THE DERIVATION OF INFINITIVE FORMS IN MIRK'S FESTIAL

ADRIAN WERNER

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

The essential nature of the infinitive is nominal. Its substantival realization is clearer on inspection of the underlying syntactical relations of the language. One phrase structure rule which introduces nouns into the grammar is satisfactory for the derivation of infinitive structures which arise from the NP dominated embedded sentences forming the underlying source of their derivation. This is the principle of the noun phrase complementation captured in the phrase structure rule:

\[ NP \to (\text{Det}) \ N \ (S) \]

The following simple sentences such as,

1. He confermep pe old lawe.
2. All crysten men comen to pe chyrche pys day.

can be embedded into higher sentences

3. ...he was circumysed, forto conferme pe old lawe.

(46 : 20)

4. ...hyt ys comyn use to all crysten men forto come to pe chyrche pys day...

(59 : 2 - 3)

transformationally mapped onto the surface structure forms considerably different from derived strings of simple sentences (1 - 2).

The rule that converts a relevant sentence into an infinitival phrase, that is, 'infinitive formation transformation' or 'infinitive phrase rule' consists in the operation of tense and modal deletion, namely Aux (aspect is retained), and the insertion of to or forto into a position in front of the verb of the clause,
the place occupied previously by the tense and modal. This may be specified by the rule:

Rule A. \( \text{tense} + \text{modal} \Rightarrow \text{TO FORTO} \)

The infinitival form is used with \( \text{to} \) or with \( \text{forto} \) by Mirk in \textit{Festial}, and since these forms are often applied quite alternatively they do not appear to differ semantically. The use of \( \text{forto} \) to express purpose in the meaning of 'in order to', 'for the purpose of' at the beginning of the Middle English period seems to have weakened in this function in Mirk's language, or if it does convey this semantic interpretation, can essentially be used in the same position and accordingly the two forms occur in the form of free variation. For example:

(5) For ryght as he was circumset, to fulfyll and conferme pe old lawe, ryght soo he was folowed, to begynne and to halow pe crystallawe for no nede pat he had perto, for he was cleane without synne, but fort]}{forto mak} pe sacrament pat schuld waschen and clause hom pat takypyc eristromeyn ynyhs name, of all synne.

\( [50 : 32 - 36] \)

\( [51 : 1] \)

(6) ...he schall have bettyr lust fortto lowren pen to lagh, fortto syke pen fortto syng to reme pen rymov, to drowpe pen to daunce.

\( [65 : 21 - 23] \)

Mirk is apparently inconsistent in his overall usage of the infinitival form being either marked with \( \text{TO} \) or \( \text{FORTO} \). We assume that \( \text{forto} \) is the equivalent of \( \text{to} \) whatever it occurs to signal the infinitival form in \textit{Liber Festialis}. Mossé (1968: 101) remarks that “a possible origin of this use of \( \text{for} + \text{to} \) may lie in the construction \( \text{for} + \text{object} + \text{to} + \text{inf.} \). ... For hom to lere gode hewes. And for to leton her wolvernes”.

Rule A is valid except in cases when \( \text{to} \) and \( \text{forto} \) are generally deleted after verbs of perception, though they are occasionally used by Mirk in \textit{Liber Festialis}. For example:

(7) And when sche herd hym speke of the gret mode...

\( [177 : 24 - 5] \)

(8) ...he segh a drownet man east up on pe watyr.

\( [7 : 36] \)

(9) And as glad as pe Fadyr ys fortto see pe chilldre ryse from depe to lyfe, soo glad ys Crist, and moch mor, fortto se a mon to ryse out of deddy syn and nevyr aftyr to hit mor.

\( [187 : 14 - 17] \)

The form of the infinitive which is not accompanied by \( \text{to} \) or \( \text{forto} \) is also used after a class of causatives; however, with a few verbs both 'the plain infinitive' and 'the to-infinitive' are found in Mirk's \textit{Festial}. For example:

(10) ...fyrst let hym unswar to a question.

