1 Infinitival complements

In this exercise, we are going to extend the system we have to allow for sentences such as (1). Of particular relevance is the fact that it contains two clauses. One is the one whose verb is *expected*, and the other is the one whose verb is *to make*. The definition of "clause" here that I'm using is basically something that has a verb and a T node.

(1)   I expected Tracy to make pasta

An *infinitival clause* is a clause that is untensed, it is neither present nor past. To handle these, we will start by adding the following things to our system:

- Verbs like *want* or *expect* that take infinitival complements have a [uT*] feature—their "object" is a TP.

- We will call the θ-role of an embedded clause "Proposition."

- So, we add to the UTAH: TP sister of V is a Proposition.

- Infinitival clauses have a T with a feature [tense:inf].

It is common to start off thinking of *to* as itself being of category T. But this can't be right. Consider sentence (2).

(2)   I wanted Tracy not to have been making pasta.

Part 1. Explain (concisely) why *to* cannot be T in (2). Assume that *not* cannot move. Assume the Hierarchy of Projections we used in class:

$$T > (Neg) > (Modal) > (Perf) > (Prog) > v > V$$

Part 2. Assume that *to* has the same category as some existing type (it's not a new type of thing). Propose a category for *to*, and use the sentences in (3) and (4) as part of a (quick, short) argument for how *to* behaves in at least one respect like other things of this category.

---

(3)   a.   * Tracy should can make pasta.

b. * Tracy can should make pasta.

(4) a. * I expect Tracy to should make pasta.

   b. * I expect Tracy should to make pasta.

Part 3. Even in light of what you proposed in part 2, there is something strange about *to*. Compare (5) and (2)—what is different about *to* syntactically? (When thinking about this, it may help to assume that the [tense:inf] T—by itself—has no pronunciation.)

---

(5) Tracy should not have been making pasta.

Even in languages where there is not a direct analog of English *to*, it is very uncommon for verbs or auxiliaries to move to T in infinitival clauses—even when such things move to T in tensed clauses. Think about what it is in our system that makes auxiliaries move to T in tensed clauses.

Part 4. The part of our system that causes auxiliaries to move to T is that extra assumption we added to Agree: If two conditions (the [*u*Infl:] feature is valued by T, on something with an [Aux] feature) hold, then a feature is valued as strong. With this in mind, think of how we might understand the behavior of *to* (and fits in with the crosslinguistic tendency just mentioned).

Part 5. Draw a tree for (6) (same ground rules as for the trees you drew in section 2). Assume that non-finite (infinitival) T is silent (has no pronunciation).

---

(6) I wanted them not to cook it.