0. Introduction

There are basically two analyses in the literature of 'bare' infinitives like those in (1)

(1) a. Fifi wanted to dance the rhumba.
    b. Fifi promised to dance the rhumba.

Under one analysis, the bare infinitive and its complements are dominated by $\overline{VP}$. Under the other analysis, the infinitive and its complements are part of a clause. The $\overline{VP}$-analysis has been adopted in a number of different frameworks and by a number of different authors even within a given framework. Thus, in the transformational framework, Bresnan (1972), Lasnik and Fiengo (1974) and Schachter (1976) have argued on behalf of a non-clausal analysis of at least some subset of infinitives. More recently, it has been associated with the lexical-functional theory (Bresnan 1981, Morin 1980, Wehrli 1980), with the fusion and binding theory (Brame 1976, 1979, 1981a, b). It has been adopted by Gadzar (1981) and in Montague Grammar (Bach 1979). The clausal analysis of bare infinitives is associated more systematically with the Revised Extended Standard theory in its different manifestations (the "Filters and control" theory, Chomsky-Lasnik (1977), the Government and binding theory, cf. Chomsky (1980, 1981).

The import of a solution to the problem of analyzing (1) extends beyond the problem of bare infinitives. Underlying the clausal analysis is the hypothesis that finite and infinitival complements are both contained in a clause whether or not there is an overt subject present in surface structure. This hypothesis necessitates postulating abstract subjects, deletion rules and/or various other mechanisms for putative clauses without subjects or complementizers (see Chomsky-Lasnik (1977) for examples and also the discussion in Brame (1981b). Underlying the $\overline{VP}$ analysis is the hypothesis that constituents which correspond to propositions need not be clauses. Where there is no superficial subject, there need not be an abstract subject, hence no clause.
The analysis of (1) and the assumptions and hypotheses which underly it have implications for the analysis of (2)

(2) a. Fifi was happy for Dodo to finally have finished.
    b. Fifi preferred for Dodo to finish on time.

Under the clausal analysis, these sentences have the structure illustrated in (3)

(3) ... Adj \[ [for] [NP to VP]]
    \[ S \]
    \[ V \]
    \[ S \]
    \[ COMP \]

So the infinitive is dominated by S and for is a complementizer. Someone who adopts the VP analysis of (1) could adopt (3) for (2) or generalize the VP analysis and treat for NP as a prepositional phrase. Koster and May (1982) have argued that adopting the first option leads to redundancy in the grammar in that one must extend base rules to introduce both S and VP and a COMP daughter of VP. They argue that the ensuing complications to the grammar are not motivated by distributional differences between the two categories containing infinitives. I shall have nothing more to say about such an approach. Rather, I shall focus on the second possibility which treats all infinitives as dominated by VP, thus as being categorically distinct from tensed verb phrases, with the understood subject as part of a PP.² There are various ways of interpreting the relationships holding between the putative PP and VP in (2). One way is to attach both constituents directly to the matrix VP as in (4a). Another way is to hypothesize that the PP and infinitive are contained within a clausal unit, as in (4b), or are within an NP as in (4c)

(4) a. ... \[ \{\{Adj\}\} (PP) \[ VP \]
    \[ V \]
    \[ S \]

b. ... \[ \{\{Adj\}\} (PP) \[ VP \]
    \[ V \]
    \[ S \]

\[ V \]
\[ S \]
\[ NP \]

I am not aware that anyone has suggested (4a) in print.³ The analysis in (4b) has been suggested by Brame (1981a).⁴ The analysis of (4c) has been proposed by Schacter (1976) who argues that the optional PP is realized as the for-phrase 'subject' of the infinitive in a structure identical to that required for gerundives. What is common to these proposals is that the NP and the infinitive do not form a constituent. We see therefore
that one important issue arising from the analysis of (2) is the exact nature of the relationship between the infinitive and its 'subject'. A second issue is the category dominating the PP and the infinitive. In other words, adopting the hypothesis that infinitives are \( \overline{VP} \) does not preclude the possibility that they are contained within clauses. This is precisely the point on which (4a) (4b) and (4c) differ. A third issue is the constituency of \( \text{for} \). It is a necessary corollary of the \( \overline{VP} \) hypothesis that \( \text{for} \) is a preposition and heads a PP. In the \( S \) analysis outlined above, \( \text{for} \) is a complementizer. The complementizer for is, however, semantically related to the preposition \( \text{for} \) of simple sentences (Bresnan 1972) and, as we shall see, it has special properties which distinguish it from both the simple preposition and simple complementizers like that. Furthermore, there seems to be a consensus that whether one treats \( \text{for} \) as complementizer-like or as preposition-like is mere terminological quibbling. It seems to be the case that proponents of the \( S \) analysis will grant \( \text{for} \) some of the properties of the simple preposition while it is necessary within the \( \overline{VP} \) analysis (as we shall show) to distinguish the \( \text{for} \) which precedes the 'subject' of the infinitive from the simple preposition. The substantive issues involve rather the constituency of the elements \( \text{for}, \text{NP} \) and the infinitive.

There has been considerable discussion of the \( \overline{VP} \) and clausal analyses with respect to bare infinitives. I do not intend to repeat that discussion here (but see Brame (1981a, b), Bresnan (1972, 1981), Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) and Koster and May (1982). Rather, I wish to discuss some data from a non-standard data of English which I shall call Ottawa Valley English (henceforth OVE). I believe that this data, and a proper analysis of it, will shed some light on the various issues discussed above.

