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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the syntactic, semantic, and structural features of infinitival small clauses. The analysis of the small clauses was conducted on the basis of the evidence drawn from the novel “A Farewell to Arms” by Ernest Hemingway. The methods used in the study were descriptive-inductive and statistical analysis. The research showed that the author of the novel used infinitival small clauses to replace a variety of reduced clauses. They included reduced objective clauses, adverbial clauses of purpose, result, condition, and reduced relative clauses. The study demonstrated that reduced objective clauses replaced by infinitival small clauses had the highest frequency of occurrence. The research also revealed that Ernest Hemingway predominantly used infinitival small clauses with infinitives after verbs in comparison to infinitival small clause following other parts of speech.
INTRODUCTION

In the process of communication we use sentences – full and elliptical. The sentences we use are either based on explicit predication only or on an explicit predication with an embedded implicit predication. For example:

a) John is leaving for London.

b) John wants to leave for London.

In linguistics, both types of sentence have received a lot of attention, starting with transformational – generative grammarians and ending with modern traditional grammarians, who have focused their attention mostly on the formal structure of the sentences with relatively little consideration given to the semantic aspects.

The basis for the sentence is a predication, i.e. to form a sentence we need two units: the subject (the entity we wish to talk about) and the predicate (the property we wish to ascribe to the entity). Predication is the attribution of a property to an entity. The process of attribution necessarily involves such categories as person, tense, and mood. The other categories, such as voice, aspect, order, are not essential: they are secondary predicativity features. Thus, if a construction has the said features, it is a construction of explicit (fully realized) predication. And if a construction only consists of an entity and its property, it is a construction of implicit (unrealized) predication. In linguistic literature, such constructions are generally referred to as small clauses.

The analysis of small clauses was initiated by transformational – generative grammarians who analysed sentences with the infinitive, the gerund and the participle as based on two predicative structures where one structure is included in another. The sentences of a language were said to be based either on one full predication or on one full predication plus one or more than one reduced predication included in the full predication.

Transformationally, the small clause is the result of the so-called generalized (double-based) transformation whereby two full predicative clauses are combined into one structure. Depending on the communicative needs, the embedded clause may be reduced to three structures: infinitival, gerundial, and participial.

In the English language the range of use of infinitival small clauses is significantly higher than that of gerundial or participial small clauses. The reason for that is that infinitives are capable of replacing gerunds and participles in clauses, while gerunds and participles lack the ability to replace infinitives.

The problem of reduction of full predications to small clauses has been discussed in the writings of many scholars, including Hathaway (1967), Lenci (2001), Duffley (2000),
However, the phenomenon of the small clause cannot be regarded as well-studied, for it is still argued about in the linguistic literature. Only the most typical cases are unquestionably acknowledged as reduced predications based on implicit predicative relationship.

Infinitival small clauses are also characteristic of a wide variety of their structural and syntactic types. In this study we distinguish infinitival embedded predications with the infinitive used with mental verbs of perception, cognition, and affection, with material verbs, and verbs of saying, as well as small clauses of double relations, small clauses with the infinitive used after nouns, pronouns, and adjectives. Among the syntactic types the present paper analyses reduced objective clauses, reduced relative clauses, and reduced adverbial clauses of purpose, result, and condition.

The research problem has professional significance as it extends existing knowledge. The practical importance of the work is determined by the fact that the results of the research can be used in the classroom in the process of teaching learners how to form infinitival constructions and make their language more natural and economical.

The purpose of the work is to examine the structures containing the infinitive as part of the small clause and find out what kinds of clauses infinitival embedded predications predominantly represent. The evidence for the present paper was taken from the novel “A Farewell to Arms” by Ernest Hemingway. The objectives of the study are:

1) the analysis of the syntactic types of infinitival small clauses;
2) the analysis of semantic and structural features of infinitival small clauses;
3) the analysis of the frequency of occurrence of different infinitival small clauses.

The description of small clauses is based on semantic types of the processes, an attempt which has not been made yet in works examining small clauses in general.

The method applied in the research is the descriptive-inductive method. The method of statistical analysis was used to show the frequency of occurrence of the different types of infinitival small clauses in the novel “A Farewell to Arms” by E. Hemingway. The corpus consists of 312 pages.
1. THE SMALL CLAUSE, ITS NATURE AND TYPES

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the three types of small clauses, namely infinitival, gerundial, and participial, which are widely used in the English language of the present day.

Baxter Hathaway (1967: 7) considers the grammar of a language to be a description of its devices for forming predications or combining them into larger predications. However, it is important to distinguish between the notions of primary and secondary predications first. In Lenci’s terms\(^1\), predication is a binary relation between a predicator and a subject. Guéron and Hoekstra (1995) hold the belief (cited after Lenci, 2001: 4) that “predications are not complete linguistic objects by themselves, but need to be integrated into a structure which is complete”.

Lenci (op. cit., 4), in his turn, analyses three main approaches to predication. The first approach, as quoted by the linguist, belongs to Williams (1980) and Shein (1995) who regard predication as an independent relation which is interpreted in terms of theta-role assignment\(^2\). Rothstein (1995) and Heycock (1994) adhere to the belief that predication cannot be reduced to theta-role assignment, but that it is “an independent formal relation between syntactic constituents based on the notion of syntactic function” (Lenci). According to Lenci (ibid. p. 4), the notion of syntactic function in question is also identified with the notion of a propositional function. As far as the third approach quoted by Lenci is concerned, it belongs to Guéron and Hoekstra (1995) who hold that “predication consists of an inclusion relation which involves a node agreement, understood as an inclusion operator”. Unlike the views of the linguists presented in Lenci’s paper, the latter assumes that predication is actually determined by tense.

Predication as such can be looked upon from the structural and semantic points of view. Structurally, full or primary predication is characteristic of full independent clauses with explicit predicative relationships between the subject and the predicate. Secondary or reduced predication, on the other hand, occurs in the form of small (dependent) clauses, in which the predicative relationships are grammatically implicit. Semantically, nevertheless, both full and small clauses are equally capable of conveying the necessary meaning of the sentence (Hathaway, 1967: 238).

---

\(^1\) Retrieved from: [http://alphalinguistica.sns.it/QLL/QLL96/AL_PredTheory.pdf](http://alphalinguistica.sns.it/QLL/QLL96/AL_PredTheory.pdf)

\(^2\) The term is used in Government and Binding theory (Chomsky, 1981), cited after Giparaite (2003: 25), for semantic roles such as agent or patient (Matthews, 1997: 377).
As far as the contrast between primary and secondary predication is concerned, secondary predication, according to Lenci (2001: 2), is different from primary predication in that it works in terms of “complex predicate configurations”. The meaning of reduced predications, as held by the linguist, depends on the matrix verb. If the matrix verb denotes, for instance, perception, then the small clause is believed to refer to an event rather than to a proposition\(^3\) (for more information on events and propositions, see Cowper, 2001 82-85).

As already pointed out, secondary predication is the result of the transformation and reduction of primary predication. According to Lenci (2001: 1)\(^4\), it is not only the mere existence of small clauses that is still under debate. The linguists that accept them are not unanimous in their interpretation regarding the structure of included predications. Small clauses are defined by Stowell (1995), as quoted by Lenci\(^5\), as “the black holes of syntactic theory: most of the discussion about them has been devoted to the question whether they exist or not”. Giparaite (2003: 20) quotes a number of definitions of a small clause that demonstrate a wide variety of views as far as the notion of a small clause is concerned:

I. A small clause is “a structure which has clausal characteristics in that it contains a subject phrase and a predicate phrase” (1a below) (Aarts, 1992: 21);

II. A small clause is “a constituent which has a propositional meaning, i.e. the same sort of meaning as a full clause structure has, but it lacks any verb forms” (Haegeman, 1994: 57,59);

III. A small clause is “a clause in which the verb (usually a form of BE) and sometimes other elements have been deleted” (Wekker, Haegeman, 1985: 34);

IV. A small clause is “a phrase that has a clausal (or propositional) interpretation, but lacks the full inflectional morphology of a sentence” (Culicover, 1997: 47).

On the basis of the descriptions of the small clause presented in her paper, Giparaite (op. cit., 20) draws the conclusion that all the grammarians agree only in that a small clause is “a clausal constituent”. In the present paper, we shall adhere to the view that a small clause

---

\(^3\) Lenci uses the term “epistemic small clauses” to name reduced predications that denote propositions, and “eventive small clauses” to refer to reduced predications that denote events. The linguist claims that these two kinds of small clauses are structurally different, for they are projections of “different types of functional heads”, i.e. the head of the small clause assigns different types of case.


clause, being unable to stand on its own, is a reduced predication included into a primary predication.

The range of small clauses has up to now significantly enlarged, even though originally the term of small clause appeared to describe patterns of sentences like those in (1):

(1)  
   a. Ben considers Ann attractive / an attractive woman.
       $S + V + DO + PrA/PrN$
   b. Ben saw Ann drunk.
       $S + V + DO + PrA(state)$
   c. Ben painted the fence blue.
       $S + V + DO + PrA(result)$
   d. Ben arrived exhausted.
       $S + V + PrA$

All the examples above share the same feature: they all contain a secondary predicate: Ann (is) attractive, Ann (is) an attractive woman, Ann (is) drunk, the fence (is) blue. The Small Clause Theory, as explained by Lenci (op. cit., 1), analyses such sentences as “forming a syntactic constituent with its subject of predication”, namely Ann, the fence from (1) (a, b, c) above. The subject of the secondary predication in (1d) is Ben that also performs the syntactic function of the subject for the primary predication. These constructions resemble clauses with full predication, for they also contain a subject-predicate relationship, but at the same time they do not have an inflexional element. Lenci (op. cit., 2) expands this idea by claiming that the predicative complements of raising verbs and copular\(^6\) constructions are characterized by the absence of an inflexional element and a subject-predicate relationship, similar to the small clauses in (1) above. In other words, the predication within small clauses is established without the copular verb.

Recently, the notion of small clauses has been applied to many different constructions, for instance with regard to complex object constructions, absolute constructions, predicate appositives\(^7\), and the like. This tendency, in fact, has proven to be responsible for all the ambiguity and confusion that is widely argued about by many linguists of the present day, as far as small clauses are concerned.

---

6 It should be pointed out that Lenci (2001: 8) tends to use the term “copular” with respect to such verbs as “seem, consider, believe, find” and the like, while the verb “be” is regarded by the linguist as a pure auxiliary. Other linguists, however, call the verb “be” a copular verb, and the verbs “seem, consider, believe, find” – raising verbs. Some other authors show a tendency to use the term of “link verbs” with regard to the latter ones.

7 Owing to the limitation of space, absolute constructions and predicate appositives are not discussed. The paper will include only the cases with a high level of occurrence.
Ambiguous clauses frequently also occur due to the difficulty in tracing the subject in reduced predication. In Duffley’s terms, at this point we deal with the problem of control (2000: 2). Predications are specified by the agreement between the subject and the predicate, as well as by the signal of tense present in the predicate. According to Lenci (op. cit., 3), if a clause contains no subject, only a predicate, the predicative relationship is hardly possible. However, as further argued by Lenci, there is a difference between verbal and non-verbal predicates. The former ones are characterized by tense, while the latter ones can participate in the formation of a predicate being devoid of tense. Non-verbal predicates, unlike their verbal counterparts, are capable of combining with the subject indirectly, by means of the copular verb “be” or by being case-marked. Case-marking allows a non-verbal predicate to become a predicator (Lenci, op. cit., 3).

Hathaway (1967: 214) claims that in primary predication the subject and the predicate are linguistically equal, i.e. they both participate in the predication. But as soon as the primary predication is reduced to a phrase with one of the non-finites as the headword, one of its members becomes dependent on the other as in the example that follows:

(2) His driving is reckless.

In (2) his driving consists of two elements. The nominal element his is dependent on the headword driving. The reduced predication under discussion fails to distinguish between generality and particularity.

On the other hand, the small clause in (2) is not as problematic a case as, for instance, the abstract gerund in (3) below:

(3) Eating fruit is healthy.

The subject part of the passive gerund, as Duffley (2000: 5) puts it, is unknown. The possibility of the formation of such sentences might become rather questionable at times, but clauses such as (3) are linguistically acceptable, for the subject implied in the secondary predication here is actually a universal one. Thus, the small clause eating fruit remains somewhat finite in meaning (cf. Hathaway, 1967: 211).

Duffley (2000: 7) also discusses ambiguous control cases that occur due to a variety of syntactic functions performed by the infinitive. Even though infinitives are believed to represent the verb, they can also function as nouns, adjectives, or adverbs, occupying the positions typical of the said parts of speech. In addition, infinitives, as held by Hathaway (1967: 209), never function as finite verbs unless a clause contains an auxiliary. However, owing to the presence of the latter, the main verb can no longer be called an infinitive, for it

---

becomes a finite verb. Only finite forms are considered to be verbs proper, even though infinitives are characterized by a number of verb properties (Hathaway, op. cit., 209).

Hathaway (op. cit., 210) points out the difference between the subject and the agent of the matrix verb. Subjects belong to the syntactic domain, while agents have to do with semantics. When the agents and subjects coincide in a sentence, the reduced predications present in the sentence can be more clearly described. In fact, in the process of syntactic analysis, we usually look for subjects. Agents become important only when the subject of a sentence is difficult to detect. In completely abstract infinitive phrases, as Hathaway (ibid., 211) puts it, “neither subject nor agent is given formal expression”. In (4a) below, the negative infinitive occupies subject position, thus serving the syntactic function characteristic of a noun or pronoun, as becomes obvious from (4b):

(4) a. Not to sing would be incongruous.
      b. It/that/a denial would be incongruous.

As already said, infinitives are also capable of fulfilling the function of an objective complement (i.e. being the verbal part of a complex objective complement). Both Hathaway (op. cit., 210-214) and Duffley (op. cit., 11) hold that in most cases the subject of the matrix verb is also the subject of the infinitive. Then the infinitival phrase occupying direct objective complement position can be regarded as a reduction of an object clause to a construction where the infinitive comes to represent only the predicate part of the included predication. However, Hathaway hastens to point out that “since subject and direct object exist on the same linguistic level the direct object infinitive phrase is not dependent upon its subject”. Consider the following examples:

(5) a. They arranged that they would go to Greece.
      b. They arranged to go to Greece.

The underlined part of (5a) is an object clause which contains the same subject as the principal clause, i.e. they. (5a) is a composite sentence consisting of two primary predications. The modal verb would in the object clause in (5a) is not explicit in the infinitival small clause to which it has been reduced. The pronoun they as the subject is implied in the underlined small clause in (5b), since it was dropped in the process of reduction.

