapter 4) and the verbs of commanding and permitting (Chapter 5). If we look at the overall figures for all verbs that are attested with a to-infinitive (Table 7.3), we find that 109 verbs (both subject and object control) are attested with a to-infinitive, but only 28 of them (26%) also occur with a to-PP (this figure includes spatial to-PPs).

Various attempts have been made in the past to account for the distribution of the two infinitives in OE after individual verbs. The overall verdict appears to be that the two infinitives are in free variation and that their distribution defies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semantic group</th>
<th>(1) to-inf (= N)</th>
<th>(2) that</th>
<th>(3) to-PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbs of persuading and urging (see Chapter 3)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs of INTENTION (Chapter 4)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs of commanding and permitting (Chapter 5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sum of columns (2) and (3) can exceed (1) because many verbs take both complements.
The category of the to-infinitive (see the review of previous work in Mitchell 1985: §§723ff.). As soon as the subjunctive *that*-clause is included in the equation, the distribution of the to-infinitive is accounted for: it matches the distribution of the *that*-clause. The match cannot be perfect because we are dealing with corpus data, so there are some verbs with very few attestations which cannot show the full range of their possible complementation patterns. The ragged edges of the match all involve infrequently attested verbs. Those of the intention verbs and the verbs of persuading and urging which do not occur with a *that*-clause are quite rare (five attestations or fewer in the Toronto Corpus; see above, Chapters 3 and 4) and the same is true of those verbs which occur with a subjunctive *that*-clause but not with a to-infinitive.

The to-infinitive apparently came to be analysed as the non-finite alternative to the subjunctive *that*-clause. This must have happened after the category change of N to V, as we will argue in the next chapter. When the to-infinitive had become a non-finite subjunctive, it started to spread to subjunctive contexts other than the purposive/goal environments of (i)–(iii), and started to follow the distribution of the finite subjunctive. This is why the only construction that matches the distribution of the to-infinitive as verb complement in OE is the subjunctive *that*-clause.

If we look at the distribution of the to-infinitive in the domain of grammatical functions, we find a match there, too. OE *that*-clauses (subjunctive or otherwise) do not occur in typical NP-positions such as subject position, or as the complement of a preposition; and neither do to-infinitives. When *that*-clauses start to occur in such positions in Middle English, to-infinitives do so, too—hence the more ‘nominal’ behaviour of to-infinitives in Middle English discussed in §7.2.3 above. The ME example (40), in which the to-infinitival phrase occurs as subject complement, is matched almost word for word by (41), an example from the same text, with a subjunctive clause in the same position (relevant structures in bold):

(40) þe zeuend stape is to loki mesure ine mete and ine drinke
    the seventh step is to maintain moderation in food and in drink
    (Ayenbi I 260.486)

(41) þe zixte stape of temperance and of sobrete is þet
    the sixth step of temperance and of sobriety is that
    ech loki guode mesur ine his
    each maintainsubj good moderation in his
contenance (Ayenbi I 260.486)
countenance
‘the sixth step of temperance and of sobriety is that each should maintain good moderation in his countenance’

ME to-infinitives are indeed more ‘nominal’ than PE to-infinitives, but the point is that they are also more nominal than OE to-infinitives. In this respect their behaviour simply followed that of the subjunctive that-clause, which started to realize grammatical functions which earlier had been the exclusive domain of NPs.

How relevant is this distributional match between to-infinitive and subjunctive clause as evidence of the category of the to-infinitive? Selectional properties of the matrix verb are often argued to be syntactically represented in the C-head of the selected clause (e.g. Stowell 1981); if the same matrix verb may select either a finite complement (the subjunctive that-clause) or a non-finite complement (the to-infinitive) and these two complements can be seen to be semantically equivalent but differ only in finiteness, speakers’ grammars could make sense of their data by analysing both structures as containing a C-head with the same selectional features.

7.3.3 Positional evidence from objects
To-infinitives differ positionally from to-PPs and bare infinitives in that they are always clause-final, as we saw in Tables 7.1 and 7.2. Full-blown CPs as a rule extrapose in OE, and if to-infinitives show up in that same position, this is accounted for if they, too, are full-blown CPs.

If to-infinitives are CPs, and the non-finite counterpart of subjunctive that-clauses, one would expect the rates at which objects follow or precede their governing verbs to be roughly the same for both. Pintzuk (2002: 287) reports an overall rate of 36.6% post-verbal full NP-objects in OE. A count of the rates of NP objects preceding or following (argument) to-infinitives with subjunctive (argument) clauses (with genuine subjunctives, not combinations of modal + bare infinitives) in the first ten segments of the Toronto Corpus for three intention verbs, i.e. wilnian ‘want’, giernan ‘desire’, hogian ‘intend’, two verbs of persuading and urging, i.e. manian ‘admonish’ and niedan ‘urge’, and one verb of commanding, i.e. bebeodan ‘command’, yields a similar rate (32%).

Table 7.4 compares this rate to that at which objects of to-infinitives appear pre- and post-verbally in these same segments after these same verbs. The to-infinitival figures exclude cases in which the infinitival object appears to the left of the matrix verb (scrambling) or in any other derived position (topicalization, wh-movement). It does include a number of instances in
which the status of the NP is ambiguous (either an object of the matrix verb or an object of the infinitive, i.e. the structural ambiguity observed by Bock and discussed in §§4.3.3 and 5.3); for this reason, I expected the frequency of the OV-order with to-infinitives to come out slightly higher than that of the finite clauses. However, the proportions came out exactly the same.

It would appear, then, that object position in to-infinitival and finite subjunctive clauses is determined by the same processes, and that object positions in to-infinitival clauses do not require special mechanisms to derive them.

7.3.4 Evidence from to-infinitival relatives

A further clue to the CP-status of to-infinitives involves to-infinitival relatives with preposition stranding. P-stranding in OE involves only movement of a prepositional object to an A′-position, i.e. there are no prepositional passives (Allen 1977, 1980). The facts of P-stranding are summarized by Van Kemenade (1987: 152–3) as follows: when there is an overt relative pronoun in SpecCP, we always find pied-piping, unless that overt element is a personal pronoun or an R-pronoun, in which case the preposition can be stranded. When there is no overt element in SpecCP—as in infinitival relatives, þe relatives, and tough movement constructions—preposition stranding is obligatory. Examples of P-stranding in to-infinitival constructions are (41) and (42):

(42) & he [... ] wæpn gegrap mid to
and he [... ] weapon seized with to
campienne ⟨LS 12(NatJnBapt) 103⟩
fight
‘and he [... ] grabbed a weapon to fight with’

(43) þone seofðan heofon he geworhte him sylfum on to
the seventh heaven he made him self in to
sittenne ⟨HomS 27, 35⟩
sit
‘the seventh heaven he made for himself to sit in’
The fact that there is no overt *wh*-element in SpecCP in the case of this second group of constructions has led some scholars to posit two different relativization strategies, with non-finite and finite relatives being assigned separate analyses: finite relatives as instances of *wh*-movement, and non-finite relatives as instances of deletion under identity (Allen 1976; Bresnan 1976; see also Grimshaw 1975 for ME). In such analyses movement out of a PP is impossible in OE.

Analyses that unify the two constructions (pied-piping and P-stranding) were first proposed by Vat (1978) and van Riemsdijk (1978) and further built on by van Kemenade (1987). They involve clitic pronouns that are either deleted after movement (see e.g. Vat) or are null to begin with (see e.g. van Kemenade). The facts of the distribution of the two types fall out naturally if the empty SpecCP position of infinitival relatives and *tough* movement constructions is assumed to be occupied by this pronoun. As only clitic elements can move out of PPs, this accounts for the fact that we find P-stranding in the *to*-infinitival cases; this movement is in fact obligatory because the *φ*-features of the null clitic need to be identified (van Kemenade 1987: 164–71).

Whether *to*-infinitival relatives are the result of *wh*-deletion or *wh*-movement, and whether the non-overt element is a null clitic-pronoun or an empty Operator (as in the analysis in Haegeman 1984: 468–70, in turn based on Epstein 1984), the fact remains that all of these analyses require a SpecCP position to host the (null) relative pronoun or empty *wh*-operator. This means (as is also observed in Van Kemenade 1992: 148) that these *to*-infinitives must be analysed as CPs.

Analysing such clauses on a par with finite relatives accounts for the fact that stranded Ps occupy a fixed position in both, namely strictly adjacent to the verb. The only exceptions are infinitival *to* and the negative *ne*, but they are clitics on the verb.⁸

---

⁸ Cf. (41), here repeated as (i), with its (reconstructed) finite counterpart, (ii), and their Dutch translations:

(i) *wæpn mid to campienne*
   
   weapon with to fight
   
   Du: *een wapen om mee te vechten*
   
   a weapon for with to fight
   
   ‘a weapon to fight with’

(ii) *ðæt wæpn ðe he mid campode*
   
   the weapon which he with fought
   
   Du: *het wapen waar hij mee vocht*
   
   ‘the weapon (that) he fought with’
The structural similarities of finite and non-finite relatives, then, lend further support to a CP-analysis for at least some to-infinitives.

7.3.5 Scrambling: evidence against CP status?

OE examples like the following could be offered against CP-status:

(44) and þæt gefremede man gewilnode to bedigianne. ⟨ApT 1.14⟩
and that committed crime wanted to conceal.
‘and wanted to conceal the crime he had committed.’

The infinitival object þæt gefremede man appears to have been scrambled out of the infinitival phrase. If the infinitival phrase is indeed a CP one would not expect to be able to scramble any material out of it, and example (44) could therefore constitute a serious objection to a CP analysis.

The same phenomenon is exhibited by Dutch te-infinitival phrases, however, as observed by Koster (1984). Significantly, the complementizer om, which is usually available as an option for such Control complements, is impossible once material has scrambled out:

(45) a. Hij zei dat hij probeerde (om) de tafel te herstellen.
He said that he tried for the table to repair.
‘He said that he tried to repair the table.’

b. Hij zei dat hij (*om) de tafel probeerde te herstellen.

c. Hij zei dat hij de tafel (*om) probeerde te herstellen.

d. Hij zei dat hij de tafel probeerde (*om) te herstellen.

The ‘intact’ to-infinitival phrase in clause-final position in (45a) is a CP, and therefore has a position for om in C. Koster opts for an analysis of cases like (45b–c) as reduced CPs (i.e. IPs), which do not have a C position because the CP-node has been ‘pruned’. Scrambling can only take place out of such reduced clauses, and it is this which accounts for the ungrammaticality of om in (45b–c): the relative positions of infinitival object and finite verb indicate that scrambling has taken place and that we are dealing with reduced clauses without a C-position for om. A similar analysis for the OE to-infinitive would entail that ‘intact’ to-infinitives, i.e. to-infinitives without scrambling, should be analysed along the lines of (45a), whereas the to-infinitive in (44) may well be an reduced clause, as in Koster’s analysis of (45b–c). It is true that even ‘intact’ to-infinitives never appear with an overt complementizer in OE; but they do very soon afterward, in eME
For ‘for’ is the exact counterpart of Dutch om here, and occupies C.

An IP analysis for instances like (44) has consequences for the analysis of PRO and the PRO theorem (Chomsky 1981), according to which the conflicting binding requirements of the feature configuration of PRO as [+pronominal, +anaphoric] bars PRO from occurring in governed positions. As an IP is not a barrier for government in Chomsky’s sense (1986), PRO would not be licensed in such a position. Other analyses have been proposed for PRO, e.g. PRO as a wholly [+anaphoric] element (Bennis and Hoekstra 1989b), or the ‘anaphoric AGR’ analysis of Borer (1989), or PRO as [+pronominal] in some contexts but [+anaphoric] in others (Koster 1984), or as wholly [+pronominal] (Petter 1998). Minimalist accounts dispense with the notion of government altogether and propose a case-checking account of PRO (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, 1995), so that the barrier-hood of CP or IP becomes irrelevant. A discussion of the relative merits of these accounts is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that (44) does not constitute a serious objection to the analysis of the OE to-infinitive as a CP in light of the Dutch facts.

7.3.6 Conclusions

Analysing the to-infinitive as a CP accounts for its obligatory clause-final position, its distribution, and the fact that objects of to-infinitives precede or follow their governing verb at the same rates as objects precede or follow finite subjunctives. Further evidence of CP status is provided by to-infinitival relatives, which pattern with finite relatives and require a SpecCP position, and the emergence of the complementizer for in eME, which could not have arisen in the absence of a C-position.

We will now present evidence that the to-infinitive is in competition with the finite subjunctive clause, and has in effect come to be analysed as a non-finite subjunctive. The evidence is qualitative (a comparison of the two structures in two versions of the same text) and quantitative (a comparison of the relative rates of the two structures in OE and ME subcorpora representing six successive periods). We conclude that the to-infinitive increases at the expense of the
subjunctive *that*-clause rather than at the expense of the bare infinitive, which has always been the traditional position.

### 7.4 *That*-clauses and *to*-infinitives in competition

#### 7.4.1 Evidence from two manuscripts of Gregory’s Dialogues

There is extensive evidence that subjunctive clause and *to*-infinitive start to compete in late Old English. Such competition indicates that the two structures had become functionally identical. The *to*-infinitive was apparently analysed as a non-finite alternative to the subjunctive clause, i.e. as a non-finite subjunctive, further evidence that its status was no longer that of a PP but of a clause containing a V-head, most likely a full-blown CP. Evidence for such competition is found in a comparison of two manuscripts of the OE translation of Gregory’s *Dialogues*.

The earlier manuscript contains Bishop Wærferth’s original translation of the collection of legends about early Italian saints which we now know as *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great*. This translation was undertaken at the instigation of Alfred the Great some time between the early 870s and early 890s and survives most prominently in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 322 (ms C). About a century or a century and a half later, between 950 and 1050, someone produced a revised version of the text (ms H; Yerkes 1982: 9–12). What is unusual about this revision is that it went beyond simple changes in vocabulary and spelling but systematically changed the syntax of the original translation: prepositional phrases replace datives or genitives, subjunctives (rather unexpectedly) replace modal + bare infinitive periphrases, etc. (Yerkes 1982).

How are we to account for these differences between C and H? Yerkes is reluctant to describe the changes as a straightforward diachronic development. The syntax of the revision and that of the original translation differ to a far greater extent than would be expected, given the relatively short lapse of time between the two versions. He discusses a number of other possibilities, e.g. the original translation was perhaps felt by the Reviser to be too close to the Latin original; he immediately adds, however, that this seems unlikely as Wærferth’s translation does not rigidly follow its Latin example either. Many changes take the wording even further away from Gregory’s original text, and still others are just as far away from the Latin as Wærferth’s translation (Yerkes 1982: 10–12). Perhaps Wærferth and the anonymous Reviser spoke different dialects, but there is no external evidence for this (nothing whatever is known about this Reviser). It is also possible that the changes made by the Reviser simply reflect his own stylistic preferences. In general,
the Reviser’s changes in H have the effect of making the text more concise and more tightly structured: coordinated clauses are reworked into subordination structures of various kinds (see the examples in Yerkes, §§44–52). This might be regarded as a general drive from paratactic to hypotactic constructions, perhaps the result of a growing literary tradition. Yerkes concludes that ‘either English syntax—at least as manifested in writing—used to change more rapidly than it does today, or the Reviser thought that Wærferth’s style needed a lot of improving, or both’ (ibid. p. 11). In the end, our best guess must be that at least some of the changes must be indicative of diachronic development.

One of the most striking differences between the C and H versions is that the latter contains considerably more *to*-infinitives. There are 25 *to*-infinitives that the two mss have in common; in addition, C has four *to*-infinitives where H has a different structure (see Appendix III, Table 2); but there are 53 more *to*-infinitives in H than in C, even though only the first two books of the text in the H ms have survived. The majority of these replace one particular structure, and it is not the bare infinitive, the structure usually regarded as the one that is replaced by the *to*-infinitive, as we saw in Chapter 1. In fact, in only three of these 53 cases do we find a bare infinitive in C. First, C *hit ne gewunode naht elles ðencan* ‘it [the unhappy mind] used to think of nothing else’ (⟨GD 4.18⟩) is replaced in H by *hit ne gewunode nan ðing elles to ðenceanne* ‘it used to think of nothing else’ (Yerkes 1982: 33). The other three attestations of a *to*-infinitive in H after this verb, however, replace a subjunctive *that*-clause in C (‘subjunctive *that*-clause’ in the sense defined in §1.6: a clause with a subjunctive form, or ‘neutralized’ subjunctive forms which are ambiguous between subjunctive and indicative but can be expected to be subjunctive because of the putative nature of the clause, and clauses with modals, indicative or subjunctive). Compare (47), from C, with (48), from H:

(47) Dauid, þe gewunade, þæt he hæfde witedomes gast in him ⟨GD 4.40.26, C⟩
    ‘David, who was wont, that he had the spirit of prophecy in him’

(48) Dauid, þe gewunode to hæbbenne witedomes gast on him ⟨GD 4.40.26, H⟩
    ‘David, who was wont to have the spirit of prophecy in him’
In the second case of a *to*-infinitive in H replacing a bare infinitive in C, the Reviser has employed another matrix verb: Wærferth’s *eode* . . . *hladan* ([GD 115.6]) appears in the Revision as *ferde to hladene*. Both *gan* (of which *eode* is the suppletive past tense form) and *feran* are included in the set of verbs of motion and rest discussed in Chapter 2 which could take a bare-infinitival complement indicating simultaneity. The Reviser may have felt that the actions of going and drawing water were consecutive rather than simultaneous, and must have changed the infinitive for that reason. The final example involves an ingressive aspectualizer, *onginnan* ‘begin’; this is in line with the development we discussed in Chapter 4 by which the *to*-infinitive was used to restore the original ingressive meaning which had become bleached when verbs of the *ginnan*-group were complemented by a bare infinitive.

The phenomenon exemplified by (47) and (48) above, with *to*-infinitives in the later ms replacing subjunctive *that*-clauses in the earlier text, is in fact what happens most frequently. Thirty-one of the 53 cases show up as a subjunctive *that*-clause in the older C version, as we see in Table 7.5.

The great majority of these 31 cases involve the intention verbs. Examples are *gewilnian* ((49) and (50) below), *tilian* ([GD 11.125.14]), *wiþsacan* ([GD 10.78.19]), *geteohhian* ([GD 5.52.20]), *forestihhian* ([GD 5.55.32]), and *secan* ([GD 5.44.32]).

(49) *forþon þe he gewilnode, þæt he hæfde lôf & herenesse because that he desired, that he have glory and praise þæs clænan lifes* (GD 8.117.30, C)

‘because he desired that he might have glory and praise for a clean life’

Table 7.5. Structures in C supplanted in H by the *to*-infinitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>function of <em>to</em>-infinitive in H</th>
<th>corresponding structure in C</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complement of verb</td>
<td>verb has no complement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simplex verb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinate clause</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bare infinitive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>that</em>-clause</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjunct of purpose</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinate clause</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>that</em>-clause</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of noun</td>
<td>NP (genitive)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP with <em>to</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of adjective</td>
<td>PP with <em>to</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>that</em>-clause</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of <em>wesan</em></td>
<td>no corresponding structure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(50) forþam þe he gewilnode to hæbbenne þæt lof &
because that he desired to have the glory and
herungeo his mæran drohtnunge (GD 8.117.30, H)
praise his excellent conduct
t‘because he desired to have the glory and praise for his excellent
conduct’

In 14 cases, both C and H employ the same matrix verb. There are a further
12 cases in which a that-clause complement after an intention verb in C is
paralleled by a to-infinitival complement in H, although with different matrix
verbs, e.g.:

(51) se þe ær þam deade symble tilode & wilnode, þæt he
he who before the death always toiled and desired, that he
licode þam ælmightig Gode (GD 10.85.35, C)
pleased the Almighty God
‘he who before death always toiled and desired that he please the
Almighty God’

(52) se þe eac ær his deade hogode to gelicienne Gode
he who also before his death intended to please God
ælmihtigum. (GD 10.85.35, H)
Almighty.
‘he who also before his death intended to please God Almighty.’

At first sight one might be tempted to explain the different choice of
complement by postulating that H in these cases employed a verb that
did not allow a that-clause, only a to-infinitive, but this explanation is
not tenable: all the verbs in question are also attested with that-clause
complements.

There are also instances of subjunctive clauses being replaced by
to-infinitives after verbs of persuading and urging. The first two examples
are niedan (in C) and its cognate neadian (in H). In both cases the
Latin text expresses the goal-argument by a (bare) infinitive; C has a

9 Other such verb pairs are: C blinnan 'stop', 'cease', H geswican 'stop', 'cease' ((GD 27.4, 66.23, 135.39,
and 163.16)); C geadmodian 'condescend', H gemenedemian 'condescend' ((GD 70.18)); C tilian 'strive',
H dencan 'intend' ((GD 10.76.25)); C forsacan 'refuse', H wiðsacan 'refuse' ((GD 10.82.5)); C bebeodon
'order', H geteohhian 'determine' ((GD 10.78.13)); C nelde hyran 'did not want to hear', H (ne) gedærrian
'(not) agree' ((GD 155.27)); C gedærodian 'resolve', H dencan 'intend' ((GD 21.145.35)); C gedencan 'intend',
H forlætan 'leave' ((GD 96.18)).
The category of the to-infinitive, whereas the later H has a to-infinitive (relevant structures in bold):

(52) þæt hi wæron genydēde [...] þæt hi scoldon niwe wisan that they were forced [...] that they should new ways
hycgan & smeagean (GD 2 (C) 3.104.20)
consider and think
‘that they were forced that they should consider and adopt new ways’

(53) þæt hi [...] wæron geneadode niwe þing to that they [...] were forced new things to
smeagenne (GD 2 (H) 3.104.16)
think
‘that they [...] were forced to adopt new things’

(54) in þære spræce hi wæron genyddē, þæt hi for in that lecture they were forced, that they because-of
þære lætræn tide wunedon læng þonne hi the late hour remained longer than they
sceoldon. (GD 2 (C) 12.126.20)
should.
‘At that lecture they were forced that they remained longer than they should, because of the late hour.’

(55) On þære spræce hi wurdon geneadode to wuniannæ oð At the lecture they were forced to remain until
ða lætræn tide. (GD 2 (H) 12.126.22)
the late hour.
‘At the lecture they were forced to remain until a late hour.’

The third instance is with onælan ‘incite’. The Latin text employs ad + gerund, which usually prompts a to-infinitive in an OE translation, but not in C, which selects a finite clause (not a subjunctive, however). Relevant structures again in bold:

(56) & mid swiþe mycclum ege he wearð onæled, þæt
and with very great awe he was inspired, that
he wæs manna sawla þam ælmihtigan Gode
he was men’s souls to-the almighty God
gestreonende (GD 1 (C) 4.33.23)
winning
‘and he was inspired with a very great awe that he was winning the souls of men to God’
Syntactic Status

(57) Eornostlice swa micel hæte hine onælde sawla to Truly so great fervour himACC inspired souls to
gestrynnenne Gode ælmihtigum, þæt he swa wæs win for-God almighty, that he so was
mynstra hyrde (GD 1 (H) 4.33.22)
monastery’s shepherd
‘Truly, such great fervour inspired him to win souls for God Almighty, that he thereby became the shepherd of the monastery’

The fourth instance is with eaðmedan/eaðmodian in C and medemian in H. These verbs translate the Latin deponens dignor ‘deign’, ‘condescend’; in the Latin original the verb is followed by a bare infinitive, in C by a subjunctive clause, and in H by a to-infinitive.

(58) Petrus cwæð: swiðe wundorlic is þæt, þæt God Peter said: very amazing is that, that God
hine geæadmodað, þæt he gehyreð þara humbles, that he hears of-those
bene (GD 1 (C) 9.70.16) prayers
‘Peter said: it is utterly astonishing that God condescends to hear their prayers’

(59) Petrus cwæð, swyðe wundorlic þæt is, þæt God hine Peter said, very amazing that is, that God himACC
gemedemode eac on wacum þingum to gehyrenne þara humbles also in trivial matters to hear their
bena (GD 1 (H) 9.70.15) prayers
‘Peter said: it is utterly astonishing that God condescends to hear their prayers even in trivial matters’

Finally, four subjunctive that-clauses of purpose are replaced by to-infinitives, e.g.:

(60) ða gelamp hit, þæt seo forecwedene fostermoder þæs then happened it, that the aforesaid foster-mother of-the
halgan weres abæd an hriddern hire to læne æt oðrum holy man asked a sieve her as loan from another
wife æt oðrum holy man asked a sieve her as loan from another
woman ...
'Then it happened that the aforesaid foster mother of the holy man asked a sieve for herself as a loan from another woman, her neighbour...'

a. ... to þon þæt heo mihte sum dæl hwætes on
do to that that she might some quantity of-wheat in
geclænsian. (GD 1.96.31, C)
clean.
‘... in order that she might clean some wheat in it.’

b. ... to feormianne sumne dæl hwætes. (GD 1.96.31, H)
do to clean some quantity of-wheat.
‘... to clean some wheat.’

The text of the Latin original does not appear to have been the motivation for the Reviser’s changes, unless the Latin bare infinitive—which is the structure used in the source text in the majority of these cases—has served as a model for employing at least some of the to-infinitives in H. It is clear from the material in glosses and in the OE Bede (a fairly literal translation), however, that it was the OE bare infinitive, not the to-infinitive, that was regarded as the equivalent of the Latin infinitive; the latter was equated with the Latin future participle, the gerund, or the gerundive.

However one wants to account for the changes, the important point to note is that subjunctive that-clauses and to-infinitives had apparently come to be perceived as potential stylistic variants, which would seem to indicate that they were functionally equivalent and were candidates for competition.

7.4.2 Evidence from a quantitative study
The evidence from the comparison of C and H could be dismissed as anecdotal, no more than an indication of a tendency of the to-infinitive to replace both to-PPs and subjunctive clauses as goal-argument. There is also, however, extensive quantitative evidence that the subjunctive clause in all its functions is replaced by the to-infinitive in the transition from OE to ME, and instances like (46)–(60) above acquire greater significance in this light. Table 7.6 presents some figures for to-infinitives and that-clauses as adjunct and complement in four OE subcorpora (the BGAH) and two Middle English corpora (the PPCME). The subcorpora are ordered in time, with OE1 the earliest and M2 the latest.

This count includes only subjunctive that-clauses in which the subject is identical to the subject of the matrix clause in the case of the INTENTION group
Table 7.6. Relative frequencies of to-infinitives and compatible subjunctive that-clauses in Old English and Middle English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>function</th>
<th>OE1</th>
<th>OE2</th>
<th>OE3</th>
<th>OE4</th>
<th>total OE</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>total eME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(52%)</td>
<td>(51%)</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intention</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(38%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manipulatives</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(66%)</td>
<td>(62%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(92%)</td>
<td>(86%)</td>
<td>(87%)</td>
<td>(90%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(‘subject control’), or to the object of the matrix clause in the manipulatives (‘object control’), and in that sense compatible with to-infinitives, which are always controlled. The finite complements of intention verbs and verbs of persuading and urging are almost invariably as ‘controlled’ as the to-infinitives found after these groups, but the same is not true of the verbs of ordering and permitting—as many as 30 per cent of themes expressed by a finite clause have no overt controller in the higher clause, necessitating in many cases the indefinite pronoun man ‘one’ as subject of the lower clause.10

When the Fischer Exact test is applied to the figures in Table 7.6, the variation we see in the four OE periods turns out not to be significant, nor is the variation between the two eME periods. The difference between the OE and eME totals, however, is highly significant, with $p < .0001$.11

This means that the rise in the number of to-infinitives in these three environments is in all probability related to the decline in the number of subjunctive that-clauses, contrary to the traditional view that the increase in to-infinitives occurred at the expense of the bare infinitive (see §1.3 above). If we include frequencies of the bare infinitive for the intention verbs—the only environment where the two infinitives are functionally equivalent—we find that its

---

10 We will argue in Ch. 10 that man functions, to all intents and purposes, as the overt counterpart of (arbitrary) PRO, by which it is eventually ousted.

11 I am grateful to Mirjam Ernestus (Department of General Linguistics), Cor Koster (Department of English), Evert Wattel (Department of Mathematics), all of the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam, and Anthony Warner (Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York) for their help with the statistical information in this section.
Table 7.7. Relative frequencies of to-infinitives, compatible subjunctive clauses, and bare infinitives for intention verbs (excluding the ginnan-group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE (BGAH)</th>
<th>eME (PPCME)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to-infinitives</td>
<td>75 (21%)</td>
<td>133 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatible that-clauses</td>
<td>263 (73%)</td>
<td>82 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare infinitives</td>
<td>22 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1 Percentage of to-infinitives in OE and eME

overall share remains constant in OE and eME (5% in OE, 6% in eME), as is clear from the figures in Table 7.7.12

Figure 7.1 is based on the figures in Table 7.6, but excludes the figures of the first OE period, as the numbers are too small to be significant.

12 Corresponding figures for verbs of commanding cannot be as clear-cut because bare and to-infinitive are not functionally equivalent here: the former is part of an AcI in a monotransitive complement, the latter encodes the theme-argument of a ditransitive complement; see Ch. 5 above. Counting bare infinitives means including hatan ‘command’ and lætan ‘let’, which are not attested with to-infinitives in OE etc. For a fuller treatment of these issues see Los (1999: 265ff.), which attempts to gauge the position of the bare infinitive after the verbs of commanding and permitting and concludes that the percentage for the overall share of the bare infinitive actually rises in eME: 42% in eME v. 37% in OE.
The curves in Figure 7.1 show slight dips and rises in the OE and ME periods respectively, but they are not significant; what is significant is the steep climb between the fourth OE period and the first ME period. This change may not have been as drastic as Figure 7.1 suggests because the ME corpus does not represent the same dialects as the OE corpus. The OE texts are mainly written in the West-Saxon Schriftsprache (Southern), and this dialect is badly represented in the selection of the first part of the ME corpus because few eME texts from the South have survived. However, a study of a southern text fragment in the M1 subcorpus, *Vices and Virtues* (c. 1200)—which is more representative of a dialect that is a direct continuation of West-Saxon, and generally more conservative in its syntax than the AB texts that make up the bulk of the M1 subcorpus—confirms the abrupt jump in the ratio of *to*-infinitives to subjunctive clauses: in this text (included in its entirety in the Michigan Corpus), we find 83 per cent of the structures after intention verbs are *to*-infinitives, whereas 17 per cent are *that*-clauses, which is even higher than the overall percentage of *to*-infinitives for intention verbs in eME. This suggests that the steep climb in Figure 7.1 is not due to dialectal variation.

The progression of a linguistic innovation often shows up as a characteristic S-curve (Chen 1972). It is possible to construct a logistic curve for each of these three environments on the basis of these five data points, as shown in Figure 7.2.

Both figures show that the *to*-infinitive has made the greatest inroads on the domain of the subjunctive clause in the function of the purpose adjunct, which fits the available evidence that this was the earliest environment of the *to*-infinitive (Chapter 2). The change lags behind in the other two environments; the logistic curves in Figure 7.2 give the turning point of the change—the point at which there are more *to*-infinitives than *that*-clauses—as AD 986 for purpose adjuncts, give or take c. 84 years; AD 1209 for manipulatives, give or take c. 43 years, and AD 1211 for intention verbs, give or take c. 44 years. The turning point for purpose adjuncts is much more difficult to pinpoint than those of the other environments because the purpose curve is much shallower, as if change in this early environment does not progress as fast.13

All in all, these figures confirm that there is a systematic relationship between subjunctive *that*-clause and *to*-infinitive: they are in competition in OE, with

---

13 This does not mean that the data in Figure 7.1 constitute counter-evidence for the ‘constant rate hypothesis’, also known as ‘the rate identity effect’ (e.g. Kroch 1989a, b). According to this hypothesis, the competition between two structures often progresses at a constant rate in all environments, even if the change is more advanced in one environment and less so in others. In our case, the data points are too far apart, and too imprecisely dated, to determine the turning point with enough precision to confirm or reject this hypothesis.
the *to*-infinitive beginning to oust the subjunctive *that*-clause in ME. There is evidence that the PE situation was not reached until 1800 (cf. Rohdenburg 1995).

### 7.5 Conclusions

We have argued in this chapter that the *to*-infinitive cannot be analysed as a PP in OE, in spite of its PP origins. Its distribution is no longer that of a *to*-PP, its dative inflection has fossilized and does not behave like the dative inflection found on true N-heads, and it takes accusative objects rather than the genitive objects one would expect if it was still nominal. The *to*-infinitive obligatorily occurs to the right of its governing verb, unlike other nominal or prepositional objects, and much like finite clauses. Evidence from relative clauses, the position of the *to*-infinitival object, and the emergence of an overt complementizer—*for*—in eME all argue for CP-status. The most telling piece of evidence is the fact that the *to*-infinitive has entered into competition with the finite subjunctive clause and can be seen to oust it gradually in a number of environments. All the available evidence suggests, then, that the *to*-infinitive
was already being analysed as a non-finite subjunctive in OE. The implications of this analysis will be explored in the next chapter.

Finally, a crucial finding is that the increase in to-infinitives, which has always been thought to have occurred at the expense of the bare infinitive, can be shown to have occurred at the expense of the finite subjunctive clause. Bare infinitives remain stable well into the Middle English period, until the shake-up of the verb system and the emergence of the auxiliary as a separate syntactic category.
8

The changing status of infinitival *to*

8.1 Introduction

If the *to*-infinitive is a non-finite subjunctive clause in OE, and a CP, where is infinitival *to*, and what is its status?

Although the *to*-infinitive originally derives from a preposition, we saw in the previous chapter that it is not a prepositional phrase in OE but a full-blown clause. We will sketch a scenario for the rise of the *to*-infinitive in the first section of this chapter that offers a plausible account of how such a reanalysis of PP to CP may have come about.

