

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky



Diplomová práce

Bc. Radka Straková

**Syntactic, Semantic and Stylistic Aspects of the Subject of the
Infinitive**

Syntaktické, sémantické a stylistické aspekty podmětu infinitivního děje

Praha, 2014

Vedoucí práce: prof. PhDr. Libuše Dušková, DrSc.

Poděkování

Ráda bych poděkovala vedoucí své diplomové práce, prof. PhDr. Libuši Duškové, DrSc., za trpělivost, ochotu a všechny cenné rady, a své rodině za podporu, bez které by tato práce nikdy nemohla vzniknout.

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 4. prosince 2014

.....
Radka Straková

Abstrakt

Předmětem této diplomové práce je podmět infinitivního děje z hlediska syntaktického, sémantického a stylistického. Práce si klade za cíl podrobný popis různých forem podmětu infinitivního děje a zjištění vzájemných vztahů mezi jeho formou, syntaktickou funkcí a sémantikou. Dílčím cílem práce je srovnání odborné a beletristické angličtiny z hlediska zkoumaných rysů infinitivního podmětu.

V úvodní části práce je infinitiv stručně uveden jako jeden z prostředků komplexní větné kondenzace a dále je definován z formálního a funkčního hlediska. Zbytek teoretické části je věnován podrobnému popisu podmětu infinitivního děje. Hlavní částí práce je vlastní výzkum, který je založený na vzorku 200 dokladů infinitivních konstrukcí získaných z korpusu britské angličtiny. Jelikož se práce zaměřuje na dva odlišné funkční styly, analýza je provedena pro každý z nich zvlášť. V poslední části výzkumu jsou poté oba funkční styly porovnány z hlediska distribuce syntaktických funkcí a realizace podmětu infinitivního děje.

Abstract

The diploma thesis is concerned with syntactic, semantic and stylistic aspects of the subject of the infinitive. The aim is to examine all forms of realization of the infinitival subject, and to investigate relation between the syntactic function of the infinitive and the form and semantics of its subject. Furthermore, the thesis attempts to characterise and compare fiction and academic prose in terms of realization of the subject of the infinitive.

In the theoretical part of the study, the infinitive is introduced as one of the means of complex condensation, and is discussed from a formal and functional point of view. Further, a general characterisation of the subject of the infinitive is presented, focusing on various forms of its realization and on its interpretation. The main part of the study, the corpus-based research, consists in a detailed analysis of 200 instances of an infinitival clause collected from the British National Corpus. Since the study focuses on two different registers, the material is analysed for each of them separately. In the last part of the analysis, the registers are subsequently compared in terms of distribution of syntactic functions of the infinitive and realization of the infinitival subject.

List of abbreviations and symbols

AP	academic prose
BNC	British National Corpus
C_o	object complement
C_s	subject complement
F	fiction
O	object
O_d	direct object
O_i	indirect object
NP	noun phrase
PP	prepositional phrase
PREP	preposition
S	subject
SC	sentence context
TM	Tough Movement
V	verb
*	unacceptable
?	questionable status

List of tables

Table 1: Overview of the forms of the infinitive	4
Table 2: Subject – Distribution of infinitival clauses (AP)	30
Table 3: Subject – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)	31
Table 4: Object – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)	33
Table 5: Part of the Predicate – Distribution of infinitival clauses (AP)	37
Table 6: Part of the Predicate – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)	38
Table 7: Postmodifier – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)	40
Table 8: Complementation of an Adjective – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)	43
Table 9: Adverbial – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)	44
Table 10: Subject – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)	47
Table 11: Object – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)	48
Table 12: Part of the Predicate – Distribution of infinitival clauses (F)	52
Table 13: Part of the Predicate – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)	52
Table 14: Postmodifier – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)	53
Table 15: Adverbial – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)	56
Table 16: Overall distribution of the syntactic functions of the infinitive in the registers	60
Table 17: Overall distribution of the realization of the infinitival subject in the registers	61

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Background	2
2.1 Non-finite Clauses as Means of Complex Condensation	2
2.2 The Infinitive	3
2.2.1 Forms of the Infinitive	3
2.2.2 Syntactic Functions of the Infinitive	4
2.2.2.1 Subject	4
2.2.2.2 Object	5
2.2.2.3 Part of the Predicate	6
2.2.2.4 Postmodifier	7
2.2.2.5 Complementation of an Adjective	7
2.2.2.6 Adverbial	8
2.3 Subject of the Infinitive	10
2.3.1 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as a Subject	12
2.3.2 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as an Object	15
2.3.3 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as Part of the Predicate	19
2.3.4 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as a Postmodifier	20
2.3.5 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as an Adjective Complementation	22
2.3.6 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as an Adverbial	22
3. Material and Method	26
3.1 Material	26
3.2 Method	26
4. Analysis	30
4.1 Subject of the Infinitive – Academic Discourse	30
4.1.1 Subject	30
4.1.2 Object	33
4.1.3 Part of the Predicate	37
4.1.4 Postmodifier	39
4.1.5 Complementation of an Adjective	43
4.1.6 Adverbial	44

4.2	Subject of the Infinitive – Fiction	47
4.2.1	Subject	47
4.2.2	Object	48
4.2.3	Part of the Predicate	52
4.2.4	Postmodifier	53
4.2.5	Complementation of an Adjective	55
4.2.6	Adverbial	56
4.3	Comparison of the Registers	59
4.3.1	Subject	63
4.3.2	Object	64
4.3.3	Part of the Predicate	64
4.3.4	Postmodifier	66
4.3.5	Complementation of an Adjective	67
4.3.6	Adverbial	67
5.	Conclusion	69
	Bibliography	72
	Resumé	74
	Appendices	78

1. Introduction

The subject of the present diploma thesis is the subject of the infinitival action in English fiction and academic prose. The infinitive, as one of the means of so-called complex condensation, is characterised by a substantial degree of inexplicitness. One aspect of this inexplicitness is the subject of the infinitive. The interpretation of the infinitival subject often requires us to use clues from either the superordinate clause or the broader context. However, the infinitive also occurs with the subject explicitly expressed.

The study deals with the infinitival subject from a syntactic, semantic and stylistic point of view. The main aim is to examine all forms of realization of the subject of the infinitive, and to investigate relation between the syntactic function of the infinitive and the form and semantics of its subject. Furthermore, the study attempts to characterise and compare fiction and academic prose in terms of realization of the infinitival subject.

Concerning the structure, the thesis consists of a theoretical and a practical part. In the theoretical part, the subject matter is introduced by a brief characterisation of non-finite clauses as means of complex condensation, and the infinitive is discussed from a formal and functional point of view. Further, a general characterisation of the subject of the infinitive is presented, focusing on various forms of its realization and on its interpretation. Finally, each syntactic function of the infinitive is discussed in detail in terms of the infinitival subject. On the whole, the purpose of the theoretical chapter is to lay the theoretical ground to enable detailed analysis of material, namely 200 instances of an infinitival clause, collected from the British National Corpus.

The main part of the diploma thesis, the corpus-based research, consists in a detailed analysis of the collected material and is divided into three main chapters. Since the study focuses on two different registers, the material is analysed for each of them separately. Therefore, in the first chapter, the infinitival clauses extracted from academic texts are discussed in terms of their syntactic function and realization of their subject, whereas in the second chapter the same analysis is carried out for the infinitival clauses occurring in fiction. In the third chapter, the registers are subsequently compared in terms of distribution of syntactic functions of the infinitive and realization of the infinitival subject.

Finally, the diploma thesis is concluded by a chapter presenting an overall comparison of the two registers, and summarising the whole study and its findings.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Non-finite Clauses as Means of Complex Condensation

In English, verb forms, and accordingly verb phrases and clauses, are traditionally classified into finite and non-finite. Non-finite verbs are not marked for as many grammatical categories as finite ones. More specifically, they in general do not express tense, mood, person and number distinctions. The finite verbs are in this respect seen as limited (see Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 89; Crystal, 2007: 212). For instance, “when the *-s* form is used, the verb is limited to the third person singular of the present tense” (Crystal, 2007: 212). On the other hand, a non-finite verb form can be referring to any person, number, mood, or tense.

Besides being marked for fewer categories, non-finite clauses, which have a non-finite V as the head of their verb phrase, often lack a subject and a subordinator. Therefore, a characteristic feature of non-finite clauses is their inexplicitness. Moreover, they cannot occur as independent clauses, therefore, “they are characteristically subordinate” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 89). Huddleston and Pullum further suggest that there is a link between inexplicitness of non-finite clauses and their subordinate nature. According to them, the non-finite clauses can be less explicit because to interpret them, clues from the superordinate clause can be used.

On account of their inexplicit and compact nature, non-finite structures serve as principal means of the so-called complex condensation, which is characteristic of English (see e.g. Dušková et al., 2006: 542). The term complex condensation denotes tendency to express information usually conveyed by dependent clauses by non-sentence elements, resulting in much denser sentence structure (Mathesius, 1961: 171). However, this inexplicitness inevitably carries the danger of a misunderstanding. Therefore, the advantage of condensation (or compression, to use Quirk et al.’s term) “must be balanced against the stumbling block of ambiguity” (Quirk et al., c1972: 724).

Regarding the types of non-finite verb phrases and clauses, Dušková et al. (2006: 265) distinguish three types of non-finite structures, namely the infinitive [1], the gerund [2], and the participle. The participle subsumes forms having two distinct suffixes, *-ing* [3a] and *-ed* [3b]:

[1] *He seemed to realize the difficulty.*

[2] *I remember seeing her there.*

[3a] *I saw his success growing.*

[3b] *I’ll keep my fingers crossed.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 267, 269, 586, 587)

Moreover, Quirk et al. further differentiate between two distinct types of the infinitive, namely *to*-infinitive and bare infinitive, distinguishing thus altogether four structural types of non-finite clauses. Nevertheless, *to*-infinitive and bare infinitive are usually considered to be mere subtypes of the infinitive.

Due to the subject matter of the present study, the following chapters will be devoted solely to the infinitive, focusing especially on the subject of infinitival clauses.

2.2 The Infinitive

2.2.1 Forms of the Infinitive

As already mentioned, we distinguish two subtypes of the infinitive according to the presence or absence of the infinitival marker *to*:

[4] *They forced me to sign the petition.*

[5] *All I did was ask a question.*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1174)

While *to*-infinitives [4] occur “in a very wide range of constructions” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1174) and Dušková et al. (2006: 266) consider them a basic form provided that the *to*-infinitive functions as an independent clause element, bare infinitives [5] are considerably more restricted¹.

The infinitive is generally negated by placing *not* in front of the first infinitival element, such as in *It is important **not** to move*. However, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 803) argue that there is also “an alternant where *not* follows *to*” (e.g. *It looks bad for them to **not** smile.*), which is semantically equivalent. The latter version is a special case of the construction called a ‘split infinitive’.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, non-finite clauses are not marked for such a wide range of grammatical categories as finite clauses are. However, infinitival clauses can to some extent express aspect and voice distinctions. The overview of all the infinitival forms is presented in Table 1:

¹ The occurrence of the bare infinitive as an independent sentence element is very limited. Therefore, since the present study deals with the infinitive as independent element, the bare infinitive is for our purposes rather marginal.

Table 1: Overview of the forms of the infinitive²

Aspect	Voice	
	Active	Passive
Non-perfective non-progressive	to do	to be done
Perfective non-progressive	to have done	to have been done
Non-perfective progressive	to be doing	[to be being done]
Perfective progressive	to have been doing	[to have been being done]

As Dušková et al. (2006: 267) point out, the distinct forms of the infinitive can express whether the infinitival action is simultaneous, successive, or subsequent to the action expressed by the finite verb. In other words, they express time with respect to the time expressed in the superordinate clause, regardless of the actual tense of the finite verb. In general, expression of simultaneity and posteriority is ascribed to non-perfective infinitives, whereas perfective infinitives are said to express anteriority (Dušková et al., 2006: 267).

2.2.2 Syntactic Functions of the Infinitive

Infinitival clauses can occur in a wide range of grammatical functions. Dušková et al. (2006: 542) distinguish several functions of the infinitive. The infinitive can function as subject, object, part of the predicate, or adjectival complementation. Moreover, it can also occur in adverbial and attributive function.

The more detailed description of the syntactic functions of the infinitive will be provided in the following subchapters.

2.2.2.1 Subject

Nominal infinitival clauses functioning as a subject of the clause in which they are embedded may occur in two distinct positions:

- [6] *To resist would be pointless.*
 [7] *It would be pointless to resist.*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1403)

Semantically, the infinitival clause *to resist* is in the same relation to the predicate in both the examples. However, structurally, the sentences apparently differ. While in [6] the infinitival clause occurs before the matrix V and thus, as observed by Mair (1990: 20), occupies the position typical of subjects in English, in [7] the infinitival clause is

² Dušková et al. (2006: 267) distinguish six distinct forms. However, Quirk et al. (1985: 153) further add two more possible combinations, progressive passive forms, marked by square brackets in Table 1.

moved to the end and the subject position is occupied by the pronoun *it*. The pronoun *it* is anticipatory, which means that “the *it* is not referential, and the *to*-clause functions as logical subject of the main clause” (Biber et al., 1999: 724). Such a construction is called ‘extraposition’. Even though Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1403) call the non-extraposed infinitival subject clause a basic version (as opposed to the version with extraposition), it is extraposition that is significantly more frequent (see e.g. Dušková et al., 2006: 543; Mair, 1990: 32).

The infinitive functioning as a subject is closely related to the construction called ‘Tough Movement’:

[8] *John was a delight to talk to.*

(Mair, 1990: 67)

In such a construction the surface S is in fact O of the infinitive which itself actually functions as S. The underlying structure of the sentence is thus *To talk to John was a delight*.

Predicates embedding infinitival subject clauses are usually verbonominal:

[9] *It would be **impolite** to leave so early.*

[10] *To play with him was **great fun**.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 542-543)

The structure containing extraposition and an adjective as the semantic nucleus of the predicate, as exemplified in [9], is then the most prototypical case of the infinitival subject clause (Mair, 1990: 26-27). However, notwithstanding the preference of extraposition, on the whole, “all structural types of subject clauses [...] are rare in English” (Mair, 1990: 27).

2.2.2.2 Object

In comparison to the infinitive functioning as a subject, the infinitive occurring in monotransitive and ditransitive patterns of complementation, i.e. functioning as an object, is considerably more common. The infinitive in monotransitive pattern of complementation without an explicit subject is even suggested to be “the most frequent pattern of infinitival complementation in modern English” (Mair, 1990: 101).

Similarly to its subject function, the infinitive functioning as O might be extraposed. The non-extraposed infinitival object is exemplified in [11], while [12] illustrates the extraposed version:

[11] *He doesn't want to be disturbed.*

[12] *I found it difficult to adapt myself.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 550, 551)

In [11], the infinitival clause functions as a direct object of *want*, whereas in [12] it is the anticipatory *it* that occupies the position of the object. The anticipatory *it* is followed by the object complement and the infinitive then functions as the extraposed object. Quirk et al. (1985: 1062, 1393) emphasise that in such cases (i.e. when infinitival objects co-occur with an object complement) extraposition is obligatory. However, while extraposition of the infinitival subject clauses is prototypical, the extraposed infinitive in object function does not occur so frequently. On the contrary, extraposition of the object is rather rare (see Dušková et al., 2006: 551).

Furthermore, the infinitive can also occur in ditransitive patterns of complementation. However, constructions of this type, as well as infinitival objects in monotransitive pattern having an overt subject, will be discussed in the chapter focusing on the subject of the infinitive.

2.2.2.3 Part of the Predicate

When occurring after copular verbs, the infinitive can be considered part of the predicate. The infinitive then functions as a subject complement and it “further identifies or describes the subject of the main clause” (Biber et al., 1999: 659).

We can differentiate between two structures containing the infinitive functioning as a subject complement:

[13] *Our task is to describe and to interpret, not to praise or to criticize.*

[14] *The deadline seems to be feasible.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 546, 547)

Copular verbs taking the infinitive might be *be* [13], or the verbs *seem*, *appear*, *chance* and *happen* [14]. Instances such as [14] are examples of ‘subject raising’ (Dušková et al., 2006: 548). The underlying structure of [14] is *It seems that the deadline is feasible*, containing the subject *the deadline* in the dependent clause. On the other hand, in [14] the subject is ‘raised’ into the superordinate clause. In other words, the subject “belongs semantically in a lower clause than that in which it functions syntactically” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 65).

Further, the infinitive also occurs after adjectives such as *likely*, *sure* or *certain*:

[15] *She is not likely to remain single.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 547)

Such constructions are closely related to the above mentioned structure [14]. As Dušková et al. (2006: 548) claim, [15] contains subject raising as well. However, in this case, the infinitive is not a subject complement, but part of the subject. The underlying

construction in this case would be *That she will remain single is not likely*. Therefore, in [15] only part of the subject is raised into the position of the S. Dušková et al. (2006: 548) consider instances of this type as having ‘split subject’.

As already mentioned, the bare infinitive is very limited in its functions. However, Quirk et al. (1985: 1067) point out that the subject complement in pseudo-cleft sentences is one of rare functions in which the bare infinitive commonly occurs³:

[16] *What the plan does is ensure a fair pension for all.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1067)

2.2.2.4 Postmodifier

The infinitive can further occur as part of a noun phrase in which it functions as a postmodifier of the head noun:

[17] *Their chance to go abroad was lost.*

[18] *The man to help you is Mr Johnson.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1266, 1272)

In general, postmodification by means of the infinitive clause is quite common. Quirk et al. (1985) distinguish two types. Firstly, the infinitive can specify the content of the head, which is in general an abstract noun [17]. Secondly, it can provide additional information about the head noun [18]. The former are called appositive clauses, the latter are termed relative infinitive clauses (Quirk et al., 1985: 1260, 1265, 1271-1272).

The infinitive functioning as a postmodifier can also occur with a relative pronoun:

[19] *A good place **at which** to eat is the pub round the corner.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1266)

However, this more explicit alternative is less common and more formal (Quirk et al., 1985: 1266). The postmodifying infinitive after certain nouns can also be preceded by an interrogative pronoun and the preposition *of* or *as to*, such as in *the question of how to proceed* (Dušková et al., 2006: 567).

2.2.2.5 Complementation of an Adjective

The infinitive can further function as a complement of an adjective. Dušková et al. (2006: 559) distinguish two groups of adjectives taking *to*-infinitive complementation:

[20] *I am **glad** to be able to help.*

[21] *He was **most unwilling** to make any alterations.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 559-560)

³ The bare infinitive is further “found after perception verbs and causatives like *make* or *let*” (Ojea, 2008: 78).

The first group consists of adjectives expressing stance, such as *angry* or *happy* [20]. Secondly, the *to*-infinitive complements adjectives (such as *ready* or *reluctant*) expressing the disposition to realization of the action [21].

However, infinitives functioning as complementation of an adjective should not be confused with the superficially similar structure, described in 2.2.2.1, which contains an adjective followed by a *to*-infinitive functioning as an extraposed subject clause.

2.2.2.6 Adverbial

Unlike the previous syntactic functions, the infinitive in adverbial function is characterised by being integrated into the sentence structure rather more loosely. According to Dušková et al. (2006: 561), it is an optional constituent of a clause. Nevertheless, Quirk et al. (1985: 507) also mention the infinitive functioning as an obligatory clause element, such as in *I went to visit my mother*. Quirk et al. explain that in such cases the infinitival clause is only superficially similar to the infinitive of purpose and is more integrated into the sentence structure. Dušková (1999: 38) even suggests that such structures, which she calls adverbials of goal, “are to be regarded as transitional elements between object and adjunct [...]”

Regarding the semantic roles, infinitival adverbial clauses may express purpose, goal, and, occasionally, other roles. They can also have temporal function or even function as disjuncts or conjuncts.

Clauses of purpose are by far the most common type of the infinitive in adverbial function (see Biber et al, 1999: 828; Dušková et al., 2006: 561). Moreover, not only are they the most typical type of infinitival adverbial clause, but they are also more typical in this function than corresponding finite adverbial clauses (Quirk et al., 1985: 1107).

To-infinitives expressing purpose often occur with the subordinators *so as* or *in order*⁴. Compare for example:

[22] *I left early to catch the train.*

[23] *Students should take notes **so as** to make revision easier.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1107)

While in [22] the infinitive expresses purpose by itself, in [23] the relation is overtly marked by the subordinator. The employment of the subordinator is often favourable as they “often make the meaning of the adverbial clause instantly recognizable and prevent any potential misinterpretation” (Biber et al., 1999: 840).

⁴ Even though the whole structure *in order to* or *so as to* is often treated as the subordinator, according to Biber et al. (1999: 827), “*to* in this case is the infinitive marker and not strictly part of the subordinator.”

Other subordinators that might be used with the infinitival adverbial of purpose are *as if* and *as though*:

[24] *He examined the notes thoroughly, as if to see if they were real.*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1153)

Although the infinitive also involves intention and purpose, in this case it is somewhat reduced and “the stated purpose is not verified fact” (Biber et al., 1999: 841). The purposive nature of such structures is so weakened that for instance Dušková et al. (2006: 564) do not consider them adverbials of purpose at all but classify them as adverbials of manner.

Another frequent role of the infinitival adverbial is, to use the terminology of Dušková et al., adverbial of “false purpose”:

[25] *I awoke to find the room flooded by sunshine.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 562)

The infinitive of this type strongly resembles the infinitive of purpose. However, as Dušková et al. (2006: 562) point out, there is a substantial difference between the two types. Unlike adverbials of purpose, adverbials of “false purpose” lack the intention. They thus in fact do not express purpose, but temporal relation, and might be paraphrased by a coordinative construction (e.g. *I awoke and found the room flooded by sunshine.*), or, as added by Quirk et al. (1985: 1079), by “using a *when-* or *after-*clause” (e.g. *When I awoke, I found the room flooded by sunshine.*). Moreover, infinitival clauses of “false purpose” cannot be preceded by the subordinators *so as* and *in order*.

Dušková et al. (2006: 563) further distinguish the infinitive functioning as adverbial of goal, such as in [26] below:

[26] *She has sent me to collect the luggage.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 563)

As already mentioned, Dušková (1999: 38) considers them to be “transitional elements between object and adjunct.” This is due to the fact that “in spite of the fact that they represent semantic elements of adverbial character, they are part of the verb’s government” (Dušková, 1999: 38). On the other hand, the infinitive of purpose is not. Furthermore, unlike the infinitive of purpose, it is impossible to paraphrase the infinitive of goal using the subordinators *in order* or *so as*.

Moreover, *to-*infinitive adverbial clauses may also, less frequently, express for example cause, concession, comparison, or result (Dušková et al., 2006: 564).

Finally, the specific type is the infinitive following expressions modified by *too* or *enough*. While *too* “expresses a degree that exceeds the maximum or upper bound

consistent with fulfilling the need, purpose, or desire,” *enough* expresses “a degree that is at least as high as the minimum or lower bound” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1262):

[27] *The suitcase is **too** small to hold all these things.*

[28] *Solar energy is abundant **enough** to be practically without limit.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 561)

Interestingly, while Quirk et al. (1985: 1140) or Knotková (1986: 250-251) treat such structures as adjuncts, Biber et al. (1999: 199) or Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1256)⁵ consider them adjective complements.