However, it is only true when the matrix verb is in the active. Clauses with the matrix verb in the passive are quite ambiguous. Let us have a look at the example given by Hathaway (1967: 213) to illustrate the ambiguity caused by a passive matrix verb:
(6) a. ACTIVE: We told him to stay away.
   \[ S \quad Obj/S_1 \]

   b. PASSIVE: He has been told to stay away. (=someone told him that he should stay away)

   In (6a) there are two personal pronouns, one in subject position and the other in the position of an indirect objective complement. However, the latter could be considered the implicit subject \( S_1 \) of the embedded predication \textit{him to stay away}. The sentence raises no doubts regarding the agents of the actions. Having been passivized, the distinction between the agents of actions becomes rather questionable. The subject part of the secondary predication (6a) functioning as an indirect object has become the explicit subject of the clause (6b). But in (6b) it is only the agent of staying away, and the agent of telling remains unknown. It is obvious that “the transformational process is somewhat different when the verb that is followed by an infinitive is active from when the verb is passive (Hathaway, op. cit., 214). Duffley (op. cit., 6) and Hathaway (op. cit., 213) share the opinion that in case the matrix verb and the infinitive as part of the compound verbal predicate are in the passive, the subjects of both are the same, while the agents are different. Hathaway’s example proves to be highly ambiguous at this point:

   (7) He was expected to be beaten by Dempsey.

   It is not an easy task to decide whether Dempsey is the agent of expecting or the agent of beating.

   Coming back to the issue of distinguishing between agents and subjects, it should be pointed out that abstract infinitives are quite ambiguous in this respect even in the active voice. The problem of distinction under discussion is illustrated in (8) below:

   (8) I want to buy a house.

   The infinitive \textit{to buy} fulfills the syntactic function of part of a compound verbal predicate \textit{want to buy} in the sentence above. The personal pronoun \textit{I} can be regarded as the subject not only of the matrix verb, but also of the infinitive (See Hathaway,1967: 212), which functions as an abstract noun here. The nominal nature of the infinitive in (8) becomes evident if we put it in subject position, as can be seen from (9):

   (9) To buy a house is expensive.

   Thus, when the verb followed by an infinitive is active, the transformation process is undoubtedly different from when the verb is passive.
2. STRUCTURAL TYPES OF SMALL CLAUSES

For the sake of clarity, we could classify small clauses into three major classes, namely: 1) infinitival; 2) gerundial; and 3) participial.

Infinitival small clauses

According to Hathaway, predications with included infinitives constitute the following patterns (infinitival small clauses are italicized):

(10) Pretending to know how to do everything is my chief vice.
(11) Since learning how to drive a car, I have had no accidents.
(12) To learn how to drive a car, you need lessons.
(13) Jonas was quick to end the affair.
(14) They were ready to protect themselves.
(15) To make that move he will have to be desperate.
(16) He is too proud to do anything like that.
(17) He is too much a fool to solve his own problems.
(18) This question is difficult to answer.
(19) He went to Spain to see her.
(20) I’m waiting for your letter to arrive to answer your questions.
(21) The meeting was arranged to clear the air.
(22) He was required to walk a tightrope.
(23) His desire to sleep surprised her.
(24) His trip to town to buy some wine was adventurous.
(25) I need a house to rent.

The first three examples ((10), (11), (12)) are cases of reduced predications when the infinitive becomes the object of a gerund (as in (10)), a participle, an –ing form in reduced adverbial clauses (as in (11)), or of another infinitive (as in (12)) (Hathaway, op. cit., 215). In (10) the subject principal position is occupied by an included predication consisting of [a gerund + an infinitive (in the direct objective complement position with respect to the gerund) + an adverbial clause of manner (in the position of a direct objective complement of the infinitive)]. Syntactically, both the infinitives, as held by Hathaway (ibid. p. 215), are abstract and “subjectless”.

To perform the function of an adverbial, the clause can be transformed into a clause with two primary predications, the first of which is an adverbial clause of time: As soon as I learnt how to drive a car, I had no car accidents. (12), in its turn is a reduced clause of
purpose or condition, which can be tested through transformation as well: *If you want to learn how to drive a car, you need lessons* (condition); *In order for you to learn how to drive a car, you need lessons* (purpose). However, the latter of the two transformations of (12) resembles a semi-predicative structure rather than a clause with a full predication. The clause begins with a for-to-infinitival construction *in order for you to learn how to drive a car* which cannot be regarded as a full predication, for the predicative relationship between the two elements of the construction is implicit.

Sentence (13) (S(subject) + Cop(ula) + Pr(edicative) A(djective) + Inf(initive)), in Hathaway’s (1967: 216) terms, is the result of the redistribution of sentences consisting of S(subject) + V(erb) + Adv(erb). Since in copular predications the predicative complement (most often nouns or adjectives) is usually the predicator “of lexical content”, it is possible to turn the verbs into infinitives, and adverbs into predicative adjectives by redistribution. Consider (13a) and (13b) below:

(13a) Jonas quickly ended the affair. (Hathaway, 1967: 216)  
S + Adv + V + DOC

(13b) Jonas was quick to end the affair. (Hathaway, 1967: 216)  
S + Cop + PrA + Inf + DOC

The predicate of (13b) contains two constituents (in contrast to (13a) where the predicate consists of a single finite verb), namely a copula and a predicative adjective, the combination of which Korneyeva (1985: 42) calls a compound nominal predicate.

In (14) the infinitive follows the predicative complement *ready* and serves to show the relationship of “respect”, “purpose”, or “manner”, whereas in (15) it represents a reduction of a temporal or conditional clause (and a redistribution) (Hathaway, 1967: 216). Hathaway points out that the relationships mentioned above are but very relative. They may “overlap and blend into one another”. Thus, (14) and (15) are very close semantically. Let us have a look at the structure of (14) which is analogous to that in (13b):

(14) They were ready to protect themselves.  
S + Cop + PrA + Inf + DOC

In (16) and (17) we have to do with reductions of degree clauses to infinitival small clauses, where the infinitives modify the predicative adjectives (or the predicative nouns) they follow. The predicative adjectives (or nouns) are also modified by the degree adverb (Degree) *too* that precedes them. Consider the structure of the two clauses presented below:

(16) He is too proud to do anything like that. (Hathaway, 1967: 217)  
S + Cop + Degree + PrA + Inf + DOC

---

9 The abbreviation DOC here represents the grammatical term *Direct Objective Complement*. 
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(17) He is *too much a fool to solve his own problems.* (Hathaway, 1967: 217)

S + Cop + Degree + Q(uantifier) + PrN + Inf + DOC

(18) is an example of clauses where the infinitive within the small clause is of double valence. The problem arises: is it the question that is difficult, or the answer? The reason for the ambiguity here might be the absence of a direct objective complement after the infinitive in the small clause *difficult to answer.* After all, (14) expresses no ambivalence typical of (18). Structurally, the latter looks as follows:

(18) This question is *difficult to answer.*

S + Cop + PrA + Inf

As for (19), it represents one of the most frequently occurring infinitival reduced predications. Here the infinitive serves as a substitute for a reduced clause of purpose or result when the subjects of both the primary and secondary predications coincide (*He went to Spain. He saw her*). The original sentence may be phrased in the following way: *He went to Spain so that he could see her* (the underlined clause being a clause of purpose that has been reduced to the infinitival phrase *to see her*).

According to Hathaway (op. cit., 218), clause (20) exemplifies the reduction of two adverbial clauses of time. However, the two infinitives that appeared owing to the reduction are controlled by different implicit subjects. The subject of the for-to-infinitival construction is *the letter,* while the subject of the other infinitive is the same as that in the principal clause. Hathaway illustrates the presence of the two adverbial clauses in (20) by means of the following sentence: *I am waiting until your letter arrives before I answer your questions.* However, the scholar’s suggestion should not be taken for granted, as on the basis of what was said above another source clause seems to be possible, namely: *I am waiting until your letter arrives in order to answer your questions.* If we regard the latter as the clause the reduced predications originated from, then one of the infinitives (i.e. *to answer your questions*) is the result of a clause of purpose. As for the structure of (20), it is presented below:

(20) I’m waiting *for your letter to arrive to answer your questions.* (Hathaway, 1967: 218)

S + V + for-to-Inf + Inf +DOC

(21) and (22) differ from the rest of the examples with infinitival small clauses in that they both contain a passive matrix verb. Having undergone the passive transformation, the main clauses of the two have lost their explicit agent-subjects (See Hathaway, 1967: 218). The lost subjects of the purpose infinitives, nevertheless, can still be inferred from the rest of the passive sentences. They actually occupy subject position. However, (21) and (22) are
not analogous cases of infinitival small clauses following a passive matrix verb. Let us first have a glimpse at their active counterparts:

(21a) They arranged the meeting to clear the air.

\[ S + V(\text{active}) + \text{DOC}(n) + \text{Inf}(\text{purpose}) + \text{DOC}_{inf} \]

(22a) They required him to walk a tightrope.

\[ S + V(\text{active}) + \text{IOC}^{10} + \text{Inf}(\text{DOC}) + \text{DOC}_{inf} \]

The subject of (21) was originally the direct object of (21a), while the subject of (22) originated from an indirect object, as shown in (22a). The reason for that is the impossibility to form a semantically valid active sentence with the direct objective complement of (22a) in the subject position. Consider (22b) and (22c) below:

(22b) *To walk a tightrope was required from him.

(22c) *A tightrope was required to be walked (by him).

It should be noted that it is only with the matrix verb in the passive that (21) and (22) appear to be structurally identical:

(21) The meeting was arranged to clear the air. (Hathaway, 1967: 218)

\[ S + V(\text{passive}) + \text{Inf}(\text{purpose}) + \text{DOC}_{inf} \]

(22) He was required to walk a tightrope. (Hathaway, 1967: 218)

\[ S + V(\text{passive}) + \text{Inf}(\text{DOC}) + \text{DOC}_{inf} \]

As far as (23) and (24) are concerned, the infinitives here stand next to nouns and depend upon them. However, in the former clause the infinitive functions as a direct objective complement in respect to the noun desire, while in the latter one the infinitive serves as a reduced clause of purpose. The reduced predication His desire to sleep derives from He desired to sleep where the syntactic function of the infinitive is also that of a direct objective complement. As for the included predication His trip to town to buy some wine, it might have originated from He took a trip to town so that he could buy some wine, the underlined part of which is a subordinate clause of purpose. Both in (23) and (24) the included predications perform the subject function with regard to the matrix verb. Consider their structures shown below:

(23) His desire to sleep surprised her.

\[ S(\text{pron} + n(+\text{derived})^{11} + \text{Inf}(\text{DOC})) + V + \text{DOC} \]

(24) His trip to town to buy some wine was adventurous.

\[ S(\text{pron} + n(-\text{derived}) + \text{Inf}(\text{purpose}) + \text{DOC}_{inf}) + \text{Cop} + \text{PrA} \]

---

10 The abbreviation IOC here stands for the grammatical term Indirect Objective Complement.

11 (+derived) here stands for the fact that a noun has been derived from a corresponding verb; (-derived) serves to indicate that a noun has not undergone any derivational processes.
(25) is the last of the cluster of the examples given on pages 9-10 that is to be discussed now. Here, as well as in (23) and (24), the infinitive of the small clause follows a noun, but it already represents a reduced relative clause (i.e. *I need a house which I could rent*). Unfortunately, infinitives that occur in the process of the reduction of relative clauses are, as a rule, highly ambiguous. It is not clear from (25) what controls the infinitive, the subject of the matrix verb, or the predicative noun that precedes it. The structure of the clause may be reflected as follows:

(25) I need *a house to rent.*

\begin{align*}
S + V + \text{PrN(DOC)} + \text{Inf}
\end{align*}

Example sentences (10) to (25) analysed above are the cases when the infinitive appeared owing to the reduction of object, degree, purpose, relative, or adverbial clauses, and remained present in all the clauses in question.

In the process of the embedding of a clause in the matrix clause, the infinitive may be dropped. Consider the sentences below:

(26) Ted considers *her a flirt.*

Cf. *Ted considers + She is a flirt → Ted considers her to be a flirt → Ted considers her a flirt.*

(27) Ted made *her angry.*

(28) I thought *him a good catch.* (Hathaway, 1967: 223)

(29) They thought *me home.*

(30) He found *the resulting product of high quality.* (Hathaway, 1967: 223)

(31) We painted *the barn red.* (Hathaway, 1967: 224)

(32) We washed *the windows clean.* (Hathaway, 1967: 225)

(33) a. Ted considers *her a bore.*

b. Ted considers *her as a bore.*

(34) It is necessary *for you to telephone home right away.* (Hathaway, 1967: 227)

(35) We find it important *for you to be here.* (Hathaway, 1967: 227)

(36) My wish is *for you to go home.* (Hathaway, 1967: 228)

(37) It was polished with wax *for its surface to shine.*

(26) is a further reduction of *Ted considers her to be a flirt* which is a clause with a reduced infinitival predication. The reduction is characterized by the omission of the copula, i.e. *to be.* It usually happens when a copula stands between the subject and the predicative complement. It should be noted that “in pure copula predication it is the predicate complement that is the predicator with lexical content” (Hathaway, op. cit., 225).
Since (26) is an example of a double reduction, its structure differs from that of the infinitival small clauses analysed earlier. The subject-part *her* of the reduced predication *her a flirt* is, in fact, of double valence. On the one hand, it performs the syntactic function of a direct object in respect to the matrix verb. On the other hand, it serves as a subject with regard to the predicate part of the included clause (*a flirt*). Consider the structural representation of (26) below:

(26) Ted considers her a flirt.

\[ S + V + COC^{12} (S + PrN) \]

The following example, (27), originates from *Ted made her be / feel angry*. In the process of a further reduction a copula or a raising verb has been dropped (for more information on infinitival small clauses with the infinitive deleted, see Park, Myung-Kwan).

(27) is structurally somewhat similar to (26), except that the predicate part of the included clause in the former one is occupied by an adjective. :

(18) Ted made her angry.

\[ S + V + COC (S + PrA) \]

The structure of (28) corresponds to that of (26):

(28) I thought *him a good catch*. (Hathaway, 1967: 223)

\[ S + V + COC (S + PrN) \]

The predicate part of the embedded predication in (29) differs from those in earlier examples in that it is represented by an adverb of place. Here, as well as in other reduced predications presently discussed, the copula has been deleted. Thus, instead of *They thought me to be home* we have *They thought me home*. Consider its structure below:

(29) They thought *me home*.

\[ S + V + COC (S + Pr(adv)) \]

As can be seen from the structural representation of (30) below, the predicate part of its small clause is occupied by a prepositional phrase of attributive nature:

(30) He found *the resulting product of high quality*. (Hathaway, 1967: 223)

\[ S + V + COC (S + Pr(PrepPh)) \]

It should be of interest to point out that the subject-parts of the included predications in clauses like 17-21 become the subjects of the matrix verb in the process of passivization. The predicate part of the small clause then becomes the so-called retained object (See Hathaway, 1967: 223). Structurally, it may be reflected as follows:

x. I found *the novel interesting*.

\[ S + V(\text{active}) + COC (S + PrA) \]

---

12 The abbreviation *COC* here represents the grammatical term *Complex Objective Complement*. 
The novel was found interesting.