If *to* is no longer a preposition in OE, what is its status? Morphologically it appears to be a prefix. Infinitival *to* must precede the infinitive in Old English without any intervening material. The same phenomenon is found in Modern German, and is one of the reasons that infinitival *zu* has been argued to be a bound morpheme, with the same status as the participial prefix *ge*-

Infinitival *to*, participial *ge*-, the verbal clitic negation *en* (for those dialects that have preserved it), and the auxiliaries (for those dialects that have the Dutch version of verb-raising) may vary in their morphological status (bound, clitic, or free) but they all share a single characteristic in continental West Germanic: they are the only elements that can intervene between particles and their verbs in embedded (i.e. non verb-second) contexts, a generalization captured by an analysis in which these elements head some functional projection (whether T(ense))₀, I(nfl)₀, or M(ood)₀). Though PE has lost the OE negation clitic, the verbal prefix *ge*-, and the verb-raising operation, the strong positional affinities of infinitival *to* with modal verbs remain and there is evidence to show that it is a non-finite modal in speakers’ grammars. As *to*-infinitives have already become non-finite subjunctives in OE, and the PE equivalent of the old subjunctive ending is the modal verb, the traditional generative analysis of infinitival *to* in the same functional head in which the modal verbs are generated (I₀, T₀, or M₀) makes sense.
Its category and position, then, have not changed in the recorded history of English. What has changed is its morphological status, from prefix to free word. We will argue that this change was caused by pressure from the system: the synthetic expression of the subjunctive, i.e. by a morphological ending, was replaced by an analytic one in which the subjunctive was expressed by a periphrasis with a modal verb, first moved to $T^0$ from $V^0$, and subsequently reanalysed as generated in $T^0$. The unexpected rise of *to* as an independent form may have been motivated by the rise of the analytic subjunctive; in other words, when the subjunctive information came to be expressed by an independent word rather than by a morpheme, infinitival *to*, which also expressed subjunctive information, followed suit.

This scenario, if correct, is of significance for general theoretical considerations in historical linguistics. Not only would it constitute an example of degrammaticalization, a phenomenon so rare as to have been argued to be non-existent (e.g. by Lehmann 1995 [1982]), but it would also go some way towards validating current assumptions about the complexity and level of abstractness of syntactic competence and its role in syntactic change. In historical phonology, it is taken for granted that the phones that constitute natural classes (of plosives, fricatives, etc.) may undergo similar changes (e.g. Grimm’s Law) even though the language user is not consciously aware that these sounds have anything to do with each other. In historical syntax, however, the notion that language users have an unconscious knowledge of syntax at a similar level of abstractness—say, functional projections—which plays a part in syntactic change often meets with resistance. The scenario I propose here for the degrammaticalization of infinitival *to* shows, however, that syntactic change can be grammar-driven.

### 8.2 The rise of the *to*-infinitive

#### 8.2.1 The category change from noun to verb

The infinitival marker *to* is homophonous with the preposition *to* and points to a *to*-PP as the most likely origin of the *to*-infinitive. The distribution of the *to*-infinitive originally followed that of the *to*-PP, which is why we find it as purpose adjunct and as goal-argument; we have argued previously that its emergence as theme-argument represents an innovation in that the *to*-infinitive in this function no longer follows the *to*-PP but the subjunctive *that*-clause. The *to*-infinitive has an ending in -e in Old English, which can only have been a dative inflection. As the preposition *to* takes a dative in Old English, this is another argument for taking the PP to be the original category of the *to*-infinitive.
The structure in (1), then, is the most likely origin of the to-infinitive:

(1) to berenne
   to (preposition) + ber- (verb stem) + -*anja- (derivational suffix) + -"i (dative sg inflection)
   PG: *to beranjöi

The anja-element is a derivational suffix that creates a nominalization from a verbal stem. It is important to remember that derivational suffixes can be category-changing (see e.g. Haspelmath 2002: 77, 234; Plank 1994), and that the nominalization of a V is an N-head. The only V-characteristic it inherits from the verbal stem is the argument structure, though, again because of its N-status, these arguments do not have to be expressed. If they are expressed, they will not appear as NPs with structural case but as PPs or as NPs with inherent case (usually genitive), as only V- or P-heads can assign structural case. Because it is an N-head, it appears with dative inflection after the preposition to. At this stage, its category is PP.

If there is anything special about the anja-element, it is that it is specifically a purposive PP and distributes like other purposive PPs. Purposive PPs occur primarily as purpose adjuncts. Examples of such purposive PPs are given in (2)–(4):

(2) Me nædre beswac and me neodlice to forsceape scyhte
    me serpent seduced and me eagerly to evil-deedDAT incited
    and to scyldfrece (GenA,B 896)
    and to wicked-craving
    ‘The serpent seduced me and incited me eagerly to an evil deed and to a wicked craving’

(3) Forgif þu me, min frea, fierst ond ondgiet ond
    Give you me, my Lord, time and understanding and
    geþyld ond gemynd þinga gehwylces þara þu me,
    patience and purpose thingGEN PL eachGEN of-those you me,
    soþfæst cyning, sendan wylle to cunnunge. (Res 22)
    just king, send want to trialDAT.
    ‘Please give me, my Lord, time and understanding and patience and purpose for each of the things that you want to send me, just king, to try me.’

(4) hi þa ealle heora hors æt him to bryce & to
    they then all their horses from him to usedAT and to
    nytnesse onfengon (GD(C) 2.15.35)
    benefitDAT received
    ‘they then received all their horses from him for their use and benefit’
It is not only the category change that is typical of derivational morphology, but also the fact that there is always more than one suffix to do the same job. In (2)–(4) we have examples of the nominalizing suffixes -e, -ung, and -nes. Each suffix will have its own subset of V-stems to attach to, and there will not be a single suffix that fits all Vs. -ung, for example, is used in OE to form feminine abstract nouns from second-class weak verbs (Wright and Wright 1925 [1908]: §615); a suffix -ing did the same for first-class weak verbs, although there was already some interchange between the forms already in OE (Campbell 1959: §383).

The subset of V-stems to which a suffix attaches may change over the years. The cognates of -ung in Modern German and Dutch (-ung/-ing) do not pick out V-stems from a particular morphological class, as in OE, where -ung was reserved for the second class of weak verbs and -ing for the first class. The three (originally four) classes are no longer differentiated by distinct morphological endings in the modern West Germanic languages as they were in OE, where the second weak class was unique in having -od- in the simple past and past participle. In Dutch and German they have all come together into a huge, single class of ‘regular’ verbs. Following this change, the subset of V-stems that can take -ung/-ing in those languages appears to be based on the verb’s aktionsart and picks out Vs with the feature [+telic]. The modern suffix -ung/-ing has been argued to have an inherently perfective meaning (Hoekstra and van der Putten 1988: 175) and its base has broadened.

PE -ing has of course been even more successful and now attaches to all Vs, which is why it is no longer analysed as derivation but as inflection, and hence is no longer category-changing. There are in fact many parallels between the genesis of the PE present participle in -ing and the to-infinitive, or indeed, any non-finite form. The present participle, which doubles as the progressive, is generally assumed to derive from the action noun in -ung/-ing in an on-PP (again, a specific preposition). A phrase like he was on hun tungge ‘he was on the hunt’, in which hun tung is still an N-head and on a preposition, would subsequently have been reanalysed into he was a-hunting. Once the derivational suffix had generalized to accept the verb stems of all verbs as input, it became analysed as inflectional, with the resulting form in -ing analysed as V rather than N, and, presumably, entered into competition with the present participle in -end(e)/and(e) (CHEL: 144–7, 252–3). It seems that there is a similar story to tell about the derivational suffix *-anja in (1).

There is a long-standing debate in the morphological literature about which affixes can be argued to be the domain of the syntax and which the domain of the lexicon. Some affixes, although derived in the lexicon, are subject to syntactic checking processes, as for instance personal endings on finite verbs.
or case endings on nouns; these processes do not create new lexical entries, they apply to an entire major category (i.e. A-heads, V-heads, or N-heads) without exception, and they are not category-changing. This is inflectional morphology. Other affixes only apply to a restricted set of items and not to an entire category, they often exhibit competition, and the forms they create need to be analysed as separate lexical entries. This is derivational morphology (Booij 1997a; 2000: 360–9).

The fact that derivational affixes are typically lexically restricted, and that there is a range of them effecting the same category change (i.e. the various affixes that attach to verb stems to create nouns: -en, -e, -ung, -nes, etc. in OE; -en, ge-, -ing, -nis, -erij, etc. in Modern Dutch), inevitably creates competition, an instability amenable to change. It is not difficult to imagine that a situation could arise in which a nominalizing affix competes so successfully that its input is subject to fewer and fewer restrictions, until it eventually attaches to any member of the major category V. The question then is, inevitably, whether it would still be analysed as derivational rather than inflectional, as the ability to apply to an entire major category is the preserve of inflection. If it is analysed as inflectional, it would no longer be category-changing, and the V-head to which it would attach would remain a V-head rather than become N.

Although such a scenario has, to my knowledge, never been proposed before as the genesis of the to-infinitive, it has a definite advantage over other accounts, which assume that there was an infinitival or gerundial form readily available that was nominal enough to be inserted into the complement of the preposition to, as if the verbal features of the infinitive are part of the heritage of the verbal stem from which the action noun derives—an assumption strengthened by the use of the term ‘verbal noun’ for these nominalizations. Apart from the fact that there is no historical evidence for either a gerundial form or an infinitive behaving as a noun, either in Gothic or in OE, the morphology of living languages shows that nominalizations, although derived from verbs, are N-heads, and not V-heads. As such they lack the ability to assign structural case (see §7.2.6):

[a] verbal noun, in contrast [with the infinitive that develops from it], is a (declinable) substantive, derived from the root of a verb. Important is the difference in the syntax: the verbal noun is constructed as a substantive, thus, for example, with the ‘object’ in the genitive: ‘the killing of a man,’ as opposed to the accusative with an infinitive, ‘to kill a man.’ Example: OIr. guin (verbal noun *gwhoni) duini (gen) ‘the killing of a man.’ (Beekes 1995: 251)

1 This is the assumption found in Prokosch (1939: 204): ‘The infinitive is a verbal noun which has retained a closer association with the verb system proper than [other types of action nouns].’
In exceptional circumstances they may later be reanalysed as V-heads again, if the derivational suffix outcompetes the other nominalizing suffixes, and they come be to analysed as non-finite verbs; but the only ‘verbal feature’ they retain when they are still nominalizations is that they inherit thematic roles.

If the to-infinitive is in origin an action noun whose derivational affix was generalized to other verb-stems in the specific context of the purposive to-PP, to the extent that the affix came to be analysed as inflectional rather than derivational, we do not have to postulate the existence of a nominative infinitive in prehistoric OE or PG, or in any other case apart from the dative, and the fact that there is no evidence for such a stage other than the ‘evidence’ of the to-infinitive itself is no longer worrying.

The mechanism through which the recategorization took place, then, is in this scenario basically a morphological recategorization: a derivational category-changing suffix competed so successfully with other suffixes with the same function that it was generalized to accept as input any member of a major category (V), so that speakers started to analyse it as inflection rather than derivation, and it ceased to be category-changing.

The bare infinitive is an example of a much earlier nominalization, and derives from a V-stem + derivational affix with accusative case (see (5) in Chapter 7). There was originally no direct relationship between the present tense of a verb and the infinitive, as the infinitive was based on a V-stem, witness the Latin infinitive capere ‘take’ without i and its present tense forms capio ‘I take’ etc. with i. Once the derivational suffix was generalized to take any V-stem as input, and the bare infinitive was reanalysed as a V-stem with an inflectional rather than a derivational suffix, it was incorporated into the verbal paradigm, often with analogical changes in form. The forms for the present tense and the infinitive, still showing their different origins in Latin, exhibit a far closer resemblance to each other in Gothic: hafjan and hafja, respectively (Van Loey 1970: 158), and the association between the present tense (plural) form and the infinitival form is even closer in Modern Dutch (Booij 1997b: 44–5). The complete acceptance of the bare infinitive in the modern West Germanic languages is shown by the fact that it is often regarded by grammarians as the ‘unmarked or base form’ of the verb (Crystal 1985: 157).

There is nothing inherently unlikely about the fact that a second infinitival form—the to-infinitive—emerged while there was already an older infinitive in existence, as the early history of the IE languages shows the same thing

---

2 Note that the bare infinitive serves as the citation form of the verb in Modern Dutch, whereas the citation form in PE is the to-infinitive.
happening again and again (Beekes 1995: 251). It explains why there is no historical evidence of the bare infinitive ever behaving nominally enough to appear in nominal positions, or with prepositions other than to.

The scenario sketched in this section entails that the category change from N to V should not necessarily be regarded as a long, drawn-out development proceeding in minimal steps (as in e.g. the scenarios in Disterheft 1980), but could also represent a radical reanalysis which may well have been achieved by one generation of speakers. As soon as the input reaches a critical stage in which \*-anja can be seen to attach to almost any V, ‘new’ speakers may decide that it is inflection rather than derivation. The immediate effect of this reclassification is that \*-anja will no longer be category-changing, and the V-stem to which it attaches will remain a V-head. The verbal behaviour of the infinitive, then, is not directly connected to its descent from a nominalization in the sense meant by Prokosch, who argues that it retained some of its verbal features (see the quotation in n. 2 above); as a nominalization, it was an N-head. However, it would never have been reanalysed as a V-head if it had not contained a V-stem.

8.2.2 The category change from prepositional phrase to noun phrase

Although the category-change from N to V makes it unlikely that the to-PP in which the new infinitive is embedded continues to be analysed as a PP, it does not immediately follow that its new category will be TP (or IP, MP, or whatever functional projection checks the subjunctive mood). We will now see how the reanalysed to-PP came to be interpreted as a subjunctive form and aligned itself with the subjunctive clause.

The directional meaning of prepositional to (‘towards a goal’) is of course crucial here. The goal may be situated either in space or time. In the case of the latter, the effect of to is to add prospective relative time reference. Even when the complement contains a ‘standard’ N-head (as opposed to a nominalization of a verb) that is not a location, the sense of prospect is present, as in the Small Clause example of (88c) in Chapter 9, here presented in its original form:

(5) and hi ealle anmodlice þone eadigan cuðberhtum to and they all unanimously theacc blessed Cuthbert to biscope securon ⟨ÆCHom II, 10 88.242⟩
biscopdat chose ‘and they all unanimously elected the blessed Cuthbert bishop’

To biscope is a state-of-change predicate expressing the result of the election; the state of being a bishop is subsequent to, and not simultaneous with, the election.
When this prospective *to* combines with a nominalization of a V-stem, the result is a future event. Although such nominalizations lack the V-property of being able to assign structural case, they preserve the event structure and the thematic roles of the V-stem, even though, as N-heads, they do not need to express these arguments explicitly. *Forsceap* ‘evil deed’ in (2) above (cf. the V *forscieppan*) still brings with it the sense that a deed is done by somebody; *cunnung* ‘test’, ‘trial’, ‘experience’ in (3), from the verb *cunnian* ‘try’, ‘test’, entails that certain events put somebody to the test. *Gield* ‘payment’, from *to gylde* (see example (8) below), entails somebody making payments; *to geligre* ‘to fornication’ (Or 3, 9.72.2), from *gelicgan* ‘lie together’, entails two people doing just that. When the arguments ‘inherited’ from the verb are present, they appear with genitive case because the N-head is unable to assign structural (accusative) case: *cwalu* ‘killing’ expresses the *theme*-argument ‘inherited’ from *cwellan* ‘kill’ by the genitive form *his in to his cweale* ‘to his murder’ ⟨ÆCHom I, 14.1 214.35⟩ and the same goes for the *theme*-argument inherited by *slege* ‘killing’ from *slean* ‘kill’ in *to þæs hælendes slege* ‘to the murder of the Saviour’ ⟨ÆCHom I, 20 292.5⟩. See also the quotation from Beekes in §8.2.1.

‘Inherited’ *themes* are occasionally found as dative arguments rather than genitives:

(6) we sceolon [...] wuldrian and herian urne drihten on eallum we should [...] glorify and praise our Lord in all þam ðingum þe he for ure lufe gefremede. us to the things which he for our love did usDAT to alysednysse. ⟨ÆCHom I, 2 44.1⟩ redemptionDAT.

‘we should [...] glorify and praise our Lord in all the things which he did out of love for us to our redemption.’

Compare the genitive in

(7) eft þa þa we forwyrtie væron. þa sende he þone afterwards when we condemned were then send he the ylcan sunu to ure alysednysse ⟨ÆCHom I, 1 24.31⟩ same son to ourGEN redemption

‘afterwards when we stood condemned, he sent that same son to redeem us’

We saw in Chapters 2 and 3 that the purposive *to*-PP was found in three environments:

(i) as purpose adjunct to VP
(ii) as purpose adjunct to an NP, e.g. anweald ‘power’, tima ‘time’, and AP, e.g. gearu ‘ready’

(iii) as GOAL-argument of verbs of urging and persuading

The other expression of purpose was the finite subjunctive clause, which occurred in the same contexts and could always replace the to-PP. For to forscæpe ‘to an evil deed’ in (2) we could have found þæt ic þær forscæpe gefremede ‘that I did an evil deed there’; for to cunnunge ‘to test’ in (3) the writer could have used the subjunctive clause to þon þæt þu me cunnie ‘in order that you may test me’. Actually attested parallel passages are (8)–(9) and (10)–(12), all with the matrix verb niedan ‘urge’. The GOAL-argument of this verb is expressed by a to-PP in (8), but by a subjunctive clause in (9) (GOAL-arguments in bold):

(8) Gyf hwa befaeste his nyxtan ænig nyten & hit bið if anyone entrusts his neighbour any animal and it is dead oððe gelewed oððe ætbroden, & hit nan man ne dead or injured or carried-off, and it no man not gesyhð, Sylle him aþ & ne nyde hine to gylde. ⟨Exod 22.10⟩ sees, give him oath and not force him to repayment.

Lat: [...] et ille reddere non cogetur (Vulgate)
‘If anyone entrusts an animal to his neighbour and it dies or is injured or is carried off, and no one saw it, let him swear an oath and do not force him to repayment.’

(9) Se þe æt his nextan hwæt to læne abit, gif hit bið he who from his neighbour something as loan asks, if it is gelewed oððe dead baftan þam hlaforde, nyde man hine þæt injured or dead after the lord, force one him that he hit gylde. ⟨Exod 22.14⟩
he it repay.

Lat: [...] reddere compelletur (Vulgate)
‘He who borrows something from his neighbour, if it is injured or dies in the absence of its lord, he should be forced to repay it.’

Gylde ‘to (re)payment’ is a deverbal nominalization, formed by the derivational suffix -e from the verb gieldan ‘pay’, ‘repay’. Gylde ‘inherits’ the three thematic roles associated with gieldan in that it implies the existence of an AGENT (the payer), a RECIPIENT (the payee), and a THEME (the payment). As an N-head, gylde does not require its arguments to be spelled out; they
may remain implicit. The agent is identical in reference to the theme of the matrix verb anyway (obligatory object control).

The subjunctive clause in (9) contains a form of *gieldan*, which, as a finite V-head, requires at least the expression of its agent and theme, which are realized as *he* ‘he’—controlled by the matrix object *hine* ‘him’—and *hit* ‘it’ respectively. Note that *hit* is a pronoun and conveys old information whose content has to be inferred from the preceding discourse; in this particular case, the fact that the object has little informational weight probably accounts for its non-expression in (8). This is confirmed by the fact that in those cases in which ‘inherited’ objects of the embedded verb are actually expressed, it is informationally contentful and impossible to infer from the context; pronouns as ‘inherited objects’ are rare (though not unknown; see ⟨ÆCHom I, 14.1 214.35⟩).

Another set of close parallels, this time also incorporating an example with a *to*-infinitival goal-argument, is given as (10)–(12). The verb is, again, *niedan* ‘urge’, ‘force’ (goal-arguments of *niedan* in bold):

(10) *se dema [...] hine þa nydde to deofolgyld[a]
the ruler [...] himACC then urged to demon-worshipGEN begonge. ⟨Mart 5 756⟩
practise.
‘the ruler [...] then urged him to practise demon-worship.’

(11) Ðone nydde Decius se kasere deofolgeld to himACC urged Decius the Emperor demon-worshipACC to begangenne. ⟨Mart 5 1972⟩
practise.
‘The Emperor Decius urged him to practise devil-worship.’

(12) þær hy mon nydde þæt hy deofulgyld there themACC one urged that they demonsACC weorðedon. ⟨Mart 5 2207⟩
worshippedSUBJ.
‘there someoneone urged them to worship demons’

The situation described is the same in all three cases—someone is urged to worship demons—and again, the *to*-PP in (10), the *to*-infinitive in (11), and the subjunctive clause in (12) all convey the same amount of information. Both *weorðian* and *begangan* require as their thematic roles an agent (the worper) and a theme (that which he worships). The latter role is expressed straightforwardly by an accusative object in (11) and (12); in (10), the nominalization *begonge* is, as an N-head, unable to assign structural case to an
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object, but instead employs a genitive: deofolgyld[a] ‘of demon-worship’. As in
(8), the underlying agent is automatically inferred to be identical in reference
to the accusative theme of the matrix verb.

The fact the verbs of persuading and urging appear almost invariably with
controlled complements means that the content of embedded T and AgrS is
predetermined by material in the matrix clause. The subject of the embedded
structure is controlled by the matrix object and in that sense anaphoric; the
content of T is similarly controlled by the matrix T. Cross-linguistic studies
indicate that tense-markings on the subjunctive are typically the result of tense-
copying and are not independently meaningful (Noonan 1985: 53). Picallo
actually expresses this dependence on the tense of the main clause as ‘anaphoric’

This redundancy of the information in T and AgrS suggests that the absence
or presence of these structures does not materially affect or limit the range of
expression of either the to-PP or the predecessor of the to-infinitive, compared
to the subjunctive clause: the information-carriers are the finite verb and
the object of the subjunctive clause, neatly paralleled by the non-finite verb
and structural accusative object contained in the to-infinitival phrase or the
nominalization and its inherited genitive object contained in the to-PP. This
means that the subjunctive clause does not have an edge over the purposive
to-PP, in spite of its more extensive structure.

The single crucial difference that sets the OE to-PP apart from the sub-
junctive clause, and makes it more limited in scope of expression, is in fact
the limitation of its derivational morphology. Purposive, non-spatial to-PPs
in Old English are generally constructed from nominalizations of verbs, not
just from any NP, as we saw in the §8.2.1. These nominalizations are formed by
attaching a derivational affix to the verb stem; but such derivational affixes are
typically restricted to the type of verb they may attach to, and it is also typical
that there is a range of affixes available. There are some verbs that cannot be
nominalized because there is no affix that fits them; there is no single affix
that may attach to all verbs. It is this that limits what the purposive to-PP can
express.

The to-infinitive and the subjunctive verb are created from V-heads by means
of inflectional morphology, which means that there are no restrictions on
which verbs may appear in that position, unlike the verb embedded in the
nominalization in the complement of the preposition to of a purposive to-PP.
This means that to-infinitives are as versatile in their expression of the goal-
argument as subjunctive clauses; unlike the to-PP, they are not dependent on
the random workings of derivational processes, and may select any verb. It is
this crucial difference that set the to-infinitive apart from its original model
and made it side with the subjunctive clause, to the point of becoming its competitor, and eventually ousting it; many PE INTENTION verbs no longer take a that-clause at all, and the same goes for some of the PE manipulatives.

The rise of the to-infinitive occurred at the expense of the subjunctive clause, as we saw in Chapter 7. The to-PP may also have declined, although the evidence here is more anecdotal. We saw from an estimate based on a sample of verbs of persuading and urging that the proportions of subjunctive clauses, to-PPs, and to-infinitives as goal-argument after these verbs averaged $6:6:1$ throughout the OE period (see Chapter 3), proportions that certainly do not hold for PE, which suggests that the frequency of the to-PP also suffered. The two manuscripts of Gregory’s Dialogues show that the scribe of ms H replaced two purposive to-PPs in ms C (one an adjunct of NP—given below as (13), for comparison with (14) from ms H—and one an adjunct of AP) by to-infinitives, versus five purposive that-clauses (four as adjunct of VP, one as adjunct of AP) (see Appendix III, Table 3).

(13) hi þa ealle heora hors æt him to bryce & to nytnesse onfengon ⟨GD(C) 2.15.35⟩ benefitDAT received
‘they then received all their horses from him for their use and benefit’

(14) þa underfengon hi ealle æt him hyra horsa to brucenne & to notienne ⟨GD(H) 2.15.32⟩ use and to enjoy
‘then they received all their horses from him to use and to enjoy’

When the to-infinitive equalled the subjunctive that-clause in information content and the range of its use and distribution, it came to be analysed as a non-finite alternative of the finite subjunctive clause and spread to all subjunctive contexts, and also those which were outside the domain of the to-PP, expressing not only purpose adjuncts and goal-arguments, but also theme-arguments of intention verbs, verbs of commanding and permitting, and commissives, as we saw in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 respectively: contexts which fitted the future orientation and non-actuation aspects of the subjunctive.

PE infinitival to is generally analysed as an I-head ($I^0$) in standard works on GB theory (e.g. Haegeman 1994), heading an I(nflection) projection. Such a position fits in well with our analysis of to as a non-finite subjunctive element, as this is the same head in which PE modal verbs are base-generated. This could
mean that the syntactic status of *to* has undergone little change in the course of the last millennium. We will explore this idea in the next two sections.

Morphologically, infinitival *to* has changed from clitic/affix to free word, as we will see in §8.5.

### 8.3 The status of *to* in Old English

Since Pollock’s (1989) proposal that cross-linguistic differences in adverb placement warrant the assumption that tense and nominative agreement, earlier subsumed under I(nflection), should be assigned their own functional heads, $T^0$ and $AgrS^0$ (the ‘split IP’ hypothesis), the number of possible positions for infinitival *to* has increased from two ($C^0$ or $I^0$) to three ($C^0$, $T^0$, or $Agr^0$), with some scholars inventing a range of new functional projections and positions for infinitival *to* and for the infinitival verb itself (e.g. ‘$InfP$’ in Jarad 1997, or ‘$Agrp$’ in Lattewitz 1993). More recent changes in theoretical thinking have abolished agreement projections altogether and introduced a ‘split’ CP, which gives us even more projections at the left edge of the clause: $ForceP$, $FocusP$, $FinP$ (Rizzi 1997), hence more head-positions that could host *to*. Mainstream generative tradition usually places PE infinitival *to* in I(nflect) or, more specifically, in $T$(ense) (Stowell 1981; Haegeman 1986).

Several studies have argued against placing OE *to* in $T^0$: Van Gelderen (1993), Jarad (1997), and Kageyama (1992). Jarad and Kageyama both fail to spot the aspectual differences between bare and *to*-infinitive (Jarad 1997: 47ff.; Kageyama 1992: 101), and consequently fail to see that the two infinitives are not interchangeable. Jarad supports this view with example (15) *hatan* ‘command’ with a *to*-infinitive taken from secondary sources without noticing that it is a gloss; glosses are not translations but interlinear transliterations in which *to*-infinitives standardly decode gerunds or gerundives in the Latin text. Such an example does not mean that *hatan* could ever appear with a *to*-infinitive in OE; it is overwhelmingly attested with bare-infinitival AcIs, as a verb of causation; it rarely appears with a subjunctive clause at all, because it expresses a peremptory command (see Chapter 5):

(15) Ða fiondas gehet to lufianne ⟨Mt Head Gl (Li) 16⟩
    The enemies commanded to love
    Lat: *inimicos praecepit diligendos*
    ‘[he] commanded [us] to love [our] enemies’

Jarad comments that ‘if *to* headed an infinitival TP, it would make an infinitive (in control structure) temporally different from a gerund’ (i.e. a bare infinitive)
(1997: 47), and as he fails to find such a difference in OE, infinitival to therefore cannot be in \( T^0 \). We saw in the previous chapters, however, that the two infinitives are not in free variation at all. There is very little distributional overlap, which rules out a single analysis for both infinitives. Jarad, and Kageyama, make their task even more difficult by not drawing a distinction between the to-infinitive after wesan ‘to be’ and the one after other verbs, although they behave very differently both distributionally (the to-infinitive as a predicate of wesan does not have a subjunctive analogue), structurally (the wesan-to-infinitive must be transitive) and positionally (the wesan-to-infinitive both precedes and follows wesan whereas the other to-infinitive is always clause-final). An example of a to-infinitive in a wesan-construction is:

\[
\text{(16) witodlice gylp is to forbugenne} \quad (\text{ÆCHom II, 13 133.182})
\]

‘truly, arrogance must be avoided’

Kageyama’s proposal, that to heads an agreement phrase (AgrP), is prompted by the behaviour of this wesan-to-infinitive and we will see in the following chapter that this makes sense. His proposal does not do anything, however, for the to-infinitive that we have been investigating so far, the to-infinitive that appears as theme- or goal-argument of lexical verbs, in which function it parallels and ousts the subjunctive clause. This infinitive is a full-blown clause. Kageyama proposes that the morphology of the to-infinitive, like that of the passive participle in standard GB, absorbs the external theta-role of the verb. An analysis along similar lines was proposed earlier for the Dutch te-infinitive by Vanden Wyngaerd (1989), prompted by the same facts: as in OE, Dutch to-infinitives only appear in ‘controlled’ constructions and never with overt subjects, only with non-overt PRO; there are no te-infinitival ECM constructions in Dutch, and to-infinitival ECM does not emerge in English until well into the Middle English period (see the next chapter). Kageyama’s analysis has the advantage of eliminating PRO, but cannot handle the to-infinitival relatives, the emergence of for as a complementizer, the subjunctive semantics, or the clause-final position of the to-infinitive (see Chapter 7). Significantly, all of the arguments against the AgrP-analysis put forward by Kageyama’s critics (Beukema and Van der Wurff 1993; Jarad 1997: 41–4; and Fischer 1996b: 124–30) are based on attestations of the to-infinitive after verbs other than wesan. The different behaviour of the wesan-to-infinitive and the to-infinitive in other positions makes a unified analysis of ‘the’ OE to-infinitive impossible: there are two types, one a CP and the other, the wesan-to-infinitive, an AgrP. The wesan-to-infinitive will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.
Van Gelderen, Jarad, and Kageyama all make much of the fact that perfective *have*, passives, and negation are not attested in OE *to*-infinitival complements, although they do occur in ME (cf. (1) and (2) in Chapter 7). The fact that these structures are not attested in OE cannot be argued to entail that they are structurally impossible in Old English, and that their appearance in Middle English is evidence of a genuine change. As OE *to*-infinitives appear exclusively in control structures, they involve an act that the subject needs to have control over (cf. Dik 1985: 31) and this entails automatically that one would not expect to find passive or negated complements in such an environment other than in ‘laboratory’ conditions; they cannot be expected in a corpus of performance data, which is the only data source we have for Old and Middle English (see the discussion of Mittwoch 1990 in §1.6 above).

Although such ‘negative evidence’ remains a problem in a historical work like this, there is another source of evidence. If we look at the subjunctive *that*-clause after such ‘control’ verbs (i.e. the verbs discussed in Chapters 3–6), which is the finite counterpart of the *to*-infinitive, we find very few examples with passives, *have*, or negation there, in spite of the fact that the subjunctive *that*-clause is far more frequent than *to*-infinitives in the OE period (as we saw in Table 7.5 above). The use of perfective *have* does not become consistent or frequent until Middle English; but the tense and subject of the subjunctive CP, whether finite or non-finite, is controlled by antecedents in the matrix clause, and it is this that makes passives, negation, and *have* almost incompatible with such CPs. The fact that such structures as (1) and (2) in Chapter 7 are not attested until ME has more to do with the rise of *to*-infinitival ECM-constructions, where the *to*-infinitival clause is not controlled by matrix clause antecedents, and the greater frequency of the *to*-infinitival itself, than with a change in underlying structure.

The case against *to/te/zu* in PE, Dutch, and German being in $T^0$ has also been presented by e.g. Wurmbrand (2001: 109ff.). There is no single syntactic/semantic feature that unites *to/te/zu* complements: some of them can be said to be ‘tensed’ (i.e. the controlled complements) but others cannot (the complements of raising verbs like *seem*). The bare infinitives in the complement of modal verbs can be said to require a future interpretation but do not have *to/te/zu* (Hinterhölzl 1999: 66). The distribution of *to/te/zu* versus bare infinitives is so haphazard that Wurmbrand sees no other option but to invoke lexical or selectional restrictions imposed by the matrix verb (Wurmbrand 2001: 113), as the presence or absence of the infinitival marker does not correlate with the tense properties of the infinitives, or indeed with any other property. Other attempts to account for either the distribution of the two infinitival complements or cross-linguistic differences between PE, Dutch, and
German with respect to subject-to-subject or subject-to-object raising out of infinitival complements only succeed by tinkering with standard assumptions of the theory and proposing (well-argued but extensive) modifications. Examples are Wilder’s account of zu in C₀, which hinges on the acceptability of subject-to-subject raising out of CP-complements (Wilder 1988); Ruys’ proposal that the Minimality Condition does not hold in German and Dutch (Ruys 1987); Beukema and Den Dikken’s assumption that T₀ is generated in C₀ in OV-languages (Beukema and Den Dikken 1989); and Abraham’s treatment of Dutch te/German zu as situated in the subject position of a light verb construction (which, interestingly, also hosts participial ge- in these languages) which manages without PRO altogether (Abraham 1983, 1989, 1997, 2001). Hyde (2000) attempts an analysis in which PRO, lexical NPs, and NP-trace are all in complementary distribution, but the victims here are the difference between control and raising, which is given up, and infinitival to itself, which, analysed as a preposition (ignoring the vast difference in distribution and internal structure between it and the PE preposition to, with the inevitable result that such an analysis creates more problems than it solves), fails to capitalize on its affinity with the modal verbs.

These analyses require extensive modifications to existing theories and none can offer elegance and simplicity and yet do justice to the facts. Significantly, the single most complicating factor in any analysis is the existence of the raising constructions: subject-to-subject raising in Dutch, German, and PE with seem, appear and their Dutch and German counterparts, and subject-to-object raising (‘ECM’) with to-infinitives in PE. If it were not for these constructions, PRO and infinitival to would always co-occur. The presence in particular of ECM-structures in PE prompts Miller in his typological study of non-finite structures to posit a change in parameter setting, from [+Accord] in OE to [−Accord] for infinitival complements. I will argue in the next chapter that the ECM-facts in PE are still so problematic—most verbs that allow it only allow it in the passive: the few verbs that officially allow it in the active form hardly ever show up in performance corpora; the construction is restricted to a particular genre and only occurs in ordinary speech in a grammaticalized form; etc.—that it seems likely that it is not part of the ‘core’ grammar of English, and should therefore not play too prominent a part in the analysis of infinitival to. ECM in English appears to a large extent still dependent on extra syntactic ‘routines’ acquired after the ‘core grammar’ is already in place, i.e. a ‘virus’ (to use a term from Sobin 1997), rather than part of the unconscious internal grammar; see §9.5.3 below. The subject-to-subject raising constructions after seem and appear verbs have their roots partly in the wesan-to-infinitive, whereas the PRO + to constructions involve the ‘subjunctive’
to-infinitive, different entities with different histories, and it is this that prevents an elegant, unified analysis of PE to.

