This paper presents an analysis of the historical development of for to infinitives in English within the framework of Distributed Morphology advocated by Halle and Marantz (1993). Having demonstrated that there were two types of for to infinitives in Middle English that exhibited different syntactic behaviors, I argue that the change from the early type to the late type was caused by the shift of correspondence between morphosyntactic/semantic features and the phonological expressions that realized them. This hypothesis enables us to maintain an invariant syntactic structure of inflected infinitives and deal with its parametric changes within the phonological component.*
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1. Introduction

Current theories of the Minimalist Program assume that the computational system of the language faculty is maximally uniform across languages and the range of parametric variations is confined to the domain of the lexicon. Under this framework, the trigger of a parametric

* This is a revised and extended version of the paper read at the symposium of the 18th Annual Meeting of the Modern English Association held at Aoyama Gakuin University on May 18, 2001, part of which has appeared in Eigo Seinen. I would like to express my gratitude to Masachiyo Amano, Tomoyuki Tanaka and participants at the meeting for their valuable comments and suggestions. I am also indebted to two anonymous EL reviewers for their detailed comments on an earlier version of this paper. This work is supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Grant No.15720111. All remaining errors are my own.
change in a particular language should not be attributed to the computational system itself, but to some grammar-external pressure that affects lexical items. Keeping to this general assumption, I will pursue the possibility that some parametric changes are to be treated within the phonological component. This hypothesis crucially depends on the idea of Distributed Morphology (henceforth DM) put forth by Halle and Marantz (1993) and others, which says that the lexicon should be decomposed into several subparts within a derivational model.

The main focus of this paper is the historical development of for to infinitives in English. While it has often been claimed in the literature that the development of infinitives was promoted by syntactic or lexical factors that changed their structural shape, I will maintain that their clause structure has been invariant throughout the history of English and that only its morphophonological realizations changed. This analysis not only provides effective solutions to empirical problems concerning this construction, but also has a conceptual advantage of being able to radically reduce the burden of the syntax and the pure lexicon in the process of parameter setting.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews basic facts about the historical development of for to infinitives in Middle English (ME) and early Modern English (EModE) and points out some issues. Section 3 briefly introduces the theoretical framework of DM and its technical devices. Section 4 proposes the syntactic structure of for to infinitives and then section 5 investigates how the historical development proceeded. Section 6 demonstrates that our analysis is also applicable to to infinitives in Old English (OE) and Modern English (ModE). Section 7 makes concluding remarks.

2. Facts and Issues

According to Mustanoja (1960), the infinitive marker to began to be accompanied by for in the 11th century. This construction became

---

1 In this paper, the term “phonological component” will be used in a broad sense, defined as the subsystem of the computational system for human language that derives a PF representation after Spell-Out (Chomsky (1995)). Part of this component is dedicated to morphological operations that manipulate syntactic terminal nodes to create new X0 elements. See also section 3.
common in the course of the 13th century, but its frequency gradually declined in the subsequent centuries and finally became obsolete in the mid-16th century, except for certain fixed expressions (see also Visser (1996)). An important point to note is that the nature of for to infinitives was not uniform throughout. They exhibit different syntactic properties in different periods, with respect to both external environments in which they appear and internal word order patterns.

As for external environments, for to infinitives in early Middle English (EME) were employed most frequently as purpose adjuncts, as reported by Mustanoja (1960), Ono (1969) and others. They also appeared in subject position or as a complement of matrix verbs. Relevant examples are given below:

(1) Purpose Adjunct

a. Þatt dide he forr to shœwenn swa / Unnse33endli3 that did he for to show in this way unspeakable meocnnesse, meekness
   ‘That he did to show in this way unspeakable meekness,’
   (?c1200 Ormulum 3612 / Ono (1969: 262))

b. Locrin & Camber: / to þon scipē comen. / for to Locrin and Camber to the ship came for to habben al þa æhte have all the property
   ‘Locrin and Camber came to the ship, to have all the property’
   (a1225 Lay. Brut (Clg) 2227 / ibid.)

(2) Subject Position

a. vorte makien ðe deofles hore of hire: is reo<u>ðe for to make the devil’s whores of her is sorrow ouer reouðe. over sorrow
   ‘To make the devil’s whores of her is sorrow beyond all sorrow.’
   (a1250 Ancrene Riwle (Nero) 131.17 / ibid.: 258)

2 In (2b), the infinitive occurs in the extraposed position. This example is included here for expository purposes.
b. Is hit god for to hiheren godes weordes and heom
is it good for to hear God's words and them
athalden:
observe
'Is it good to hear God's words and to observe them?'
(a1225 Lambeth Homilies 47.27 / ibid.)

(3) Control Complement
a. Efter þe wende forte habben idon al þe he
after that he thought for to have done all that he
wilnede.
desired
'After that he thought to have done all that he desired,'
(c1225 St. Juliana (Bod) 87 / ibid.: 259)
b. auh god ... ne wilnede nout uorto climben & feolle
but God not desired not for to climb and fall
'but God ... did not desire to climb and fall'
(a1250 Ancrene Riwle (Nero) 61.37 / ibid.)

The matrix verbs in (3) are control verbs that take their own external
arguments, so that the for to infinitives in (1)–(3) are all control infinitives in the usual sense. I will assume that control infinitives are, like
finite clauses, headed by C that expresses the force/mood of the clause,
essentially following Chomsky (1995, 2000) and many others.3 These
for to infinitives may freely appear in adjunct positions as in (1) or
move to subject position as in (2) due to their categorial status as CP.

As for to infinitives developed from EME through late Middle
English (LME), they came to appear in environments where they had
not been allowed to occur before. These environments include comple-
ments of raising and exceptional Case-marking (ECM) verbs, as exem-
plified in (4):

---

3 Bošković (1997) claims that control infinitives in Present-day English (PE) are
IPs in light of an economy condition which states that if a sequence of lexical ele-
ments has several possible structural descriptions, then the candidate with the fewest
projections is chosen. Given this condition, control infinitives in PE are analyzed as
IPs since they lack an overt complementizer. Even if we adopt this approach, for
to infinitives in EME will turn out to be CPs in our analysis, because for and to in
early inflected infinitives acted as complementizers rather than inflections, as will be
argued in section 5.
(4) **Raising / ECM**

a. But he semede for to be / A man of gret auctorite
   but he seemed for to be a man of great authority
   (c1380 *The Hous of Fame* 2157–2158 / Fischer (1988: 70))

b. it plese yow to don Jon Paston or Thomas Playter ...
   it please you to make John Paston or Thomas Playter
   for to speke
   for to speak

c. yf they knowe any suche thyng for to bene done,
   if they know any such thing for to be done
   (c1475 *Gregory's Chron.* 133 / Visser (1973: 2313))

In contrast to the examples in (1)–(3), these *for to* infinitives cannot be CPs. If they were, the raising operation in (4a) would violate the well-known ban on A-movement out of CP clauses; in addition, the lexical subjects of the infinitives in (4b, c) would be Caseless because the CP node would prevent them from entering into Case-checking relation with the matrix verbs, whatever the precise mechanism may be. Thus, these examples clearly show that *for to* infinitives newly acquired its status as IP in LME.