S + V(passive) + O(retained)

(31), unlike the examples that have just been analysed, contains a reduced clause of result in the form of the predicate part red of the included clause the barn red. Thus, the structure of the clause may be represented in the following way:

(31) We painted the barn red.

S + V + COC (S + Pr(result))

Hathaway assumes that the clause originated from two clauses with full predications: We painted the barn. The barn is (now) red (Hathaway, 1967: 224). However, having undergone the process of reduction, both the constituents of the small clause came to be ambivalent. The barn is both the object of the matrix verb (painted) and the subject of the predicative adjective (red). Red seems to function adverbially with regard to the matrix verb, and attributively with regard to the subject part of the included predication.

Structurally and semantically (32) is analogous with (31):

(32) We washed the windows clean. (Hathaway, op. cit., 225)

S + V + COC (S + Pr(result))

The type of reduction of the infinitive phrase is also illustrated in (33) (a, b, c). All the three clauses are synonymous, i.e. (33a) is an example of a double reduction of a full predication, (33b) is a clause that has retained its reduced infinitival clause, and (33c) contains the particle as¹³ and represents the third option of the small clause.

(33) a. Ted (S) considers (V) her (S-part) a bore (Pr-part(n)).

b. Ted (S) considers (V) her (S-part) to be (Inf) a bore (Pr-part(n)).

c. Ted (S) considers (V) her (S-part) as (part) a bore (Pr-part(n)).

The remaining four clauses of this cluster ((34)-(37)) have to do with the for-to-infinitival construction. A for-to-infinitival construction occurs within the range of a small clause when the subject of the infinitive performs other syntactic functions than those of a direct objective complement or adjunct. The construction under discussion serves as a substitute for noun clauses, adverbial or relative clauses. As far as the substitution of reduced nominal clauses by for-to-infinitival constructions is concerned, the construction may occupy the positions of a subject of the matrix verb (as in (34)), a subject-part of a complex object included clause (as in (35)), or as a predicative complement (as in (36)). In

¹³ Transformational grammarians recognize the copulative function of the particle “as” as a marker of predication between the object and its complement. Traditionalists do not share the view of transformationalists regarding the copulative use of the particle. (Hathaway, 1967, 226,227)
(34) the construction as the subject of the main clause is introduced by the introductory subject it. In (35), however, it acts more like the so-called proxy.

For-to-infinitival constructions, as it has already been mentioned above, may replace reduced adverbial clauses of time, condition, purpose, and degree. (37) illustrates the replacement of a reduced adverbial clause of purpose. It has presumably been derived from It was polished with wax so that its surface would shine.

**Gerundial small clauses**

The functional range of gerunds and participles, however, is not as wide as that of infinitives, which are capable of replacing gerunds and participles in the majority of constructions. The latter, in their turn, are devoid of such ability (Hathaway, 1967: 229). Thus the discussion of gerunds and participles as constituents of small clauses is not going to be as exhaustive as that of infinitives.

The following cluster of examples illustrates the use of gerunds (in (38)) and abstract nouns (in (39) – (43)) embedded in predications:

(38) *His decision* astonished everyone.
(39) *The serenity of nature* fascinates me.
(40) *Ted’s accomplishment of the task* was quick.
(41) *Ted’s up-bringing* lacked strictness.
(42) *His portrayal* seemed plausible.
(43) *His arrival* with a son was unexpected.

According to Hathaway (op. cit., 242), the predicate part of a reduced predication can be occupied by a gerund (if in the process of reduction the matrix verb cannot be reduced into a noun), or by an abstract noun derived either from a verb or from a predicative adjective. Thus, the predicate part of the included predication in (38) is an example of an abstract noun derived from the verb *decide*, while the abstract noun occupying a corresponding position in (39) is undoubtedly a derivative of the predicative adjective *serene*. Originally, the clauses were phrased as follows: *He decided (something). It astonished everyone. / Nature is serene. This quality fascinates me.* It should be noted that the of-phrase in (39) can be replaced by a reduced predication consisting of the subjective genitive of the noun *nature* followed by the abstract noun *serenity*: *Nature’s serenity fascinates me.*

The reduced predication in (40) contains a proper noun in the genitive case as the subject of the small clause, an abstract noun derivative from a verb and an object of the

---

14 Hathaway (1967) prefers to call the introductory “it” a “dummy”.

preposition. The whole clause can be transformed back into the source clause: *Ted quickly accomplished the task*. The transformation makes it possible to notice that predicative adjectives become adverbs in such cases.

(41) serves as an illustration of the fact that not all verbs can derive abstract nouns. Gerunds appear instead.

The small clause of the following clause, i.e. (42), is ambiguous because of the dubious nature of its subject-part *his* which can be regarded either as an objective genitive derived from *Someone portrayed him* (obj), or as a subjective genitive that originated from *He (S) portrayed someone*.

The included predication *his arrival with his son* (in (43)) is the result of the reduction of *He arrived with his son*. Here, just as in (38), the abstract noun in the predicate position of the reduced predication is a verb derivative.

Hathaway (op. cit., 240) quotes Lees’s ambiguous examples with gerunds and their interpretations:

(44) *His drawing* fascinated me because he always did it lefthanded.

The phrase *his drawing* that occupies the position of the subject of the clause is an embedded predication, the primary predications being marked by the verbs *fascinate* and *do* in the past simple tense. The adjunct (adverbial) *always* points to a generalization. Since the whole clause is a generalization, the meaning of *his drawing* here is that of *whenever he drew*. However, taken out of context, the construction *his drawing* is semantically far from being generalizing, for it does not possess a tense marker.

Another Lees’s example of ambiguity in gerundial reduced predication quoted by Hathaway is phrased as follows:

(45) *His drawing* fascinated me because I didn’t know he could be persuaded so easily.

The fact that he had been persuaded to draw something implies that his drawing was not his regular activity. Apparently, it was a single action rather than a habit. Even though the small clause employed in (45) is grammatically identical with that used in (44), the meaning of the two differs significantly. Owing to a different context, *his drawing* in (45) no longer implies a generalization as it does in (44) (for more information on gerundial small clauses and small clauses with verbal nouns, see Siegel, 1998 and Cornilescu (a)).
Participial small clauses

As for participles, they are considered to be more typical of semi-predicative constructions\(^\text{15}\) than of small clauses (See Hathaway, 1967: 172-178). Nevertheless, it shall be of use to analyse several examples with participial phrases representing reduced predications:

(46) *Having seen John,* she hurried to the railway station.

(47) *Having bought a ticket,* Ann could go to the concert.

(48) She found *him smiling* at the photo.

Participles, like gerunds, have the category of voice and the category of order, as can be seen from the small clause included in (46). In some cases, participles may occur instead of reduced causal clauses, as (47) illustrates. The clause can then be transformed into *Since Ann bought a ticket, she went / could go to the concert.* However, it also seems possible to assume that the participle in (47) represents a reduced temporal clause (*As soon as Ann bought a ticket, she could go to the concert*) (cf. Hathaway, 1967: 174). In (48) the present participle performs an objective function within the small clause *him smiling* (for more information on participial small clauses, see Cornilescu (a) and Cornilescu (b)).

As for the semantic features of small clauses, non-finites – infinitives, gerunds, and participles – serve as predicators almost equally well. Hathaway argues that “predication is merely a movement of thought, not of the things the thought is about” (1967: 239).

Thus, for instance, the verb *refused* and the noun *refusal* may be regarded as two different ways of conveying the same idea in (49a) and (49b) below:

(49) a. *He refused* to help me.

b. *His refusal* (to help me) annoyed me.

In (49a), which is a full independent clause, we have to do with the explicit predicative relationship between the subject of the clause, expressed by the pronoun *he* in the nominative case, and the predicate, expressed by the finite form of the verb *refuse* (in the past simple). Unlike (49)a, which contains a primary predication only, (49b) is an example of a reduced predication embedded in the primary predication. The subject of the latter clause *his refusal (to help me)* is, in fact, a small clause with the nominal element in the form of the possessive pronoun *his* and the verbal element, expressed by the abstract noun *refusal* that was initially derived from the verb *refuse,* i.e. here we have to do with a

\(^\text{15}\) Semi-predicative constructions occur in the form of a complex objective complement, or a complex subject the elements of which display predicative behaviour.
small clause of the so-called second rank. The nominal and the verbal elements of the small clause in question share a predicative relationship. However, (49b) as a whole is undoubtedly a clause with a primary predication, as well. Instead of two clauses with full predications (i.e. *He refused to help me. It/the fact annoyed me*), we have one clause with two kinds of predication. It should be noted that even though one of the predications was reduced so as to become part of another predication, semantically it has retained its initial predicative force.

All finite verbs have the grammatical categories of tense, while gerunds, infinitives, participles and abstract nouns derived from verb bases do not have the ability of signalling tense. Thus, semantically a predication within a small clause is quite often ambiguous. Duffley (2000: 2) argues that it is wrong to believe that the to-infinitive, for instance, serves to express only something potential or hypothetical and that it always contains a future-tense operator.

Duffley (op. cit., 2) makes an attempt to prove that a to-infinitive may also imply the realization of its event. According to Duffley, the to-infinitive is a prepositional phrase that acts as a result specifier with respect to the matrix verb. The particle *to* is considered to be a preposition that denotes the relation of the infinitive to the matrix verb, similar to the preposition *at* which serves to relate the noun *purse* and the verb *grabbed* in the clause *He grabbed at her purse* (Duffley, op. cit.,: 2). The example below serves as a basis for further explanation of Duffley’s ideas:

(50) He longed to leave home.

The matrix verb in the example above is said to express a before-position event with respect to the infinitive which, in its turn, expresses an after-position event with respect to the matrix verb’s event. The so-called preposition *to* here means a movement in terms of time and makes the transition from the matrix verb to the infinitive possible. However, whether the movement is realized in the infinitive or not yet, largely depends on the meaning of the matrix verb itself, as becomes obvious from (51a) and (51b):

(51) a. I *wanted* to go abroad.
   b. I *managed* to go abroad.

In (51a) the movement from the matrix verb to the goal manifested in the infinitive can only be regarded as possible in the future, while from (51b) it is clear that the infinitival event has already been realized. Hence, Duffley (op. cit., 2) manages to prove that an infinitive, being deprived of the grammatical category of tense, can be not only a means of...

---

16 The present paper will only be concerned with small clauses of the first rank (e.g. I heard *him refuse*); consequently, such constructions as in (49b) will not be analysed in great detail.
expressing possible future events, but also an implication of the result of the event in the matrix verb. Briefly speaking, its temporal or resultative implication depends on the nature of the matrix verb.

However, Duffley’s approach to the infinitival marker *to* seems to be rather arguable. Whatever its origin, there is no point in going so deeply into the analysis of the meaning of *to*, as such treatment of the particle will only evoke unnecessary ambiguity.

In fact, most grammarians adhere to the view that the particle *to* is an analytic particle: originally a preposition, in the course of history it came to be the marker of the infinitive. However, Duffley argues that if the opinion of the latter is true, then to-infinitives should be regarded as nouns functioning as “objects of prepositions”. Nevertheless, later the linguist agrees that the treatment of *to* as a preposition actually causes quite a serious confusion, for the presence or absence of *to*, as has already been pointed out above, largely depends on the verb of the matrix clause. For instance, modal verbs, verbs of inducement and the like are followed by unmarked infinitives.

As far as the matrix verbs are concerned, the problem of their meaning was quite widely discussed by Karttunen already in 1971. The American scholar suggests dividing English verbs (that take infinitival direct objective complements which in the present paper are to be considered parts of the verbal predicate) into “implicative” and “non-implicative” (“factive”) verbs. Before proceeding to the discussion about the semantic differences between implicative and non-implicative verbs, it is necessary to define the terms *proposition* and *presupposition*. The propositional component, according to Karttunen (1971: 350), carries the illocutionary force of the clause, and the presuppositional component expresses the unstated beliefs of the speaker that underlie the proposition.

Clauses with an implicative matrix verb are held to contain a presupposition of some necessary condition which determines whether the event described in the direct objective

---

17 The problem of classification, as Duffley calls it, is further discussed in his article. The linguist analyses cases where it appears to be difficult to distinguish between an infinitive without its marker and the finite verbs that are homonymous with their infinitives. For instance, in the sentence “I made him go” the verb “go”, as argued by Duffley, can be either an unmarked infinitive or a finite verb. In the present paper it is to be regarded as an infinitive without the particle “to”.

18 Karttunen prefers the term “complement” to the term “direct object”; however, in order to avoid ambiguity, the latter will be used throughout the present paper.

19 In Yule’s terms, a presupposition is “something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance” (1996: 25). It should be noted that presuppositions are characteristic of speakers, not sentences. Besides, presuppositions may not necessarily be true. For instance, the speaker’s presuppositions regarding the clause *Tom’s sister has written three letters* might be like the following: a person called Tom exists; he has a sister; his sister can write; Tom has only one sister, etc. In the literature, presupposition is frequently considered to be a relationship between two propositions. Let us have a glimpse at the examples below:

(52) a. Tom’s friend is tall.
   b. Tom has a friend.

It is obvious that (52a) presupposes (52b). Hence, the relationship between two clauses.
complement of the clause took place. Non-implicative matrix verbs are devoid of any such
presupposition.

Karttunen (op. cit., 341) provides a list of implicative and non-implicative verbs and
phrases. See the table below:

| IMPLICATIVE VERBS AND PHRASES | Manage, remember, bother, get, dare, care, venture, condescend, happen, see fit, be careful, have the misfortune, have the sense, take the time, take the opportunity, take the trouble, take it upon oneself; |
| NON-IMPLICATIVE VERBS AND PHRASES | Agree, decide, want, hope, promise, plan, intend, try\(^{20}\), be likely, be eager, be ready, have in mind. |

It is from the meaning of implicative matrix verbs that we realize whether the
infinitival event has been fulfilled, and under what spatial and temporal circumstances
(Karttunen, 1971). The difference under discussion is illustrated especially clearly below,
where (53a) is a clause containing an implicative verb in the predicate, and (53b) is a clause
with a non-implicative matrix verb:

\[(53) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Ann managed to make a speech.} & \quad = \acute{\alpha}. \text{Ann made a speech.} \\
\text{b. Ann hoped to make a speech.} & \quad \neq \acute{\alpha}. \text{Ann made a speech.}
\end{align*} \]

Karttunen (ibid. p. 342) believes that the meaning of (53\(\alpha\)) is included in (53a), owing
to the implicative nature of the verb manage. In fact, it seems to be rather difficult to
believe that the proposition expressed by (53a) is true and to doubt regarding the
truthfulness of (53\(\alpha\)). As for (53b), there are no grounds to assume that the event of making
a speech took place, since the verb hope is incapable of implying any belief in the truth of
its infinitive as part of the verbal predicate.

