

control

George thinks that [giving himself a presidential pardon] would be a good idea
George thinks that [giving him a presidential pardon] would be a good idea

null subjects clearly possible in non-finite contexts. Now, how about:

John forgot that he ate the beans (do theta-roles)
John forgot to eat the beans (oops)

He seems to have eaten the beans (raising)
He forgot to eat the beans (control)

arguments for a distinction:

idioms

the cat seems to be out of the bag
the cat forgot to be out of the bag

expletives

it seems [that...]
*it forgot [that...]

subject's theta-role, complement's theta-role:

John forgot.
*John seems

also, object control:

He persuaded John to leave (control)
He expected John to leave (ECM)

binding!

I promised John to defend myself/*himself
I persuaded John to defend *myself/himself

binding domains would have to be very weird, if there were no PRO.

so, two types of infinitives; control, and raising. Let's practice:

John is eager to leave
Mary is likely to leave
I tried to defend myself
Fido appears to like sushi

Mary decided to meet at 10

(and mention partial control)

okay, now, what determines whether you get PRO or raising?

point at ex. on board:
john is eager to leave
I would like very much to leave
I arranged to leave early

now add 'for Mary' to these.
what's 'for Mary'? not a PP;

I would like for it to be obvious that (I am the best candidate)
I arranged for the cat to be out of the bag...

apparently 'for' can license Case on Spec TP, just like 'believe'.
Looks like *for* is a complementizer, here.

notice that even when *for* is absent, you have reasons to think that *Mary* doesn't get case
from *would like*, *want*, etc.--the verbs can't be passivized.

so we need a null *for* as well as the overt *for*.

now:
it seems *for...
it is likely *for...
I believe *for John...

raising complements are TPs,
control complements are CPs.

(and C must be null when PRO is null, at least in our dialect of English)