\( [10 : 13] \)

(11) ...and bade hom go to Bedeleem.

\( [49 : 6] \)

(12) Wherfor he bade riche mon and womon to pray to God, to rase hur agayn to lyue; and se he dudde.

\( [178 : 31 - 3] \)

(13) ...for Herode, kyng of Iewes, made to sle hom wythout gult.

\( [35 : 29 - 30] \)

(14) peras he, pys day rchersyth how God made Adam and Eve fortto laboure and to kepe paradyse, and bade hom ete of al pe treuen yn paradyse, excepte won tre pat he kepte a chev to hymselfe.

\( [66 : 11 - 13] \)

In the majority of cases the infinitive preceded by \( \text{to} \) or \( \text{forto} \) is found after the causative verb \( \text{make} \). These verbs and similar ones must be marked as \( \left[ \pm \text{TO} \pm \text{FORTO} \right] \)

Rule A does not hold in case of the plain infinitive occurring after modals as in the examples below:

(15) ...pat no man may tell hit.

\( [3 : 24 - 5] \)

(16) But for soho durst not for scheame goo byfor Crist.

\( [303 : 33] \)

(17) ...forge wold do no mercy, and parfor pe schull have no mercy.

\( [4 : 19 - 20] \)

When the infinitive follows the modal at some distance, that is, when it is separated from the modal by one word or a whole group of words, then the 'to-infinitive' is found.

(18) We wer fourty geong men ynfere, and herden of a holy man pat was ynyhs centre, and wolden have gon to hym to have herd his preechynge.

\( [8 : 5 - 6] \)
(19) Then sory may pae be put hauue ben won to swer by his her, by sydes, by blod and bones of hym.

(3 : 34 - 5)

The next procedure of the infinitive derivation erases, moves or marks with the preposition the subject of the underlying finite clause, the discussion of which will be presented in greater detail later in the article.

Infinitive structures are characteristic of being deprived of a finite verb which is a marked form specifying the number and person of the subject and the verb. They are then manifestations of the non-finite verb forms in which the specification of the subject—verb agreement cannot be accounted for, and hence are assumed as unmarked forms.

We can formalize the infinitive transformational rule and present it in the form:

Rule B: Matrix verb ∩ Tense ∩ Modal ∩ (Aspect) ∩ X ⇒
TO
Matrix verb ∩ FORTO ∩ (Aspect) ∩ X

This is a rule of Aux-replacement for to or forto, but it retains the perfect or progressive aspect of the infinitival structure.

Let us illustrate this by Modern and Middle English examples:

(20) We expected Paul [Paul would have prepared it]
We expected Paul to have prepared it.

After modals before Rule B has operated:

(21) And when he schuld haue prayde for her bope amendement,...
(154 : 35)

(22) But wold God pat we haden ben cast vp all ynfere, pat we myghten hauue ben rayset all togedyr!
(8 : 6 - 8)

After matrix verbs expressing purpose, hope, desire, wish, expectation, etc. This construction was extensively used by Mirk.

(23) ...and put hom ynto pe see, hopying soo forto haue drownyd hom al.
(204 : 33)

(24) ...and bynd her hondys and fete and cast her peryn, forto haue drownyd her pore.
(201 : 30 - 33)

(25) pe kyng of Jerusalem, pursued Daud to haue shayne hym, ryght soo pis Saule puresewet Crist, and his dyscepyles, and his swartnyts, to haue broght hom to pe depe.

(53 : 5 - 7)

No example of the progressive aspect of the infinitive was recorded in Mirk's Festial, as in a Modern English structure:

(26) We expect Paul [Paul is singing in the opera-house tonight], ⇒
We expect Paul to be singing in the opera-house tonight.

Such constructions as:

(27) pys story ys yn holy chyrch yn hegch ensampull to yche Goddes servant pat deyrythy to gete pe blesyng of hyys Fadyr of Heuen, ...
(94 : 26 - 8)

or (28) We expect Paul [Paul (will) do it], ⇒
We expect Paul to do it.

imply the future reference of the infinitival structure possibly modified by the type of the matrix verb.