Besides the above mentioned types, all of them being adjuncts, infinitival clauses may also function as conjuncts [29] or disjuncts [30]:

[29] *To conclude, let us enumerate the most important points.*

[30] *To be sincere, I didn't like it.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 562-563)

As conjuncts, they typically occur in the initial position. Dušková et al. (2006: 562) contrast them with purpose adjuncts and explain that their purposive function is weakened and they thus rather serve to connect the sentence with the previous parts of the text, i.e. function as conjuncts. When functioning as style disjuncts, they express a speaker's attitude and comments on his or her manner of speaking.

2.3 Subject of the Infinitive

It has been already discussed that non-finite clauses are characterised by a substantial degree of inexplicitness. Their interpretation requires us to use clues from either the superordinate clause or the broader linguistic context. One aspect of this inexplicitness is a subject of the infinitive, which is commonly missing.

Having said that, infinitive clauses are not strictly subjectless. On the contrary, they often contain an explicit subject. The presence of an explicit subject might be, as suggested by Crystal (2004: 124), very beneficial, as it might help to avoid potential ambiguity of a condensed structure.

We can thus distinguish two basic types of infinitival clauses according to the presence or absence of an overt subject of the infinitive:

⁵ Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1256) treat structures such as that in [1T] as an indirect complement of an adjective licensed by *too* rather than by an adjective, as opposed to a direct complement licensed directly by an adjective.

- i. Subjectless infinitive⁶
[31] *The best thing would be to tell everybody.*
- ii. Infinitive with subject
[32] *The best thing would be **for you** to tell everybody.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 993)

As will be discussed later, the presence of the subject is obligatory in some cases, whereas in some other cases the overt subject is merely optional.

Nevertheless, to differentiate between subjectless infinitives and infinitives containing S might be somewhat misleading. When dealing with the subject of the infinitive it is necessary to distinguish two uses of this term. In the above mentioned classification the subject of the infinitive is regarded as an overtly expressed element. However, what is actually often meant by the S of the infinitive is the agent of the action expressed by the infinitival clause. This agent might but does not have to be expressed. Therefore, the term subjectless infinitive in fact means that the infinitive lacks the overt element expressing the subject, not the subject itself. In other words, regardless of the presence or absence of the explicit S of the infinitive, the agent of the infinitival action is always present (although sometimes it has to be inferred). What thus seems to be more than plausible is Jacobs's (c1995: 50) view that infinitival clauses always have a subject, only sometimes it is understood rather than overt.

In the case of absence of an overt S, the subject of the infinitival action must be recoverable from the context, either linguistic or extralinguistic. In general, there are four possible interpretations of the subject of the infinitive. Firstly, it might be identical to the S of the superordinate clause [33]. Secondly, it might correspond to some constituent of the superordinate clause other than the subject [34]. Further, the subject of the infinitive might be identified as the speaker ('I') [35]. Finally, it might be understood as being indefinite or as expressing the general human agent [36].

[33] *I didn't claim to be an authority.*

[34] *I told grandma to make me and Tim some more.*

[35] *It's a hard work, to be honest.*

[36] *To be an administrator⁷ is to have the worst job in the world.*

(Biber et al., 1999: 695; Quirk et al., 1985: 995)

If the S of the infinitive is understood to be identical to a constituent of the superordinate clause (such as S or O), this constituent is considered its antecedent and we then speak about 'control'. A covert S of the infinitive is considered 'the controlled

⁶ When using the term "subjectless", we adhere to the terminology used by Mair (1990: 20, 22). Therefore, in the present study, the term is used to describe the infinitive lacking an overt element expressing the subject of the infinitive, and not in its traditional sense implying verbs with zero valency.

⁷ Paraphrased by Quirk et al. (1985: 995) as 'For a person to be an administrator [...]'.

element', whereas its antecedent (which itself might be unexpressed) is 'the controller' (see e.g. Mair, 1990: 106; Matthews, 2007: 146). These control relations are said to be often operating according to a so-called 'configurational principle' (Mair, 1990: 106, 171). This principle "provides for the closest available [nonperipheral] constituent of the matrix clause to become the 'controller' of the subjectless infinitive" (Mair, 1990: 106).

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1193), 'control' is one way of interpreting infinitival clauses. Besides this type (called 'controlled interpretation') they further differentiate between 'raised interpretation' (i.e. when "the missing subject is retrievable from the raised complement in the matrix clause") and 'non-syntactical' interpretation (or 'pragmatic', as used by Geisler (1995: 69)) which is applicable when "the missing subject is not linked to an antecedent in some syntactically specified position" and "has to be identified from the context" (such as in [35] and [36] above).

Generally speaking, when overtly present, the subject of the infinitive is typically expressed by a *for*-phrase:

[37] **For us to take part in the discussion would be a conflict of interest.**
(Quirk et al., 1985: 1061)

As demonstrated in [37], "when the subject is a pronoun [...], it is in the objective case" (Quirk et al., 1985: 1061).

However, as will be discussed in more detail in the following subchapters, there are differences as to whether the noun phrase or the *for*-phrase preceding the infinitive is the constituent of the superordinate clause or simply the subject of the infinitive.

In the following subchapters, the subject of the infinitive will be more closely examined with respect to the syntactic function of the infinitival clause.

2.3.1 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as a Subject

As stated in 2.2.2.1, there are two different structures containing the infinitive functioning as the subject of the matrix clause, namely extraposed and non-extraposed. Accordingly, since both constructions might occur either with or without their own subject, Mair (1990: 20) distinguishes four basic structural types:

- i. Extraposed and subjectless
- ii. Extraposed with subject
- iii. Non-extraposed and subjectless
- iv. Non-extraposed with subject

According to Mair's (1990: 22) corpus findings, the non-extraposed structure with subject (iv.) is the least numerous version as opposed to its extraposed subjectless

counterpart (i.), which is the most numerous. This is in agreement with our previous claim that extraposition is typical of the infinitive functioning as a subject, and also with Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1252) who also assert that “the subjectless form is much more frequent”.

Non-extraposed constructions having S explicitly expressed require the presence of *for* introducing the subject:

[38] **For him** to offer help means nothing.

(Dušková et al., 2006: 544)

It is usually agreed that the *for*-phrase in such cases only expresses the subject of the infinitival action (Dušková et al., 2006: 544-545; Mair, 1990: 41) unless separated from the infinitive by a comma or intonationally (Mair, 1990: 41-42).

On the other hand, with extraposed structures having the explicit subject it is “often not clear whether *for* + NP should be regarded as a prepositional phrase within the matrix clause or as the subject of the infinitive” (Mair, 1990: 22). In other words, it might not be clear whether the *for*-phrase is part of the matrix clause or of the infinitival clause (see also Hicks, 2003: 20), as in the following example:

[39] *It might be helpful for you* to know that I'm earning seven thousand pounds at the moment.

(Mair, 1990: 53)

However, as Mair (1990: 52-53) suggests, there is not a radical difference in meaning between the two interpretations but rather a slight shift in emphasis. While in case of interpreting *for you* as part of the matrix clause *helpful* would be understood in the sense of specific helpfulness (‘It might help you’), regarding *for you* solely as the subject of the infinitive would result in the sense of general helpfulness (‘It might be helpful (for all of us) if you knew...’). To further illustrate the ambiguity of [39], there are two possible unambiguous paraphrases of this example:

[40a] To know that I'm earning seven thousand pounds at the moment might be helpful **for you.**

[40b] **For you** to know that I'm earning seven thousand pounds at the moment might be helpful.

In [40a] *for you* is clearly part of the matrix clause. On the other hand, in [40b] *for you* only expresses the subject of the infinitival action (see Mair, 1990: 41; Hicks, 2003: 20). This is acknowledged by Dušková et al. (2006: 545) who agree that the *for*-phrase in cases such as [38b] is only the subject of the infinitive. However, they imply that the *for*-phrase might (although does not have to) also denote the entity experiencing the state or attitude expressed by the adjective embedding the infinitive clause, i.e. might be

related to the adjective, not just the infinitive as [40a]. Nevertheless, Mair (1990: 41) argues that “for such an interpretation to be plausible [...] *for* + *NP* should be separated from the infinitive intonationally or by means of a comma.”

Finally, there are semantic restrictions preventing, to some extent and in some cases, the interpretation of *for*-phrases as constituents of the matrix clause:

Within the matrix clause, *for*-phrases denote experiencers or beneficiaries. This means that the noun following the preposition *for* is generally animate or at least denotes a referent which can be metaphorically construed as a mind-possessing entity, capable of experiencing the action or state referred to in the infinitival subject clause.

(Mair, 1990: 42)

Therefore, as Mair explains, inanimate entities introduced by *for* are very unlikely to be interpreted as experiencers, and are thus merely agents of the infinitival action.

The Tough Movement construction (e.g. *John was a delight to talk to.*) is rather specific with respect to the S of the infinitive. As already discussed, the surface S (*John*) is neither the S of the matrix clause nor of the infinitive. In fact, it is the object of the infinitive. The subject of the infinitival action is thus different and might be usually identified as being indefinite or expressing the general human agent. However, even TM constructions might occur with a *for*-phrase explicitly expressing the S of the infinitive:

[41] *John is difficult **for Mary** to please.*

(Hicks, 2003: 17)

In such cases, the same problem arises as to whether to treat the *for*-phrase as part of the matrix clause or solely as the subject of the infinitive. However, in this particular case, a different view is held by Dušková et al. (2006: 545) who claim that, in the case of verb-nominal predicates embedding the infinitive clause, the interpretation of a *for*-phrase partially depends on the Adj, and, for instance, in the case of the adjectives *easy*, *difficult*, *hard* and *pleasant*, the *for*-phrase always expresses both the agent of the infinitival action and the experiencer.

Nevertheless, what differentiates TM constructions with explicit subject from both extraposed and non-extraposed infinitives with S is the fact that while the former permits only one *for*-phrase, the latter permits up to two *for*-phrases (Hicks, 2003: 19). Compare the following examples:

[42] *John is difficult (**for Mary**) (*for Bill) to please.*

[43] *It is difficult (for Mary) (**for Bill**) to please John.*

[44] *(**For Bill**) to please John is difficult (for Mary).*

(Hicks, 2003: 17)

According to Hicks (2003: 19), when two *for*-phrases occur in such constructions it is natural that one of them is analysed as the subject of the infinitive and the other one as part of the matrix clause. It is thus possible for both extraposed [43] and non-extraposed [44] variants to unambiguously express both the agent of the infinitival action and the entity experiencing (or being evaluated by) what is expressed by the adjective. As Hicks (2003: 19) further explains, it can be assumed that the *for*-phrase immediately preceding the *to*-infinitive (*for Bill* in the examples above) is its subject, and the *for*-phrase immediately following the verb-nominal predicate (*for Mary*) is part of the matrix clause, i.e. the experiencer. Dušková et al. (2006: 545) further add that the experiencer might also be expressed by a *to*-phrase (e.g. *It was a great surprise to us for him to admit his fault*).

Finally, Dušková et al. (2006: 543-544) mention that the specific construction occurs with the evaluating adjectives such as *kind*, *clever*, *wrong*, *crazy*, etc. With these adjectives the experiencer (and the S of the infinitive at the same time) is usually overtly expressed by an *of*-phrase (e.g. *It was careless of you to leave the gate open*).

2.3.2 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as an Object

Monotransitive structures with no overt subject, i.e. structures containing an infinitival clause functioning as an object and immediately following the matrix verb, are characterised by the fact that the agent of the infinitival action is as a rule identical to the subject of the matrix V (Dušková et al., 2006: 551; Quirk et al., 1985: 1185-1187).

[45] *He refused to cooperate.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 549)

Therefore, in [45], the antecedent of the understood subject of the infinitive is *He*, i.e. the subject of the matrix clause.

Nevertheless, Biber et al. (1999: 695) argue that there is an exception to this in the form of the verb *say*⁸. The exception consists in the fact that with certain uses of the verb, “the implied subject of the *to*-clause refers to the speaker (rather than the main clause subject)” (Biber et al., 1999: 695):

[46] *Jerry said to tell you how sorry he is.*

(Biber et al., 1999: 695)

Mair (1990: 107) suggests that in such cases it is the object of *say* that controls the understood subject of the infinitive even if the O is not overtly present but, similarly to the subject itself, understood. This might be explained from the pragmatic point of

⁸ Besides *say*, Mair (1990: 107) claims that the verbs *shout* and *yell* seem to behave in a similar way.

view, for “if one says something there has to be an addressee, regardless of whether it is explicitly mentioned or not” (Mair, 1990: 107).

The infinitive functioning as O often occurs with a preceding noun phrase. Even though in general two basic types of this structure are distinguished according to whether the intervening NP is a constituent part of the matrix clause or only S of the infinitive (Dušková, 1999: 29), the approach to this construction considerably differs among scholars. However, the following overview will be based predominantly on the theory presented in Dušková (1999) and Dušková et al. (2006).

In the examples below, the NP belongs exclusively in the infinitival clause and, therefore, what functions as an object of the main verb is the whole structure consisting of the NP and the infinitival clause (Dušková, 1999: 31-32; Dušková et al., 2006: 551):

[47] *I intend **John** to accompany you.*

[48] *I hate **you** to be troubled.*

(Dušková, 1999: 29, 31)

What supports this view is for instance the fact that in such cases the NP cannot occur as an object by itself (i.e. without being complemented by an infinitival clause), as in [47], or that its semantic relation to the main verb is different than it would be without the presence of the infinitive, as in [48] (see Dušková, 1999: 32; Dušková et al., 2006: 551-552). In other words, what is hated (or intended) in [47] and [48] is not *you* (or *John*) but the whole situation expressed by the infinitival clause. The intervening NP then acts solely as the S of the infinitive, expressing the agent of the infinitival action which is different from the S of the superordinate clause. However, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1201) or Mair (1990: 110) take a different approach claiming that the intervening NP in fact is O of the matrix verb. Nevertheless, they call such an object a ‘raised object’ (i.e. “the subject of an embedded clause [promoted] to the rank of object in the matrix clause” (Mair, 1990: 110)) explaining that it is O of the main verb from syntactic point of view and S of the infinitive from a semantic point of view. However, Mair still agrees with monotransitive analysis of these constructions. Moreover, Quirk et al. (1985: 1216-1219) provide yet another point of view. While their analysis of [48] is the same as that of Dušková and Dušková et al., they argue that [47] is a borderline case and that the NP in [47] functions rather as O_d and the infinitival clause as C_o.

Other borderline cases are exemplified in [49] and [50]:

[49] *I saw **him** arrive.*

[50] *I supposed **her** to be a widow.*

(Dušková, 1999: 33)

With the verbs of perception (e.g. [49]) it is not clear whether the intervening NP is solely the S of the infinitive, the shared element (which will be discussed in the following paragraph), or the O of the main verb followed by the C_o in the form of the infinitival clause (Dušková et al., 2006: 553-554; Dušková, 1999: 32). Similarly, sentences with the infinitive after verbs such as *consider*, *believe*, or *suppose* ([50]) might be considered a “transitional case between the sentence types S + V + O and S + V + O + C_o”⁹ (Dušková, 1999: 33-34). However, regardless of classification, the understood subject of the infinitive is in both cases identical to the intervening nominal element. Moreover, the verbs represented by [50] are specific in that “the intervening NP cannot be omitted even when it is coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1180), and a reflexive pronoun thus has to be used in the case of correspondence of the agent of the infinitival action to the S of the matrix V (see also Dušková et al., 2006: 553).

As already stated, it is necessary to distinguish structures which are seemingly similar to the previously discussed sentences in that the infinitive functioning as O is preceded by a NP, but in which the NP is not only part of the infinitival clause but, at the same time, a constituent of the superordinate clause. According to Dušková et al. (2006: 555), the NP is thus shared by the matrix V and the infinitive, and such a structure is therefore an example of ‘apo koinou’ construction¹⁰:

[51] *He persuaded **me** to accompany John.*

[52] *I advised **him** to consult his doctor.*

(Dušková, 1999: 29)

Unlike in the previously discussed structures, in [51] and [52] the NP preceding the infinitive functions as O of the matrix verb from both a structural and a semantic point of view. Therefore, in this case we deal with infinitival clauses in ditransitive pattern of complementation (Mair, 1990: 149).

Regarding the subject of this type of structure, infinitival clauses, as already suggested, might be seen as having S in the form of the preceding NP which, at the same time, functions also as O of the matrix verb (Dušková, 1999: 36). However, it can also be approached from a different point of view: the infinitive in such structures can be considered subjectless, and the understood subject of the infinitive then as being controlled by the object of the matrix verb (Mair, 1990: 150, 162).

⁹ The view favouring the latter pattern held e.g. by Quirk et al. (1985: 1185, 1195, 1202-1203).

¹⁰ Interestingly, Mair (1990: 110) considers the structures represented e.g. by [O3] and [O4] to be a specific type of “fused constructions” (the term used by Matthews) claiming that it is the previous type in which the intervening NP is shared, i.e. is O of the matrix verb and S of the infinitive at the same time.

On the whole, when an intervening NP is present, regardless of its status, the configurational principle is usually at work and a shift in control takes place – “from the subject of the matrix clause to its object [...]” (Mair, 1990: 106-107). However, there are also exceptions:

[53] *Sam promised **me** to get some food.*

[54] *I asked **my boss** to have the afternoon off.*

(Mair, 1990: 173; Quirk et al., 1985: 1216)

Unlike in the previously discussed sentences, in [53] and [54] the understood subject of the infinitive is, notwithstanding the presence of the intervening NP, identical to the S of the superordinate clause and not to its O. In [53], the subject control might be explained by the lexical meaning of the matrix verb, as “in the speech act of promising, one normally commits oneself to a future course of action but not somebody else” (Mair, 1990: 171-172). The verb *promise* is thus exceptional, as it typically does not occur with the following NP allowing different interpretation (see Dušková et al., 2006: 556; Quirk et al., 1985: 1216), and is “the only major verb following this pattern” (Biber et al., 1999: 696). On the other hand, in [54] the configurational principle is overridden rather by pragmatic and contextual factors. Although the sentence might be considered ambiguous, in the real world it would be very unlikely to interpret *my boss* as being the agent of the infinitival action (Mair, 1990: 173). However, interestingly, with verbs such as *persuade* or *tell*, the subject-control interpretation is not possible notwithstanding its contextual plausibility (Mair, 1990: 172). Consequently, in [53] and [54], the intervening NP is not a shared element (see Dušková, 1999: 35).

Furthermore, another verb which is unique in terms of the interpretation of the subject of the infinitive is the phrasal verb *agree* (*with someone to do something*):

[55] *For the present I shall ask my reader to agree with me to call it 'X' [...].*

(Mair, 1990: 108)

In this case “both the subject and the object of the matrix clause are the implicit subject of the infinitival clause” (Mair, 1990: 108). Moreover, “if on the other hand the infinitive refers to an action that can reasonably be performed only by one of the participants,” the subject of the infinitive tends to be interpreted as being identical to S of the matrix verb (similarly to the verb *promise*) (Mair, 1990: 108).

Infinitival clauses in object function might also occur with the subject introduced by a preceding *for*-phrase:

[56] *Jack prefers **for his wife** to drive the truck.*

[57] *They arranged **for Mary** to come at once.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1193)

In both [56] and [57], the *for*-phrase expresses the agent of the infinitival action. However, there is a difference between the structures. With verbs of wanting (e.g. [56]), *for* might be optionally used in American English (Dušková et al., 2006: 558; Quirk et al., 1985: 1062). However, Dušková et al. (2006: 558) point out that in both the varieties *for* is obligatory if the NP does not immediately follow the matrix verb, such as in *I want very much **for you** to go*. On the other hand, certain verbs occurring in such constructions (e.g. *wait for*, *plan for*, or *arrange for* in [57]) should be considered prepositional. The preposition *for* is thus an integral part of the predicate and the *for*-phrase is obligatory (Biber et al., 1999: 694, 698; Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1179; Quirk et al., 1985: 1193).

Moreover, the infinitive of this type also occurs after other prepositional Vs, and its S thus can be introduced by other prepositions such as *on* (e.g. *You may rely **upon us** to do our best*). The NP introduced by *on* might be regarded either as being a shared element or as belonging exclusively to the infinitival clause (Dušková et al., 2006: 558).

2.3.3 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as Part of the Predicate

The subject of the infinitive functioning as a subject complement and occurring after copular *be* can be made explicit in a preceding *for*-phrase, too, such as in [59] below. Otherwise, the subject of the infinitive has to be inferred from the context. It might correspond to the subject of the matrix clause or controlled, for instance, by a possessive determiner preceding the subject, as in [58]:

[58] *Our task is to describe and to interpret, not to praise or to criticize.*

[59] *The order was **for everybody** to stay indoors.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 546)

If both the subject and the subject complement have the form of the infinitive, the S of the infinitive functioning as C_s is identical to the S of the infinitive functioning as the subject. Therefore, for instance, in the case of *To be human is to err* (Quirk et al., 1985: 1063), the subject can be understood as the general human agent.

As for the structures containing subject raising, the subject of the infinitive is identical to the subject of the matrix clause:

[60] *John happened to see Tom.*

[61] *He is likely to win.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 548)

As already mentioned, when the subject is raised it means that it “belongs semantically in a lower clause than that in which it functions syntactically” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 65). Therefore, the structure of this type is different from other sentences

containing the subject of the infinitive corresponding to the subject of the matrix verb in that “there is no direct semantic relation” between the S (e.g. *John* in [60]) and the V (e.g. *happened* in [60]), and S thus has a semantic role only with respect to the infinitive (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 66, 1194).

2.3.4 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as a Postmodifier

When the infinitive functions as a postmodifier, its subject “is normally covert and can either be arbitrary or generic in reference, or be inferred from the context via control” (Geisler, 1995: 13).

The head noun which is modified by the infinitive might but does not necessarily have to be the subject of the infinitive.

[62] *The next train to stop at Mickleham goes at ten-thirty.*

[63] *He has a tendency to exaggerate.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 568)

In [62], the subject of the infinitive is identical to the head noun. Although in this particular case the head noun, at the same time, functions as the S of the matrix verb, it is not the rule. Besides the head noun, the understood subject of the infinitive might be controlled by the S of the matrix verb, as in [63] (Dušková et al., 2006: 567-568).

Geisler (1995: 70) further claims that besides the head noun and the subject of the matrix verb, any NP functioning as an argument in the matrix clause can in fact control the understood subject. For instance, in [64], the agent of the infinitival action is identical to the indirect object of the matrix verb:

[64] *If there is what the same paper has called a 'British obsession about soldiers in politics', then many parts of the world have been giving us plenty to be obsessed about.*

(Geisler, 1995: 70)

However, we often find sentences in which the subject of the infinitive is identical to neither the head noun nor any other constituent of the clause, such as in [65]:

[65] *The most convenient time to go is Saturday morning.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 568)

In such cases the subject of the infinitive is said to be vague. According to Dušková et al. (2006: 568), it might include a speaker or a hearer and thus be interpreted as *we* or *you*. In the former case, *we* can be interpreted as either exclusive or inclusive. Furthermore, it might be interpreted as the general human agent and thus understood as people in general. This is example of relation between the understood S and its referent

termed pragmatic control (Geisler, 1995: 69). On the whole, in such cases the interpretation of the subject of the infinitival action depends on the context.

Similarly to other types, postmodifying infinitival clauses may also occur with the subject overtly expressed. Typically, the agent is expressed by possessive determination of the head noun [66], or by a *for*-phrase [67] (Dušková et al., 2006: 568):

[66] *I don't doubt **his** ability to do research work.*

[67] *There's nothing **for you** to cry about.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 568)

Subjects introduced by *for* are often employed to prevent misinterpretation of another clausal element as the understood subject (Geisler, 1995: 72).