The paper will be organised as follows: in section 1, I shall present the data from OVE; in section 2, I shall discuss briefly an analysis of this data which is an extension of, and development of analyses in Chomsky (1981) and Koster and May (1982) (see Carroll (1981) for details). I argue that the Government and binding theory can account for both Standard English facts and the facts of non-standard dialects in a simple, general and principled fashion. In section 3, I shall discuss the analysis outlined above and illustrated in (4a) and show that this logical possibility within the \( \overline{VP} \) analysis is not supported by empirical
facts. In section (4), I shall turn to Brame's (1981a) analysis and try to show that the facts of OVE present certain difficulties for it, difficulties which arise from the fact that the NP and \( \text{VP} \) are not treated as a constituent or from the fact that the \( \text{for} \) and NP are treated as a constituent. The claim is, thus, that a sentential analysis can serve as the basis for a simple and general analysis of infinitives in both Standard English and OVE. It will be argued that the prepositional status or complementizer status of \( \text{for} \) is not really relevant for accounting for major differences in the dialects. Rather, I shall argue that \( \text{for} \) before infinitives in OVE is both a preposition AND a complementizer. The important difference between analyses, then, must result from postulating that NP and the infinitive form a constituent (this conclusion follows from my interpretation of Brame's equivalence relation as stating that the infinitive is dominated by a clausal node, see note 4). One can extrapolate from a sentential analysis of bare infinitives to account for \( \text{for NP to VP} \) sequences in standard and non-standard dialects. One cannot extrapolate readily from the \( \text{VP} \) analysis of bare infinitives to account for the same range of facts.

1. OVE and the distribution of FOR
1.1. Selection and infinitival complements

OVE is of interest because it reveals some of the properties of Ozark English in that (5) are grammatical

(5) a. Fifi was happy for to go.
   b. Dodo waited for to go.
   c. We went out for to get a drink.
   d. This machine is for to drill with.
   e. I was going for to sit down to supper when the phone rang.
   f. Dodo wanted the books for to read them.

Standard English does not permit \( \text{for-to} \) sequences. In characterizing the distribution of \( \text{for} \) in OVE, the first observation to make is that \( \text{for} \) does not appear before all or just any infinitive. The following are ungrammatical

(6) a. *Dodo tried for to come.
   b. *We promised Fifi for to be good.
   c. *Dodo was sure for to know the answer.
d. *Dodo persuaded the boy for to leave.

e. *Dodo wanted the boy for to look at himself.

The sentences (6a-d) are alike in that none of the infinitives can have an overt 'subject'. In (6a-c) the matrix subject is understood as the 'subject' of the infinitive. In (6d-e), the matrix direct object is understood as the 'subject' of the infinitive. These last two examples differ in that persuade never co-occurs with for (see (7a, c) while want does (see (5f)). What is wrong with (6e) is that the understood subject must be the matrix subject, hence the reflexive pronoun is not properly bound

(7) a. *Dodo persuaded for the boy to look at himself.

b. Dodo wanted for the boy to look at himself.

c. *Dodo persuaded for to leave.

d. Dodo wanted for to leave.

The verb persuade is a 'control' verb, want is not. Thus we draw the conclusion that the persuade/promise type verbs (call them Type A verbs to avoid controversy over how (6) looks underlyingly) do not permit for in OVE. OVE is like Standard English in this respect.

A second fact is that for does not appear before bare infinitives after verbs like those in (8)

(8) a. *We believe Fifi for to having a good time.

b. *Fifi tends for to be pig-headed.

c. *Fifi seems for to be pig-headed.

Call these Type B verbs. They too do not permit for at all. It might be the case that (8a), for example, is out simply because Fifi must be interpreted as the subject of the infinitive and therefore must follow for. Sentence (9) reveals that this conjecture is not borne out

(9) *We believe for Fifi to be having a good time.

Again, OVE is like Standard English in not permitting for with Type B verbs. OVE is like Standard English too in permitting infinitives to follow both Type A and Type B verbs when no for is present. The sentences of (6) and (8) can be rendered grammatical in both varieties simply by removing for.

Where OVE differs from Standard English is in permitting for to precede bare infinitives following a subset of verbs and adjectives whose complements may take (but do not require) a 'subject'. Call these Type C verbs. Reconsider (5) and compare it to (10)
(5) a. Fifi was happy for to go.
    b. Dodo waited for to go.
    c. We went out for to get a drink.
    d. This machine is for to drill with.
    f. Dodo wanted the books for to read them.

(10) a. Fifi was happy for you to go.
    b. Dodo waited for us to catch up.
    c. We went out for you to get some fresh air.
    d. This machine is for you to drill with.
    e. Dodo wanted for Fifi to see her books.

Other facts worthy of note: not all the verbs permitting for-to sequences permit tensed sentential complements

(11) a. *Dodo waited (for) that you \{leave \[are leaving\]

    b. *We went out (for) that you could smoke.

    c. *This machine is (for) that \{I drill with (it) \[I am drilling with (it)\]

    d. *Everything is arranged for the parents except (for) that they stay in town (compare: Everything is arranged for the parents except for to stay in town)

Some verbs and adjectives thus can select for-to sequences but not tensed clauses.