The infinitive structure is capable of expressing passivity and a good many instances of this construction have been found in Liber Festialis:

(29) ...hit schall be schowet to all pe world yn gret confusion and schen-schyp.
(2 : 21 - 2)

(30) For when pou comyst to schryfte, pou comyst forto be demed of thy schryft-fadyr.
(89 : 25 - 6)

(31) And when pe kyng was come to be folowet, ...
(158 : 12 - 3)

Essentially the same structure is found in Modern English examples:

(32) They expected Paul [Paul be prepared for the lecture] ⇒
They expected Paul to be prepared for the lecture.

It is worth noting here that infinitive structures can result from the subjunc-
tive embeddings as presented in examples (32 - 35):

(33) ...he was circumcised for to conferme pe old lawe.

(46 : 20)

is derived from

(33a) ...he was circumcised [he (subj) conferme pe old lawe],

or

(34) ...he send Pylat to Rome forto be per yn hostage for a tribet...

(130 : 28 - 9)

with the underlying structure of

(34a) ...he send Pylat to Rome [Pylat (subj) be per yn hostage for a tribet],

(35) They ordered he [he (subj) dig a ditch in the garden], ➞ They ordered him to dig a ditch in the garden.

After that-formation rule the structure results in the reappearance of subjunctive in the surface.

(35a) They ordered that he dig a ditch in the garden.

The following transformations are relevant for the derivation of infinitival structures:

1. Equi-NP-Deletion.
2. Subject-raising.
3. Marking the subject with the oblique case.

1. The Equi-NP-Deletion applies whenever there is an instance of the identical noun phrase in the clause with that of the matrix sentence, that is, the subject noun phrase of the embedded sentence is erased by the higher identical object noun phrase of the matrix, or in case there is no coreferential (identical) object, with the subject of the matrix sentence.

The operation of this rule can be exemplified in the following sample derivations:

(36) Nycholas charged hym forto kepe his counsell.

(13 : 6 - 7)

(37) Scho holpe forto bury hym.

(231 : 30)

The Equi-NP-deletion rule erases the constituent subject noun phrase under the condition of identity with the coreferential matrix object and subject in (36a) and (37a) respectively. On the basis of the above examples the rule of Equi-NP-deletion may be presented in the following form:

\[ NP_1 \rightarrow V \rightarrow (NP_2) \rightarrow [NP_3 \rightarrow VP] \]

NP_2 is erased by NP_1 — Equi-subject-deletion applies
NP_3 is erased by NP_2 — Equi-object-deletion applies

The rule operates provided that no more than one S-node separates the two coreferential noun phrases and that they are identical at the underlying structure level.

Let us point out that the rule operates here at the level of the underlying structure which is not the deepest structure of the derivation. Deep structure level is regarded as more abstract than the underlying structure.
A. The infinitive embedded sentence may be the subject of the matrix sentence, e.g.

(38) ...To put away all maner wordes vanyte ys a pryncypal salue.

(39) For to labur bysylly ys that othy salue.

Extraposition can operate on these structures and they are transformed into

(38a) A pryncypal salue ys to put away all maner wordes vanyte.

(39a) That othy salue ys for to labur bysylly.

An essentially similar operation is presented by the example (40):

(40) To protect his old parents is Paul’s duty.

derived from the structure

(40a) [Paul protects his old parents] is Paul’s duty.

The underlying structure of (39) has the form of (39b)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
NP_1 \\
S \\
NP_2 \\
Vp \\
V \\
NP_4 \\
NP_3
\end{array}
\]

The embedded subject of the infinitive clause has been erased by the coreferential object noun phrase of the matrix sentence which follows the embedded sentence but does not precede as in the previous examples (36-37) and from which we have:

\[
NP_1 = [NP_2 - VP - V] - NP_3
\]

NP_3 is erased by NP_2 following the embedded sentence. In this case and similar ones Equi-object-deletion applies.

B. The infinitive embedded sentence may be the object of the matrix sentence, that is, the only object of the matrix verb.