Further, *for*-phrases do not normally occur with infinitives in passive, as it is possible to express the S by a *for*-phrase only with active postmodifying infinitives (Geisler, 1995: 34). Nevertheless, if a passive infinitive is preceded by a *for*-phrase, the *for*-phrase does not express the agent of the infinitival action but the underlying object, such as in *The time has come **for him** to be taken seriously* (Geisler, 1995: 180).

Even though the agent of passive infinitives is characteristically vague, they can occur with the agent overtly expressed as well. The subject is then introduced by the preposition *by*. Such optional subjects are called *by*-agents by Geisler (1995: 68):

[68] *the problem to be solved by John*

(Geisler, 1995: 180)

With passive infinitives, an optional *by*-phrase is the only possible lexical realization of the agent (Geisler, 1995: 70-71).

Furthermore, in the case of appositive postmodification, Quirk et al. (1985: 1271) mention that the S may be introduced not only by *for*, but also by the preposition *to*, such as in *The appeal **to us** to give blood received strong support*.

However, on the whole, it is rather rare for the postmodifying infinitive to occur with the S overtly expressed by a *for*-phrase (Biber et al., 1999: 633; Geisler, 1995: 73).

When the subject of the postmodifying infinitive is not overtly expressed, ambiguity with respect to the agent of the infinitival action may arise in certain cases:

[69] *He is the best man to choose.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1267)

In [69], it is not clear who does the choosing. There are two possible readings of the sentence. Either the person described as *the best man* (i.e. *he*) is the one who should make the choice, or this person would be the best to be chosen. In other words, the head (*the best man* in this case) might be interpreted either as S or O of the infinitive (Quirk

et al., 1985: 1267). In the latter case, the subject of the infinitive is not identical to any constituent of the clause and is thus vague. Its interpretation is then similar to that of [44]. On the whole, in cases such as [69], the subject of the infinitival action has to be inferred from the context, on which depends the interpretation of the whole sentence.

2.3.5 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as an Adjective Complementation

Regarding the infinitive functioning as an adjective complementation, the agent of the infinitival action typically corresponds to the subject of the matrix verb (i.e. the entity having qualities expressed by an adjective) (Dušková et al., 2006: 560). Therefore, for example, in [70] it is *I* who is both sorry and caused a delay:

[70] *I'm sorry to have caused a delay.*

[71] *John is eager to please.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 560)

Similarly, in [71] it is *John* who is characterised by the adjective and at the same time is the subject of the infinitive. This differentiates the infinitive of this type from seemingly similar structures (called Tough Movement constructions), such as *John is easy to please*, in which the infinitive functions as S in the underlying structure and the surface subject (*John* in this case) is not the subject of the infinitive but in fact its object (Dušková et al., 2006: 543-544; Mair, 1990: 67).

However, with some adjectives expressing stance, the infinitive can have S on its own, too, expressed by a preceding *for*-phrase:

[72] *He is not eager **for me** to become his successor.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 560)

Therefore, in [72] it is *me* who is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action.

2.3.6 Subject of the Infinitive Functioning as an Adverbial

The most common type of the adverbial infinitive, the infinitive of purpose, is characterised by the fact that “the subject of the underlying clause is as a rule identical with that of the superordinate clause” (Dušková, 1999: 39), such as in [73] and [74]:

[73] *The boy climbed the tree to pick some apples.*

[74] *He served her to repay his debt.*

(Dušková, 1999: 38, 39)

As illustrated by the examples above, the implied subject of the infinitive is assumed to correspond to the S of the matrix clause even when preceded by a NP (unlike in the case of the infinitive functioning as an object). Accordingly, sentences containing the purposive infinitive whose agent is different from the S of the matrix clause are thus

considered defective. Even if it is possible to logically identify the agent, such structures are not completely acceptable, as for example *?Too see the procession, I put the child on my shoulders* (Quirk et al., 1985: 1121-1122).

Nevertheless, Quirk et al. (1985: 1121-1122) and Biber et al. (1999: 829-830) argue that the standard attachment rule (i.e. the equivalence of the understood S and the S of the superordinate clause) is sometimes relaxed, and non-equivalence of the subjects can in fact occur in some cases. This applies especially to infinitival clauses functioning as disjuncts, which will be discussed later, but might occur with the purposive infinitive as well. Consider the examples below:

[75] *To borrow books from this library, it is necessary to register as a member of the library.*

[76] *The meeting was adjourned by the Head of Department to provide time for consultation with course committees.*

[77] *To check on the reliability of the first experiment, the experiment was replicated with a second set of subjects.*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 729; Quirk et al., 1985: 1122-1123)

Firstly, the attachment rule is relaxed if the S position of the matrix clause is occupied by anticipatory *it* (Quirk et al., 1985: 1122), as in [75] where the S of the infinitive might be understood as the GHA. Secondly, in [76] the implied agent of the passive construction in the matrix clause (expressed by the *by*-phrase) might be considered the agent of the infinitive. However, “we can also take the whole matrix situation as providing the interpretation” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 729). In other words, either *the Head of Department* or ‘the whole act of adjourning’ might be understood as providing time. Similar explanation might be applicable to [77], too. However, it might also be explained by the fact that the non-correspondence is typical of formal scientific writing in sentences “where the implied subject is to be identified with the *I*, *we*, and *you* of the writer(s) or reader(s)” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1122-1123), such as in [77].

Naturally, the purposive structures whose agent does not correspond to the subject of the superordinate clause and that do not belong among the above mentioned exceptions occur as well. However, in such cases, the subject of the infinitive has to be explicitly expressed (Dušková, 1999: 39). The S is then expressed by a *for*-phrase:

[78] *He opened the door for her to go out.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 562)

Regarding infinitive clauses of purpose containing *in order* or *so as*, there is a considerable difference between the two subordinators. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 728), infinitive clauses preceded by *so as* cannot contain a subject. On

the other hand, those with *in order* might (similarly to the construction without the explicit subordinator) contain a *for*-phrase overtly expressing the agent. Therefore, only infinitival structures with *in order* can express the subject of the infinitival action different from that of the matrix clause. This is exemplified by the following examples:

[79] *He resigned so as to avoid any conflict of interest.*

[80] *In order for the flavours to mingle properly, the dish should be cooked very slowly in a low oven.*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 728)

While in [79] *he* is the subject of both the main verb and the infinitive, in [80] what is intended to mingle is not the subject of the superordinate clause (*the dish*) but *the flavours* expressed in the preceding *for*-phrase. In case of the subjectless infinitive of purpose containing *in order*, the attachment rule applies as well, i.e. the subject of the infinitive corresponds to the subject of the superordinate clause.

As for the distribution of infinitives of purpose, generally speaking, the purposive infinitives with the subject overtly expressed are much less common than subjectless constructions (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 728).

Similarly to the infinitive with *so as*, the structures with the subordinators *as if* or *as though* do not allow a *for*-phrase expressing the agent of the infinitival action (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1262). Therefore, in this type of the adverbial infinitive, the subject of the infinitive is identical to the subject of the superordinate clause.

Regarding the adverbial of goal, it differs from the purposive infinitive also with respect to the infinitival S. Unlike the infinitive of purpose, the S of the infinitive of goal preceded by a NP characteristically corresponds to the O of the matrix V, not to its S. Therefore, in *He sent me to collect the luggage* it is *me* who is supposed to collect the luggage, not *he* (Dušková, 1999: 36). As for the syntactic status of the NP preceding the infinitive, Dušková et al. (2006: 563) explain that it functions as O_d of the matrix V.

The infinitive of purpose and the infinitive of goal might be sometimes difficult to distinguish. Therefore, in certain cases, ambiguity with respect to the S of the infinitive occurs. Consider for instance the example below:

[81] *He phoned me to confirm the date.*

(Dušková et al., 2006: 562)

In [81], the structure can be interpreted either as the adverbial of purpose or as the adverbial of goal, and it is thus not clear who is the agent of the infinitival action. In the case of adverbial of purpose, the subject of the infinitive would be identical to the subject of the matrix clause (i.e. *he*), whereas the latter interpretation would imply that it

is the object of the matrix verb (i.e. *me*) who is supposed to do the confirming. However, if the infinitive is fronted, the interpretation of O as the subject of the infinitive is not possible, as infinitive clauses can be fronted only if the understood S is identical to the subject of the matrix clause (Quirk et al., 1985: 1108).

The infinitive of “false purpose”, which does not express intention but rather has temporal function, occurs only subjectless (see Quirk et al., 1985: 1079):

[82] *I awoke one morning to find the house in an uproar.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1079)

Therefore, the S of the infinitive of “false purpose” is invariably identical to the S of the superordinate clause, which is further supported by the fact that the infinitive of this type can be paraphrased by a coordinated structure (e.g. *I awoke one morning and found the house in an uproar*).

With the structures where the adverbial infinitive follows an expression modified by *too* or *enough*, ambiguity might occasionally occur. For instance, in *She was too young to date*, it is not clear whether the subject of the infinitive is indefinite (‘*She was too young for others to date her*’) or corresponds to the S of the matrix clause (‘*She was too young to date others*’) (Quirk et al., 1985: 1141).

Similarly to the previous examples, with this type of the infinitive, a *for*-phrase specifically introducing the agent of the infinitival action can be used as well, such as in *The bag is too heavy **for you** to carry* (Dušková et al., 2006: 561).

Sometimes, the *for*-phrase introducing the agent of the action is used despite its correspondence to the S of the matrix verb. The subject is thus redundantly repeated, such as in *She’s too polite **for her** to ever say anything like that*. Such redundancy is optional and might be employed for example for emphasis (Quirk et al., 1985: 1141).

The infinitival clauses functioning as style disjuncts belong among constructions in which “the attachment rule does not apply, or at least is relaxed” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1122). In other words, notwithstanding the absence of the overt subject, the subject of the infinitive does not correspond to the S of the superordinate clause, such as in [83]:

[83] *To say the least, their techniques are old-fashioned.*

(Quirk et al., 1985: 1122)

As Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1266) claim, the subject of the infinitive in such structures has to be interpreted non-syntactically. Both Huddleston and Pullum and Quirk et al. then agree that the understood subject is usually the speaker (‘I’). Quirk et al. (1985: 1069) further add that in this respect style disjuncts are very similar to conjuncts which also imply the speaker as being the subject of the infinitive.

3. Material and Method

The aim of the present research is to examine all forms of realization of the subject of the infinitive, and to investigate relation between the syntactic function of the infinitive and the form and semantics of its subject. Furthermore, the research attempts to compare two distinct registers, namely fiction and academic prose, in terms of distribution of syntactic functions of the infinitive and realization of the infinitival subject. Fiction and academic prose have been chosen due to their similarity with respect to a frequent use of complex condensation (see Hladký, 1961: 111-113).

3.1 Material

Since the present research focuses on the subject of the infinitival action in two distinct registers, 100 instances of infinitival clauses for each register (200 in total) have been collected and subsequently studied.

As a source of data for the analysis, the British National Corpus (BNC), which is one of the most significant synchronic corpora of the English language containing 100 million words, was chosen. The BNC consists of a wide range of both written and spoken sources. However, since the present thesis focuses solely on the infinitive occurring in fiction and academic prose respectively, the search was limited to the corresponding registers (more specifically, only two categories of the BNC, namely 'fiction and verse' and 'academic prose', were searched). The corpus was accessed via Lancaster University.

The complete list of the collected sentences is provided in the appendix. Each sample sentence has been not only numbered, but also labelled with A or F (standing for *academic prose* and *fiction* respectively), for the sake of clarity. Moreover, what is further given in the appendix is the BNC code of every extracted sentence.

3.2 Method

As suggested in the previous subchapter, the data were extracted separately for each of the analysed registers. For the extraction, combination of automatic and manual approach was chosen. Firstly, a specific query was created to obtain material as relevant as possible. The query used (“_V?I”) ensured that only instances containing verbs tagged as *INFINITIVE* were retrieved. The search returned 484 478 hits in the category of academic prose and 620 123 hits in the category of fiction. However, the process of tagging is not completely reliable. Therefore, the results of the search were subsequently

sorted out manually by going through concordance lines in order to eliminate sentences irrelevant for the study. What was then included were first 100 relevant instances containing an infinitival clause (in each register).

In order to obtain 100 instances of the infinitive, it was necessary to go through 99¹¹ sentences in the category of academic prose and 146 sentences in the category of fiction.

What was retrieved but considered incorrectly tagged / irrelevant and thus excluded from the research were following cases:

- The base form of a verb following a modal verb (such as *can*, *should*, etc.):
 - (1) *This, surely, is much more like what we really **would say** in a normal conversation.*
- The infinitive following modal constructions such as *be able to*, *be allowed to*, *have to*, *ought to*, etc.:
 - (2) *On the other hand, with the expansion of feudal ties, there was a growing expectation that any lord **ought to resolve** the disputes among his own vassals.*
- Base forms of a verb accompanied by an auxiliary verb in imperative (3), interrogative (4) or negative declarative (5) sentence structures in either past simple or present simple tense:
 - (3) *No, **don't answer**.*
 - (4) *'Why **do** Americans always **think** theirs is the only country that's part of the modern world?'*
 - (5) *Philip **didn't know** what that meant, so he **didn't say** anything.*

Generally speaking, only instances of the infinitive functioning as an independent sentence element were included in the research.

In order to maintain clarity of the analysis, and since the syntactic functions of the infinitive substantially differ with respect to the infinitival subject, it was decided to study each of the functions separately. The collected infinitival clauses were therefore examined in terms of their syntactic function and, accordingly, divided into corresponding categories. Each of the categories was then studied in terms of realization of the infinitival subjects. The infinitival clauses were classified into five categories according to the type of realization of their S. The following types of realization were distinguished:

¹¹ The number of sentences needed to be gone through is lower than the number of instances of the infinitive required to be collected due to the fact that (as will be discussed later) the sentences containing more than one infinitival clause were not considered a single instance, and, therefore, the sample of academic prose contains a higher number of sentences with multiple infinitival clauses.

- i. Subject identical to the subject of the matrix clause;
- ii. Subject identical to another element (which was further sub-classified according to whether it is a constituent of the matrix clause or an exclusive member of the infinitival clause);
- iii. Expressed subject introduced by a preposition (similarly to the preceding category, further sub-classified according to its membership);
- iv. Subject that is not identical to any constituent / is inferable from the sentence context;
- v. Unexpressed general subject.

The categories above were chosen to cover all the possible realizations of the infinitival subject and, at the same time, maintain simplicity and clarity. In the category ‘Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context’ (iv.), two different cases of a specific subject are subsumed. Firstly, there are instances in which the infinitival subject is controlled by a possessive pronoun (or an *of*-genitive) modifying the S of the matrix clause (or the head noun in the case of a postmodifier), i.e. by a component of a sentence constituent. Secondly, it covers cases in which the subject is understood to be specific but is controlled neither by any constituent of the matrix clause nor by its component, i.e. is logically inferred from the sentence. On the other hand, the category ‘Identical to another element’ covers mainly cases of ‘NP + *to*-infinitive’ construction in which the infinitive functions as an object, and cases of the postmodifying infinitive whose S is identical to the head noun. However, the respective realizations are always distinguished and commented on in the text. Further, the category ‘unexpressed – general’ includes infinitival subjects which are understood to be general or which allow general interpretation (and whose controller was identified neither in the sentence nor a broader context).

Moreover, the infinitive functioning as a postmodifier is specific in that it is necessary to distinguish whether a sentence constituent controlling the infinitival subject is, at the same time, the head noun modified by the infinitive. Therefore, to reflect this in the tables, in the chapters dealing with the postmodifying infinitive, the category ‘subject identical to another element’ was further subdivided.

During the analysis, it was revealed that with the infinitives whose subjects can be classified as “unexpressed – general”, a broader context is required to unambiguously determine the understood S of the infinitive. Therefore, a micro-analysis of 20 instances was carried out using the function of the corpus manager which enables us to see the immediately preceding and following context, and therefore helps to reveal whether the

understood infinitival S is general or specific but controlled by an element occurring outside the respective sentence. The results of this subsequent search (i.e. the broader context of the respective sentences) are also provided in the appendix.

In the retrieved material, several sentences containing more than one infinitival clause occurred. These instances might be divided into two different groups and, accordingly, two different approaches were chosen. If a sentence contained two or more infinitival clauses governed by a different sentence constituent, such infinitival clauses were considered distinct instances and the sentence was thus included more than once. This is reflected in the appendix where the instances occurring in the same sentence are marked by a subscript added to the BNC code of the respective sentence, as exemplified in the excerpt from the appendix below:

F086	FP7 1761 ₁	The idea had been to keep only what was mine , but I found there were things I couldn't bear to part with.
F087	FP7 1761 ₂	The idea had been to keep only what was mine, but I found there were things I couldn't bear to part with .

However, this is reflected only in the appendix and not in the analysis itself. Therefore, if such an instance is examined in the text, only the infinitival clause relevant for the particular part of the analysis is in bold and the remaining infinitival clauses occurring in the same sentence might be traced in the appendix.

On the other hand, in the case of the infinitival clauses controlled by the same element, they were regarded as a single instance, such as for instance the two structures exemplified below:

A064	J7X 119	For instance, every speaker must make a decision about what to make explicit and what to leave implicit .
A088	J6Y 1191 ₂	The expert refused to do what the lessors wanted him to do , namely to rewrite his certificate in a way which he thought would make the certificate conclusive against the lessees' interests .

In A064, the infinitival clauses are coordinated, and in A088 the second infinitival clause functions as an apposition of the first one. Moreover, A088 contains another infinitival clause not governed by the same constituent and thus regarded as another instance.

4. Analysis

The analytical part of the present research is divided into three main chapters. The first chapter consists in the detailed analysis and description of the collected infinitival clauses occurring in academic texts, while in the second chapter the same analysis is carried out for the infinitival clauses extracted from fiction. The chapters are further subdivided and the collected material is thus discussed for each of the syntactic functions of the infinitive separately. The final chapter then aims at comparing the registers in terms of distribution of syntactic functions of the infinitive and realization of the infinitival subject.

4.1 Subject of the Infinitive – Academic Discourse

4.1.1 Subject

In the whole analysed sample of academic prose, fourteen cases of the infinitive functioning as a subject of the matrix clause have been detected. Eleven of them (A003, 007, 022, 041, 049, 058, 063, 076, 079, 093, 094) are cases of extraposition, whereas only one instance (A085) contains a non-extraposed infinitival clause. Moreover, the sample contains two examples of the so-called ‘Tough Movement’ construction (A023, A099). The distribution of the subject infinitival clauses with respect to their structure and S of the infinitive is presented in the Table 2 below:

Table 2: Subject – Distribution of infinitival clauses (AP)

Type of construction	No. of occurrences	%
Non-extraposed subjectless ¹²	1	7.1
Non-extraposed with S	-	-
Extraposed subjectless	7	50
Extraposed with S	4	28.6
Tough Movement construction	2	14.3
Total	14	100

As the table suggests, almost 30 per cent of the subject infinitival clauses occur with the subject of their own. All of them are extraposed. Subjectless clauses are mostly extraposed, too. The non-extraposed variant occurs only once. The results are thus in

¹² Even though the term “subjectless” is traditionally used to describe clauses containing a verb with zero valency, in the present study the term “subjectless” is used to describe the infinitive lacking an overt element expressing the subject of the infinitive (as we adhere to the terminology used by Mair (1990: 20, 22) in this respect) (See also the chapter 2.3).

accordance with the fact that extraposition is generally considered more typical of the infinitive in this function, and with Mair's (1990: 22) claim that the extraposed subjectless structure is the most frequent, whereas the non-extraposed variant with subject is supposed to be the least numerous.

The following table reveals the distribution of various types of realization of the S of the infinitival clauses:

Table 3: Subject – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		-	-
Identical to another element		-	-
Expressed – introduced by PREP	Constituent of the matrix clause	1	7.1
	Member of the infinitival clause	3	21.4
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		2	14.3
Unexpressed – general		8	57.2
Total		14	100

Regarding the subjectless infinitival clauses functioning as S, their agent might be mostly interpreted as general (A022, 023, 041, 049, 058, 076, 085, 099):

- [1] It is more accurate **to see the East Anglian affinity as a court connection rather than a narrowly Woodville one.** (A022)
- [2] **To approach this in a more formal sense** would also require mathematical programming techniques. (A085)
- [3] When this process becomes revolutionary upheaval is not always easy **to identify** and the decision as to whether it was a radical reinterpretation rather than simply an adjustment depends on the observer's standpoint. (A023)

Even though [1] and [2] structurally differ, in both the cases the agent of the infinitival action is not explicitly stated, and the agent might be understood as the GHA or as referring to the writer/speaker, i.e. as *we*, either inclusive or exclusive.

In [3], which is the example of the 'Tough Movement' construction, the surface subject, which is the whole clause *When this process becomes revolutionary upheaval*, is in fact the object of the infinitive, and the agent of the infinitival action might also be understood as not referring to anyone in particular.

However, there are two instances of subjectless infinitival clauses whose agents are not general:

- [4] In order to draft effectively, and to make intelligent use of precedents, the drafter must not only know what to say but why it is necessary **to say it**, how to say it, and what will be the result of saying it differently. (A007)
- [5] It is the main function of the Statutory Instruments Act **to ensure that where an instrument is made by a Minister of the Crown in pursuance of powers delegated to him by Parliament, Parliament shall have a reasonable opportunity to scrutinise his efforts with a view to deciding whether or not to endorse them.** (A079)

In [4], the S of the infinitive can be inferred from the sentence context. It might be understood as the S of the superordinate clause in which the clause containing the infinitival clause is embedded, i.e. *the drafter*.

In [5], the subject of the infinitive is understood to be *the Statutory Instruments Act*. Therefore, it is controlled by the *of*-genitive modifying the head of the NP functioning as C_s in the underlying structure. The S of the infinitive might also be said to be inferred from the sentence context.

Further, there are four instances (A003, A063, A093, A094) with the agent of the infinitival action explicitly expressed and introduced by a preposition:

- [6] Professor Hurstfield has argued that they were not, and that, provided no harm was done to the state, it would be anachronistic **for the historian to object to them.** (A063)
- [7] It is left **to the reader to plot these points on figure 10.3, and to connect the first and third.** (A003)

In [6], the infinitive is preceded by a NP introduced by the preposition *for*. With such structures it is “often not clear whether *for* + NP should be regarded as a prepositional phrase within the matrix clause or as the subject of the infinitive” (Mair, 1990: 22). However, in this particular case, the semantic structure of the adjective allows only one interpretation, and the *for*-phrase thus shall be considered an exclusive constituent of the infinitival clause solely expressing the agent of the infinitival action.

[7] differs in that the NP (which is also understood to be the agent of the infinitival action) is not introduced by the preposition *for*, but by *to*. Moreover, since *to leave something to somebody* is a phrasal verb (dictionary.cambridge.org), in this case the prepositional phrase is rather part of the matrix clause, not solely the S of the infinitival clause.

4.1.2 Object

The sample of academic prose contains thirty instances of the infinitive functioning as an object. In terms of the structure, the most prevalent construction is the non-extraposed infinitive functioning as O either in the monotransitive or ditransitive pattern of complementation. However, there is also one case of extraposed infinitival object.