Let us turn to changes in internal word order patterns. In EME, objects could precede verbs within *for to* infinitives. Both obj. *for to V* and *for obj. to V* patterns were permissible, as illustrated in (5) and (6). Adverbials could also appear between *for* and *to*, as in (7):⁴

(5) **Obj. For To V**

Strenchepatt sifepp lufe & lusst / Pe bodiʒ forr to
strength that gives love and lust the body for to
pinenn
torment
‘fortitude that gives love and lust to torment the body’
   (?c1200 *Ormulum* 5522–5523)

(6) For **Obj. To V**

Forr patt he wollde wurrıpenn þær / ... / Forr uss to
for that he desired be there for us to

⁴ These word order patterns were free choice options; there seems to have been no restriction on the kind of NPs and adverbials that could intervene between *for* and *to* in (6) and (7).
cleanse through his death
‘For that he desired to be there ... to purify us through his death’

(7) For Adv. To V

I lufe, i sop mecnesse, / Forr swa to winnenn
I love I confirm meekness for in this way to acquire
eche lif / Inn heffness ærd wiþ endless
eternal life in heaven’s land with angels
‘I love, I confirm meekness, to get eternal life in heaven’s
land with angels in this way.’

However, no element could intervene between to and infinitive verbs;
thus, no split infinitives were observed in EME.

Later in LME, the OV patterns in (5) and (6) gradually disappeared. Also noteworthy is that some new infinitival constructions became available in this period, which were observed in for to infinitives as well. First, infinitives came to be employed as indirect interrogatives with wh-phrases:

(8) Wh For To V

a. I wiste neuere where for to reste.
   I knew never where for to rest
   (c1450 York Plays 511.338 / Visser (1966: 977))

b. The kyng of Englande ... wyst nat where for to passe
   the king of England knew not where for to pass
   the ryuer ...
   the river
   (1523 Froiss. I. cxxvi.152 / OED)

Secondly, overt lexical subjects came to appear with the complementizer for:

(9) For Subj. For To V (cf. Tanaka and Miyashita (1999))

a. what is more catholick i’ the city than for husbands
   what is more catholic in the city than for husbands
daily for to forgive the nightly sins of their bedfellows
daily for to forgive the nightly sins of their bedfellows

5 The term “complementizer for” refers to for accompanied by an overt lexical subject, whereas “infinitive marker for” is meant to refer to for directly followed by to + V, but this terminology does not imply any categorial distinction between the two items.
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(1607 Dekker, Northw. Hoe v. Wks. 1873 III. 74 / OED)

b. storyes ryght plesaunte and frutefull for all parsones for
stories right pleasant and fruitful for all persons for
to pastyme with

to pastime with (1523 IX Drunkardes title-p. / OED)

Thirdly, the word order in which adverbials appear between to and V came to be allowed:

(10) Split Infinitives

a. forto enye suche bi her owne laboure fynde, make and
for to any such by her own labor find make and
multiply.

(c1445 Pecock Donet 6.23 / Visser (1966: 1039))

b. It is good for to not ete fleisch and for to not drynke
it is good for to not eat meat and for to not drink
wyn.

(c1382 Wyclif Rom. 14.21 / ibid.: 1040)

c. he came ... into a place in which he leide him down
he came into a place in which he laid himself down
forto there slepe and reste.

for to there sleep and rest

(c1449 Pecock Repressor 224 / ibid.: 1041)

Interestingly, the old pattern where an adverbial occurs between for and to as in (7) disappeared in exchange for the introduction of split infinitives. Searching corpora of Paston Letters and OED, Tanaka and Miyashita (1999) conclude that no element could in fact intervene between for and to in for to infinitives in LME and EModE.

To sum up, we must distinguish two types of for to infinitives in ME and EModE. The early type always projects CP clause structures and allows some XP element to intervene between for and to but not between to and V. The late type, in contrast, may project IP as well as CP and allows some XP element to intervene between to and V but not between for and to; in addition, the late type may cooccur with wh-phrases and overt lexical subjects with the complementizer for. Given this distinction, we are led to the following questions:

(11) a. How can we explain the change from early for to infinitives to late for to infinitives?

b. What is the relationship between the infinitive marker for and the complementizer for?
c. Why did *for to* infinitives demise in EModE?

These changes must be appropriately accounted for by a restricted grammatical theory.

Previous analyses made under the standard Principles-and-Parameters (P&P) framework, however, fail to achieve this goal. One reason for this is that *for to* infinitives do not conform to the familiar X-bar theoretic structure of infinitives where there is only one head position for infinitive markers. This problem arises especially in the case of late *for to* infinitives, which may consist solely of IP but always contain the complex infinitive marker. It has sometimes been argued that the sequence *for to* is base-generated under Infl as part of infinitival morphology, but it is not clear at all why more than one word may appear in a single terminal node and cooccur with another infinitival morphology -*e* attached to the verbal stem. Nor do previous syntactic analyses provide any significant insight into the relation between the infinitive marker *for* and the complementizer *for*, partly because of their conventional view of the lexicon and lexical items. Fischer (1988), for example, argues against recognizing any genealogical relationship between the two *fors* on the basis of their compatibility in the *for subj. for to V* construction in (9). The implicit assumption here is that homophony in the functional domain of the lexicon does not entail any etymological connection between the relevant lexical items. However, argument of this kind leaves unsolved the fundamental question of why the infinitive marker and the complementizer have the same phonological form in the first place.