Verbs and adjectives selecting for-to sequences also select simple noun phrase complements or gerundives with for

(12) a. Dodo waited for Fifi.

    b. We went out for pizza.

    c. This machine is for \{drilling with\}.

    d. Everything is arranged except for the accommodations.

    e. This book is \{for to sell\} \{for sale\} \{for selling\}

We can summarize this section by stating that for does not precede all infinitives; it is precluded with Type A and Type B verbs. Type C
verbs, which permit for-to sequences, also permit for plus NP or for plus gerundive. These same verbs do not all select tensed sentential complements. In general, we can conclude that the selectional properties of verbs in OVE parallel those of verbs in Standard English even with respect to the last two properties noted. The one difference between the two varieties is that OVE permits for to precede bare infinitives as well as NPs and gerundives with Type C verbs but Standard English limits the distribution of for to the latter two environments.

1.2. For-to sequences and reflexives

We observed above in discussing (6e) that it was ungrammatical because the reflexive was not properly bound. This conclusion follows from the fact that (7b) is grammatical. There is no absolute restriction on reflexives or reciprocals in the complement position to infinitives following for in OVE. Nor is it required in these cases that a 'subject' be present before the infinitive.

(13) a. They are here for to talk to \{themselves?\} each other\}
    b. I brought them these pills for to medicate \{themselves?\} each other\}
    c. Dodo \{\text{wanted}?\} for to look at herself.

OVE does place familiar restrictions on the distribution of complement reflexives/reciprocals. The antecedent must be 'locally' determined in some sense. Thus (14) is ungrammatical.

(14) a. *They are here for you to talk to themselves.
    b. *The books were brought for the bookseller to line up against each other on the shelves.
    c. *I purchased these pills for them for me to be able to properly care for themselves.

The sentences of (14) contrast with (15)

(15) a. We are here for you \text{1} to learn to talk to each other\text{1}.
    b. The teacher led the children against the wall for them to line themselves up.
    c. I purchased these pills for the coaches for the athletes\text{1} to be able to properly care for themselves\text{1}. 
OVE does differ from Standard English in not permitting reflexives or reciprocals in the position following for.  

(16) a. *You are here for yourself to fish.
   b. *These sheep are for themselves to sell.
   c. *I brought you these pills for youself to take when you are sick.
   d. *I gave you the part that's for yourself to drill with.

Only simple pronouns are allowed in this position. The sentences in (16) should be compared to (17) where the reflexive appears without for.

(17) a. Fifi wanted herself to win.
   b. Fifi preferred herself to be chosen.
   c. The girls wanted each other to win.

In short, the reflexive and reciprocal are possible both after and before the infinitive when for is not also present. When for occurs, only the complement reflexive is allowed.

1.3. for-to sequences and question-formation

We do not find (18) in OVE.

(18) a. *What did I buy books for Mary to read?
   b. *Who did I buy books for to read them?
   c. *What did I go out for Fifi to buy?
   d. *What did I go out for to buy?
   e. *Who did I go out for to see Dodo?
   f. *Who has she got no patience for to play with?

   (compare: She's got no patience for to play with you)
   g. *Where did Fifi wait for to go? (# Fifi waited where for to go (someplace))
   h. *What did we go out for to eat?

All the sentences in (18) are ungrammatical in Standard English. Interestingly enough modifications to some will make them grammatical in both Standard English and OVE.

(19) a. What did I go out to buy?
   b. Who has she got no patience to play with?
   c. Where did Fifi wait to go?
   d. What did we go out to eat.

Compare (19) to (20)
(20) a. *What did I go out in order to buy?
b. *Who has she got no patience in order to play with?
c. Where did Fifi wait in order to go (must = Fifi waited where in order to go someplace)
d. *What did we go out in order to buy?

Some of the sentences in (19) can be interpreted as purposives but no overt mark of this is possible whether the mark is for or in order. Both of these marks create islands of the infinitives.

While OVE seems to resemble Standard English in this respect, it differs from Ozark. Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) report the following as grammatical

(21) Who did you try for to go to the church social with you.

(21) is out in OVE for two reasons: try does not permit either an overt subject or for to follow it; no extraction would be possible from try infinitival complements even if for were permitted.

In section 1 we have seen that OVE resembles Standard English in a number of respects. These resemblances cannot be accidental. It is not the case that for is selected by all verbs. It is not the case that for follows arbitrary verbs within a given group (Type A, Type B or Type C). We have seen that islands are created by the presence of for in OVE (thus preventing question formation) as they are formed by in order in Standard English. We also saw that reflexives/reciprocals are permitted in complement position but not in 'subject' position to the infinitive. Let us now turn to an account of these facts.