(41) ...he trauayde forto bryng man ynto owr lastyng reste.

(42) pe byschoppys of pe contray comen togedy forto chese anoper byschopppe.

(43) Wherfor Saynt Marke prayde forto amende hs schone pat wer tone.

This set of examples illustrates the operation of Equi-subject-deletion. The infinitive embedded subject has been erased by the coreferential matrix subject preceding the embedded noun phrase in question.

The embedded sentence may be an object of the matrix sentence whose main verb is followed by another object except the infinitive. For example:

(44) ...he send Pylat to Rome forto be per yn hostage for a tribet pat pe kyng shuld gene to pe Empeour.

(45) Abraham ... made Isak to ber wod to breyn hysself wyth.

(46) For when pe kyng of Inde had send a messager pat heght Abbanes, ynto pe contrey of Cosare, to seche hym a carpenter pat coupte make hym a palyce...

The above sentences are illustrations of the application of Equi-object-deletion transformation.

The situation seems to be slightly complicated, however, in case of such verbs as behetan “promise”. Let us consider the following pair of sentences:

(47) Mary persuaded John to see the new film in the A.B.C.

(48) Mary promised John to see the new film in the A.B.C.

The superficial similarity of these two sentences seems to obscure the underlying structure relations of sentence elements. In (47) the underlying embedded subject is John since it was he whom Mary persuaded to see the film and thus the simplex sentence which has been embedded into the matrix is ‘John saw the new film in the A.B.C.’ whereas in (48) it is Mary who promised John that she would see the new film in the A.B.C. and accordingly the sentence embedded is ‘Mary saw the new film in the A.B.C.’ A semantic interpretation
that it was Mary who promised John that John would see the new film in the A.B.C. cannot take place in this situation.

Sentences (47) and (48) may be diagrammatically presented in the following form:

\[(47a)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow
\\
NP_1 \\
\downarrow
\\
NP_2 \\
\downarrow
\\
VP \\
\downarrow
\\
\text{MARY} \\
\text{PERSUADED} \\
\text{JOHN} \\
\underline{\text{JOHN}} \\
\text{SEE THE NEW FILM} \\
\text{IN THE A.B.C.}
\end{array}
\]

\[(48a)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow
\\
NP_1 \\
\downarrow
\\
NP_2 \\
\downarrow
\\
VP \\
\downarrow
\\
\text{MARY} \\
\text{PROMISED} \\
\text{JOHN} \\
\underline{\text{MARY}} \\
\text{SEE THE NEW FILM} \\
\text{IN THE A.B.C.}
\end{array}
\]

Infinitives produced through Equi-NP-deletion transformation appear to occur most frequently of all other infinitive structures generated by other transformations and analyzed in the present study of Mirk's language.

2. The second possible way of deriving infinitives is through the subject-raising transformation by raising the constituent subject into the higher sentence. The subject-raising rule operates in two directions; either by raising the subject noun phrase out of the embedded sentence into the subject position of the matrix sentence and hence raising to subject operates, or into the object position of the containing sentence in the case of which raising to object is at work. After raising has operated the remaining part of the embedded sentence, more specifically the verb phrase, is immediately put into the infinitival form. Thus, the rule operates on subject and object clauses yielding in traditional terms 'nominative and infinitive' and 'accusative and infinitive' constructions respectively.

The rule may be illustrated by the following set of examples.

a) (49) \(\ldots\) he begynnyth to know pe good from pe sueell.

\[35 : 23 - 4\]

b) (50) Seynt Poule\ldots\ doxynp ... forto syng pe mas fastynge.

\[127 : 12 - 3\]

c) (51) Hit ys gret nedo forto aske helpe and socour of God: forto defende vs out of temptacyon.

\[128 : 36\]

The sample sentence (51) seems to be derived from the underlying structure:

\[51a\] Ys gret nedo [hit askel helpe and socour of God],

\[hit defende vs out of temptacyon].