DM opens up a way of resolving these problems. Its theoretical framework will be given immediately below, but what is important at present is that in DM, “words” are inserted into the output of the syntax, unlike the standard P&P model, and phrase markers that undergo syntactic computation need not be isomorphic to the corresponding structures that feed into “word” insertion. The peculiar characteristics of the complex infinitive marker *for to* (in particular the late one) will be best captured by this grammatical model. In addition, the traditional notion of the lexicon is broken down in DM, in a way which enables

---

us to deal with polysemy and homophony of functional items in an explicit manner. This novel view of the lexicon, together with the understanding that there were two types of *for to* infinitives, will naturally explain why the same phonological form *for* was employed both as an infinitive marker and a complementizer.

Aside from these empirical consequences, DM has a conceptual advantage as well. The basic idea I propose here is that the changes in *for to* infinitives were essentially morphological ones and their clause structure in the narrow syntax was not affected. This stands in sharp contrast to previous analyses which argue that new rules such as S-bar deletion were introduced into the syntactic component (Lightfoot (1981)), or new categories such as T arose in the lexicon (Gelderren (1993)). These analyses only describe the changes at best and do not make clear why such changes took place at a particular period in the history of English. Given the minimalist assumption that the narrow syntax is maximally uniform across languages, the null hypothesis should be that syntax is diachronically inert and changes occur only at the interface levels, triggered by some grammar-external pressures such as morphological attrition. This line of inquiry is pursued, for example, by Longobardi (2001), who treats the development of the French preposition *chez* without any explicit reference to DM.7

On these grounds, we are led to conclude that DM is the most promising theoretical model for analyzing the historical development and demise of *for to* infinitives. Let us then move on to a more detailed description of the framework adopted in this paper.

3. Theoretical Framework

A fundamental thesis of DM is that the atoms of syntactic representations that appear as terminal nodes in the narrow syntax are not words or morphemes with their phonological features equipped but only bundles of morphosyntactic and semantic features. At some point in a derivation, these bundles of features are sent to the phonological side of the PF/LF branching and undergo a series of operations that rearrange

---

7 I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for bringing my attention to Longobardi's paper.
them. The rearranged nodes are then provided with phonological features in accordance with information in *Vocabulary*, the list of phonological expressions called *Vocabulary* items and correspondence rules that connect them with morphosyntactic/semantic features in terminal nodes. The assignment of phonological expressions is referred to as *Vocabulary Insertion*, or as *Late Insertion* due to its postsyntactic nature. The module of the grammar responsible for operations at the phonological component is called *Morphology*.

Following Halle and Marantz (1993), I assume that there are at least three kinds of movement operations in Morphology that take place prior to Vocabulary Insertion: morphological *Merger*, *Fusion*, and *Fission*. Merger joins a head with the head of its complement and creates a new X0 node while maintaining separate morphemes within the newly derived word. This operation is analogous to syntactic head movement in that it exchanges a structural relation between two terminal elements, but unlike head movement, it is assumed to be a lowering operation. If two terminal nodes under a single X0 node created by Merger are further affected by Fusion, these nodes turn into a single terminal node. On the other hand, Fission is an operation that splits off a certain (bundle of) feature(s) from a single terminal node and sets it up as another independent terminal node. The relation among these three operations can be illustrated as follows:

(12) $\begin{align*}
\text{(12) } & \quad \text{XP} \\
& \quad \text{X} \\
& \quad \text{YP} [f_1, f_2] \\
& \quad \text{Y} \\
\text{Merger} & \quad \Rightarrow \\
& \quad \text{XP} \\
& \quad \text{YP} \\
& \quad \text{Y} \\
& \quad \text{X} \\
\text{Fission} & \quad \Downarrow \\
\text{XP} & \quad \text{X} \\
& \quad \text{YP} [f_1] [f_2] \\
\text{Fusion} & \quad \Downarrow \\
\text{XP} & \quad \text{YP} Y + X
\end{align*}$
After a phrase marker transferred to the phonological component is rearranged through Merger, Fusion and Fission, Vocabulary Insertion is applied; thus, Vocabulary interprets the structure and inserts Vocabulary items into each terminal node. Linearization takes place at the same time. Since the PF interface condition which requires temporal ordering is imposed on phonological expressions, i.e. Vocabulary items, linearization must wait until this point (Late Linearization; Embick and Noyer (2001)).

In addition, I propose that Morphology involves another operation after Vocabulary Insertion/Linearization, which I will call Phonological Cliticization, with the following properties: (i) it is sensitive to both morphosyntactic and phonological features of a given terminal node; (ii) since this operation comes after Linearization, it is implemented on the basis of precedence and is applied only to string-adjacent Vocabulary items; (iii) unlike Merger, it does not exchange the positions of relevant items.

Given all this, the derivational model assumed here can be represented as follows (Marantz (2001), Embick and Noyer (2001) and others):  

(13) A Derivational Model under DM

\[ \text{Lexicon} \xrightarrow{\text{Merge/Agree/Move}} \text{LF} \]

\[ \text{Morphology} \]

\[ \text{Merger/Fusion/Fission} \]

\[ \lor \]

\[ \text{Vocabulary Insertion/Linearization} \]

\[ \lor \]

\[ \text{Phonological Cliticization} \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\[ \text{PF} \]

\[ 8 \text{ In the following discussion, I will assume the standard Y-model where the transference of syntactic information takes place only once in a derivation, but the analysis given below can easily be restated in terms of a model with cyclic Spell-Out, in which syntactic information is sent to the phonological component more than once in a derivation (Chomsky (2000, 2001) among others).} \]
After all the operations in Morphology are properly carried out, morphosyntactic/semantic features transferred to the phonological component are deleted to satisfy the Full Interpretation at PF.

A comment is in order here with respect to the execution of Vocabulary Insertion. In what follows, we are primarily concerned with the realization of infinitive markers and verbal suffixes. Vocabulary Insertion into these functional terminal nodes, referred to as f-morphemes in Harley and Noyer (1998), is deterministic in the sense that only one Vocabulary item corresponds to a given node. An f-morpheme is realized by a certain Vocabulary item if the item matches all or some subset of the features in the morpheme. When several items satisfying this requirement compete, the item that matches the largest number of features is chosen (the Subset Principle; Halle (1997)). How, then, can we treat homophony and polysemy of functional elements in this framework? Homophony arises when a single phonological expression, say /α/, corresponds to several distinct sets of morphosyntactic/semantic features, as in (14):

\[
\begin{align*}
/α_1/ &\leftrightarrow [X, Y] \\
/α_2/ &\leftrightarrow [Z, W]
\end{align*}
\]

In this case, /α_1/ and /α_2/ are regarded as distinct Vocabulary items that happen to have the same phonological form. Polysemy, on the other hand, arises in situations where a Vocabulary item /β/ corresponds to a certain set of morphosyntactic/semantic features and there are no other competing items, as in (15):

\[
/β/ \leftrightarrow [X, Y] \quad \text{(no other competing Vocabulary items)}
\]

Under the Subset Principle, f-morphemes that include [X, Y], e.g. those specified as [X, Y, Z], [X, Y, W] and so on, are all realized as /β/. In such a case, /β/ is said to be a polysemic Vocabulary item.