2. For is a preposition AND a complementizer

In Carroll (1981, 1982a, b), I argued that all of the above facts of OVE could be accounted for within the Government-binding theory in a way completely compatible with proposed analyses of Standard English if we assume that for is either a preposition or a complementizer in surface structures. When there is no overt subject the for which surfaces is a preposition; when there is an overt subject, the for which surfaces is a complementizer. Both fors are present underlyingly. Before turning to the details of my proposals and their justification, let me spell out the analysis proposed for Standard English (Chomsky 1981, Koster and May 1982)
2.1. Standard English

In the Government-binding theory, lexical heads govern subcategorizing complements. A subset of those heads (verbs and prepositions) also assign abstract Case to the elements they govern. All phonetically realized nouns are required to have an abstract Case. Phonetically null nouns do not require Case. Subjects of infinitives may be overt or phonetically null. Case cannot be assigned to them by AG features (in INFL) since infinitives do not bear them. Thus it is hypothesized that the complementizer for assigns Case and governs the subject of the infinitive. The complementizer is thus like the preposition for in this theory in possessing the capacity to govern and assign Case. Whenever an overt subject is present for will necessarily also be present. In order to restrict the distribution of non-trace null elements to the position of subject of infinitive and COMP, it is hypothesized that the null element in question--PRO--must be ungoverned. Thus when PRO is present for must be absent. The theory will thus account for the absence of for with bare infinitives in Standard English. A second principle is required to explain the absence of for before an extraction site (i.e. to explain why (21) and sentences like it are ungrammatical in Standard English). This principle is the Empty Category Principle (ECP) which requires that the trace of a moved category be properly governed. Here we can understand 'proper government' to mean government by $X^0$. This will exclude government by both for and INFL. The ECP will account for the impossibility of questioning out of subject position when that or for is present (Chomsky 1981). One additional principle is required by the theory namely that government (hence Case assignment) cannot occur over a major boundary. With these details in mind we can now turn to a discussion of GB and OVE.

2.2. OVE

The first thing we can say about the GB analysis of infinitives is that it will not account for OVE or Ozark if we assume that for-to sequences like those in (5) have the structure illustrated in (22)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AdjP} \\
\text{S} \\
\text{S}
\end{array}
\]

(22) Fifi was [happy [ for [ PRO to go]]]

The reason should be obvious. We have stated that for governs and assigns Case. This principle is operative in OVE given (10). If we do not accept that for governs then we must either abandon the principle that overt
nouns have Case or that Case is assigned by governing elements. Both Chomsky (1981) and Koster and May (1982) are aware of this problem and their way of dealing with it is to hypothesize that the complementizer sometimes governs and sometimes does not. Neither, however, spell out the conditions under which government is optional. My own interpretation, based on the facts of OVE, is that government is not optional but rather is blocked by the presence of a major category boundary between the governor and the subject of the clause. This means that when PRO occurs as the subject of the clause, any co-occurring for is necessarily outside of $\bar{S}$, as is required by the principle stating that PRO is ungoverned. On the other hand, when the subject is an overt lexical item, the for which shows up must be in COMP, as is required by the restriction that such nouns have Case. Thus there are two fors; one is a complementizer, the other is outside of $\bar{S}$. Given the distribution noted in (12), it is only natural to assume that the for outside of the clause is a preposition. In OVE, then, infinitives are contained in clauses which have a complementizer which governs and assigns Case. The NP subject and the for do not form a constituent. In addition, the clause is contained in a PP headed by for.

Following Hantson (1980), I shall assume that English (both Standard and OVE) has a rule deleting prepositions before complementizers. This will prevent the derivation of the ungrammatical $^*I$ wanted for for Fifi to sing.

The structure of (3a) is thus (23)

\[
(23) \quad \text{Fifi was [happy} \quad [\text{for} \quad [\{\{\} \text{[PRO to go]}\}\}\]\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{AdjP} & \text{PP} & \text{NP} & \text{S} \quad \text{COMP} \quad \text{S}
\end{array}
\]

So far, I have justified (in terms of the co-occurrence of for and overt subjects, the absence of for with Type A verbs, the same distribution of for-to sequences and PPs) only the claim that for is a preposition outside of the clause. I have not justified the NP which dominates the $\bar{S}$ in (23). One argument on behalf of (23) is simply that the phrase structure rules don't permit $\bar{S}$ to follow prepositions in English (cf. Hantson (1980) for discussion)\textsuperscript{15}

\[
(24) \quad \text{a. John doubted about} \quad \begin{cases} 
^*\{\text{[for Mary to leave]}\} \\
\{\text{[Mary leaving]}\} \\
\end{cases} \\
\text{b. John was afraid about} \quad \begin{cases} 
^*\{\text{[that Mary would go]}\} \\
\{\text{[Mary going]}\} \\
\end{cases}
\]
c. John is angry at \[ \{ \text{*[that you leave]} \} \]
\[ \{ \text{*[for you to leave]} \} \]

\[ \{ \text{*[that you go]} \} \]
\[ \{ \text{*[for you to go]} \} \]

\{ \text{you going} \}

This could be countered by the argument that \( \tilde{X} \)-theory does not countenance an NP dominating exclusively a clause since there is no noun head. One must then either hypothesize that the clause doesn't have a nominal head (say a \([±N]\) feature in inflexion) or that it is a marked structure not necessarily excluded by the theory but which must be acquired on the basis of positive evidence.