Karttunen also suggests a way of testing the felicity of his argumentation by adding a
negative clause to the clauses with implicative and non-implicative predicates. Consider
(54a) and (54b) below:

\[(54) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. *Ann managed to make a speech, but she didn’t make it.} \\
\text{b. Ann hoped to make a speech, but she didn’t make it.}
\end{align*} \]

\(^{20}\) The verb “try” can only be considered non-implicative provided it is followed by an infinitive (e.g. Ann tried to open the tin). When followed by a gerund, it becomes an implicative verb (cf. Ann tried opening the tin).
(54a) obviously contradicts itself, for the verb *manage* implies the accomplishment of the speech-making event, while the negative clause *she didn’t make it* states quite the opposite. The other clause, i.e. (54b), produces no impression of contradiction.

Karttunen (1971: 342) agrees with the linguists who claim that the infinitive as part of the compound verbal predicate after a non-implicative matrix verb contains a future-tense operator or a modal, not the past simple tense that is generally characteristic of the infinitival counterparts that follow implicative verbs. However, it does not necessarily follow that a clause with a non-implicative verb like *hope* presupposes the fulfillment of the event described in the infinitive, as can be seen from the following example:

(55) Ann hoped to make a speech. ≠ *Ann will make a speech.*

Another example is also semantically invalid:

(56) *Ann hoped to make a speech, but she will not make it.*

All that has been said above leads us to the assumption that if the clause with an implicative matrix verb is true as a whole, its infinitive as part of the compound verbal predicate must also be considered true. Clauses with non-implicative predicates are devoid of any implicative relationship between the main verb and its infinitive (Karttunen, op. cit., 343). Thus, (53a) is undoubtedly implied by (53a), but not by (53b).

It is obvious that Karttunen shares Duffley’s belief that a to-infinitive does not always contain a future-tense operator and that the temporal or resultative meaning of an infinitive is a matter of the influence of the matrix verb, which is either implicative or non-implicative.

As far as the temporal nature of the *gerund* is concerned, it can express something that is future, simultaneous, or prior with regard to the event of the matrix verb (Duffley, op. cit., 5). However, Duffley argues that gerund, unlike the infinitive, does not involve temporality, and that “any temporal relation between the events expressed by the –ing and the main verb is simply a logical implication based on the latter’s lexical meaning”. The gerund acquires a temporal implication only due to the lexical meaning of the matrix verb and the syntactic function of the gerund (Duffley, ibid. p. 6). Thus, the grammatical category of tense does not impact the gerund or infinitive directly (non-finites have no category of tense). Consider the examples in the table below:

| (57) a. I am considering taking German lessons. | FUTURE |
| (57) b. I enjoy taking German lessons. | SIMULTANEITY |

26
(57) c. I remember / regret taking German lessons.

Having presented a general view on the classification, syntax and semantics of small clauses, it should be noted that for the limitation of space of the present paper, our attention will further be focused on infinitival small clauses as used by Ernest Hemingway in the novel “A Farewell to Arms”.
3. THE SYNTACTIC TYPES OF INFINITIVAL SMALL CLAUSES IN ERNEST HEMINGWAY’S NOVEL “A FAREWELL TO ARMS”

3.1. Introductory observations

This part of the present paper focuses on the syntactic types of the infinitival small clauses present in Ernest Hemingway’s novel “A Farewell to Arms”. The number of examples with infinitives as parts of embedded predications in the novel exceeded eight hundred (816). In the novel “A Farewell to Arms”, the author predominantly used the infinitival embedded predications that served to replace reduced objective clauses, adverbial clauses of purpose, condition, result, and relative clauses. It goes without saying that the types of infinitival small clauses enumerated above were not the only ones met in the said novel. There were also reduced adverbial clauses of comparison, cause, and time. However, the latter were not numerous enough to be discussed in the present paper, for altogether they accounted for 22 cases (out of 816).

3.2. Reduced objective clauses

Objective clauses embedded in other clauses by means of the infinitive had the highest level of occurrence in the novel under discussion, i.e. 393 cases. In 194 cases, embedded objective clauses were represented by infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after verbs expressing material processes. In 139 cases, reduced objective clauses occurred in the form of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after verbs expressing mental processes (predominantly, mental processes of perception and cognition). In 39 out of 393 cases of the reduced objective clauses, the matrix verb preceding the infinitival small clause was that of saying. 24 reduced objective clauses were represented by infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after an adjective (See Table 1).

As far as infinitival embedded predications derived from objective clauses are concerned, it will be of use to have a look at a couple of examples below, with the source clause suggested and the embedded predication being italicized:

(58) (... I can’t recommend you to try that wine. (Hemingway, 2006: 111)
Source: I can’t recommend that you should try that wine.

(59) The moon was supposed to rise (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 124)
Source: It was supposed that the moon would rise.

Reduced objective clauses in the form of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after verbs of mental processes could be illustrated by the following examples:

(60) I saw the nurse look at me strangely. (Hemingway, 2006: 314)
Source: I saw that the nurse looked at me strangely.

(61) I remember it [Caporetto] as a little white town (…). (Hemingway, 2006: 160)

Source: I remembered that it was a little white town.

(62) (…) you would find the environs attractive. (Hemingway, 2006: 274)

Source: You would find that the environs are attractive.

Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after verbs of saying also serve to represent reduced objective clauses. Consider:

(63) I would have to tell them [the waiters] not to put ice in the whiskey. (Hemingway, 2006: 297)

Source: I would have to tell the waiters that they should not put ice in the whiskey.

(64) I order you to come back (…). (Hemingway, 2006: 199)

Source: I order that you come back.

Last but not least, as far as reduced objective clauses are concerned, they were also represented by infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after an adjective. The following two examples serve to illustrate such cases:

(65) It isn’t good for you to drink alone. (Hemingway, 2006: 91)

Source: It isn’t good that you drink alone.

(66) (…) it was unseemly for a nurse to be seen unchaperoned with a patient who did not look as though he needed attendance (…). (Hemingway, 2006: 116)

Source: It was unseemly that a nurse would be seen unchaperoned with a patient who did not look as though he needed attendance²¹.

3.3. Reduced adverbial clauses of purpose

There was a considerable number of reduced adverbial clauses of purpose found in Ernest Hemingway’s novel, even though they were not as high in number as reduced objective clauses. The former accounted for 201 cases, 168 of which were represented by infinitival embedded predications following verbs that expressed material processes, and 23 following adjectives (See Table 2).

The infinitival embedded predication with the infinitive preceded by a verb denoting material processes that originated from the reduction of an adverbial clause of purpose is illustrated by (67) and (68) below:

(67) Crowell (…) kept track of all the horses for something to do. (Hemingway, 2006: 126)

²¹ In order to see the proportional relationship of the reduced objective clauses discussed above, see Appendix 4.
Source: Crowell kept track of all the horses in order to have something to do.

(68) For a foreigner to hunt he must present a certificate that had never been arrested. (Hemingway, 2006: 77)

Source: In order to hunt, a foreigner must present a certificate that he had never been arrested.

It should be noted that (68) might also have been derived from the adverbial clause of condition if a foreigner wants to hunt, he must present a certificate that he had never been arrested.

Reduced adverbial clauses of purpose in the form of infinitival embedded predications with the infinitive after a noun were reflected in the following examples:

(69) (...) I did not have strength to pull myself up (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 222)

Source: I did not have strength in order to pull myself up.

(70) It takes a long time to be [a V.A.D.]. (Hemingway, 2006: 30)

Source: It takes a long time in order to be a V.A.D.

3.4. Reduced adverbial clauses of result

In the majority of (i.e. in 71) cases the so-called resultative small clauses of double relations served to represent reduced adverbial clauses of result in the said novel. The matrix verb of all the clauses containing a resultative small clause expressed material processes. Let us have a closer look at the examples below and compare them to their source clauses:

(71) We could pry a board loose and see out of the south window (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 211)

Source: We could pry a board so that it would be loose and see out of the south window.

(72) He [the proprietor] filled the glass with grappa from a short bottle. (Hemingway, 2006: 230)

Source: He filled the glass from a short bottle so that it was filled with grappa.

(73) (...) the carabiniere put his hands on my collar. (Hemingway, 2006: 227)

Source: The carabiniere put his hands so that they were on my collar.

---

22 V.A.D. stands for Voluntary Aid Department.

23 In order to compare the proportions of the reduced adverbial clauses of purpose analysed above, see Appendix 5.

24 For comparison of the number of the reduced adverbial clauses of result with the number of other types of small clauses, see Appendix 6.
3.5. Reduced adverbial clauses of condition

Among other types, there were infinitival embedded predications that served to replace reduced adverbial clauses of condition. In the novel “A Farewell to Arms” we found 29 cases of such embedded predications, with the infinitive preceded by an adjective. Consider the examples of reduced adverbial clauses of condition together with their source clauses:

(74) (...) it will be easier *for you to talk English*. (Hemingway, 2006: 251)

*Source:* It will be easier for you if you talk English.

(75) It would be false *for you to deny that* [there is winter sport at Montreux]. (Hemingway, 2006: 273)

*Source:* It would be false if you denied that there is winter sport at Montreux.25

3.6. Reduced relative clauses

Infinitival embedded predications with the infinitive preceded by a noun or a pronoun predominantly serve to represent reduced relative clauses. The frequency of occurrence of reduced relative clauses was as high as 100 cases. The novel in question contained 49 reduced relative clauses with the infinitive following a pronoun, and 51 clauses with the infinitive following a noun. Consider the infinitival embedded predications below and the relative clauses they may have been derived from:

(76) I did not see a place to sit (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 316)

*Source:* I did not see a place where I could sit.

(77) I have known many men to escape the front through self-inflicted wounds. (Hemingway, 2006: 143)

*Source:* I have known many men who escaped the front through self-inflicted wounds.

(78) They had no guns to lose or forget about. (Hemingway, 2006: 226)

*Source:* They had no guns which they could lose or forget about.26

3.7. Reduced clauses of other types

As already mentioned above, infinitival embedded predications of other types were found in 22 cases in the novel “A Farewell to Arms”. Besides the types of reduced adverbial clauses discussed earlier, Ernest Hemingway used reduced adverbial clauses of

---

25 To compare the number of the reduced adverbial clauses of condition with regard to the number of other types of small clauses, see Appendix 6.

26 In order to compare the number of the reduced relative clauses with respect to the number of other types of small clauses typical of the novel, see Appendix 6.
time (in (79)), cause (reason) (in (80) and (81)), and comparison (in (82)). Consider the said types of reduced adverbial clauses and compare them to their tentative source clauses presented below:

(79) He [Count Greffi] waited for me to sit down. (Hemingway, 2006: 252)
Source: He waited until I sat down.

(80) I (…) instantly felt a fool to mention death. (Hemingway, 2006: 153)
Source: I instantly felt a fool because I mentioned death.

(81) What reason is there for her [Catherine] to die? (Hemingway, 2006: 318)
Source: What reason is there why she should die?

(82) The priest accepted it as a joke. (Hemingway, 2006: 13)
Source: The priest accepted it as if it were a joke.27

4. THE SEMANTIC AND STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF INFINITIVAL SMALL CLAUSES

4.1. Introductory observations

This part of the present paper focuses on the semantic and structural features of the infinitival small clauses present in Ernest Hemingway’s novel “A Farewell to Arms”. As far as the structure of the infinitival small clauses is concerned, in the majority of cases the infinitive followed verbs, expressing material, mental (verbs of perception, of cognition, and affectivity), and verbal processes. The infinitive was also found in constructions with adjectives, nouns, indefinite pronouns, and in resutative small clauses of double relations (e.g. He painted the barn red). Let us now move on to the semantic and structural analysis of infinitival embedded predications typical of the novel under discussion.

4.2. Small clauses with infinitives after verbs

It is commonly known that verbs serve to express various processes: material, happening, mental, verbal, relational, and existential. The process is believed by most linguists to be of primary importance in the sentence. All other components build around it and depend upon it. However, small clauses are believed by most linguists to follow predominantly mental and material (causative) verbs. Less frequently embedded predications occur after verbs of saying.

27 To see the proportional relationship between the reduced adverbial clauses in question and other types of small clauses, see Appendix 6.
4.2.1. Small clauses with infinitives after mental verbs

As far as the verbs of mental processes typical of the said novel are concerned, Ernest Hemingway used infinitival embedded predications with mental verbs of perception (such as see, look, watch, hear, listen, sound, smell, taste, and feel), cognition (such as suppose, find, consider, remember, forget, remind, mean, expect, hope, and know), and affection (such as love, like, dislike, hate, want, wish, etc.). For the sake of clarity, the infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after verbs expressing the three types of mental processes will be analysed separately.

4.2.1.1. Small clauses with infinitives after mental verbs of perception

In clauses based on mental processes, the participant in the subject (S) position has no influence upon the situation, as a rule. In fact, he or she could be considered as a Recipient Experiencer, or even an Affected Patient, for he or she is actually affected by the process in the matrix verb. Let us consider the following example from Ernest Hemingway’s novel “A Farewell to Arms”, the infinitival embedded predication being italicized:

(83) (...) I saw a street-car cross a bridge. (Hemingway, 2006: 148)

S + Pr + COC [n + Bare Inf + O]

It is evident that the subject I can hardly be regarded as the Agent of the sentence, for the process of seeing is non-volitional. Semantically, the nominal part (a street-car) of the small clause a street-car cross a bridge in the form of a Complex Objective Complement (COC) that functions as the direct objective complement of the matrix clause is considered to be the Phenomenon and represents Rhematic, or new, information in the sentence. The semantic structure of (83) could be represented as follows:

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Perception + Phenomenon + Effected Patient (dispositive)

Syntactically, the Complex Objective Complement in (83) consists of a noun (n) preceded by a determiner, an unmarked (or bare) infinitive (BareInf), and an object of the infinitive (O), i.e. a bridge. The nominal part of the Complex Objective Complement (COC) is a kind of subject of the infinitive within the embedded predication. The reason for the usage of an unmarked infinitive in (83) is that it follows a mental verb of perception in the active voice.