4. The Structure of For To Infinitives

As we have mentioned above, the grammatical model of DM allows a phrase marker that undergoes syntactic computation and the corresponding structure that feeds Vocabulary Insertion at Morphology not to be isomorphic. This enables us to hypothesize that the perceptible changes in for to infinitives took place only at the surface level while their syntactic clause structure was invariant throughout their historical development. I propose here that they have the four-layered structure below:
I employ a split-CP analysis of clause structures, in which the complementizer is decomposed into several distinct heads. Though many proposals are independently made as to the number of heads and their labels (Culicover (1991), Müller and Sternefeld (1993), Rizzi (1997) and many others), I essentially follow the basic idea of Bhatt and Yoon (1991) and assume that the traditional Comp is split into two heads that project CP and SubP. The former is a clause type indicator that carries features such as \([\pm \text{wh}]\) and expresses the force/mood of the clause, whereas the latter serves as a subordinator indicating that the clause can appear only in embedded positions.

The functional categories given in (16) are more closely defined in terms of a (bundle of) feature(s) that characterizes them:

(17)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{C: } & [-\text{wh}] [+\text{directional}] [+\text{functional}, -\text{N}, -\text{V}] \\
\text{Sub: } & [+\text{subordinate}] \\
\text{Infl: } & [-\text{finite}] [+\text{functional}, +\text{N}, +\text{V}]
\end{align*}
\]

C includes the [+directional] feature, which stands for the purposive and irrealis meanings of control infinitives. C and Infl also have categorial features...
features, specified as [+functional, −N, −V] and [+functional, +N, +V], respectively. The latter is intended to capture the ambiguous property of the early infinitival suffix, which had both verbal and nominal characteristics: it represents nonfiniteness as a verbal inflectional suffix, and at the same time, it serves as a (category-changing) nominal derivational suffix.

5. The Changes in For To Infinitives

We are now ready to discuss our main concerns. I will first establish the positions of for and to in early for to infinitives and then consider the questions raised in (11) above: (i) how the development of for to infinitives in LME is accounted for; (ii) what the relationship between the infinitive marker for and the complementizer for is; and (iii) why for to infinitives demised in EModE.

5.1. Early For To Infinitives

As for the origin of for to infinitives, it is commonly held that the extra infinitive marker for was introduced to reinforce the directional and purposive meaning formerly carried by to (see Curme (1931) and Visser (1966)). In the present model, this meaning is expressed by the [+directional] feature located in C. Thus, the traditional view can be restated in our terms by saying that for to infinitives emerged when the Vocabulary item /to/, which had corresponded to the bundle of features in C and Sub in OE, came to serve as a pure subordinator in EME so

10 For the characterization of lexical and functional categories in terms of [±N], [±V] and [±functional] features, see Fukui (1995). Under this system, P and C are expressed as [−functional, −N, −V] and [+functional, −N, −V], respectively. I further assume that the Case-assigning property stems from the [−N] feature (Chomsky (1981)), irrespective of the value of [±functional]. If this is the case, not only P but also C will act as a legitimate Case-assigner. To avoid dwelling on this matter in the text, I will mention the Case-assigning ability of the infinitive marker and the complementizer in footnotes whenever it is necessary.

11 The nominal property of infinitives was clearly marked by the dative case suffix -enne in OE to infinitives. Even after the suffix declined to be spelled out as -en in ME, inflected infinitives retained their nominal property. This is evident from the fact that they cooccurred with a wide variety of prepositions other than the infinitive marker for. In LME, this construction was less productive than in EME, but it was permitted until EModE (Lightfoot (1979)).
that another (semantically similar) Vocabulary item, i.e. /for/, was newly borrowed to realize the features in C including [+directional].

It thus seems reasonable to suppose that the correspondence between Vocabulary items and morphosyntactic/semantic features in early for to infinitives looks like (18):

(18) Early For To Infinitives

/for/ ⇔ [-wh] [+directional] [-N, -V]  
/to/ ⇔ [+subordinate]  
/-en/ ⇔ [-finite] [±functional, +N, +V]

Since the bundle of [-wh] [+directional] [-N, -V] on the one hand and [+subordinate] on the other both constitute their own terminal nodes in the syntactic component, no morphological operations are required to execute Vocabulary Insertion of /for/ and /to/. The only necessary operation is the morphological Merger of Infl and the verbal stem Vb, which itself is made up of the root and the verbalizer v. This is motivated by the affixal property of /-en/:

(19) Merge (Infl, Vb)

After this operation is carried out and each Vocabulary item is inserted in accordance with (18), the structure looks like (20):

---

12 For more detailed discussion of OE to infinitives, see section 6.

13 In (18), /for/ is not specified with respect to the value of the [±functional] feature. This captures the polysemic nature of /for/, which may correspond either to C ([±functional, −N, −V]) or to P ([−functional, −N, −V]).

14 Alternatively, it may be that the verbal stem raises and adjoins to Infl in the narrow syntax. Since the choice between these options does not affect our discussion, I will leave the matter open here.
To put it briefly, *for* and *to* in early *for to* infinitives directly realize the two heads of the split-CP structure.

Recall here the observation in section 2 that no element could intervene between *to* and infinitive verbs in early *for to* infinitives. This property generally holds true for inflected infinitives in OE and EME, which suggests that *to* behaved as a clitic attached to infinitive verbs. Then, I would make an auxiliary assumption in (21):¹⁵

(21) The Vocabulary item */to/* corresponding to [+subordinate] is a phonological clitic.

Accordingly, Phonological Cliticization is applied after Vocabulary Insertion/Linearization on the basis of linear adjacency between */to/* and the verbal stem (see section 3). This prevents any overt element from appearing between them, so that no subject positions, i.e. [Spec, I] and [Spec, v], are available and it looks as if there were no IP projection involved in early inflected infinitives.¹⁶

¹⁵ Vocabulary items inserted into the domain of complementizers sometimes appear as clitics in other languages as well. It is proposed that complementizers cliticize onto a host internal to IP in Hebrew (Shlonsky (1988)) and Irish (McCloskey (1996)). Moreover, Pesetsky (1991) argues that the English null complementizer in finite clauses is an affix attaching to the matrix verb. These phenomena may be attributed to the ability of the [+subordinate] feature to behave as a clitic when supplied with certain Vocabulary items.