Such an analysis is still possible if we concede that PE to encodes what Noonan (1985) terms Determined Time Reference. Noonan notes that the distinction between Determined Time Reference DTR and Indetermined Time Reference (ITR) appears to be a very basic one in human language; not all languages encode all possible contrastive ‘modalities’, but if a language contains a minimum of only two complement types—say, indicative and subjunctive—the primary break is typically this distinction (Noonan 1985: 133). Cross-linguistically, then, subjunctives encode complements with Determined Time Reference. A complement having DTR typically refers to a future world-state relative to the time reference of the higher predicate (ibid. 92), but may also simply represent potential events or states:

The range of DTR complements includes those whose time reference is the same as [that of the root clause], such as complements to phasal (or aspectual) predicates like begin, those that are timeless in the sense that they represent general conditions or states, such as certain complements of like, and those that have no time reference because they represent non-events (as distinct from those that are simply potential) such as certain complements of try. (ibid. 94)

Achievement and negative achievement predicates (with meanings like manage, fail, or avoid) also tend to be expressed by DTR complements (ibid. 126). This list covers all the groups of verbs occurring with the to-infinitive in OE, and also includes the impersonal verbs (psychological predicates) which have given rise to the PE raising verbs (see §9.6 below) and impersonal constructions of the type it is good to . . . (evaluative predicates). If we realize that DTR is not necessarily restricted to prospective time but also includes timeless evaluative and psychological predicates, it is possible to find a unified meaning for to.

OE does not exhibit subject-to-subject or subject-to-object raising out of to-infinitival complements (Fischer 1989; Miller, who argues against Fischer, can only offer OE ECM-examples with verbs of thinking and declaring from Bede and glosses; Miller 2002: 160–1), so the distributional situation is much clearer than in PE. To in OE occurs only in control constructions, as a non-finite subjunctive element, and has subjunctive features to check against an appropriate functional head—the actual label (T₀, M₀, I₀, or otherwise) is of less importance. Whatever label we choose, it should be the one in which PE modals are base-generated, as this brings out the affinity of to with the subjunctive ending in OE and the modal verbs in OE and PE. For the remainder of this work we will use the label T₀.
8.4 To as a non-finite modal

If infinitival to is a subjunctive element in OE and base-generated in the same position as the modals, it could be argued to be a non-finite modal. This would mean that it has actually undergone little or no syntactic change since OE; Pullum presents compelling evidence that PE speakers analyse infinitival to, ‘as strange as this may seem’ (1982: 197), as a non-finite modal. The idea originates with Postal, and, independently, Hudson (1984 [1982]) and Fiengo (1980) (Pullum 1982: 197). Going over earlier proposals for the status of infinitival to, Pullum observes that to is obviously not an affix because its morphological status is that of a free word; it is not a particle on a par with the particles of phrasal verbs; and neither is it a complementizer, because unlike regular complementizers like that, to can be stranded by ellipsis as in (17) below. It is not a preposition, because there are no other prepositions that take uninflected VPs as complement, and the distribution of the PP as verb complement does not parallel that of to-VP, nor can it be modified by the typical PP modifiers right, straight. The preposition to does not show the contraction exhibited by infinitival to in gonna, wanna. Infinitival to cannot bear high stress when it is stranded under ellipsis, while the preposition to can (Zwicky and Levin 1980):

(17) *It would be easy not to like McCoy, but then again, it would be easy TO.
(18) For the last time, Mudd, who did you give it TO?

Zwicky and Levin (1980) also note that infinitival to shares this failure to bear stress when stranded with the non-finite forms of auxiliaries (which boils down to have, be, and, in British English only, do, as modals have no non-finite forms; examples from Pullum 1982):

(19) *I didn’t enjoy battling against the Gorn; I’d have to be crazy to HAVE Ø.
(20) *I wouldn’t be upset not to be chosen as the next Science Officer, but on the other hand, I wouldn’t be upset to BE Ø.
(21) *The United Kingdom hasn’t yet agreed to support the Federation, but it could DO Ø at any time.

The VP-ellipsis itself is another feature shared by auxiliaries and infinitival to:

(22) Asked if the points adopted by the Commonwealth would make any difference in South Africa, the Canadian Foreign Minister, Joe Clark, said he believed they would. (MicroConcord)
(23) We used to have to promise to do things to get elected, and now we have to promise not to. (MicroConcord)
Negatives are placed after finite auxiliaries but before non-finite forms; infinitival \( \text{to} \) patterns with non-finite verbs in this respect: \( \text{has not gone, not having gone, not to have gone} \). Although \( \text{not} \) can also be placed between \( \text{to} \) and the infinitive (as increasingly happens in American English; see below), the rule holds absolutely when negation and VP-ellipsis occur together; \( \text{not} \) can be clause-final after stranded finite auxiliaries, but never after non-finite ones (examples from Pullum 1982):

(24)  *By three o’clock I will have/be finished but you will have/be not \( \emptyset \).

(25)  *You usually pay a lot of attention to what McCoy says, but you ought 
      to not \( \emptyset \).

Pullum’s final point involves contraction of infinitival \( \text{to} \) in informal speech into forms like \( \text{wanna, hafta, gonna, oughta, gotta, s’posta} \). These contractions are only possible when the verb and + \( \text{to} \) etc. are adjacent in deep structure:

(26) Who do you want to/*wanna feed the chickens?

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{[CP who do [IP you [V want [IP t [to feed the chickens?]]]]]
\end{aligned}
\]

Similar contractions involve another non-finite modal, \( \text{have} \), with \( \text{should have} \) contracting into \( \text{shoulda, might have} \) into \( \text{mighta} \). Pullum relates such contractions to clause union or verb-raising phenomena:

(27) 

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{VP} & > > \text{VP} \\
\text{V} & \text{want} \\
\text{VP} & \text{t} \\
\text{V} & \text{live} \\
\text{VP} & \text{want} \\
\text{VP} & \text{live}
\end{aligned}
\]

Analysing \( \text{to} \) as \( \text{V} \) or \( \text{AUX} \) would not require any special mechanisms to account for the contracted forms.

For Pullum, infinitival \( \text{to} \) is a \( \text{V} \). He rejects AUX because he rejects the AUX-node as it was at that stage of the generative enterprise (1982: 196), and he also rejects tense as a possibility because he thinks of the tense-category as the domain of bound morphemes rather than independent elements, and he does not see a semantic connection with a time reference (ibid. 197). More recent theories, however, do not regard functional projections as the exclusive domain of either bound or free morphemes. Cross-linguistically, we find the same functional information expressed either synthetically or analytically: verbal endings in one language or one stage of a language express the same information as a string of auxiliaries in another; case endings in one
express the same functional information as that by free words (prepositions) in another; a comparative or superlative adjectival ending in one expresses the same information as independent words like *more*, and *most* express in another. Checking such elements in the same functional projection captures the fact that they express the same functional information; their morphological status can be dealt with by postulating that this checking takes place covertly in the case of bound morphemes, but overtly in the case of free words. Analysing *to* as a non-finite modal perfectly captures its semantic and syntactic similarities to the finite modal verbs. The only difference between OE and PE would be the morphological status of *to*, and that would be accounted for by postulating that it checks its subjunctive feature overtly in PE but covertly in ME. All in all, the Tense Projection is a likely choice for infinitival *to*.

Although it is impossible to match the subtleties of Pullum’s PE evidence in a dead language like OE, there is other evidence to show that infinitival *to* in OE is also best analysed as a non-finite modal. Such an analysis would account for the fact that it shares properties with other typical T⁰ elements.

Infinitival *to*, the verbal prefix *ge-*-, the verbal clitic negation *ne*, and the auxiliaries in Old English may vary in their morphological status (bound, clitic, or free) but they all share a single characteristic, which is also found in continental West Germanic dialects—they are the only elements that can intervene between particles and their verbs in embedded (i.e. non-verb-second) contexts (examples from van Kemenade and Los 2003):³

(28) forðæm hio nanne swetne wæsðm forð ne
because she no sweet fruit forth not
bringð ⟨CP 45.341.22⟩
brings
‘because it does not produce any sweet fruit’

(29) þæt him wære alyfed ut to farenne ⟨GD 2 (H) 25.155.26⟩
that him was allowed out to go
‘that he was allowed to leave’

(30) ær he ut wolde faran to gefeohte ⟨Or 3.8.122.11⟩
before he out wanted go to fight
‘before he wanted to go out to fight’

(31) hie þa men ut gelædan woldon ⟨LS 1.1 (AndrewBrig) 172⟩
they those men out GE-lead wanted
‘they wanted to lead the men out’

The clearest manifestation of the special status of these elements is found in relative clauses with stranded prepositions. Nothing is allowed to intervene

³ In verb-second context the finite verb moves away and leaves the particle stranded.
between the stranded preposition and the verb, with the single exception of these elements. OE to patterns exactly like Dutch te in this respect (for OE, see example (53) in §8.7 below; for Dutch see Bennis 1986: 280). These facts can be captured by an analysis in which these elements (clitic ne, clitic to, free modals, and bound ge-) are all in the same projection.

The difference between OE and PE to, then, boils down to a difference in morphological status: the subjunctive feature of OE came to be checked overtly rather than covertly. We will try to account for this change in §8.5. We will begin by presenting evidence of the loosening of the bond between to and its infinitive.

8.5 To moves overtly to T⁰ in Middle English

8.5.1 The emergence of to V and V

We noted in the previous chapter that no material can intervene between to and the Old English infinitive, as this was one of the reasons why a prepositional analysis is unlikely. We also noted that coordinated to-infinitives with the second to omitted are rare in OE. The second conjunct of such coordinated structures almost invariably repeats to, again in marked contrast to regular PPs. These phenomena point to infinitival to being a bound morpheme in OE. In the early Middle English period, however, it becomes a free word.

The clearest evidence is of course the emergence of split infinitives as in (32) (c. 1225):

(32) Her amidde wes this meiden iset forte al to-renden
Here among was this maiden set for-to all asunder-rend
reowliche (Kathe, 4.408)
cruelly
‘Amongst this the maiden was placed to tear all asunder cruelly’

The instance in (32) allows another interpretation, i.e. interference from the verbal particle to- in to-renden. The first instance in van der Gaaf’s study on split infinitives dates from c. 1400 (example (3) in Chapter 7, from van der Gaaf 1933: 15).

Example (33) has been claimed to represent a case of infinitival to being stranded by VP-ellipsis (van Gelderen 1993: 42):

(33) þey wld nat do / For hym þat þey were
they would not do / For him that they were
ordeyned to (Handl Sin 6401–2)
ordained to
‘they did not want to do / For him what they were appointed to’
Table 8.1. Frequency of $to\ V$ and $to\ V$ and $V$ and $V$ in Old English and early Middle English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>corpus</th>
<th>$to\ V$ and $V$</th>
<th>$to\ V$ and $V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old English Helsinki Corpus</td>
<td>61 (98%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(N = 62)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early Middle English (Sanders)</td>
<td>72 (55%)</td>
<td>59 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(N = 131)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If VP-ellipsis occurred at this early date, this would support our analysis of infinitival $to$ as a non-finite modal (as in examples (22) and (23)). The data allow of other interpretations, however. A more probable interpretation of (33) is that this is not infinitival $to$ but prepositional $to$ stranded from a $to$-PP; *ordain* is attested with $to$-PP complements (e.g. *OED* 1387 Trevisa Higden (Rolls) VIII.19). Van Gelderen’s other instances with *prey* and *join* also involve *wh*-movement, like (33), and so could also be preposition stranding. Among the instances in Visser (1963–73: §1062), the first unequivocally non-*wh*-moved instance dates from 1632 (‘Pursue your project real, Master Compass advised you to’; Ben Jonson, *Magnetic Lady*, I. 162).

There are, however, other, far more unequivocal signs that $to$ and the infinitive are no longer inseparable from eME onwards. In eME, sequences of $to\ V$ and $V$, i.e. two coordinate $to$-infinitives in which $to$ only appears with the first conjunct, become extremely frequent, as a comparison of an OE and an eME corpus shows (Table 8.1). An eME example of $to\ V$ and $V$ is:

(34) al fornawt þu prokest me to for-gulten & all fornothing you incite me to sin and forgan þe blisse up-o blisse. þe crune up-o forgo the bliss upon bliss the crown upon crune; of meidenes mede (HALI,164.520) crown; of maiden’s reward ‘all for nothing you incite me to sin and forgo the bliss upon bliss, the crown upon crown, of maiden’s reward’

It is important to note that we are probably not dealing with a $to$-infinitive conjoined to a bare infinitive in many such instances because the matrix verb is not otherwise attested with a bare infinitive. We saw in §7.2.2 that the rules of coordination in OE, as well as those of ‘naive’ PE, are considerably more relaxed than many stylists suggest, in that what is coordinated in such sentences is two

---

4 I am grateful to David Denison for pointing this out to me.
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CPs, with ellipsis of the higher verb and subject of the second conjunct under identity. As long as both conjuncts are each well-formed complements with respect to the matrix verb, that seems to be enough, both for OE and ‘naive’ PE. The structure underlying (34), then, is:

(35) þu prokest me to for-gulten & þu prokest me to forgan you incite me to sin and you incite me to forgo þe blisse the bliss

When to-infinitives are found conjoined with PPs, or that-clauses, or NPs, or bare infinitives in OE, there is usually independent evidence that the governing verb subcategorizes both for to-infinitives and PPs, or to-infinitives and that-clauses, or to-infinitives and NPs, etc. In example (34), however, both conjuncts are purpose adjuncts, and we saw in Chapter 2 that bare infinitives had already ceased to appear in this function in OE. This means that forgan in (35), although identical in form to a bare infinitive, should nevertheless not be analysed as such, but as a to-infinitive without to. West Germanic to-infinitives are not derived from bare infinitives by some process of ‘to-insertion’ but represent a separate nominalization, a gerund (see above, §7.2.1).

To-infinitives and bare infinitives are occasionally found conjoined in OE, but the vast majority of such coordinations obey the ‘looser’ conventions of OE. Fischer notes that the majority of the OE examples of to V and V provided by Visser (1963–73: §967) and Mitchell (1985: §§929, 935, 956) depend on matrix predicates that are attested independently with both bare and to-infinitives, and it seems likely that the second conjunct in these instances is not a to-infinitive without to but a bare infinitive (Fischer 1996b: 115). There are a few exceptions, but they are different from the to V and V sequences we find in such profusion in ME; for a discussion, see again Fischer (1996b). The evidence, then, points to a change in infinitival to: it is no longer an inseparable element.

The question is what the motivation for such a development could have been. It is tempting to regard the absence of the -enne ending on the second conjuncts of such to V and V sequences as licensing the omission of the second to in some way, but for a number of reasons the relation between the absence of the ending cannot be straightforwardly related to the absence of to.

The first one is the observation that the phonological reality of the -enne ending itself is problematic. Delbrück (1907) points out that there may be a connection between the fact that the du-infinitive is not inflected in Gothic but simply ends in -an and the fact that -an endings in to-infinitives are quite frequent in OE poetry. He suggests that the -enne spelling (and perhaps
pronunciation) was a convention adopted at a later stage by analogy with the dative ending on nouns in -en, e.g. to westenne ‘to [the] waste’; see also Demske-Neumann (1994: 55). The ending certainly does not behave like a genuine nominal ending, as we saw in §7.2.5.

Secondly, there are no obvious links between the pattern of the demise of the inflectional ending and the syntactic behaviour of the infinitive in individual texts; and the patchy spellings in the Katherine Group, for instance, suggest that the presence or absence of the ending is largely determined by spelling conventions and probably not a reliable guide to whether these endings were phonologically present. Certain frequent verbs keep it (to donne, to ganne, to cumenne) and others appear either with -en or even -e without any set pattern. It could even be argued that the consistency of the ending in OE is due to spelling conventions, and that its demise in eME is due to the fact that there was no longer a written standard. For all of these reasons it is probably safer not to attach very much importance to the presence or absence of -enne, -en, or -e in individual texts.

Another point is that the loss of the ending means that there is nothing to formally distinguish a bare from a to-infinitive in OE apart from the presence of infinitival to, which makes it less likely that to would be allowed to be dropped as well. In spite of the fact that there are no formal differences between the two infinitives in PE, the two infinitives each have their own domain, and there is never any ambiguity about any form: we can always tell whether we are dealing with a bare infinitive or with a to-infinitive because of the presence of infinitival to, which can only be dropped in a to V and V sequence when its syntactic structure allows a to-infinitival second conjunct to be recognized as such, as in the following two examples, where work and live cannot be bare infinitives because bare infinitives do not occur as complements of determined ((36)) or like ((37)):

(36) I had decided to follow my father’s advice and finish, but I was also determined to follow my own inclinations and work as much as I could in sculpture. (MicroConcord)

(37) Only the private householder will be able to retain the integrity of individual old buildings, so that future generations will know what they were really like to look at and live in. (MicroConcord)

As Modern Dutch and German te-/zu-infinitives lost their endings many centuries ago but have nevertheless retained the strict adjacency between te/zu and infinitive until the present time, the loss of the ending in itself is apparently not sufficient to loosen to; in Dutch, te V en V is only allowed in a few highly idiomatic phrases (see Fischer 1996b: 113 for examples). The loss of the ending
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is probably best regarded as a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the loosening of the bond between to and its infinitive.

8.5.2 The OV/VO change

If to is not a free element in OE, its subjunctive features cannot be checked by overt movement, but only by movement at LF, which means that it is licensed in the same way as the subjunctive endings on the finite verb.

We would expect the objects of to-infinitives to be directly affected by the Middle English OV/VO change, as it affects the position of object NPs, and to-infinitives assign case in the same way as finite verbs. This is exactly what we find. The Katherine Group, eME (c. 1225) texts from the West Midlands, represents a dialect which exhibits high rates of VO patterns in finite clauses (see e.g. Kroch and Taylor 2000). To-infinitival objects, too, both full NPs and pronouns, occur almost exclusively to the right of the infinitive, with very few exceptions. In OE, by contrast, full NP objects precede and follow finite and non-finite verbs at about the same rate (32% VO, 68% OV; see Table 7.4), but pronouns almost invariably precede (see also Pintzuk 1996, 2002).

In an OV dialect in which infinitival to is a clitic, it will have to raise to T₀ covertly in order to check its subjunctive features. Objects—even when scrambled—never raise to positions higher than T₀; there are no objects in the Vorfeld in OE, and this forces the analysis during the language acquisition process that to can only check its features covertly. But if objects no longer precede infinitival to, the language acquisition input gives few if any clues that to is supposed to raise to T₀ at LF, or, indeed, that the entire to + V complex raises to T₀ at LF. Let us assume a TP structure as follows:

\[
(38)
\]

The presence of OV orders in infinitival clauses forces the analysis during the language acquisition process that infinitival to moves to T₀ covertly. Alternatively, it is the entire to + V complex that moves covertly to T₀.
Table 8.2. VO grammars and their outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>options</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SpAgrO</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VO₁</td>
<td>to V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>to V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object covertly to SpecAgrO; to + V complex covertly to T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>to V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object covertly to SpecAgrO; to covertly to T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output 1 + 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₃</td>
<td>to V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>[→ T]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object covertly to SpecAgrO; to + V complex overtly to T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₄</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>[→ T] V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object covertly to SpecAgrO; to overtly to T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a structure such as (38) the assumption is that the loss of OV orders translates as the inability of the object to move overtly. If we assume infinitival to to be a clitic or affix, there is nothing to prevent an analysis in which to or the to + V complex move overtly. We end up with four possible analyses, set out in Table 8.2. Covertly moved elements appear in bold type; arrows indicate traces of moved elements.

Note that the movement of to, or alternatively, of the to + V complex, to T⁰ has become, to all intents and purposes, vacuous, and it could be at this point that some learners decide that the to, or the to + V complex, may move overtly, as both analyses yield the same output; overt movement could be a more economical option. Option VO₄ innovates by analysing to as a word rather than a bound morpheme, and moving it to T⁰ separately.

It is possible that these orders, and the grammars that generate them, co-existed for some time. The facts and analyses surrounding the phenomenon of the loss of OV in Middle English are open to a number of interpretations; some studies argue for a rapid decline in OV orders (e.g. Kohonen 1978; Hiltunen 1983), whereas others argue that the loss of OV orders was more gradual and did not proceed at the same pace in the various ME dialects (Allen 2000; Kroch and Taylor 2000; Van der Wurff 1997). I am going to assume in the rest of §8.5.2 that OV orders were not lost overnight, and that subsequent generations still encountered relic OV orders in their input. If the VO grammars of Table 8.3 still occasionally allow objects to move overtly, we would expect to find the orders in this table.

All orders are attested, including the remarkable order generated by VO₄, although it is infrequent. Examples of this order are given in (39) and (40).
Table 8.3. ‘Relic’ OV with VO grammars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VO grammars</th>
<th>Output with object movement to SpecAgrO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VO₁</td>
<td>O to V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂</td>
<td>O to V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₃</td>
<td>to V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₄</td>
<td>to O V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from the PPCME; the text is South-eastern, mid-fourteenth century (objects in bold):

(39) he ne heþ miȝte to hit endi ⟨AYENBI,I,113.252⟩
   he not has power to it end
   ‘he does not have the power to end it’

(40) huanne he him yelt to him overcom ⟨AYENBI,I,253.383⟩
   when he them yields to him overcome
   ‘when he yields to them, to overcome him’

For more examples see Jarad (1997: 154–8).

The phenomenon involves both pronouns and full NP objects. A Northern example of the latter (object in bold) is:

(41) he sal bath regn in pes and rest to temple make he
    he shall both reign in peace and rest to temple make he
    sal be best (Cursor Mundi 8318; Visser 1963–73: §978; Jarad
    shall be best 1997: 157)
    ‘he shall reign both in peace and rest, and be the best to build a temple’

This appears to rule out all the usual mechanisms that may move objects in front of verbs (noun-incorporation, clitic object pronouns, scrambling), with the exception of movement to SpecAgrO.

It seems likely, then, that these infrequent to–Obj–V orders combine the inference that to moves overtly and independently, the result of one of the new VO grammars, with the old option of moving objects overtly. This order does not appear in OE (no VO grammars, as VO surface structures are derived⁵) or PE (no OV orders). It is at the same time compatible with the fact that to has remained a free element in PE.

⁵ This holds for the GB framework, in which a great deal of work has been done on OE word order, and which assumes underlying OV order which, in combination with the adoption of operations like V₂ and heavy constituent shift, is able to account for the great majority of attested orders (see Pintzuk 1996: 246), although this system will also generate orders that are not attested (Fuss and Trips 2002).
This scenario explains how to could be reanalysed as a free word once VO grammars were adopted, although the increasing adoption of a VO grammar is again, like the loss of infinitival inflection, only a necessary, not a sufficient, condition for the degrammaticalization of to. The change in the morphological status of infinitival to must have been prompted by something else. The most obvious candidate is the fact that the synthetic subjunctive was being replaced gradually by the analytic subjunctive of modal + infinitive periphrasis, which represents a change from covert to overt movement (V₀ to T₀, with subsequent reanalysis of modals as elements base-generated in T₀). As infinitival to was also regarded as a subjunctive element, it may have started to move to T with the modals for that reason.

8.5.3 The lexicalization of T₀

We saw in the previous chapter that the identification of the to-infinitival clause with the finite subjunctive clause is of long standing. The two are so similar (positionally, distributionally, and semantically) that the conclusion that the to-infinitive had already become the non-finite counterpart of the subjunctive clause in OE is inescapable. The behaviour of PE to confirms that speakers construe it as a non-finite modal, as we saw in §8.4. Modals and to are in a way complementary: modals have no non-finite forms, to has no finite forms.

The subjunctive verb in the that-clause with which the to-infinitive is in competition already has two forms in Old English: one form has a subjunctive ending, and the other form has a periphrasis with a modal verb. This competition within the subjunctive clause is probably prompted by the phonological erosion of the verbal endings which have started to obscure the formal distinctions between indicative and subjunctive forms. The periphrasis, already available in OE, was used as an alternative way of expressing the subjunctive, and clauses with the new analytic form (with should or would) have the same distribution as the clauses with the old synthetic form. Examples are (42) with the synthetic and (43) with the analytic subjunctive:

(42) [Antiochus] bæd eac ða modor þæt heo hire bearn tihte,
[Antiochus] asked also the mother that she her child urged,
þæt he huru ana abuge ⟨ÆLS (Maccabees) 166⟩
that he at-least alone submitsubj
‘[Antiochus] also asked the mother to urge her child that he at least, as the only one, would submit’

A minimalist framework may either adopt the position that AgrO-features can be both strong and weak in OE (e.g. Van der Wurff 1997), or adopt an OV base (as suggested for Dutch in Barbiers 1998). See also Zwart (1993).
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(43) þa coman þa Cristenan and ðone cempan tihton þæt he then came the Christians and the warrior urged that he 
ðone sceolde feor fram ðære byrig. \(\langle \text{ELS (Sebastian) 435}\rangle\) 
gō should far from that town.

‘Then the Christians came and urged the warrior to go far away from that town.’

Yerkes notes in his study of the two mss of the OE translation of Gregory’s Dialogues the equivalence of the two constructions; cf. (44) and (45) (from Yerkes 1982: 36):

(44) hwylc æfter þam beon sceolde \(\langle \text{GD 147.26, C}\rangle\)

what after that be should

‘what would be after that’

(45) hwylc wære æfter oðrum \(\langle \text{GD 147.26, H}\rangle\)

what wereSUBJ after others

‘what would be after others’

There is a general restructuring of the verb system in Middle English that eventually results in the establishment of auxiliaries as a separate class base-generated in \(T^0\). Full equivalence of the new modal + infinitive and the old subjunctive appears to have been reached in early ME; by 1350, modals outnumber subjunctives in dependent clauses (Lopez Couso and Mendez Naya 1996). Modals have become the equivalent of the subjunctive inflection; the bare infinitive that follows them has become the equivalent of the bare verb stem. It is this process that offers an explanation for the degrammaticalization of to in this same period. To, as the equivalent of the subjunctive, and like the earlier subjunctive inflection fixed to the verb, now follows the new modals in moving overtly to \(T^0\) as a free form.

8.5.4 Conclusions

The loosening of the bond between infinitival to and its infinitive in eME is, we have argued, motivated by changes in the expression of the subjunctive. The subjunctive is increasingly becoming expressed by a modal periphrasis rather than by a subjunctive ending on the verb. In theoretical terms, the subjunctive starts to raise to \(T^0\) overtly rather than covertly. When subjunctives are phased out altogether—the subjunctive in embedded clauses in PE is a reinvention—this leads to complications in the system: finite subjunctives raise overtly, but non-finite subjunctives (i.e. infinitival to) raise covertly. We have seen that a necessary condition for the reanalysis of to from clitic to a free subjunctive
morpheme is the loss of OV orders; but the reanalysis itself may well have been triggered by the behaviour of its finite counterpart, the new modal verb. If this scenario is right, the change can be argued to be grammar-driven, which is an unusual result.

8.6 The emergence and subsequent loss of for to

The OV/VO change affected infinitival to in other ways. The new infinitival complementizer for, which is first found in eME, originally appeared in C but merged with infinitival to when it came to be adjacent to it as a result of the new VO orders. For a time there were two variant infinitival markers, forto and to, with the latter eventually winning out.

Why did the preposition for come to be used as complementizer in the first place? The traditional explanation is that infinitival to had lost some of its purposive force, and needed for to reinforce purposive meaning: ‘[it] may have arisen from either the fact that the directive force of to was too much toned down, or to a trend to reinforce the directive force of the preposition to. The early introduction of for to makes the second conjecture more probable’ (Visser 1963–73: §949). These two motivations are of course connected: why would the directive (or better: purposive) force of to need reinforcing if there had not been a loss of purposive meaning? It is easy to see why a new purposive marker was needed: as the non-finite alternant of the subjunctive clause, the to-infinitival clause had spread beyond its original limits of purpose phrase and was appearing in all subjunctive (DTR) contexts apart from that of reported speech, and the restoration of purposive force is the most likely trigger. The phenomenon is paralleled by the emergence of the purposive reinforcing element om ‘for’ in Dutch.

A third motivation for the emergence of for may have been the need for an overt complementizer to mark the left edge of the infinitival clause, and so bring such clauses into line with their finite counterpart, the subjunctive clause, whose left edge is marked by that. The idea that for was initially positioned in the complementizer position C, which is also the most likely position for its counterpart om in Dutch, is supported by attestations of the order for O to V—with the object being the object of the infinitive rather than the object of for. Moreover, this order appears mainly in southern dialects, which are conservative in retaining OV; example (46) with pronominal object, and
(47) with full NP-object, come from the same South-eastern text (c. 1200):

(46) Ac þu scalt stonden tefore me a domesdaiȝe, and tefore 
but you shall stand before me on doomsday, and before 
all mankenne, þar ic þe scal undernemen mid þa 
all mankind, where I you shall receive with the 
ilche wordes þe þu ofte hafst þeherd for þe te 
same words that you often have heard for you to 
warnien (VICES1,12.85; PPCME) 
warn 
‘But you shall stand before me on the day of judgement, and before all 
mankind, where I shall receive you with the same words that you have 
often heard, in order to warn you.’

(47) hie neðerið hem for eadmodnesse te habben and for to 
they humble them for humility to have and for to 
helpen godes þe(a)ruen (Vices and Virtues 11; Holthausen 1921: 45) 
help God’s poor 
‘They humble themselves in order to have humility and to help God’s poor’

See also the data in Kroch and Taylor (2000). The similarity of this pattern 
to the Dutch om NP te V suggests strongly that for in these early attestations 
is in C.

Inevitably, the for marker quickly spread beyond its original purpos- 
ive environment, just as the to-infinitival phrase had done at an earlier 
stage. In this, ME for is again closely paralleled by Dutch om, which has 
also spread to all DTR contexts and is generally optional, except in pur- 
pose adjuncts—its original environment—where it is obligatory (Gerritsen 
1988). Om has not spread beyond the subjunctive domain: it does not occur 
with the te-infinitive in raising constructions or reported speech comple- 
ments (Petter 1998: 60). Its absence from raising complements indicates 
that om is still in C (explaining its incompatibility with raising comple- 
ments, which are usually analysed as IP rather than CP and so lack a C-position).

Its non-occurrence with reported-speech complements echoes the pat- 
tern of the spread of the to-infinitive itself. Although to-infinitives spread 
to Determined Time Reference contexts in OE (the typical subjunctive 
environment with prospective semantics; see §8.3), they do not occur 
after verbs of saying and declaring in OE, although they robustly occur
with subjunctive clauses. A search of the BGAH corpus resulted in the following list of verbs that are found with subjunctive clauses but not with to-infinitives:

(48) ærendian ‘carry a message’; andswarian ‘answer’; andwyrdan ‘answer’; ascian ‘ask’; beladian ‘excuse’; cweðan ‘say’; foreseegan ‘predict’; for-wregan ‘accuse’; iewan ‘point out’; innian ‘include’, ‘restore’; ondettan ‘confess’; secgan ‘say’; tacnian ‘signify’; ðancian ‘thank’; ðreagan ‘rebuke’; widlicgan ‘oppose’; wrecan ‘utter’

Secgan alone accounts for 119 out of the 165 instances of the [ _ NP that-clause] frame in the BGAH corpus after verbs that are not attested with the corresponding non-finite frame (i.e. object-controlled [ _ NP to VP]). The case of the NP is dative, and many of these verbs may also occur with double object complements (usually dative + accusative), a situation reminiscent of the verbs of commanding and permitting in Chapter 5.

The reason that these verbs do not occur with a to-infinitive in OE is probably because verbs of saying and declaring are cross-linguistically found with the most ‘maximal’ finite clause complement, i.e. a finite clause that is most similar to a main clause (Noonan 1985: 49), and this is also true of OE, where such verbs often have an indicative complement clause. Subjunctives do occur, but the motivation for their use differs from that of the subjunctive clause after control verbs. Three kinds of dependency are important with subjunctives (ibid. 92):

(i) time-reference dependency
(ii) truth-value dependency
(iii) discourse dependency

The first type of dependency typically refers to a future world-state relative to the time reference of the higher verb, but may also refer to events or states that are simply potential rather than future, or even timeless in the sense that they represent non-events in some cases (ibid. 92–4). It appears that the to-infinitive in OE, after the control verbs, is the non-finite counterpart in particular of the subjunctive that depends on time reference. The subjunctive in the clause that is an argument of the verbs of saying and declaring appears to depend on the other two factors: discourse, in that it represents reported speech; and truth-value, in that the subjunctive in these cases may reflect non-commitment on the part of the speaker vis-à-vis the truth or untruth of the reported message. Unlike the time-reference subjunctive, which is never seen to alternate with the indicative, the verbs of saying may also be followed by an indicative clause,
generally indicating that the speaker is prepared to vouch for the truth of what he is saying.\(^6\)

There is evidence that the subjunctive clause itself followed the same trajectory in its spread. The relative particle \(ei\) ‘that’ in Gothic, which also functions as a complementizer, is clearly associated with the subjunctive, whereas \(patei/pammei\) ‘that’ is mainly reserved for clauses in the indicative (Klinghardt 1877: 170, 175, 179). It is the latter type that we find with the verbs of saying and declaring in Gothic (‘verba der sinlichen äusserung’, ibid. 171; see also van Moerkerken 1888: 38–50). Only a few of these verbs occasionally occur with a subjunctive complement, also when they report something of which the truth is not in doubt. This development has been described by Bernhardt (1877a: 14) as the beginning of an expansion of the subjunctive (‘Ein anfang weiterer ausdehnung dieses optativs’).

The exact pattern of the emergence of \(for\) as an overt complementizer in C is obscured by a lack of texts from the relevant area and period and by the speed of the various other developments affecting \(to\) and its infinitive, i.e. the loss of OV orders and the new status of \(to\) as an overt expression of T. What is clear, however, is that \(for\) did not remain in C for long. It becomes attached to \(to\) very rapidly, with the resulting complex \(forto\) functioning as a compound infinitival marker; see e.g. Jarad (1997: 90); Jack (1991: 316); Roberts (1993 [1992]: 260).