Concerning the infinitival subject, the overall distribution of different types of realization of the subject of this type of the infinitive is presented in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Object – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		17	56.7
Identical to another element	Constituent of the matrix clause	7	23.3
	Member of the infinitival clause	6	20
Expressed – introduced by PREP		-	-
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		-	-
Unexpressed – general		-	-
Total		30	100

As demonstrated in Table 4, in more than half of the instances the subject of the infinitive is identical to the subject of the matrix clause. The remaining instances are structures in which the infinitival clause is preceded by a NP that is either the exclusive member of the infinitival clause or the element shared by both the infinitival clause and the superordinate clause.

All of the instances (except for (A040), as will be discussed in the following paragraph) with an infinitival subject corresponding to the S of the matrix clause (A001, 006, 008, 014, 052, 056, 059, 061, 062, 068, 081, 082, 083, 087, 089, 092) occur in the monotransitive pattern of complementation, i.e. the infinitival clause immediately follows the matrix verb and functions as O_d:

- [8] In the mid-1980s the government had already begun **to implement austerity measures which cut spending and led to price rises**. (A089)
- [9] The decision went against the Harringtons, but they still refused **to capitulate**, presumably confident of ducal backing, and the matter was not finally settled until 1475, when Hornby was confirmed to the daughters and hence to the Stanleys. (A008)

For example, in both [8] and [9], the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, i.e. *the government* and *they* respectively.

On the whole, the analysed sentences are thus in accordance with the claim that monotransitive structures without an overt subject are characterised by the fact that the agent of the infinitival action is as a rule identical to the subject of the matrix verb.

Moreover, as already mentioned, there is also one example of extraposed infinitival object:

[10] I think Cruttenden's arguments are in many ways convincing, but one must recognise that if intonation is influenced by and reflects the grammar, it follows that it must be a help to listeners in interpreting the grammar of what they hear, and perhaps more importantly, if a speaker's intonation is inappropriate in relation to the grammar, listeners will find it more difficult **to interpret the grammar**, and may be confused. (A040)

In [10], it is the anticipatory *it* that occupies the position of the O and is followed by the C_o (*more difficult*). The infinitival clause is extraposed and functions as O in the underlying structure. However, notwithstanding their structural differences, the agent of the infinitival action is in this case the same as that of the previously discussed constructions, i.e. identical to the subject of the matrix clause (i.e. *listeners*).

In more than 40 per cent of the instances (A002, 004, 012, 017, 020, 033, 035, 047, 050, 073, 088, 091, 100) the infinitive occurs with a preceding noun phrase. In most of them, the intervening NP is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action. However, the instances differ as to whether the NP is a constituent part of the matrix clause or solely S of the infinitive.

In half of the instances containing the infinitive preceded by a NP (A012, 020, 033, 073, 088, 100) the NP is clearly an exclusive member of the infinitival clause, such as in [11] and [12] below:

[11] Their effect was to cause ***the indemnifier to suffer the loss or damage caused by the indemnitee's negligence towards the indemnifier***. (A020)

[12] The expert refused to do what the lessors wanted ***him to do***, namely ***to rewrite his certificate in a way which he thought would make the certificate conclusive against the lessees' interests***. (A088)

In both the sentences the intervening NP (*him* and *the indemnifier* respectively) does not function as an object of the matrix verb. Instead, it is the whole structure consisting of the NP and the infinitival clause that functions as O. Therefore, the structures such as [11] and [12] can be viewed as belonging to the monotransitive pattern of complementation, and the intervening NP then as acting solely as the S of the infinitive, expressing the agent of the infinitival action which is different from the subject of the

matrix clause. Such an interpretation is in [11] supported by the fact that the intervening NP (i.e. *the indemnifier*) in this case cannot occur as O by itself (i.e. without being complemented by the infinitival clause) (**Their effect was to cause the indemnifier.*). On the other hand, in [12] it is supported by the fact that the semantic relation of the matrix verb to the intervening NP (i.e. *him*, referring back to the subject of the previous clause, i.e. *the expert*) is different than it would be without the presence of the infinitival clause. More specifically, in this case it is clear that it is not *the expert* himself that *the lessors* want, but a certain action that he would be capable of doing.

Further, other examples of a structure in which the intervening NP belongs exclusively to the infinitival clause are [13] and [14], in which the infinitival clause is governed by the verb *allow*:

- [13] The column was prepared by suspending the Amberlyst A-15 in 72% ethanol for 24 hours before slurrying it into columns and allowing ***it to settle by gravity***. (A073)
- [14] The outcome of the investigations will allow ***recommendations to be made concerning the office environment***, and also shed light on the linked human processes of attention, memory and reading. (A100)

However, these sentences slightly differ from [11] and [12]. While the previously discussed structures typically do not allow ditransitive interpretation, sentences containing an infinitival clause governed by *allow* are not clear-cut examples of monotransitive pattern and are often ambiguous. Nevertheless, since in both the analysed instances the intervening NP is inanimate (and thus cannot act as a recipient), to view the nominal element solely as the agent of the infinitival action is the only possible interpretation here (see Drábková, 2003: 27; Dušková et al., 2006: 555). Moreover, the examples above differ in that the infinitival clause in [13] is active whereas [14] is in passive voice. Therefore, while in [13] the intervening NP is a direct agent of the action expressed by the infinitival clause, in [14] the passive voice is used to avoid specific identification of the agent. Consequently, even though the NP (i.e. *recommendations*) functions as the subject of the infinitive, the agent of 'making' such 'recommendations' is, from the logical point of view, general.

Finally, the remaining seven instances might be analysed as belonging to the ditransitive pattern of complementation. In other words, in these cases the intervening NP is regarded not only as the subject of the infinitive but also, at the same time, as functioning as the object of the matrix verb. Therefore, the NP is shared by the matrix

verb and the infinitive, and these sentences might be considered examples of 'apo koinou' construction:

[15] Unlike a winding-up, the board of directors does not become *functus officio* on the appointment of a receiver but the directors' powers are substantially superseded since they cannot act so as to interfere with the discharge by the receiver of his responsibilities and accordingly their powers are suspended 'so far as is requisite to **enable a receiver to discharge his functions.**' (A050)

[16] There were further measures in the 1530s; an Act of 1533 attempted to limit the size of the flock that one man might own and to prevent the engrossing of holdings and another in 1536 **authorized the King to proceed against any encloser of land converted from tillage since 1488** (58, pp.104–6, 110–11). (A002)

In both [15] and [16], the intervening NP (*a receiver* and *the king* respectively) functions as O of the matrix V from both a structural and a semantic point of view. However, while in [15] it functions as O_i, in [16] it is O_d. Moreover, [15] resembles the previously discussed [11] in that in both the cases the infinitive is governed by the verb of causation (*enable* and *cause* respectively). However, while *cause* is typically monotransitive, *enable* might be seen as allowing both interpretations (see Mair, 1990: 120-121, 123-124). Nevertheless, the ditransitive analysis of *enable* (meaning to "give somebody an opportunity to do something" (Mair, 1990: 124)) is more plausible in this case.

Nevertheless, in both the cases the NP is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action. These infinitival clauses, as already discussed in the theoretical part of the thesis, then might be viewed as having S in the form of the preceding NP which, at the same time, functions as O of the matrix V, or they might be regarded as having no overt subject and the understood S of the infinitive then as being controlled by the object of the matrix verb.

In [17] and [18], the intervening NP might also be considered a shared element. However, these sentences slightly differ in terms of the agent of the infinitival action:

[17] On the other hand, he had played a nationally constructive role also, especially since he and Hugh Scanlon helped *the TUC* **defeat Barbara Castle's incomes policy in 1969.** (A091)

[18] The model does not provide answers to some of the curricular problems which concern us, but it may help *us* **to frame our questions more accurately.** (A047)

In these sentences, the infinitival clause is governed by the verb *help* and the preceding NP functions as its O_i. It might be argued that in [17] the verb *helped* implies that both *the TUC* and *he and Hugh Scanlon* participated in defeating *Barbara Castle's incomes*

policy. Therefore, due to the semantic structure of the governing verb *help* what is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action is both the subject of the matrix clause and the intervening NP¹³. On the other hand, in [18] the subject of the superordinate clause is inanimate. It is *us* that would potentially frame questions, and the subject of the matrix verb (i.e. *it* referring back to *the model*) would rather be a means which ‘we’ might use as an inspiration for the actual framing. In other words, it is only the intervening NP that is understood to be the agent of the action expressed by the infinitive.

4.1.3 Part of the Predicate

Concerning the infinitive functioning as part of the predicate, examples of all three distinct structures occur in the sample of academic prose, namely the infinitive following copular *be*, and the structures called ‘Subject raising’ and ‘Subject raising with split subject’. Their distribution is presented in Table 5 below:

Table 5: Part of the predicate – Distribution of infinitival clauses (AP)

Type of construction	No. of occurrences	%
Copular <i>be</i>	3	25
Subject raising	6	50
Subject raising with split S	3	25
Total	12	100

Half of the instances contain a raised subject, whereas the two remaining types are evenly distributed among the rest of the instances.

The realization of their subjects with respect to the type of construction is demonstrated in Table 6:

¹³ However, for the purposes of simplification, although the S of the infinitive is understood to be both the subject of the matrix clause and the intervening NP, the instance has been classified as an example of the subject of the infinitive identical to another element which is a constituent of the matrix (see Table 4).

Table 6: Part of the Predicate – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)

Subject	Copular <i>be</i>		Subject raising		Subject raising with split S	
	No. of oc.	%	No. of oc.	%	No. of oc.	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause	-	-	6	100	3	100
Identical to another element	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expressed – introduced by PREP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context	2	66.7	-	-	-	-
Unexpressed – general	1	33.3	-	-	-	-
Total	3	100	6	100	3	100

None of the instances occurs with the subject explicitly introduced by a *for*-phrase. Moreover, as the table suggests, realization of the S of the infinitive functioning as part of the predicate is closely related to the type of the structure.

The infinitive following the copular verb *be* (and thus functioning as C_s) occurs in three instances (A013, 019, 090):

- [19] The problem, in short, was **to find a system** where the landowner could continue to create all the beneficial interests he wished in favour of members of the family, and, at the same time, would be able to deal with the land, by sale, long lease, or mortgage, as if he were a sole owner. (A013)
- [20] Their effect was **to cause the indemnifier to suffer the loss or damage caused by the indemnitee's negligence towards the indemnifier**. (A019)
- [21] The main concern of this chapter is **to complete the description of intonational form**, including analysis of perhaps the most difficult aspect, that of recognising fall-rise and rise-fall tones when they are extended over a number of syllables. (A090)

In all the sentences, the infinitival clause identifies or describes the S of the matrix clause. However, the agent of the infinitival action is not identical to this S.

The subject of the infinitive in [19] might be interpreted as general, or, possibly, also as the speaker. On the other hand, in [20] the agent is specific, and is controlled by a possessive pronoun preceding the S. Similarly, in [21], the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the *of*-genitive modifying the subject. However, even though the understood subject of the infinitive is *this chapter*, it is rather the author of the chapter that might be considered the logical agent of the infinitival action.

Regarding the most numerous type, the subject of all the sentences containing a raised subject, i.e. containing the infinitive after the verbs *seem* (A030, 078), *happen* (A024, 075), or *appear* (A018, 029), is identical to the subject of the superordinate clause, such as in [22]:

[22] (23) above expresses a favourable reaction to the fact that the speaker happened **to find friendship where he was not seeking it**. (A024)

The remaining three sentences contain ‘subject raising’ as well. However, in these cases the infinitive follows the adjectives *likely* (A044, 098) and *certain* (A053) respectively, and the infinitive does not function as C_s but as part of the subject which is split by the adjective, as for example in [23]:

[23] This evidence is frequently interpreted as suggesting that larger local authorities are likely **to be more efficient than smaller ones**, but no statistical evidence has been produced to support this claim. (A044)

As expected, in [23] (as well as in the two remaining cases), the subject of the infinitive is also identical to the S of the matrix clause. This is even more evident in the underlying structure, which is ‘... *it is likely that larger local authorities are more efficient than smaller ones.*’

Besides the correspondence of their S to the S of the matrix clause, there is another feature that the constructions with a raised subject (such as [22] and [23]) have in common. They differ from the rest of the analysed sentences containing the S of the infinitive corresponding to the S of the superordinate clause in that their S has a semantic role with respect to the infinitive exclusively, and is not directly semantically related to the matrix verb.

4.1.4 Postmodifier

Twenty-six of the analysed infinitival clauses are part of a noun phrase in which they function as a postmodifier of the head noun. The distribution of realization of the infinitival subject in these clauses is demonstrated in Table 7 below:

Table 7: Postmodifier – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		11 (10) ¹⁴	42.3 (38.5)
Identical to another element ¹⁵	The head noun	2 (3)	7.7 (11.5)
	Another constituent	2	7.7
Expressed – introduced by PREP	Constituent of the matrix clause	-	-
	Member of the infinitival clause	1	3.8
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		4	15.4
Unexpressed – general		6	23.1
Total		26	100

Table 7 reveals that the infinitive in this function exhibits a high variation in terms of realization of its subject. In 23.1 per cent of the infinitives the agent of the infinitival action is general, whereas in 73 per cent of the instances the infinitival subject is controlled either by a constituent of the matrix clause (either the subject or another element) or by another expression occurring in the sentence but not functioning as a sentence constituent. Moreover, there is also one instance containing the subject explicitly expressed by a *for*-phrase:

[24] Finally, in 1603 a plan was devised, though never executed, *for every county, inland and coastal, to contribute money to standing fleets for the protection of merchant shipping.* (A026)

In [24], the infinitival clause functions as a discontinuous postmodification of *a plan*. As for the agent of its action, it is *every county, inland and coastal* that is supposed to *contribute money to standing fleets for the protection of merchant shipping*. Therefore, unlike in the rest of the instances, the subject of the postmodifying infinitive is in this case introduced by the preposition *for*. Moreover, since there are not multiple plans devised for each of the counties, but rather ‘*a plan that every county, inland and*

¹⁴ The brackets reflect the fact (which will be discussed in detail in one of the following paragraphs) that in one of the instances the S of the infinitive is controlled by the head noun which at the same time functions as the S of the matrix clause, and the infinitive thus can be classified in two different categories.

¹⁵ The tables presenting the realization of the S of the postmodifying infinitive slightly differ from the remaining tables. Unlike the other functions of the infinitive, the postmodifier requires differentiating between two controllers of the infinitival S – the head noun and another constituent of the matrix clause which functions as neither the S of the matrix clause nor the head noun. Therefore, the category “identical to another element” reflects this, and does not indicate whether the element is a constituent of the matrix clause or an exclusive member of the infinitival clause. However, for the sake of clarity, this is not reflected in Table X (4.3) presenting the overall distribution of the realization of the infinitival S in both the analysed registers, and both the categories (controlled by the head noun or by another constituent) are thus classified into the category “identical to another element – constituent of the matrix clause”.

coastal, should contribute money ... was devised’, the *for*-phrase shall be considered an exclusive member of the infinitival clause.

However, the analysed sample suggests that the most common realization of the subject of the postmodifying infinitival clauses is its correspondence to the S of the superordinate clause, as the subject of the infinitive is identical to the S of the superordinate clause in almost half of the cases (A028, 042, 043, 045, 057, 064, 069, 070, 077, 080, 095):

[25] For instance, every speaker must make a decision about **what to make explicit and what to leave implicit**. (A064)

[26] This evidence is frequently interpreted as suggesting that larger local authorities are likely to be more efficient than smaller ones, but no statistical evidence has been produced **to support this claim**. (A045)

In [25] the coordinated postmodifying infinitives are preceded by the preposition *about* and the interrogative pronoun *what*. The agent of the infinitival action is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, i.e. *every speaker*. Similarly, in [26] the agent of the infinitival action is identical to the subject of the matrix clause (i.e. *statistical evidence*). However, this sentence differs from [25] in several respects. Firstly, the postmodifying infinitive is discontinuous. It is thus ambiguous and might be interpreted either as a postmodification or an adverbial of purpose. In the case of postmodifying interpretation, the underlying structure would be ‘... *but no statistical evidence to support this claim has been produced*.’ Secondly, it is the only instance in which the subject of the matrix clause, which controls the subject of the infinitive, is, at the same time, the head noun modified by the infinitive.

However, there are also instances (A031, 071) in which the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the head noun that does not function, at the same time, as the S of the matrix clause:

[27] Molecular biology will allow a scientific approach **to identify the population at risk**. (A071)

[28] However, there does seem to be some consensus of opinion and parallel findings **to demonstrate continuity in the area of disorders of conduct** (Robins, 1966; Rutter and Madge, 1976). (A031)

The postmodifying interpretation of the infinitival clauses above is supported by the fact that it is possible to paraphrase them as ‘... *a scientific approach that will identify the population at risk*’ and ‘... *consensus of opinion and parallel findings that would*

demonstrate continuity in the area of disorders of conduct...' respectively. In both the sentences, the head noun controlling the subject of the infinitive is inanimate.

Besides the subject of the matrix clause and the head noun, the analysed sample also contains two instances in which the S of the infinitive is controlled by another sentence constituent:

[29] By assigning, the defendant, the original lessee, had given the assignee power **to assign again**, which would include the power to surrender, in whole or in part, to the landlord. (A009)

[30] Second, instead of continuing with the constitutional convention whereby the Prime Minister has the right to choose a government and a Cabinet, there is a concern to transfer this to Members of Parliament when Labour is in office, giving them the right **to elect Cabinet ministers**. (A097)

In both [29] and [30], the NP containing the infinitival clause functions as O_d of the verb *give*. The subject of the infinitive is then controlled by the preceding NP functioning as O_i . While in [29] the NP directly denotes the agent (*the assignee*), in [30] it is a personal pronoun (*them*) referring back to the previous clause and the agent of the infinitival action is thus understood to be *Members of Parliament*.

Further, there are four instances (A010, 027, 032, 066) in which the subject of the infinitive is explicitly stated in the sentence, but corresponds to neither S nor O:

[31] The two men's inability **to make common cause** illustrated one of the main reasons why the government had less to fear from oppositionists than the radical manifestos of 1861 – 2 appeared to suggest. (A027)

[32] 'As to the ability **to determine that issue between the parents**, it appears to me that there is little to choose between the family court in England and that in Australia. (A066)

In [31] (as well as in (A032)), the agent of the infinitival action is expressed by possessive determination of the head noun and thus by a component of a sentence constituent. The agent of the infinitival action is thus understood to be *the two men*.

On the other hand, in [32] the agent of the infinitival action is understood to be *the family court in England and that in Australia*. The subject of the infinitive is therefore not expressed by possessive determination of the head noun and is not a component of a sentence constituent, but logically inferable from the sentence context.

Finally, in six instances (A011, 021, 036, 067, 072, 096), the subject of the infinitive is pragmatically controlled and its interpretation thus depends on the broader context:

[33] Although this road emerges on the eastern side of the town, attempts **to trace it much further** have failed. (A021)

[34] His suggestion that the council feared a usurpation displays the hindsight **to be expected from someone writing after June 1483**, when Gloucester had indeed used the protectorship as a stepping-stone to the throne. (A072)

In all the instances (such as the examples above), the infinitival subjects do not refer to anyone in particular. For instance, in [33], the general human agent is implied as the agent of the infinitival action. Similarly, in [34] the subject might be understood as being general. Moreover, non-specificity of the agent of the infinitival action is in this case even more emphasised by the passive form of the infinitive. What is further worth noting is the fact that the passive form of the infinitive “[...]” is suggestive of formal text sorts “[...]” (Dušková, 2009: 43).

4.1.5 Complementation of an Adjective

The distribution of types of realization of the subject of the infinitive functioning as adjective complementation is demonstrated in Table 8 below:

Table 8: Complementation of an Adjective – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)

Subject	No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause	4	100
Identical to another element	-	-
Expressed – introduced by PREP	-	-
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context	-	-
Unexpressed – general	-	-
Total	4	100

As apparent from the table, there are only four instances containing the infinitive functioning as complementation of an adjective (A015, 025, 037, 084). None of the instances occurs with the agent of the infinitival action explicitly expressed. What then functions as understood subject of the infinitive in all the instances is the S of the superordinate clause:

[35] However, recent studies showed that malt lymphomas, whatever the organ involved, were susceptible **to spread to or to recur in other mucosal sites**. (A025)

[36] In any case many rulers were for long reluctant **to send ambassadors to foreign capitals** if a lower-ranking representative would suffice. (A084)

Therefore, for example in [35] or [36], it is *malt lymphomas* and *many rulers* respectively that act as agents of these infinitival clauses. The sample thus appears to support the claim that this realization of the infinitival subject is typical of the infinitive of this type.

4.1.6 Adverbial

The last syntactic function of the infinitive, adverbial, has been detected in fourteen instances. Regarding the semantic roles, by far the most frequent type is the adverbial infinitive of purpose. Besides the infinitive of purpose, infinitival clauses of goal and result have also been detected. On the other hand, the sample does not contain any examples of infinitival conjuncts or disjuncts.

The distribution of different realizations of the subject of the adverbial infinitive is demonstrated in Table 9:

Table 9: Adverbial – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (AP)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		10	71.4
Identical to another element	Constituent of the matrix clause	-	-
	Member of the infinitival clause	-	-
Expressed – introduced by PREP	Constituent of the matrix clause	2	14.3
	Member of the infinitival clause	-	-
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		-	-
Unexpressed – general		2	14.3
Total		14	100

The most prominent realization of the subject of the adverbial infinitive is its correspondence to the subject of the matrix clause, which occurs in more than 70 per cent of the instances (A005, 016, 034, 038, 048, 054, 055, 065, 074, 086). Besides the subject of the infinitive controlled by the S of the matrix verb, the analysed sample contains two instances in which the subject is overt and introduced by the preposition *for* (A046, 060), and two instances in which the subject of the infinitive is neither explicitly expressed nor inferable from the sentence context and is understood generally (A039, 051).

The subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause for instance in [37], [38] and [39]:

- [37] A company which has a subsidiary undertaking to which these requirements do not apply must take all reasonable steps **to secure that the subsidiary keeps such records as will enable the directors of the parent company to ensure that any balance sheet and profit and loss account prepared under Part VII complies with the Act's requirements.** (A016)
- [38] **In order to draft effectively, and to make intelligent use of precedents,** the drafter must not only know what to say but why it is necessary to say it, how to say it, and what will be the result of saying it differently. (A005)
- [39] US firms already had considerable sums invested in European subsidiaries between the two wars, and post-1945 FDI served both **to rebuild what had been destroyed and to extend it.** (A065)

The subject of the infinitive in [37] is identical to the subject of the matrix clause, i.e. *a company which has a subsidiary undertaking to which these requirements do not apply*. In this case, the infinitival clause might also be interpreted as a postmodification of *all reasonable steps*. On the other hand, in [38] the subordinator *in order* is employed and the any potential misinterpretation is thus prevented. In [39], the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause as well. However, unlike in [38], [37] and in the remaining sentences, in this case ([39]) the coordinated infinitival clause functions as an adverbial of goal (since *in order* or *so as* cannot be used) (see Dušková et al, 2006: 563).

Further, in [40], the subject of the infinitive of purpose might also be identified as the S of the matrix clause:

- [40] Stopping only **to emphasize that this is not because we belong to different disciplines and that several other final positions are open to anyone from either discipline,** we then leave readers to make up their own minds, or else to decide that there is no monopoly of wisdom to be had. (A034)

However, the sentence differs from the previously discussed instances in that the infinitival clause is embedded in another non-finite clause whose subject is not explicitly expressed as well. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the absence of the subject of the *ing*-clause, since it is understood to be *we*, the subject of the infinitival clause might still be considered to be controlled by the subject of the matrix clause.