There are stronger arguments on behalf of (23), namely the restrictions on reflexives/reciprocal subjects in these clauses marked with \textit{for} \((\text{contrast (17) which in this analysis do have reflexive subjects})\). The binding theory requires that reflexives and reciprocals be coindexed to a c-commanding NP in the category in which they are governed. The relevant governing categories are stipulated as NP and S. Now if the clause is directly attached to PP, as in (25), the binding theory will permit the reflexive to be coindexed to NPs in the matrix.

\[
(25)
\]

This is because the subject is not governed in the embedded S but in the embedded \( \tilde{S} \). Thus the relevant governing category for the reflexive/reciprocal in (25) is the matrix S. We know, however, that binding is
blocked in these constructions. It makes sense, given the theory, to suppose that the reflexive/reciprocal is contained in a governing category and that that category is NP.

The same structure will provide a ready explanation of the island-nature of the for-to sequences and also of in order to sequences if we hypothesize that the latter are also PPs. Extraction will be blocked by subadjacency. 17

Thus we find that by postulating that infinitives in OVE are contained in NPs not only do we provide an account of the peculiar distribution of for-to sequences in this variety, we also account for the restrictions on reflexives and questions involving them. The explanation is perfectly consistent with the GB account of Standard English. Furthermore, it provides a tidy explanation of changes in English over time. There is reason to suppose that infinitives in earlier stages of the language were 'nominal' in character (Lightfoot 1979). OVE and Ozark can be seen as vestiges of these earlier stages. At some point, infinitives are reanalysed as clauses only, with for as only a complementizer. Presumably at this point, for-to sequences disappear from the Standard variety, reflexives can become subjects and extraction is possible from infinitives. 18

Before turning to the VP account of infinitives, I want to reiterate what I think are the important points for comparison. First, the fors which surface are both prepositions and complementizers; a preposition in the for-to sequence, a complementizer before an overt subject. Both fors govern and assign Case, always. Thus the complementizer must be granted properties of the preposition. Neither the complementizer nor the preposition forms a constituent with the 'subject' NP which follows. This NP does form a constituent with the infinitive. Both are contained in a clause. All of these aspects of the analysis are necessary for it to work. Let us now turn to the VP analyses.

3. for NP and the VP analysis

3.1. the 'simple' analysis

In this section, I want to briefly consider the simplest approach to (2), namely (4a). According to such an analysis, verbs, adjectives and nouns which are followed by infinitives will select a PP and a VP complement. The selection reflects idiosyncratic properties of the head and not
some general principle. Thus in Standard English the verb want selects just \( \overline{VP} \) while in OVE it will select optionally a PP and a \( \overline{VP} \). In the same way the verb promise selects an optional NP and \( \overline{VP} \) but no PP. The difference between Type A, Type B and Type C heads will be that only the latter select a PP. This selectional distribution will be the same in both Standard English and OVE. Where the two varieties differ is in the fact that in Standard English the preposition requires a complement while in OVE for will optionally select an NP.

I assume that these aspects of the analysis in (4a) will be true also of the second analysis where the preposition is a special preposition and is dominated by \( \overline{S} \). What I am calling a 'simple' analysis is one which treats the for NP as just another PP.19 This can be shown to lead to considerable difficulties. First consider that ordinary prepositions do not precede infinitives

(26) a. *Fifi was afraid about to leave.
   b. *Dodo is angry at to leave.
   c. *the probability of to leave.
   d. *the insistence on to leave
   e. *John was happy with to leave.

This can be accounted for in Standard English where prepositions will always select NPs, including for. In OVE, however, only for will permit optional selection of NP. This distribution is an accident and does not follow from anything in the \( \overline{VP} \) analysis.

Another accidental fact is that although for in OVE optionally selects NP when it precedes \( \overline{VP} \), it doesn't optionally select a complement when no infinitive is present. Recall that the verbs selecting for-to sequences also select for NP

(27) a. I waited for you.
   b. I waited for (you) to leave.

If we equate these two fors then we can give the following syntactic frame to wait

(28) wait: \( V, \_ \_ (P_{FOR} (NP)) (\overline{VP}) \)

However, if all of the parenthesized material is optional we can derive

(29) which is not grammatical
(29) *I waited for.

In other words, the optionality of the NP as a complement to for must be made dependent upon the presence or absence of the following VP, and this in spite of the fact that they do not form a constituent. Even if we stipulate this (and can justify the stipulation), it is a property peculiar to for and not to prepositions in general. Both of these facts suggests that the 'simple' analysis is incorrect.

There are other complications. It can be shown that if for NP is a PP attached to a matrix VP then it is not like the PPs in (30)

(30) a. Dodo was happy for Fifi.
    b. We went out for beer.
    c. Dodo waited for Fifi.
    d. The machine is for private use only.

In both Standard English and in OVE, the preposition of (30) strands under question formation. In neither OVE nor in Standard English will the for strand

(31) a. What did I wait for?  a'. *What did I wait for to be sent?
    b. Who was I happy for?  b'. *Who was I happy for to go?
    c. What did we go out for?  c'. *What did we go out for to see.

The simple preposition will appear sentence-initially under question-formation, the other for will not

(32) a. For whom was I happy?  a'. *For whom was I happy to go?
    b. For what did I wait?  b'. *For what did I wait to be sent?

The simple preposition can appear in extrapoosed positions but the for which can precede infinitives does not

(33) a. A book was sent in the mail for me.
    a'. *To be happy scares me for John.
    b. A letter arrived by special delivery for me.
    b'. *To speak to you right now is dumb for me.