¹⁶ *For* and *to* may also optionally undergo Phonological Cliticization to form reduced infinitive markers spelled out as *forto, forte, fort* and so on.
Other syntactic properties of early for to infinitives naturally follow from the structure in (20). First, since the infinitive markers occupy functional heads higher than IP, the whole clause structure is necessarily CP. This is why early for to infinitives were confined to positions in which CP infinitives may appear, i.e. adjunct positions, subject positions, and complements of control verbs, as shown in (1)–(3) above, and were excluded from complements of raising and ECM verbs that select IP infinitives. Secondly, the structure in (20) correctly predicts the word order patterns within early for to infinitives. Since for and to head two independent projections, their Spec positions are available to other XP elements. The patterns illustrated in (5)–(7) can be bracketed as follows:

(22) a. Obj. For To V (cf. (5))
$$[\text{CP } \text{the body for to torment} \quad \text{be bodi}_3 \text{ forr } [\text{SubP to } [\text{vP pinenn } t_i] ]]$$

b. For Obj. To V (cf. (6))
$$[\text{CP forr } [\text{SubP ussi to } [\text{vP clennsenn } t_i \text{ purrh hiss } dæp]] ]$$

for us to cleanse through his death

c. For Adv. To V (cf. (7))
$$[\text{CP forr } [\text{SubP swa to } [\text{vP winnenn eche lif] ]} ] $$

for in this way to acquire eternal life

When the object moves to either Spec position, the OV word orders in (22a, b) are derived. Alternatively, when an adverbial XP is base-generated in [Spec, Sub], the for adv. to V order in (22c) is obtained.

The present analysis based on the split-CP structure is further supported by other arguments. There is independent evidence to show that for and to were located in head positions above IP. For to in EME

---

17 I tentatively assume that this is an instance of topicalization. Detailed discussion of the OV order in infinitives is beyond the scope of this paper, but I would refer the reader to Bianch (1999), who points out that topicalization occurs within infinitives in Italian and attributes its applicability to the nature of complementizers. Incidentally, one might argue that if an overt lexical subject is base-generated in [Spec, v] and then undergoes topicalization to [Spec, C] or [Spec, Sub], then the subj. for to V or for subj. to V order would be erroneously derived. However, these options are excluded for reasons of Case. Given that the infinitival suffix -en still retained its Case-bearing ability, either -en or the subject would be Caseless because both of them would have to be Case-marked by for (see also notes 10 and 19).
could introduce finite clauses as well as infinitives:

(23) a. For to he time cam hat he heredige helle.
until the time came that he harrowed hell

(c1200 Trinity College Homilies 23 / OED)

b. Ich wulle liggen and greden Vort ich habbe
I will lie down and cry out until I have
uor3iuenesesse of mine misdeden
forgiveness of my sins

(a1250 Cristes Milde Moder 156 / MED)

c. From eve fort hit is dai-li3t
from evening until it is daylight

(c1250 The Owl and the Nightingale 332 / MED)

By extending the proposed basic clause structure to finite clauses, we may reasonably suppose that for and to above serve as a clause type indicator and a subordinator, respectively, to form a complex conjunction that expresses a temporal directional meaning ‘until.’ Since /for/ and /to/ are both unspecified with respect to finiteness in the correspondence rules in (18), nothing prevents them from occurring in finite clauses as far as there are no other competing Vocabulary items specified as [+finite]. This is an instance of polysemic f-morphemes, which lends strong support to the idea that /for/ and /to/ reside in the domain of complementizers in early for to infinitives.

Let us next examine whether the OV orders are really derived through leftward movement of objects to the higher Spec positions. As we have seen, adverbials could intervene between for and to in early for to infinitives. Though objects tend to follow infinitive verbs in such cases, they occasionally appear between for and to together with an adverbial. I have found three obvious examples in Ormulum, which are given below:

(24) For Obj. Adv. To V

a. & ȝet tiss Goddspell se33p off hemm, / Forr uss
and yet this Gospel says of them for us
burh hemm to lærenn,
through them to teach
‘And yet this Gospel says about them to teach us through them,’

(?c1200 Ormulum 411-412)

b. Josæp comm / ... / Till Beþpleæm, Daviþess burrh, /
Joseph came to Bethlehem David’s chamber
GRAMMATICAL CHANGE AT PF

Forr sillferr þær to reccnenn
for silver there to pay
‘Joseph came ... to David’s chamber in Bethlehem to
pay the silver there’ (ibid.: 3558–3561)
c. Þatt halhþe weress fólhþenn her, / Forr Drihhtin
that holy men follow here for Lord
swa to cwemenn.
in this way to please
‘That holy men shall come here to please the Lord in
this way.’ (ibid.: 5394–5395)

Strikingly, the objects precede the adverbials in all of these cases. This
pattern suggests that the OV order in early inflected infinitives is not
the direct reflection of the base-generated positions of objects and verbs,
because adverbials cannot intervene between them at the underlying
structure.

Our analysis correctly derives this order by means of leftward move-
ment of objects across adverbials. Suppose that the derivation has
reached the stage in (25) and the numeration includes an adverbial that
merges in [Spec, Sub]:

(25) [SubP to [IP -en [vP Vb Obj.]]]

Given that syntactic Merge is preferred over Move (Chomsky (1995)),
the adverbial must be merged in [Spec, Sub] before the object moves to
the outer Spec position. This yields the for obj. adv. to V word order
in (24).

