THE MEANINGS OF SENTENCES
OUR ROADMAP

• Philosophical contemplation: Worlds, situations, and the meaning of sentences
• Negative polarity items and downward entailment
• Overview of theta roles and sentence meaning
• The relationship between theta roles and infinitives
• Modeling the semantic properties of sentences
**THE REFERENTIAL VS INTERNALIST DEBATE AND POSSIBLE WORLDS**

Referential

- Sentence meanings are abstract “objects.”
- *That* clause refers to an abstract object.
- Two kinds of abstract objects
  - Russelian proposition \(<x,y>\): an ordered pair consisting of \(x\) and the property \(y\)
  - Possible worlds, which include modality (necessity, possibility, contingency).

Internalist

- Sentence meanings are internal mental structures.
- Harold and Fiona’s beliefs are qualitatively identical.

Possible Worlds

- Modal realism (David Lewis): Other possible worlds exist in the way that the real world exists. Each world is an island, distinct from the other worlds.
- Lewisian possible worlds: Meanings of sentences are sets of possible worlds.
  - If you know the meaning of a sentence, then you know the conditions that must hold in order for the sentence to be true.
  - Some sentences are necessarily true-i.e., true in every possible world
    - *Two plus three equals five* and *Three plus four equals seven* are both true in every possible world. So, the meaning of each sentence is the set of all possible worlds.
      - In essence, these two sentences have the same meanings.
      - Not intuitive…
- Enter situations…

Harold believes that there is life on Venus, and Fiona does too.
Barwise and Perry: Sentence meanings are sets of possible situations

A minimal situation in which some condition holds contains just enough entities, properties, and relations to make that condition hold.

- A minimal situation in which *Two plus three equals five* is distinct from a minimal situation in which *Three plus four equals seven*.

Two sentences that are true in the same set of possible worlds are true in different sets of situations.

Necessary falsehoods: No possible situation in which some proposition is true.

- No situation in which *Two plus three equals six* is true.
- BUT, the set of situations in which *Two plus three equals six* or *Three plus four equals eight* are distinct.
- SO…situations can be impossible.

SITUATIONS

Spatiotemporally delimited parts of the world (or of possible worlds).

- One or more individuals instantiating one or more properties or standing in one or more relations

  - E.g. – The spatial confines of The Hideaway on Tuesday, 6 October between 1:15 p.m. and 4:15 p.m.
FOUR IS EVEN.

- Russellian proposition: <4, evenness>
  - The ordered pair consisting of the number 4 and the property of being even.

- Situation theory: The set of situations in which 4 is even.

- The meaning of *Four is even* would also include minimal situations in which four is even and five is odd and in which both four and five are even (remember, situations can be impossible).

-WTF does this have to do with anything??!!!

...Well, the permissibility of certain words/phrases depends on the presence of other words/phrases.
Any, at all, yet, lift a finger are **negative polarity items (NPIs)**.

*Not* is an **NPI licensor**.

NPI licensors are downward entailing

If one sentence entails the other, there is no possible world in which the first sentence is true and the second sentence is false.

- A entails B: one can’t truthfully assert A and not also truthfully assert B. Not a reciprocal relationship; B does not entail A.

a. The anarchist assassinated the emperor.
b. The emperor died.

c. No gods worry. No gods worry about income tax.
d. Some gods worry. Some gods worry about income tax.
e. All gods worry. All gods worry about income tax.
f. At most three gods worry. At most three gods worry about income tax.

- c/f are downward entailing. d/e aren’t downward entailing
SUMMARY: WHAT DO NPIS TEACH US?

• Modularity of Mind
  • Some part of our brain is performing set-theoretic calculations when we encounter NPIs

• Architecture of Linguistic Theory
  • Tight interaction between syntax and semantics

• Sentence meanings are sets of possible worlds
OVERVIEW OF THEtas
ROLES
Review of Theta Roles

(a) Most first-year college students buy expensive textbooks.
   agent                theme/patient

(b) Eric admires his basketball coach.
   experiencer         theme/patient

(c) Julia traveled (from Beijing to Moscow).
   agent               source    goal

(d) The butcher cut slabs of beef (in the walk-in fridge)
   agent               theme/patient    location
   (with a sharp knife).
   instrument

