INFINITIVES: A UNION OF THETA THEORY, SEMANTICS, STRUCTURE, AND CASE (PRETTY MUCH EVERYTHING THAT’S IMPORTANT IN SYNTAX)

10 - 12 February
Overview of the different types of infinitives.

- Tense inside infinitives...yes, really.
- They're not all CPs! (a look at English, Icelandic, Hindi-Urdu, Japanese)
- Exceptional Case Marking vs Raising to Object.
- Infinitives in a language that doesn’t mark them; a look at Mandarin. (Next week)
1. Most citizens understand the Constitution of the United States to elaborate certain fundamental rights.

2. What do most citizens understand the Constitution of the United States to elaborate?


5. Many people told the founders what to elaborate in the Constitution of the United States.
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.” (We’ll return to this.)

**BACKGROUND, REVIEW, AND SOME TECHNICAL TERMINOLOGY**

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.

Remember ...

**The Case Filter:** All DPs must be marked with a Case in order to be pronounced.

- Case is a necessary, not sufficient condition for pronunciation.
  - Silent subjects in Spanish.
  - Op in relative clauses.
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** 
  - Unlike in subject control, in object control, the object is coreferential with PRO.
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.
  *The professor_{i} persuaded the students PRO_{i} to draw intricate syntax trees.*
- With *promise*, the subject reaches across the object to control PRO. 
  Barnett_{i} promised the doctor PRO_{i} 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.
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 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*.
  - As we see *for* is optional, at least with *want* and this looks like an ECM construction.
    - Sally wanted him to eat chocolate.
  - Johnson (2011) notes that the optionality of *for* is similar to the optionality of *that*.
    - Sally said (that) he eats chocolate.
a. K-peinzen da-me (wunder) morgen goan.
   1sg-think that-1pl (we) tomorrow go
   ‘I think that we’ll go tomorrow.’

b. K-peinzen da-j (gie) morgen goat.
   1sg-think that-2sg (you) tomorrow go
   ‘I think that you’ll go tomorrow.’ [Corbett 2006:50]


**SIDEBAR**

- Complementizers can behave in other interesting ways.
- For instance, in West Flemish (spoken in Belgium, The Netherlands, France) complementizers agree with subjects.
There are four types of infinitives:
- Raising
- Subject Control
- Object Control
- Exceptional Case Marking

Raising, Control, and ECM are distinguished by their semantics:
- Raising matrix verbs do not have a semantic subject. Control and ECM matrix verbs do.
- An entailment test can distinguish between Object Control and ECM.
TENSE, INFINITIVES, AND CLAUSE SIZE
A DIGRESSION THROUGH OTHER SMALLER CLAUSES

- We’re very familiar with the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis at this point and this idea is related to the concept of small clauses.

1. a. She will let [them make a cabinet]. = VP [Johnson 2011, EX 65a]
   b. They will make [them angry at me]. = AP [EX 65b]
   c. She saw [them in the dark room]. = PP [EX 69b]
   d. The baby-sitter wants [those kids in the bathtub] = PP
   e. The review committee determined [him unethical]. =AP
   f. The shady used-car salesman let [the naïve couple negotiate an awful deal]. = VP

- Johnson argues that these are small clauses and not TPs/IPs because we can’t get the material that appears in T inside of these clauses.

2. a. *I will let her should make a cabinet.
   b. *I will let her to make a cabinet.
   c. *I will let her makes a cabinet. [EX 67]
   d. *She saw them to be in the next room.
Johnson situates the “subject” of the small clause in the specifier of the phrase.

• The semantic subject of “big” clauses starts off in Spec, VP.

• The semantic subject of “small” clauses starts – and remains in – the specifier of whatever phrase the clause is.
One of the crucial tasks in analyzing infinitives is to figure out whether/how the differences in semantic relationships translate to differences in structure.

Spoiler:
• Control infinitives are CPs.
• Raising and ECM infinitives are TPs.
• 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 “to do” is in the unrealized future with respect to “ought.”

• 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???

**“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]
- No *for* complementizer
  - I hoped for you to meet my parents.
  - *I hoped for your meeting my parents.*

- No WH movement
  - 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.

---

**Properties of Gerunds**

*Gerunds are TPs.*

(5) a. The table on which you should put your coat is in the next room.
   b. The table on which to put your coat is in the next room.
   c. *The table on which putting your coat is in the next room.*

(8) a. Jenny remembered [PRO to bring the wine].
    b. Jenny remembered [PRO bringing the wine].

(9) a. Jim tried [PRO to lock the door].
    b. Jim tried [PRO locking the door].

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)
When Stowell says that a clause lacks S’, in contemporary models, this means that the clause lacks a CP projection.

**IMPORTANT**: Even though the formalism has changed throughout the years, the fundamental idea remains the same and is present throughout current syntactic literature.

Stowell’s 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)
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
- No case is assigned to PRO. CP (S’) blocks the relationship.
- Object control is like subject control – CP.

(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.
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]
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.
- 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), if (1)/(3) were good.
  - 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:** 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.’

Both English and Icelandic provide evidence that raising and ECM clauses lack CP projections.

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

AGREEMENT AND INFINITIVAL COMPLEMENTS

- 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]
LONG DISTANCE AGREEMENT

- 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 (masculine).
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]

Not all control infinitives are full CPs, though!
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 \([_{XP} \text{tehnii \ kad-nii}/^{*\text{naa}] \ chaaah-\text{ii} \ thii.}\]
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.fem/*masc want-pfv.fem be.past.fem.sg

‘Shahrukh had wanted to cut the branch.’

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. (They agree with nothing.)