The infinitive or purpose is also found in [41] and [42]:

- [41] They help with the provision of housing, food and employment and give continuing support with money, perhaps **to set up a business, go on a visit to Pakistan or to cope with unforeseen disasters.** (A039)
- [42] **To prevent further cases** the Indian community in the United Kingdom should be made aware of the risks associated with the use of ethnic remedies, and their distribution and sale should be monitored. (A051)

However, unlike in the previously discussed infinitives of purpose, in [41] and [42] the subject of the infinitive does not correspond to the subject of the matrix clause. In [41], it is implausible that the subject of the matrix clause *they* acts as the agent of the infinitival action. The interpretation of the agent requires a broader context. However, the closer examination of the broader context has not revealed it. Nevertheless, since *they* are ‘helping’ and ‘giving support with money’ to someone else, it is clear that the implied agent is the actant receiving help. This actant might either be specific (and inferred from the broader context) or understood generally. Similarly, in [42] *the Indian community in the United Kingdom* does not seem to be the agent of the infinitival action, especially as the matrix clause is in passive voice and *the Indian community* is merely a potential recipient of the information. What does seem plausible then is to view the purpose of the infinitive generally and to interpret the agent of the infinitival action as the general human agent.

On the whole, [41] and [42] are rather unusual as infinitives of purpose are characterised by the correspondence of their S to the S of the matrix clause (unless having a S explicitly expressed by a *for*-phrase) and sentences containing the purposive infinitive whose agent is different from the S of the matrix clause are usually not considered completely acceptable (see 2.3.6). Nevertheless, it has also been mentioned in the theoretical part that the attachment rule is sometimes relaxed. Therefore, the non-correspondence in [42] might be explained by the fact that it is typical of formal scientific writing in sentences “where the implied subject is to be identified with the *I*, *we*, and *you* of the writer(s) or reader(s)” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1122-1123).

Further, there is an instance in which the adverbial of purpose has the subject explicitly expressed by a preceding *for*-phrase:

[43] One package will address the common queries and concerns which many women have upon experiencing this event, and would be designed ***for women who have just had a miscarriage to read in their own time.*** (A060)

In [43], the S of the infinitive is *women who have just had a miscarriage*. The explicit subject is introduced by the preposition *for* and the PP might also be seen as the prepositional object of the verb *design*. Therefore, the PP is not only an element expressing the agent of the infinitival action but also part of the matrix clause and, therefore, a shared element.

Finally, there is an instance in which the infinitive is preceded by *enough* and functions as an adverbial of result:

[44] For many it is not long enough **to become literate or numerate in any real sense.**
(A046)

In this sentence, the S of the matrix clause is *it* which, as the broader context verified, is anaphoric referring to a period of time (or, more specifically, education). The agent of the infinitival action is specific, namely *many*, and is, similarly to the preceding example, introduced by the preposition *for*. Interestingly, even though the *for*-phrase is in this case also a shared element, it is fronted and the infinitival clause thus does not follow it. In other words, the structure is discontinued.

4.2 Subject of the Infinitive – Fiction

4.2.1 Subject

In the sample of fiction, only two instances of the infinitive in subject function have been detected. The realizations of their infinitival subjects are presented in Table 10:

Table 10: Subject – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		-	-
Identical to another element	Constituent of the matrix clause	1	50
	Member of the infinitival clause	-	-
Expressed – introduced by PREP		-	-
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		1	50
Unexpressed – general		-	-
Total		2	100

Firstly, the infinitive functioning as a subject occurs in [45], containing two asyndetically coordinated extraposed subjectless clauses:

[45] It would be Kirov's job **to turn those rumours into reality, provide evidence which would damn him forever.** (F003)

Notwithstanding the lack of an explicitly introduced agent, the understood subject of the infinitival action is not general, but specific. The person who is supposed *to turn those rumours into reality* and *provide evidence* is *Kirov*. Therefore, the S is not identical to any of the sentence constituents. Instead, the agent is controlled only by part of the genitive construction which functions as C_s in the underlying structure (*Kirov's job*), namely by the determiner. The S of the infinitive thus might be viewed as inferred from the sentence context.

Secondly, the infinitive in this function occurs in the following example:

[46] Besides, it didn't take me long to figure out I was wrong.' (F074)

Similarly to [45], [46] is also extraposed and subjectless. However, in this case the subject of the infinitive is controlled by O of the matrix verb. Therefore, the agent of the infinitival action is understood to be *me*.

4.2.2 Object

The most frequent function of the infinitive in the sample of fiction is the object. There are forty-seven cases of the infinitive in this function, i.e. almost half of the analysed sentences. The most prevalent construction is the non-extraposed infinitive either in the monotransitive or ditransitive pattern of complementation. As for the extraposed infinitival O, only two instances have been detected.

Concerning the subject of the infinitive of this type, the overall distribution is presented in Table 11:

Table 11: Object – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		26	55.4
Identical to another element	Constituent of the matrix clause	15	31.9
	Member of the infinitival clause	4	8.5
Expressed – introduced by PREP	Constituent of the matrix clause	1 (2)	2.1 (4.2)
	Member of the infinitival clause	1 (-)	2.1 (-)
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		-	-
Unexpressed – general		-	-
Total		47	100

In more than half of the instances the subject of the infinitive corresponds to the subject of the matrix clause. The second most numerous group consists of instances containing the infinitival clause preceded by a NP which is either the exclusive member of the infinitival clause or is shared by both the infinitival clause and the matrix clause. Furthermore, there are two instances of the infinitival subject explicitly expressed and introduced by a preposition.

The most frequent type of realization of the subject of the infinitive, i.e. the infinitival subject controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, invariably occurs with the instances in the monotransitive pattern of complementation, i.e. when the infinitival

clause immediately follows the matrix verb and functions as O_d (F001, 004, 005, 006, 016, 018, 025, 027, 028, 031, 036, 043, 065, 068, 071, 076, 078, 080, 082, 083, 084, 087, 091, 093, 094, 100):

[47] She knew perfectly well he'd been trying **to hide the fact that he'd come alive as the streets had filled with people**. (F016)

[48] She felt sure that Freddie Nash was as in love with her as she was with him for there was hardly a day when they did not manage **to meet**, often in Jock Hallett's cottage, where their mutual passion, already discovered at The Angel, seemed to intensify. (F065)

In both the sentences above, the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix verb which is in both the cases realized by a personal pronoun (*he* and *they* respectively).

As already mentioned, the sample contains two sentences in which the agent of the infinitival action differs from the subject of the matrix clause and is explicitly expressed by a NP preceding the infinitival clause and introduced by a preposition:

[49] If he considered it necessary **for her to know such things**, did that mean she was remaining on board after today? (F042)

Not only is [49] the only instance containing the subject of the infinitive expressed by the preceding *for*-phrase, it is also one of two examples of extraposed infinitival object. The position of O is occupied by the anticipatory *it* which is followed by the C_o (*necessary*). However, what functions as O in the underlying structure is the infinitival clause. Concerning the *for*-phrase expressing the agent of the infinitival action, it might be viewed from two different points of view. Firstly, it might be seen as serving only to express the agent of the infinitival action, and thus belonging exclusively to the infinitival clause. However, the *for*-phrase might also be viewed as being related to the adjective and thus belonging also to the superordinate clause. In this case, *for her* would express not only the agent of the infinitival action but also the entity for whom the action expressed by the infinitive would be *necessary*. Nevertheless, there is not a radical difference in meaning between the two interpretations.

Besides [49], the infinitival O is extraposed in [50]:

[50] Surprisingly they agreed and, to show their compliance, said they would leave it up to me **to tell Trevor Proby that he was sacked**. (F061)

In this sentence, the position of O is also occupied by the anticipatory *it* and the infinitival clause functions as an extraposed O. However, unlike in [49], in this case the

anticipatory *it* is not followed by a C_o, but by the prepositional phrase *up to me* which is understood to express the agent of the infinitival action. Since the prepositional phrase is part of the phrasal verb *to leave something up to somebody*, the subject of the infinitive thus might be understood to be controlled by the prepositional phrase which is part of the matrix clause.

In more than 40 per cent of the analysed instances (F010, 011, 013, 015, 017, 022, 030, 045, 046, 053, 054, 056, 064, 077, 079, 081, 088, 096, 098, 099) the infinitive occurs with a preceding noun phrase. In all of them, the intervening NP is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action. However, the instances differ as to whether the NP is a constituent part of the matrix clause or solely the subject of the infinitive.

There are four instances (F030, 056, 081, 096) in which the NP is clearly an exclusive member of the infinitival clause, such as in [51] and [52] below:

[51] I hope he isn't going to expect ***you to listen to him singing again.*** (F081)

[52] Whether he wanted to be hurt and suffer, or an excuse to hit me back, I don't know, but I'm sure he wanted ***me to hit him.*** (F096)

In both the sentences it is the whole structure consisting of the NP and the infinitival clause that functions as O of the matrix verb, and the sentences thus belong to the monotransitive pattern of complementation. Therefore, the intervening NP (*you* and *me* respectively) functions solely as the S of the infinitive, expressing the agent of the infinitival action which is different from the subject of the matrix clause.

The sample further contains twelve instances (F013, 015, 017, 022, 045, 046, 054, 064, 077, 079, 088, 099) in which the status of the NP preceding the infinitive is not entirely clear.

Firstly, in two of these instances the infinitive is preceded by a NP and governed by the verb *hear*:

[53] If you'd heard ***him talk about her when he'd had a few*** you'd think different. (F088)

[54] 'I heard ***the nurse ask her*** if she wanted to take a last look at me. (F099)

As mentioned in the theoretical part, with the verbs of perception (such as *hear*) it is not clear whether the intervening NP is solely the S of the infinitive, the O of the matrix verb followed by the infinitive functioning as the C_o, or a shared element belonging to both the superordinate clause and the infinitival clause. However, in these cases, the ditransitive interpretation is supported by the fact that in both the sentences, the NP (*him* and *the nurse* respectively) might function as O of the matrix verb and preserve the

semantic relation to the governing verb even if not followed by the infinitival clause (see Dušková et al., 2006, 553-554).

Secondly, there are ten bare infinitival clauses governed by the verb *make* or *let*, such as [55] and [56]:

[55] Over the meal, she became a little more cheerful and relaxed and made *Sara laugh* with her tales of her sojourn in Rome. (F013)

[56] It hurt like hell but he was damned if he was going to let *the gunman escape*. (F015)

Similarly to [53] and [54], in [55] and [56] it is not unequivocally clear to which pattern of complementation such instances belong. However, according to Dušková et al. (2006: 554) or Drábková (2003: 72), from functional point of view, the intervening NP, which unambiguously functions as an agent of the infinitival action, should be regarded as a shared element.

Finally, the three remaining instances are ditransitive, i.e. the intervening NP is shared by both the infinitival clause and the superordinate clause:

[57] Whether he had had plans laid for me at the time, or whether at the back of his mind, hidden from consciousness, he knew that in taking *me to live with him* he would be enrolling someone to deal with the business side of his life, I was never sure. (F010)

[58] We always want someone to help *us exercise the horses*. (F053)

[59] Julia was half convinced that she should tell *the young people to go to the cinema and dances again* but she consulted Pat. (F098)

While in [57] the intervening noun phrase functions rather as O_d , in [58] and [59] it functions as O_i .

In [57] and [59], the so-called configurational principle is at work and there is a shift in control from the subject of the superordinate clause to its object. In other words, in these sentences it is the intervening NP that is understood to be the subject of the infinitive. On the other hand, [58] slightly differs. In this case it might be argued that due to the semantic nature of the governing verb *help* it is implied that both *someone* and *us* would participate in exercising horses. In other words, the agent of the infinitival action is both the subject of the matrix clause and the intervening NP¹⁶.

¹⁶ However, similarly to [A091], even though the subject of the infinitive is understood to be both the subject of the MC and the intervening NP, the instance has been classified as an example of the subject of the infinitive identical to another element which is a constituent of the MC (see Table X).

4.2.3 Part of the Predicate

There are fourteen cases of the infinitive occurring after the copular verb *be*, or in the so-called ‘Subject raising’ and ‘Subject raising with split subject’ constructions:

Table 12: Part of the Predicate – Distribution of infinitival clauses (F)

Type of construction	No. of occurrences	%
Copular BE	1	7.1
Subject raising	11	78.6
Subject raising with split S	2	14.3
Total	14	100

The most frequent type is the structure with a raised subject.

Table 13 below (which presents realization of the infinitival subjects with respect to the type of construction) shows that all the instances have an implicit subject, and that the realization of the S and the type of the structure are interconnected:

Table 13: Part of the Predicate – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)

Subject	Copular BE		Subject raising		Subject raising with split S	
	No. of oc.	%	No. of oc.	%	No. of oc.	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause	-	-	11	100	2	100
Identical to another element	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expressed – introduced PREP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context	1	100	-	-	-	-
Unexpressed – general	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1	100	11	100	2	100

In [60], which is the only instance containing an infinitive after the copular verb *be*, the infinitive does not have a S of its own, and, therefore, the agent of the infinitival action has to be inferred from the sentence context:

[60] The idea had been **to keep only what was mine**, but I found there were things I couldn't bear to part with. (F086)

In this case, the S of the infinitive is specific, and can be inferred from the possessive pronoun *mine* which is contained in the O of the infinitive (therefore, the agent of the infinitival action is “I”).

The infinitival clauses most frequently occur in the construction with ‘Subject raising’ after the verbs *seem* (F008, 026, 029, 033, 037, 038, 066, 085, 089), *appear* (F039), and *turn out* (F019):

[61] ‘You can help Claudia, Dana, and then we’ll collect your things from the hotel, though you seem **to have bought a fresh wardrobe.**’ (F029)

In all of these sentences (including [61] above), the subject is specific and corresponds to the subject of the superordinate clause.

Similarly, in both the instances with a split subject (F024, 090), the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the S of the superordinate clause:

[62] Tomorrow, she promised — not of course that Ven was likely **to want to accompany her anywhere for a third day in a row** — but tomorrow she would insist on going sightseeing on her own. (F024)

For instance, in [62], the underlying structure is ‘... *it was likely that Ven wanted to accompany her anywhere for a third day in a row ...*’ and the understood S of the infinitive is thus *Ven*.

However, in all the above mentioned sentences with the infinitival S identical to the S of the superordinate clause, the S belongs to the superordinate clause only syntactically, whereas semantically it belongs only to the infinitival clause.

4.2.4 Postmodifier

There are fifteen infinitival clauses in the analysed sample occurring as part of a noun phrase and functioning as a postmodifier of the head noun. The distribution of realization of their S is as follows:

Table 14: Postmodifier – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		10	66.7
Identical to another element	The head noun	2	13.3
	Another constituent	-	-
Expressed – introduced by PREP	Constituent of the matrix clause	-	-
	Member of the infinitival clause	2	13.3
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		-	-
Unexpressed – general		1	6.7
Total		15	100

The most frequent realization of the subject of the infinitive of this type is its correspondence to the subject of the matrix clause, which occurs in more than 66 per cent of the instances (F002, 007, 032, 034, 048, 062, 070, 072, 073, 095). Besides the S of the matrix clause, the infinitival subjects are also, less frequently though, controlled by the head noun (F011, 052), or, in one case, unexpressed and general (F044). Moreover, there are also two instances containing the subject of the infinitive introduced by a *for*-phrase:

[63] Well whatever — now's the time, one would have thought, *for Tod and me to kick off our shoes and get the feel of the place.* (F069)

[64] 'There won't be anything *for him to eat* if she doesn't write.' (F097)

In both [63] and [64], the subject is overtly expressed by the preceding *for*-phrase. Moreover, in both cases the *for*-phrase might be considered the exclusive member of the infinitival clause expressing the agent.

In [65], the preposition *for* occurs as well. However, in this case it does not introduce the subject of the infinitive but is part of the PP containing the head noun and its postmodification, and the subject of the infinitive is identical to the S of the matrix clause (i.e. *Christine*):

[65] Half blinded by the foam, Christine scrambled for something to grab on to to break her fall. (F062)

Besides [65], the subject of the infinitive is identical to the subject of the matrix clause in nine instances, such as in [66], [67] and [68] below:

[66] I felt dirtied by the corruption of pimps, yet I would soon be free of them for I had just one more job to do, and then I would be loosed to the consolations of Masquerade and to the joys of the South Pacific's winds. (F002)

[67] Rain had no clear idea what to do with her, apart from taking her to the Villa Fiesole, and she was already seeing the warped logic of Edouard's argument: Barbara Coleman might be safer where she was. (F034)

[68] When she asked him if he would come with her to see Joanne he put forward the excuse of having his article to write, so Lyn went with Kevin. (F048)

In [66], the agent of the infinitival action corresponds to the S of the matrix clause, i.e. *I*. In [67], the infinitival clause is introduced by the interrogative pronoun *what*, and the subject of the infinitive is also identical to the S of the matrix clause. Similarly, in [68] it is the subject of the MC, i.e. *he*, that is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action. Moreover, the correspondence of the infinitival subject to the S of the MC is in this case even more emphasised by the possessive determination of the head noun.

Further, there are two instances, which are seemingly similar:

[69] We always want someone **to help us exercise the horses**. (F052)

[70] How will you find children **to teach**?’ (F072)

[69] is ambiguous. The infinitival clause might be interpreted either as a postmodifier of *someone*, or as an object¹⁷. Nevertheless, regardless of its interpretation, it is *someone* that is understood to be the subject of the infinitive. Therefore, in the case of interpreting the infinitival clause as functioning as a postmodifier, the S of the infinitive is controlled by the head noun. On the other hand, in [70] the head noun is not the S of the infinitival clause but in fact its O. Therefore, in this case the infinitival clause is unambiguously attributive, and it is the S of the matrix clause (*you*) that is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action.

Finally, there is an instance in which the subject of the infinitive is unexpressed and vague:

[71] ‘That’s no way **to speak of the Dead**. (F044)

Even though the anaphoric use of *that* indicates that the sentence is a response to the previous utterance (as confirmed by the subsequent examination of the broader context), the agent of the infinitival action does not have to be understood as the person apparently making negative comments about a deceased person. In fact, it might rather be viewed as the general human agent.

4.2.5 Complementation of an Adjective

The analysed sample of fiction contains only one instance (F050) where the infinitive functions as an adjective complementation¹⁸:

[72] He paused to draw on the cigar, still loath **to reveal what he had come to say**. (F050)

The subject of the infinitive in [72] corresponds to the S of the matrix clause, which is typical of the infinitive of this type.

¹⁷ In this case, the intervening NP would be considered an exclusive member of the infinitival clause and the whole structure *someone to help us exercise the horses* would function as the object.

¹⁸ Due to the occurrence of only one item, it was considered unnecessary to present the realization of its infinitival subject in a table.

4.2.6 Adverbial

In fiction, there are twenty-one instances in which the infinitival clause functions as an adverbial. Concerning the semantic roles, the most frequent type of the adverbial infinitive is the infinitive of purpose (F009, 020, 021, 023, 035, 040, 049, 059, 060, 063). Further, there is also a significant number of the infinitival clauses of goal (F012, 041, 047, 051, 067). Besides the infinitive of purpose and goal, infinitival clauses of false purpose (F014, 057, 058) and result (F055, 092) have also been detected. Moreover, there is one instance whose semantic role is not clear-cut (F075).

The overall distribution of different realizations of the subject of the adverbial infinitive is demonstrated in Table 15:

Table 115: Adverbial – Realization of the subject of the infinitive (F)

Subject		No. of occurrences	%
Identical to the subject of the matrix clause		18	85.6
Identical to another element	Constituent of the matrix clause	1	4.8
	Member of the infinitival clause	-	-
Expressed – introduced by PREP	Constituent of the matrix clause	-	-
	Member of the infinitival clause	-	-
Not identical to any constituent / inferable from the sentence context		2	9.6
Unexpressed – general		-	-
Total		21	100

By far the most frequent realization of the subject of the adverbial infinitive is its correspondence to the S of the matrix clause, which occurs in more than 85 per cent of the instances (F009, 012, 014, 020, 021, 023, 035, 040, 041, 049, 051, 057, 058, 059, 060, 063, 067, 075). Further, there are two instances in which the agent of the infinitival action is explicit but does not correspond to the subject of the matrix clause (F047, 092). Finally, in one instance the subject of the infinitive appears to be ambiguous (F055).

In all the instances of the adverbial infinitive of purpose, the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, such as in [73] and [74]:

[73] As the stray bullets whistled across no-man's-land, Charlie fell on his knees and crawled back to the reserve trenches, **to brief his section on what they might expect once they were pushed forward another hundred yards.** (F035)

[74] This error proved to be nearly the last straw needed to break his credit, since he had raised every cent he could **in order to invest in land for building.** (F040)

The understood subject of the infinitive is *Charlie* in [73] and *he* in [74], both functioning as the subject of the matrix clause. However, the sentences differ in that in [73] the infinitival clause expresses purpose by itself, whereas in [74] the relation is overtly marked by the subordinator *in order*, which makes the meaning of the sentence even more lucid.

Unlike in the previous instances, the infinitival clauses in [75] and [76] lack the intention and thus do not express purpose but, rather, temporal relation:

[75] On the third morning, they arose **to find that the blizzard had died down**, to be followed by keen frost as the temperature plummeted. (F057)

[76] On the third morning, they arose to find that the blizzard had died down, **to be followed by keen frost** as the temperature plummeted. (F058)

Neither of the clauses can be preceded by *in order* or *so as*, and both might be paraphrased by a coordinative construction ('...they arose and found that the blizzard had died down...' and '...the blizzard had died down and was followed by keen frost...'). As for the infinitival subject, in all the three infinitives of "false purpose" (such as [75] and [76] above), the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the S of the matrix clause. The analysed sample is thus in accordance with the claim that the infinitive of "false purpose" occurs only without an overt subject and its implied subject is invariably identical to the S of the matrix clause (see 2.3.6). Both the exemplified infinitival clauses occur in the same sentence. However, they are not coordinated. In [75] the subject of the infinitive is understood to be *they*, whereas in [76], which is embedded in the nominal clause subordinate to [75], the subject of the infinitive is controlled by *the blizzard*. Moreover, while in [75] the infinitival clause is active, the infinitival clause in [76] is passive. Therefore, even though the subject of the infinitive in [76] is the subject of the matrix clause, the entity performing 'following' is *keen frost* expressed in the PP following the infinitive.

As for the infinitives of goal, in four out of the five instances, the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, such as in [77] and [78]:

[77] The famous film director from France could speak no English, and so Miranda was being sent **to do the interview as well as provide the paper's weekly caricature**; she had the address of the location, a newsagent's in the High Street of a part of the city she had never heard mentioned before, Giblett Park, though she had lived in London most of her life; the Press Office had said that he would give her ten minutes between takes, or more if she were lucky and the filming was going well and Jean-Claude Meursault was feeling mellow. (F012)

[78] He paused to draw on the cigar, still loath to reveal what he had come **to say**. (F051)

Therefore, the subject of the infinitive in [77] and [78] is understood to be *Miranda* and *he* respectively. However, there is one instance of the adverbial infinitive of goal that is rather specific in terms of the agent of the infinitival action:

[79] When she asked him if he would come with her **to see Joanne** he put forward the excuse of having his article to write, so Lyn went with Kevin. (F047)

In [79], the subject of the matrix clause (*he*) also acts as the subject of the infinitive. However, in this case it is not the only entity that is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action. The entity that is understood to potentially visit Joanne is both *he* and *her* expressed in the PP preceding the infinitival clause. Therefore, this instance is specific in that the implied subject of the infinitive is partly controlled by the subject of the matrix clause and partly has to be inferred from the sentence context.