All of these facts suggest that the simple preposition (without the infinitive) and the for NP which precede the infinitive are not the same, i.e. that there are two different prepositions with different properties. If we grant this we can account for the facts noted in (31-33) but we are forced to claim as accidental the fact that only Type C verbs select
both the simple and the infinitive-associated for. All of the above discussion shows that the simple analysis is missing some important differences between prepositions and the for of infinitives. Correcting this must lead, it seems, to abandoning the hypothesis that the for we have seen are the same or are even both simple prepositions.

Now let us consider the problem of the distribution of the reflexive pronoun in OVE. We must exclude both (6e) and (16b), repeated here

(6e) *Dodo wanted the boy for to look at himself.

(16b) *These sheep are for themselves to sell.

At the same time we must generate (7b) and (34)

(7b) Dodo wanted for the boy to look at himself.

(34) Dodo wanted it for herself.

We cannot simply hypothesize (say as Bresnan (1981) does) that the reflexive must be coindexed with the subject. This rule will exclude (6e) correctly but will not account for (7b) unless we grant that the boy is the subject and not the object of a preposition. This is precisely what the simple analysis denies. The rule in question would exclude (16b) in the same way it excludes *Himself left but observe that the PP hypothesis predicts that (16b) will be as grammatical as (34). Once again, the facts argue against the simple PP VP analysis.

Turning now to the restrictions on question-formation, we have already seen that the for NP sequence does not behave like a simple prepositional phrase, contrary to the predictions of the simple analysis. This analysis predicts that the bare infinitives and the infinitives of for-to sequences should behave the same way with respect to question-formation (both are VPs). The sentences (18) and (19), however, reveal that this prediction is wrong.

To sum up this section, we have seen considerable evidence that the for NP preceding infinitives does not behave like a prepositional phrase. At the same time, we have seen that the infinitive phrases do not behave the same way when a for NP sequence is present as when it is absent. We have also seen that even stating the subcategorisation for verbs selecting both for NP and for-to sequences is problematical. We conclude that the simple analysis cannot be seriously entertained. Let us now turn to the analysis illustrated in (4b)
3.2. the not-so-simple analysis

The analysis illustrated in (4b) differs from the simply analysis in at least two ways. First it is granted that the for NP plus infinitive (or for-to sequence) constitute a clause. Secondly, in Brame's analysis, the for is a preposition but it is not the same preposition as that of (12). It has a distinct subcategorisation frame, shown in (35)

(35) ( _____ (NP^P)) (VP), where NP^P is the object of a preposition

As in the simple analysis, Type A and Type B heads will select only VP complements or NP VP not PP VP. It is thus an accident that the distribution of for-to sequences in OVE mirrors that of Standard English. Furthermore, it is also an accident that both for and an NP 'subject' are absent following the verb try in OVE (as in Standard English) but that both are present in Ozark (see (21)). The VP analysis predicts that we should find a dialect where try selects for but where no NP appears. To my knowledge no such dialect exists. This fact follows from a theory where the distribution of for is dependent upon the distribution of null subjects. It does not follow from a theory where the distribution of for reflects idiosyncratic selectional properties of heads. Note, however, that this analysis does avoid many of the problems of the simple analysis. Thus we can account for the fact that the for complementizer and its complement do not behave like the simple preposition for and its complement because they are separate entities. However, we lose an account of the fact that heads selecting for NP or for plus gerundive also select for-to sequences and for NP VP. We must subcategorize these heads for both the prepositional for and the for complementizer and VP. Only in this way can we avoid the problem (noted above) of the simple preposition requiring an NP while the for complementizer only takes one optionally. Thus the analysis is missing a generalization.

The analysis under discussion also is better able to deal with the reflexive facts. This is because the PP is contained in S. The analysis will exclude the 'subject' reflexives if we hypothesize that reflexives must be bound in the same S. This hypothesis plus the structure indicated will also correctly distinguish between (6e) and (7b).

More problematic is the treatment of the question-formation restrictions. In the fusion and binding theory, there is no transformation and
hence no movement of a WH-word. Lexical items compose (on the basis of contextual restrictions stated in the lexicon) to form syntactic phrases, and syntactic phrases compose to form larger units (cf. Brame (1980) for details). The theory includes a binding operation linking operators like WH-words to "absent" arguments. The binding operation is, of course, required for the correct interpretation of the sentences containing operators. Thus if a WH-word corresponds to a questioned direct object, the sentence-initial operator will be coindexed to a VP (or V̅P) which must be lacking an argument in order for the sentence to be well-formed. Now binding will be allowed into S̅ since constituents in tensed S̅ can be questioned. Binding will be allowed into V̅P in OVE given (19). It will not be allowed into the V̅P of (18) or (20). We cannot ban binding into V̅P. It would not be correct to simply exclude binding into S̅ on general grounds given the Standard English (36)

\[
\begin{align*}
(36) & \quad \text{a. Who}_i \text{ was I eager } \left[ \text{for Fifil [to see]}_i \right] \\
& \quad S \quad \text{PP} \\
& \quad V̅P \\
\text{b. About what}_i \text{ did I prefer } \left[ \text{for Fifi} \right] \\
& \quad S \quad \text{PP} \\
& \quad \left[ \text{to be concerned} \right] \\
& \quad V̅P
\end{align*}
\]