(e) The aspiring underling wrote the report
   agent               theme/patient
   (for her supervisor).
   benefactor

   (the supervisor was supposed to write the report but the underling wrote it in order to earn brownie points)
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• A verb’s clausal arguments also have to fulfill both c-selection and s-selection requirements.
• Deny, say, and wonder all C(category)-select for an embedded clause.
• However, these verbs have different S(emantic)-selection requirements.
  • Deny takes a propositional complement.
  • Wonder takes a question complement.
  • Say takes either a proposition or a question.

  a. Martha denied that John has left.
  a.* Martha denied whether John has left.
  b. Martha said that John has left.
  b.* Martha said whether John has left.
  c. *Martha wonders that John has left.
  c.* Martha wonders whether John has left.

  (Johnson 2011, Ch2, EX 143-144)

• Some verbs c-select either a clause or an NP and both the clause and the NP have the same semantic properties.

  a. John asked me what the time is/*the time. Question
  b. I’ll assume (that) he’s intelligent/*his intelligence. Proposition
  c. Bill couldn’t believe how hot it is/*the heat. Exclamative

• Other verbs s-select for the same thematic types, but c-select only clauses.

  a. John wondered what the time was/*the time. Question
  b. I’ll pretend that he’s intelligent/*his intelligence. Proposition
  c. Bill complained how hot it was/*the heat. Exclamative

  (Johnson 2011, Ch2, EX 139)
INFINITIVES: A UNION OF THETA THEORY, SYNTAX, AND SEMANTICS
Infinitives present pretty much every challenge there is to syntactic theory. Their semantics and morphology (i.e. the lack thereof since the subject of many infinitives is silent) interact with some of the most fundamental aspects of syntactic theory – e.g., the Theta Criterion and the Case Filter.

The quick and dirty:

- In **Raising** infinitives, the subject of the main clause is semantically related to the verb in the embedded clause, but not to the verb in the main clause.
  - Verb in the main clause does not have a theta role for a subject.
- In **Control** infinitives, the subject/object of the main clause is semantically related to the verbs in both the main clause and the embedded clause.
  - Both the main and embedded clause verbs have theta roles for subjects.
- In **Exceptional Case Marking** (ECM), the DP that “looks” like the object of the main clause is actually semantically related to the verb of the embedded clause.
  - Both the main and embedded clause verbs have theta roles for subjects.
  - There is debate about whether these are actually “raising to object.”

---

1. Barnett seemed to understand the formula. **Raising**
2. Barnett tried to understand the formula. **Subject Control**
3. Barnett persuaded the doctor to examine Tilman. **Object Control**
4. Barnett believed the doctor/her to have examined Tilman. **Exceptional Case Marking**
5. Barnett promised the doctor to examine Tilman. **Subject Control** (a special case)

[Davies and Dubinsky 2004, CH 1, EX 1-5]
RAISING VS SUBJECT CONTROL

1. Barnett seemed to understand the formula. **Raising**
2. Barnett tried [Barnett] to understand the formula. **Subject Control**

- In the second sentence, *Barnett* is the agent of the trying and of the understanding.
- We need some item in the lower clause to satisfy the s-selection requirements of the embedded verb.
- The technical term for this silent DP is **PRO**. PRO is argued to not get case. Hence, its silence.
  - Barnett$_i$ tried PRO$_i$ to understand the formula.
  - Barnett seemed Barnett to understand the formula.
- There is no PRO in the *seem* sentence. There is only one semantic subject.

Sidebar:
- The traditional explanation for the silence of PRO rests with the Case Filter, which basically says that a DP needs case in order to be pronounced.
- This does not mean that every DP that gets case is pronounced. Think pro-drop in Spanish and other languages.
- Case is a necessary, not sufficient condition for pronunciation.
Object Control vs Exceptional Case Marking

3. Barnett persuaded the doctor to examine Tilman. **Object Control**

4. Barnett believed the doctor/her to have examined Tilman. **(ECM)**
   - In ECM, the verb in the main clause is transitive and the embedded clause is the object of the verb.
   - The embedded subject is accusative and we have a reason for this exceptionality. Non-finite T doesn’t assign nominative, so the embedded subject gets accusative from the verb in the main clause.
   - There is no PRO in ECM constructions. The verb in both the main clause and the verb in the embedded have semantic subjects and each subject is pronounced.
   - **Object Control** constructions are ditransitives. *Persuade* has two objects – the DP ‘the doctor’ and the clause ‘PRO to examine Tilman.’
   - The doctor is both the object of persuade and the subject of examine. The doctor cannot get case in the embedded clause and is represented by PRO.
   - **Barnett persuaded the doctor, PRO, to examine Tilman.**