The last instance in which the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause is [80]:

[80] It cannot move and shoot in the same turn, except that it can be turned **to face its intended target**. (F075)

In [80], the subject of the matrix clause controlling the subject of the infinitive is the anaphoric *it*. Regarding the syntactic function of the infinitival clause, it might be said that its function is fused, as the infinitive expresses both manner and purpose, and, moreover, even spatial circumstances.

Finally, there are two instances in which the adverbial infinitive is preceded by an adjective intensified by *too* and *enough* respectively:

[81] ‘Perhaps I’m hoping to meet a man rich enough **to keep me in comfort** so I can indulge my every whim and fancy and give up work for good,’ she said drily. (F092)

[82] ‘It was a little too hot **to ignore**, don’t you think?’ (F055)

In [81], it is the direct object of the superordinate clause, i.e. *a man*, that is understood to be the agent of the infinitival action. As for [82], even though the sentence appears to be ambiguous, the most plausible interpretation is to regard the subject *it* as anaphoric and *hot* as its quality. However, the subject *it* is not the agent of the infinitival action in this case, but in fact the object of the infinitive. Therefore, the broader context is required to infer the S of the infinitive. The subsequent examination of the broader context revealed that, most plausibly, the infinitival S might be inferred from the

preceding discourse and interpreted as referring to the speaker and the addressee (or, in other words, to both participants of the dialogue).

4.3 Comparison of the Registers

In 4.1 and 4.2., the collected sample was analysed separately for each register. The present chapter then aims at comparing the registers.

The overall distribution of functions of the infinitive and realizations of the infinitival subject is demonstrated in Table 16 and Table 17 respectively on the following pages. What follows is a detailed discussion and comparison of the results of the analysis.

However, it is necessary to stress that, due to the limited size of the analysed sample and complexity of the topic, the results presented in the following chapters should be considered tentative. The study therefore does not aim at providing definitive findings but rather at serving as a ground for further treatment of the subject of the infinitival action.

Table 16: Overall distribution of the syntactic functions of the infinitive in the registers

Syntactic Function	Academic Prose		Fiction	
	Number of occurrences	%	Number of occurrences	%
Subject	14	14	2	2
Object	30	30	47	47
Part of the predicate	12	12	14	14
Postmodifier	26	26	15	15
Adjective complementation	4	4	1	1
Adverbial	14	14	21	21
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 17: Overall distribution of the realization of the infinitival subject in the registers

Academic Prose								Total
Syntactic Function	Identical to the S of the matrix clause	Identical to another element		Expressed – introduced by PREP		Not identical to any const. / inferable from the SC	Un-expressed – general	
		Constit. of the matrix clause	Member of the inf. clause	Constit. of the matrix clause	Member of the inf. clause			
Subject	-	-	-	1	3	2	8	100
Object	17	7	6	-	-	-	-	
Part of the Predicate	9	-	-	-	-	2	1	
Postmodifier	11 / 10	4 / 5	-	-	1	4	6	
Adjective complement.	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Adverbial	10	-	-	2	-	-	2	
Total	51 / 50	11 / 12	6	3	4	8	17	
Fiction								Total
Syntactic Function	Identical to the S of the matrix clause	Identical to another element		Expressed – introduced by PREP		Not identical to any const. / inferable from the SC	Un-expressed – general	
		Constit. of the matrix clause	Member of the inf. clause	Constit. of the matrix clause	Member of the inf. clause			
Subject	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	100
Object	26	15	4	1 / 2	1 / 0	-	-	
Part of the Predicate	13	-	-	-	-	1	-	
Postmodifier	10	2	-	-	2	-	1	
Adjective complement.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Adverbial	18	1	-	-	-	2	-	
Total	68	19	4	1 / 2	3 / 2	4	1	

As demonstrated in Table 16 on page 60, there is a resemblance between the two registers with respect to the distribution of syntactic functions of the infinitive. In both fiction and academic prose, the most frequent function of the infinitive is object. The prevalence of this function is striking especially in the sample of fiction, where it occurs in almost half of the instances. On the other hand, what is the least frequent in both the registers is the infinitive functioning as a complement of an adjective.

However, there are some differences with respect to the distribution of the remaining functions. Even though the occurrence of other functions in the sample of fiction is naturally lower due to the prevalence of the object function, it is still worth noting that the infinitive functioning as a subject and a postmodifier is much less frequent in F, whereas the adverbial function occurs more frequently in fiction than in academic prose. The infinitive functioning as a subject or a postmodifier appears to be typical of academic prose (as will be discussed in more length in the following paragraphs). Concerning the adverbial function, the lower proportion of the adverbial infinitive in academic prose is rather surprising considering that, according to Biber et al. (1999: 826, 828), they are supposed to be most common in academic prose and, moreover, *to*-clauses of purpose are claimed to be “the most common form of non-finite clause in that register” (Biber et al., 1999: 833). Nevertheless, the higher frequency of the adverbial infinitive in fiction might possibly be explained by the frequent need to describe circumstances in this functional style.

Concerning the different types of realization of the subject of the infinitive, by far the most frequent is its correspondence to the subject of the matrix clause. In academic prose, it occurs in more than half of the instances, and in fiction it is even more frequent, as it occurs in almost 70 per cent of the instances.

The analysed material further suggests that the infinitival subject introduced by a preposition is in general rather rare. In the whole analysed sample, there are only eleven instances (which is 5.5 per cent) containing the S introduced by a preposition. As for the prepositions themselves, besides the preposition *for*, which is typically used for the introduction of the infinitival subject, the preposition *to* occurs as well. On the other hand, the infinitival S controlled by another element of the matrix clause (besides the subject) is more common. It occurs in 30 per cent of all the analysed sentences. As for the distribution of the two abovementioned realizations of the infinitival subject, the registers do not significantly differ.

What is further worth noting is the fact that in academic prose almost 20 per cent of the infinitival subjects are general, while in fiction there is only one instance containing the subject understood to be the general human agent. This might be attributed to the fact that due to the nature of the formal texts, the agent often tends to be avoided.

Finally, in the following subchapters, the registers are compared in more detail for each of the syntactic functions of the infinitive separately.

4.3.1 Subject

Concerning the infinitive in subject function, there is an imbalance between the samples. While the infinitive in this function occurs in 14 per cent of the instances in the sample of academic prose, it is only two per cent in the sample of fiction.

The samples also differ with respect to the realization of the S of the infinitive. While in AP the significant number of instances contain a general S or a S introduced by a preposition (*for* and *to* respectively), neither of these realizations occurs in the sample of fiction. Nevertheless, this could be attributed to the limited number of instances in the sample of F.

The results show that in general the realization of the subject of the infinitive functioning as a subject is very diverse and that, besides its correspondence to the S of the matrix clause, naturally, all different types of realization might occur. No prevalent tendency as to the subject realization has been detected.

However, the analysed samples confirm that extraposition is typical of the infinitive in subject function, as both instances in F and almost 80 per cent of the instances in AP are extraposed. As for the remaining instances in AP, there are two cases of the Tough Movement construction, and only one instance in which the infinitive is not extraposed and thus occurs in initial position:

[83] **To approach this in a more formal sense** would also require mathematical programming techniques. (A085)

The initial infinitival clause in [83] contains a pronominal reference to a preceding discourse (*this*) and serves as a cohesive device, i.e. in function that does not occur in the sample of fiction at all. Furthermore, the results appear to confirm that the extraposed structure without an overt subject is the most frequent, whereas the non-extraposed variant with subject is the least numerous. While the former structure occurs in half of the instances, the latter does not occur in the analysed material at all.

It is further worth noting that in AP not only is this type of the infinitive more common and typically occurs extraposed, it is also often (in more than 60 per cent) controlled by an adjective. This might be explained by the fact that “extraposed *to*-clauses controlled by an adjective present a stance that is not directly attributed to anyone” and “this detachment suits academic prose” (Biber et al., 1999: 723-724).

4.3.2 Object

Unlike the previous type, the realization of the infinitival subject of the most frequent type, the infinitive functioning as an object, is in both the samples more similar and also slightly more homogeneous. In both the registers, the subject is controlled either by the subject of the matrix clause or by the intervening NP. Moreover, in the sample of fiction the subject that is not identical to the S of the matrix clause and is introduced by a preposition also occurs. However, this realization has been detected only twice. Moreover, it occurs solely in the sentences containing an extraposed infinitival object.

As for the distribution, the registers are similar as well. In both academic prose and fiction, the two prevalent realizations seem to be rather balanced, with ca. 55 per cent of the instances containing the implied subject identical to the S of the matrix clause, and ca. 45 per cent having the subject different from the S of the matrix clause. Therefore, the results confirm Biber et al.’s (1999: 698) claim that the former pattern is most common in all registers, but do not confirm that it is particularly common in fiction. In the case of the infinitival S different from the S of the matrix clause, as already mentioned, the majority of the infinitival subjects are controlled by a NP preceding the infinitive, whereas the subject introduced by a preposition is very rare with only two instances (i.e. 1 per cent) detected in the whole analysed material.

Besides the lack of the infinitival S introduced by a preposition in AP, another difference between the analysed samples is related to the status of NPs controlling the S. While in AP the proportion of NPs belonging exclusively to the infinitival clause to NPs with the status of a shared element is rather balanced, in F noun phrases shared by both the matrix and the infinitival clause significantly prevail. In other words, NP + infinitive structures in the monotransitive pattern of complementation are not very frequent in F.

4.3.3 Part of the Predicate

The distribution of the infinitive functioning as part of the predicate is also very similar in both registers. While in academic prose the infinitive of this type occurs in 12 per

cent of the instances, in fiction it is 14 per cent. In both the samples, examples of all three distinct structures occur, namely the infinitive following copular *be*, and the structures called 'Subject raising' and 'Subject raising with split subject'. The registers are also similar in that in both of them, the infinitive with subject raising is by far the most numerous and the two remaining structures are then evenly distributed.

Concerning the infinitival subject, the analysed sample shows that its realization is closely related to the type of the structure. In both the registers, the only realization of the subject of the infinitive with subject raising (either with or without a split S) is its correspondence to the subject of the matrix clause. On the other hand, in both the registers, all instances with copular *be* contain different type of the subject of the infinitive. Typically, the infinitival subject of a structure with copular *be* is specific and has to be inferred from the sentence context. In AP, it is realized by a possessive pronoun or by an *of*-genitive modifying the subject of the matrix clause. In F, the implied S is also inferred from the possessive pronoun. However, in this case it does not precede the S of the matrix clause but is contained in the O of the infinitive. Moreover, in AP, one instance where the subject might be interpreted as general has also been detected.

What differentiates these structures (such as [85] below) from the rest of the instances containing the infinitival subject identical to the S of the matrix clause (such as [84] below) is the fact that in the former case the S belongs to the superordinate clause only syntactically, whereas semantically it belongs only to the infinitival clause. Compare:

[84] She knew perfectly well he'd been trying **to hide the fact that he'd come alive as the streets had filled with people.** (F016)

[85] 'You can help Claudia, Dana, and then we'll collect your things from the hotel, though you seem **to have bought a fresh wardrobe.**' (F029)

The infinitive in [84] functions as an object, whereas in [85] it is part of the predicate. In [84] the subject *he* is directly semantically related to the matrix verb. In other words, *he* is the understood agent of both *try* and *hide*. On the other hand, in [85] the subject *you* has a semantic role only with respect to the infinitive and is not directly semantically related to the matrix verb. This is even more evident in the underlying structure that would be '*...it seems that you have bought a fresh wardrobe*'. It is thus not *you* that *seems*, but the whole situation.

4.3.4 Postmodifier

In the sample of academic prose, the most frequent syntactic function of the infinitive, object, is closely followed by the infinitive functioning as a postmodifier which occurs in 26 per cent of the instances. The analysed sample thus appears to be in accordance with the fact that “postmodifiers are extremely common in academic prose” (Biber et al., 1999: 607). On the other hand, the postmodifying infinitive is slightly less common in fiction where it occurs in 15 per cent of the instances and, together with the infinitive functioning as part of the predicate or adverbial, is considerably less common in comparison to the infinitive in object function.

The subject of the infinitive functioning as a postmodifier is often identical to the S of the matrix clause. In both the registers, this realization is most frequent. However, similarly to the infinitive in subject function, the infinitive of this type is very heterogeneous with respect to the infinitival S as all the other forms of realization occur as well, although less frequently.

The diversity of different forms of realization of the infinitival S is wider in academic prose, which might be linked to the fact that postmodification is in general more employed in AP, but it also suggests that uses of postmodification are different in the two registers. In fiction, the subject of the infinitive is mostly specific, controlled predominantly by the S of the matrix clause, or in two instances controlled by the head noun and in two instances introduced by the preposition *for*. There is only one sentence in which the subject of the infinitive is understood to be the GHA. On the other hand, in AP specifying the agent of the infinitival action is often avoided and the general subject is thus the second most frequent realization of the infinitival S. Moreover, means of expressing the specific agent are much more diverse as five different realizations have been detected, namely the infinitival subject controlled by the head noun, controlled by O_i , expressed by possessive determination of the head noun, logically inferred from the sentence context, and expressed by a *for*-phrase.

Moreover, while in AP all the head nouns are inanimate, 20 per cent of the head nouns in F are animate. Furthermore, the understood subjects are exclusively animate in F, but in AP more than 20 per cent of the infinitival subjects are inanimate. The results thus show that distribution of the postmodifying infinitive and realization of its subject is affected by the functional style in which it occurs, especially by the impersonal nature of academic prose.

4.3.5 Complementation of an Adjective

As for the infinitive functioning as adjective complementation, this type is infrequent in both the registers. While there are four instances of this type of the infinitive in the sample of academic prose, only one instance occurs in fiction.

Concerning the infinitival subject, instances of this type of the infinitive detected in the analysed sample are characterised by complete homogeneity. In all the instances the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, which is claimed to be typical of the infinitive in this function. Therefore, even though the number of the instances is not significant enough to draw any ultimate conclusions, it appears to confirm the claim.

4.3.6 Adverbial

The infinitive functioning as an adverbial occurs in 14 per cent of the instances in academic prose and in 21 per cent in fiction. As already mentioned, this is rather surprising as the adverbial infinitives are claimed to be most common in academic prose (see Biber et al, 826, 828, 833).

In both the registers, the most frequent type of the adverbial infinitive is the infinitive of purpose. However, while in AP the prevalence of the purposive infinitive is substantial (as it constitutes 86 per cent of the adverbials), in F the distribution is less homogeneous with only half of the instances being purposive. Therefore, even though the results of the research do not confirm that the adverbial infinitive of purpose is “the most common form of non-finite clause in that register” (Biber et al., 1999: 833), the results nevertheless suggest that the purposive structure appears to be typical of academic prose (at least within the range of adverbial infinitives). Furthermore, Biber et al. (1999: 833) claim that purposive infinitives in academic prose often occur in initial position in which they may have two distinct functions. Firstly, they “give a lead into the next stage of discussion, by stating its purpose” and, secondly, they can “provide a cohesive link with the previous discourse.” The analysed sample of academic prose contains an example of the latter function:

[86] **To prevent further cases** the Indian community in the United Kingdom should be made aware of the risks associated with the use of ethnic remedies, and their distribution and sale should be monitored. (A051)

The adverbial infinitive in initial position in [86] (which is one of three initial infinitives of purpose occurring in the sample of AP) contains an item referring to or mentioned in

the immediately preceding discourse, namely *further cases*. Therefore, it might be seen as a cohesive device. On the other hand, in fiction adverbial infinitives in initial position do not occur at all.

Besides the infinitive of purpose, infinitival clauses of goal, false purpose and result have also been detected. However, while in AP only the infinitives of goal and result occur, the sample of F in addition contains infinitival clauses of false purpose. Furthermore, rather interestingly, no examples of a disjunct or a conjunct have occurred in the analysed samples. On the whole, not only does the infinitive functioning as an adverbial seem to be slightly more common in fiction, its usage in fiction is also more diverse than in academic prose.

Concerning the subject of the adverbial infinitive, the results demonstrate that its realization depends on the type of the adverbial. For instance, in all the infinitives of “false purpose” (all of them occurring in F), the S of the infinitive is controlled by the S of the matrix clause. The results thus show that the infinitive of “false purpose” occurs only without a covert subject and its implied subject is invariably identical to the S of the matrix clause (see 2.3.6). On the other hand, the infinitival adverbial of result appears to be the least homogeneous, as three distinct realizations have been detected, namely the infinitival subject controlled by O_d , introduced by a preposition *for*, and inferred from a broader context. As for the infinitive of purpose and goal, both of them typically occur with the subject controlled by the S of the matrix clause. However, even though this realization occurs in most of the instances, several exceptions have been detected. Firstly, there is one infinitival clause of goal in the sample of fiction which is specific in that the understood subject of the infinitive is partly controlled by the S of the matrix clause and partly has to be inferred from the sentence context. Secondly, in F all the infinitives of purpose are in correspondence with the fact that the infinitive of purpose is characterised by the fact that, if an overtly expressed subject is missing, “the subject of the underlying clause is as a rule identical with that of the superordinate clause” (Dušková, 1999: 39). On the other hand, in AP, even though more than 80 per cent of the infinitives of purpose comply with the rule (with nine sentences containing the subject controlled by the S of the matrix clause and one sentence having the infinitival S explicitly expressed by a *for*-phrase), there are also two exceptions in which the subject of the infinitive neither corresponds to the S of the matrix clause nor is expressed by a *for*-phrase. Therefore, the analysed sample confirms that in the case of the infinitival clauses of purpose the attachment rule is sometimes relaxed.

5. Conclusion

The diploma thesis was concerned with the subject of the infinitival action in English fiction and academic prose. The main aim was to examine all forms of realization of the subject of the infinitive, to investigate relation between the syntactic function of the infinitive and the form and semantics of its subject, and to characterise and compare fiction and academic prose with respect to realization of the infinitival subject.

In the theoretical part of the study, the subject matter was introduced by a brief characterisation of non-finite clauses as means of complex condensation. Then, the infinitive was defined from a formal and functional point of view. Further, the subject of the infinitive was generally characterised, and various forms of its realization and its interpretation were discussed. Finally, each syntactic function of the infinitive was investigated in detail in terms of the infinitival subject. The main part of the thesis consisted in a corpus-based research. Since the study focused on two different registers, the collected material was analysed for each of them separately. The final part of the analysis was then devoted to comparison of the registers in terms of distribution of syntactic functions of the infinitive and realization of the infinitival subject.

The thesis revealed that the analysed registers, namely fiction and academic prose, are rather similar with respect to the distribution of syntactic functions of the infinitive. In both of them, the most frequent function of the infinitive is object, whereas the infinitive functioning as a complement of an adjective occurs least frequently. The registers differ mainly in the distribution of the subject and attributive function which appear to be typical of academic prose. Furthermore, it was, rather surprisingly, revealed that the infinitive functioning as an adverbial occurs more frequently in fiction even though the adverbial function is supposed to be most common in academic prose. This might be explained by the frequent need to describe circumstances in fiction.

Regarding realization of the subject of the infinitive, it was observed that fiction and academic prose do not significantly differ in terms of proportion of different realizations of the infinitival subject. However, there was one exception. The analysis confirmed that in formal texts the agent of the infinitival action often tends to be avoided, as in the sample of academic prose almost 20 per cent of the infinitival subjects are general, which makes it the second most frequent type of the infinitival subject in academic prose. On the other hand, in fiction there was only one instance containing the subject understood to be the general human agent detected. This confirms

that academic prose is in comparison to fiction very impersonal. This was also demonstrated by the fact that the understood subjects of the infinitival clauses functioning as a postmodifier are not only mostly specific in fiction and general in academic prose, but also exclusively animate in fiction but in academic prose in more than 20 per cent of the cases inanimate.

What proved to be by far the most frequent type of the infinitival subject in both the registers was its correspondence to the subject of the matrix clause. In academic prose, it occurs in more than half of the instances, and in fiction it is even more frequent, as it occurs in almost 70 per cent of the instances. Besides this realization, both the registers contain a rather high number of subjects controlled by another constituent of the matrix clause (and shared by the matrix clause and the infinitival clause). However, in comparison to the subject identical to the subject of the matrix clause, it is considerably less frequent. In academic prose, this realization was detected in more than 10 per cent of all the analysed sentences, and in fiction it was 20 per cent.

On the other hand, the analysed material revealed that other realizations are rather rare in both the registers, as in the whole sample there were detected only eleven instances (5.5 per cent) of the infinitival subject introduced by a preposition and ten instances (5 per cent) of the subject identical to an element belonging to the infinitival clause. As for the prepositions used for introducing an infinitival subject, two prepositions were detected, namely *for*, which is typically used for the introduction of the infinitival subject, and the preposition *to*. As for the distribution of the two abovementioned realizations, the registers do not significantly differ.

Moreover, the research confirmed that syntactic functions of the infinitive differ in terms of realization of the subject of the infinitive, and that there thus often exists a relation between the syntactic function of the infinitive and the form of its subject. As a matter of course, the only function that does not occur with the infinitival subject identical to the subject of the matrix clause is the infinitive in subject function. Nevertheless, while in this case the impossibility of such an arrangement is rather obvious, there were also some other tendencies revealed.

Firstly, it was observed that the subject of the infinitive introduced by a preposition typically occurs with all the syntactic functions except for part of the predicate and adjective complementation. This does not demonstrate that this realization of the infinitival subject is not possible with these syntactic functions, but rather that it is not so frequent. Moreover, adjective complementation proved to be the most

homogenous in terms of realization of the subject of the infinitive. It is the only syntactic function in the analysed sample whose subject is always controlled by the subject of the matrix clause. On the other hand, the infinitive functioning as a subject or a postmodifier is the most heterogeneous in terms of the realization of the subject of the infinitive.

Further, it was demonstrated that overt subjects not introduced by a preposition and belonging solely to the infinitival clause are characteristic of the infinitive in object function. In other words, they occur only with this function.

Finally, it was revealed that the realization of the subject of the infinitive is closely related not only to the syntactic function but, in certain cases, also depends on the type of structure within a syntactic function. This is valid especially for infinitival structures functioning as part of the predicate and adverbial. As for part of the predicate, the only realization of the infinitival subject with subject raising (both with or without a split S) is its correspondence to the subject of the matrix clause. On the other hand, the structure with copular *be* is less homogenous and occurs with several different types of the infinitival subject. As for adverbial function, the realization of the subject of the adverbial infinitive also depends on the type of the adverbial. The subject of the infinitive of “false purpose” is invariably identical to the subject of the matrix clause. Similarly, the infinitive of purpose and goal also typically occur with the subject controlled by the subject of the matrix clause. However, in these cases, several exceptions were detected and it was confirmed that in the case of the infinitival clauses of purpose the attachment rule is sometimes relaxed. On the other hand, the infinitive of result is much less homogenous and occurs with its subject introduced by a preposition, controlled by an object and inferred from a broader context.

To conclude, the research demonstrated that academic prose and fiction are very similar with respect to the realization of the subject of the infinitive, and confirmed that the major difference consists in a tendency of academic texts to avoid agent. It was also shown that the realization of the subject of the infinitive is often closely related to the syntactic function and type of the structure of the infinitive.