5.2. Late For To Infinitives

Let us now consider question (11a): how we can account for the
change from early for to infinitives to late for to infinitives illustrated in
section 2. As is well known, the infinitival suffix -en slowly declined
through ME and came to be spelled out as -e or φ in LME (Nakao
(1972)). It is not unreasonable to suppose that along with its decline,
the Vocabulary item /-e/ lost its ability to carry the bundle of features
in Infl and the loss was made up for by linearly adjacent Vocabulary
items, i.e. /for/ and /to/, through diachronic reanalysis. This triggers
readjustment of correspondence rules for early for to infinitives given in
(18). Though precise correspondences between each item and mor-
phosyntactic/semantic features will not be so significant for our argu-
ment, let us assume that the correspondence rules for late for to infini-
tives look like (26):
(26) **Late For To Infinitives**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/for/</td>
<td>[-finite]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/to/</td>
<td>[+functional]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/-e/</td>
<td>[+N, +V]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the one-to-one correspondences between Vocabulary items and syntactic terminal nodes in early *for to* infinitives are broken down here. Fission must be applied to decompose the bundle of features in Infl into three terminal nodes, and one of them must further merge with the verbal stem to meet the affixal property of the item /-e/:

(27) i. Fission ([-finite, ±functional, +N, +V] ⇒ [-finite] + [±functional] + [+N, +V])

ii. Merge ([+N, +V], Vb)

After the rearrangement of the morphosyntactic/semantic features and the subsequent Vocabulary Insertion, we get (28):

(28)

Our DM model, thus, can successfully resolve the apparent paradox of there being more words than syntactic terminal nodes by means of morphological operations and late insertions of Vocabulary items after syntax.

The emergence of the new infinitival constructions in LME is immediately accounted for by the shift of *for to* from the domain of complementizers to that of Infl. The following are the structures of the rele-

---

18 If a single application of Fission creates a binary branch, then it must be applied twice to decompose a bundle of features into three terminal nodes. This point is ignored here.
vant part of the examples in (4a), (8a), and (10a):

(29) a. **Raising / ECM** (cf. (4))

he seemed [IP t to [Inf for to] [vP be a man of great authority]

b. **Wh For To V** (cf. (8))

I knew never where [CP where [Spec, C] [SubP Sub [IP PRO [Inf for to] [vP reste]]]]

to rest

c. **Split Infinitives** (cf. (10))

[CP C [SubP Sub [IP PRO [Inf for to] [vP any such by her own labor fynde]]]]

Since the whole clause structure of *for to* infinitives was reanalyzed as IP, they came to occur as the complement of raising/ECM verbs, as in (29a). The shift of the infinitive markers also enabled them to cooccur with a *wh*-phrase in [Spec, C], which must agree with a [+wh] feature in C, as in (29b). Their cooccurrence was not allowed in early *for to* infinitives because the Vocabulary item /for/ was then specified as [−wh] (see (18)). Another important consequence of the shift of *for to* was the loss of the clitic property of the Vocabulary item /to/. This was because /to/ no longer corresponded to the [+subordinate] feature in Sub (see the definition given in (21)). [Spec, ν] became available to elements such as adverbials and shifted objects, hence the emergence of split infinitives as illustrated in (29c).

Let us next consider how we can explain the *for subj. for to V* pattern shown in (9) above. Closely connected to this is the question in (11b) concerning the relationship between the infinitive marker *for* and the complementizer *for* that developed in LME. The key to understanding the ambiguous status of *for* in this period lies in the process of diachronic reanalysis of the correspondence rules. I have just argued that the loss of the ability of /-e/ to represent the full content of Infl caused it to be replaced by the neighboring items /for/ and /to/. Note, however, that there was still another possibility. If the features formerly carried by /-en/ came to be realized solely by /to/, it would be possible for /for/ to remain in the domain of complementizers. The corre-
spondence rules that are expected to result from this option are illustrated in (30). Since /to/ has shifted to Infl, /for/ corresponds to the features in C and Sub:

(30) To Infinitives with the Complementizer For
/to/ \(\Leftrightarrow\) \([-\text{finite}] [+\text{functional}]\)
/to/ \(\Leftrightarrow\) \([-\text{finite}] [+\text{functional}]\)
/-e/ \(\Leftrightarrow\) \([+\text{N}, +\text{V}]\)

My claim is that the complementizer for emerged as a result of this alternative shift of correspondence rules. Given this, morphological operations after syntax proceed as follows:

(31) i. Merge (C, Sub)
ii. Fuse (C, Sub)
iii. Fission ([−finite, ±functional, +N, +V] \(\Rightarrow\) [−finite, ±functional] + [+N, +V])
iv. Merge ([+N, +V], Vb)

Merger of C and Sub and the subsequent Fusion are necessary for the creation of a single terminal node that corresponds to the Vocabulary item /for/. After the Vocabulary items are inserted into the rearranged terminal nodes, (32) is obtained:

(32)

```
CP
  \|-- SubP
     \|-- IP
        \|-- [−wh] [+directional]
        \|-- [+functional, −N, −V]
        \|-- [+subordinate]
          \|-- for [−finite][±functional]
            \|-- to Vp \sqrt{P}
                \|-- Vb [+N, +V]
                    \|-- -e
```
Since /for/ is not a phonological clitic, [Spec, I] is available to overt lexical subjects, hence the emergence of the for subj. to V construction in LME.\(^{19}\)

To summarize, the infinitive marker for in late for to infinitives and the complementizer for were derived from the for in early for to infinitives through different processes of shifting the correspondence rules in Morphology. This is the answer to the question in (11b).

Thus, there were two homophonous Vocabulary items expressed as /for/ in LME. They have the same phonological matrix but correspond to distinct sets of morphosyntactic features; /for/\(_1\) is specified as [−finite] while /for/\(_2\) corresponds to features in C and Sub. For a speaker who has acquired both of these items, the for subj. for to V construction should be acceptable with the following structure:

\begin{align*}
\text{(33) For Subj. For To V (cf. (9))} \\
[\text{CP} \ [\text{SubP for [IP husbands ... [Infl for to] [vP forgive the nightly sins of their bedfellows]]]}]
\end{align*}

Examples like this have sometimes been taken to constitute evidence against the view that the infinitive marker for has developed into the complementizer for. On the other hand, the present analysis can naturally account for their compatibility without dissociating them completely, by claiming that there were two types of infinitive marker for and one of them (i.e. the early type) developed into the other (i.e. the late type) and the complementizer for. It thus can be said that the two fors

\(^{19}\) I have assumed that the overt lexical subject in infinitives is assigned Case by the categorial [−N] feature in C (see note 10), contra the popular minimalist analysis in which the subject of infinitives is Case-checked through Spec-head relation with Infl (Watanabe (1993), Boškovič (1997) and Martin (2001)). It is expected that the rise of the for subj. to V construction in LME took place hand in hand with weakening of the Case-bearing ability of the infinitival suffix (see note 17). If -e could not bear Case, a lexical subject will obligatorily appear in (32) to satisfy the Case-assigning property of for. Another possibility is that -e was still able to bear Case optionally and [Spec, I] may be absent. In that case, (32) will serve as another structural description of for to infinitives without lexical subjects. Either analysis will go without conflicting with the present framework, but I will not pursue this matter further here.
The possibility that diachronically related functional homophones may coexist in an individual’s grammar is further confirmed by Ono’s (1969) investigation of Ancrene Riwle, which exhibits both early and late for to infinitives. Of 346 examples of for to infinitives attested in this text, about half of them (162 examples) are purpose adjuncts, which he calls “final notion” and many of the others (146 examples) occur as subjects, objects of verbs and prepositions, and modifiers of nouns and adjectives (see (2a) and (3b) in section 2). Among them is one example where an XP element intervenes between for and to. These cases can be analyzed as early for to infinitives with a full CP clause structure. At the same time, there are also 12 examples found in “objective predicate” positions, as shown in (34):