   **Unlike in subject control, in object control, the object is coreferential with PRO.**

The Odd Case of Promise

5. Barnett promised the doctor to examine Tilman. **Subject Control**
   - Like persuade, promise is ditransitive.
   - Usually, the DP that is closest to PRO is coreferential with PRO.
     - *Barnett, persuaded the doctor PRO, to examine Tilman.
   - With promise, the subject reaches across the object to control PRO. Barnett, promised the doctor PRO, to examine Tilman.
EXPLETIVE/PLEONASTIC SUBJECTS

Allowed with Raising Infinitives

It seemed to be raining.

There seems to be a unicorn in the garden.

[Davies and Dubinsky, EX 18]

- We can also have an expletive subject of a finite embedded clause.
  - It seems that there is a unicorn in the garden.

Not allowed with Control or ECM Infinitives

*It tried to be raining.

*There tried to be a unicorn in the garden.

[Davies and Dubinsky, EX 19]

- These are ruled out by s-selection and the Theta Criterion. Try needs a semantically contentful and agentive subject.

*It finds the professor her students to be diligent.

- Here the semantic criteria are met, but we don't have syntactic positions for both the expletive and the semantic subject. And we have no need to insert the expletive because there is a "real" subject.

Theta theory predicts this distinction. The matrix verb in control and ECM constructions needs a semantically contentful subject.
OTHER DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN RAISING AND CONTROL

- **Embedded passivization**
  - With raising, there can be an embedded passive. Constructions with the embedded passive have a very similar meaning to their active counterparts.
    1. Barnett seemed to have read the book.
    2. The book seemed to have been read by Barnett.
      
      [Davies and Dubinsky 2004, EX 8]
  - With control, the active-passive pairs have different meanings or the embedded passive is not allowed.
    3. The doctor tried to examine Tilman.
    4. Tilman tried to be examined by the doctor.
    5. Barnett tried to read the book.
    6. ?The book tried to be read by Barnett. [EX 8-10]

- **Idiom chunks**
  - Idioms are allowed with raising and ECM, but not with control.
    7. The cat seemed to be out of the bag.
    8. Tina believed the cat to be out of the bag by now.
    9. ?The cat tried to be out of the bag.
    10. ?Tina persuaded the cat to be out of the bag. [EX 23-24]
Even though these two kinds of infinitives have the same surface string, there is an important argument structure and meaning difference.

Object control verbs are ditransitives and ECM verbs are transitive.

We can also tease these two apart with an entailment test.

Barnett would prefer the doctor to examine Tilman.

ECM. Preferring the doctor to examine Tilman does not entail preferring the doctor. Barnett might hate the doctor and have an actual preference for every other human being except in the context of examining Tilman.

The referee ordered the players to redo the last play.

Object control. Ordering the players to redo the last play entails ordering the players.
CONTROL
INFINITIVES AND
EMBEDDED WH
CLAUSES - GOOD

1. Sally told Jim how to eat chocolate.
2. Sally asked when to leave.
3. Sally decided when to leave.
4. Sally wondered what to eat.
5. Sally told Jim whether to eat chocolate.
6. Sally asked whether to leave.
7. Sally decided whether to leave.
8. Sally wondered whether to eat chocolate.

[Johnson 2011, CH 3, EX 143-144]

The Shapes of Infinitives

- Do the differences in semantic relationships translate to differences in structure?
- Are infinitives all the same category?
- We might assume that since they’re clausal complements, they’re all CPs.
  - However, in English, control infinitives can take embedded questions as complements. Raising and ECM infinitives seem not to take embedded questions as complements.
RAISING AND ECM INFINITIVES AND EMBEDDED WH CLAUSES - BAD

1. *John appears when to eat chocolate.
2. *John seems when to have left.
3. *John is likely how to dance.
4. *Jill believes when Sean to leave work. [based on Johnson 2011, CH 3 EXs 146-148]

  ▪ But…the issue might be semantic. The meaning of raising and ECM verbs might forbid them from selecting an embedded question as a complement.