The clause in question is the result of embedding one simple clause with explicit predicative relationship (I saw a street-car.) into another (It crossed a bridge.), thus

28 The Phenomenon is an entity that is perceived or sensed by the Recipient Experiencer and ‘acts’ upon the latter by means of the mental process (Valeika, Buitkienė, 2006: 70-71).
rendering the syntactic relationship between a street-car and cross implicit or secondary. It should be noted that here we have to do with a situation that is complete, i.e. the Recipient Experiencer at subject witnessed the process of the street-car’s crossing the bridge from beginning to end\textsuperscript{29}. Besides, special mention should be given to the syntactic structure of the passivized version of (83). Consider:

(84) A street-car was seen to cross a bridge.

\[ S + \text{Pr(passive)} + S_1 \]

As can be seen from the structural representation of the syntactic constituents of the clause, having undergone the passive transformation, the infinitive retrieves its marker to and changes its syntactic function from that of the verbal part of the direct Complex Objective Complement to that of part of the complex subject \((S_1)\), the other subject part being a street-car \((S)\). The explanation for such a change lies in the grammatical rule that the direct objective complement (DOC) of the active clause becomes the subject of the passive clause. Thus, having been part of the direct objective complement, the infinitive turns out to be part of the complex subject.

The same can be said about (85) and (86), except that their passive transformations are unusual, even though grammatically possible. The two clauses could be regarded as system-clauses rather than speech-clauses. Consider:

(85) I heard the door open (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 86)

\[ S + \text{Pr} + \text{COC} \ [n + \text{BareInf}] \]

\[ \ast \text{The door was heard to open.} \]

(86) (...) I felt a rib snap (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 263)

\[ S + \text{Pr} + \text{COC} \ [n + \text{BareInf}] \]

\[ \ast \text{A rib was felt to snap.} \]

A similar analysis could be applied to (87) and (88), where the nominal part of the direct Complex Objective Complement is expressed by a pronoun \((\text{pron})\) in the objective case, not a noun. Consider:

(87) I saw you sew up [the belly]. (Hemingway, 2006: 313)

\[ S + \text{Pr} + \text{COC} \ [\text{pron} + \text{BareInf}] \]

(88) I felt her [the girl] stiffen away when I touched her. (Hemingway, 2006: 191)

\[ S + \text{Pr} + \text{COC} \ [\text{pron} + \text{BareInf}] \]

It should be noted that such verbs as look, listen, and watch, unsurprisingly to other mental verbs of perception, generally represent volitional processes and have an Agent in the

\textsuperscript{29} As already pointed out, an incomplete situation, or a situation that is still in progress, is represented in clauses by the present participle. Cf: ‘I saw a street-car cross a bridge’ and ‘I saw a street-car crossing a bridge’.
subject position of the clause instead of a Recipient Experiencer (Valeika, Buitkienë, 2006: 71). However, it is not the only peculiarity of the sentence that follows. In (89), we have to do with a verb in the imperative mood in the active voice. Consequently, the primary subject of the clause is omitted. Besides, the passive transformation of the clause in question is hardly possible even grammatically, even though the syntactic structure coincides with that of (87) and (88). Consider:

(89) Look at it snow. (Hemingway, 2006: 288)

(S) + Pr + COC [pron + BareInf]

*It was looked at to snow.

The semantic structure of (89) could be presented as follows:

(Agent) + Mental Process of Perception + Affected Patient

Both the syntactic and semantic structures of (90) are very close to those of (89), except that the former clause is in the indicative mood, and the subject position of the embedded clause is occupied by a proper name. Consider the syntactic and semantic structures of the following clause:

(90) I (…) watched Catherine row. (Hemingway, 2006: 266)

S + Pr + COC [ProperName + BareInf]

(Agent) + Mental Process of Perception + Affected Patient

The following example with an infinitival embedded clause after a mental verb of perception serves to illustrate a slightly different picture of the syntactic structure of the clause. Unlike all the examples above, in (91) the embedded predication her move depends directly on the direct objective complement (to watch) of the matrix verb (like) in the predicate (Pr) position, not on the matrix verb itself. A passive transformation of (91) is also unlikely, for mental verbs expressing affectivity are not generally passivized. Consider:

(91) I liked to watch her [Catherine] move. (Hemingway, 2006: 37)

S + Pr + DOC + COC [pron + BareInf]

*She was liked to be watched to move.

*To watch her move was liked.

In (92) the embedded infinitival clause in the form of the Complex Objective Complement consists of a Nominal Phrase (NomPh), a Bare Infinitive, and an Adverbial Adjunct of Direction (Dir). The Nominal Phrase performs the function of the subject of the infinitive, which in its turn serves as a predicate within the construction. As for the Adverbial Adjunct of Direction, it represents the Circumstance of the action expressed by the unmarked infinitive come in the small clause his breath come toward me. Consider:
(92) I felt his [Rinaldi’s] breath come toward me. (Hemingway, 2006: 72)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + BareInf + Dir] \]

Since here we speak of a non-volitional process, the structural representation of the semantic components of the clause above is as follows:

Recipent Experiencer + Mental Process of Perception + Phenomenon +Circumstance of Direction

The following examples, (93) – (94), reveal a similar picture of the semantic and syntactic structures, except that their Complex Objective Complements are expanded by the medium of Adverbial Adjuncts of Place (Place) expressed through prepositional phrases. Consider the syntactic and semantic structures of (93) and (94) below:

(93) You (…) saw the smoke ball distort and thin in the wind. (Hemingway, 2006: 181)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + BareInf + Place] \]

Recipent Experiencer + Mental Process of Perception + Phenomenon +Circumstance of Place

(94) I watched the sudden round puffs of shrapnel smoke in the sky above a broken farmhouse. (Hemingway, 2006: 180)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + BareInf + Place] \]

Recipent Experiencer + Mental Process of Perception + Phenomenon +Circumstance of Place

Examples (95) to (97), unsimilar to (93) and (94), have no Adverbial Adjuncts. Consider:

(95) (…) I saw his [the captain’s] Adam’s apple go up and then down. (Hemingway, 2006: 157)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + BareInf] \]

(96) I felt the rain on my face turn to snow. (Hemingway, 2006: 181)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + BareInf] \]

(97) (…) we could feel our joints crack. (Hemingway, 2006: 200)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + BareInf] \]

Special mention should be given to the cluster of examples (98) to (104) which do not contain an explicit bare infinite. Nevertheless, they could be regarded as embedded infinitival clauses with the infinitive omitted from their surface structure. The infinitives, thus, lie in the deep structure of the clauses in question and can be easily retrieved. Consider the structures of the clauses below, the omitted infinitives suggested in braces:
(98) (...) I could see the big mirror {hang} on the other side of the room (...).
(Hemingway, 2006: 85)

S + Pr + COC [NomPh + {BareInf} + Place]

(99) (...) I felt her [Catherine’s] hand {lie} on my shoulder. (Hemingway, 2006: 72)
S + Pr + COC [NomPh + {BareInf} + Place]

(100) (...) we could hear the sound of a great bombardment {echo} far to the north.
(Hemingway, 2006: 181)
S + Pr + COC [NomPh + {BareInf} + Place]

(101) (...) he heard me {walk/move} in the room (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 16)
S + Pr + COC [pron + {BareInf} + Place]

(102) (...) I felt blood {coagulate} on my face (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 225)
S + Pr + COC [n + {BareInf} + Place]

(103) I (...) could feel the whole compartment {be} against me. (Hemingway, 2006: 157)
S + Pr + COC [NomPh + {BareInf} + PrepPh(Attr)]

(104) I felt it [the automatic pistol] {press} against the back of the chair.
(Hemingway, 2006: 33)
S + Pr + COC [pron + {BareInf} + Place]

It should be of interest to point out a semantic difference between the prepositional phrases in (103) and (104) with the preposition against. In (103) the prepositional phrase against me could be regarded as an Attribute restricting the Nominal Phrase the whole compartment within the embedded clause, while in (104) a similar prepositional phrase serves as an Adverbial Adjunct of Place. Let us have a look at the passive transformations of the two clauses under discussion, even though they are rather ungrammatical:

(103) *The whole compartment could have been felt {to be} against me.
(104) *It [the automatic pistol] was felt {to press} against the back of the back of the chair.

In 103 the prepositional phrase becomes a kind of a Predicative, and the prepositional phrase in 104 retains its syntactic function of an Adverbial Adjunct of Place.

The following cluster of examples differs from the previous one in that the nominal part of the Complex Objective complement in each of the clauses is followed by a Predicative Adjective (PrA) or the Past Participle (PartII), not a prepositional phrase. Here too the infinitive may be considered to lie in the deep structure of embedded clauses. However, it should be noted that in all of the cases presented below the omitted infinitive is
be. It would also be of use to have a look at the sentences such clauses originated from. Consider the syntactic structures of the clauses (105) to (109) and their source clauses:

(105) (...) we saw (...) the road bare and white (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 9)
S + Pr + COC [n + PrA]
Source: We saw that the road was bare and white.
S + Pr + OC30 [S + copula + PrA]

(106) I (...) felt it [the cognac] warm all the way down. (Hemingway, 2006: 70)
S + Pr + COC [pron + PrA + Dir]
Source: I felt that it [the cognac] was warm all the way down.
S + Pr + OC [S + copula + PrA + Dir]

(107) (...) I sometimes see you dead in it [in the rain]. (Hemingway, 2006: 125)
S + Pr + COC [pron + PartII + Place]
Source: I sometimes see that you are dead in it [in the rain].
S + Frequency31 + Pr + OC [Conj32 + S + copula + PartII + Place]

(108) (...) I watched the wound closed. (Hemingway, 2006: 313)
S + Pr + COC [noun + PartII]
Source: I watched the wound to be closed. OR I watched as the wound was closed.
S + Pr + DOC + Inf(passive) S + Pr + OC [Conj + S + Pr(passive)]

(109) (...) I had never seen anyone so beautiful. (Hemingway, 2006: 93)
S + Pr + COC [IndPron33 + Degree34 + PrA]
Source: I had never seen that anyone could be so beautiful.
S + Frequency + Pr + OC [Conj + S + copula + Degree + PrA]

As can be seen from the syntactic structures presented above, the embedded predications in question resulted from Objective Clauses in which the adjectives and past participles functioned as Predicative Complements after the copula be in Compound Nominal Predicates (except (108)). As soon as the matrix clause is merged with the Objective clause, the copula is dropped instead of transforming it into an infinitive. However, (108) deserves special attention, for it originated from an Objective Clause with a Predicate in the passive. Thus, the omitted infinitive is the result of an auxiliary be, not a copula, and the past participle closed is the notional part of the past simple passive of the
verb that was retained after the subordinate Objective Clause was embedded into the main clause.

Last but not least, as far as mental verbs of perception are concerned, it should be pointed out that if the action of the infinitive refers to the person denoted by the subject of the matrix clause, the nominal part of the embedded predication is expressed by a corresponding Reflexive Pronoun (ReflPron). However, in such a case the embedded clause can not be regarded as a Complex Objective Complement. If a reflexive pronoun were a Direct Objective Complement, it would be able to occupy the subject position of a corresponding passive clause. Besides, the entity expressed through the medium of a reflexive pronoun cannot be considered as a Phenomenon, from the semantic point of view, for the same entity can not be the Recipient Experimenter and the Phenomenon at the same time. Consider (110) and (111) below:

(110) (…) I felt myself rush bodily out of myself (…). (Hemingway, 2006: 59)
S + Pr + ReflPron + BareInf + Manner\(^{35}\) + Dir
*I was felt to rush bodily out myself.

(111) (…) I felt myself slide back. (Hemingway, 2006: 59)
S + Pr + ReflPron + BareInf
*I was felt to slide back.

The infinitival embedded predications with the infinitive preceded by a mental verb of perception occurred in the said novel in 110 cases\(^{36}\).

4.2.1.2. Small clauses with infinitives after mental verbs of cognition

As already mentioned, in the novel “A Farewell to Arms” mental processes of cognition were realized by the following verbs: *suppose, find, consider, remember, forget, remind, mean, expect, hope*, and *know*. Syntactically, in the majority of cases, secondary predications with infinitives embedded into clauses with a mental matrix verb of cognition serve to perform the grammatical function of the Direct Objective Complement of the matrix verb, the infinitive occupying the position of the verbal part within the Complex Objective Predicative. However, there are cases where in the process of the further reduction of the clause the infinitive was deleted from the surface structure of the embedded predication, but could be easily restored. On the basis of what has just been pointed out, let us now have a closer look at the syntactic and semantic structure of

---

\(^{35}\) The word *Manner* stands for the Adverbial Adjunct of Manner.

\(^{36}\) In order to see the proportional relationship of the small clauses in question with respect to other kinds of mental verbs, see Appendix 1.
embedded infinitival predication within clauses with a mental verb of cognition at the position of the matrix verb.

In (112) the embedded clause with the infinitive performs the syntactic function of the Complex Objective Complement after the mental matrix verb of cognition in the active voice. The subject of the infinitive within the small clause *it to be flatter* is realized through the pronoun *it*, and the other part of the small clause could be regarded as a kind of a Compound Nominal Predicate (CNPr) within the embedded clause. The reason for that is the fact that the infinitive *to be* is a kind of a copula, and the Predicative Adjective in the comparative degree (comp) *flatter* is a Predicative that follows the said copula and attributes the quality of being flatter to the entity expressed by the pronoun *it*. This could be best illustrated by the syntax of the source clause of (112). It is obvious that the embedded predication in question is the result of the reduction of the Object Clause (OC) *that it was flatter*. Consider:

(112) I had expected *it [Bainsizza] to be flatter* (...) (Hemingway, 2006: 177)

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + PrA(comp)]

Source: I had expected *that it [Bainsizza] was flatter*.

S + Pr + OC [S(pron) + CNPr (copula + PrA(comp)]

It should be pointed out that the infinitive can frequently serve as the Direct Objective Complement (DOC) of the matrix verb alone. However, in such a case we can hardly speak of an embedded infinitival predication within the matrix clause. Even though the infinitive is characteristic of almost all the syntactic functions typical of the noun, it alone cannot represent the implicit predicative relationship typical of the embedded predication, as can be seen from the syntactic structure of (113) below:

(113) I had expected to become devout myself (...) (Hemingway, 2006: 254)

S + Pr + DOC [Inf + PrA + ReflPron]

In (113) both the matrix verb and the infinitive refer to the same entity *I*. The situation is somewhat similar to that of (110) and (111) where the matrix verb is followed by a Reflexive Pronoun. In (113) a Reflexive Pronoun is possible but redundant. Consider (113a) and (113b) below, the latter being the result of a passive transformation:

(113a) *I had expected *myself to become devout myself* (...)  
(113b) *I had been expected by *myself to become devout myself*.