Some further principle will be required to exclude (18) and (20) for I cannot see how they will be excluded by the theory as presently formulated. Furthermore, in both OVE and Standard English, some means for excluding binding into the PP must be formulated, so that a complement of for cannot be questioned. In Brame (1979), there is a rule of Subject Interpretation which will interpret a sentence-initial WH-word in sentences like (37a) but not (37b)

\[
\begin{align*}
(37) & \quad \text{a. Who do you think } \_ \_ \_ \text{ left?} \\
& \quad \text{b. *Who do you think that } \_ \_ \_ \text{ left?}
\end{align*}
\]

The rule is given in (38)

\[
(38) \quad \emptyset \rightarrow NP^S / V \_ \_ \_ \text{ VP}
\]

Rule (38) does not apply in the context of a preposition so that (18b, e) cannot be interpreted by it. However, this account of the ungrammaticality of these sentences fails to explain why it involves only 'complementizers',
i.e. why it involves that and a preposition that has complementizer properties. There is no connexion in this account of the peculiar non-prepositional status of for-complementizer and its resemblances to that. It would appear that a generalization is being missed.

We conclude that Brame's analysis is far superior to the simple analysis in that it can deal with the fact that the for-complementizer does not behave like the simple preposition since it claims they are distinct entities. It can also account for the lack of reflexive 'subjects' since the reflexive is contained in \( \tilde{S} \) and has no proper antecedent in that context. However, we have also seen that it fails to explain why only those verbs and adjectives which can be followed by the for preposition are also followed by the for-to sequences, why there are dialects where try selects for and NP before VP or only VP but no dialects where try selects for and VP but where a 'subject' can never appear. This lacunae is curious if the distribution reveals only idiosyncratic facts of selection. We have seen that there is no principled reason why the for-complementizer (i.e. for\(^C\)) behaves like that with respect to question-formation since for\(^C\) is still categorially a preposition, head of a PP. Finally, some additional account of the absence of binding into VP following for in OVE must be provided. It must allow binding into the same context in Standard English and binding into VP in both dialects where no for is present.
4. Conclusions

In this paper, I have discussed a number of facts concerning the distribution of for-to sequences in OVE as well as specific restrictions on reflexives and questions within them. I have argued that a simple account can be given of these facts by hypothesizing that the for of for-to sequences is a true preposition while the for of for NP to VP is a complementizer; that both are present underlyingly in OVE with Type C verbs; that the presence of for preposition is a fact of selection but the presence of for complementizer follows from general principles of the grammar and is predictable; that at no time does the for preposition or the for complementizer form a constituent with the following NP. I have shown that a lexical account of these same facts which claims that for is a simple preposition is untenable in that it fails to account for a number of significant differences between prepositions and the for NP sequence. I have also argued that an analysis which distinguishes between for NP and for NP will still fail to account for the distributional pattern of for in OVE. This can be corrected only by complicating the lexical analysis required for Standard English. In contrast, the Government-binding theory will account for all the existing data, standard and non-standard, without modification of fundamental principles or basic mechanisms. What we must be willing to concede, and I admit that the point is controversial, is that clauses can be exhaustively dominated by NP. This concession has implications for X-theory, the issue of the head of clauses and possibly also the analysis of gerundives. All of these issues must be left for future research.
Notes
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1. Bresnan (1972) argues that tough constructions like (i) have non-clausal structure (although she doesn't use the terminology $\overline{VP}$)

   (i) Fifi is tough (for us) $\overline{VP}$ [to please]

Lasnik and Fieno (1974) discuss as well tough constructions. Schachter (1976) discusses infinitives in the light of gerundives. He proposes the rule in (ii)

   (ii) $\begin{cases}
   (\text{Det}) \text{NOM} \\
   S \\
   (\text{PP}) \overline{VP}
   \end{cases}$

2. It is difficult to find a neutral terminology to label many of the things I shall be discussing. I shall call the NP which follows the simple prepositional for, the complement to for. I shall refer to the NP following for in (2) as the 'subject' of the infinitive even though the relationship between the NP and the infinitive is one of the questions at issue. I hope the use of scare quotes will be sufficient to indicate to the reader that the NP under discussion has a semantic relationship to the infinitive without necessarily also having a structural relationship.

3. Morin (P.C.) has suggested in passing that the for NP can belong to a PP. I am not sure that (4a) is what he envisages.

4. This is my interpretation of Brame's paper. What he actually says is that there is an equivalence relation between the prepositional phrase plus $\overline{VP}$ and $\overline{S}$, as in (i)

   (i) $(\text{P}^C (\text{NP}^P)) (\overline{VP}) \equiv \overline{S}$

   where $\text{P}^C$ is a preposition (the 'complementizer'-like preposition) and $\text{NP}^P$ is the complement of a preposition.

It is not necessary that one interpret (i) as saying that both the PP and $\overline{VP}$ are contained in $\overline{S}$, however, it is not obvious to me what else can be meant by (i). We shall see furthermore in 3.1. that there are empirical
reasons for supposing that for NP to VP sequences are not simply PP VP complements to a matrix verb or adjective. I suspect that these reasons have motivated (i) (Brame does not provide any reasons for not opting for (4a)).