  ▪ For instance, with control infinitives, the WH can be positioned inside the embedded clause or in the main clause and this maps to a difference in meaning.

    ▪ Sally told Jim how to eat chocolate.  How refers to the act of eating
    ▪ How did Sally tell Jim to eat chocolate?  How refers to the act of telling

  ▪ There isn’t this same contrast for raising infinitives. The sentences below have the same meaning as (1)/(3).

    ▪ When does John appear to eat chocolate?
    ▪ How is John likely to dance?

  ▪ I think the judgments are murkier for ECM clauses, but I think I get the same meaning for the sentence below as I would get for (4) if it were grammatical.

    ▪ When does Jill believe Sean to leave work?

  ▪ The point is that there might be something else going on with (1)-(4) that rules out the embedded question.
In Icelandic, embedded finite clauses begin with the complementizer að…

1. María segir að þú hafir leisið bókina.
   Mary.nom says that you.nom have read book.the.acc
   ‘Mary says that you have read the book.’

…and so do control infinitives…

2. María lofaði að lesa bókina.
   Mary.nom promised that to.read book.the.acc
   ‘Mary promised to read the book.’ [Johnson 2011, CH 3, EX 145]

…but not raising infinitives.

3. *María hafði virst að hafa vaskað upp diskana
   Mary.nom had seemed that to.have washed up dishes.the.acc
   ‘Mary had seemed to have washed up the dishes.’

4. María hafði virst hafa vaskað upp diskana
   Mary.nom had seemed to have washed up dishes.the.acc
   ‘Mary had seemed to have washed up the dishes.’
   [Johnson 2011, CH 3, EX 149]
ECM infinitives cannot have að either.

1. Við teljum frambjóðendurna vera frambærilega.
   
   we.nom believe candidates.the.acc be pretty good
   
   ‘We believe the candidates to be pretty good.’ [Þráinsson 2007:414]

2. *Við teljum að frambjóðendurna vera frambærilega.
   
   we.nom believe that candidates.the.acc be pretty good
   
   ‘We believe the candidates to be pretty good.’

Control infinitives are CPs. They’re full clauses.

Raising and ECM infinitives are TPs. They’re “smaller” clauses.

...But not “small clauses.” =(3) The infinitives have tense information.

3. a. She will let [them make a cabinet]. = VP [EX 65a]
    
    b. They will make [them angry at me]. = AP [EX 65b]

    c. She saw [them in the next room]. = PP [EX 69b]

Where Things Get Murky

1. Misato wanted to eat durian.
2. Misato wanted for him to eat durian.
3. Junko preferred to eat natto.
4. Junko preferred for me to eat natto. [Johnson, 2011 CH 3, EX 143-144]

- For here is a complementizer – and not a preposition. (It is sometimes referred to as a prepositional complementizer.)
  - For forms a constituent with the entire clause. In clefts, one constituent can reside between it’s and that.
    - It’s for him to eat chocolate that Sally would prefer.
    - *It’s to him how to eat chocolate that Sally should explain. [EX 153]
      - The underlying structure here is Sally should explain how to eat chocolate to him.
      - The sentence is ungrammatical because two constituents – the clause “how to eat chocolate” and the PP “to him” are between it’s and that.

- This isn’t problematic, given what we’ve just learned. Control infinitives are CPs, so in all of the above examples, there is a CP complement and in the second sentence of the pair, there is an overt complementizer.
But *for* is optional, at least with *want* and this looks like an ECM construction.

- Sally wanted him to eat chocolate.

Johnson notes that the optionality of *for* is similar to the optionality of *that*.

- Sally said (that) he eats chocolate.

If *for* is a complementizer, then it seems to assign accusative case to the embedded subject.

- In sentences in which *for* is not present, either the silent complementizer assigns case or the embedded clause is actually a TP and the pronounced subject gets case from the verb in the higher clause.
- This would mean that *want/prefer* sometimes c-select for a CP and sometimes C-select for a TP.

**Sidebar:** Complementizers can behave in other interesting ways. For instance, in West Flemish, complementizers agree with subjects.