In (114) the embedded predication consists of the relative pronoun (RelPron) *what* functioning as the nominal part, and the infinitive *to do* occupying the position of the verbal part of the Complex Objective Complement. (114) could be regarded as the result of the reduction of a complex clause with a subordinate object clause, even though the matrix verb
and the infinitive refer to the same person and the passive transformation is impossible. Consider:

(114) I don’t know what to do. (Hemingway, 2006: 85)

\[ S + Pr + COC [RelPron + Inf] \]

*Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon*

Source: I don’t know what I should do.

\[ S + Pr + OC [RelPron + S + Pr] \]

*I am not known by myself what to do.*

In (115) and (116) we have to do with two interesting cases of the syntactic structure of embedded infinitival predications. The embedded predication in (115) consists of the for-to-infinitival construction (for-to-Inf) *for me to get in out of the rain,* the subject part of which functions as the Indirect Objective Complement (IOC) of the mental matrix verb of cognition *mean,* and the predicate part is realized through the medium of the marked infinitive (Inf) *to get* and the Adverbial Adjunct of Direction (Dir) *out of the rain.* Semantically, the Indirect Objective Complement *me* is not a Phenomenon but a Recipient, thus the subject of the matrix clause should be considered an Agent, not a Recipient Experiencer. For-to-infinitival constructions are believed by most linguists to result from the reduction of the adverbial clauses of time, condition, purpose, and degree. However, in the case of (115) the embedded clause presumably originated from an object clause. Consider the syntactic and semantic structures of (115), as well as the syntactic structure of its source clause:

(115) (…) she [Catherine] meant *for me to get in [into the station building] out of the rain.* (Hemingway, 2006: 156)

\[ S + Pr + COC [for-to-Inf (IOC + Inf) + Dir] \]

*Agent + Mental Process of Cognition + Recipient +Circumstance of Direction*

Source: She meant *that I should get in out of the rain.*

\[ S + Pr + OC [conj + S + Pr + Dir] \]

As far as (116) is concerned, the embedded predication includes a pronoun as its notional part, and a marked infinitive together with its object as its verbal part. The peculiarity of the sentence under discussion lies in the fact that the first of the two infinitives performs the syntactic function of the Direct Objective Complement (DOC) of the matrix verb and semantically refers to the purpose or reason of the process expressed in the matrix verb. The other infinitive of the said clause serves as the verbal part of the embedded infinitival predication *you to brush your teeth,* which in its turn depends on the Direct Objective Complement *to remind.* Consider:
(116) [I kept the old toothbrushing glass] to remind you to brush your teeth. (Hemingway, 2006: 164)

(S + Pr + DOC) + Inf (reason / purpose) + COC [pron + Inf + O]

The following four examples with embedded infinitival predications, (117) to (120), all follow a passive matrix verb that expresses a mental process of cognition. Before moving on to the structural analysis of the said clauses, consider their syntactic and semantic structures as presented below:

(117) It was forbidden to play the flute at night. (Hemingway, 2006: 77)

AntS + Pr(passive) + NotionalS(Inf) + DOC(n) + Time

Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon + Recipient Experiencer + Circumstance of Time

(118) We were supposed to wear steel helmets (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 33)

S + Pr(passive) + S₁(Inf) + DOC(NomPh)

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon

(119) He’s [Mr Meyers] supposed to have been in the penitentiary at home. (Hemingway, 2006: 124)

S + Pr(passive) + S₁(Inf) + Place + Place

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon + Circumstance of Place

(120) (...) the floorwalkers would not be expected to return (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 227)

S + Pr(passive) + S₁(Inf)

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon

It is evident that in none of the four clauses above the infinitive functions as part of the Complex Objective Complement after the matrix verb. In (117) the infinitival phrase to play the flute at night performs the syntactic function of the Notional Subject (NotionalS) extraposed with the Anticipatory Subject it (AntS). According to the Principle of Weight, longer syntactic units should occupy the final position in a clause, the subject being expressed through the medium of anticipatory it (Valeika, Buitkienė, 2006: 42). In the clauses (118) to (120), the infinitive serves to function as part of the complex subject (S₁), the other part occupying the initial position in the clause before the matrix verb. It should also be of use to have a look at the active voice counterparts and source clauses of (117) – (120):

(117a) They forbade everyone to play the flute at night.

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + O + Time]
Agent + Material Process + Affected Patient

Source: They forbade that we played the flute at night.

(118a) They supposed us to wear steel helmets.

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + O]

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon

Source: They supposed that we should wear steel helmets.

(119a) Everyone supposed him to have been in the penitentiary at home.

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf(perf) + Place + Place]

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon

Source: Everyone supposed that he had been in the penitentiary at home.

(120a) No one expected the floorwalkers to return.

S + Pr + COC [n + Inf]

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Cognition + Phenomenon

Source: No one expected that the floorwalkers would return.

The source clauses leave no doubt that the embedded infinitival predications under discussion are all reductions of objective clauses. The nominal part of the Complex Objective complement in (117a) was presumably dropped in the process of reduction. The remaining part of the embedded predication being too long to occupy the subject position, the anticipatory subject it was placed in the initial position of the passive clause. The semantic and syntactic structures of the rest of the three clauses in question are clear enough and do not require any further explanation.

The remaining examples to be analysed, as far as mental verbs of cognition go, are presented below. Clauses (121) to (124) are regarded in the literature as verbless small clauses, since the infinitive is not present in the surface structure. Consider:

(121) I thought ‘Mr. Britling’ a very good study of the English middle-class soul. (Hemingway, 2006: 252)

S + Pr + COC [IndivPh137 + NomPh]

(122) I remembered it [Caporetto] as a little white town (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 160)

S + Pr + COC [pron + particle + NomPh]

(123) You will find the climate delightful and beautiful. (Hemingway, 2006: 274)

S + Pr + COC [n + PrA]

(124) You will find all the inhabitants extremely courteous and friendly. (Hemingway, 2006: 275)

37 IndivPh represents the grammatical term Indivisible Phrase.
S + Pr + COC [NomPh + Degree + PrA]

As can be seen from the syntactic structures of (121) to (124) above, the embedded clauses resulted from reducing the objective source clauses further by deleting the infinitive *to be* from the surface structure of reduced infinitival predications. Originally, the infinitive was the copula, and the remaining part of the Compound Nominal Predicate was either a Predicative Noun or a Predicative Adjective (PrA). (121) and (122) serve to illustrate the embedded infinitival predications where the verbal part of the Complex Objective Complement is expressed by a Predicative Noun which was retained after the infinitive was dropped. On the other hand, (123) and (124) are examples of reduced infinitival predications with a Predicative Adjective as the verbal part of the Complex Objective Complement. The nominal part position of all the four small clauses ((121) – (124)) is occupied by the former subjects of the objective clauses that were later reduced to the said embedded predications.

The infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after mental verbs of cognition were not as large in number as those with mental verbs of perception. Mental verbs of cognition were followed by infinitival embedded predications only 20 times\(^{38}\).

### 4.2.1.3. Small clauses with infinitives after mental verbs of affection

As far as mental verbs of affection are concerned, in the novel “A Farewell to Arms” Ernest Hemingway employed such verbs as *want, wish, would like, like, love, hate,* and *can’t stand.* However, unquestionable embedded infinitival predications appeared to follow only verbs of wish, i.e. *want, wish,* and *would like.* All the rest of the said verbs occurred in the predicate position before the infinitive which performed the syntactic function of the Direct Objective Complement of the clause. In the literature, such clauses are sometimes regarded as small clauses as well, for they contain two propositions. However, in the present paper we focus on the infinitival small clauses with a more evident implicit predicative relationship than in sentences (125) to (129) where the implicit predicative relationship could be traced between the infinitive and the subject of the matrix verb. Consider:

*(125) I like *to row. (Hemingway, 2006: 246)*

S + Pr + DOC (Inf)

*(126) I loved *to ride out along the country roads with her [Catherine]. (Hemingway, 2006: 299)*

\(^{38}\) To compare the frequency of occurrence of infinitival small clauses used with mental verbs of cognition to those used with other mental verbs, see Appendix 1.
Thus, (125) may be viewed as consisting of two predications: *I like + I row*. Similarly, clauses (126) to (129) consist of two propositions, as well: *I love + I ride out; I hate + I leave; I can’t stand + I see; I want + I go*.

In most cases infinitival small clauses follow a mental matrix verb of affection and function as part of the Verbal Predicate of the clause. In the corpus, the infinitive most frequently appeared to represent the verbal part of the Complex Objective Complement which resulted from the reduction of an objective clause. Semantically, the embedded infinitival predications represent the Phenomenon. Consider:

(130) *I would like you to go to Abruzzi.* (Hemingway, 2006: 15)

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + Place]

*Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Affection + Phenomenon + Circumstance of Place*

*Source:* *I would like that you went to Abruzzi.*

(131) *Priest wants us never to attack.* (Hemingway, 2006: 20)

S + Pr + COC [pron + Frequency + Inf]

*Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Affection + Frequency + Phenomenon*

*Source:* Priest wants that we would never attack.

(132) *The Pope wants the Austrians to win the war.* (Hemingway, 2006: 13)

S + Pr + COC [n + Inf + O]

*Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Affection + Phenomenon*

*Source:* The Pope wants that the Austrians would win the war.

(133) *I don’t want anyone else to touch you.* (Hemingway, 2006: 103)

S + Pr + COC [IndPron + Inf + O]

*Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Affection + Phenomenon*

*Source:* I don’t want that anyone else would touch you.

(134) *I wish you to do something for me.* (Hemingway, 2006: 232)

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + O + PrepO]

---

39 PrepOC stands for the Prepositional Objective Complement.
Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Affection + Phenomenon + Beneficiary

Source: I wish that you would do something for me.

(135) I want you both to be happy. (Hemingway, 2006: 239)

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + PrA]

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Affection + Phenomenon

Source: I wish that you both would be happy.

(136) I don’t want you to get Scotch and crazy to-night. (Hemingway, 2006: 126)

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + PrA + Time]

Recipient Experiencer + Mental Process of Affection + Phenomenon + Circumstance of Time

Source: I don’t want that you would get Scotch and crazy to-night.

(137) Lots of them [Italians] would have liked him [the Duke of Aosta] to be king. (Hemingway, 2006: 41)

S + Pr + COC [pron + Inf + PrN]

As can be seen from the examples above, the nominal part of the Complex Objective Complement – that can also be regarded as the subject of the infinitive within the embedded predication – was represented in the novel by a pronoun in the objective case, a noun, or an indefinite pronoun. The predicate part of small clauses, i.e. the infinitive, was often followed by its object within the range of the small clause (e.g. in (132) – (134)), by an adverbial adjunct of place (e.g. in (130)) or time (e.g. in (136)), by a predicative adjective (e.g. in (135) and (136)), or a predicative noun (e.g. in (137)). When followed by a predicative adjective or noun, the infinitive was always of copular nature, for in such cases it originated from Compound Nominal Predicates.

The following cluster of examples - (138) to (145) – illustrate embedded predications that resulted from further reduction of objective source clauses which were discussed in greater detail above (See pp. 17-19). After the deletion of the infinitive to be, the remaining verbal part of the Complex Objective Complement happens to be occupied by a Past Participle (PartII), a Prepositional Phrase (PrepPh), an Adverbial Adjunct of Manner (Manner), an Adverbial Adjunct of Place (Place), a particle, a Predicative Noun (PrN), or a Predicative Adjective (PrA). Consider:

(138) I want it [the knee] cut off (…). (Hemingway, 2006: 98)

S + Pr + COC [pron + PartII]

(139) I want some eggs fried too. (Hemingway, 2006: 269)
S + Pr + COC [NomPh+ PartII]
(140) I don’t want her [Catherine Barkley] with any of these war babies. (Hemingway, 2006: 108)
S + Pr + COC [pron + PrepPh]
(141) No I want your ears the way they are. (Hemingway, 2006: 154)
S + Pr + COC [NomPh + Manner]
(142) The Italians didn’t want women so near the front. (Hemingway, 2006: 30)
S + Pr + COC [n + Place]
(143) He [the doctor] probably wanted me away for a while. (Hemingway, 2006: 307)
S + Pr + COC [pron + particle + Time]
(144) I wish you good luck. (Hemingway, 2006: 302)
S + Pr + COC [pron + PrN]
S + Pr + COC [pron + PrA]

Even though the structural patterns with infinitival small clauses as Complex Objective Complements were the most productive ones in the novel, there were cases when the infinitive functions as the Predicative Attribute after the copula. Consider:

(146) All I wanted was to see Catherine. (Hemingway, 2006: 116)

In fact, it is rather difficult to apply a syntactic analysis to the clause above. What is clear is that the infinitive in (146) is not the verbal part of a Complex Objective Complement.

The number of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by a mental verb of affection was somewhat similar to the number of infinitival embedded predications following mental verbs of perception. In the novel “A Farewell to Arms” mental verbs of affection appeared in the position of the matrix verb in 79 cases.\(^\text{40}\)

4.2.2. Small clauses with infinitives after material verbs

Material processes, also called processes of doing or agentive processes, consist of such components as the Agent, the Process, the Affected Patient, the Effected Patient, the Recipient, the Beneficiary, and the Circumstances. The Agent, differently from the Recipient Experiencer typical of mental processes, is an entity that affects another entity through the material process, i.e. the Agent causes something to happen. Therefore,

\(^{40}\) To compare the frequency of occurrence of infinitival small clauses used with mental verbs of affection to those used with other mental verbs, see Appendix 1.
material processes are also regarded by most linguists as causative processes (Valeika and Buitkienė, 2006: 27).

The Affected patient is an entity that is influenced by the material process. In the surface structure of the active clause, the Affected Patient performs the syntactic function of the Direct Objective Complement. In passive clauses, the Affected Patient occupies the subject position. In case of a doubt, the wh-question “what does/ did X do?” can be applied not only to probe the process but also to identify the Affected Patient (Valeika and Buitkienė, 2006: 35).

As far as the Effected Patient is concerned, it is an entity that comes into existence through the medium of the material process (Valeika and Buitkienė, 2006: 37). The Recipient in its turn appears in the sentence in the grammatical function of the Indirect Objective Complement and represents an entity that receives or benefits from something due to the material process expressed by the matrix verb (op.cit. 39). In passive clauses, it is sometimes possible to notice the Recipient in the subject position. The Beneficiary is an optional element of the sentence. It denotes an entity “for whom the process is carried out” (op. cit. 43). The Circumstances are realized syntactically as Adverbial Adjuncts.