An interesting example is:

\[\text{(49) For qui it was no3te Pet(\textit{ir})i\textquoteleft s a3te Dat o3\textit{(ir)} men hauid For why it was naught Peter’s own That other men had him bita3te For to kepe unto thair nede, And for to tha him entrusted For to keep until their need, and for to the pou(\textit{er}) men to fede poor men to feed (\textit{Cursor Mundi}, Edinburgh fragment, 76–80, corr. to 11. 19065–8 in Morris 1966 [1876]: 1092) \]

‘For it was not Peter’s own that other men had entrusted to him to keep until they needed it, and to feed the poor’\(^7\)

\(For + to\) appear to have merged into a single infinitival marker here; the pre-verbal object suggests that \(forto\) is in C, as if \(for\) in C has taken \(to\) with it. An additional \(to\) has been added in the position of the trace of the first \(to\). Instances like (49) show that the position of \(to\) is in a state of flux in this period, probably

\(^6\) Although this appears to be a general rule, there are exceptions (see Mitchell 1985: §§877, 2100; Mitchell and Robinson 1982: §156).

\(^7\) I am grateful to Frank Beths for providing this example.
because of the problem of accommodating such relic OV structures into a VO grammar.°

For appears in four configurations in ME (‘Object’ denotes the object of the infinitive; note that the construction in (50a) should not be confused with the PE construction in sentences like It is important for this analysis to be investigated (Postal 1974: 150; Fischer 1988; Fischer et al. 2000: 216ff.):

(50)  
   a. for Object to V  
   b. for to V Object  
   c. Object for to V  
   d. for to Object V

For Object to V, the order in (50a), is limited to early Southern dialects and clearly connected with OV orders. For is in C, the object has moved to SpecAgrO, and to is a clitic that moves covertly to T.

The other orders show no particular chronology or geography, as far as I have been able to make out; and this is not surprising as they may be generated by various grammars, which becomes readily apparent when comparing these orders with the information in Tables 8.2 and 8.3. We will go through them one by one.

For to V Object (50b) is by far the most common order, which is only to be expected if the grammar has become predominantly VO. It can be generated in many ways: for could be in C, but there is nothing to force this analysis during the language acquisition process if objects are no longer found to the left of the infinitive (as in (50a)). For to could also be analysed as a compound infinitival marker—moving either covertly to T, as in the older analysis, or overtly, as we argued that to does at a later stage.

Object for to V (50c) represents a stage in which for to has become a compound infinitival marker, on a par with the ‘simplex’ form to. As for to comes to be glued together, particularly in a VO grammar which mainly exhibits orders such as (50b), we expect this order in texts of

° Significantly, the status of that other verbal prefix, ne, shows the same behaviour in the same text: loosening of the bond between ne and V. The data in Iyeiri (2001) appear to suggest that ne has been reanalysed as an element that follows the subject rather than preceding the finite verb and, like to in (49), we find occasional doublings, in which the same clause has one ne in its old pre-verbal position and a second ne in the new, post-subject position:

(i) Bot i ne of him ne had pite (Cursor Mundi, 9588; Iyieri 2001: 42)

One wonders if ne and to, as pre-verbal prefixes or clitics, are reanalysed together in this period.
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Later date, and/or from areas which are progressively VO. Example (51) is a case in point:

(51) & ne drede ich na deð for to drehen for him and not dread I no death for to suffer for him

(Margarete; D’Ardenne 1977: 61)
‘and I do not fear to suffer death for his sake’

Although this instance is early (c. 1225), it has been taken from a progressive VO dialect. The OV order, as in (51), is marked in this text, as in this dialect even pronouns are predominantly found to the right of the verb.

For to Object V (50d) represents a stage in which to is no longer a clitic, but relic OV orders are still possible (i.e. grammar OV4 discussed above). It is possible that for is still in C in such instances and has taken to along, or for to has become a compound marker which moves overtly to T. An example is:

(52) swo hi nomen conseil betuene hem þet hi wolden go so they took counsel between them that they would go forto hyne anuri (Kentish Sermons 9; from Jarad 1997: 154)
for-to him greet ‘in this manner they agreed that they would go to greet him’

There are more examples in Jarad (1997: 154–8).

The speedy grammaticalization of for to into a compound infinitival marker retaining little of its original purposive force, then, was at least partly caused by the loss of OV orders in this period. For subsequently became meaningless as a marker of the left edge of the clause (with the loss of OV orders, the clause was sufficiently marked by to in T) and was phased out; alternatively, forto and to could be regarded as competing forms of the infinitival marker, with to eventually ousting forto in most British dialects.

8.7 The grammaticalization and degrammaticalization of to

The early development of infinitival to, from preposition in prehistoric OE to prefix in OE, is a prime example of the phenomenon of grammaticalization, which was discussed briefly in §4.4 in the context of the aspectualizers onginnan/beginnan. The term itself is due to Meillet, who describes it as ‘le passage de mots autonomes au rôle d’agents grammaticaux’ (‘the passage of autonomous words to the role of grammatical elements’); Meillet 1948 [1912]: 133). In other words, lexical words become functional elements. In time, such elements may lose their free-word status and become bound morphemes.
Grammaticalization typically involves a loss in the lexical domain (‘semantic bleaching’) and a corresponding gain in the functional domain. It is accordingly relevant to the history of infinitival to, as that history involves a lexical Head (‘P’ in prehistoric OE or perhaps PG) ultimately becoming a functional Head (say, ‘T’ in PE). The near-loss of free-word status in OE is connected with this grammaticalization process.

One of the models to differentiate between varying degrees of grammaticalization was proposed by Lehmann (1995 [1982]), and used by Haspelmath to gauge the extent to which the German counterpart of the to-infinitive (the zu-infinitive) has been grammaticalized (Haspelmath 1989; see also Fischer 1997b). OE to scores highly on three of Lehmann’s parameters.

The fact that the to-infinitive developed out of a verbal nominalization only in the context of the purposive to-PP and never occurred with another preposition means that it scores high on the first parameter, ‘paradigmaticity’, from the beginning.9 ‘Paradigmatic variability’ is high, too, because the value of this parameter increases when restrictions imposed on the contexts in which the item can appear are dropped (Lehmann 1995 [1982]: 141), or if there is an increase in its distribution (ibid. 142). As soon as the to-infinitive becomes a subjunctive and spreads beyond the contexts of the purposive to-PP (e.g. as theme-argument of intention verbs and verbs of commanding and permitting), the value of this parameter increases. Because the to-infinitive has not ousted the finite subjunctive to the same extent as in later periods, it could be argued that in OE the value of this parameter has not yet reached its highest point. The fact that there is some restructuring of the respective functions in ME, with some to-infinitives venturing into positions that they are barred from in PE (Fischer 1997b; Rohdenburg 1992), could be argued to indicate that the value of this parameter peaked in ME.

OE to scores highly on the following three parameters because of one single characteristic: its morphological status of prefix. The parameters of ‘bondedness’, ‘syntagmatic variability’, and ‘syntagmatic weight’ measure things like the freedom with which an element can be shifted around in its context or its scope. The latter is translated by Haspelmath and Fischer as the ability of zu/to to scope over a second conjunct without needing to be repeated, and as OE to does need to be repeated because of its prefix status, it scores as highly grammaticalized on this parameter. The high grammaticalization scores on these parameters all decline when ME

9 Haspelmath and Fischer both refer to the bare infinitive here, but we have seen in §7.2 that there are no grounds for assuming that the to-infinitive derives from the bare infinitive.
to develops into a free word. The change in morphological status means that ME to automatically scores as having degrammaticalized on these three parameters.

Lehmann’s definition of the term ‘syntagmatic weight’, however, allows another interpretation which is independent of the question of the morphological status of to and hence independent of its score on the other two parameters. The syntagmatic weight or structural scope is the structural size of the construction which the grammatical element in question helps to form: in other words, how many levels of grammatical structure its complement contains (Lehmann 1995 [1982]: 143). As the element grammaticalizes, there is a corresponding reduction in the subcategorization frame (ibid., quoting Vincent 1980: 56ff.). In the case of the to-infinitive, the purposive to-PP consists of a P0 with an NP (or, more specifically, DP) complement. The categorial change that turned the nominalization into an infinitive makes a comparison difficult; if we assume that infinitival to is in T0 and that its complement is a VP, how does DP compare to VP with respect to structural substance? There is a natural relation between CP and DP as functional categories but not between CP and any of the major (lexical) categories (Roberts and Vincent 1991; Vincent 1993: 163 n. 18). If CP is the verbal counterpart of DP, the fact that infinitival to is complemented by VP rather than CP—the counterpart of DP with respect to structural substance—could be argued to represent a reduction in structure. OE to scores as highly grammaticalized on this interpretation too, independently of its morphological status, and more importantly, on this parameter ME to continues to score highly and does not degrammaticalize.

The position of OE and ME to with respect to the final parameter, ‘paradigmatic weight’, is more difficult to assess. This parameter refers to the extent to which grammaticalized elements show phonological reduction and semantic bleaching. Here, too, OE infinitival to scores high on the grammaticalization scale, and one would be tempted to claim that to is less grammaticalized in OE than in ME, because it is only in ME that we find it occasionally written as te or even t- when the infinitive starts with a vowel. However, OE spelling is too regular to make much of the fact that infinitival to is spelled with a full vowel rather than the e that spells schwa, a point made by Fischer (1997b, 2000). Te spellings emerged when there was no longer a written standard in ME. In contrast, West-Saxon, the language of 98 per cent of all extant OE texts, was a Schriftsprache with very consistent spellings, which make it unlikely that phonological reduction would be reflected in the spelling. Early phonological reduction is very probable in light of the fact that the te spellings that do occur—in glosses, where spellings were perhaps less careful
than in other text types (e.g. ⟨PsGlC 65.9⟩), but also in prose—occur in early texts, such as:

(53) Hwæt we eac wiernað urum cildum urra peninga mid to Lo we also prevent our children our money with to plegianne, ðæm ìlcum ðe we ëft tiocchiað urne eard play, the same that we afterwards intend our land & urne ëdel & ùre ìerfe eall ëtsonmne to and our property and our inheritance all together toprep te forlætanne ⟨CP 50.391.27⟩

to inf-element leave

‘For the same reason we prevent our children from playing with our money, even though they are the same ones that we afterwards intend to leave all our land and our property and our inheritance to’

Infinitival to may well have appeared as te in (53) to avoid confusion with the preposition to that immediately precedes it. Cura Pastoralis, the source of this example, contains two other examples of te spellings. The fact that it is an early text could indicate that the to spelling had not yet been consolidated. This is one reason why we cannot be sure that ME to scores more highly on this parameter than OE to.

The second problem is that prepositions are themselves the most functional of the major lexical categories. Unlike adjectives, verbs, or nouns, prepositions form a relatively closed set. As functional rather than lexical elements, they often appear in unstressed positions, and accordingly exhibit phonologically reduced forms. Many prepositions in PE have unstressed forms, a fact not evident from the spelling (see e.g. Gussenhoven and Broeders 1990 [1987]); and it is worth noting that one of the three te spellings in Cura Pastoralis concerns the preposition to rather than infinitival to (e.g. te færwyrde ‘to (their) ruin’ ⟨CP 65.463.5⟩). Te spellings, then, probably have little significance beyond indicating that the spelling system either has not reached the consistency of a proper standard (as may have been the case with Cura Pastoralis) or has suffered a general breakdown (as is the case in ME, when French takes over as the official language and there is no longer an English standard) and cannot be used as evidence that the to-infinitive in OE scored lower on this particular parameter than in ME.

The issue of semantic bleaching also falls under this parameter heading. It is clear that the purposive force of the preposition to must have been reduced when to was reanalysed as a subjunctive, on a par with the synthetic subjunctive inflection or its replacement, the modal in the analytic subjunctive
The changing status of infinitival to periphrasis. Its meaning became more abstract. The introduction of for is usually interpreted as a reinforcer of the original purposive meaning, and it clearly shows that to was not felt to be purposive enough. The fact that for subsequently disappeared from the (standard) language has been taken by Fischer (1997b, 2000) as an indication that to was regaining some of its original meaning. Fischer offers a number of interesting arguments for the idea that to somehow underwent a process of resemanticization in ME, but they are not conclusive. The fact that the to-infinitive in English, unlike Modern Dutch, never shows raising with commissive verbs (e.g. promise, threaten) would only be significant if English had not developed raising to-infinitives at all, which it did (with verbs like seem); the loss of the to-infinitive after verbs of motion and rest—e.g. ME could have ‘she lies to sleep’ rather than ‘she lies sleeping’—does not convince either, because the to-infinitive has already developed a participial use in OE (see §9.5.5 below), the one still surviving in the fossil ‘he is to blame’. Although resemanticization, coupled with to regaining its free-word status, tells a neat degrammaticalization story, the loss of for in ME is unlikely to have been motivated by a resemanticization of to. We argued §8.6 that the appearance of for may be as much a case of the renewal of purposive force as of a need to mark the left edge of the clause; its disappearance is more likely to be due to its merger with to into an infinitival marker forto, and to the loss of its original role as left-edge marker after the OV/VO change, than to a consistent pattern of degrammaticalization. The purposive force was later restored by other expressions, e.g. in order to (see §2.1).

The only point, then, on which to could be said to have degrammaticalized in ME is the change in its morphological status. This ME development is extraordinary from the viewpoint of grammaticalization as a strictly irreversible process (see Haspelmath’s notion of unidirectionality; see Haspelmath 1989, 1999). Degrammaticalization is rare enough to have been argued to be non-existent; Lehmann, for instance, cannot find a single case of alleged degrammaticalization that bears closer scrutiny, and states that ‘what we need [...] are not hypothetical, but historical examples’ (1995 [1982]: 18). The behaviour of to, from clitic back to free-word status, provides just such an example.

8.8 Conclusions

The to-infinitive, although clearly an innovation, has aligned itself so solidly with an existing structure, the subjunctive clause, that there is no need to invent a new functional projection to host it. To should be dealt with as the subjunctive (or for PE, the modal verb that has taken over the subjunctive) is
dealt with, and *to* should be accommodated in the functional projection that accommodates the modals, say T^0. The main difference between subjunctive clauses and *to*-infinitives is finiteness rather than mood/tense/aspect. This means that my position is that there has been no change in the position of *to* since it stopped being a preposition in prehistoric times.

In this section we have described the changes in infinitival *to* that took place in eME. Its most striking feature is the loosening of the bond between *to* and its infinitive, which was so close in OE as to suggest that *to* was a clitic or even a bound morpheme: nothing could intervene, and *to* could not be dropped from second (or subsequent) conjuncts in a sequence of coordinated *to*-infinitives; we saw in Chapter 7 that it is this behaviour that speaks out most clearly against infinitival *to* being a preposition in OE, and against the infinitival ending being on a par with genuine dative endings.

In ME, the status of *to* changes: second conjuncts appear freely without *to* where they can only be interpreted as *to*-infinitives (and not as bare infinitives), and split infinitives (at first with objects rather than adverbs) become possible. We have argued that this change demonstrates that infinitival *to* was no longer covertly moving to T^0 to check its tense features, but overtly, and that this change, although facilitated by the gradual loss of OV orders that took place in ME, was triggered by the behaviour of the finite counterpart of infinitival *to*: the finite subjunctive, which was increasingly coming to be expressed by a free form (a modal verb) raising to T^0 overtly, rather than by a bound form (a subjunctive ending), raising to T^0 covertly. The overt movement of *to*, then, would bring it in line with the rest of its paradigm: the modal verbs. If this was indeed the trigger, the change would be an example of a rare phenomenon: a grammar-driven change.
Part V
Changes in Middle English
The rise of *to*-infinitival Exceptional Case-Marking

9.1 Introduction

We have so far argued that the *to*-infinitive did not undergo a category change (Chapter 7) and that the position of infinitival *to* has been the same throughout the recorded history of English, i.e. it heads the projection that hosts the subjunctive ending in OE and the modal verb in ME. What is a new development is that *to* degrammaticalized to a free form in ME.

Another change in the *to*-infinitival complement in this period is the rise of the *to*-infinitival ECM-construction. This has been discussed extensively in the literature, e.g. in Bock (1931), Fischer (1989, 1990, 1992), Jespersen (1940), Lightfoot (1991), Warner (1982), and Zeitlin (1908). The *to*-infinitival ECM-construction after the verbs of thinking and declaring in particular (verbs like *prove, suppose, believe*) has received a great deal of attention, as these verbs do not appear with ECM until later in the ME period (roughly speaking, in texts with strong Latin influence in the fourteenth century, and in original English texts in the fifteenth century), and it has been established that these verbs do not constitute a reflex of OE verbs like *gefrignan* ‘find’, ‘meet’ or *witan* ‘know’ that appear with a bare-infinitival ECM-construction (or AcI)—such verbs, when followed by AcIs, involve direct perception and should be regarded as perception verbs rather than verbs of thinking (see Fischer 1989).

The verbs of thinking and declaring, however, are not the first verbs to appear with a *to*-infinitival ECM-construction. There is solid evidence of *to*-infinitival ECMs at an earlier period after the ditransitive verbs, which points to a reanalysis of the *to*-infinitival object control construction with which these verbs occurred in OE. The idea of a reanalysis of the object control construction has also been suggested by e.g. Fischer (1991, 1992), but we will show in this chapter that it needs to be refined further: it is only the object control constructions with the verbs of commanding and permitting, not the verbs of persuading and urging, that are relevant here. The reanalysis apparently did not involve *to*-infinitives being substituted for bare infinitives
in a bare-infinitival ECM (or AcI) construction, although the fact that verbs of commanding and permitting are both two- and three-place does play a role, as we will see below (§9.3).

A reanalysis of the object control construction must have been triggered or promoted by other factors, as it involves such a fundamental change in underlying structure: to-infinitives appear with overt subjects, and no longer exclusively with a PRO subject. Other factors have played an important role, e.g. the loss of OV orders (Fischer 1989) and the loss of the to-infinitive in the wesan-construction (§§9.4.5–9.4.6). The latter to-infinitive is crucially different from the to-infinitive after other verbs in that it does not have a that-clause analogue, is not obligatorily clause-final, does not have a PRO subject, and is not a CP. Its syntactic status resembles that of a passive participle, and its function is similar to that of predicate in a small clause construction.

It has also been noted that ECMs after the verbs of thinking and declaring almost invariably occur in a passive construction at their first appearance, or in another construction in which surface NP to VP is avoided (Warner 1982). It has been argued that saliency played a role here: the new construction was too conspicuous and was only acceptable in an ambiguous, transformed state that allowed of other interpretations. The implication of this view is that one might expect this to change in later times, when the construction became fully acceptable, but studies of the construction in later periods show that it still occurs overwhelmingly with its matrix verb passivized, or its NP moved by other syntactic operations; see e.g. Fanego (1990) for the construction in Shakespeare.

Postal shows that the vast majority of thinking and declaring verbs in PE still exhibit all manner of restrictions in PE, with many verbs not allowing ECM at all in their active form (e.g. allege; see the lists in Postal 1974); and figures for the construction in a PE corpus show proportions of active to passive constructions in ECMs of 1 : 3 (with great variations in individual verbs), whereas the overall ratio of active to passive in a PE text is 9 : 1 (Mair 1990: 159), and about half of all ECM-constructions in Mair’s corpus show wh-movement of the ECM-subject (ibid. 191). It seems, then, that surface NP to VP is still avoided and probably structural, and not simply a feature of its first emergence.

Recent studies indicate that the passive ECM is strongly associated with considerations involving information structure (Mair 1990; Hannay and Keizer 1993; Noël 1998), with the matrix subject almost invariably expressing given information. This suggests that the raising of subjects or objects out of embedded clauses may have been a way to compensate for the loss of V2, and that such strategies filled the need for more constructions to create subjects. This idea will be discussed in §9.4.2.
9.2 The analysis of to-infinitival ECMs in Present-day English

Sentences like (1)–(9) from a PE corpus (MicroConcord) exemplify a to-infinitival clause in which the infinitival subject is not PRO but an overt NP, with these NPs in bold:

1) Between Bicknell and Terry are those who believe Classicism to be the best possible style, without resorting to religion or evolution to justify it.
2) The pagan philosophers [ . . . ] are unable to set free the immortal soul, even after it has attained wisdom, and believe it to be proceeding unceasingly to false blessedness and returning unceasingly to true misery.
3) Joyant attributed [the painting Chicago écuyère] to 1888, perhaps because he believed it to have been one of the paintings that Lautrec showed at Les Vingt.
4) Rechem believes the results to be unscientific, and under the new agreement will be able to append its own commentary to the council’s existing document, especially if it is to form part of a submission to the European Commission.
5) The Jewish-Christian tradition identified the gods of polytheism with subordinates of the devil, malevolent spirits entrapping their worshippers, impelling them to worship the created order (hence the images in temples where polytheists believed their gods to be resident) rather than the Creator.
6) [ . . . ] 49 per cent of women and a surprising 32 per cent of men reported that they were virgins at marriage. In spite of this, 79 per cent of Italian men believed their wives to have been virgins when they married.
7) The semantic aspect refers to the ‘themes’ of a literary text. Although Todorov advances no ‘general hypothesis’ about the articulation of literary themes, he does, as a structuralist, believe them to be finite and knowable.
8) Kate [Bush] believes this [The Sensual World] to be her ‘most personal and female album’.
9) In other words, if you live in the North-west but believe Yorkshire to be a fundamentally more attractive investment, you are being cheated.

The verb believe has no more than two thematic roles to assign, and so has only one internal argument. Because believe cannot be three-place, we have to assume that this internal argument is the entire string of NP to VP, e.g. Classicism to be the best possible style in (1), it to be proceeding unceasingly to false blessedness and returning unceasingly to true misery in (2), etc. This means
that the \textit{NP to VP}-string must be a constituent at the highest level. Government
and Binding Theory labels it an IP (TP in post ‘split-IP’ terms), with the bold
NPs in (1)–(9) in SpecIP/TP, the subject position, as in (10), a basic structure for (4):

(10)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{Rechem} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{the results} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{to} \\
\text{be unscientific}
\end{array}
\]

The infinitival subject \textit{the results} cannot be assigned case by infinitival I\textsuperscript{0} (if
infinitival I\textsuperscript{0} could assign case, we would expect a sentence like \textit{*The results
to be unscientific is a bad thing to be OK}), nor can it move up to the subject
position of the higher clause (as in subject-to-subject raising with verbs like
\textit{seem}) as this position is already filled by the subject \textit{Rechem}. Substituting
the pronoun \textit{them} for the subject NP of the lower clause shows that the NP
\textit{these results} has accusative rather than nominative case, and as the only possible
accusative case-assigner available is the higher verb, \textit{believe}, there are two basic
analyses available: one in which the lower subject \textit{these results} is directly case-
marked by \textit{believe} (which is why such structures are referred to as ‘Exceptional
Case-Marking’ in GB); or one in which it is first raised to the object position
of the higher verb, after which case-marking or case-checking proceeds in
the usual way (this is the subject-to-object scenario current both in earlier
transformational work and in more recent Minimalist Theory in which the
lower subject raises to the SpecAgrO position of the higher clause to have its
case-features checked). We will not choose between the various scenarios here,
although we will use ‘ECM’ as a convenient label to refer to the construction.

Whichever scenario is preferred, both operations presuppose a weaker
clausal barrier than CP, i.e. IP, to allow the subject of the lower clause
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to be governed (GB) or moved (Minimalism). The to-infinitive in an ECM-construction, then, is usually held to be an IP (or TP), as are (subject-to-subject) raising complements, e.g. internal arguments of verbs like seem or appear. What both raising and ECM have in common is that there is a mismatch between case-assignment and theta-role assignment: the lower verb assigns the thematic role, but the higher verb assigns structural case—nominative case (raising) or accusative case (ECM).

Although neither the operation of ECM (with bare infinitives, ‘AcI’, see examples (11) and (12) in Chapter 1) nor raising (e.g. with wesan ‘to be’, or possibly the modal verbs, including onginnan/beginnan; see Chapter 3) are unknown in OE, the fact that these operations involve to-infinitives from ME onwards represents an innovation.

In PE, the to-infinitival ECM appears after two distinct groups, the verbs of commanding and permitting (the want-verbs), and the verbs of thinking and declaring (the believe-verbs). There are not just semantic, but also syntactic, differences between the two groups. The want-verbs consist of verbs of commanding and permitting, plus want, expect, hate, intend, like, mean, need, prefer, require, and wish. They generally appear in the active form, with some verbs, like want itself, not allowing passives at all; many of its members also allow for to complements; complements designate states of affairs rather than propositions and tend to have prospective orientation; many want-verbs may occur with a subjunctive that-clause; some are also subject control INTENTION verbs (again, like want itself), and have apparently joined the commanding and permitting group because the assumptions underlying their use have become those of directives, in line with the natural development of verbs of commanding from verbs with milder meanings (see Chapter 5). Directives are often encoded by fairly mild terms for reasons of politeness, with the expression of one’s wishes readily interpretable as a directive. They are basically verbs of commanding and permitting in which the to-infinitival complement, which first occurs in a three-place object control construction (Chapter 5), is reanalysed as a two-place ECM-construction, as we will see in §9.3. This is the earliest to-infinitival ECM-construction to emerge; the attestation given as example (4) in Chapter 7 dates from 1340.

The believe-verbs are very different in that very few verbs allow active ECM, as we will see in §9.4. Many more allow passive ECM, or allow active ECM only with specific NPs. The embedded verb is almost entirely restricted to be. Complements designate propositions rather than states of affairs; and they do not occur with for to infinitivals. They have been argued to be the only true ECM-verbs (Bach 1977; Bresnan 1979; Lasnik and Saito 1993). Lasnik and Saito
present subtle but unmistakable evidence (judgements are theirs) with respect
to pronominalization (Principle C violations):

(11) Joan believes he\textsubscript{i} is a genius even more fervently than Bob’s\textsubscript{i} mother does
(12) ?*Joan believes him\textsubscript{i} to be a genius even more fervently than Bob’s\textsubscript{i} mother does
(13) ?Joan wants him\textsubscript{i} to be successful even more fervently than Bob’s\textsubscript{i} mother does

reciprocals:

(14) ?I believed [those men to be unreliable] because of each other’s statements
(15) ??*I wanted [those men to be fired] because of each other’s statements

negative polarity:

(16) ??I believed [none of the applicants to be qualified] after reading any of the reports
(17) ??*I wanted [none of the applicants to be hired] after reading any of the reports

and binominal each:

(18) ??I believed [them to be incompetent] for three reasons each
(19) *I wanted [them to be fired] for three reasons each

These data can be interpreted as evidence that the strength of the boundary
between the matrix verb and the NP to VP-string is different for each group,
with perhaps only the NP of the believe-verbs raising to the object position in
the higher clause (in a non-GB frame) and able to C-command the relevant
item in the lower clause. Alternatively it could be argued that the to-infinitive
of the want-verbs still has a PRO subject and that these verbs are actually
three-place in (13), (15), (17), and (19) as the NP is ‘mind-possessing’. An ECM-
analysis is much more plausible if it is not. Whatever the analysis, the examples
clearly show that there are two groups, each with its own history and analysis.
A possible candidate for dual membership is expect, which occurs both as a
directive and a verb of thinking and declaring.
9.3 The ECM after want-verbs

9.3.1 Introduction

Postal (1974: 318) notes that ditransitive verbs like allow, permit, and order allow both the object control construction and the to-infinitival ECM, hence the ambiguity (earlier noticed by Huddleston 1971: 158, and Zeitlin 1908: 108) of a sentence like (20); interpretation (20a) is the object control structure, while (20b) is the ECM:

(20) I allowed Bob to leave.

   a. I allowed Bobi [CP [IP PROi [Ito [VP leave]]]] (= I gave Bob permission to leave)
   b. I allowed [IP Bob [Ito [VP leave]]] (= I gave permission for Bob to leave)

This ambiguity arises only when the NP (Bob in (20)) is animate, or, in Postal’s terms, ‘mind-possessing’. When it is not, as in (21) and (22), an ECM analysis is much more likely, especially if the to-infinitive is a passive, as in (22). Postal judges an object control interpretation to be just about possible in (21), but not in (22):

(21) I allowed the bomb to blow up the building.
(22) I allowed the building to be blown up by the bomb.

Most striking is the behaviour of order (Postal 1974: 318–19). The judgements are Postal’s, and it should be noted that grammaticality judgements on the acceptability of ‘to be’ in (23b and c) vary dramatically.

(23) a. I ordered that Bob be removed from the room.
   b. I ordered Bob (*to be) removed from the room.
   c. ordered the chair (to be) removed from the room.
   d. I ordered Bob to leave the room.

Postal notes that in the case of order, the situation is further obscured by interaction with some constraint that a to-infinitival ECM is only allowed when it does not lead to ambiguity between an object control reading and an ECM-reading; this is why to be in (23b) is ungrammatical.

To-infinitival ECM is first encountered with this group of verbs. A first conclusion is that the to-infinitival ECM-construction after these verbs is the reflex of the older bare-infinitival ECM-construction which we found with the
two-place variant of the verbs of commanding and permitting in OE, e.g. (51) and (52) of Chapter 5; (51) is here repeated for convenience as (24):

(24) þu þe bebude hælo cuman to Iacobes
    you who ordered fame come to Jacob’s
    cinne? (PPs (prose)43.6)
    ‘you who ordered fame to come to Jacob’s kin?’

To-infinitival ECM would then arise because the bare infinitive (cuman in (24)) was replaced by the to-infinitive, and this idea is at the heart of the debate about the nativeness or foreignness of the to-infinitival ECM-construction after the verbs of thinking and declaring between Zeitlin, Callaway, Bock, Jespersen, Nagucka, and Visser (Los 1986; Fischer 1989). The situation is actually more complex.

9.3.2 Reanalysis of object control to ECM

Reanalysis of object control constructions after the persuade-type verbs can be one source of to-infinitival ECM, as has been suggested in the work of Fischer (e.g. Fischer 1992). This hypothesis can be refined further: we saw in Chapters 3 and 5 that there are two classes of object control verbs, verbs of commanding and permitting and verbs of persuading and urging. It is the former that we find occurring with ECM, not the latter. The reason must be that it is only these verbs that have two-place variants, for cognitive/semantic reasons, i.e. the range of directive meanings from causative/peremptory (‘to command a situation such that [AcI]’) to request (‘give permission/a command to NP such that [PRO to VP]’); see Chapter 5. The former meaning is marked syntactically by a bare-infinitival ECM in OE (the AcI), the latter by an object-controlled to-infinitive, crucially with an animate, or better, ‘mind-possessing’ NP. Verbs of persuading and urging do not occur with such a structure (Chapter 3). We saw that there was a correlation between inanimate NPs in the AcI-construction and animate or ‘mind-possessing’ NPs in the object control construction. Then there was the case difference: inanimate NPs are always accusative and co-occur exclusively with a bare infinitive, which makes sense if they are not recipients of the matrix verb (which typically have dative case), but receive their thematic role from the infinitive. The animate NP with to-infinitives, on the other hand, is almost invariably dative, and correlates with the dative recipients found in the other three-place subcategorization frames of these verbs. (25) and (26) recapitulate the subcategorization frames
Table 9.1. Status of NP in bare-infinitive constructions with verbs of causing, commanding, and permitting in the PPCME corpus (periods M1 and M2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>implicit</th>
<th>inanimate</th>
<th>animate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bidden ask</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commaunden command</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don do (causative)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haten order</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leten let</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maken make</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolien suffer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffren suffer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of these verbs:

(25) **RECIPIENT**          **THEME**          **verbs of commanding**
V [NP<sub>dat</sub>] [NP<sub>acc</sub>]
V [NP<sub>dat</sub>] [PRO to-VP]
V [NP<sub>dat</sub>] [that-clause (subj)]
V [NP<sub>acc</sub> VP]
V [NP Pred]

(26) **THEME**                **GOAL**            **verbs of persuading**
V [NP<sub>acc</sub>] [to-PP]
V [NP<sub>acc</sub>] [that-clause (subj)]
V [NP<sub>acc</sub>] [PRO to-VP]

Tables 9.1 and 9.2, presenting the picture in the PPCME (adjusted with respect to occurrences of to V and V),\(^1\) show that these next patterns are no longer intact in ME.

The case of the NPs cannot be compared as nouns are no longer marked for dative or accusative case; however a striking difference remains between OE and ME with respect to animate NPs in NP to VP-constructions: the column ‘inanimate’ in Table 9.2 is no longer practically empty, as it was in OE (cf. Tables 5.2 and 5.4 above); there is one case of an inanimate NP in an NP to VP-string after verbs of commanding and permitting, and this is an attestation with aliefan ‘allow’ in a late OE homily, ECM-like but not a real (passive) ECM

\(^1\) The second infinitive in a sequence of to V and V in ME is not a bare infinitive but a to-infinitive without to; this represents a new development. See §8.5.1.
Table 9.2. Status of NP in to-infinitive constructions with verbs of causing, commanding, and permitting in the PPCME corpus (periods M1 and M2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>implicit</th>
<th>inanimate</th>
<th>animate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bidden ask</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commaunden command</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don do (causative)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haten order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leten let</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maken make</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðolien suffer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffren suffer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

because there is no agreement between plural *mylnum* (which, as a dative, cannot passivise anyway) and singular *nis*:

(27) ne mylnum nis alfyed to eornenne ne on not to-millsDAT not-is allowed to run nor on huntað to ridenne ne nan unalyfedlic weorc to hunting to ride nor no unallowed workACC to wyrcenne *(HomU 36, 29)*.

‘mills are not allowed to turn nor is anyone allowed to go out hunting or to do anything that is not allowed’

There is a marked increase in eME of such constructions, in which the NP is no longer the recipient of the higher verb (NP in bold), although it is still case-marked by that verb. Instead, it receives its thematic role from the to-infinitive:

(28) and makeþ to comen al out of smak. al þet me wes and makes to come all out of taste all that one was ywoned byuore to louie *(AYENBI, I, 106.146; c. 1340)* accustomed before to love

‘and he makes completely insipid everything that one used to love’

(29) þou comaundd þy comaundement to ben greteliche you commanded thy commandment to be strictly kept *(EARLPS, 145.2145)*

kept

‘you commanded your commandment to be carried out to the letter’
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These instances appear to be to-infinitival ECM-constructions, and as such represent an innovation. There is a slight difference between the two periods (M1 and M2) with respect to overall proportions of object control versus ECM-like constructions (Table 9.3) but it is not statistically significant.