Bibliography

Sources

British National Corpus (BNC) – accessed from <<http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/>>

References

BIBER, D. et al. (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

CRYSTAL, D. (2004) *Making Sense of Grammar*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

CRYSTAL, D. (2007) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DRÁBKOVÁ, D. (2003) *Infinitive Clauses with Subject in British and American English*. Diploma thesis. Praha: Karlova Univerzita v Praze.

DUŠKOVÁ, L. (1999) 'A Note on the Object + Infinitive Construction in English' in Dušková L. *Studies in the English Language*, Pt. 2, pp. 29-40. Praha: Karolinum.

DUŠKOVÁ, L. et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.

DUŠKOVÁ, L. (2009) 'Noun Modification in Fiction and Academic Prose'. *Brno Studies in English*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 29-51.

GEISLER, C. (1995) *Relative Infinitives in English*. Uppsala: Almqvist-Wiksell (distr.).

HICKS, G. (2003) "So Easy to Look At, So Hard to Define": Tough Movement in the Minimalist Framework. Dissertation. York: University of York.

HLADKÝ, J. (1961) 'Remarks on Complex Condensation Phenomena in some English and Czech Contexts'. *Brno Studies in English*, Vol. 3, pp. 105-118.

HUDDLESTON, R. & PULLUM G. K. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.

JACOBS, R. A. (c1995) *English Syntax: A Grammar for English Language Professionals*. New York: Oxford University Press.

KNOTKOVÁ, K. (1986) *Kapitoly z anglické gramatiky I*. Praha: UK.

MAIR, C. (1990) *Infinitival Complement Clauses in English: A Study of Syntax in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MATHESIUS, V. (1961) *Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecně lingvistického*. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.

MATTHEWS, P. H. (2007) *Syntactic Relations: A Critical Survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OJEA, A. (2008) 'A Feature Analysis of *To*-infinitive Sentences'. *Atlantis*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 69-83.

QUIRK, R. et al. (c1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Harlow: Longman.

QUIRK, R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

dictionary.cambridge.org

Resumé

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá podmětem infinitivního děje, a to jak vyjádřeným, tak nevyjádřeným. Pro infinitiv, jakožto pro jeden z prostředků tzv. komplexní kondenzace, je příznačné, že pro interpretaci konatele jeho děje je často nutné využít bezprostřední větný či širší kontext. Obecně vzato existuje několik možných interpretací infinitivního podmětu. Podmět infinitivu může být totožný podmětu nadřazené věty či může být řízen jiným jejím členem. Dále může být podmětem infinitivu obecný konatel či může být za konatele považován mluvčí. Infinitiv se nicméně také vyskytuje s podmětem explicitně vyjádřeným. V takovémto případě je infinitiv často uvedený předložkou, a to nejčastěji předložkou *for*.

Cílem této diplomové práce je podrobný popis a analýza různých forem infinitivního podmětu a zjištění vzájemných vztahů mezi formou podmětu infinitivního děje, syntaktickou funkcí infinitivu a sémantikou. Dílčím cílem práce je poté srovnání odborné a beletristické angličtiny z hlediska zkoumaných rysů podmětu infinitivního děje.

Metodologicky je práce založena na analýze vzorku 200 dokladů infinitivní konstrukce, pro jehož získání byl použit Britský národní korpus (British National Corpus – BNC). Jelikož se práce snaží porovnat dva odlišné funkční styly, byly věty obsahující infinitivní konstrukce excerpovány zvlášť pro odbornou a zvlášť pro beletristickou angličtinu (tedy 100 vzorků pro každý subkorpus), výzkum byl proveden na každém souboru samostatně a výsledky byly poté porovnány.

Z hlediska struktury je práce rozdělena do několika částí. Po stručném úvodu následuje teoretická kapitola, ve které jsou nejprve infinitiv a ostatní neurčité tvary slovesné představeny jako prostředky komplexní větné kondenzace, tj. prostředky zhušťující větnou stavbu a nahrazující delší a explicitnější hlavní a vedlejší věty. Poté následuje stručný popis infinitivu z formálního hlediska. Větší prostor je následně věnován popisu syntaktických funkcí infinitivu, tj. podmětu, předmětu, příslovečného určení, součásti přísudku, doplnění adjektiv a funkci atributivní. Závěrečná a také nejpodstatnější část teoretické kapitoly je věnovaná podrobnému popisu podmětu infinitivního děje. Jelikož každá ze syntaktických funkcí infinitivu má s ohledem na podmět infinitivního děje svá specifika, je infinitivní podmět nejprve charakterizován z obecného hlediska a poté je v samostatných podkapitolách detailněji rozebrán pro každou z funkcí zvlášť.

Teoretická část práce vychází především z *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* (2006) Libuše Duškové a kol. a z *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (1985) Randolpha Quirka a kol. Dalšími významnými zdroji jsou studie *Relative Infinitives in English* (1995) Christera Geislera a *Infinitival Complement Clauses in English: A Study of Syntax in Discourse* (1990) Christiana Maira. Dále byly informace čerpány především z *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (1999) od Douglase Bibera a kol. a z *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (2002) od Rodneyho Huddlestona a Geoffrey K. Pulluma.

Výzkumná část diplomové práce tvoří její hlavní část a je taktéž rozdělena do několika částí. V úvodní kapitole je představena metodologie výzkumu. Nejprve jsou popsány zdroje výzkumného materiálu a poté je dopodrobna rozebrán způsob shromažďování a roztřídění analyzovaných dat.

Samotný výzkum je rozdělen do tří hlavních kapitol. První kapitola je věnovaná detailní analýze dokladů shromážděných ze subkorpusu odborné angličtiny, zatímco ve druhé kapitole je ta samá analýza provedena pro infinitivní struktury shromážděné ze subkorpusu beletrie. V poslední kapitole jsou poté oba funkční styly a výsledky analýz porovnány.

Jelikož má každá ze syntaktických funkcí co se týče podmětu infinitivního děje svá specifika, je každá z kapitol dále rozdělena a data jsou analyzována pro každou ze syntaktických funkcí zvlášť. Toto uspořádání navíc přispívá k větší přehlednosti celé práce.

Všechny excerpované infinitivy jsou zkoumány z hlediska jejich syntaktické funkce a formy konatele infinitivního děje. Doklady jsou nejprve rozděleny do skupin (a tedy kapitol) dle jejich syntaktické funkce a poté do několika podskupin dle typu podmětu jejich děje. U každé ze syntaktických funkcí je poměr různých typů infinitivního podmětu nejprve uveden v přehledné tabulkové formě. Tato tabulka je poté okomentována, stejně jaké konkrétní vybrané příklady. Rozlišovány byly následující typy podmětu infinitivního děje: podmět totožný podmětu nadřazeného slovesa; podmět totožný jinému členu (který byl dále dělen podle toho, zda je členem nadřazené věty či patří pouze do infinitivní klauze); vyjádřený podmět uvedený předložkou (který se dále dělil podobně jako předchozí typ); konkrétní podmět, který není řízen žádným z členů, ale dá se vyvodit z větného kontextu; nevyjádřený obecný podmět.

Diplomovou práci uzavírá kapitola, ve které jsou stručně shrnuty závěry výzkumu. Analýza ukázala, že z hlediska výskytu syntaktických funkcí infinitivu se analyzované funkční styly nijak významně neliší. V obou případech se infinitiv nejčastěji vyskytuje ve funkci předmětu. V odborných textech má tuto funkci 30 procent infinitivních konstrukcí a v beletrii to je dokonce téměř polovina shromážděných infinitivů. Naopak nejméně častou funkcí je doplnění adjektiv, které se vyskytuje pouze v 5 procentech celého vzorku. Pokud jde o rozdíly mezi funkčními styly, ukázalo se, že infinitiv ve funkci příslovečného určení se překvapivě vyskytuje častěji v beletrii, a to i přesto, tato funkce infinitivu je obecně považována za typickou pro odborný funkční styl. Analýza dále ukázala, že infinitiv ve funkci podmětu a infinitiv ve funkci atributivní se typicky vyskytují v odborném stylu, zatímco v beletrii jsou spíše vzácné.

Co se týče samotného podmětu infinitivního děje a jeho forem, jsou si oba funkční styly také velice podobné. V odborném stylu je podmět infinitivního děje nejčastěji totožný s podmětem nadřazené věty a v beletrii odpovídá podmětu nadřazené věty dokonce v 70 procentech analyzovaných případů. To z tohoto typu realizace činí obecně zdaleka nejčastější typ podmětu infinitivního děje. Druhým nejčastějším typem je podmět infinitivního děje totožný jinému členu nadřazené věty (a patřící do obou predikací). Ve vzorku odborné angličtiny se tento typ vyskytl ve 12 procentech případů a v beletrii ve 20 procentech.

Dále se ukázalo, že ostatní typy podmětu infinitivního děje se v obou funkčních stylech vyskytují spíše zřídka. Podmět totožný jinému členu než podmětu nadřazené věty, který je pouze konatelem infinitivního děje, se vyskytl pouze v 5 procentech celého zkoumaného vzorku a infinitivní podmět uvedený předložkou nebyl s 5,5 procenty o mnoho častější. Pokud jde o samotné předložky, kterými je infinitiv uveden, v analyzovaném vzorku se objevila předložka *for*, která je v této funkci obvyklá, a také předložka *to*. Co se týče distribuce těchto dvou typů infinitivního podmětu, funkční styly se od sebe v tomto ohledu nijak významně neliší.

Hlavní rozdíl mezi funkčními styly spočívá ve výskytu obecného konatele infinitivního děje. Výzkum potvrdil, že formální angličtina má tendenci nespecifikovat konatele děje. Ve vzorku odborných textů je obecný konatel s 20 procenty druhým nejčastějším typem podmětu infinitivního děje. Naopak v beletrii se obecný konatel vyskytl pouze jednou.

Analýza dále potvrdila, že různé syntaktické funkce infinitivu se z hlediska formy infinitivního podmětu liší a že forma podmětu často na syntaktické funkci závisí. Kromě toho, že infinitiv ve funkci podmětu se přirozeně nemůže vyskytnout s podmětem totožným podmětu nadřazeného slovesa (jelikož podmětem je samotný infinitiv), bylo zjištěno, že infinitivní podmět uvedený předložkou se u infinitivu ve funkci doplnění adjektiv a u infinitivu jako části přísudku vyskytuje velice zřídka, jelikož se v analyzovaném vzorku nevyskytl ani jednou. Infinitiv ve funkci doplnění adjektiv se navíc ukázal býti z hlediska podmětu infinitivního děje nejvíce homogenní. Jako jediný se objevil pouze s podmětem řízeným podmětem nadřazené věty. Naopak atributivní syntaktická funkce a funkce podmětu vykazují v tomto ohledu nejvyšší variaci. Také se prokázalo, že typ infinitivního podmětu totožný s jiným členem než s podmětem nadřazené věty, který je pouze podmětem infinitivního děje, se objevuje výlučně u infinitivu ve funkci předmětu.

V neposlední řadě se ukázalo, že formu podmětu infinitivního děje ovlivňuje nejen syntaktická funkce infinitivu, ale často (především u adverbálních infinitivů a infinitivů, které jsou částí přísudku) i typ struktury v rámci jedné syntaktické funkce. Zatímco u struktur s povýšením podmětu (ať už s rozštěpeným podmětem či ne) je podmět infinitivu vždy řízen podmětem nadřazené věty, struktury se sponovým *be* jsou mnohem různorodější. Co se týče infinitivu ve funkci příslovečného určení, forma jeho podmětu také často závisí na typu příslovečného určení. V případě nepravého účelu například nalezneme pouze infinitivní podměty totožné s podmětem nadřazeného slovesa, zatímco příslovečná určení účinku se vyskytují s vyjádřeným podmětem uvedeným předložkou, podmětem řízeným předmětem a také s nevyjádřeným podmětem vyvozeným ze širšího kontextu.

V samotném závěru diplomové práce nalezneme seznam všech použitých zdrojů a také přílohy, kterými jsou tabulky obsahující číslovaný seznam všech shromážděných a následně analyzovaných dokladů.

Lze tedy shrnout, že diplomová práce ukázala, že anglický odborný styl i beletrie jsou si z hlediska podmětu infinitivního děje velice podobné a že nejvýznamnějším rozdílem mezi nimi je sklon vyhýbat se v odborných textech konkrétnímu konateli. Dále bylo prokázáno, že forma podmětu infinitivního děje často úzce souvisí se syntaktickou funkcí infinitivu či jeho strukturou.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Lists of extracted sentences

List of extracted sentences – ACADEMIC PROSE

No.	BNC code	Sample sentence
A001	HWG 550 ₁	There were further measures in the 1530s; an Act of 1533 attempted to limit the size of the flock that one man might own and to prevent the engrossing of holdings and another in 1536 authorized the King to proceed against any encloser of land converted from tillage since 1488 (58, pp.104–6, 110–11).
A002	HWG 550 ₂	There were further measures in the 1530s; an Act of 1533 attempted to limit the size of the flock that one man might own and to prevent the engrossing of holdings and another in 1536 authorized the King to proceed against any encloser of land converted from tillage since 1488 (58, pp.104–6, 110–11).
A003	B16 661	It is left to the reader to plot these points on figure 10.3, and to connect the first and third.
A004	J72 219	Similarly, s 81 empowers the SIB to make regulations "as to the ... rights and obligations of the participants" in authorised unit trust schemes.
A005	J7C 25 ₁	In order to draft effectively, and to make intelligent use of precedents , the drafter must not only know what to say but why it is necessary to say it, how to say it, and what will be the result of saying it differently.
A006	J7C 25 ₂	In order to draft effectively, and to make intelligent use of precedents, the drafter must not only know what to say but why it is necessary to say it, how to say it , and what will be the result of saying it differently.
A007	J7C 25 ₃	In order to draft effectively, and to make intelligent use of precedents, the drafter must not only know what to say but why it is necessary to say it , how to say it, and what will be the result of saying it differently.
A008	EEE 707	The decision went against the Harringtons, but they still refused to capitulate , presumably confident of ducal backing, and the matter was not finally settled until 1475, when Hornby was confirmed to the daughters and hence to the Stanleys.
A009	FCS 202 ₁	By assigning, the defendant, the original lessee, had given the assignee power to assign again , which would include the power to surrender, in whole or in part, to the landlord.
A010	FCS 202 ₂	By assigning, the defendant, the original lessee, had given the assignee power to assign again, which would include the power to surrender, in whole or in part, to the landlord.
A011	HY7 1378 ₁	A decision was taken in principle to require agencies with independent sources of income to transfer them to the central treasury.
A012	HY7 1378 ₂	A decision was taken in principle to require agencies with independent sources of income to transfer them to the central treasury.
A013	ABP 1056 ₁	The problem, in short, was to find a system where the landowner could continue to create all the beneficial interests he wished in favour of members of the family, and, at the same time, would be able to deal with the land, by sale, long lease, or mortgage, as if he were a sole owner.

A014	ABP 1056 ₂	The problem, in short, was to find a system where the landowner could continue to create all the beneficial interests he wished in favour of members of the family, and, at the same time, would be able to deal with the land, by sale, long lease, or mortgage, as if he were a sole owner.
A015	H0J 270	Don't be afraid to limit the time spent with your language helper to one hour a day at first.
A016	GVG 1082 ₁	A company which has a subsidiary undertaking to which these requirements do not apply must take all reasonable steps to secure that the subsidiary keeps such records as will enable the directors of the parent company to ensure that any balance sheet and profit and loss account prepared under Part VII complies with the Act's requirements.
A017	GVG 1082 ₂	A company which has a subsidiary undertaking to which these requirements do not apply must take all reasonable steps to secure that the subsidiary keeps such records as will enable the directors of the parent company to ensure that any balance sheet and profit and loss account prepared under Part VII complies with the Act's requirements.
A018	HY9 1367	Indeed, religious tensions appear to have been at the root of the party divide — not the sole cause, it should be stressed (indeed, much of this book has been concerned with documenting the complex ways constitutional and religious issues interacted), but perhaps the most potent source of conflict, with attitudes towards Dissent (whether one was sympathetic or hostile to Protestant Nonconformists) being one of the strongest predictors of partisan allegiance.
A019	J6T 154 ₁	Their effect was to cause the indemnifier to suffer the loss or damage caused by the indemnitee's negligence towards the indemnifier.
A020	J6T 154 ₂	Their effect was to cause the indemnifier to suffer the loss or damage caused by the indemnitee's negligence towards the indemnifier.
A021	H7Y 903	Although this road emerges on the eastern side of the town, attempts to trace it much further have failed.
A022	EEE 864	It is more accurate to see the East Anglian affinity as a court connection rather than a narrowly Woodville one.
A023	EA3 654	When this process becomes revolutionary upheaval is not always easy to identify and the decision as to whether it was a radical reinterpretation rather than simply an adjustment depends on the observer's standpoint.
A024	HXG 1581	(23) above expresses a favourable reaction to the fact that the speaker happened to find friendship where he was not seeking it.
A025	HU4 7401	However, recent studies showed that malt lymphomas, whatever the organ involved, were susceptible to spread to or to recur in other mucosal sites.
A026	EEY 764	Finally, in 1603 a plan was devised, though never executed, for every county, inland and coastal, to contribute money to standing fleets for the protection of merchant shipping.
A027	HY7 1291 ₁	The two men's inability to make common cause illustrated one of the main reasons why the government had less to fear from oppositionists than the radical manifestos of 1861 – 2 appeared to suggest.
A028	HY7 1291 ₂	The two men's inability to make common cause illustrated one of the main reasons why the government had less to fear from oppositionists than the radical manifestos of 1861 – 2 appeared to suggest.
A029	HY7 1291 ₃	The two men's inability to make common cause illustrated one of the main reasons why the government had less to fear from oppositionists than the radical manifestos of 1861 – 2 appeared to suggest.

A030	J14 1035 ₁	However, there does seem to be some consensus of opinion and parallel findings to demonstrate continuity in the area of disorders of conduct (Robins, 1966; Rutter and Madge, 1976).
A031	J14 1035 ₂	However, there does seem to be some consensus of opinion and parallel findings to demonstrate continuity in the area of disorders of conduct (Robins, 1966; Rutter and Madge, 1976).
A032	CGF 1102 ₁	The word ‘mothering’ is sexist in many contexts because it reinforces the ‘natural’ connection of women with children and childcare — a connection that feminists have criticised, since under our present social arrangements it has the entirely sexist consequences of defining non-mothers as non-women, restricting women's opportunities to do other things if they wish , exploiting their unpaid labour and in some cases causing them to be seen as less important than the children they give birth to.
A033	CGF 1102 ₂	The word ‘mothering’ is sexist in many contexts because it reinforces the ‘natural’ connection of women with children and childcare — a connection that feminists have criticised, since under our present social arrangements it has the entirely sexist consequences of defining non-mothers as non-women, restricting women's opportunities to do other things if they wish, exploiting their unpaid labour and in some cases causing them to be seen as less important than the children they give birth to .
A034	EDD 230 ₁	Stopping only to emphasize that this is not because we belong to different disciplines and that several other final positions are open to anyone from either discipline , we then leave readers to make up their own minds, or else to decide that there is no monopoly of wisdom to be had.
A035	EDD 230 ₂	Stopping only to emphasize that this is not because we belong to different disciplines and that several other final positions are open to anyone from either discipline, we then leave readers to make up their own minds, or else to decide that there is no monopoly of wisdom to be had .
A036	EDD 230 ₃	Stopping only to emphasize that this is not because we belong to different disciplines and that several other final positions are open to anyone from either discipline, we then leave readers to make up their own minds, or else to decide that there is no monopoly of wisdom to be had .
A037	HXS 1176	Many more details of this kind of exploitation of imagery could be picked out of the Miller's Tale; the above, however, is sufficient to make the point that the composition of the tale is extremely well organized, wasting no details, and indeed harmonizing the disparate plots in the magnificent denouement of the tale .
A038	HJ1 7925	Finally, interviews will be conducted with men, covering their views on childbearing and visiting patterns and social support networks of men and women, in order to complement comparable material already collected from women .
A039	F9S 710 ₁	They help with the provision of housing, food and employment and give continuing support with money, perhaps to set up a business, go on a visit to Pakistan or to cope with unforeseen disasters .

A040	K93 1709	I think Cruttenden's arguments are in many ways convincing, but one must recognise that if intonation is influenced by and reflects the grammar, it follows that it must be a help to listeners in interpreting the grammar of what they hear, and perhaps more importantly, if a speaker's intonation is inappropriate in relation to the grammar, listeners will find it more difficult to interpret the grammar , and may be confused.
A041	FDV 430 ₁	It is convenient to consider the third and fourth issues together : has the prisoner the right to make representations before the Secretary of State sets the date for the first review, and has he a right to be told the judicial view of his tariff?
A042	FDV 430 ₂	It is convenient to consider the third and fourth issues together: has the prisoner the right to make representations before the Secretary of State sets the date for the first review , and has he a right to be told the judicial view of his tariff?
A043	FDV 430 ₃	It is convenient to consider the third and fourth issues together: has the prisoner the right to make representations before the Secretary of State sets the date for the first review, and has he a right to be told the judicial view of his tariff ?
A044	ED5 791 ₁	This evidence is frequently interpreted as suggesting that larger local authorities are likely to be more efficient than smaller ones , but no statistical evidence has been produced to support this claim.
A045	ED5 791 ₂	This evidence is frequently interpreted as suggesting that larger local authorities are likely to be more efficient than smaller ones, but no statistical evidence has been produced to support this claim .
A046	H88 199	For many it is not long enough to become literate or numerate in any real sense .
A047	FA3 739	The model does not provide answers to some of the curricular problems which concern us, but it may help us to frame our questions more accurately .
A048	GVG 924 ₁	Unlike a winding-up, the board of directors does not become functus officio on the appointment of a receiver but the directors' powers are substantially superseded since they cannot act so as to interfere with the discharge by the receiver of his responsibilities and accordingly their powers are suspended 'so far as is requisite to enable a receiver to discharge his functions.'
A049	GVG 924 ₂	Unlike a winding-up, the board of directors does not become functus officio on the appointment of a receiver but the directors' powers are substantially superseded since they cannot act so as to interfere with the discharge by the receiver of his responsibilities and accordingly their powers are suspended 'so far as is requisite to enable a receiver to discharge his functions .'
A050	GVG 924 ₃	Unlike a winding-up, the board of directors does not become functus officio on the appointment of a receiver but the directors' powers are substantially superseded since they cannot act so as to interfere with the discharge by the receiver of his responsibilities and accordingly their powers are suspended 'so far as is requisite to enable a receiver to discharge his functions .'
A051	FT0 1157	To prevent further cases the Indian community in the United Kingdom should be made aware of the risks associated with the use of ethnic remedies, and their distribution and sale should be monitored.
A052	A1A 937 ₁	Much difficulty could be avoided if the only candidates permitted to work for a PhD were those who were virtually certain to obtain it, but that is not a feasible option in the modern university.