Shahrukh-ne \([_{CP} \text{tehnii \ kad-naa}/^{*\text{nii}] \ chaaah-\text{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.’

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

Want c-selects for a CP in the second sentence and c-selects for something smaller in the first sentence.
Restructuring infinitives (RIs) are smaller than CPs. For our present purposes, they can be TPs or VPs.

Because RIs are “structurally deficient”, they’re permeable to “outside” operations. A head in the matrix clause can have a relationship with a head or phrase in the embedded clause.

**SIDEBAR:** For proposals which argue that restructuring clauses are VPs, there’s evidence suggesting that negation cannot appear inside the embedded clause. This makes sense, since negation is higher than VP.

Syntax trees are like Tinder. You have to be sufficiently close in order to hook up. 😊
a. John-ga migime-dake-o tumureru  
   John-Nom right-eye-only-Acc close-can  
   'John can close only his right eye'  
   can > only  
   ▪ John has the ability to close only his right eye, and leave his left eye open.  
     ▪ In technical terms, can scopes over only. Can is higher in the tree.  
   ▪ John \( [_{CP \ \ PRO_{i \ right-eye-only} \ close}] \) can  
   ▪ Accusative is assigned by the embedded verb to the embedded object.  

b. John-ga migime-dake-ga tumureru  
   John-Nom right-eye-only-Nom close-can  
   'John can close only his right eye'  
   only > can  
   ▪ Only John's right eye can close; his left eye cannot close.  
     ▪ In technical terms, only scopes over can. Only is higher in the tree.  
   ▪ John \( [_{CP \ \ t_{i \ close}}] \) can  
   ▪ The embedded object escapes the embedded clause and moves to a  
     position in the higher clause, where it is assigned nominative by T.  
     ▪ Yes, shocker! It is argued that T here assigns nominative to both the subject and the  
       object.  
   ▪ Escaping a clause leads us to the ECM vs raising-to-object debate...  

On a Raising-to-Object analysis, the subject moves out of the lower clause to a position in the higher clause. One piece of support for this approach comes from passivization. (There are other arguments based on reflexives. We’ll come back to that in the unit on Binding Theory.)

If the complements of both believe and appear are TPs and the subject of the lower clause can be passivized with believe, why not with appear?

Maybe the subject of the complement of believe actually moves to an object position in the higher clause and that’s why it can be passivized.

BUT, it’s not a semantic object, so where does it go??

It has to come after the matrix verb, so we can’t add another bar level.

So, some position which intervenes between V and TP has to be “created.” Hmmm….

This is problematic because it violates the Projection Principle.

The Projection Principle:
Representations at each syntactic level are projected from the lexicon in that they observe the subcategorization properties of lexical items. (Reworded from Johnson 2011)

OR, as stated in Carnie:
Lexical information (such as theta roles) is syntactically represented at all levels. (Carnie, Ch 8, EX 31)

Per the Projection Principle, a transitive verb shouldn’t have a ditransitive structure.
The ECM Analysis:
We’re left with no explanation for the contrast between being able to passivize the embedded subject to the complement of *believe* but not the embedded subject to the complement of *appear*.

The Raising-to-Object Analysis:
We violate the Projection Principle and “create” structure that wouldn’t otherwise be there.
Clauses come in different “sizes and this idea is used to explain a variety of facts.

Icelandic was one language which provided support for a big clause/smaller clause distinction.

Icelandic was our friend. It’s now about to crush us...
IN FINITE CLAUSES, A QUANTIFIER AGREES IN CASE, GENDER, AND NUMBER WITH THE NOUN IT MODIFIES . . .

a. Strákarnir komust allir í skóla.
   boys.the.nom got all.nom.pl.masc to school
   ‘The boys all got to school.’

b. Strákana vantaði alla í skólann.
   boys.the.acc lacked all.acc.pl.masc to school
   ‘The boys were all absent from school.’

c. Strákunum leiddist öllum í skóla.
   boys.the.dat bored all.dat.pl.masc in school
   ‘The boys all felt bored in school.’

d. Strákanna var allra getið í ræðunni.
   boys.the.gen were all.gen.pl.masc mentioned in speech.the
   ‘The boys were all mentioned in the speech.’

...AND THE QUANTIFIER AGREES IN NON-FINITE EMBEDDED CLAUSES AS WELL.

a. Strákarnir vonast til að komast allir í skóla.
   boys.the.nom hope for that to get all.nom.pl.masc to school
   ‘The boys all hope to get to school.’

b. Strákarnir vonast til að vanta ekki alla í skólann.
   boys.the.nom hope for that to lack not all.acc.pl.masc to school
   ‘The boys all hope not to be absent from school.’

c. Strákarnir vonast til að leiðast ekki öllum í skóla.
   boys.the.nom hope for that to bore not all.dat.pl.masc in school
   ‘The boys all hope not to be bored in school.’

d. Strákarnir vonast til að verða allra getið í ræðunni.
   boys.the.nom hope for that to be all.gen.pl.masc mentioned in speech.the
   ‘The boys all hope to be mentioned in the speech.’

Describe the pattern and explain why it is deeply troubling.
OUR WORLD IS SHATTERED!!!
1. The FBI proved few of its trainees were actually spies.
2. The syntax professor told her former student where to attend graduate school.
3. The investigators were instructed to conduct thorough background checks.
4. How is John likely to dance at the next mid-winter ball?
5. The DNA evidence proved the defendant guilty.
6. I regret making them angry.
7. When did Skyler suspect Hank to actually be a drug dealer?
8. Beyoncé was not expected to increase sales at Red Lobster.