9.3.3 No direct competition between new ECM and old AcI

Does this mean that the OE distinctions (syntactic and semantic) between bare and to-infinitival complements have been lost completely in ME? The answer is yes and no; yes, because it is true that verbs which are not attested with infinitival complements in OE (maken ‘make’ and dolien ‘suffer’) or are not attested at all in OE (because they represent French loans, i.e. commaunden ‘command’ and suffren ‘suffer’) do not show evidence of the OE system; they are the ones where we find the innovation. But the answer is no if we look at the lexical survivors from OE: it is there that the old system is still in place. The verbs that appeared with both AcI and NP to VP in OE—beodan, bebeodan ‘command’, biddan ‘ask’, don ‘cause’, δafian ‘allow’, and sellan ‘grant’, ‘give’—still show the old contrast between ‘causative’, two-place, bare-infinitival ECM and ‘polite’, three-place, object control NP + to-infinitive. Biddan, bebeodan, and beodan have coalesced into ME bidden/beden, and survive as PE bid, which still allows the two constructions, and apparently still shows the same semantic contrast (Duffley 1992). Don ‘do’ is no longer found in these two periods of the PPCME with a subjunctive clause but only with a non-finite complement and appears to have become a causative; this was a possible, though still marginal, use in OE (see Chapter 5). Here, too, the OE system appears to be intact in ME, although δafian ‘allow’ has subsequently been lost altogether while sellan ‘grant’ has only survived in a non-directive/non-causative meaning. Do has lost its directive/causative function in PE, but we will find it occurring with a to-infinitival ECM in the fifteenth century (see §9.3.4).

If we look at the verbs that could not appear with NP to VP in OE but did appear with an AcI, i.e. hatan and lætan, we do not find to-infinitival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.3. Object control NP to VP complements versus to-infinitival ECM after verbs of causing, commanding, and permitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP to VP (control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP to VP (ECM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECMs appearing here in ME, either. We saw in Chapter 6 that *hatan* also appears as a three-place verb in OE, e.g. with dative *recipient* (although accusatives are also occasionally attested) and clausal *theme*. The only instance of a *to*-infinitive after this verb in OE allows an adjunct interpretation and is not good evidence that *hatan* allowed a *to*-infinitive as its *theme*-argument in OE:

(30) Eala lareow, nelle þu me beon hegifteme forþon þe ic ne eom weorþe þære þenunge þe þu me hat to not am worthy of-the service which you order to onfonne ⟨LS 13 (Machutus) 29v.3⟩ receive

‘Alas teacher, do not be severe with me because I am not worthy of the holy orders which you order me to receive’

The occurrences of the *to*-infinitive in ME after this verb are unequivocal arguments of *hatan* and cannot be interpreted as adjuncts:

(31) Ah þu queðen ha keiser ahest to cuðen for hwet

But you said they caesar ought to know for what

icud þing þu hete us hider to noteworthy thing you commanded us hither to cumene. (KATHE 27,137)

come.

‘But you, Caesar, they said, ought to know for what noteworthy thing you commanded us to come hither’

(32) þis word hat ous to yelde þonkes myd al oure

this word commands us to give thanks with all our

herten (AYENBI I,102.56)

hearts

‘this word commands us to give thanks with all our hearts’

There is nothing mysterious about finding this verb complemented by an (object-controlled) *to*-infinitive in ME, as the construction must have emerged either as the result of the reanalysis we discussed in §5.3 (resolution of a structural ambiguity) or as the non-finite alternative of the subjunctive clause. It is unlikely that we are dealing with a direct replacement of a bare infinitive by a *to*-infinitive here, as the *to*-ininfinitival attestations in the PPCME appear to be three-place, not two-place like the bare-infinitival ECM; none of the *to*-infinitives show any of the typical ‘causative’ characteristics that typify the
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bare-infinitival ECM-construction after this verb in OE (Royster 1918, or above, Chapter 5).

The second verb emerges as *leten* ‘let’ in ME and also preserves its old bare-infinitival ECM in the eME period.

One other verb occurs as a causative, i.e. *gar* ‘make’. This is an Old Norse loan, only found in a Northern text (*Richard Rolle of Hampole*), and there is one attestation of *unnen* ‘grant’ with a bare infinitive, which is consistent with its being a verb of commanding and permitting—see Chapter 5. *Geunnan* ‘grant’ is attested with a bare-infinitival ECM (AcI) in OE (e.g. Callaway 1913: 111).

Although the database is slender, there is nothing to suggest direct replacement of bare-infinitival AcI by to-infinitival ECM. The old AcI-verbs keep their AcIs, and are only attested with object-control *NP to VP*. In that sense, the old AcI cannot be argued to account for the emergence of to-infinitival ECM, although it does encroach on AcI territory later (see example (33) below for *do*), after it has established itself.

9.3.4 The want-verbs in the Paston Letters

Want-verbs are robustly attested a few decades later in the *Paston Letters*, a body of correspondence written by members of three generations of the same family between 1421 and 1503. With its 150,000 words or more, this corpus is large enough for most syntactic structures to be represented.

Unlike the Wycliffite Sermons, it is not a translation but a collection of letters, some of which were taken from dictation (and may reflect spoken rather than written language); this means that the ECM-constructions found in this corpus cannot be ascribed to Latin influence.

The picture presented by these data is at once familiar and alien. To-infinitival ECM-constructions are found after the same three basic groups (commanding and permitting, believe-verbs, and want-verbs), although there may be some differences in individual items due to semantic shifts (*admit* means ‘permit’ and as such it is a verb of commanding and permitting; *advertise* means ‘admonish’ and—probably—belongs to the verbs of persuading and urging; etc.). It is difficult to distinguish between verbs of persuading and urging on the one hand, and verbs of commanding and permitting on the other, as the case of the object no longer affords us any clues, and dative objects—as we must suppose the objects of the commanding and permitting verbs to be—passivize freely by this stage; the only clue is whether the verbs occur with a double-object pattern (*NP + NP*). The old situation of bare-infinitival ECMs and to-infinitival object control constructions appears to be

---

2 This section is primarily based on Los (1986), with additional material from Fischer (1995).
intact in the Paston Letters at least in the case of the lexical survivors bid and beseech. However, in the case of a third lexical survivor, do, we find inanimate ECM-subjects (ECM in bold):

(33) if the said Sir John Paston pay or doo to be paid to the foresaid Edmund [...] 1 li. sterlings (PL, Davis 1979: 250, ll. 11–13)
    ‘if the said Sir John Paston pays or causes to be paid to the above-mentioned Edmund [...] one pound sterling’

The following verbs of commanding and permitting appear with a clear to-infinitival ECM-construction (clear in the sense that it occurs with an inanimate NP or with a passive to-infinitive):

(34) ask, charge, command, do³, grant, license, require, suffer

An example is (35) with ask (ECM in bold):

(35) Item, in eny wise, and (= if) ye can, axe the probate of my fadyrs wyll to be geuyn yow (PL, Davis 1971: 338, ll. 41–2)
    ‘Item, in any way, if you can, ask for the probate of my father’s will to be given to you’

Although ask is a lexical survivor from OE ascian ‘ask’ it is not attested with an infinitival complement, probably because it was not used for requests but for questions, and may have come to be used for requests when OE biddan ‘pray’, ‘ask’ merged with beodon/bebeodon ‘order’ in ME (Goossens 1990).

Finally, there is a group of monotransitive want-verbs:

(36) desire, love⁴, will/would

The verb like mainly occurs as an impersonal (meaning ‘be pleasing to’) and does not occur with the construction. Examples of clear ECM-constructions with the verbs of (36) are (37), with desire, and (38), with will/would:

(37) I wol tell yow the cawses why þat I desyre thys to be doon (PL, Davis 1971: 264, l. 36)
    ‘I will tell you the causes why I desire this to be done’

³ In the Paston Letters do still occasionally has the ditransitive complement:

(i) or ellys by my trowth ye do your-sylf a shame (PL, Davis 1971: 336, ll. 22–3)
    ‘or else, upon my word, you do yourself an injury’

⁴ One not very clear example is:

(ii) I will loue hym bettere to be a good seculare man þan to be a lewit prest. (PL 220, ll. 29–30)
    ‘I would prefer him to be a good layman rather than an unprincipled priest.’
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(38) If ye wyll eny othyr thyng to be don in thys contre (PL, Davis 1971: 353, l. 66)
   ‘If you want any other thing to be done in this country’

It is more surprising to find that the want-verbs in (36), though rigorously monotransitive in PE (I am taking will/would to be representative of PE want), are also attested as three-place verbs in the Paston Letters, i.e. with an NP+that-clause construction. Desire is robustly attested with the NP + that-clause complement (21 out of a total of 139 occurrences), and it is unlikely that these examples are monotransitive CLAN (‘clause and nominal’) constructions in Warner’s sense (1982: 91–9)—they are attested too robustly and the meaning of the verb itself could well be one of commanding rather than monotransitive volition. One of them is:

(39) desyryng hym þat he shuld a-wayt vpon hys welle belouyd broder þe Duk of Suffolk (PL, Davis 1971: 284, ll. 23–4)
   ‘desiring of him that he should wait upon his well-beloved brother the Duke of Suffolk’

The following example is consequently more likely to be an object control construction than ECM:

(40) And the said Sir John Fastolf wolde, graunted, and desired faithfully alle the resedewe of his executours and feffees to shewe the said John Paston fauoure (PL, Davis 1971: 54, ll. 63–5)
   ‘And the said Sir John Fastolf wanted, granted, and desired faithfully all the residue of his executors and feoffees to show the said John Paston favour’

The causative cause also appears as a three-place verb (with NP + that-clause):

(41) and that causyd me that I wrot not to yow non answer (PL, Davis 1971: 167, l. 11)
   ‘and that caused me not to write an answer to you’

But it also occurs as a two-place verb, witness the ECM-construction in (42) and the Small clause in (43):

(42) þat hath causyd þe godys to be spent so þat we be not abyl to perform hys wyll (PL, Davis 1971: 211, ll. 10–11)

5 NP + that-clause complements are occasionally found with verbs that are unlikely to be ditransitive (e.g. perception verbs).
‘that has caused the goods to be spent so that we are not able to carry out his will’

(43) Ye hafe had so manye officers and reulers there whych hafe caused dyuers parties kept yn your toune (PL, Davis 1971: 53, ll. 4–6)
‘You have had so many officers and rulers there which have caused diverse parties to be accommodated in your town’

The three-place variants of (39) and (41) are important clues for the development of to-infinitival ECM after these verbs. If these verbs developed directive meanings, and became verbs of commanding and permitting, they may have fallen in with the other verbs of this group and subsequently have developed to-infinitival ECM-constructions in the same way.

The picture of the to-infinitival ECM-construction in this corpus is different from that of PE in that the construction appears to be even more popular, in the sense that it occurs with a wider range of verb types. Apart from the three groups familiar from Postal’s study, there are also the ‘negative’ verbs, i.e. verbs with meanings of hindering or neglecting: disturb, discourage, let ‘hinder’, spare ‘neglect’; there are some monotransitive verbs that appear with subject control constructions in PE, but with an ECM in which the NP is reflexive in the Paston Letters; there are some interesting examples of unexpected ECMs. Promise is a control verb in PE, and so in the Paston Letters; but occasionally there are examples like (44), which, in their context, must be interpreted as ECM, as yow ‘you’ is not the addressee:

(44) but I haue promyseid yow to be hyr knight (PL, Davis 1971: 356, ll. 21–2)
‘but I have promised [her] that you would be her knight’

---

6 The relevant example is:

(iii) Spare not this to be don in hast. (PL, Davis 1971: 204, ll. 37–8)

7 This is the case with ‘fear’ (iv); ‘agree’ (v), and ‘speed’ (vi)—the last one probably object control, but still an instance of the same general phenomenon:

(iv) The pepyll feryth hem myche the more to be hurt (PL, Davis 1971: 168, l. 28)
‘The people fear themselves much the more to be hurt’

(v) And the seyd Rogere after the seid gaderyng aggreyd hym-self to be take and examyned be persones of his owyn covyne (PL, Davis 1971: 41, ll. 10–11)
‘And the said Roger after the said gathering agreed himself to be taken and examined by people of his own faction’

(vi) I wyll spede me to send you a awnswere as hastely as I may (PL, Davis 1971: 182, ll. 47–8)
‘I will speed me to send you an answer as hastily as I may’
The situation in the Paston Letters, then, suggests that some monotransitive intention verbs of wishing or wanting have acquired directive meanings (‘your wish is my command’) and for that reason have developed both to-infinitival ECMs and the ditransitive object control structure, joining in the argument structure, of the verbs of commanding and permitting.

9.3.5 Thematic differences between commanding and persuading persist

The verbs of persuading and urging which take the to-infinitive as goal-argument in OE, and are not found with bare infinitives apart from a number of occurrences which are heavily influenced by Latin, are not found with bare infinitives in the PPCME, either. There is no difference in this respect between OE survivals from this group (e.g. driven ‘drive’, neden ‘urge’, force’, spurren ‘spur’, steren ‘stir’, ‘move’, warnen ‘warn’) and French loans (prokien ‘incite’). They have never developed to-infinitival ECM, witness the ungrammaticality of *I encouraged there to be a discussion and *Such help shouldn’t be encouraged to be given to people who do not need it (Mair 1990: 163). In spite of the major upheavals in ME, like the extensive relexification and the loss of formal case distinctions, the structural differences between the verbs of persuading and urging on the one hand and those of commanding and permitting on the other persist through history. This suggests that it is the argument structure and theta-grid of these verbs that keep the two groups distinct, even though the emergence of passivized recipients destroys the OE distinction that only the (accusative) NP in an NP to VP-construction after the verbs of persuading and urging can be passivized, unlike the (dative) NP in the NP to VP-construction after the verbs of commanding and permitting. There are occasional examples in ME in which a passive to-infinitive after verbs of persuading and urging creates structures strongly reminiscent of ECM:

(45) thei be thret to be slayn or they are threatened to be slain or presoned (PL, Davis 1971: 194, ll. 7–8) imprisoned ‘they are threatened with death or imprisonment’

In OE, only structural (i.e. accusative) objects can undergo NP-movement (passivization), but with the loss of inherent case, ME datives also start to passivize (Allen 1995). There is not much evidence of ‘recipient passives’ in the first two periods of the PPCME, however, which tallies with Allen’s findings that the first unambiguous examples of such passives appear around 1375 (Allen 1995). It seems that this distinction is still in place, at least for
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the first half of the ME period, as the only passivized objects are those of persuading-and-urging verbs, which are accusative ‘fully affected’ themes in OE and available for passivization throughout their history (see e.g. examples (30)–(34) in Chapter 3).

An example from the PPCME is the verb *distracten* ‘distract’, which occurs with passivized object in (46). Although a French loan, it has the typical motion-based persuading-and-urging meaning, literally ‘pull off’, cf. OE *onwendan* ‘turn’, ‘incite’. It has apparently been assigned the subcategorization frames of the verbs of persuading and urging on the basis of its thematic structure, and the fact that it appears with its object passivized is therefore unremarkable (nominative subject in bold):

(46) ne þey schulde not be distract to ministre to þe pouere
nor they should not be distracted to minister to the poor
men (AELR3, 37.124)
people
‘nor should they be discouraged from ministering to the poor’

Similarly, the verb *neden* in (47), reflex of the OE verb of persuading and urging *niedan* ‘urge’, ‘force’, allows its accusative theme-argument to be passivized, as it did in OE (passivized theme in bold):

(47) asswa se þe maȝen iseon. water hwenne me Punt hit &
just as you may see water when one dams it and
stoppeð hit bfore wel þt hit ne maȝe dunewart þenne
stops it in-front well that it not may downward then
is hit ined aȝein forto climben upwart. (ANCRIW,II.59.592)
is it forced again for-to climb upward.
‘just as you may see water when it is dammed and stopped in front, so
that it cannot flow downwards, then it is forced to climb up again’.

The new ‘recipient passives’ abound in later ME, however; an example is the following, from the fifteenth century:

(48) fore sche xal not be souerd ther to pleye þe
for she shall not be suffered there to play the
brethele (PL, Davis 1971: 203, l. 62)
whore
‘for she shall not be suffered to play the whore in that place’

It is remarkable, in the face of the loss of so many formal distinctions, that the basic distinction between the two groups still survives in PE. Even though
The rise of to-infinitival Exceptional Case-Marking

251

a verb like persuade is a French loan, it still takes the same three constituents as goal-argument as its OE counterpart tyhtan: subjunctive clauses (49a), to-infinitives (49b), and purposive (49c) as opposed to purposive into-PPs (49c). Note that spatial to-PPs (49d) are out. Persuade does not appear with ECM-constructions (50):

(49) He persuaded John:

   a. that he should see a doctor
   b. to see a doctor
   c. into going to the doctor
   d. *to a doctor

(50) *He persuaded the Town Hall to be demolished.

Order and allow, on the other hand, take a to-infinitival complement in both object control constructions (51b) and ECM-constructions (51c); they also appear with Small Clauses, judging by the range of predicates allowed (adverbs and spatial PPs (51d) for both order and allow; participles are also possible, as in (51e), but only with order, not with allow):

(51) He ordered/allowed the citizens:

   a. *that they should disperse unmolested
   b. to disperse unmolested
   c. to be dispersed unmolested
   d. out/into the countryside
   e. He ordered them pardoned

The finite clause in (51a) is no longer acceptable, as it is completely ousted by the to-infinitive after verbs of commanding and permitting. Although our own quantitative investigation stops at 1350 (see Chapter 7), the competition between these structures continues and can be traced until well into the early Modern period (Rohdenburg 1995). A comparison between the language of the Paston Letters and PE shows that more verbs have lost their finite complements. The following verbs still occur with NP + that-clauses in the Paston Letters, though no longer in PE: advise, ask, charge, command, counsel, desire, entreat, require, and warn (‘summon’). This is about half of all the verbs that are found with this complement in this fifteenth-century corpus (Los 1986: 57). The complements in (51b–e), however, have survived from OE onwards as typical for the commanding-and-permitting verbs, even though order and allow themselves are French loans. Their thematic structure, the basic meaning of the verb, must be the reason why these distinctions are so tenacious.
9.3.6 Conclusions

Although the intrinsic property of this group of verbs to have both two-place and three-place variants may well have helped to further the rise of to-infinitival ECM after these verbs, and offers a reasonable explanation for the fact that the verbs of persuading and urging are not found with the construction, the reanalysis of constituent structure involved is so unusual (to-infinitival ECM has no parallel in the other Germanic languages) and so fundamental (there is no precedent for the subject position of a to-infinitive to be filled with overt material in OE) that there must have been a further cause to promote it.

Fischer (e.g. 1989, 1992) has suggested that the loss of OV orders is a possible cause; in an OV language like Dutch, an NP that occurs to the left of the infinitive and is clearly not an argument of the higher verb can only be interpreted as the object of the to-infinitive, because it occupies the prototypical object position, i.e. the position preceding the verb. If OV orders are lost, the pre-verbal position will be interpreted as a subject position, which may certainly have helped to promote the new construction.

There is still no sign of the believe-verbs appearing with ECMs in this particular period. As the second passive is connected to the loss of V2, which had not really got under way in the M1–M2 periods of the PPCME (i.e. the period 1150–1350), this is only to be expected.

The important finding of §9.3 is that the to-infinitival ECM-construction itself was already established in early Middle English after the verbs of commanding and permitting before it came to be used with the believe-verbs. We will discuss the latter group in §9.4.

9.4 The ECM after believe-verbs

9.4.1 Restrictions on to-infinitival ECM with believe-verbs

The nine ECM-examples with believe in (1)–(9) constitute the only instances in the PE corpus from which they have been taken where believe is active rather than passive, and where the NP that functions as infinitival subject has not been A-moved (passivized; 75 instances) or A′-moved (topicalized or wh-moved; 14 instances). This is not a quirk of this particular corpus: every corpus investigation, whether of PE, eModE, or ME ECMs, has reported similar skewed ratios of actives versus passives (Postal 1974 and Mair 1990 for PE; Fanego 1992 for eModE, Fischer 1994 and Warner 1982 for ME). Miller notes that many languages that normally do not allow ECM do occasionally allow it when the NP has been wh-moved (Miller 2002). Postal notes that
the class of *believe*-verbs is usually taken to be very small, with its only members the verbs *believe, prove, find,* and *show,* but is much larger if it is realized that many verbs only allow *to*-infinitival ECM in the passive, or only allow *be* as their infinitive (note that all nine examples in (1)–(9) above have *be* or its perfective, *have been*). With *estimate,* for instance, existential *there* and non-anaphoric (expletive) *it* are possible, but no other pronouns in the active construction, only NPs containing as their head ‘a measuring phrase specifying a value along some parameter’, as shown in (52a–b) (Postal’s (23)):9

(52)  

\[\begin{align*}
  a. & \quad \ast I \text{ estimate that beam to weigh } 47 \text{ tons.} \\
  b. & \quad I \text{ estimate the weight of that beam to be } 47 \text{ tons (ibid.} 299). 
\end{align*}\]

In the passive construction, this restriction does not apply:

(53)  

That beam was estimated to weigh 47 tons (ibid.).

If the NP has been A′-moved, this may also rescue some sentences that would otherwise be unacceptable; cf. (54a) with topicalization, (54b) with wh-movement, and (54c) with relativization, also a form of wh-movement:

(54)  

\[\begin{align*}
  a. & \quad \text{That beam I estimate to weigh } 47 \text{ tons.} \\
  b. & \quad \text{Which beam did they estimate to weigh } 47 \text{ tons?} \\
  c. & \quad \text{the beam which they estimated to weigh } 47 \text{ tons (ibid.} 301–2) 
\end{align*}\]

Complex NP shift also rescues structures that would otherwise yield violations with this verb:

(55)  

\[\begin{align*}
  a. & \quad \ast I \text{ estimated all of the dinosaurs which we caught yesterday in Central Park to be over } 175 \text{ feet long.} \\
  b. & \quad I \text{ estimated to be over } 175 \text{ feet long all of the dinosaurs which we caught yesterday in Central Park. (ibid.} 302) 
\end{align*}\]

If these constraints—especially passivization—are taken into account, the *believe*-class is much larger. All these verbs can be described as verbs of

8 Postal’s decision to exclude the verb *consider* on the grounds that it does not occur with a *that*-clause is debatable; other authors find this complement perfectly acceptable as long as the finite clause expresses an opinion: *I consider that John is a first-rate salesman* (Bolinger 1977: 129). This verb is abundantly attested with finite clauses in earlier stages of the language, for instance in the *Paston Letters* (mentioned before; Los 1986).

9 Cf. Bolinger’s comment that the most favourable ECM subjects for *believe* are nouns referring to information, e.g. *claim, report, opinion, theory, accusation,* in combination with predicates such as *true, genuine, self-evident, accurate* (Bolinger 1977: 127).
propositional attitude:

(56)  acknowledge, admit, affirm, allege, assume, believe, certify, concede, consider, declare, decree, deduce, demonstrate, determine, discern, disclose, establish, estimate, feel, figure, find, gather, grant, guarantee, guess, hold, imagine, intuit, judge, know, note, posit, presume, proclaim, prove, reckon, recognize, remember, report, reveal, rumour, say, show, specify, state, stipulate, suppose, surmise, take, think, understand, verify (ibid. 305–10)

Some of the restrictions reported by Postal have been described in other terms by Bolinger (1977: 127): the proposition expressed by the ECM-construction must express an opinion, not a fact. This explains the common restriction that the infinitive must be to be (ibid. 127–9). Miller (2002: 149), relying on his intuitions as a native speaker, easily constructs sentences like *I believe them to have a dog, but notes that *I believe them to go is out: the verb is apparently restricted to statives, particularly have and be. Mair notes, too, that the infinitive tends to be static and that the matrix verb typically denotes speech acts and propositional attitudes (Mair 1990: 95). Although he constructs examples like they believed us to have sold the house (ibid. 99), his corpus (The Survey of English Usage, at that time consisting of 895,000 words) does not have any examples like it without passivization: The Soviet Union is believed to have made some small sales in Europe (ibid. 175). As noted in §9.2, a search in the 2,000,000 + words of the MicroConcord Corpus for ECMs with believe only results in to be examples.

Are these restrictions motivated by syntactic or extra-syntactic factors? And why are they of such long standing? The accounts of Fischer (1994) and Warner (1982) show that they were in place at the first emergence of the to-infinitival ECM after these verbs, while those of Postal (1974) and Mair (1990) show that they have not changed since.

The earliest believe-ECMs are found in the fourteenth century. The material in Warner’s Corpus, the Wyclifite Sermons, translations from Latin c. 1390, suggests that the believe-verbs came to allow the to-infinitival ECM after these verbs, while those of Postal (1974) and Mair (1990) show that they have not changed since.

The earliest believe-ECMs are found in the fourteenth century. The material in Warner’s Corpus, the Wyclifite Sermons, translations from Latin c. 1390, suggests that the believe-verbs came to allow the to-infinitival ECM after these verbs, while those of Postal (1974) and Mair (1990) show that they have not changed since.

(57)  thou, that art not beleeeued to ben in vertue you, who are not believed to be in virtue fulendid (Sap 12.17 EV; Warner 1982: 142)

fully-perfect

Lat: tu, qui non crederis esse in virtute consummatus
‘you who are not believed to be fully perfect in virtue’
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(58) whom to be prince of the paleis and of myche power thei
whom to be prince of the palace and of much power they
knewen (Esth 9.4 EV; Warner 1982: 142)

Lat: Quem principem esse palatii[...] cognoverant
‘whom they knew to be prince of the palace and very powerful’

With Latin as its external model, it seems that the ‘target’ (the to-infinitival
ECM-construction) had to be approached obliquely by a series of changes
taking place where ‘least noticeable’ or by ‘minimal alteration’, as surface NP
to VP was apparently unacceptable with the believe-verbs. Examples of such
‘minimal alterations’ are a Small clause expanded by to be or the selection of
‘an infinitive with future reference, particularly to come’ (Warner 1982: 149)
as its predicate. Configurations in which surface NP to VP is avoided by
passivization as in (57), however, are not straightforwardly easy to interpret as a
‘minimal alteration’ although it is true they make the new ECM less noticeable,
i.e. less salient, because the resulting structure has a surface resemblance to
the subject-to-subject raising of NPs (see also Warner 1982: 149), as if the
strings are expected, are believed, are supposed, etc. are reanalysed as raising
predicates like seem and appear. Such analyses have indeed been proposed
for the last two, as if they have developed into modal verbs of obligation and
logical deduction (see Visconti 2004 for are/is supposed and Noël 2001 for are/is
believed).

The problem is that surface NP to VP never really became acceptable with
the believe-verbs, and the fact that to be is the only infinitive found here
casts doubt on the assumption that we are dealing with a proper VP. This
supports the traditional assumption that the to-infinitival ECM owes a lot to
the NP PRED (or Small clause) construction, with a ‘minimal alteration’ in the
addition of the string to be, or, in other words, with the Agr-head spelled out by
overt material (see also Bock 1931; Warner 1982: 148–9). The passive-restriction,
and especially its tenacity—it has now been around for five hundred years—is
difficult to account for in a view in which the restriction is one of the steps
of minimal alteration by which the construction comes to be acceptable over
the years: ‘it is difficult to see how such long term stability in variation can
have been maintained with parameters which are merely a consequence of
the “least noticeable” changes which happened to be available in lME syntax’

10 In fact, to cumenne ‘to come’ can be shown to be a reanalysis of a Small clause predicate tocumendne
‘future<acc.sg’, consisting of a particle to and the present participle of the verb cuman, and it spearheaded
the reanalysis of the wesan-to-infinitive (see below, §9.4.6).
(Warner 1982: 155). The wider availability and greater frequency of to-infinitival ECM in configurations in which the NP is moved, or the to-infinitive is to be, points to these as the unmarked structures, despite the apparent complexity introduced by movement. The situation points to a continued resistance to ECM in the grammar. The introduction of to-infinitival ECM destroyed the earlier neat distribution of PRO and overt NPs, which were in complementary positions in OE, and the uniform analysis of ‘clausal’ to-infinitives as CPs. All this suggests that there must have been good reasons to introduce the new construction.

9.4.2 The expression of unmarked themes after the loss of verb-second

Mair’s corpus findings show that the PE situation is basically the same as the findings of Warner (1982) for ME: the NP in a to-infinitival ECM, specifically the one after the believe verbs, usually undergoes movement, either by passivization or relativization. Mair connects their predominance to the conflicting demands of textual coherence and the rigid word order of PE. An example from his corpus is:

(59) Thanks to the ubiquitous television set, the best known Canadians in Britain are, quite possibly, Bernard Braden, Hughie Green and Robert McKenzie. Others more talented—Jon Vickers, Lynn Seymour, Mordecai Richler, Sir William Butlin, John Hemming, Oscar Petersen, Garfield Weston, Paul Anka, Glenn Ford, Yvonne de Carlo, Raymond Burr, Donald Sutherland and Christopher Plummer—are probably seldom identified as Canadians. Many of them are generally assumed to be Americans, which raises the whole struggle to maintain a separate identity from her giant neighbour. (Mair 1990: 180)

The first position of a clause provides the starting point of the entire message, and usually contains given information (the ‘theme’); the most favourable position for new information (‘rheme’) is towards the end of the clause (‘end focus’). In a V2 language like Dutch and OE, the constituent before the finite verb constitutes the ‘unmarked’ theme, and as there are no syntactic or categorial restrictions on the first position it follows that Dutch or OE unmarked themes do not have to be subjects, but can be adverbials, or objects.

The unmarked theme in PE, on the other hand, is restricted to the subject; other material may precede the subject, but such items constitute marked themes which usually imply a contrast of some sort, and have a specific discourse function (for a discussion of marked versus unmarked themes, see
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Downing and Locke 1995: 222–37). No such contrast is implied in (59). Textual coherence demands that the given information of that final sentence (‘many of them’, referring to the list of names) appears as subject, and Mair notes that none of the available alternatives to a passive ECM (finite and non-finite) will meet this requirement:

(60)  

\(\text{a. People generally assume many of them to be Americans.}\\
\text{b. People generally assume that many of them are Americans.}\\
\text{c. It is generally assumed that many of them are Americans.}\\
\)

A verb-second language like Modern Dutch or Old English, however, may encode its unmarked theme by constituents other than subjects. Cf. the Dutch translation of this phrase (with impersonal men ‘one’ in (61a), with a passive in (61b)), in which the unmarked theme is a PP:

(61)  

\(\text{a. Van deze mensen neemt men meestal aan dat ze Amerikanen zijn.}\\
\text{b. Van deze mensen wordt meestal aangenomen dat ze Amerikanen zijn.}\\
\)

Such contrasts between V2 and SVO languages have been studied in the literature on the translation of Dutch texts (Lemmens and Parr 1995; Hannay and Keizer 1993), as particular care has to be taken when translating from Dutch to English to make sure that unmarked themes in Dutch remain unmarked themes in English.\(^\text{11}\)

V2 was lost at the end of the Middle English period, and the evidence suggests that it should be translated in syntactic terms as a failure of the finite verb to move to a higher structural position in the clause. In a syntactic representation like (62), this means that the verb (base-generated in V) no longer moves as high as C\(^0\) or F\(^0\) (the ‘second position’; the first position is SpecCP) but only as high as T\(^0\). Subject and topic are both in SpecCP in OE; but when V2 is lost, the subject remains in SpecTP (a slightly simplified version of the structure provided by

\(^{11}\) Specifically to be avoided are translations of (61) such as Of these people, it is generally assumed that they are Americans, which preserves the syntactic structure of the source, but not its ‘communicative’ structure, since Of these people, as a marked theme in English, receives undue emphasis (see also Hannay and Keizer 1993: 71–2).
There is evidence of OE having a high functional projection for subject and object clitics ('FP' in (62)), so it is only attestations of inversion of the finite verb and a nominal (as opposed to pronominal) subject that constitute solid evidence that V2 is still in place. The decline of such attestations indicates that the loss of V2 sets in at the end of the fourteenth century and gains momentum during the fifteenth century (van Kemenade 1987: 219–23). As a result of the loss of V2, the topic position in SpecCP (the ‘first’ position), when not occupied by negative or wh-operators, is reserved for marked themes, and the unmarked theme comes to be identified with the nominative subject position, which can only be filled by an NP. The loss of V2 coincides with the rise of subject-to-object raising (ECM) with to-infinitival complements and preposition stranding after passivization.\footnote{The rise of preposition stranding in passive constructions probably represents yet another mechanism by means of which NPs can be fronted to become unmarked themes, e.g. \textit{he was well thought of}; \textit{the doctor was sent for}. The earliest example of this type in Denison (i.e. with the prepositional passive resulting in the repositioning of an NP into the unmarked theme position; Denison's earlier examples do not appear to be motivated by considerations of information structure) is dated \textit{c. 1400: no prophete is so mychel leten of in his owene cuntre as . . .}, ‘no prophet is so well regarded in his own country as . . .’ (\textit{Pep. Gosp.} 44.9, Denison 1985: 191).}

The emergence of such raising phenomena can be related to the loss of V2 because the loss of V2 results in a situation in which topics and subjects no longer have the same syntactic status in ME. They may both occupy SpecCP in OE, but that position comes to be associated exclusively with topics when V2 is lost. Henceforth, only subjects, i.e. nominative NPs, could be unmarked
themes. This represented a restriction on the ways information could be organized in a text, which in turn created a need for more strategies to move NPs into subject position. The emergence of (passive) to-infinitival ECM after the believe-verbs in late ME, then, represents one such strategy, as it allowed the embedded subject to be fronted, making it an unmarked theme. The timing of the rise of the one and the loss of the other fits, and it explains the PE restrictions on the construction. The persistence of the passive in PE, and the virtual impossibility of infinitives other than to be, show how great the tension is between the need for the construction and its profound incompatibility with English grammar.