The impersonal subject hit or expletive hit is a syntactic subject and behaves like any other noun phrase functioning as subject and therefore easily can be raised. (Cf. Perlmutter's (1970: 116) analysis of the expletive there).

b) (52) \(\ldots\) I beleue Yhesu forto be God and man.

\[53\] We beleue now fully pis forto bever Godis body.

Sentences (52) and (53) are the result of hat-deletion and the infinitivalization operating on structures in

\[52a\] I beleue, hat Yhesu is God and man.

\[127 : 12 - 3\]

c) (53a) We beleue now fully hat pis is verry Godis body.

\[171 : 6\]

6 Stadia Anglica VII
'Raising to subject' may be diagrammatically presented in the following form:

\[ S \rightarrow NP \quad VP \]

\[ S \quad NP \quad VP \]

The embedded noun phrase undergoes raising into the higher sentence and emerges as a derived subject of the matrix sentence. The remainder of the embedded sentence is converted into the infinitival phrase.

Raising of the constituent subject noun phrase to matrix object instead of subject would result in an ungrammatical sentence.

\[ (49b) \quad * \text{To know pe good from pe enell begynnyth he.} \]

The embedded noun phrase is lifted up into the position of a surface object of the matrix verb, the embedded verb phrase is put into the infinitive form.

Let us compare a Mod. English example for 'raise-subj':

\[ (54) \quad \text{Mary is certain to leave for New York.} \]

which is derived from the underlying structure

\[ (54a) \quad \text{Is certain [Mary leaves for New York].} \]

and not from the extrapolation of \((54b)\).

\[ (54b) \quad \text{It is certain that Mary will leave for New York.} \]

Essentially the same derivation applies to Middle English sentences:

\[ (55) \quad \text{Ihesus ys ... ready forto helpe me.} \]

\[ (56) \quad \text{... he wer worthy to take liys deth...} \]

\[ (57) \quad \text{... Kyng Iewes ys certeyne forto be borne per.} \]

Accurately, sentence \((55)\) is derived from the underlying structure

\[ (55b) \quad \text{ys ready Ihesus helpe me, etc.} \]

The rule of subject-raising may be presented in the following form:

\[ X \quad VP \quad Z \quad NP \quad V \]

NP is raised into X-subject position if the subject slot of the matrix sentence is open for the raised subject to be inserted. NP is raised into Z-object position if the matrix sentence does not have an object and whose position is open for the embedded subject to be inserted. The embedded subject noun phrase is raised out of that sentence if one S-node separates it from the matrix verb phrase.

Let us analyse the following two sentences:

\[ (58) \quad \text{I beleue Ihesu to be god and man.} \]

\[ (59) \quad \text{Nycholas charged hym forto kepe hit counself.} \]

They seem to have similar surface structures though they have been generated through different transformations. Sentence \((58)\) is an example of 'raise to object'. The rule applies raising the embedded subject into the matrix object position.

\[ X \quad \{Z \quad Y \ldots\} \]

\[ X \quad Z \quad \{Y \ldots\} \]

Sentence \((59)\), on the other hand, is a result of Equi-object-deletion rule which erased the embedded subject upon identity with the coreferential object of the matrix sentence.
The superficial similarity of the two sentences can easily be distinguished syntactically, for Equi-object-deletion applies when the matrix object is specified in the underlying structure whereas 'raising to object' operates when the object is not lexically defined in the underlying structure.

In B, Z is the 'original' object, the existence of which in the underlying structure excludes the 'raise to object' since the object position has already been filled by Z.

In A, Z is a derived object obtained by raising the embedded subject. The vacated object position after the matrix verb has been filled by the raised subject. Configurations (A₂) and (B₁) respectively represent the underlying structures on which the two transformations operate.

\[ (A₂) \quad S \quad V \quad N P \quad V P \]
\[ (B₁) \quad S \quad V \quad N P \quad V P \]

Let us note here that such verbs as believe, know, allow the operation of subj ect raising transformation whereas ask, expect etc., require Equi-NP-deletion under these circumstances. The fact that the constituent subject in (58) has been raised out of the clause to object of believe seems to be supported by the possibility of the operation of reflexivization in this position. It could not have operated if the subject concerned had not been raised into the higher sentence first and since the reflexive transformation applies when the two nouns in question are dominated by the same S-node, that is, after the 'raising to object' has applied. For example:

(60) Paul believes [Paul be witty].
(60a) Raise to obj: Paul believes Paul [be witty].
(60b) Reflex + Inf: Paul believes himself to be witty.