   1sg-think that-1pl (we) tomorrow go  1sg-think that-2sg (you) tomorrow go
   ‘I think that we’ll go tomorrow.’  ‘I think that you’ll go tomorrow.’

   [Corbett 2006:50]

Hindi-Urdu is a split Ergative language. When the verb is in the perfective aspect (meaning that the action was necessarily completed), the subject is Ergative. Otherwise, it’s Nominative (or Dative).

Nominative and Accusative are not morphologically marked. Ergative is marked with the suffix –ne.

Participals and auxiliaries agree with the highest argument of the verb that is not overtly case-marked.

- There’s agreement with the subject in (1) and agreement with the object in (2).

1. Rahul kitaab parh- taa thaa
   Rahul.masc. book.fem read-hab.masc.sg be.past.masc.sg
   ‘Rahul used to read (a/the) book.’

2. Rahul-ne kitaab parh-ii thii
   ‘Rahul had read the book.’ [Bhatt 2005, EX 2]
   - Pfv = perfective aspect

In long distance agreement (LDA), the verb agrees with an argument that is not its own. A matrix verb agrees with an embedded object.

LDA can only occur in Hindi-Urdu if the matrix clause has an Ergative subject. If the matrix clause has a Nominative subject, the matrix verb has to agree with it (because the Nominative is the highest unmarked argument).

1. Verb in the main clause agrees with the subject in the main clause.

Shahrukh [tehnii kaat-naa/*nii] chaah-taa thaa
Shahrukh.masc branch.fem cut-inf.masc/*fem want-impfv.masc.sg be.past.masc.sg
‘Shahrukh wants to cut the branch.’

2. Main clause verb cannot agree with embedded object.

*Shahrukh [tehnii kaat-naa] chaah-tii thii
Shahrukh.masc branch.fem cut-inf.masc want-impfv.fem.sg be.past.fem.sg
‘Shahrukh wants to cut the branch.’ [Bhatt 2005, EX 7]

There’s not actually long-distance agreement here…
...but there is here.

- When there is an embedded infinitival clause and the subject in the main clause is ergative, the main clause verb *may* agree with the embedded object.
- When the main clause verb agrees, so does the infinitive. = 1
- When the main clause verb is in the default, so is the infinitive. = 2

1. Main clause verb and infinitive agree with embedded object

Shahrukh-ne [tehnii kaat-nii/*naa] chaah-ii thii.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.fem/*masc want-pfv.fem be.past.fem.sg
‘Shahrukh had wanted to cut the branch.’

2. Main clause verb and the infinitive are in the default

Shahrukh-ne [tehnii kaat-naa/*nii ] chaah-aa thaa.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.masc/*fem want-pfv.masc.sg be.past.masc.sg
‘Shahrukh wanted to cut a/the branch.’

[Bhatt 2005, EX 6]
Bhatt proposes that in (1) on the previous slide, the infinitival complement is smaller than a full CP, so it’s “permeable.”

The T in the matrix clause can cross into the embedded clause to establish a relationship with the embedded object, the consequence being that all verbs agree with the embedded object.

Shahrukh-ne [\(_{\text{XP}}\) tehni
\(_{\text{nii}}\) kaat-nii/*naa] chaah-ii thii.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.fem/*masc want-pfv.fem be.past.fem.sg

‘Shahrukh had wanted to cut the branch.’

However, in (2), the embedded clause is a CP and this full clausal projection is not permeable. The matrix T cannot establish a relationship with the embedded object, and the consequence is that all verbs appear in the default form.

Shahrukh-ne [\(_{\text{CP}}\) tehni
\(_{\text{nii}}\) kaat-naa/*nii ] chaah-aa thaa.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.masc/*fem want-pfv.masc.sg be.past.masc.sg

‘Shahrukh wanted to cut a/the branch.’

The verbs agree with no DP.

There is also a slight meaning difference. In the LDA construction, there is emphasis on the embedded object.