9.4.3 Virus Theory

Another point often noted about the ECM-constructions with the believe-verbs is that they are restricted to certain formal registers. The ECM-sentences with believe in (1)–(9) are in that respect fairly representative. None of them occur in a narrative text, for example, although such texts are included in the corpus from which they were taken. The believe-ECM firmly belongs to the register of argumentative, scholarly texts. It is not part of everyday, colloquial speech, and so not part of the Primary Linguistic Data (PLD) either. The one exception is probably is/are supposed to, and in the MicroConcord Corpus this exceptional status is borne out by the fact that 10 out of the 80 passive instances of the construction with this verb occur in direct speech, and a further two in a narrative text. As it is this verb in which the ECM-construction has been argued to have developed into an unanalysed, idiomatic chunk, equivalent to a deontic modal (Visconti 2004), it cannot be taken as evidence that the construction is sufficiently represented in the PLD to be acquired as part of the core grammar. The suppose-phrase may well be acquired as an underanalysed, formulaic chunk, unlikely to trigger the acquisition of the ECM-construction.

There is some support for the idea that the passive ECM after suppose and other verbs is used as an alternative to modal verbs. Note that Dutch translation studies equate be supposed to with the Dutch modal zou ‘should’, ‘would’, ‘be supposed to’ (Hannay and Keizer 1993), and that the OE modal sceolde could be used with this meaning to show ‘that the reporter does not believe the statement or does not vouch for its truth’ (Mitchell and Robinson 1982: 115; see also under sculan (13) in Bosworth and Toller 1882):

(63) Ḟa wæs ðær eac swiðe egeslic geatweard, ðæs

Then was there also very terrifying doorkeeper, that gen
nama sceolde bion Caron (Bo 35.102.16)
name should be Caron

‘Then there was also a very terrifying doorkeeper whose name is said to be Caron’ (Bosworth and Toller 1882: IV. [sclan, sceolan], (13))

There are other constructions which have been argued to be outside speakers’ core grammars. Sobin (1997) refers to such constructions as ‘viruses’, on the analogy of computer viruses tampering with the instructions of operating systems (the ‘core grammars’ of computers). Because the grammar system is highly abstract and subconscious, its core components—case assignment, feature checking—are not ‘accessed casually’ (Lasnik and Sobin 2000: 367) and therefore not accessible to any routines that speakers might try to add at any later stage (the viruses). Virus manipulations, then, cannot be manipulations of the abstract ‘core’ system but are restricted to superficial surface manipulations of this system (ibid. 268). One of these superficial mechanisms is ‘chunking’. Lasnik and Sobin give the example of people being taught to use you and I in subject position instead of the you and me that their grammar makes available; that this learning is only superficial is evident from the hypercorrections that ensue, most commonly the phrase *between you and I, which is a clear violation of the core grammar rule that prepositions assign oblique case.¹³

Lasnik and Sobin show that viruses may mimic ‘core’ operations, as their example of the who/whom distinction shows. Although this distinction between nominative and oblique for relative and interrogative pronouns dropped out of the language in Middle English, it has been kept alive artificially for who/whom. Case-assignment/-checking is about as ‘core’ an operation as one can think of, and if the hypothesis that the ‘core’ grammar cannot be casually accessed is right, the correct use of who/whom must be difficult for speakers to learn at any time after the ‘core’ grammar is acquired (say, after the age of six or so). It is a feature of written rather than spoken language and not likely to be encountered as part of the Primary Linguistic Experience. Not surprisingly, hypercorrect uses ensue. Lasnik and Sobin quote sentences like:

(64) We feed children whom we think are hungry.

Such hypercorrections show that the whom-replacement routine cannot ‘see’ both a moved whom and its source position and cannot construct a rule that involves the regular operation of case-assignment/-checking. The most it can do is use secondary clues, i.e. the relation between whom and the following verb,

¹³ This usage is even found among ‘authoritative’ speakers (like Mrs Thatcher; Honey 1995).
of which it must not be the subject, or the adjacency of whom and a following nominative pronoun.

Viruses typically create structures that are prestigious and uncharacteristic of child language, and the believe-ECM clearly fits this profile. The ECM-virus mimics an NP to VP-constituent, but it is unable to achieve a real change in the core grammar: this would entail too great an upheaval, affecting as it does the distribution of PRO and, perhaps, the analysis of clausal to-infinitives as CPs. The be-supposed-to string, acquired as an underanalysed chunk, is not salient enough to trigger the actual active construction.

An interesting approach in the same direction is that of Quirk (1965), who argues that the be-supposed-to construction is derived paradigmatically rather than transformationally, i.e. on the model of similar verbs like feel or know in he is felt/known to be careful. Bolinger (1974), quoted in Mair (1990: 179–180), notes that there is one verb of propositional attitude which could be expected to take passive ECM, like the other verbs of propositional attitude in (56), but which only occurs with active ECM:

(65)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. He denied it to be the case.
  \item b. *It was denied to be the case.
\end{itemize}

Bolinger offers the interesting suggestion that this failure of deny to conform to the usual pattern is connected to the fact that this verb is also the only verb of propositional attitude that cannot be used parenthetically:

(66)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item It was the case, (or so) he believed/assumed/said/*denied.
\end{itemize}

Apparently, then, verbs may come to allow passive ECM without first allowing the active construction, and bypass, so to speak, the ‘core’ grammar.

The biggest stumbling-block to the construction becoming part of the core grammar is probably the ban on overt subjects in complement IPs. If the suggestion that the function of to is to assign null case to PRO is valid (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, 1995), the ban on overt subjects can be related to case-assignment and feature-checking, operations central to the computational system of grammar, which may explain why the language is so slow to incorporate the construction into its core grammar—the restrictions on to-infinitival ECMs after believe-verbs are of long standing, as we saw in §9.4.1. If the core grammar cannot generate the structure usually proposed for ECM (cf. (10) above), to-infinitival ECMs must be derived by other existing mechanisms with some surface alterations from the operation of the virus. Most of them can be accounted for by two virus routines added to the core: to be as an overt expression of the AgrP-head, and passive believe-verbs as raising verbs (see Table 9.4).
Table 9.4. Accounting for believe-ECMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>active to-infinitive</th>
<th>to-infinitive is to be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active matrix V</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive matrix V</td>
<td>raising virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrP with overt head</td>
<td>raising virus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we tease out active from passive structures, we get the following distribution: believe-verbs occur with (i) active matrix verb and to be as the to-infinitive, as in (67), (ii) passive matrix verb with active to-infinitive, as in (68), and (iii) passive matrix verb with to be as the to-infinitive, as in (69), which is a rare instance in which to be is part of a passive construction. Active matrix verb with active to-infinitive does not occur (infinitival subjects in bold):

(67) Rechem believes the results to be unscientific.

(68) Just as journal serialization affected the chapter formation and the structure of the nineteenth-century novelistic, so also the expectation of the break, mediated by the specific form of attention which audiences are believed to give to television, produces a mutation within the novelistic towards segmented narration.

(69) Investigations established that the security forces were directly responsible for the massacre, which was believed to be directed against supporters of the left-wing party, the Patriotic Union.

Want-verbs occur with (i) active matrix verb and active to-infinitive as in (70), (ii) active matrix verb with passive to-infinitive as in (71), (iii) passive matrix verb with active to-infinitive as in (72), and (iv) passive matrix verb and passive to-infinitive as in (73) (the relevant NP—infinitival subject or matrix object—is in bold):

(70) The Chief Cabinet Secretary, Mayumi Moriyama, ordered all cabinet members yesterday to search campaign fund records for any contributions from an industry notorious for tax evasion and links with organised crime.

(71) They also ordered £25,000 surety to be seized.

(72) Courts will weigh parents’ financial means in imposing fines and compensation, and they will be ordered to attend court hearings.

(73) A man on the run from Crumlin Road prison, Belfast, was ordered to be extradited from the Irish Republic.

The ECM after want-verbs is more firmly anchored in the language, as Table 9.5 demonstrates.
Table 9.5. Accounting for want-ECMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>active to-infinitive</th>
<th>passive to-infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active matrix V</td>
<td>object control/ECM</td>
<td>AgrP with overt head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive matrix V</td>
<td>object control/raising virus</td>
<td>object control/raising virus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passive want-ECMs generally target ‘mind-possessing’ NPs and as such apparently derive from passivized object control constructions, not from proper ECMs. Searches of the MicroConcord Corpus and the Internet did not contain any attestations with inanimate, ‘non-mind-possessing’ passivized infinitival subjects, with the exception of the string be-allowed-to, which appears to function as an alternative for the modal may, as in:

(74) Food brought into the settlement was always escorted and none was allowed to be taken out. <http://home.pacific.net.sg/~alfarabi/briggs.htm>

The data presented by Lasnik and Saito (1993) point to a difference in the strength of the clausal boundary between the want and believe-ECMs (see §9.3). Most cases in which both matrix verb and to-infinitive are active have ‘mind-possessing’ NPs and are probably best analysed as object control constructions; even with non-mind-possessing NPs, an object control interpretation is still just about possible (Postal 1974: 318ff.; see also §9.2.1). A problem for this analysis is that there is no evidence in the history of want (unlike require and desire) that it was ever anything but two-place, although the preference for ‘mind-possessing’ NPs is clear (even for its ECM-examples, the OED gives as definition to desire (a person) to do (something): want 5b).

As soon as the NP loses its agentive character, object control interpretations are stretched to the limit; cf. the following, from MicroConcord:

(75) Of crucial importance is that none of these experiments require the animals to suffer any pain whatsoever.

The combination of non-agentive NPs and active to-infinitives can only be derived by assuming an ECM-structure as in (10), with an overt subject in the lower Spec, IP.

This brings us back to our discussion of two- and three-place constructions after the verbs of commanding and permitting in Chapter 5. The to-infinitival ECM moved into the niche left by the bare-infinitival AcI when that construction ceased to be productive. The analysis of the AcI itself is just as problematic.
as the to-infinitival ECM\textsuperscript{14} and cannot cast any light on how the latter should be analysed. The fact that the genuine ECM is only found with those verbs that allow a three-place reading—and I include here verbs like want and expect in their directive sense—could point to a more elaborate structure than (10), one which somehow makes use of this extra NP position that is not available to the believe-verbs. The restrictions on ECM with believe-verbs strongly suggest that structure (10) is banned, and that the surface strings are the product of additional virus routines that make use of the existing raising and AgrP possibilities.

9.4.4 ECM and the Small clause

The relationship between the to-infinitival ECM and the Small clause (AgrP) in PE is most strongly suggested by their distribution. If a verb allows to-infinitival ECM it generally allows the Small clause as well, though not vice versa, as there are a number of verbs that only appear with SCs (with as), e.g. accept, depict, establish, and picture; and many verbs that do not allow the ‘full-blown’ NP to VP-sequence, but insist on passivization, still occur with an AgrP (Postal notes that this is the case with e.g. deem; in his analysis, the SCs after these verbs are the result of a process of ‘to be-deletion’; Postal 1974: 315). The cross-linguistic distribution of SCs and ECM-constructions is discussed in Miller (2002).

There are many competing analyses for the Small clause (for a discussion see e.g. Aarts 1992), but for the moment we will assume it to be an agreement phrase (e.g. den Dikken 1987); such an analysis reflects both its clausal nature and its lack of tense. The to-infinitival ECM-construction is usually assigned an IP analysis (or TP in a ‘split IP’-analysis):

\begin{align*}
\text{(76)} & \quad \text{a. They considered } [_{\text{AGR}} \text{Samantha } [_{\text{AGR}} \text{[NP a fool]]} ] \quad \text{small clause} \\
& \quad \text{b. They considered } [_{\text{IP}} \text{Samantha } [_{\text{I to [VP be [NP a fool]]]} ]] \quad \text{ECM}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{14} Acls contain a proper VP as there are no restrictions on which verbs can occur in the construction (apart from the restriction that the Acl has to denote an event), but the fact that the infinitival subject may remain implicit is problematic for an ECM-analysis. The obvious analysis for such implicit subjects is that they are PRO, but as PRO is not supposed to occur in the same positions as overt NPs such an analysis immediately leads to complications. Analysing the Acl as an AgrP is attractive, as it would show that predicates can be VPs and so would complete the predicate paradigm (AP, PP, NP, and VP) by showing that all major categories can occur as predicate, which is a considerable simplification of the grammar. The fact that the NP in Spec,AgrP can only passivize when the predicate in the Agr-complement is AP, PP, or NP but not when it is VP argues against an AgrP-analysis for the Acl, however.
The link between SC and ECM is also evident from the fact that SCs are subject to the same restrictions as to-infinitival ECMs:

\[(77) \quad \text{They estimated the plane’s weight as (being) 600 tons in excess of specifications. (Postal 1974: 303)}\]

These structural similarities are usually expressed in terms of the properties of the boundaries or the heads of these two constructions. Neither the boundary of the to-infinitival ECM-construction (IP or TP) nor that of the Small clause (AgrP) constitutes a barrier for government (in GB) or movement (raising), and the non-finite head, whether I, T, or Agr, cannot assign nominative case to a subject in its specifier.

We saw that the infinitival verb in a to-infinitival ECM-construction with the believe-verbs is restricted to to be (either the copula or the passive auxiliary), especially when the matrix verb is active and the ‘raising virus’ cannot operate. In many cases, to be can be omitted without any ill effects (cf. (76a and b) above). This has prompted some scholars to assume ‘to be-deletion’ or ‘to be-insertion’ to relate sentences like (76a and b). The equivalence is not complete, however. Sentences (78) and (79) below are (corpus) instances of NPs complemented by what looks like to-infinitival adjuncts, but could well be Small clauses, as the Small clause test—whether subject and predicate can be connected by a form of the verb to be—has a positive: old scores are to be settled; a building is to be seen are both OK.

\[(78) \quad \text{with old scores to be settled and fresh ones to be started} \]
\[(79) \quad \text{with not a building to be seen nor an engine heard} \]

The coordination rules are mysterious, perhaps involving different modalities. (78), in which to be expresses obligation, does not permit to be to be dropped, whereas (79), in which to be expresses ability, does. Note that we find that the entire phrase to be has to be deleted, although it is not a constituent in any standard approach. The similarities between to be-dropping in small clauses like (78) and (79) and the ECM problem of to be-insertion or deletion, however, suggests that the relationship between the ECM subject and its complement resembles that of the SC subject and its complement, with to be as the overt expression of the Agr-head, like as, rather than a lexical primitive, V. 15 To be in

15 Andersson (1985: 216ff.) proposes to be-insertion to derive one type from the other; Stockwell et al.(1973: 578) and Borkin (1973) argue for the opposite, i.e. to be-deletion. GB does not readily allow such rules because to be does not form a constituent. The to be-deletion rule is also construction-specific, which again is not readily compatible with a GB framework. For more discussion, see Aarts (1992: 69–70).
16 Note in this respect also the optionality of being in the small clause predicate of (77) above.
These cases is a lexical instantiation of the small clause head rather than part of a VP. ‘Core grammar’ is not affected because these verbs remain complemented by an AgrP; the lexicalization of Agr^0 is added as a ‘virus’.

This virus may have emerged after the *wesan to*-infinitive, which was participial rather than clausal in OE and occurred as AgrP-complement, came to be reanalysed as a passive (*to be-*) to-infinitive in ME.

9.4.5 The *to*-infinitive as predicate after *wesan*

We have discussed only one type of *to*-infinitive in this book so far, the type that came to be regarded as a non-finite subjunctive clause and competed as such with the finite subjunctive. There is, however, a second type which does not have a subjunctive *that*-clause analogue, and which is participial rather than clausal: the *to*-infinitive after *wesan* ‘to be’. An example is:

(80) witodlice gylp is to forbugenne ⟨ÆCHom II, 13 133.182⟩

truly arrogance is to avoid
‘truly, arrogance must be avoided’

Although this infinitive must also be assumed to be a V-head at some level (its deep structure object must be assigned accusative case, as only transitive verbs appear in this construction), it exhibits a number of characteristics that set it apart from the *to*-infinitive in other positions.

(i) Distributionally it patterns like a passive participle, and, as in (80), it occurs in a typical participle function as the predicate in a Small clause, as in the following example with *tellan* ‘consider’:

(81) ic ðiss an lif to lufienne tealde. ⟨ÆHom 24, 62⟩

I this one life ACC to love considered.
‘and I considered this one life worthy of love.’

(ii) Positionally the *to*-infinitive in such *wesan*-constructions appears with some frequency to the left of the matrix verb, as we saw in (81), and also in (82) below, which is disallowed when the *to*-infinitive is the complement of control verbs, as we saw in Chapter 7:

(82) Nu ge habað gehyred anrædlice hwæt eow to donne is
Now you have heard constantly what you DAT to do is
and hwæt eow to forgane is. ⟨ÆLet 1 (WulfsigeC) 159⟩
and what you to forgo is.
‘Now you have heard constantly what you should do and what you should not do.’

A count of *wesan*-infinitives in late OE prose comprising the works of Ælfric and Wulfstan and a number of anonymous homilies results in the following figures: 120 instances of the *wesan* + *to*-infinitive order (as in (80)) as opposed to 14 instances of *to*-infinitive + *wesan* order (as in (82)). The latter figure (c. 8% of the total) is admittedly higher than the percentages we found for extraposed *to*-infinitives after verbs other than *wesan*, as these do not exceed 1%, but it does not compare so well with the figures for the infinitive + finite verb order with e.g. bare infinitives, which we found to be 37% (Table 7.2 above), in the same range as the orders of nominal objects preceding the finite verb.

The 120 instances of the order as in (80), however, occur overwhelmingly (98%) in root clauses, whereas the 14 instances of the order as in (82) all occur in embedded clauses. The counts of infinitive + finite verb order with bare infinitives are similarly higher in embedded clauses, as is clear from a count of the bare-infinitival complements after the eleven most frequent intention verbs: 21 out of the 82 bare-infinitival complements in root clauses preceded the finite verb (= 26%) whereas 60 out of 117 bare-infinitival complements in embedded clauses did so (= 51%). The fact that the *wesan* + *to*-infinitive construction is a typical root-clause phenomenon may therefore be responsible for the relatively low count of *wesan* *to*-infinitives preceding the finite verb.

By and large, then, the figures for the *to*-infinitive as predicate are sufficiently different from those of the *to*-infinitive as argument to point to a structural difference between the two, with the *to*-infinitive after *wesan* conforming to adjective or participle orders (i.e. predicates), whereas the *to*-infinitive after other verbs conforms to clausal orders.

(iii) Semantically the *to*-infinitive as predicate of *wesan* differs in that its interpretation carries strong modal overtones of obligation or necessity/ability, which is absent from the *to*-infinitive in other positions; cf. the translation *must* in (80), and sentences (78) and (79) above, in which *to be* + past participle expresses obligation and ability. The Dutch counterpart of the *wesan*-to-infinitive may express necessity/obligation or ability, and can often be replaced by an adjective in *-baar*; cf. PE -able. The *-baar* affix similarly requires the verb stem to be transitive.

In Modern Dutch, the two infinitives with *te* similarly defy a unified analysis; the *to*-infinitive in controlled complements, i.e. the *to*-infinitive that
has a *that*-clause analogue in OE (which has been ousted completely by the *to*-infinitive in PE, and, presumably, in Dutch, too) is the only one that allows *om*, whereas the *wesan*-infinitive can occur as predicate in a Small clause, and cannot be extraposed:

(83) Hij zei dat hij probeerde (om) de tafel te herstellen
    He said that he tried (for) the table to repair
    ‘He said that he tried to repair the table’

(84) Ik vind [sc*zijn houding [te prijzen]] (cf. (81) above)
    I think his attitude to praise
    ‘I consider his attitude praiseworthy’

(85) a. Ik zei dat ik zijn houding te prijzen vind
    I said that I his attitude to praise think
    ‘I said that I consider his attitude praiseworthy’

b. *Ik zei dat ik vind zijn houding (om) te prijzen
    I said that I think his attitude (for) to praise
    ‘I said that I consider his attitude praiseworthy’

The failure to extrapose is also seen in lexicalized past participles in Dutch, in contrast to the freer order of past participles in a perfect periphrasis (Booij, p.c.); the categorial status of *te prijzen* in (85) and *gesloten* in (86b) appears to be A rather than V:

(86) a. Ik zie dat de deur gesloten is/is gesloten
    I see that the door closed is/is closed
    ‘I see that the door is closed’

b. Ik vind dat die jongen gesloten *is/is* gesloten
    I think that that boy introverted *is/is introverted
    ‘I think that that boy is introverted’

Such differences warrant separate analyses for the two types of *to/*te*-infinitive. The *to*-infinitive in controlled complements is a V, hence the entire *to*-infinitival phrase is a clause; the *wesan*-to*-infinitive, however, is an A. It does not assign case, but, like any A in a Small clause predicate position, licenses a subject. I here follow the analysis of the Small clause as an agreement phrase (cf. den Dikken 1987). Such a structure allows both the clausal nature of SCs and the lack of tense to be properly represented. (87) shows the SC-subjects
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and predicates of (80)–(82):

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\text{Spec} \\
&\text{NP} \\
&\text{gylp} \\
\end{aligned}
\quad
\begin{aligned}
&\text{AgrP} \\
&\text{Agr'} \\
&\text{Agr}^0 \\
&\text{AP} \\
\end{aligned}
\quad
\begin{aligned}
&\text{to forbugenne} \\
&\text{to lufienne} \\
&\text{to donne} \\
\end{aligned}
\]

The Specifier hosts the subject of the SC, and the NP in this position will be assigned structural case by the higher verb, although thematically it belongs to the lower predicate. AP is the prototypical filler of the predicate position. The head of the phrase (Agr\(^0\)) can, but need not, be overt; languages rich in markings for case or phi-features show agreement between the subject and its predicate. Languages without such rich morphology often have a preposition-like element welding subject and predicate together, which has been argued to be in Agr\(^0\): as in PE, tot in Dutch, and to in OE. The prefix to in the examples in (87) probably moves there covertly. Examples of each appear in (88a–c):

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{(88)} \\
a. \text{They chose } [\text{AGR}_P \text{the blessed Cuthbert } [\text{AGR}_R \text{as } [\text{NP}_P \text{their bishop}]]) \\
b. \text{Zij kozen } [\text{AGR}_P \text{de gezegende Cuthbert } [\text{AGR}_R \text{tot } [\text{NP}_P \text{bischop}]]) \\
c. \text{Hi gecuron } [\text{AGR}_P \text{þone eadigan cuðberhtum } [\text{AGR}_R \text{to } [\text{NP}_P \text{biscope}]]) \\
\text{(see } \langle \text{ÆCHom II, 10 88.242} \rangle \text{)}
\end{aligned}
\]

Copula-structures can also be analysed as an SC, with subject-to-subject raising:

\[
\text{(89) } [\text{IP}_P \text{he}\text{is } [\text{AGR}_P \text{t}_1 [\text{AGR}_R \text{a burden on the community}]])]
\]

Dutch (90a) and OE (90b) show a construction much like this, but with the recipient of the burden as a preposed NP; the OE sentence marks it as a dative, and it is presumably an argument of the

\[17\] Note that many NP predicates consist of a relatively contentless N-head, with the semantic load being conveyed by the adjective that modifies it; cf. the following two examples (from Leech and Li 1995):

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{(vii)} & \text{ They considered it an interesting case.} \\
\text{(viii)} & \text{ They considered it interesting.}
\end{aligned}
\]

Such examples show that AP is the most prototypical filler of the predicate slot.
burden-NP:

(90) a. hij werd zijn mensen tot last
he became his people to burden

b. he his leodum wearð to aldorceare (Beo 904)
henom his peopledAT became3sg to burden
‘he became a burden to his people’

To in (88) and (90) can be argued to be in Agr⁹, as the exact parallel of PE as, which is also a P.

The suppressed agent-role of to-infinitive in the wesan-construction sometimes appears as a dative NP, as in (91):

(91) þes an geleafa is eallum to healdenne (ÆHom 9, 104)
‘everyone should hold this one faith’

The dative NP has a parallel in the by-phrase in which the demoted agent of the past participle may optionally appear in a passive construction, but we will not explore the exact nature of this dative further.¹⁸ The to-infinitive—and, perhaps, the passive participle, too—appears in the SC complement, as an AP; as such it can appear in principle in any SC, not just the one in the complement of wesan, and we saw above (example (81)) that they are attested as predicates in SCs after tellan ‘consider’.

The analysis of the wesan-to-infinitive as A accounts for many of the differences between the two types of to-infinitive: the positional difference (the wesan-to-infinitive is not a clause but a small clause predicate); the semantic difference (only transitive verb stems are allowed as the base of a to-infinitive in the wesan-construction); and the distributional difference (the wesan-to-infinitive patterns like an adjective in a predicate position, whereas the other to-infinitive patterns as a subjunctive that-clause). Note that the SC analysis for the former also means that this to-infinitive does not have a PRO subject, unlike the clausal to-infinitive.

¹⁸ A possible direction for such an exploration could be the parallels with the ‘possessive dative’, in which to be + dative NP expresses a possessive relationship—cf. Latin mihi est lit. ‘to me is’ → ‘I have’, or the ‘with me is’ construction in the Celtic languages—and some work has been done by Hoekstra (e.g. 1994) and den Dikken (e.g. 1995) in which such constructions fall out automatically as the result of a particular structural configuration. Such accounts provide a structural basis for the semantic similarities between the OE sentence (91) and its PE equivalent Everyone has to hold one faith. In this analysis, the verbs wesan and have are not lexical primitives but overt realizations of functional heads.
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9.4.6 Unaccusatives in the wesan-construction

The construction with *wesan* and a *to*-infinitive was lost in the course of the ME period, and has been charted by Klöpzig (1922) and Fischer (1991). The loss of the construction appears to be spearheaded by the emergence of unaccusative infinitives in the construction, particularly the infinitive *tocumenne* ‘to come’. Klöpzig argues convincingly that the emergence of this particular infinitive was the result of a confusion with the inflected form of the present participle of a verb *tocuman* ‘come’, ‘arrive’: *tocumendne*, in which the prefix *to* was misanalysed as infinitival *to*. The future participle of the Latin *conjugatio periphrastica*, i.e. the -urus sum construction, is usually translated with a periphrastic OE construction with *wile* or *sceal*:

(92) cui benedicturus sum: þone ic wile bletsian (‘himAccI will bless’)
(93) lecturus sum cras: ic sceal rædan to merigen (‘I shall read tomorrow’)

However, the frequent biblical phrase *venturus est* ‘he is coming’, ‘he will come’ (cf. Luke 7.20; Matt. 11.3, 16.27; John 1.15) was often translated or transliterated by means of the present participle *tocumend*; -ne is the ending for the masculine accusative singular. The use of a periphrastic construction with a form of *wesan* ‘to be’ and a present participle to translate similar constructions in Latin was not unusual (see e.g. Callaway 1913: 200–3 for some statistics on the translation of various Latin periphrastic constructions). There must have been two choices for *venturus* originally: the adjective *toweard* ‘future’ or the present participle *tocumend*; but the latter had already come to be confused in OE with the *to*-infinitive *tocumenne*. Klöpzig accordingly found four constructions for the phrase *venturus est* in Gospel translations and glosses: *he is toweard; he is tocumendne; he is tocumenne;* and the OE future periphrasis with *wile* or *sceal* (relevant structures in bold; data from Klöpzig 1922: 383–4):

(94) Matt. 17:11: helias quidem *venturus* est
Helias uuuetetlice [to]cymende is (North Umbrian).
Witodlice helias is toweard (West-Saxon)
‘Truly Elijah will be coming’

(95) Matt. 11:3: tu est qui *venturus* es?
arð Ḟu seðe tocymende wæs ðis? (North Umbrian)
eart þu þe to *cumenne* eart? (West-Saxon)
ar þu se þe cwome scalt? (Mercian)
‘are you the one who is to come?’
(96) Matt. 16:27: Filius enim hominis venturus est in gloria patris sui
sunu forðan monnes tocymenda is in wuldor faderis his (North
Umbrian)
mannes sunu ys to cumenne on his fæder wuldre (West-Saxon)
‘The Son of Man is to come in his Father’s glory’

(97) Luke 7:20: tu es qui venturus es?
ðu arð seðe tocymende wæs ð arð? (North Umbrian)
eart þu ðe to cumenne eart? (West-Saxon)
‘are you the one who is to come?’

This use of the to cumenne infinitive becomes very frequent in eME (Klöpzig
1922: 382 cites many examples from Laȝamon’s Brut, the Ormulum, Ayenbite,
etc.); there are only a few examples with other unaccusatives, but they increase
in frequency. The last attestations of the wesan-to-infinitive are at the end of
the fourteenth century (van der Gaaf 1928). From then on, we find passive
to-infinitives like (98), from John Wyclif’s Bible translations:

(98) Manes sone is to be bitraied in to the hondis of men (Matt. 27.21;
Klöpzig 1922: 385)
Lat: Filius hominis tradendus est in manus hominum
‘The son of Man is to be betrayed into the hands of men’

Note that the same modalities are present in this passive construction as in
the earlier wesan-to-infinitive, i.e. obligation and necessity/ability, and that
this is still true in PE, witness (78) and (79) above, or the apposition in (99),
which cannot be translated by a passive to-infinitive in Dutch, only by an active
one—in spite of the fact that there is no general ban on passive te-infinitives
in that language:

(99) An exception is [Name], not to be confused with a similarly named
establishment next door (adapted from corpus example)

cf. Dutch: niet te verwarren met/*niet te worden verward met
not to confuse with/not to be confused with

The fact that the to be to-infinitive is extremely frequent in the ECM-
construction with the believe-verbs in PE suggests that it replaces the
wesan-to-infinitive in the predicate position of a small clause; the wesan-to-
infinitive in the OE sentence (100) would then have a ME to be to counterpart,
as in (101).
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(100) ic ðiss an lif to lufienne tealde. (ÆHom 24, 62)
I this one life to love considered.
I \[\text{AGRP} \text{this one life} [\text{AP} \text{to love}] \text{considered.}\]
‘I considered this one life worthy of love.’

(101) or elles þat sche holde here-self wondurliche holy and to be commendeþ þat sche hæþ forsake grete and ryche mariages off worþy mennes sones þat sche myȝte han be maried to (AELR3,33.7)
‘or else that she considers herself wonderfully holy and to be praised that she has forgone grand and rich marriages with the sons of worthy men whom she might have been married to’
sche holde \[\text{AGRP} \text{here-self} [\text{AP} \text{wondurliche holy}] \text{]}\] and sche holde \[\text{IP} \text{here-self} [\text{t} \text{to} \text{be commendeþ} \ldots \text{]}\]

The question is whether to be commendeþ in (101) was regarded (analysed) as a small clause predicate at its first appearance (with to be as an overt expression of the Agr-head) or as part of an ECM-construction. Note that both to-infinitives—the old wesan-to-infinitive and the new to be to-infinitive—have overt subjects, and nothing has changed in this respect; the major difference is that the to-infinitive is now passivized overtly.

Although the ‘loose’ rules of coordination that were discussed in the previous chapter still hold in ME, it is unlikely that they alone can account for (101), where we find AP-predicates of small clauses conjoined to the to be to-infinitive in an ECM-construction; as usual, subject and matrix verb are ellipted under identity, but herself is ellipted as well, even though its function, and analysis, differs in the two conjuncts: in the first one it is a small clause subject, but in the second it is the subject of the ECM-construction. This does not conform to the usual picture presented by instances of even ‘loose’ coordination which we discussed in Chapter 7. The question arises whether both conjuncts are not in fact small clauses in (101), with to be a lexicalization of the Agr-head.\(^{19}\)

9.5 Conclusions

The loss of the wesan-to-infinitive and the rise of its replacement, the to be-infinitive, facilitated the rise of the to-infinitival ECM-construction with the believe-verbs. The fact that the to-infinitive in the construction with this group

\(^{19}\) For discussion of the development from an active wesan-to-infinitive to a passive form with to be to, see Bock (1931), Fischer (1991), and particularly Miller (2002).
(but not with the *want*-verbs) is usually restricted to *to be* suggests that the construction after the *believe*-group is perhaps better analysed as a small clause without a VP, with the string *to be* lexicalizing the Agr-head.

We have argued that the emergence of ECMs with *believe*-verbs is not the result of a parameter resetting or feature change—traditional generative explanations—but is connected with the loss of V2. First constituents in a V2 language are the result of topicalization and are not restricted to any particular function (it is A′-movement), which means that any constituent can appear as unmarked, old information. When V2 was lost, old information could only be expressed in English by subjects, and this restriction created a need for more strategies to create subjects. Passive ECM represents such a strategy. The restrictions that the construction has shown throughout its history probably indicate that there is a strong ban in the core grammar on overt subjects in Spec,IP complements in surface structure, and the ECM-construction has remained marginal. The register restriction on this type of ECM, together with this ban on overt embedded subjects, strongly suggests that the construction is still outside the core grammar of English and requires additional routines (‘viruses’) that are acquired after the core grammar is in place. One virus inserts the string *to be* as a lexicalization of the Agr-head, on the analogy of the new passive *to be* to-infinitive that emerged when the *wesan*-to-infinitive was lost; another adds the passive strings of these *believe*-verbs to the inventory of the raising verbs. Raising verbs take an IP complement, but always NP-move its subject. The hypothesis that *be*-supposed/*be*-believed and even *be*-allowed are reanalysed as raising verbs is supported by the fact that these strings have acquired modal meanings.

The ECM after the *want*-verbs is more robust than after the *believe*-verbs. It represents a reanalysis of the object control construction after verbs of commanding and permitting, which have always been both two- and three-place. Small clauses may have been a factor here, too, as they are a possible complement of the two-place versions of these verbs.
Innocent bystander: the loss of the indefinite pronoun *man*

10.1 Introduction

This chapter explores an event in the history of English which at first sight is unlikely to be at all connected to any developments affecting *to*-infinitives: the demise of the indefinite pronoun *man* ‘one’, which has disappeared in English but still flourishes in Modern Dutch (*men*) and Modern German (*man*). An investigation into the uses of *man* in OE texts reveals that its position was greatly affected by the decline of the subjunctive clause and by the loss of V2.