In not drawing it with embedded sentences and referring to this process as 'raising' transformation rather than as 'it-replacement' or 'pronoun replacement' transformations discussed by Rosenbaum (1967) or 'it-substitution' as in R. Lakoff (1968), we follow P. Kiparsky and C. Kiparsky (1970). Rosenbaum's it | S analysis with it occurring as a dummy element in the underlying structure

\[ \text{NP} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{S} \]

does not seem to be well motivated and has not accordingly been accepted in this study.

3. The final operation necessary for the derivation of infinitives is exemplified by marking the subject of the underlying constituent sentence with a preposition. The remainder of the sentence is converted into the non-finite form as a consequence of putting the subject into the oblique case. Before these transformations have operated the early rules of subjectivization and objectivization apply.

It was observed by Jespersen as early as 1933 that "the for-group is felt as belonging closely to the infinitive as its subject-part. Thus through sentences like It was an uncommon thing for him to be away days and nights on end; the for-group cannot be anything else but the subject of the infinitive" (Jespersen 1969: 344).

There is evidence in Emonds (1970) that the for-to complementizer assumed by Rosenbaum (1967), Lese (1969), underlying all infinitives, has the syntactic properties of a preposition and the transformation puts the embedded subject into the object position of for as in the diagram:

\[ \text{NP} \quad \text{FOR} \quad \text{S} \]

[a man is byried in chireh], is notte profyte.

The prepositions which mark the subject of the infinitival structure are in Mirk's grammar for and to functioning as prepositional equivalents of the dative. To, however, is recorded to be used more often by Mirk but since the function of these prepositions is essentially equivalent in all instances tested in Liber Festidul, their use with the infinitive will be treated interchangeably.

It has been suggested by P. Kiparsky and C. Kiparsky (1970) that the preposition for in infinitive nominalization is inserted by a group of predicates called 'emotives'. This means that whenever the infinitival subject is marked with...

1. Modiano (1969: 95 - 7) speaks of the 'for' and 'to' prepositions in the function of prepositional equivalents of the dative.
2. P. Kiparsky and C. Kiparsky (1970: 109) postulate a semantic distinction determining the syntactic form of predicates, and this is a distinction made between emotive...
this preposition, the matrix verb is of an emotive character, having the feature [+EMOT]. Although the Kiparsky’s proposal seems not to be thoroughly elaborated, it is more convincing than Rosenbaum’s ‘for-to complementizer placement’ rule. We assume that in all cases in which marking with the prepositions for or to takes place it indicates the subject of the infinitive structure involved in an activity of ‘the subjective value’. The following sentence will exemplify this operation:

(61) ... it is notte profytte for a man to ben byried in chirech...

Sentence (61) is derived from (61a) after the subjectivization has operated:

(61a) [a man is byried in chirech], is notte profytte.

This may be diagrammed as (61b):

The ‘for-insertion’ rule marks the infinitive embedded subject with for in the surface and the ‘infinitive formation’ rule converts the rest of the structure into the non-finite form.

Some further examples may illustrate the infinitive construction in the oblique case.

(62) Hit was grete gladnesse to all cristen men for to se hym pat was so lightly before redy forto destruye hom...

(63) Then ys hit nedfull to ioch man to lerne how he schall haue pys belone

(64) For hit ys synnossylf to me to tell pe Ioy and pe gladnesse pat pay haddyn yn lor herdes pat day ...

and non-emotive predicates which are characteristic of taking for in infinitive nominative and having the semantic property of expressing ‘the subjective value of a proposition’.