(34) of þen oðer holie monne þet he makede vorte ileuen þet
of the other holy man that he made for to believe that
he was engel
he was angel

(a1250 Ancrene Riwle (Nero) 100.18 / Ono (1969: 259))

In this example, the for to infinitive follows the causative verb make, the “object” of which is preposed as a relative operator. Tanaka (1994) argues that postverbal NPs of causative make in OE and ME were in fact external arguments of embedded predicates, observing that make could be followed by inanimate NPs that do not have any thematic relations with it, and that it could take that clauses as its complement as well. Causative make then should be counted as an ECM verb, and the example above will be an instance of late for to infinitives, in which the infinitive marker for to is located in Infl and the whole clause struc-

---

20 Fischer (1988) claims that the origin of the complementizer for is the preposition for that introduces benefactive NP. This view is not incompatible with the present analysis, because /for/ corresponding to C and Sub may be treated as a polysemic Vocabulary item. That is to say, the Vocabulary item /for/, which realizes the bundle of [−wh] [+directional] [−N, −V] [+subordinate], may be interpreted either as a preposition or a complementizer according to the value of the [±functional] feature in the corresponding terminal node (see note 10). The idea of regarding for as a prepositional complementizer is not new. For example, Bresnan (1972) discusses in detail the emotive and desiderative meaning of the complementizer for and its relation to the preposition for.
ture is IP. We are therefore forced to conclude that the author of *Ancrene Riwle* had acquired both early and late types of *for to* infinitives. I conjecture that this text reflects the situation of the period when late *for to* infinitives first began to spread.

5.3. The Demise of *For To* Infinitives

I will next take up the issue in (11c) concerning the demise of *for to* infinitives. Of the two kinds of *for* that developed from the early infinitive marker *for*, the complementizer *for* has survived into PE, whereas the late infinitive marker *for* that realized a feature in Infl disappeared in EModE. Their developmental pathways can be delineated as follows:

$$
\text{[for] [-wh] [+directional] [-N, -V] [+subordinate]}$$

$$\text{[for] [-finite] \Rightarrow to be lost}$$

What, then, was the cause of their divergent fates in the historical development? I suspect that there was some economy consideration at work. Compare again the postsyntactic structure of late *for to* infinitives in (28) with that of *to* infinitives with the complementizer *for* in (32). The point to observe is that in the former, the bundle of features in Infl is decomposed by Fission into three terminal nodes, which are phonologically realized by the Vocabulary items /for/, /to/, and /-e/; in the latter, on the other hand, the same set of features is realized by fewer items, i.e. /to/ and /-e/. Let us then postulate an economy condition which requires that, all other things being equal, a relatively simple representation is preferred over a more complex one:

$$\text{(36) Economy of Representation}$$

Use as few Vocabulary items as possible for a given syntactic structure.

When more than one pattern of phonological realization is available to a given syntactic structure, the one with the fewest Vocabulary items will eventually be chosen. This condition naturally explains the demise of *for to* infinitives: the pattern in (28) was gradually swept away along with the emergence of the more economical option in (32).\(^{21}\)

\(^{21}\) The economy condition in (36) is not an inviolable principle, but must be regarded more loosely as a tendency of preference. Otherwise, for instance, the
6. To Infinitives in OE and ModE

Finally, I will show that our DM-based analysis can also shed new light on to infinitives. Specifically, our approach can resolve long-standing puzzles about the categorial status of OE to infinitives and highlight similarity and difference between to infinitives in OE and ModE.

The categorial status of OE to infinitives has been a matter of great controversy. A dominant view is that they were categories of PP headed by the preposition to (Kageyama (1992), Jarad (2000) and others). This hypothesis crucially rests on the following two facts: (i) the infinitival suffix -enne expresses dative case, which is supposed to be assigned by a preposition; and (ii) there are some examples where a purposive adjunct to infinitive is conjoined with an ordinary PP, as in (37):

(37) Ut eode to his gebede oððe to leornianne mid his geferum.
comrades
‘He went out to give his prayer or to study with his comrades.’ (Bede 162.7 / Kageyama (1992: 99))

The well-known parallel structure condition on coordination requires that the to infinitive must also be PP.

Los (1999), however, raises an objection to the PP-analysis and argues quite convincingly that OE to infinitives had already acquired their clausal property. Her argument for the CP-analysis is constructed on distributional and positional properties that support parallelism between to infinitives and that clauses. First, verbs of intention, commanding, or permitting could take subjunctive that clauses or to infinitives as their Theme argument in OE. This is evident from the following case, where two manuscripts of the same text employ different com-

past form of the verb knit would always be spelled out as knit, and an actual form knitted would be blocked on the grounds that it uses more Vocabulary items. In the present case, for to infinitives would not have emerged to begin with, because they are less economical than to infinitives. The violable nature of this condition may be related to the imperfectness of the phonological component (Chomsky (1995)), but I leave this issue to future research. See Collins (2001) and references cited therein for further discussion on this condition.
implementation patterns:

(38) a. forpon þe he gewilnode, þæt he hæfde lof & because that he desired that he have glory and herenesse þæs clænan lifes praise of-the clean life
‘because he desired, that he might have glory and praise for a clean life’

(Gregory’s Dialogues 8.117.30, C / Los (1999: 87))

b. forþam þe he gewilnode to hæbbenne þæt lof & because that he desired to have the glory and herunge his mæran drohtnunge praise his excellent conduct
‘because he desired to have the glory and praise for his excellent conduct’

(ibi., H / ibid.)

However, verbs of this class could not take PPs as their complement. If OE to infinitives were genuine PPs, they would have been prevented from occurring in the complement of these verbs on the same grounds that ordinary PPs were excluded, contrary to fact. Thus, their distributional property indicates that they were more clause-like than is expected from the popular PP-analysis.