We saw in Chapter 7 that the *to*-infinitive increases at the expense of the subjunctive clause. We argued in Chapter 8 that the *to*-infinitive was able to be re-analysed into a non-finite alternative of the subjunctive clause, in spite of having no positions for overt subjects or tense, because these positions in the finite clause are filled by material already present in the higher clause: the tense in the embedded clause is dependent on that of the higher clause, and the subject is either identical to the subject or to the object of the higher clause. In other words, the material in AgrSP and TP is anaphoric and controlled, just like the non-overt content of these positions in the *to*-infinitival clause. The non-overt NP in the subject position of *to*-infinitives, PRO, is controlled by the subject (subject control) or object (object control) of the higher clause.

There are of course *to*-infinitives that have no overt controller, as in (1a), where the controller is the *agent* of *sacrifice* that has become implicit through passivization, or (1b), where the understood subject of *accuse* or *call* cannot be linked to any implicit or explicit role:

(1) a. The travel industry expects more cutbacks as holidays are sacrificed **to meet** the mounting cost of household bills. (MicroConcord)

   b. Equally, it is as useful **to accuse** a politician of ambition as it is **to call** a bear hairy. (MicroConcord)

Instances such as (1a) and (1b) are referred to as ‘arbitrary PRO’ or ‘generic PRO’ in the literature. We will argue in this chapter that OE *man* is the overt
counterpart of this arbitrary PRO. Like PRO, it cannot occur as object of a verb or preposition, only as subject; and like arbitrary PRO, it appears as embedded subject when there is no overt controller available in the higher clause. As it is precisely this type of embedded subjunctive clause that is supplanted by the to-infinitive with its PRO subject, man is in effect being outcompeted by its non-overt counterpart, arbitrary PRO. This is why man starts to disappear from embedded clauses.

Main clause man is also threatened by changes elsewhere in the syntax. The loss of verb-second (V2) entails a change in the status of topic positions, and man may have had too little content to appear in such an important position. These factors may have hastened its decline.

10.2 Traditional accounts of the loss of man

The indefinite pronoun man in OE derives from the noun man. This is a typical instance of grammaticalization, cf. also the PE use of the ‘general’ nouns that constitute an intermediate category of vague, generic, ‘light’ predications: people, creature, thing, stuff (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 274). Man is first weakened into men and me (although it is possible that these spellings reflect the loss of the West Saxon written standard rather than actual phonetic change in the transition to ME). It behaves like a pronoun in OE and is no longer a full noun (van Bergen 2000a, b, c). Haspelmath (1997) calls pronouns like PE one ‘generic pronouns’ and notes that languages rarely have a distinct form for them and usually make do with a true indefinite pronoun like someone. Koenig (1999) makes a finer-grained distinction for French on that separates its use as a generic pronoun from its use as an ‘ultra-indefinite’, a contentless, discursively inert NP whose function is purely to express the thematic role of agent. We will argue that OE man is such an ‘ultra-indefinite’.

The indefinite pronoun man, often written men or me, is still much in evidence in the first two periods of the Helsinki Corpus of Middle English Texts, ME1 (1150–1250) and ME2 (1250–1350), with 193 and 207 attestations each (Rissanen 1997: 518); but it is lost in the course of the fifteenth century. The last mention in the OED of men is (2), and of me (3):

(2) Men muste putte hym self at the vpper syde of hym. (1484, Fables of Æsop v. vii)
‘One must put oneself at the upper side of him.’

(3) Thinges . . . , Of whiche me may not be withoute. (c. 1483 Caxton Dialogues 6/20)
‘Things [. . .] which one cannot do without’
Rissanen (1997) presents a detailed discussion of the collapse of the Old English system of indefinite marking with *hwa*, ‘who’, *hwilc* ‘which’, *hwæthwugu* ‘something’, etc., and connects its loss to the generalization of the *wh*-pronouns as expressions of the relative pronoun. *Wh*-pronouns already had two functions—interrogative and indefinite—and an additional third use may have compromised the communicative function of the system. The old system, which included indefinite *man*, was replaced by the *some/any* paradigm, with its clear contrast of assertive versus non-assertive contexts, and by the use of *one* as a ‘proform’, the lexical expression of the head of the noun phrase.

The demise of *man* may have been hastened by the fact that the form may have become too opaque because of the existence of similar forms with similar meanings. First, the plural of the full lexical form *man*, i.e. *men*, can only be disambiguated from the ME form of indefinite *man*, i.e. *men*, by the singular or plural ending of the finite verb—and number is not consistently marked on ME verbs (this is especially true of the modal verbs, which are developing invariant forms at this period). Secondly, the full lexical noun *man* ‘man’ was acquiring some indefinite meanings, repeating to some extent the earlier grammaticalization that had produced the OE indefinite pronoun in the first place, although this new use of the full lexical noun *man* never became a proper indefinite (Rissanen 1997: 521, reporting on Raumolin-Brunberg and Kahlas-Tarkka 1997). However, interference from these other *man/men* forms is unlikely to have been the primary cause of the loss of indefinite *man*. The only form such interference could have taken would have been the rise of some other form to take over the indefinite pronoun function. There is one likely candidate for such a form, i.e. *one*—but the time-lag between the loss of the one and the rise of the other makes this unlikely (see also Rissanen 1967, 1997), and we will see below that the functions of the two forms are very different.

We will argue that the linguistic niche of indefinite *man* was itself largely lost, and that it was this that may have contributed significantly to its demise.

10.3 The four environments of *man* in Ælfric

In order to establish the niche of *man* in Old English we investigated its use in Ælfric. Ælfric’s works consist of, for the most part, original, untranslated prose; though Ælfric draws heavily on various Latin and Greek sources, he is

---

1 Rissanen (1997: 521) points out that this new use should not be regarded as some form of regrammaticalization, as it does not represent a reflex of the original indefinite pronoun (OE *man*, ME *men*, *me*), which had clearly been formally differentiated from the noun *man* well before this period.
a conscious stylist, as his own views on the translation process, as set out in
his preface to the translation of Genesis, testify, and his language may be safely
regarded as a good representative of authentic Old English.

*Man* occurs 430 times in Ælfric’s works. Seventy-two instances occur in the
second conjunct of a pair of clauses coordinated by the conjunctions *and* ‘and’
or *ac* ‘but’, as in:

(4) and *man* þa deadan ne mihte, þe þær adydde
and one the dead not could, who there cast-out
wærón, […] nateshwôn bebyrgean for heora
were, […] by-no-means bury for their
mægenleaste ⟨ÆHomM 4, 77⟩
feebleness
‘and because of their weakness people were completely unable to bury
the dead who had been cast out there’

There are so many problems surrounding such clauses that for the moment
they have been excluded. One problem is that it is often impossible to decide
whether they are main or subclauses; the word order of OE *and/ond* or *ac*
clauses varies and can be either subordinate (i.e. verb-late) or root (with inver-
sion of *man* after *þa*, *ne*, and *wh*-constituents); see Mitchell (1985: §1685,
§§1720–9).

We will therefore concentrate on the remaining 358 instances of
*man*. They can be broken down into the syntactic contexts in Table 10.1.

We will see that *man* in main clauses is outcompeted by the passive construc-
tion after V2 is lost, and that *man* in subjunctive *that*-clauses is outcompeted by
arbitrary PRO as a side-effect of the competition between these finite clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clause type</th>
<th>subtype</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>main clause</td>
<td>1. <em>man</em> clause-initial</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>man</em> not clause-initial</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subclause</td>
<td>3. subjunctive <em>that</em>-clause</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. other</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Mitchell (1985: §1724) also notes the problems of editorial punctuation practice and scribal con-
fusion between the *positura* (signifying a full stop) and the Tironian sign for the Latin word *et*, which
means that some instances at least of *f* in OE manuscripts do not stand for *and* but mark the beginning
of a new sentence, which further complicates the analysis of *and/ac* clauses.
and the to-infinitive. The only niche in which man was not threatened by other constructions was subtype 4, ‘other subclauses’, but this was apparently not enough to guarantee its survival.

10.4 Man in main clauses

10.4.1 Introduction

Table 10.1 shows that the favourite position of main clause man in Ælfric is not clause-initial but in XP–V–man or XP–man–V orders. These orders are systematically related to each other. The position of man is the same in both cases; it is the position of the finite verb that is different, and that position depends on the sort of constituent that sits in the XP position, as we will show in §10.4.2. Rissanen notes that Old English man seems to be used ‘when the focus of interest is totally removed from the referent of the subject to some other element of the clause’ (Rissanen 1997: 514; 1987: 417–18) and this is the key to its function in these orders. OE man, like Dutch men, is an ‘ultra-indefinite’ and far more contentless than generic pronouns like PE one, you, or people. The decline of verb-second (V2) in Middle English has consequences for the information structure of the clause and specifically for subjects, whose function becomes far more prominent, as we argued earlier in connection with the rise of the ECM-construction (§9.4.2). After the loss of V2, passives are preferred if the subject is an indefinite, although an indefinite can still be used as a last resort if passivization leads to orders that conflict with focus. PE indefinites, however, have more content than OE man.

10.4.2 Man in SpecMP

The fact that non-initial man appears in the orders XP–V–man and XP–man–V is due to the fact that OE has a special position for subject pronouns, and man shows its pronominal nature by exhibiting the same behaviour in this respect. Man will follow the finite verb when the first constituent, in SpecCP, is a wh-word, the negator ne, or a member of a restricted group of adverbs, most prominently þa ‘then’—as do all other subjects, nominal and pronominal alike:

(5) þa gebrohte man him to, tomiddes þam folce, ænne dumne then brought one him to, among the people, a dumb mann, & se wæs eac swilce deaf (ÆHom 18, 25) man, and he was also likewise deaf ‘then was brought to him/then people brought to him, among the people, a man who was dumb, and also deaf’
The clitic nature of pronoun subjects emerges when the first constituent is not a *wh*-word, the negator *ne*, or an adverb like *þa* ‘then’, but a topicalized nominal or prepositional object, or adjunct, like *Be ðisum lytlan* ‘By means of this little thing’ in (6). When these constituents appear in the first position, subject nominals invert in OE, but pronouns do not, and neither does *man*

(6) *Be ðisum lytlan man mæg understandan* 〈ÆGenPref 72〉
   By this little one may understand
   ‘By means of this little thing can be understood’

Van Bergen (2000a, b, c) identifies this as one of the diagnostics for pronominal status, indicating that *man* in these instances at least behaves as a pronoun rather than as the nominal expression it must have been originally. This special behaviour of these pronominals can be translated structure-wise as a failure of the verb to move all the way up to C in such cases; it sits lower, in the head of the MP (‘M’ in tree (7) below). The clitic behaviour of *man* is in itself not important for our argument; we just need to know that *man* occupies the same position in the two orders, i.e. SpecMP. It is the position of the verb that is different: C in (5), having moved there from V, via T and M, as in (7), but M in (6), having moved there from V via T as in (8). Technically, both orders represent the V2 phenomenon, even if the one in (6) appears to be V3 on the surface.
Spec, MP, the inverted subject position, is a position of little textual prominence, which makes it eminently suitable for the ‘ultra-indefinite’ man. In a V2-language like OE, the first position in Spec,CP is reserved for topics/themes, as we saw in §9.4.2. The requirements of textual coherence generally (though not invariably) demand that these topics contain some sort of link with previous material (given information). This link may imply contrast (‘marked theme’) or not (‘unmarked theme’) in Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) sense. OE does not distinguish syntactically between marked and unmarked themes; both appear in Spec,CP.

10.4.3 The loss of V2 and information structure

The evidence suggests that the loss of V2 should be translated in syntactic terms as a failure of the finite verb to move to either C or M (see trees (7) and (8)); it stays in T(ense). When V2 is lost, this really means that two operations are lost: not just that of the finite verb to C or M but also that of an XP-topic to Spec,CP, which means that the subject henceforth remains in Spec, TP and does not move to the ‘old’ topic position in Spec,CP (see Van Kemenade 1997, 2000, 2001).\(^3\) This means that marked and unmarked themes come

\(^3\) The pronominal subject position in Spec,MP is not lost until eModE, but with loss of verb movement, this second subject position is on the surface indistinguishable from the canonical subject position in Spec,TP. Interestingly enough, pronominal subjects continue to show a positional difference compared to full nominal subjects with respect to the placement of the negative element not until well into the seventeenth century (Fischer et al. 2000: 135; Rissanen 1994, 1999). The ultimate demise of the ‘mood phrase’, then, cannot be argued to have taken place before eModE.
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to be marked syntactically: subjects (‘unmarked themes’) remain in Spec,TP while topicalized constituents may surface in Spec,CP with (secondary) focus (‘marked themes’); for examples of such focused constituents, see Chapter 9, note 11.

The connection of the decline of *man* with the loss of V2 now stands revealed: when XP-topics no longer automatically move to Spec,CP, but do so only when they are marked themes, subjects in Spec,TP are the only elements that can function as ‘unmarked themes’. Their prominent discourse function is unlikely to be satisfied by a contentless element like *man*. *Man* is a perfect subject when the unmarked theme is carried by some constituent other than the subject (as in (6)). After the loss of non-subject unmarked themes, it loses this niche. It cannot provide a link with previous material as it cannot refer, and is therefore unlikely to be an unmarked theme itself; nor can it be a marked theme, as it has too little informational content. When the subject is indefinite, PE prefers a passive, and the frequency of passive constructions significantly increases after the loss of V2 (Seoane Posse: forthcoming).

However, we saw in Table 10.1 that clause-initial *man*, although a minority pattern, does occur in Ælfric; the constituent linking the clause to the preceding one is not always the topicalized constituent, and there are also instances, as in PE, in which there are no overt links with the preceding discourse at all. We will see that few of Ælfric’s clause-initial *mans* bear translation by PE one or people. Most require a passive in PE. We will look at these clause-initial *mans* next.

10.4.4 Man clause-initial

Subtype 1 of Table 10.1 is the one in which *man* occupies its most prominent position: the first position of the sentence. This position is a topic position, the position of given, background information, often reserved for anaphoric material that provides a link with the previous sentence, to maximize textual cohesion (‘unmarked theme’). In OE any XP, argument, or adjunct could appear here, but in PE it is reserved for subjects. There is a secondary focus position in front of the subject in PE, reserved for ‘marked themes’ and hosting material that is prominent in that it is either new or contrastive with what has gone before (for a discussion of marked and unmarked themes see Downing and Locke 1995: 222–37 and Halliday 1967, 1994 [1985]).

Eleven of the initial *mans* in Ælfric show that *man* also has a more ‘generic’ use in that it can refer to the collectivity of human beings rather than an indefinite set of human beings, and as such could be said to have more semantic content than in the previous examples. These 11 of the 26 clause-initial
uses are precepts: *Man ne meg* ‘You/One cannot . . . ’, *Man mot* ‘You/One are not allowed to . . . ’, or *Man sceal* ‘You/One must . . . ’, often, but not invariably, at episode boundaries. This appears to be a use in which *man* ‘refers’:

(9) Hit is awriten: *Man* sceal hine gebiddan to his drihtne ⟨ÆCHom I, 11 172.23⟩

‘It is written: one must pray to one’s lord’

*Man* occurs in Ælfric on a number of occasions when another element has taken over the burden of textual cohesion. In (10) the two sentences are linked by the repetition of the verb in the second sentence (*smyrað* ‘anointers’):

(10) Hu is he gesmyrod? *Man* smyrad cyning mid gehalgodum ele þonne man hine to cyninge gehalgað. ⟨ÆCHom II, 1 7.162⟩

‘How is he anointed? One anoints a king with consecrated oil when he is consecrated as king.’

Another example is (11), in which the textual cohesion is accomplished by *þissum* ‘this’:

(11) *Man* cwæð on bocum gehu be þissum bearnteame, þæt [. . . ] ⟨ÆHOMM 2 98⟩

‘It is said in books in various ways about this progeny, that [. . . ]’

This use of *man* is not generic as in (9) and cannot be translated by PE generics. It is interesting to note that there are variants of this expression that are either active with indefinite *we*: *We rædað on bocum* ‘We read in books’ (e.g. ⟨ÆCHom I, 18 244.15⟩), or passive, as in *On bocum is geredd* ‘In books is read’ (e.g. ⟨ÆCHom I, 22 320.2⟩), or start with an expletive, as in *hit stent on bocum awritten* ‘It stands written in books’ (e.g. ⟨ÆHOM 21 397⟩). There are two things to note about such phrases. The first is that they confirm the link between OE *man*-clauses and the use of passives which has been noted before (e.g. Fischer 1994) and which we will discuss more fully in §10.4.5; *man* does the same job as the passive in that it obscures the agent of the
action. The second is that all initial constituents here are unmarked themes that do not refer back to the previous clause because these sentences start a new episode.

In fact, all the remaining examples of clause-initial _man_ in _Ælfric_ appear when textual cohesion is relaxed because of the start of a new discourse unit. In six cases this is signalled by the presence of _þa_ ‘then’, which has been argued to be an episode boundary marker (Brinton 1993; Enkvist 1986; Foster 1975; see also §4.5 above); but even when there is no _þa_, it is clear that many of these examples of clause-initial _man_ introduce a new episode, e.g.:

(12) (Ælc man sceal arisan þonne þe æfre on life wæs; wære he on wætereadruncen, oððe hine Wilde deor æton, oððe hine fyð forbærnde færllice to duste, and ðæt dust wurde toworpen mid blædum, swaðeah se ælmihtiga God mæg hine eft aræran, se ðe ealle þas woruld geworhte of nahte, and se ðe ðises ne gelyfð, ne bið his geleafa naht.)

_Man_ bewint þone deadan gewunelice mid reafe [. . .] _ÆHom_ 11, 332–9
garment [. . .]

‘(Every man will then rise again who was ever alive; if he was drowned in water, or if wild animals ate him, or if fire burned him unexpectedly to ash, and the ash was scattered by blasts, the Almighty God can nevertheless raise him up again, he who created this whole world out of nothing, and he who does not believe this, has no faith.)

‘The dead person is usually shrouded in a garment [. . .]’ [and the text goes on to describe the spiritual significance of this shroud]

Again, note that the last clause is best translated by a passive, and not by an indefinite.

This analysis of clause-initial _man_ shows that there are two uses, a generic use in precepts as in (9), which is a minority pattern, and a use as an indefinite. This indefinite could appear in clause-initial position in OE, but only at the start of a new episode when no link to previous material is required, or, more rarely, when the link is accomplished by a constituent elsewhere in the clause. These findings confirm the restricted use of _man_. Another important finding is the fact that PE translations of non-generic _man_ usually require a passive rather than a generic pronoun. We will argue in §10.4.5 that this is because _man_ is in most cases an ‘ultra-indefinite’. Too contentless to survive as an unmarked theme after V2 was lost, it was outcompeted by the passive construction.
10.4.5 Man as an ultra-indefinite

French, another language that has lost V2, has not lost its indefinite pronoun on. On has two functions that are very different from OE man. In informal speech it has largely taken over the function of the first person plural, so much so that the use of nous is increasingly restricted to written rather than spoken language (Koenig 1999: 236; see e.g. McWhorter 2001: 224, who notes that On a parlé avec elle hier is the only way to express We talked with her yesterday in ‘social, wine-with-dinner French’). The second use is that of generic pronoun, a use which resembles that of PE one/people/you, and it translates as people or you in PE. An example is (13), from Koenig (1999: 237):

(13) Quand on a les cheveux longs, on est souvent arresté par la police
‘When you have long hair, you often get arrested by the police’

The third use of on translates as ‘someone’ in PE and is labelled an ‘ultra-indefinite’ by Koenig. Ultra-indefinites express agent roles only and are a contentless placeholder for that role; they are discursively inert, unlike other indefinites (e.g. quelqu’un ‘somebody’) in that the denotatum of the agent satisfied by on cannot be directly referred back to, as (14) illustrates (Koenig 1999: 241–3). It is best translated by a passive in PE (ibid.). It is this on that most resembles OE man.

(14) *Oni a tué la présidente. Il était du Berry, paraît-il.
‘Someonei killed the president. He was from-the Berry, seems-it.’

We cannot get such judgements from OE in the absence of native speakers. In the case of Dutch men, however, we find that it shows the same discourse inertness (example adapted from Koenig 1999: 243):

(15) Iemandi/*Meni heeft blijkbaar gezegd dat hiji gelijk heeft
‘Someonei has apparently said that he right has’

Hij can either refer back to iemand or to another discourse referent, but not to men. Like ultra-indefinite on, Dutch men is also best translated by a passive in PE.
Some evidence that ultra-indefinites are extremely compatible with V2 information structure, but less so with a non-V2 language like PE, is available from Dutch–English translation studies. The contrasts between marked and unmarked themes in V2 and non-V2 languages receive special attention in translation studies (e.g. Hannay and Keizer 1993) and in translation manuals (Lemmens and Parr 1995), as particular care has to be taken when translating from Dutch to English to make sure that unmarked themes in Dutch remain unmarked themes in English. Such studies not only demonstrate the important role of subjects in PE, but also the incompatibility of the Dutch ultra-indefinite man and English information structure. Translating Dutch men is explicitly presented as a challenge.

Translation textbooks observe that men is often used as a deliberate strategy to obscure the agent, and note that a good English translation generally needs a more specific indication of the subject (Lemmens and Parr 1995: 275). The first option is to go for a passive construction in translation. An example is (16), a V2 construction with the adjunct daarom ‘for this reason’ as its unmarked theme, the finite verb voegt ‘adds’ in second position followed by the subject men (Modern Dutch does not have a system of pronominal clitics, unlike the one we saw operating in the OE example (6) above, and only has the order XP–V–men):

(16) Sap van druiven is maar kort houdbaar. Daarom voegt men wijngist aan het sap toe.

‘Grape juice can be stored only for a short period of time, and that is why yeast is added to it.’ (recommended translation, ibid. 308)

Dutch men is apparently so devoid of content that it obscures the identity of the agent as effectively as a passive construction. The PE generic pronouns are not recommended because they have too much content.

To define that content, we turn to studies of PE discourse. There we find that the generic pronouns we, you, they, or people always define interlocutors, either by inclusion or exclusion. Even one, which is perhaps the most impersonal of all generics, defines and includes interlocutors. It clearly conveys a stronger sense of involvement on the part of both interlocutors than the passive—witness

---

4 There is an additional difference between PE one and Dutch men in that the former is associated with a formal register. The greater formality of one versus the indefinite use of you, we, they appears to be a fairly recent development (cf. Seoane Posse 2000 for the situation of these indefinites in early Modern English). Unlike PE one, Dutch men is not restricted to formal discourse and easily surfaces in
examples like:

(17)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Physical pain is often inflicted upon children.} \\
& \quad \text{One often inflicts physical pain upon children.}
\end{align*}

These examples have been taken from Siewierska (1984: 243), who notes that (17b) carries unfavourable overtones because even with one there is a sense that the interlocutors are involved in some way. No such effects are conveyed by (17a), the impersonal passive.

When the patient argument conveys new information, a passive is less desirable because it would locate an informationally salient constituent in the subject position, and the sentence, though perfectly grammatical, becomes stylistically awkward, especially if the constituent is particularly heavy and complex; an example is (18a). In such cases, one may come to the rescue, as in (18b), from Siewierska (1984: 247; see also Seoane Posse 2000: 105–6).

(18)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{The snorting contempt with which Truman would have regarded the$1000 cowboy boots and the Adolfo gowns can be imagined} \\
& \quad \text{One imagines the snorting contempt with which Truman would have regarded the$1000 cowboy boots and the Adolfo gowns (‘A good snob is hard to find’, Time, 19 Sept. 1983)}
\end{align*}

One, then, is something of a last resort: if the passive, the most natural choice when the agent is an indefinite entity, is unavailable for information-structural reasons, one will rescue the structure.

There is evidence that OE man exhibits the same functional equivalence with passives as Dutch men. Consider the following OE translations from Latin:

(19) Lat: Eos qui ducuntur ad mortem eruere ne cesses
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{those who ledP\textit{ASS3PL} to death free\textit{INF} not hesitate2\textit{SG}}
\end{align*}

OE translation: þa þe man læt to deaðe alys hi
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{those whom people lead to death free them}
\end{align*}

(i) maar dat realiseer je je normaliter niet dat het een eh zo’n groot gedeelte but that realize you yourself normally not that it a uh such-a large part
van de elektriciteit wordt opgewekt door atoomcentrales hè, niet in of the electricity is generated by nuclear-power-stations [discourse prt], not in Nederland, in Nederland is men dat zich absoluut niet bewust the Netherlands, in the Netherlands is one that oneself absolutely not aware

‘but you usually don’t realize that it is, uh, that such a large part of the electricity is generated by nuclear power stations, do you, not in the Netherlands, in the Netherlands people are not aware of this at all’

(Ernestus Corpus)
ut symble ⟨ÆLS (Edmund) 214⟩
out always
(always set free those who are being led to death)

The Latin passive is translated as an active structure, with man as its subject, even though a passive translation is perfectly possible. Another example is (20), which translates a non-finite passive construction by a finite active construction, even though a finite passive construction would again be perfectly acceptable:

(20) Lat: Sicut Filius hominis non venit ministrari sed
So Son of-man not came servePASSINF but
ministrare
serveACTINF
OE translation: Swa mannes sunu ne com þæt him man
so of-man son not came that him people
þenode ac þæt he þenode (Mt (WSCp) 20.28)
served but that he served
‘So the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve’

Because subjects have such a prominent function in PE (as only they have been able to constitute unmarked themes since V2 was lost), there is no niche for contentless indefinites of the men/man type. Indefinite subjects almost inevitably have to refer, witness the strong inclusion effect of PE one in (17b) above. A typical example of this referring function is the use of one as a circumspect, non-committal way of introducing or summarizing the views of the speaker, especially in logical discursive or scholarly texts (see also the OED: one, sense 21). Authors of fiction often play upon the formal, distancing, pompous effect of one in such texts. In the following fragment, one is made into a protective shield behind which the maligned Tuke cowers:

(21) ‘It is of course utterly unrealistic to suppose that reputations in literature are made overnight,’ said Tuke, who had been brooding on Odingsels’ hard words. ‘One despises

5 The same effect could apparently be produced with other indefinite expressions, as with a man in the following Dickens fragment, in which the pompous distancing effect of the indefinite expression to refer to one’s own person is taken to ridiculous excess:

(ii) One of Steerforth’s friends was named Grainger, and the other Markham. They were both very gay and lively fellows; Grainger, something older than Steerforth; Markham, youthful-looking, and I should say not more than twenty. I observed that the latter always spoke of himself indefinitely, as ‘a man’, and seldom or never in the first person singular.
egotism, of course, but one instances oneself; one can give Giles a few years, and one is perhaps more engagé, but one has certainly not been overwhelmed with recognition. As for music being, au fond, more serious than letters, well one feels perhaps that those who are committed to an art are the best judges of its limits.’

‘Better judges than technicians, however capable,’ said Miss Tooley, bridling. Everybody knew that when Tuke began to refer to himself as ‘one’ Bridget would do battle for him. (Robertson Davies, The Salterton Trilogy (1980 [1951]), 653–4)

If the functional equivalence of OE man with Dutch men is valid, and both are ultra-indefinites, the conclusion of this section must be that the loss of V2 played an important role in the demise of man in main clauses. Clause-initial subjects no longer occupied the same position as topics (Spec,CP) but remained in Spec,TP. Spec,CP could only host XPs that were marked themes, implying contrast. This meant that marked themes came to be also syntactically marked (as topicalized constituents), whereas unmarked themes were restricted to subjects in Spec,TP. This means that subjects came to play a far greater role in maintaining textual cohesion, the primary function of ‘unmarked themes’. This left little scope for man, whose main role had been to provide a contentless subject, functionally equivalent to the demoted agent of the passive. The changes in information structure resulting from the loss of V2 promoted the use of passives, which took over the function of man in main clauses.

10.4.6 Conclusion

When V2 was lost, the orders XP–V–man and XP–man–V (the latter corresponding to XP–V–man in the other Germanic languages, as they do not exhibit the special behaviour of pronominal subjects of OE) were lost with it. This meant that man lost its favourite main-clause environment. Contentless, discursively inert, it was eminently suited to this not very prominent post-verbal position. XP as unmarked theme, establishing the link with the preceding discourse, was henceforth restricted to subjects. Man was too contentless to appear here, and PE one only appears here as a last resort. When the subject was an indefinite, PE came to prefer passives. The increase in the use of passives generally in the IME/eModE period can probably be linked to the loss of V2 (Seoane Posse: forthcoming).

‘A man might get on very well here, Mr Copperfield,’ said Markham—meaning himself.
‘It’s not a bad situation,’ said I, ‘and the rooms are really commodious.’
‘I hope you have both brought your appetites with you?’ said Steerforth.
‘Upon my honour,’ returned Markham, ‘town seems to sharpen a man’s appetite. A man is hungry all day long. A man is perpetually eating.’ (Dickens, David Copperfield (1849–50), ch. 24)
The timing of the loss of *man* fits the loss of V2. Because subject pronouns sit in SpecMP, it is only attestations of inversion of the finite verb and a nominal (as opposed to pronominal) subject that constitute solid evidence that V2 is still in place. The decline of such attestations indicates that the loss of V2 sets in at the end of the fourteenth century and gains momentum during the fifteenth century (van Kemenade 1987: 183, 219–23). This tallies with the robust survival of *man* in the first half of the Middle English period (Rissanen 1997) and its abrupt decline thereafter. The *OED*’s final attestations of *man/me(n)* date from the 1480s, when the loss of V2 is all but complete.

The fact that French *on* has survived the loss of V2 does not invalidate our scenario that the demise of *man* was significantly aided by the loss of V2 in Middle English. French *on* developed two other uses (first person plural and generic) which prevented it from becoming as marginal as OE *man*.

### 10.5 *Man* in subjunctive *that*-clauses: competition from arbitrary PRO

If the position of main clause *man* was threatened by competition from passives in ME, this did not mean that the position of *man* in subclauses, though unaffected by the loss of V2, remained stable. *Man* in this position found itself in competition with arbitrary PRO as a side-effect of the competition between subjunctive clauses and *to*-infinitives.

OE *man* in subjunctive subclauses, subtype 3 in Table 10.1, appears typically in clauses, of the kind in (22) (evaluative predicates), (23) (verbs of commanding and permitting), and (24) (verbs of persuading and urging):

1. **(22)** Nis na god þæt *man* nime his bearna hlaf. not-is not good that one takes SUBJ his children GEN bread and wurpe hundum ⟨ÆCHom II, 8 69.88⟩ and throws SUBJ dogs DAT ‘It is not right to take one’s children’s bread and throw it to the dogs’

2. **(23)** Godes æ byt eac þæt *man* arwurþige God’s law commands also that one honour SUBJ symble hys fæder & modor mid mycelre always his father and mother with great underþeodnysse ⟨ÆAbusMor 133⟩ obedience ‘God’s law also commands that we always honour our father and mother with strict obedience’
Example (24) is unusual in that verbs of persuading and urging, when complemented by a subjunctive clause, are almost invariably accompanied by an object whose reference is identical to that of the subject of the subjunctive clause, as in (25) (object and dependent subject in bold):

(25) & we lærað eac georne manna gehwylcne, þæt he
and we teach also cheerfully menGEN eachACC, that he
Godes ege hæbbe symle on his gemynde ⟨LawICn 25⟩
God’s awe havesUBJ always on his mind
‘and we also cheerfully teach each man that he should have the fear of
God always in his mind’

This is a form of obligatory object control, in which the content of the subject of the embedded clause is determined by the object in the higher clause. It is this property of verbs of persuading and urging that made it possible for the to-infinitive to appear as complement, as the identity of the non-overt infinitival subject could readily be inferred from the object of the higher clause (‘object-controlled PRO’; see §8.2.2). An example of a to-infinitive after this same verb (læran) is given in (26) (controlling object and controlled PRO subject in bold):

(26) he [. . .] heo lærde [PRO] to healdanne regollices liifes
he themACC taught to observe regulated life’s
þeodsçipe ⟨Bede 3.16.226.26⟩
discipline
‘he taught them to observe the discipline of a regulated life’

Verbs of commanding and permitting exhibit object control as well, but do not always require the presence of an object. Objects (invariably in the dative) are present in (24) (with subjunctive clause, and object control: the overt subject of the embedded clause is identical in reference to the object of the higher verb) and (27) (with to-infinitive, and object-controlled PRO; controllers and controlled
subjects in bold):

(27) þam cildum ic bead þæt hi gehyrsume wæron fæder and meder 〈ÆCHom I, 26 378.23〉
     þæt hi gehyrsume wæron fæder and meder
     ‘I ordered the children to be obedient to their father and mother’

(28) & ic [. . .] þe bead [PRO] mine bebodu to and I [. . .] youdat order my commandments to
     keep.
     ‘and I [. . .] order you to keep my commandments.’

When there is no object in the higher clause that may serve as a controller of
the lower subject, the subject position is filled by man if the complement is
a subjunctive clause (which, as a finite clause, requires a subject), as in (23)
above, or by arbitrary PRO when the complement is a to-infinitive, as in:

(29) ic æfre fram frymðe bebead [PROarb] þone drihtenlican dæg
     I ever from beginning ordered the lordly day
     to healdanne 〈HomU 46 134〉
     to hold
     ‘I have ever from the beginning ordered the Lord’s day to be kept’

Evaluative predicates rarely have overt controllers; an example is (30) (control-
lers and controlled subjects in bold). The majority of instances have arbitrary
PRO (in to-infinitives) as in (31), or man (in subjunctive clauses) as in (22)
above.

(30) þæt he [. . .] smeage [. . .], hwæt him sy betst [PRO]
     that he [. . .] considersubj, what himdat issubj best
     to donne and hwæt [PRO] to forganne. 〈WPol 6.2 146〉
     to do and what to forgo.
     ‘that he may consider what he should do and what he should not do’

(31) acsiað georne hu betst sy [PROarb] to ask eagerly how best issubj to
     farenne 〈WHom 11 216〉
     go
     ‘ask eagerly how it is best to go’

We argued in Chapters 7 and 8 that the to-infinitive developed into a
non-finite alternative for the subjunctive clause in Old English, and provided
quantitative evidence that such subjunctive *that* -clauses were largely replaced by *to*-infinitives in the transition from OE to ME. The fact that the *to*-infinitive has no positions for independent tense (T) or overt subjects (AgrS) does not make it inferior to the finite subjunctive clause, because the information in T and AgrS in those clauses is predictable from information in the main clause. Subjunctive T is never independently meaningful but copied from the T of the higher clause; the content of AgrS in the subjunctive clause is similarly predetermined (‘controlled’) —by the object (or, in the case of monotransitive verbs, the subject) of the higher clause. The absence or presence of these structures does not materially affect or limit the range of expression of the *to*-infinitive, compared to the subjunctive clause; the subjunctive clause does not have an edge over the *to*-infinitive, in spite of its more extensive structure, and it is this that allowed the *to*-infinitive to become functionally equivalent to the subjunctive *that*-clause.