According to this derivation of infinitives the embedded subject has neither been deleted nor raised out of the constituent sentence after the ‘for-insertion’ rule has operated. In sentence (65) Mr Smith preferred for his son to work at his office, which is accepted as grammatical in some dialects of English, Equi-NP-deletion cannot apply for coreferentiality between matrix subject or object does not hold here. That subject-raising is not operative may be tested by the use of the reflexive transformation in this position.

(65a) * Mr Smith preferred for himself to work at his office.

(65a) is not grammatically acceptable which explains that the embedded subject could not have been raised into the matrix. Structures with such verbs as hate, hope, regret in

(66) I hate for Mary to cook.

are different from (65) in this respect that after the ‘for-deletion’ rule operating on (66) an ungrammatical sentence results

(66a) * I hate Mary to cook.

whereas (65) results in a grammatical sentence and thus allows the subject-raising rule.

(66b) Mr Smith preferred his son to work at his office.

On the other hand, the reflexivization is not operative on (66) which accounts for the ungrammaticality of (66b) or (67).

(67) * She hopes for herself to do it.

A number of transformational rules were set up in order to account for the relationships of the infinitive phrases and matrix sentences in Mirk’s grammar, and structures were obtained in which the underlying strings in Middle English hold true for the Modern English examples. Essentially the same phrase structure rule NP → S is the source in the derivation of the infinitive structures. We shall demonstrate on Modern English examples that the same underlying structures and transformational rules that have been presented for Middle English complement structures are found in Modern English and it is the surface realization that makes those structures look different.

Let us examine a sentence whose matrix verb is an example of the factive predicate, being simultaneously of an emotive character.

P. Kiparsky and C. Kiparsky (1970). A distinction between factive and non-factive predicates is done on the basis of preposition implying the speaker’s belief in the truth of the statement. Semantic properties of these predicates obtain the syntactic justification and thus factive predicates permit the occurrence of the noun fact plus a that-clause or gerund in the subject and object position in the sentence. Non-factive predicates, unlike factives, allow infinitival constructions which are the result of the operation of Sub-
(68) For Peter to participate in our meeting is important.

The derivation of this sentence can be pursued according to the following analysis. The underlying structure is represented as (68a):

```
(68a)
S
  NP    VP
    Det   Nom
      THE   FACT
        PETER PARTICIPATE IN OUR MEETING
```

Fact-deletion yields

(70) That Peter will participate in our meeting is important.

Extraposition can apply optionally giving

(71) It is important that Peter will participate in our meeting.

That and will-deletion followed by the for-insertion and infinitivalization rules generate structure (72)

```
(72)
S
  NP
    THE FACT

Is important for Peter to participate in our meeting.
```

The gerundive transformation can operate optionally on the structure (68a)

```
(73)
S
  NP
    THE FACT

Is important for Peter's participating in our meeting.
```

It seems unnecessary to present the derivation of sentences (61) *It is not to profyte for a man to ben byried in church* and (65) *Mr Smith preferred for his son to work at his office, for their derivation will be similar to structures occurring with non-factives, that is, they do not combine with the item fact and do not allow the gerundive transformation.

On the other hand, if the for-insertion applies to the sentence

```
(74)
S
  NP
    THE FACT

It is well known that Peter is a good doctor.
```

which is an instance of the non-emotive but factive predicate, the ungrammatical structure is yielded.

```
(75)
S
  NP
    THE FACT

For Peter to be a good doctor is well known.
```

The gerundive transformation, however, gives (76):

```
(76)
S
  NP
    THE FACT

The fact of Peter's being a good doctor is well known.
```

In (1a) the optional rule of fact-deletion can apply yielding the surface structure form (1).
When a non-emotive predicate in (75) is replaced by the emotive, non-factive predicate *improbable*, the sentence becomes grammatically acceptable. Consequently, we have:

(77) For Peter to be a good doctor is improbable.

Transformations not relevant for the discussion here have accordingly been omitted.

Hence, we reject Less' (1960) claim that the *for-to* complementizer underlies all infinitives and Rosenbaum's derivation of infinitives as *for-to constructions* resulting from the *for-to complementizer placement* rule in cases like:

(78) Everyone would prefer for you to come early.