Los’s second piece of evidence for the clausal status of OE to infinitives concerns their position in relation to matrix verbs. Ordinary PP complements could precede or follow matrix verbs in OE, as in (39):

(39) a. Gif hwa to hwæðrum þissa genied sie on woh ...
if anyone to either of these forced be unjustly
‘If anyone is forced to either of these unjustly ...’

(LawAf 1, 1–1.1 / Los (1999: 255))

b. On þæm dagum Valentinianus geniedde eft þa on those days Valentinianus forced again the Saxan to hiera agnum lande Saxons to their own lands
‘In those days Valentinian forced the Saxons back again to their own country’

(Orosius 6 33.152.1 / ibid.)

On the other hand, that clauses generally occurred in sentence-final position, as in (38a) above. The important point here is that OE to infinitives patterned with that clauses rather than ordinary PPs in this respect as well; that is, they could not precede matrix verbs but had to follow them, as illustrated in (38b).

Then, we seem to be caught in a dilemma. It is reasonable to
assume that OE to infinitives were PPs if we take into account the dative morpheme -enne and data about coordination; at the same time, they exhibited clause-like properties when they were selected by verbs of intention, commanding, or permitting.

Our DM model can successfully account for the dual categorial status of OE to infinitives. Suppose that there did exist two types of to infinitives in OE, i.e. prepositional and clausal ones, and that they have the structures in (40a) and (40b), respectively, in the narrow syntax:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
(a) & \text{PP} \quad \text{b.} \quad \text{CP} \\
\text{[-wh] [+directional] } & \text{[-wh] [+directional]} \\
\text{[-functional, -N, -V]} & \text{[+]functional, -N, -V]} \\
\text{[+]subordinate]} & \text{[+]subordinate]} \\
\text{[+]finite]} & \text{[+]finite]} \\
\text{[±functional, +N, +V]} & \text{[±functional, +N, +V]} \\
\end{array}
\]

The difference between the two structures resides in the highest category, which is interpreted as P when it is [-functional, -N, -V], or as C with the specification [+functional, -N, -V] (see note 10). The phrase markers in (40) undergo morphological operations after syntax to satisfy the correspondence rules on Vocabulary Insertion in (41):

\[
\text{OE To Infinitives}
\]

\[
/to/ \Leftrightarrow [-\text{wh}] [+\text{directional}] [-\text{N}, -\text{V}] [+\text{subordinate}]
\]

\[
/-\text{enne}/ \Leftrightarrow [-\text{finite}] [±\text{functional}, +\text{N}, +\text{V}]
\]

Note that the vocabulary item /to/ is unspecified with respect to [±functional]. Thus, according to the Subset Principle, a category specified either as [+functional, -N, -V] or [-functional, -N, -V] will be phonologically realized as to as far as other feature specifications do not contradict with (41). This is another case of polysemic f-morphemes. The present DM model therefore simply trivializes the question of whether OE to infinitives were PPs or CPs; to put the situation more correctly in our view, they were the same phonological realization of the two (minimally) distinct categories.

\[\text{22 The same situation applies to } /for/ \text{ from ME onwards (see notes 13 and 20). Notice also that under the present framework the dative case suffix -enne does not necessarily mean that to is a preposition, since complementizers with the [-N] feature are also able to assign Case.}\]
Relevant morphological operations proceed as follows (I only illustrate clausal to infinitives for the sake of convenience):

\[(42)\]

i. Merge (C, Sub)

ii. Fuse (C, Sub)

iii. Merge (Infl, Vb)

After each Vocabulary item is inserted, we obtain (43):

\[(43)\]

Then the sequence to + verbal stem + -enne results from Linearization.

An interesting similarity emerges when we compare the structure of OE to infinitives in (43) with that of ModE to infinitives. After the stage in (32) in section 5.2, the infinitival suffix -e was finally lost and consequently the features in Infl came to be realized exclusively by to, giving rise to the following correspondence rules:

\[(44)\] Modern English To Infinitives

\[\text{/for/ } \Leftrightarrow \ [-\text{wh}] [+\text{directional}] [-\text{N}, -\text{V}] [+\text{subordinate}]\]

\[\text{/to/ } \Leftrightarrow \ [-\text{finite}] [+\text{functional}, +\text{N}, +\text{V}]\]

For the realization of the complementizer for, C and Sub are merged and then fused:

\[(45)\]

i. Merge (C, Sub)

ii. Fuse (C, Sub)

After each Vocabulary item is inserted, we obtain (46):\(^{23}\)

\[^{23}\] An overt lexical subject must occur in [Spec, I] to satisfy the Case-assigning property of for that stems from its [-N] feature. When C is null, on the other hand, lexical subjects cannot appear. This is expected if infinitival C may lack categorical features. In this case, C is not phonologically realized because the correspondence rule in (44) is not met, and lexical subjects cannot appear in [Spec, I] due to the absence of Case-assigning property in C.
Interestingly, the pattern of correspondence between the Vocabulary items and the features in (44) is essentially identical with that of OE to infinitives in (41), to the extent that the same sets of features are realized by single Vocabulary items. The phonological realization of Infl is stable and optimal in both cases, because it is expressed by the fewest possible Vocabulary items (/-enne/ in OE and /to/ in ModE); furthermore, the complementizers (to in OE and for in ModE) are derived through amalgamation of the two functional heads, which also conforms to the economy condition in (36). Thus, our analysis gives an intuitively natural explanation to the transitory life of for to infinitives, which rapidly developed and died out as a temporary form that mediated stable to infinitives in OE and ModE.

7. Concluding Remarks

A theoretical implication of the analysis put forth in this paper is that some of the parametric changes that have been ascribed to the syntax or the lexicon may be more properly described as the shift of correspondence rules at the phonological component. Thus, it has been demonstrated that the difference between the two types of for to infinitives with respect to their distributions and the internal word order patterns can be well explained with the assumption that their syntactic structure has been invariant throughout the history of English. The shift of correspondence rules is triggered by the decline of a particular Vocabulary item (in our case, the infinitival suffix), and when more than one set of
rules are available to a given structure, the one with the fewest Vocabulary items is favored in light of the economy condition. There is no need to assume that a new rule was introduced into the syntactic component or a new functional category arose. The proposed model is very much in line with the spirit of the Minimalist Program in that it keeps the narrow syntax and the lexicon maximally uniform across different periods of a language and deals with its grammatical changes at the phonological component, the imperfect, variable side of the language.
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