Ernest Hemingway used a wide variety of verbs denoting material processes in the said novel, including such verbs as offer, show, decide, help, try, learn, pretend, accept, wait, refuse, plan, promise, advise, begin, drive, come, go, pound, take, bring up, bring, stand, cross, lift, send, climb, stop, create, bite, do, shoot, bombard, cut, push, retreat, buy, make, ring, wave, build, fight, and many more. Even though all material processes are considered to be of causative nature, there were four purely causative verbs extensively used in the novel as matrix verbs followed by infinitival small clauses: let, make, have, and get. In the literature these verbs are also called verbs of inducement (Kobrina et al, 1985: 99). It would be of use to remind that causative verbs, similarly to mental verbs of perception, are followed by the Bare Infinitive.

Reduced infinitival predications embedded into matrix clauses with verbs denoting material processes, similar to their counterparts discussed above, predominantly represent the Complex Objective Complement. Consider:

(147) She [Catherine] would not let me put my arm around her. (Hemingway, 2006: 36)

S + Pr + COC [pron + BareInf + O + Place]

(148) Don’t let Rinaldi drink so much brandy. (Hemingway, 2006: 172)

(S) + Pr + COC [proper name + BareInf + O]

(149) Let everybody defend his home. (Hemingway, 2006: 54)
(S) + Pr + COC [IndPron + BareInf + O]

(150) You can’t have a soldier save you a place. (Hemingway, 2006: 157)

S + Pr + COC [n + BareInf + IOC + O]

(151) I have had Italian officers visit me frequently (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 142)

S + Pr + COC [NomPh + BareInf + O + Manner]

(152) It [cognac] (...) makes the hand shake. (Hemingway, 2006: 168)

S + Pr + COC [n + BareInf]

(153) (...) a drink always makes you feel cheerful (Hemingway, 2006: 137)

S + Frequency + Pr + COC [pron + BareInf + PrA]

(154) She [Catherine] can’t make me not hate you. (Hemingway, 2006: 239)

S + Pr + COC [pron + BareInf(-) + O]

In the process of communication, the infinitive, being redundant, can be deleted from the surface structure of the clause. In such a case, the particle to represents the deleted infinitive in the small clause (if the matrix verb allows), as can be seen from (155) below:

(155) (...) I can’t recommend you to [try that wine]. (Hemingway, 2006: 111)

S + Pr + COC [pron + particle to]

In (156) and (157), infinitival embedded predications are expressed through the medium of a for-to-infinitival construction. In (156), the infinitive is active, and in (157) it is passive. On the one hand, the nominal part of the construction in question serves as the Indirect Objective Complement (IOC) of the matrix verb. On the other hand, it functions as the subject of the infinitive. Consider:

(156) He [Count Greffi] waited for me to sit down. (Hemingway, 2006: 252)

S + Pr + COC [for-to-Inf (IOC + Inf)]

(157) (...) I (...) could wait for the wounded to be brought across the pontoon bridge. (Hemingway, 2006: 29)

S + Pr + COC [for-to-Inf (IOC + Inf(passive)) + Dir]

Sometimes, however, the infinitive may be deleted from the surface structure without any semantic loss. Consider the examples below, the implied infinitive suggested in braces:

(158) He [the major] offered me {to have} a glass of cognac. (Hemingway, 2006: 56)

S + Pr + COC [pron + n]

(159) The priest accepted it [the offensive gesture] {to be} as a joke. (Hemingway, 2006: 13)

S + Pr + COC [pron + particle + n]

(160) I helped him [the soldier] {get} down. (Hemingway, 2006: 40)

S + Pr + COC [pron + particle]
(161) I won’t get her {to be} in trouble. (Hemingway, 2006: 108)
    S + Pr + COC [pron + PrepPh]
(162) I will get you {to be} drunk (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 165)
    S + Pr + COC [pron + PartII]
(163) (...) you are just making me {feel} self-conscious. (Hemingway, 2006: 302)
    S + Pr + COC [pron + O + PrA]
(164) We’ll make you {become} a socialist too. (Hemingway, 2006: 203)
    S + Pr + COC [pron + PrN]
(165) The fog made the lights {grow} yellow. (Hemingway, 2006: 148)
    S + Pr + COC [n + PrA]
(166) I’ll just make them [the letters] {sound} a little confusing. (Hemingway, 2006: 154)
    S + Pr + COC [pron + Degree + PrA]
(167) I try to make the mess {be} like the old days. (Hemingway, 2006: 169)
    S + Pr + DOC + COC [pron + PrepPh]

The reason for the large number of examples given above is the necessity to show the wide range of possible constituents of the small clauses with the deleted infinitive.

Occasionally, the infinitive serves to function as part of the complex subject of the matrix clause. Consider:

(168) What made it [the surname of the Archbishop] {sound} pretty was that it sounded like Island. (Hemingway, 2006: 43)
    S [RelPron + Pr + DOC + PrA] + CNPr [conj + S + copula + PrepPh]

As far as infinitival embedded predications preceded by verbs denoting material processes are concerned, they showed the highest frequency of occurrence (355) among all the infinitival small clauses present in the said novel.\footnote{To compare the frequency of occurrence of infinitival small clauses used with verbs expressing material processes to the ones used with other verbs, see Appendix 2.}

4.2.3. Small clauses with infinitives after verbs of saying

Another group of verbs followed by infinitival small clauses is related to the process of saying. Processes expressed by these verbs are called Verbal processes. These processes have only one participant, the Sayer. The communicative function of the Sayer is to provide another entity (the Recipient) with certain information which is called the Verbiage. The Sayer is a kind of Agent, and the Verbiage is a kind of Affected Participant. It should be noted that verbs of saying are semantically very close to verbs expressing mental and
material processes. Therefore, they are sometimes regarded as mental material verbs (Valeika, Buitkienė, 2006: 80-83).

In the novel, infinitival embedded predications occurred after such verbs of saying as *ask, request, tell, and order*. However, what follows these verbs in clauses cannot be considered embedded predications proper, even though the infinitive is preceded by a noun or a pronoun, similar to the Complex Objective Complements analysed above. Thus, in the syntactic structure of the clauses containing verbs of saying, the noun or pronoun preceding the infinitive will be regarded as the Direct Objective Complement (DOC) of the matrix verb. Consider the syntactic and semantic structures of the clauses presented below:

(169) I order *you* to halt. (Hemingway, 2006: 199)

\[S + Pr + DOC (pron) + DOC (Inf)\]

*Sayer + Verbal Process + Recipient + Verbiage*

(170) I am asking *several of my friends* to do that. (Hemingway, 2006: 254)

\[S + Pr + DOC (NomPh) + DOC (Inf) + O\]

*Sayer + Verbal Process + Recipient + Verbiage*

(171) I asked *the waiter* to get us a carriage (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 155)

\[S + Pr + DOC (n) + DOC (Inf) + O\]

*Sayer + Verbal Process + Recipient + Verbiage*

As can be seen from the examples above, the infinitive may represent the Verbiage alone, or with its Object (O). The infinitive following the Direct Objective Complement might not necessarily be in the positive. Besides, the sentence may be supplied with additional information by means of Circumstances represented in the surface structure as Adverbial Adjuncts. Consider (172) and (173) below:

(172) You ought to ask *her* [Catherine] *not to do night duty* for a while. (Hemingway, 2006: 109)

\[S + Pr + DOC (pron) + DOC (Inf (-)) + O + Time\]

*Sayer + Verbal Process + Recipient + Verbiage + Circumstance of Time*

(173) I would have to tell *them* *not to put ice in the whiskey*. (Hemingway, 2006: 297)

\[S + Pr + DOC (pron) + DOC (Inf (-)) + O + Place\]

*Sayer + Verbal Process + Recipient + Verbiage + Circumstance of Place*

In (174) the Adverbial Adjunct of Place precedes the Object of the infinitive (O), which is rather unusual for an English clause. Consider:

(174) The doctor requested *me* to write in his pocket notebook *my name* (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 96)

\[S + Pr + DOC (pron) + DOC (Inf) + Place + O\]
The following clause deserves special mention, for it contains the Recipient represented by the Indirect Objective Complement (IOC) at the syntactic level. Consider:

(175) (...) I told her [the waitress] to bring a plate for me. (Hemingway, 2006: 238)

S + Pr + DOC (pron) + DOC (Inf) + O + IOC

Sayer + Verbal Process + Recipient + Verbiage + Beneficiary

It goes without saying that when a clause is passivized, the Recipient takes up initial position in the sentence and serves to express Rhematic information. Having been one of the Direct Objective Complements in the active clause, the pronoun in the objective case us becomes the Subject (S) of the passive clause and changes its case into the nominative. The Sayer is dropped. As far as the syntactic function of the infinitive is concerned, it could be regarded as part of the Direct Objective Complement. Consider:

(176) (...) we were required to wear an automatic pistol (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 33)

S + Pr(passive) + DOC(Inf) + O (NomPh)

Recipient + Verbal Process + Sayer + Verbiage

Infinitival small clauses embedded in clauses with verbs of saying in the position of the matrix verb were not very numerous in the novel. There are 39 cases of the embedded predications under discussion42.

4.3. Small clauses of double relations

The infinitival embedded predications described above are predominantly the Complex Objective Complements (COC) of the matrix clause. However, it should be pointed out that, from the point of view of their meaning, there are two types of the Complex Objective Complements, i.e. Objective Complements with a Current Complement, which the majority of cases already discussed in the paper illustrate (e.g. You will find the climate delightful and beautiful. (Hemingway, 2006: 274)), and Objective Complements with a Resultative Complement (e.g. He [Piani] (...) poured a copper pan full. (Hemingway, 2006: 197)). Even though Resultative Complements (e.g. full) remind us of Adverbial Adjuncts, they cannot be regarded as such, for they represent the state of the subject of the embedded predication (e.g. a copper pan) that resulted from the process of the matrix verb, not the manner of the process (Valeika, Buitkienè, 2006: 129).

The resultative small clauses are assumed by most linguists to result from two underlying clauses with full predications. The second of the two source clauses serves to

42 To compare the frequency of occurrence of infinitival small clauses used with verbs of saying to the ones used with other verbs, see Appendix 2.
represent the result of the process expressed by the matrix verb. However, it is also possible to hold that such clauses appear after the deletion of the infinitive *to be*\(^{43}\). Consider (177), (178) and (179) below:

(177) I (...) ripped it [the cape] {to be} in two (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 200-201)

\[ S + Pr + COC [pron + PrepPh (result)] \]

*Source:* I ripped the cape. *There are two pieces of it (now).*

(178) I wiped it [my forehead] {to be} clean with the sleeve of my coat. (Hemingway, 2006: 226)

\[ S + Pr + COC [pron + PrA (result)] + PrepPh (instrumental) \]

*Source:* I wiped my forehead with the sleeve of my coat. *It is clean (now).*

(179) (...) water (...) was washing the ice of the roads {to be} bare (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 294)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + PrA (result)] \]

*Source:* Water was washing the ice of the roads. *The ice was becoming bare.*

The reason why the clauses in question are considered to be of double relations lies in their syntactic ambivalence. The nominal part of the Complex Objective Complement is not only the subject of the embedded predication, but also the Direct Objective Complement of the matrix verb. The verbal part of the Complex Objective Complement (e.g. *in two, clean, or bare*), on the one hand, serves to function adverbially with respect to the matrix verb. On the other hand, it performs the attributive syntactic function with regard to the subject of the small clause.

The predicate part of the embedded predications under discussion is generally expressed by a Predicative Adjective (PrA), like in (178) and (179). However, we cannot deny the existence of resultative small clauses that contain a prepositional phrase (like in (177)), or an Adverbial Adjunct of Direction (like in (180) and (181)), Manner (like in (182)), Place (like in (183)), or a Stative (like in (184)) in the predicate position. Consider:

(180) They’d send me {to be} home (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 114)

\[ S + Pr + COC [pron + Dir] \]

*Source:* They’d send me home. *I would be at home.*

(181) The manager bowed us {to go} toward the elevator. (Hemingway, 2006: 150)

\[ S + Pr + COC [pron + PrepPh (Dir)] \]

*Source:* The manager bowed to us. *And we went toward the elevator.*

(182) We roped both cars {to be} together (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 200)

\[ S + Pr + COC [NomPh + Manner] \]

---

\(^{43}\) The deleted infinitive in (96) and (97) is given in braces: {to be}.
We roped both the cars. They are together (now).

The girl drew her shawl tight around her (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 191)

The shawl was (then) tight around her.

They [the nurses] left me {to be} alone (...). (Hemingway, 2006: 90)

It is obvious that (180) and (181) appear to be rather ambivalent. The verbal part of the Complex Objective Complement in (180) seems to suit equally well to perform the syntactic function of the Adverbial Adjunct of Direction (Dir), restricting the process of the matrix verb, and the predicate of the embedded predication. In fact, home can be considered to perform both the functions at the same time. The Prepositional Phrase (PrepPh) toward the elevator in (181) is also difficult to analyse. The clause might be held to mean that the manager caused us to go towards the elevator by bowing his head in a certain direction. The source clauses of (181) suggested above seem to be incapable of conveying the whole of the message expressed in the clause The manager bowed us toward the elevator. Presumably, this is the case when the message of someone’s body language does not receive an adequate verbal expression. Hence, the ambivalence of (181).

The resultative small clause in (183) is also ambivalent in meaning. On the one hand, the verbal part of the embedded predication may answer the question how did the girl draw her shawl? In such a case it might be considered to be an Adverbial Adjunct of Manner. On the other hand, the predicate of the small clause in question is capable of passing the test of the question what was did she draw the shawl? Then, the predicate of the small clause appears to serve as a Resultative Complement.

Another ambivalent example is (185), where the verbal part of the resultative small clause in the form of the Predicative Adjective in the Comparative Degree (comp) modifies either the process expressed by the matrix verb, or the nominal part of the small clause. Consider:

I’ll fix those sandbags better. (Hemingway, 2006: 110)

The following clause belongs to the so-called classical examples of embedded predications. In (186) the subject of the matrix verb is also the subject of the small clause. In such cases some linguists speak about the problem of control (See pp. 10-11 above). Consider the syntactic structure and the source clause of (186) presented below:
The pistol clicked empty (…). (Hemingway, 2006: 199)

S/S₁ + Pr + PrA

Source: As soon as/after the pistol clicked, it was empty.

In the two examples that follow, the Agents of the actions are absent from the clauses, for (187) and (188) are passive clauses. The nominal parts of the Resultative small clauses occupy the subject positions before the matrix verbs, and the verbal parts of the small clauses occupy their original positions at the end of the clause. However, the subject of the matrix verb here is also the subject of the small clause. Consider the syntactic structures of (187) and (188), as well as their tentative source clauses below:

(187) They [the hands] were both blistered raw. (Hemingway, 2006: 276)

S/S₁ + Pr (passive) + PrA

Source: The hands were blistered so that they both looked raw.