(79) Everyone would prefer you to come early.

(1967: 54)

Instead of deriving all infinitives from the *for-to structures* we would rather treat those structures which are marked with for as a surface structure form in which the preposition is introduced by the predicates which have been called 'emotives'. For example:

(81) For a man to be byried in chirc is notte profyte.

(83) Then ys hit nedfoll to ioe man to terne how he schall haue pys beleue.

Perlmutter (1968) in his unpublished draft of (1971) remarked that such sentences as

(80) It is dangerous to lean out.

(81) To know is to love her.

do not arise from the Equi-NP-deletion, and the identity of the underlying subject is not specified. It seems that the subject of the embedded sentence in (80) has been moved not by a deletion rule but rather by that of subject-raising. Sentence (80) seems to be derived from the structure in which the expletive subject *it* is the syntactic subject of the embedded sentence and since it behaves like any other noun phrase in this position, therefore it can easily be raised to the subject of the main sentence. Sentence (80) is then derived from

(80a) It is dangerous [It lean out],

and not from the extraposition

(80b) It is dangerous that someone leans out.

or the *for-to complementizer placement*

(80c) It is dangerous for someone to lean out.

The same analysis will account for structures like:

(82) Hit ys gret neede forto aske helpe and socour of God.

(128 : 36)

Sentence (81), on the other hand, is generated by a deletion rule, and it may be suggested that the indefinite pronoun, for example, is underlying this infinitive structure on essentially the same syntactical basis as in (80), which gets deleted in the course of derivation whenever there is a need of the non-expression of the subject in the surface realization.

In any case, the generalization still holds good, and the infinitive structure, one can argue, is yielded whenever the constituent subject noun phrase has been moved from the embedded sentence by deletion, raising or being put in the oblique case in the course of a derivation.

An alternative standpoint is represented by Emonds (1970), whose arguments consist in positing that infinitives are not derived from sentences but are ever generated directly. They are not noun phrases, that is, the phrase structure rule NP→S is never their source and only those clauses which are marked with an -ing affix on the verb are noun phrases.

According to this analysis, "the only source for sentence and infinitive complements is the 'extraposed' S (and perhaps VP) → generated by VP → ... [S]".

For example:

```
NP  S    M
   V    VP
  It   FOR THE HOUSE TO BE PAINTED
   N    WOULD IRRITATE
   V    HIM
```

(1970 : 79)

Emonds (1970:79) points out that the rule of extraposition is structure preserving since "if the S under VP is non-empty, a subject S may not be extraposed". Subject-replacement rule will generate:

(83) For the house to be painted would irritate him.

This analysis favours the view that sentences and infinitive complements originate at the end of the verb phrase in the underlying structure, which unfortunately we cannot agree with in this study.

*For other arguments and detailed analysis assuming the non-NP status of infinitives see Emonds (1970).*
Summing up our analysis of the infinitive structures in Mirk's Festial, we arrive at the conclusion that they are generated through three transformational processes: Equi-NP-deletion, Subject-raising, marking the infinitive embedded subject with the oblique case; function as noun phrases and occur in subject and object positions of the matrix sentences. Accordingly, we account for the infinitive phrases in the subject NP position generated via Equi-object-deletion.

(39) Forto labur byasly ye that othyr salue.

Raising to subject

(50) Seynt Poule... turnyyp... forto syng pe mas fastyng.

Oblique case

(61) For a man to ben byried in chirc is notte profytte.

and infinitive phrases in the object NP position yielded through Equi-subject-deletion

(42) pe byschoppys of pe contey comen togedyr forto chese anoper byschoppe.

Equi-object-deletion

(44) ... he send Pylat to Rome forto be per yn hostage for a tribet pat pe kyng schuld gene to pe Emperour.

Raising to object

(52) I beleue Ihesu forto be God and man.

Oblique case

(84) He was wyulf for Godys pepull forto serue God yn holy tyme.
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