Big Picture: Having evidence for infinitives that come in different “shapes” leads us to how the shape of an infinitive corresponds to the tense information inside the infinitive.
TENSE, MEANING, AND THE CATEGORIES OF INFINITIVE CLAUSES
“It is true that to-infinitives lack the morphological feature [+Past], but this does not necessarily imply that they lack a tense operator...the tense of a to-infinitive is that of a possible future.” [Stowell 1982:562]

- Tensed complements, infinitives, and gerunds have different interpretations.
- In (1), the finite complements have their own tense specification.
  - (1a): the remembering is in the present and the visiting is in the unrealized future.
  - (1b): The wondering is in the present and the going is in the past.
  - (1c) is tricky. There is an infinitival complement inside the embedded finite clause.
    - We talked about [what we ought [PRO to do]].
    - The talking is in the past and the “ought to do” is in the unrealized future.

- In (2), the tense of the non-finite control clause is unrealized w.r.t. to the tense of the matrix clause.
  - In (2a)/(2b), the tense in the matrix clause is present. In (2c), the matrix tense is past.
  - Both the embedded finite clause in (1) and the embedded control clause in (2) contain a WH.
    - The finite clause and the control clause are CPs.
- The gerunds in (3) are bad because they don’t have a CP projection to house the moved WH word. But why???

(1) a. I don’t remember who we should visit.
   b. I wonder where he went.
   c. We talked about what we ought to do.

(2) a. I don’t remember who to visit.
   b. I wonder where to go.
   c. We talked about what to do.

(3) a. *I don’t remember who (our) visiting.
   b. *I wonder where (his) going.
   c. *We talked about what doing.

The analysis in a nutshell: Finite clauses and (control) to-infinitives contain a C position (hence, a CP projection) and they contain a tense operator which resides in/has a relationship with the C position. “…the Comp position is where tense operators must appear, at some level of grammatical representation.” (p.563)
No for complementizer
- I hoped for you to meet my parents.
- *I hoped for your meeting my parents.
  - This is expected if gerunds do not have a CP projection.

No WH movement
- Relative clauses pattern like (3) on the previous slide.
- WH movement is possible with finite (5a) and control relative clauses (5b), but not with gerunds (5c).

No tense specification of their own

Control – independent unrealized tense
- (8a): Jenny has not brought the wine at the point in time when she remembers to do so.
- (9a): Jim does not succeed in locking the door when he tries to do so.

Gerunds – tense dependent on the matrix clause
- (8b): The bringing happened prior to the remembering, but both happened in the past.
- (9b): The tense is ambiguous between present and unrealized w.r.t. the matrix.

Even though a gerund can have an unrealized tense, gerunds do not have an inherent “internally determined tense and therefore…its understood tense is determined externally by the semantics of the control verb.” (p.563)

** See Cherlon’s Ling 216 notes on relative clauses and WH Movement.
In the old days…
- S’ was analogous to CP
- S was analogous to TP
- [e] is an empty category – here, the complementizer

“There is no Comp position in a complement clause whenever the governing verb assigns Case to its subject.” (p. 565)

(11) is object control: case is assigned to the object by the matrix verb (or, in more contemporary terms, by the matrix v)
- No case is assigned to PRO. CP (S’) blocks the relationship.

(12)/(13) are ECM: case assigned to the semantic subject of the embedded clause by the matrix verb
- No CP (S’) to block the relationship.

Back to tense: In ECM, the tense of the non-finite clause is dependent on the meaning of the matrix verb.
- Present in (12); Future in (13a); Past in (13b)
- In (11), each control infinitive has its own unrealized tense.

Against the null complementizer analysis of ECM: If there were a null complementizer, the tense interpretations should pattern like control infinitives, not like gerunds.

(10) [S’ [e] [S PRO to VP]]

(11) a. John convinced his friends to leave.
    b. Sally persuaded her son to buy the camera.
    c. Frank advised the teacher to inflate the grades.
    d. Jim reminded Jenny to lock the door.

(12) a. Bill considers [himself to be the smartest].
    b. The boys found [them to be amusing].
    c. Jane showed [the solution to be trivial].

(13) a. I expect John to win the race.
    b. I remember John to be the smartest.

(15) a. [S’ For [S John to kill his goldfish]] would be wrong.
    b. [S’ For [S the prisoners to be released]] would be a big surprise.
• The interpretations of NPIs suggest that we are computing set-theoretic possible world scenarios.

• The typology of infinitives interacts with theta theory.

• The distribution of embedded WH words and complementizers, long-distance agreement phenomena, and the tense interpretations of different infinitives lead us to believe that some infinitives are full CPs and others are smaller.