OE *man*, then, could be said to be in competition with arbitrary PRO. Note that OE *man* (and German *man*, and Dutch *men*) has all the hallmarks of an overt manifestation of arbitrary PRO, including the ban on appearing in object position (of verb or preposition): *man/men* only has a nominative form. This is a marked contrast with PE generic pronouns like *one* or *people*: unlike *man* they may appear in any NP position, and even take the ’s genitive. When the *to*-infinitive ousts such subjunctive clauses, this use of *man* disappears with it. A small niche remains only in those cases in which the selection of arbitrary PRO is unavailable; after a verb of persuading and urging like *teach*, for instance, PRO would be interpreted as controlled PRO. PE *one* typically pops up as a last resort in such cases, as in (32), and this is one of the uses in which we encounter a finite clause in PE with *one* as subject:

\[(32) \text{ The Spanish daily El Pais quoted Mr Cela as saying that he did not intend to let the award change his habits, because the British side of his character had taught him *one* should only appear in the press thrice in a lifetime—‘when born, when dead and when receiving the Victoria Cross’ (MicroConcord)}\]

\[\neq \text{the British side of his character had taught him; PRO to appear in the press thrice in a lifetime}\]

10.6 *Man* in other subclauses

*Man* in subclauses other than the subjunctive *that*-clause (subtype 4 of Table 10.1) appears to be the type that is least affected by the changes discussed so far, although, like Dutch *men*, it does not invariably allow a translation by one of the PE generics. In example (33), for instance, a PE passive appears to
be the best option:

(33) And þu wel wast, leof, þæt hit wile hearmian þinum
And you well know, dear, that it will harm your
þæt hit wile hearmian þinum
þæt hit wile hearmian þinum
cynerice heora receleasynsse, gyf him man ne gestyrð heora
cynerice heora receleasynsse, gyf him man ne gestyrð heora
kingdom their rule-flouting, if them one not urges their
kingdom their rule-flouting, if them one not urges their
stuntnysse. ⟨ÆHomM 14 152⟩
stuntnysse. ⟨ÆHomM 14 152⟩
folly.
folly.
‘And you know well, dear King, that these people will harm your
‘And you know well, dear King, that these people will harm your
kingdom by their flouting of the rules if they are not urged away from
kingdom by their flouting of the rules if they are not urged away from
their folly’
their folly’

10.7 Conclusion

Many proposals have been made in the literature about the disappearance of
Many proposals have been made in the literature about the disappearance of
the OE indefinite pronoun man (Middle English men/me). We have suggested
the OE indefinite pronoun man (Middle English men/me). We have suggested
two additional factors which almost completely destroyed the niche occupied
two additional factors which almost completely destroyed the niche occupied
by man in OE.
by man in OE.

The first one was the loss of V2, which affected the information structure of
The first one was the loss of V2, which affected the information structure of
the clause, and promoted the use of various passive constructions over the use
the clause, and promoted the use of various passive constructions over the use
of an active construction with a man subject. Subjects came to play a far more
of an active construction with a man subject. Subjects came to play a far more
prominent role in maintaining textual cohesion. This left little scope for the
prominent role in maintaining textual cohesion. This left little scope for the
indefinite pronoun man, whose main role had been to provide a contentless
indefinite pronoun man, whose main role had been to provide a contentless
subject, functionally equivalent to a passive.
subject, functionally equivalent to a passive.

The second one was the competition between to-infinitives and subjunctive clauses which resulted in man, the perfect contentless filler of AgrS of a
The second one was the competition between to-infinitives and subjunctive clauses which resulted in man, the perfect contentless filler of AgrS of a
controlled subjunctive clause, being largely ousted by arbitrary PRO, its exact
controlled subjunctive clause, being largely ousted by arbitrary PRO, its exact
non-overt counterpart. In this respect, man suffered the fate of an innocent
non-overt counterpart. In this respect, man suffered the fate of an innocent
bystander in the struggle between the two structures.
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Summary and conclusions

11.1 Introduction

Although the rise of the to-infinitive in the history of English is an instance of grammaticalization, with to changing from a lexical category (P⁰) to a functional category (say, T⁰ for abstract Tense), a close examination of extant OE texts clearly shows that this process was already completed at the earliest recorded stage. To must have as is also strongly suggested by the homophony of infinitival to and the proposition to but it has already developed into an infinitival marker in OE. There are indications that the to-infinitive was already fully clausal by that stage, which means that the change of P⁰ to T⁰ must have taken place in prehistoric OE or even in Primitive Germanic. It also means that the changes in infinitival constructions found in Middle English, notably the rise of to-infinitival ECM and the split infinitive, cannot be argued to be the result of a categorial change, an idea current in recent generative literature on the subject.

The investigation further revealed that the distribution of the bare and the to-infinitive was not as chaotic as earlier studies (notably Callaway 1913 and Bock 1931) had suggested. A detailed account in terms of argument structure and thematic roles revealed that the distribution of the two infinitives was found to be fairly systematic, with the to-infinitive following the distribution of the subjunctive that-clause. This indicated that it might actually be the subjunctive clause that was under threat from the to-infinitive, and not the bare infinitive, contrary to the recurrent claim in the literature on infinitives in Old and Middle English that the to-infinitive directly competed with the bare infinitive in many positions. The to-infinitive shows some limited overlap with the distribution of the bare infinitive after two groups of verbs: the intention verbs and the verbs of commanding and permitting. There are, however, clear syntactic and semantic differences between the two infinitives after at least the latter group, as well as after the ginnan-verbs, a subset of the intention verbs, which argues against the two infinitives being in direct competition. Distributionally, positionally, and structurally, the to-infinitive after all verbs except wesan ‘be’ matches the subjunctive that-clause.
The hunch that the rise of the to-infinitive may have occurred at the expense of the subjunctive clause was confirmed by qualitative and quantitative evidence. A comparison of two versions of the OE translation of Gregory’s Dialogues showed that the later version systematically replaced subjunctive clauses with to-infinitives, qualitative evidence of the functional equivalence of the two structures and a first hint of wholesale replacement. A comparison of the numbers of to-infinitives and subjunctives in the same environments in six OE and eME subcorpora confirmed that such a wholesale replacement had in fact taken place, quantitative evidence of the competition between to-infinitive and subjunctive clause. If there was any competition with the bare infinitive at any time, it was not in OE itself, but at the pre-OE stage (when both infinitives appear as purpose adjunct), or perhaps at a later stage of Middle English, as it seems likely that the massive increase in to-infinitives in eME that resulted from the competition with the finite clause is bound to have affected the position of the bare infinitive. We leave the investigation of late Middle English to future research.

11.2 Origin of the to-infinitive

The most likely origin of the to-infinitive is what I have called the purposive to-PP, to be distinguished from the spatial to-PP. Purposive to-PPs do not express a goal in space, but in time, i.e. a future, or at least non-actuated, event. The noun that expresses an event is usually a nominalization of a verb. The categorial status of this entity is that of a noun, but it inherits the thematic structure of the verb from which it is derived. By virtue of its being an N-head, the external agent argument remains unexpressed; an ‘inherited’ internal argument may be expressed by an object in the genitive.

Purposive to-PPs are attested in two functions in OE: as purpose adjunct, and as goal-argument after the verbs of persuading and urging and after a limited number of nouns (tima ‘time’, anweald ‘power’, etc.) and adjectives (of the type gearu ‘ready’). Somewhat surprisingly in view of their less extensive structure, purposive to-PPs are capable of expressing the same information as the other constituent that is found in the same functions, i.e. the subjunctive that-clause. This is because the AgrS and T nodes of the finite clause—positions which the to-PP lacks—are filled with anaphoric, controlled material: the content of AgrS (overt in a finite clause, and PRO in a non-finite clause) depends on the object of the higher clause and is always recoverable.
The content of T depends similarly on that of the matrix tense, as subjunctive express Determined Time Reference (in the sense in Noonan 1985). This is not to say that there is no difference between to-PP and subjunctive clause; the former depends on the availability of a nominalizing suffix for a particular verb. Such suffixes are subject to the restrictions typical of derivational morphology: although there is a variety of nominalizing affixes, e.g. -ung, -dom, and -e, not a single one of these may attach to just any V-stem. It follows that not every verb is capable of being nominalized in this way. The subjunctive clause is not subject to such restrictions, as it may select any V; subjunctive affixes are inflectional and take any V as input.

Although the to-infinitive is generally supposed to derive from the bare infinitive, this position is not universally accepted, as the presence of the n-geminate points to an older ∗-ja suffix. On these grounds, the infinitive in the complement of to has been argued to be a separate formation, a gerund; and we have argued that this gerund may have come into existence as the result of a nominalizing affix competing so successfully with the other affixes—such competition is again more typical of derivational affixes than of inflectional ones—that it eventually attached to any V and came to be interpreted as inflectional rather than derivational. Inflectional affixes are not category-changing; and it may be that this was the point at which the categorial change, of N to V, took place.

The advantage of this scenario is that it explains why we do not find the bare infinitive in any other nominal positions apart from the complement of to: the answer is that the entity in the complement of to is not a bare infinitive, which means we do not have to assume that the bare infinitive was ever nominal enough to occur in this position.

The second advantage is that the function in which the to-infinitive developed (an expression of purpose) is typical of the emergence of infinitival forms in general; the emergence of the to-infinitive is in this respect completely uncontroversial, as is the fact that it derives from a nominalization of a verb—again, this is typical of non-finite forms in general. That there are two infinitives in a language that represent independent developments is similarly well attested in other languages.

As soon as the affix generalized to accept all Vs as input, it acquired the same competitive edge over the purposive to-PP as the subjunctive clause. A further consequence was that it became a competitor of the finite complement. The fact that its structural positions AgrS and T could not be filled with overt material did not matter, as these positions were only filled by anaphoric material in its competitor. The story of the further rise of the to-infinitive is one of competition with the subjunctive clause.
11.3 Competition between subjunctive clause and to-infinitive

The distribution of the to-infinitive as goal-argument of verbs of persuading and urging and conatives (Chapter 3) exhibited enough overlap with the purposive to-PP to account for the occurrence of the to-infinitive here as the result of its origins as purposive to-PP. No such explanation was available for the distribution of the to-infinitive as theme of intention verbs (monotransitive subject control), verbs of commanding and permitting (ditransitive object control), or commissives (ditransitive subject control). No single complement (the bare infinitive, or genitive, dative, or accusative objects) could account for this distribution, with the exception of the subjunctive clause. Conversely, there was only one group of verbs where the finite complement was found, but not the to-infinitive: the verbs of saying and declaring.

One of the reasons for this finding could be that the subject of the subjunctive clause after these verbs does not usually refer to the object or subject of the higher clause; and as the to-infinitive in OE occurs exclusively in control structures, this explains why these verbs are not found with such a complement. A second reason could be that the subjunctive form in these complements was actually of a different type; the cross-linguistic study of Noonan (1985) reports that subjunctives are selected to mark either Determined Time Reference (the subjunctive marks a prospective, non-actuated event; this is what we have called the ‘optative’ subjunctive) or reported speech. We suggest that the to-infinitive was at first analysed as equivalent to the optative subjunctive, and started to occur with the discourse-subjunctive (reported speech) only at a later stage. There is evidence in Gothic that the finite subjunctive followed the same course: restricted to optative contexts first, but spreading to discourse contexts later.

The functional equivalence, and therefore the plausibility of competition, was confirmed by a study of two versions of the OE translation of a Latin text, Gregory’s Dialogues. Subjunctive that-clauses in the earlier version are systematically replaced by to-infinitives in the later version, although only one bare infinitive is replaced by a to-infinitive. The majority of the verbs whose finite complement is changed belong to the monotransitive intention group, with the verbs of persuading and urging a distant second. Verbs of commanding and permitting, and of promising (the commissives, which have a number of subcategorization frames in common with each other and not with the verbs of persuading and urging, and consequently constitute a separate group) do not show this rate of replacement.

A quantitative study of six subcorpora, each representing an interval of a century—four OE subcorpora and two early ME corpora—yielded 5 usable data points, on the basis of which it was possible to construct logistic
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curves: one for purpose adjuncts, presumably the earliest function of the to-infinitive, one for monotransitive intention verbs, and one for ditransitive verbs (all the manipulatives, i.e. the two groups of urging and persuading, and commanding and permitting, together). The conclusion is warranted, then, that the to-infinitive expanded at the expense of the subjunctive clause.

This investigation stops at 1350; but another study (Rohdenburg 1995) shows that the competition between the to-infinitive and the that-clause after the manipulatives continued after this date, and that the present situation was not reached until 1800.

11.4 The categorial status of the to-infinitive

The mass of accumulated distributional, structural, and positional evidence led us to posit three different infinitives, and it was consequently impossible to talk in terms of ‘the’ infinitive when discussing categorial status. The three structures are the following:

(i) the bare infinitive;
(ii) the to-infinitive as complement of the verb wesan ‘be’, as in the PE fossil he is to blame; and
(iii) the to-infinitive as purpose adjunct, and as theme- or goal-argument of verbs other than wesan.

With respect to (i), the bare infinitive, though it has some nominal traits in that its position in the clause is that of a case-marked noun, is a V-head, and there has been no categorial change in this respect in the transition from OE to ME.

With respect to (ii), the wesan-to-infinitive behaves positionally, distributionally, and structurally like an AP and occurs as a predicate in a small clause. This infinitive is re-analysed in Middle English as an overtly passivized to be-infinitive, and facilitated the adoption of the to-infinitival ECM-construction after the believe-type verbs.

With respect to (iii), this to-infinitive appears exclusively in control constructions (with an empty category, PRO, as external argument), and functions as the non-finite counterpart of the subjunctive clause. Its distribution, internal structure, and position in the clause is that of a clause, probably CP.

All infinitives clearly contain V-heads, not N-heads. This means that there is no evidence of the categorial change from noun to verb that has frequently been put forward in recent literature to account for various changes in infinitival complements in ME: the emergence of passives, negation, and perfective have in the to-infinitival complement; and the emergence of the split infinitive,
to-infinitival ECM, and raising structures. Some of these changes we argued not to constitute a genuine change at all, but to result from the fact that OE to-infinitives of type (iii) occur exclusively in control structures where passives, negation, and perfects are rare anyway; this fact, together with the low frequency of to-infinitives compared to ME, and the low frequencies of perfective have itself (its use did not become general until ME), make it unlikely that their non-occurrence can be taken as evidence of their being structurally impossible.

The emergence of to-infinitival ECM constitutes a genuine change. Its occurrence with the verbs of commanding and permitting was the result of a reanalysis of the object control construction after these verbs; the same can be argued for its occurrence with the verbs of the want-type, as they, too, show ditransitive behaviour. The loss of OV orders greatly facilitated its rise.

Its occurrence after the believe-verbs was the result of other developments. It may have been initiated by Latin examples, and is still mainly the preserve of a formal, scholarly register in PE. Its adoption into the language was facilitated by the fact that it was structurally similar to the small clause in OE with the ‘participial’ type of to-infinitive as its predicate. When this type of to-infinitive declined, and its place was taken by the to be-infinitive, the result was a structure very like the ECM. The fact that to be in the case of many believe-verbs in PE remains the only infinitive possible in the construction suggests that many such ECMs are still AgrPs rather than full-blown IPs; we have also suggested that the fact that many such ECMs are restricted to a formal, written register indicates that the structure is acquired late, perhaps even after the core grammar is established. Such ‘routines’, acquired too late to be incorporated in the grammatical system proper, have been labelled ‘viruses’ on the analogy of computer viruses tampering with the instructions of operating systems (the ‘core grammars’ of computers). Because the grammar system is highly abstract and subconscious, its core components cannot be ‘accessed casually’ (Lasnik and Sobin 2000: 367) and therefore are not accessible to any routines that speakers might try to add at any later stage (the viruses). Virus manipulations, then, cannot be manipulations of the abstract ‘core’ system but are restricted to superficial surface manipulations of this system (ibid. 268). One of these superficial mechanisms is ‘chunking’, which ties in well with other suggestions in the literature that the passive ECM-construction contained in be supposed to is often used as equivalent to a modal verb, as if it is an unanalysed string. The most crucial factor to promote the ECM after the believe-verbs, however, is the loss of V2, which began at the end of the fourteenth century. When V2 was lost, only nominative NPs could be unmarked themes. Passive ECM-constructions (‘second passives’) allowed the subject of the embedded infinitival clause to rise to the
higher subject position, and so become an unmarked theme. This suggests that the ECM-construction provided a new strategy for moving NPs into the position of unmarked themes. This account provides an explanation for the high rates of both ‘second passives’ and to be-infinitives after the believe-verbs that are such characteristic features of the construction with these verbs in PE.

11.5 The position of to

The equivalence between to-infinitive and subjunctive clause means that the to-infinitive was reanalysed at some point as a non-finite subjunctive. This means that to has the same features to check as the subjunctive, and like the subjunctive it checks them in T. In OE, it is a bound morpheme on the infinitive, and checks its features covertly; in ME, it starts to move to T overtly and is no longer a clitic or prefix, but a free word.

Although the change is likely to have been facilitated by the gradual loss of OV orders that took place in ME, and a case could perhaps be made for learners analysing to as moving to T overtly for reasons of greater economy of derivation (since the covert movement of to, or of the to + V complex, had become vacuous in a VO grammar), this again appears to be a necessary but not sufficient cause for the change.

We argued that the actual trigger may have been the behaviour of the finite counterpart of infinitival to, i.e. the finite subjunctive form. This form, probably as a result of the general syncretism of forms in eME, and the levelling of verbal endings, was increasingly becoming expressed by a free form, a modal verb, rather than a bound form, the subjunctive ending. The difference between free and bound forms is captured in recent theories by postulating that free forms move to a functional checking position overtly, whereas bound forms do so covertly. If the subjunctive is no longer exclusively signalled by a morpheme on the verb and raising to T covertly, but more and more often by a free morpheme, a modal, raising to T overtly, could have prompted learners also to start moving infinitival to, the non-finite subjunctive, overtly rather than covertly to T. The overt movement of to, then, would bring it in line with the rest of its subjunctive paradigm: the modal verbs. If this scenario is correct, the change would be an example of a rare phenomenon: a grammar-driven change.

11.6 The value of extra-syntactic evidence

Investigating the syntax of a language without access to native speaker intuitions is a daunting undertaking. Our language samples depend on the accidental survival of written texts, and all our informants are dead. As for
the texts that have survived, we cannot take them at face value: copyists may have made deliberate or accidental changes, translations may be imperfect and reflect the syntax of the originals in the other language rather than the syntax of OE. This does not mean that we should refrain from saying anything at all.\footnote{This attitude used to be widespread, especially among scholars of synchronic syntax. Den Besten and Edmondson (1983: 208), for instance, observe that the diachronic development of the Infinitivus Pro Participo (IPP)-effect in Dutch they have deduced on the basis of synchronic data is at odds with the attested diachronic facts. This leads them to adjust not their hypothesis, but their data, in two airy sentences without further argument: ‘Yet, the historical sources are often manuscripts that have gone through the hands of many scribes from many different areas. The reliability of such sources must be in doubt.’} Some texts are clearly more reliable than others: they do not have a Vorlage in another language, and their internal syntax presents a coherent picture in the consistent way in which, say, to-infinitives appear to the right of their governing verb or in which they observe contrasts such as that between pronominal subjects in Spec,MP and nominal subjects in Spec,TP. This is why we have used the works of Ælfric as a reliable source throughout this study. But even texts that are unreliable by such standards can still yield valuable material in those instances where the translated text deviates markedly in its syntax from the Vorlage.

The finiteness of a historical corpus may mean that some questions may never be answered, especially questions of the type: is OE grammar incapable of generating construction X? In other words, can we conclude from the non-occurrence of construction X in our finite database that it was not part of OE syntax? This point is often used as an argument to dismiss the study of diachronic syntax, as opposed to synchronic syntax, to a marginal position, not part of ‘core’ linguistics, and one can see why (Koopman 1990: 11–16). The problem of ‘negative evidence’ does not mean, however, that we must throw up our hands in despair when we fail to find the crucial construction we are looking for in our data. The data we have may yield more than we might think.

A good example of the ‘negative evidence’ problem is the question whether the non-occurrence of to have to-infinitives, passive to-infinitives, and independently negated to-infinitives in OE are indicative of a structural impossibility (§8.3). Could OE grammar have generated these to-infinitives or not? Many scholars have argued the latter and have suggested that they became possible only in ME due to a categorial change (e.g. Lightfoot 1979; Jarad 1997) or to the acquisition of a new functional projection (van Gelderen 1993). The non-occurrence of these structures is, however, more likely to be due to pragmatic than to syntactic constraints. This becomes clear when we look for the same structures in the subjunctive clause, the finite equivalent of
the *to*-infinitive. In subjunctive clauses that occur in interchangeable positions with the *to*-infinitive, perfective have, passives, and independent negation are found only very rarely. In the case of the finite subjunctive, no one would argue on the basis of these structures being rare that there is a structural restriction. It is clear that they are infrequent for pragmatic reasons: finite subjunctives in the complement of verbs of intention or manipulation contain too much predetermined, ‘controlled’ material to be compatible with independent negation or tense; they refer to prospective actions, which makes them for the most part incompatible with passives. For the same reasons we should not expect these structures to occur in *to*-infinitives, their non-finite counterpart. The fact that we find few instances with finite subjunctives and none with non-finite subjunctives is more likely to reflect the fact that the former still predominate numerically over the latter in OE; the appearance of these structures with *to*-infinitives in ME is more likely to be due to the massive overall increase in *to*-infinitives in that period (see §7.4.2) than to an underlying change in the category or position of the *to*-infinitive.

Related to the problem of ‘negative evidence’ and the absence of native speaker judgements is the one we encountered in §4.4: how are we to interpret the combination of a *ginnan*-verb followed by a bare infinitive? There is plenty of evidence in the database that some instances of the *ginnan*-verbs, when followed by a bare infinitive, had lost their inchoative meaning and were bleached to something like a perfective auxiliary. But it seems impossible to tell whether this was true of all instances of *ginnan*-verbs with bare infinitives: if the infinitive happened to be a (durative) state rather than a (punctual) achievement, and if there did not happen to be present a durative adverbial of the form *for X time*, an inchoative interpretation remained possible in theory. I argued on the basis of a study of the *ginnan*-verbs with bare and *to*-infinitive in the works of Ælfric that at least by his time, in his dialect, none of the instances of a *ginnan*-verb with a bare infinitive allowed an inchoative interpretation. Unlike *ginnan*-verbs with *to*-infinitives, *ginnan*-verbs with bare infinitives never occurred in a verb-first environment. The verb-first construction in Ælfric is a narrative device to announce a thematic discontinuity, a dramatic turn in the plot. The *ginnan*-verb when used in such a construction sets the scene by indicating the action to be dramatically interrupted by the unexpected turn of events, comparable to the function of a PE phrase like *Just when he had started to V*. *Ginnan*-verbs in this position only occur with *to*-infinitives, not bare infinitives. This indicates that they can only mean ‘begin’ when followed by a *to*-infinitive, since, just like *start* in the PE example, the action they describe must be capable of allowing an interruption. With bare infinitives, it is apparently impossible to focus on the beginning of the event, only on
its completion. The action expressed by a bare infinitive cannot be inter-
rupted, and this is why they are rarely found in the verb-first construction. The conclusion must be that *ginnan*-verbs followed by a bare infinitive never have inchoative meaning, at least not by Ælfric’s time.

A final example of how we can make the most of finite historical data is the way in which the loss of verb-second kept cropping up in our investigation. One would have thought that an investigation into the *to*-infinitive, which is a non-finite, non-matrix-clause phenomenon, would have little to do with the loss of finite verb movement in matrix clauses. Yet the loss of verb-second turned out to be the crucial piece in the complex puzzle on how English was the only West Germanic language to develop a *to*-infinitival ECM-construction as in *He is believed to be a liar* (see Chapter 9) and was also found to be an important factor in the loss of the indefinite pronoun *man*—another point on which English differs from its continental cousins.

The key to making these discoveries is not to look at constructions in isola-
tion, but to focus on their function in the language. This means that we sometimes have to cast our nets wide and look at other fields—discourse, theories of textual cohesion, translation studies, pragmatics—in order to find the answers to syntactic problems.
Appendix I: List of corpora used

This investigation made use of the following electronic corpora:

1. The Toronto Corpus (see Healey and Venezky 1985 [1980]).
2. The Helsinki Corpus of English texts, created under the direction of Professor Matti Rissanen at the University of Helsinki (see Kytö 1993).
3. The Brooklyn–Geneva–Amsterdam–Helsinki (BGAH) corpus. This is the OE part of the Helsinki Corpus that has been syntactically annotated and parsed as part of an ongoing joint project of Ans van Kemenade and Frank Beths (Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam), Willem Koopman (University of Amsterdam), Susan Pintzuk (University of York), and Eric Haeberli (University of Geneva). The annotation scheme includes verb complementation patterns.
4. The Penn–Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME), annotated under the direction of Professor Anthony Kroch (University of Pennsylvania) with the support of the National Science Foundation and with supplementary support from the University of Pennsylvania Research Foundation. The annotation scheme was designed by Anthony Kroch and Ann Taylor and implemented by Ann Taylor.
5. Various Middle English texts from the Oxford Text Archive, downloaded by anonymous FTP.
6. Various Middle English texts from the Middle English Compendium, University of Michigan.
7. The MicroConcord Corpus (OUP), a small corpus of PE texts, delivered as part of the MicroConcord package.
8. The Ernestus Corpus, a private research corpus of spoken Dutch, described in Ernestus (2000: 57–63).

The search software used was Wordcruncher, MicroConcord (OUP), and Wordsmith, with some additional GREP-routines in UNIX.
Appendix II: Tables of complementation patterns

Tables 1 and 2 below are based on data from Callaway (1913: 37, 44, 161ff.), Bosworth and Toller (1882, 1921), Wülfing (1894), and Mitchell (1985: §1092), supplemented by corpus searches. Minor differences are due to the fact that I have followed the spelling of the lemmata in J. R. Clark Hall’s A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary (Hall 1960 [1984]), which sometimes differs from Callaway’s.

It is important to note that Clark Hall treats *forlætan* as a verb with many different meanings. As at least two of these meanings clearly correlate with different complementation patterns, I distinguish two *forlætans*: *forlætan*₁ ‘leave’ occurs with AcI and small clause complements; *forlætan*₂ ‘abstain from doing; ‘not attempt’ occurs with to-infinitive and that-clause complements (see the entry for *forlætan* in Bosworth and Toller 1882, 1921). It is the second *forlætan* that we find in Table 1.

**Table 1.** For monotransitive verbs taking a *to*-infinitival complement only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>acc</th>
<th>dat/gen</th>
<th>to + NP</th>
<th>ðæt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adrædan <em>fear</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aforhtian <em>fear</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anbidian <em>expect</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anðracian <em>fear, lament</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aðencan <em>intend</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beotian <em>threaten</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>besorgian <em>regret</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceosan <em>choose</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cunnian <em>attempt</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deman <em>condemn</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyrstlæcan <em>undertake</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fleon <em>shun</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forgieman <em>neglect</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forgiemeleasian <em>neglect</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forhtian <em>fear</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forlætan <em>abstain from</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forsacan <em>refuse</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forseaman <em>be ashamed</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forseon <em>despise</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundian <em>strive</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>acc</td>
<td>dat/gen</td>
<td>to + NP</td>
<td>ðæt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higian strive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyhtan hope</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ieldan delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liefan believe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murnan care</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mynnan lead, intend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oferhogian despise</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ongietan understand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onscunian shun</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reccan care</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sirwan plot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slawian be slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smeagan intend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swerian swear</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tacan undertake</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teohhian intend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðeahtian intend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðeowan threaten</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðwærian agree</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underfon attempt</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandan understand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlustian loathe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wandian hesitate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warnian shun</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weddian agree</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witan know</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiðcweðan refuse</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiðsacan refuse</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of verbs exhibiting this pattern (out of 48)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. For monotransitive verbs taking both infinitival complements (includes aspectualizers, see Ch. 3, and intention verbs, see Ch. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>acc</th>
<th>dat/gen</th>
<th>to + NP</th>
<th>δæt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ablinnan cease</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aginnan begin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginnan begin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earnian earn, strive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fon attempt</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forhogian neglect</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gieman care</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hogian intend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leornian learn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myntan intend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ondredan fear</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onginnan begin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secan seek</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swican stop, cease</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tilian strive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ȏyncan intend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ȏristlæcan presume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wenan hope, expect</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wilnian desire</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wunian be/wont</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of verbs exhibiting this pattern (out of 21)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix III: Functions of the *to*-infinitives in the C and H manuscripts of Gregory’s *Dialogues*

These tables are based on Yerkes (1982), supplemented by a corpus search.

**Table 1.** The functions of the *to*-infinitives occurring in both C and H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>function</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjunct of purpose</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of adjective</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of <em>wesan</em> ‘be’</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb complement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** The functions of *to*-infinitives in C supplanted in H by some other structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>function of <em>to</em>-infinitive in C</th>
<th>corresponding structure in H</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complement of noun</td>
<td>noun has no complement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of adjective</td>
<td>no corresponding structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of <em>wesan</em> ‘be’</td>
<td>PP with <em>to</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of <em>wesan</em> ‘be’</td>
<td>no corresponding structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of to-infinitive in H</td>
<td>Corresponding structure in C</td>
<td>Occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of verb</td>
<td>verb has no complement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simplex verb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinate clause</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bare infinitive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjunct of purpose</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinate clause</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of noun</td>
<td>NP (genitive)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP with to</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of adjective</td>
<td>PP with to</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement of wesan</td>
<td>no corresponding structure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AcI (Accusativus-cum-Infinitivo) 125, 128–31, 132–6, 243, 245
after perception verbs 15–16
after verbs of commanding and permitting 116, 124, 263
due to Latin influence 136
see also ECM
acquisition 23, 197
adjunct versus argument 47–51, 64–8, 80–2, 117–22, 140
agreement phrase, see Small Clause
arbitrary/generic control 275
aspect 39, 90–1
aspectualizers 77
see also ginnan-verbs
bare infinitive
analysis 39–40, 164, 169, 170
after ginnan-verbs 89, 90, 92
after intention-verbs 75, 77, 86
after verbs of motion and rest 34–9
as adjunct 31, 32–4
competition with to-infinitive 99, 125–6
etymology 151, 155, 196
in Gothic 29, 30, 83–4
see also to-infinitive; dative; AcI
commissives 140–3, 146, 248
with raising in Dutch 229
conatives 45, 46–51, 85
total data 20–1; Appendix 1
evidence of competition 185–9
for establishing complementation patterns 76, 87
dative 105, 270
~ and accusative verbs, see verbs of commanding and permitting
~ and genitive verbs 116–17
~ and infinitive
~ ending on to-infinitive 155–6, 163, 193
directives
see verbs of commanding and permitting
DTR (Determined or Dependent Time Reference) 207, 221
dual membership 109–16
du-infinitive (Gothic) 27, 29–30
ECM (Exceptional Case Marking) 126–7, 153, 206, 235–7
after commissives 145, 248
after verbs of hindering and neglecting 248
as “virus” 259–60
modal meanings 255, 259–60, 263, 273
no ECM in OE 207
reanalysis of object control 55, 240–3, 247–8, 263
relation to AcI 243–5
relation to Small Clause 255, 264–6
relation to loss of verb-second 257–9
restrictions on use 252–4
verbs with ~ in PE 254
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ellipsis 159–60, 208–9, 211–12, 213
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for to-infinitive 178, 229
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emergence 220–1, 223
loss 224–5
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see also ellipsis
genitive expressing purpose/goal 30, 47
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gerund 165
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grammaticalization 40, 97, 153–4, 225–9, 276
incorporation 166
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bare infinitive translates ∼ infinitive 58, 58–60, 77, 124, 136
deponentia 58

man
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as ultra-indefinite 287
loss of ∼ 276–7

manipulatives
see verbs of commanding and permitting;
verbs of persuading and urging
modal verbs 15, 39–40, 99, 143, 146–8, 218–19
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loss of argument structure 89
rise of ∼ 143–8
see also subjunctive; ECM; to

negation 153, 154, 205
negative evidence 21, 205
nominalization 156, 157, 196, 198
of Dutch infinitive 165–6
see also purposive to-PP
null operator (Op) 80, 118, 123

object control 45, 144, 200–1, 247
reanalysed to ECM 240–3, 247–8, 263
see also verbs of commanding and permitting; verbs of persuading and urging
OV/VO orders 120–1, 123, 175, 215–18, 224, 252
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passive
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∼ ECM 252–3, 254, 259, 261
∼ to-infinitive 153, 205, 272, 273
translates OE man 284, 286, 287–8
see also verbs of persuading and urging
perception verbs 15–16, 233
predicate
complex ∼ see Small Clause
prefix 269, 271
see also to
preposition stranding 175–6, 211, 212, 258n.

PRO 178, 204, 206
see also arbitrary/generic control; object control; subject control
purpose 27–31, 41
purposive to-PP 27, 30, 157
after commissives 141
as GOAL argument 56
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comparison with to-infinitive 165, 167–8, 200
distribution 171, 172
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raising 229, 234, 236, 237, 238, 255, 269
reanalysis 80–2, 117–19, 123
see also adjunct versus argument; ECM
recipient passives 249, 250
relativization 256
see also preposition stranding

scrambling 177
Small Clause 64–5, 131–2, 145, 204, 264
relation with ECM 255, 265
split infinitive 217
split IP 203
subject control 45, 73, 139, 144, 146
subjunctive clause 24, 146
as purpose adjunct 31
distribution 171–3
in decline 185–9, 179–85, 202
introduced by ei/dubbe ei in Gothic 30, 41, 85
introduced by to ðon/to ðy 30, 31, 41
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no to-infinitival parallel 87, 222
see also DTR; modal verbs; to-infinitive

to 205–7, 210
as Agr-head in Small Clause 269
as non-finite modal 208–11
as subjunctive element 203–7, 210, 228
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negation 209
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