(188) The room was furnished in red plush. (Hemingway, 2006: 150)

S/S₁ + Pr (passive) + PrepPh

Source: The room was furnished so that there was red plush everywhere.

Resultative small clauses of double relations used in Ernest Hemingway’s novel appeared 71 times.

4.4. Small clauses with infinitives after nouns and pronouns

Infinitival embedded predications after nouns and pronouns were less typical of the said novel. All in all there were 132 cases. However, they are also worthy of linguists’ attention. In the majority of cases, the infinitive performed the attributive function with respect to the noun or pronoun it refers to. Less frequently the infinitive, together with the noun or pronoun that precedes it, denoted the purpose of the action expressed by the matrix verb.

The noun or pronoun in combination with the infinitive occurred in the novel as infinitival Small Clauses (SC) with implicit predicative relationship, or as infinitival phrases even with attributive relationship. The infinitival small clauses in question occur in the syntactic function of the Notional Subject (NotionalS) introduced by the Anticipatory Subject it, the Predicative Complement after the copula within the Compound Nominal Predicate (CNPr), or the Complex Subject (CS).

In (189) and (190), the infinitives modify the nouns attributively and perform the syntactic function of the Notional Subject. In such cases the idea expressed by the Notional

---

To compare the frequency of occurrence of resultative small clauses of double relations to other small clauses, see Appendix 3.
Subject is accentuated, for the notional Subject expresses Rhematic information. Consider the syntactic structure of the two clauses in question:

\[(189) (\ldots) \text{it had all been } a \text{ mistake to think you just died.} \ (\text{Hemingway, 2006: 59})\]

\[\text{AntS + CNPr [copula + SC(PrN + NotionalS(Inf) + OC)]}\]

\[(190) \text{It was } a \text{ nuisance to have them [guns] there } (\ldots) \ (\text{Hemingway, 2006: 20})\]

\[\text{AntS + CNPr [copula + SC(n + NotionalS(Inf) + DOC + Place]}\]

Both clauses can be paraphrased so that the infinitive would occupy initial position in the clause. However, then the infinitive expresses Thematic information, and the emphasis moves on to the Predicate of the clause. Consider \((189_a)\) and \((190_a)\) below:

\[(189_a) \text{To think you just died had all been a mistake.}\]

\[\text{S [Inf + OC] + CNPr [copula + PrN]}\]

\[(190_a) \text{To have them [guns] there was a nuisance.}\]

\[\text{S [Inf + DOC + Place] + CNPr [copula + PrN]}\]

The subject position of the following two examples is occupied by the Formal Subject. Consequently, the syntactic function of the infinitive in the clauses below is that of the Predicative. Consider:

\[(191) \text{It was } no \text{ great distance to row.} \ (\text{Hemingway, 2006: 265})\]

\[\text{FormalS + CNPr [copula + SC(NomPh + Inf(Attr))]}\]

\[(192) \text{There were three others to locate.} \ (\text{Hemingway, 2006: 60})\]

\[\text{FormalS + CNPr [copula + SC(Num + DistrPron + NotionalS(Inf))]}\]

It should be noted that even though in \((192)\) the infinitive is in the active in surface structure, it is passive in meaning.

The following clause contains a for-to-infinitival construction which serves as an attribute to the noun the window. Within the construction there undoubtedly exists an implicit predicative relationship. Therefore, \((193)\) contains a true infinitival small clause which expresses the purpose or reason of the action encoded in the predicate of the matrix clause. It may be probed by the question \textit{why was there a note on the window?} and may be derived from the clause \textit{There was a note on the window that I should fill the cars with the material piled in the hall.} Consider:

\[(193) \text{There was a note on the window for me to fill the cars with the material piled in the hall } (\ldots). \ (\text{Hemingway, 2006: 185})\]

\[\text{FormalS + CNPr [copula + n + Place + SC (for-to-Inf + O) + PrepO + PartII]}\]

The for-to-infinitival construction in \((194)\) serves to replace a reduced relative clause and attributively modifies the noun it follows. The clause in question might be the result of
the reduction of the complex clause *Here there is a nightgown which you can/ should wear.* The Formal Subject (FormalS) *there* is omitted. Consider:

(194) Here is a nightgown for you to wear. (Hemingway, 2006: 301)

Place + [FormalS] + CNPr [copula + n + SC (for-to-Inf)]

Analogically, (195) was derived from *There was nobody here who he could play billiards with.* The for-to-infinitival construction here also replaces a reduced relative clause. Consider:

(195) There’s nobody here [at Stresa] for him to play [billiards] with. (Hemingway, 2006: 245)

FormalS + CNPr [copula + IndPron + Place + SC (for-to-Inf + particle)]

In (196) the for-to-infinitival construction depends more on the matrix verb that on the noun it follows. Consider:

(196) I (…) piled brush for the wheels to catch. (Hemingway, 2006: 200-201)

Without doubt, the construction in the clause above represents the reason why the subject piled the brush.

The infinitive in combination with a noun, as was already mentioned, can also occupy the subject position in the matrix clause. Consider:

(197) *The thing to do now* was to dig out in front of the wheels. (Hemingway, 2006: 198)

S [n + Inf (Attr) + Time] + CNPr [copula + Inf + Place]

The other infinitive in (197) – *to dig out* – functions as the Predicative Complement after the copula.

Nouns and pronouns followed by true infinitival embedded predications, as has already been mentioned earlier in the paper, occurred in the novel 132 times
dedicated.

4.5. Small clauses with infinitives after adjectives

In his novel “A Farewell to Arms” Ernest Hemingway uses infinitival small clauses not only after verbs, nouns, or pronouns, but also after adjectives. In the majority of cases, adjectives in the text of the novel are followed by infinitival embedded predications in the form of a for-to-infinitival construction, as in (198) below:

(198) It is very bad for the soldiers to be short of food. (Hemingway, 2006: 179)

AntS + CNPr [copula + Degree + PrA + SC (NotionalS (for-to-Inf) + DOC)]

For the proportional relationship of the small clauses in question in comparison to other structural kinds of small clauses, see Appendix 3.
Frequently, the adjective preceding a small clause is in the Comparative Degree (comp). Consider:

(199) It is easier for me to talk Italian. (Hemingway, 2006: 251)

\[\text{AntS + CNPr [copula + PrA (comp) + SC (NotionalS (for-to-Inf) + DOC)]}\]

In both the clauses above the for-to-infinitival construction functions as the Notional Subject of the matrix clause, introduced by the anticipatory subject it in the initial position. However, the construction also occurs representing a reduced adverbial clause of purpose, as (200) illustrates:

(200) This chap of yours [Gordini] was very anxious for me to see you. (Hemingway, 2006: 62)

\[\text{S (NomPh) + CNPr [copula + Degree + PrA + SC (for-to-Inf + DOC)]}\]

The clause presented above may have been derived from the following complex clause: The chap of yours was very anxious that I would see you; and can be probed by the question why was the chap anxious? or what was he anxious for?

Infinitival small clauses with infinitives after adjectives occurred in the novel not only as for-to-infinitival constructions. Sometimes the embedded predications under discussion acquire the form of an of-phrase and represent a reduced objective clause. Consider:

(201) It was very good of the doctor to let me do something. (Hemingway, 2006: 305)

\[\text{AntS + CNPr [copula + Degree + PrA + SC (NotionalS (of-phrase) + DOC)]}\]

The source clause of (201) could be phrased as follows: It was very good that the doctor allowed me to do something or that the doctor allowed me to do something was very good.

Both the structural forms of infinitival embedded predications with infinitives after adjectives are characteristic of an implicit predicative relationship between the nominal and verbal elements of the small clause.

The infinitival embedded predications with the infinitive preceded by an adjective occurred in the said novel in 10 cases only.\(^46\)

\(^{46}\) In order to see the proportional relationship of the small clauses in question with respect to other structural kinds of small clauses, see Appendix 3.
CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of Ernest Hemingway’s novel “A Farewell to Arms” revealed that the author used six syntactic types of the infinitival small clauses:

1. Reduced objective clauses;
2. Reduced adverbial clauses of purpose;
3. Reduced adverbial clauses of result;
4. Reduced adverbial clauses of condition;
5. Reduced relative clauses;
6. Reduced clauses of other types (time, reason, and comparison).

The results of the research demonstrated that the most frequent syntactic type of infinitival embedded predications is reduced objective clauses. They occurred 393 times and accounted for 48.16 per cent of the infinitival embedded predications used in the novel. In the corpus analysed there were 201 reduced adverbial clauses of purpose which accounted for 24.63 per cent, 100 reduced relative clauses which accounted for 12.25 per cent, 71 reduced adverbial clauses of result which accounted for 8.70 per cent, 29 adverbial clauses of condition which represented 3.55 per cent, and 22 reduced clauses of other types, including reduced adverbial clauses of time, reason, and comparison, which accounted for 2.70 per cent of all the infinitival small clauses found in the novel.

As far as the syntactic structure of infinitival small clauses is concerned, the infinitive followed mental verbs of perception, cognition, and affection, as well as material verbs, verbs of saying, nouns, pronouns, and adjectives. Among infinitival small clauses with the infinitive used after mental verbs, clauses with mental verbs of perception showed the highest frequency of occurrence. In the corpus examined they were used 110 times and accounted for 52.63 percent of infinitival embedded predications in which the infinitive followed verbs of mental processes. Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by mental verbs of affection appeared in 79 cases and accounted for 37.80 per cent of all small clauses with mental verbs in predicate position. Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after mental verbs of cognition were used 20 times and accounted for 9.57 per cent of the said group of small clauses. The corpus examined demonstrated a high frequency of material verbs used in the matrix clause and a low frequency of verbs of saying.

In embedded predications the infinitive also followed verbs expressing material and verbal processes (i.e. processes of saying). The results of the research showed that infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by material verbs prevail, in comparison to mental verbs or verbs of saying. Material verbs participated in the formation
of 355 infinitival embedded predications present in the novel and accounted for 58.87 per cent of cases. Mental verbs were followed by the infinitive within a small clause 209 times and accounted for 34.66 per cent of small clauses used in the novel. The range of usage of infinitival embedded predications with the infinitive preceded by verbs of saying did not exceed the number of 39 cases which makes 6.47 per cent.

Among infinitival small clauses with the infinitive following a part of speech, infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by a verb showed the highest frequency of occurrence. In 73.90 per cent of cases analysed on the basis of the collected data the infinitive within the small clauses was preceded by a verb, in 16.18 per cent of cases – by a noun, or pronoun, and in 1.22 percent of cases the infinitive was preceded by an adjective. The so-called resultative clauses of double relations accounted for 8.70 per cent of infinitival small clauses and occurred in 71 cases.

In the corpus examined infinitival small clauses predominantly served to perform the syntactic function of the Complex Objective Complement; less frequently they functioned as Complex Subjects.

Further research could involve the description of small clauses based on the gerund and the participle, which would reveal the system of small clauses as a whole.
Šis darbas nagrinėja redukuotus predikatinius sakinius su bendratimi Ernesto Hemingvėjaus romane „Atsisveikinimas su ginklais“. Tyrimo tikslai buvo šie:

1) išanalizuoti sintaksinius redukuotų predikatinių sakinių su bendratimi tipus;
2) išanalizuoti semantinius bei struktūrinius redukuotų predikatinių sakinių su bendratimi bruožus;
3) ištirti redukuotų predikatinių sakinių su bendratimi dažnumą romane.

Redukuoti predikatinių sakinių E. Hemingvėjaus romane buvo nagrinėjami, remiantis aprašomuoju-indukcinio ir statistinės analizės metodais.

Tyrimas parodė, kad autorius vartojo mažiausiai šešis sintaksinius redukuotų predikatinių sakinių su bendratimi tipus:

1) Redukuotus šalutinius papildinio sakinius;
2) Redukuotus šalutinius tikslo sakinius;
3) Redukuotus šalutinius rezultato sakinius;
4) Redukuotus šalutinius sąlygos sakinius;
5) Redukuotus šalutinius pažyminio sakinius;
6) Kai kurių kitų tipų redukuotos šalutinio sakinių (laiko, priežasties, palyginimo).

Tyrimo metu paaškėjo, kad redukuoti predikatiniai sakiniai daugiausia kilo iš šalutinių papildinio sakinių: jie sudarė 48.16% visų redukuotų predikatinių sakinių su bendratimi. Rečiau buvo vartojami redukuoti šalutiniai tikslo sakiniai (24.63%) bei redukuoti šalutiniai pažyminio sakiniai (12.25%). Redukuoti šalutiniai rezultato sakiniai sudarė 8.70%, redukuoti šalutiniai sąlygos sakiniai – 3.55%, o kai kurių kitų tipų redukuoti šalutiniai sakiniai tesudarė 2.70%. Bendrasis buvo pavartota su veiksmažodžiais (73.90%), daiktavardžiais ar įvardžiais (16.18%), bei būdvardžiais (1.22%).
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**Appendix 1**

**Table 1.** The frequency of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by mental verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by mental verbs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of perception</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(52.63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of cognition</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of affection</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** The number of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by mental verbs
Appendix 2

Table 2. The frequency of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by mental verbs</th>
<th>209 (34.66%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by material verbs</td>
<td>355 (58.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by verbs of saying</td>
<td>39 (6.47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The number of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by verbs
Table 3. The frequency of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by parts of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrasal Structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by verbs</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>73.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded noun or pronouns</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>16.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by adjectives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative small clauses of double relations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. The number of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive preceded by parts of speech
**Table 4.** The frequency of reduced objective clauses formed by means of infinitival small clauses following parts of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced objective clauses formed by means of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after verbs expressing:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>material processes</td>
<td>194 (49.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental processes</td>
<td>139 (35.37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal processes</td>
<td>39 (9.92%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reduced objective clauses formed by means of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after adjectives | 24 (6.11%) |

**Figure 4.** The number of reduced objective clauses formed by means of infinitival small clauses following parts of speech
**Appendix 5**

**Table 5.** The frequency of reduced adverbial clauses of purpose formed by means of infinitival small clauses following various parts of speech

| Reduced adverbial clauses of purpose formed by means of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after verbs expressing material processes | 168 (83.58%) |
| Reduced adverbial clauses of purpose formed by means of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after adjectives | 23 (11.44%) |
| Reduced adverbial clauses of purpose formed by means of infinitival small clauses with the infinitive after nouns | 10 (4.98%) |

**Figure 5.** The number of reduced adverbial clauses of purpose formed by means of infinitival small clauses following various parts of speech
### Table 6. The frequency of all the types of infinitival embedded predications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clauses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced objective clauses</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>48.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced adverbial clauses of purpose</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced adverbial clauses of result</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced adverbial clauses of condition</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced relative clauses</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced clauses of other types</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6. The number of all the types of infinitival embedded predications