5. This is a misnomer in the sense that OVE is spoken in only some parts of the Ottawa Valley. OVE is an Irish-based dialect. My informants come from Arnspor and Renfrew. The data has been presented more fully elsewhere (Carroll 1981, 1982a, b) along with details of data collection. Since beginning this study, I have collected data from a number of different dialects which leads me to believe that the analysis presented here for OVE may be applicable elsewhere. Certainly, it is the case that for and bare infinitives have a wider distribution than has been previously supposed (Lightfoot 1979). I have examples from several rural dialects in Canada. Furthermore, Tom Roeper (1981) has data which indicates that children pass through a stage where my analysis may be relevant. In other words, children who are not exposed to dialects with for-to infinitives nevertheless produce these sequences.

6. An aside is necessary at this point. I wish to make clear that I am trying to do two things here. One is to criticize a general approach to the analysis of infinitives. Another is to criticize specific proposals; the two go together. However, as noted, the VP analysis has been adopted by linguists adhering to radically different theories. As noted, what is common to these theories is only a commitment to analyse bare infinitives without postulating a subject or a clause. It is not obvious, for example, from a reading of Bresnan (1981) that she is committed to extending the VP analysis to other types of infinitives. Thus while it is true that the fusion and binding theory is not the only lexicalist approach and not the only theory where such an extension is possible, it does appear to be the only theory committed to generalizing the VP analysis in the manner described. I should add that my criticisms of the treatment of for NP as PPs do not invalidate Brame's treatment of bare infinitives (or anybody else's). Certainly, they do not invalidate the fusion and binding theory. I do believe that a simple and principled account for the distribution of complementizers is possible, therefore I believe it is useful to compare the Government-binding treatment to that of the fusion-binding theory. I should also add that Brame is the only person postulating a VP analysis who has even considered the Ozark data
from Chomsky-Lasnik (1977). He has rightly asked for more information. Hopefully this paper will help to satisfy that request.

7. I shall not be considering (4c) in this paper because it is clearly not a possible analysis of OVE. Anticipating the discussion somewhat, I shall show in section 1 that heads taking for-to sequences select prepositional phrases and not NPs.

8. I have omitted (5e) because the verb go in this sentence has an aspectual reading which requires that the infinitive not have a 'subject'. Sentence (5e) can be paraphrased as 'I was about to sit down to supper when the phone rang'. There is, of course, another meaning to go indicating displacement, illustrated in (5c). This meaning does not require a bare infinitive as complement.

9. I understand from American friends that (10c) is not possible in their speech. (10c) is grammatical in OVE as it is grammatical in my own speech. I believe that all speakers would find (i) acceptable even those who prefer (ii)

(i) We went out in order for you to get some fresh air.
(ii) We went out so that you could get some fresh air.

10. I may be misunderstanding here what constitutes Standard English. Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) claim that (i) is grammatical

(i) They wanted (for) themselves to be chosen.

This sentence is impeccable as far as I'm concerned. Brame (1979), however, observes that only (ii) would be permissible in his speech

(ii) They wanted to be chosen.

11. For my purposes, the following definition of government suffices:

(i) α governs γ in the structure

[...γ...α...γ...], where (i) α = [ιN, ιV]

and (ii) where ϕ dominates α in some ϕ a maximal projection, if and only if ϕ dominates γ.

The two conditions require that the governor be a lexical item (not a phrase) of some major category and that it c-command the governed element.

12. This can simply be stipulated (as in Chomsky 1981) or can be derived as a consequence of a well-formedness condition on interpretable nouns (Bouchard 1982).

13. This is not quite true. There is no complementizer following believe and other Type B verbs. Chomsky (1981) hypothesizes that these verbs
trigger the deletion of $v$-boundaries and Case-assignment proceeds from the verb. This hypothesis requires that COMP be empty, which raises the question as to why no complementizer can ever be inserted after these verbs.

14. The status of this principle is not clear. Chomsky (1981) claims that it can be derived from the binding theory because PRO is both an anaphor and a pronoun and these two different types of noun are subject to contrary conditions when governed. This leads Chomsky to conclude that PRO must be un gover ned to satisfy the binding theory. However, in the same text he adopts a different version of the binding theory where the restriction on PRO does not follow in the way. It may be necessary to stipulate the constraint.

15. In the GB theory, the to of the infinitive is not a preposition but the spelling out of INFL. The facts noted here suggest that to should not be treated as a preposition.

16. I am assuming that the binding theory refers to 'governing category' and not 'binding category' or 'accessible subject' (cf. Chomsky 1981) since the former makes the right predictions and the latter does not.

17. There is an alternative account of the subjunction violations which assumes that PP is a bounding node. We could then forego postulating an NP node above the clause. However, then we would need another explanation of the reflexive facts. I prefer a treatment which will deal with both in the same way.

18. It follows from this discussion that OVE has at least two subcategorisation frames for Type C verbs. For example, the verb want can select both a PP and $v$. Only in the latter case, will we derive (17) or (19). In other words, not all infinitives in OVE are dominated by NP; Only those infinitives where there is a mark of purpose (i.e. for) will be dominated by NP. While this makes for an analysis which is "untidy" in requiring multiple subcategorizations for Type C verbs, it reflects, I believe, the fact that OVE speakers are thoroughly acquainted with Standard English and are also aware of the nonstandard nature of their own speech.

19. This may also be true of the (4c) analysis.

20. Again, I must assume that to is not an infinitive for this claim to be valid.
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