A053	A1A 937 ₂	Much difficulty could be avoided if the only candidates permitted to work for a PhD were those who were virtually certain to obtain it , but that is not a feasible option in the modern university.
A054	HP2 263 ₁	The milk ration for children was increased specifically to compensate for the nutritional shortfall in school meals that would otherwise have occurred ; civil servants realised there would be a public outcry if the meat reduction took place and nothing was done to make up for it.
A055	HP2 263 ₂	The milk ration for children was increased specifically to compensate for the nutritional shortfall in school meals that would otherwise have occurred; civil servants realised there would be a public outcry if the meat reduction took place and nothing was done to make up for it .
A056	CGY 719 ₁	Structuralist Marxism and critical theory remain committed to Marx's analysis of the material relations of production but both are concerned to address other aspects of human social life about which Hegel had more to say than Marx .
A057	CGY 719 ₂	Structuralist Marxism and critical theory remain committed to Marx's analysis of the material relations of production but both are concerned to address other aspects of human social life about which Hegel had more to say than Marx.
A058	CRS 1255	She brushed aside Mrs Singh's assertions that her son was not making progress by telling her repeatedly that it was unreasonable to expect anything more ; she used phrases like 'He is well below average', 'He is slow', 'He is in the bottom set, you must accept that.
A059	HJ0 14221	The problem of teacher supply continues to generate considerable concern .
A060	HJ1 13386	One package will address the common queries and concerns which many women have upon experiencing this event, and would be designed for women who have just had a miscarriage to read in their own time .
A061	CFX 467	Thus, very high blood pressure can become established as a pathological state — 'essential hypertension' — which can help to precipitate strokes or heart attacks .
A062	J6P 1136	Accordingly, on the departure of a partner, the continuing firm will try, subject always to the wishes of individual clients, to retain clients for whom the outgoing partner has acted in the past and is currently acting at the date of his leaving the firm .
A063	EEY 1171	Professor Hurstfield has argued that they were not, and that, provided no harm was done to the state, it would be anachronistic for the historian to object to them .
A064	J7X 119	For instance, every speaker must make a decision about what to make explicit and what to leave implicit .
A065	HTV 617	US firms already had considerable sums invested in European subsidiaries between the two wars, and post-1945 FDI served both to rebuild what had been destroyed and to extend it .
A066	FD0 151 ₁	'As to the ability to determine that issue between the parents , it appears to me that there is little to choose between the family court in England and that in Australia.
A067	FD0 151 ₂	'As to the ability to determine that issue between the parents, it appears to me that there is little to choose between the family court in England and that in Australia .
A068	FBC 1334	In addition, they help to explain why it is that the average length of custody imposed by the higher courts is a historically proven index of prison population generally , once allowance has been made for changes in the level of recorded crime (Home Office, 1956; but cf.

A069	HXY 427 ₁	Sutcliffe makes a similar observation: "the real motivation for selecting one dialect or another has relatively little to do with the English class system as such and a great deal to do with ethnic and cultural identification. "
A070	HXY 427 ₂	Sutcliffe makes a similar observation: "the real motivation for selecting one dialect or another has relatively little to do with the English class system as such and a great deal to do with ethnic and cultural identification. "
A071	HWS 6453	Molecular biology will allow a scientific approach to identify the population at risk.
A072	EEE 1032	His suggestion that the council feared a usurpation displays the hindsight to be expected from someone writing after June 1483 , when Gloucester had indeed used the protectorship as a stepping-stone to the throne.
A073	HU2 2781	The column was prepared by suspending the Amberlyst A-15 in 72% ethanol for 24 hours before slurrying it into columns and allowing it to settle by gravity.
A074	ABP 763	In this case the forcible retaking of possession is prohibited under penalties by statute; but the retaking, though punishable, is none the less effective to restore the possession.
A075	HRK 813	For an EMPLOYEE entity, for example, an EMPLOYEE entity occurrence who happens to be a manager manages other occurrences of the entity EMPLOYEE.
A076	GV0 731	This is true, but even Daly would not exclude preglacial subsidence and it is very difficult to demonstrate the date of subsidence in many examples.
A077	EBM 93	This distinction can be put briefly by saying that whereas an appellate court has power to decide whether the decision under appeal was 'right or wrong' , a court exercising supervisory powers may only decide whether the decision under review was 'legal' or not.
A078	HY7 1036	Five considerations, three of them long-standing, two novel, seem to have been particularly important : pressure from reform-minded people outside the ranks of the government; the growing influence of enlightened bureaucrats in the Ministry of Internal Affairs; unrest in the countryside; chaos within and among the provincial gentry committees; and the unpredictable swing to the left of Iakov Rostovtsev, one of the key traditionalists on the Main Committee.
A079	C8R 975 ₁	It is the main function of the Statutory Instruments Act to ensure that where an instrument is made by a Minister of the Crown in pursuance of powers delegated to him by Parliament, Parliament shall have a reasonable opportunity to scrutinise his efforts with a view to deciding whether or not to endorse them.
A080	C8R 975 ₂	It is the main function of the Statutory Instruments Act to ensure that where an instrument is made by a Minister of the Crown in pursuance of powers delegated to him by Parliament, Parliament shall have a reasonable opportunity to scrutinise his efforts with a view to deciding whether or not to endorse them.
A081	C8R 975 ₃	It is the main function of the Statutory Instruments Act to ensure that where an instrument is made by a Minister of the Crown in pursuance of powers delegated to him by Parliament, Parliament shall have a reasonable opportunity to scrutinise his efforts with a view to deciding whether or not to endorse them.
A082	B33 2097	We do not always say what we mean to say , and leave ourselves open to misinterpretation.

A083	F9T 960	This child had been asked to look at his foot carefully ‘as if he's never seen it before’.
A084	HY5 586	In any case many rulers were for long reluctant to send ambassadors to foreign capitals if a lower-ranking representative would suffice.
A085	FT1 1356	To approach this in a more formal sense would also require mathematical programming techniques.
A086	CG0 1516	Students did not feel safe, yet the authorities did little to protect them .
A087	J6Y 1191 ₁	The expert refused to do what the lessors wanted him to do, namely to rewrite his certificate in a way which he thought would make the certificate conclusive against the lessees' interests .
A088	J6Y 1191 ₂	The expert refused to do what the lessors wanted him to do , namely to rewrite his certificate in a way which he thought would make the certificate conclusive against the lessees' interests .
A089	B12 935	In the mid-1980s the government had already begun to implement austerity measures which cut spending and led to price rises .
A090	K93 1415	The main concern of this chapter is to complete the description of intonational form , including analysis of perhaps the most difficult aspect, that of recognising fall-rise and rise-fall tones when they are extended over a number of syllables.
A091	A66 218	On the other hand, he had played a nationally constructive role also, especially since he and Hugh Scanlon helped the TUC defeat Barbara Castle's incomes policy in 1969 .
A092	FTV 987	But the question is, can he both maintain that monads do not reduce to bundles of qualities and continue to adhere to his principle of indiscernibles without being guilty of a serious inconsistency?
A093	GW1 46 ₁	It is no offence for him to engage in other sexual acts with her , unless these are otherwise unlawful, although it is an offence for him to commit an act of buggery or gross indecency with a male patient who is mentally disordered.
A094	GW1 46 ₂	It is no offence for him to engage in other sexual acts with her, unless these are otherwise unlawful, although it is an offence for him to commit an act of buggery or gross indecency with a male patient who is mentally disordered .
A095	G3L 1379 ₁	Second, instead of continuing with the constitutional convention whereby the Prime Minister has the right to choose a government and a Cabinet , there is a concern to transfer this to Members of Parliament when Labour is in office, giving them the right to elect Cabinet ministers.
A096	G3L 1379 ₂	Second, instead of continuing with the constitutional convention whereby the Prime Minister has the right to choose a government and a Cabinet, there is a concern to transfer this to Members of Parliament when Labour is in office, giving them the right to elect Cabinet ministers.
A097	G3L 1379 ₃	Second, instead of continuing with the constitutional convention whereby the Prime Minister has the right to choose a government and a Cabinet, there is a concern to transfer this to Members of Parliament when Labour is in office, giving them the right to elect Cabinet ministers .
A098	CS3 589 ₁	This bargaining process is likely to take place in secluded agencies where the state and societal elites can work out deals, sheltered from any formalized and universally applicable legislation which might make bargains too difficult to achieve .

A099	CS3 589 ₂	This bargaining process is likely to take place in secluded agencies where the state and societal elites can work out deals, sheltered from any formalized and universally applicable legislation which might make bargains too difficult to achieve .
A100	HHY 1982	The outcome of the investigations will allow recommendations to be made concerning the office environment , and also shed light on the linked human processes of attention, memory and reading.

List of extracted sentences – FICTION

No.	BNC code	Sample sentence
F001	A74 2051	I know it's a train station and that, but I dunno how to get home from here .
F002	CCW 433	I felt dirtied by the corruption of pimps, yet I would soon be free of them for I had just one more job to do , and then I would be loosed to the consolations of Masquerade and to the joys of the South Pacific's winds.
F003	CDA 2280	It would be Kirov's job to turn those rumours into reality, provide evidence which would damn him forever .
F004	BMN 1815	Corbett offered to double the usual fee and they were soon climbing into the skiff and making their way out across the Forth.
F005	HTX 2674	Owen could hardly bear to look at her , so much was she at the mercy of the music, plunging with it into pits of despair, rising with it to heights of exaltation that were almost unbearable.
F006	BMW 173	I can't wait to tell Nick I've got his job in the bag .
F007	CJX 379	It has to be somebody who knows, is connected with or in a position to observe the victim and the family .'
F008	AC3 2594	He hated avocado, kiwis and limes, and everything in those circles seemed to have little snippets of these on top of it .
F009	AMB 12	He liked taking them apart and putting them together again in the wrong order to make new toys and would do this all day until he had forgotten what they looked like in the first place.
F010	FAT 817 ₁	Whether he had had plans laid for me at the time, or whether at the back of his mind, hidden from consciousness, he knew that in taking me to live with him he would be enrolling someone to deal with the business side of his life, I was never sure.
F011	FAT 817 ₂	Whether he had had plans laid for me at the time, or whether at the back of his mind, hidden from consciousness, he knew that in taking me to live with him he would be enrolling someone to deal with the business side of his life , I was never sure.
F012	G0S 1787	The famous film director from France could speak no English, and so Miranda was being sent to do the interview as well as provide the paper's weekly caricature ; she had the address of the location, a newsagent's in the High Street of a part of the city she had never heard mentioned before, Giblett Park, though she had lived in London most of her life; the Press Office had said that he would give her ten minutes between takes, or more if she were lucky and the filming was going well and Jean-Claude Meursault was feeling mellow.
F013	J54 2574	Over the meal, she became a little more cheerful and relaxed and made Sara laugh with her tales of her sojourn in Rome.
F014	BNC 873	Rab won the first game; nip and tuck, not much in it; to lose the next .

F015	EF1 1261	It hurt like hell but he was damned if he was going to let the gunman escape .
F016	H94 1814	She knew perfectly well he'd been trying to hide the fact that he'd come alive as the streets had filled with people .
F017	CDE 796 ₁	I lack that biological instinct which makes most women want to reproduce themselves , especially when they are in their thirties and feel they might be leaving things a bit late.
F018	CDE 796 ₂	I lack that biological instinct which makes most women want to reproduce themselves , especially when they are in their thirties and feel they might be leaving things a bit late.
F019	HGU 1750	The book turns out to be an American novel for children , about a mouse who is born into a human family and has many adventures
F020	ADY 2788	I would have to crawl to have any hope of finding it .
F021	A0F 3365 ₁	It reminded me of when I used to give people money just to make them go away again .
F022	A0F 3365 ₂	It reminded me of when I used to give people money just to make them go away again .
F023	FR3 854	I had got up early that morning and done my best to make myself look presentable .
F024	JYF 1979 ₁	Tomorrow, she promised — not of course that Ven was likely to want to accompany her anywhere for a third day in a row — but tomorrow she would insist on going sightseeing on her own.
F025	JYF 1979 ₂	Tomorrow, she promised — not of course that Ven was likely to want to accompany her anywhere for a third day in a row — but tomorrow she would insist on going sightseeing on her own.
F026	H0D 2296	He didn't refer to it directly, but he did observe mildly, "You seem to be a power in the City ."
F027	C85 3653	The housekeeper hovered in the background looking very distrustful and Jess began to wish they'd never come .
F028	FS8 631	Don't try to use what you know .
F029	H8J 2187	'You can help Claudia, Dana, and then we'll collect your things from the hotel, though you seem to have bought a fresh wardrobe .'
F030	HGT 53	Just don't expect me to ring for an ambulance in the morning when you're discovered suffering from pneumonia and exposure!'
F031	JY1 507	'Of course,' she assured him cheerfully, but suddenly thought to ask , 'Did you tell your cousin that I wasn't your friend — in the 'girlfriend' sense, I mean — by the way?'
F032	ASS 2046	Why did that bastard have the right to say 'no' to him? just like that.
F033	HR9 3644	His eyes seemed to be coming from a long way away .
F034	GV2 656	Rain had no clear idea what to do with her , apart from taking her to the Villa Fiesole, and she was already seeing the warped logic of Edouard's argument: Barbara Coleman might be safer where she was.
F035	K8T 898	As the stray bullets whistled across no-man's-land, Charlie fell on his knees and crawled back to the reserve trenches, to brief his section on what they might expect once they were pushed forward another hundred yards .
F036	FRS 1885	'I decided to build a major development .
F037	HA2 3392	That seemed to be that then .

F038	H8S 487	He was standing in the doorway, his lean frame clad in a loose-fitting tawny-coloured suit that seemed <u>to emphasise the taut muscle that lay beneath it.</u>
F039	CHG 431	I was fed up after weeks of playing deck quoits and shuffleboard, and the Mantela <u>appeared to be the perfect introduction to the South Seas</u> for, instead of going straight to Sanderstown, she would call at Rarotonga, and spend a day or two there, so I would be able to fit in a visit to another island and see something of it at a leisurely pace.
F040	CDN 127 ₃	This error proved to be nearly the last straw needed to break his credit, since he had raised every cent he could <u>in order to invest in land for building.</u>
F041	CLD 2168	Only the instructor had done better and none of the officers who had come <u>to amuse themselves on the range</u> had more than a dozen hits out of 18 rounds.
F042	HHA 1114	If he considered it necessary <u>for her to know such things,</u> did that mean she was remaining on board after today?
F043	HTR 562	Loretta was beginning <u>to get used to Simmons's abrupt changes of subject.</u>
F044	F9C 2638	‘That’s no way <u>to speak of the Dead.</u>
F045	H0F 153 ₁	Please, please, please, I say to myself, let the time <u>be slow,</u> don’t let it go too quickly.
F046	H0F 153 ₂	Please, please, please, I say to myself, let the time be slow, don’t let it <u>go too quickly.</u>
F047	FU2 1085 ₁	When she asked him if he would come with her <u>to see Joanne</u> he put forward the excuse of having his article to write, so Lyn went with Kevin.
F048	FU2 1085 ₂	When she asked him if he would come with her to see Joanne he put forward the excuse of having his article <u>to write,</u> so Lyn went with Kevin.
F049	EF1 821 ₁	He paused <u>to draw on the cigar,</u> still loath to reveal what he had come to say.
F050	EF1 821 ₂	He paused to draw on the cigar, still loath <u>to reveal what he had come to say.</u>
F051	EF1 821 ₃	He paused to draw on the cigar, still loath to reveal what he had come <u>to say.</u>
F052	J54 1401 ₁	We always want someone <u>to help us exercise the horses.</u>
F053	J54 1401 ₂	We always want someone to help us <u>exercise the horses.</u>
F054	J10 4321	Let us <u>go and see.</u> ’
F055	GUE 1392	‘It was a little too hot <u>to ignore,</u> don’t you think?’
F056	FRH 2580	I want my position <u>to be clear.</u>
F057	C98 1238 ₁	On the third morning, they arose <u>to find that the blizzard had died down,</u> to be followed by keen frost as the temperature plummeted.
F058	C98 1238 ₂	On the third morning, they arose to find that the blizzard had died down, <u>to be followed by keen frost</u> as the temperature plummeted.
F059	FP7 2006	Pascoe looked around the room as though he were checking <u>to see whether he'd left anything behind.</u>
F060	FR9 1315 ₁	Surprisingly they agreed and, <u>to show their compliance,</u> said they would leave it up to me to tell Trevor Proby that he was sacked.
F061	FR9 1315 ₂	Surprisingly they agreed and, to show their compliance, said they would leave it up to me <u>to tell Trevor Proby that he was sacked.</u>

F062	G1M3340 ₁	Half blinded by the foam, Christine scrambled for something to grab on to to break her fall.
F063	G1M3340 ₂	Half blinded by the foam, Christine scrambled for something to grab on to to break her fall .
F064	H8A 1059	That it was at the seaside made it seem all the worse .
F065	CDE 1070 ₁	She felt sure that Freddie Nash was as in love with her as she was with him for there was hardly a day when they did not manage to meet , often in Jock Hallett's cottage, where their mutual passion, already discovered at The Angel, seemed to intensify.
F066	CDE 1070 ₂	She felt sure that Freddie Nash was as in love with her as she was with him for there was hardly a day when they did not manage to meet, often in Jock Hallett's cottage, where their mutual passion, already discovered at The Angel, seemed to intensify .
F067	FRC 110	Part of herself, she thought, was killed, a tender, budding part; the daisy-crowned young girl who would stay behind to haunt the old house, to appear in mirrors where the new owner expected the reflection of his own face, to flash whitely on dark nights out of the prickly core of the apple tree .
F068	AB9 1728	'So Miss Morgan would have got the lion's share of the other two hundred thousand even if she had agreed to break up the trust?
F069	FYV 1711	Well whatever — now's the time, one would have thought, for Tod and me to kick off our shoes and get the feel of the place .
F070	CEX 369	Successful in a masculine world, she has the confidence to be feminine when she feels like it.
F071	HGD 2764	He could at least have waited until tomorrow to lay down the law so firmly .
F072	FNY 406	How will you find children to teach? '
F073	GUX 282	I never ever thought, my darling, that it would ever happen to me, that a man, a real man, a man with' she gave a little, happy gurgle, 'shoulders, and legs and eyes and things to say ... would look at me... .'
F074	H97 4155	Besides, it didn't take me long to figure out I was wrong .'
F075	CM1 1708	It cannot move and shoot in the same turn, except that it can be turned to face its intended target .
F076	CB5 3399	Then he stood up and quickly began to dress .
F077	AT7 618	And let me tell you , this isn't the first time I've thought of it, either.'
F078	EFP 190 ₁	She walked down Chestnut Drive, and as she picked a leaf off a privet hedge here, and ran her hand along a row of railings there, she thought that it was not so bad after all, and that she would tell them about it: they always said, when accused of indifference, that they were interested, so she would jolly well try to make them show a bit of their interest .
F079	EFP 190 ₂	She walked down Chestnut Drive, and as she picked a leaf off a privet hedge here, and ran her hand along a row of railings there, she thought that it was not so bad after all, and that she would tell them about it: they always said, when accused of indifference, that they were interested, so she would jolly well try to make them show a bit of their interest .
F080	J2G 529	I waited till we heard him on the stairs, then told them how I had offered to drive this run , but now that I was a passenger it would be against the rules.
F081	G0Y 1926	I hope he isn't going to expect you to listen to him singing again .'

F082	EVC 2668	She lay relaxed on the bed, waiting for him, an odd, tingling sensation running through her — She had always wanted to feel his body against her own and now her wish was being granted.
F083	JXV 2679	Unconsciously she reached out and laid her hand on his arm, wanting in some way to offer comfort for a pain that was still hurting despite the passage of time.
F084	HTT 494	‘And what do you intend to do? ’
F085	H7W 882	He was still without a sweater over his lemon T-shirt, but the drop in temperature didn't seem to be bothering him.
F086	FP7 1761 ₁	The idea had been to keep only what was mine , but I found there were things I couldn't bear to part with.
F087	FP7 1761 ₂	The idea had been to keep only what was mine, but I found there were things I couldn't bear to part with.
F088	H9D 1946	If you'd heard him talk about her when he'd had a few you'd think different.
F089	EFP 155 ₁	It was in no way intense, and indeed coming from such a figure it could not help but appear a little maternal; Mrs Hill did not seem to discover anything odd in her own attitude , and would consult Clara's opinion without any attempts at subterfuge or bravado; she would defer to Clara's position in the class by outrageously open remarks such as "Now, Clara, you're the only girl likely to remember what I said last week", or "Well, I suppose I'm wasting my breath on all but Clara Maugham."
F090	EFP 155 ₂	It was in no way intense, and indeed coming from such a figure it could not help but appear a little maternal; Mrs Hill did not seem to discover anything odd in her own attitude, and would consult Clara's opinion without any attempts at subterfuge or bravado; she would defer to Clara's position in the class by outrageously open remarks such as "Now, Clara, you're the only girl likely to remember what I said last week ", or "Well, I suppose I'm wasting my breath on all but Clara Maugham."
F091	H8J 1640 ₁	‘Perhaps I'm hoping to meet a man rich enough to keep me in comfort so I can indulge my every whim and fancy and give up work for good,’ she said drily.
F092	H8J 1640 ₂	‘Perhaps I'm hoping to meet a man rich enough to keep me in comfort so I can indulge my every whim and fancy and give up work for good,’ she said drily.
F093	J54 1754	But first he wanted to hear Matthew's side of the story.
F094	HR7 2440 ₁	Whether he wanted to be hurt and suffer , or an excuse to hit me back, I don't know, but I'm sure he wanted me to hit him.
F095	HR7 2440 ₂	Whether he wanted to be hurt and suffer, or an excuse to hit me back , I don't know, but I'm sure he wanted me to hit him.
F096	HR7 2440 ₃	Whether he wanted to be hurt and suffer, or an excuse to hit me back, I don't know, but I'm sure he wanted me to hit him.
F097	FRY 838	‘There won't be anything for him to eat if she doesn't write.’
F098	G16 313	Julia was half convinced that she should tell the young people to go to the cinema and dances again but she consulted Pat.
F099	HR9 2889	‘I heard the nurse ask her if she wanted to take a last look at me.
F100	HR9 2889	‘I heard the nurse ask her if she wanted to take a last look at me.

Appendix 2: Broader context (subsequent search)

No.	BNC code	Sample sentence
A011	HY7 1378 ₁	The tsar improved the Ministry of Finance's chances of introducing economies by ordering that state agencies would have to prepare detailed estimates of their future expenditure. A decision was taken in principle to require agencies with independent sources of income to transfer them to the central treasury. The rights of the State Control to check accounts began to increase. Above all, Reiterm presided over the abolition of tax farming.
A013	ABP 1056 ₁	It was in the interest of the public and of the landowners to make land freely alienable. This was effected by the Settled Land Acts 1882 and 1925. The problem, in short, was to find a system where the landowner could continue to create all the beneficial interests he wished in favour of members of the family, and, at the same time, would be able to deal with the land, by sale, long lease, or mortgage, as if he were a sole owner. The dilemma was solved by the principle of over-reaching.
A021	H7Y 903	What should be the main east-west street was inherited from the via principalis of the second-century forts and also represents the line of the Stanegate entering from the west. Although this road emerges on the eastern side of the town, attempts to trace it much further have failed. The main road north, Dere Street, must have described a dog-leg through the site, entering from the known site of the bridge over the Tyne to the south and emerging from the town on a more easterly line on its northward approach to the Portgate.
A022	EEE 864	Conversely, the queen's servants were ipso facto the king's men (many in the literal sense of being also members of the king's household) and it would be unrealistic to ignore this dimension of their loyalty. It is more accurate to see the East Anglian affinity as a court connection rather than a narrowly Woodville one . This becomes obvious in 1483, when the usurpation of Richard III split the connection into those whose loyalties remained with the crown and those prepared to back Woodville opposition to the new regime.
A023	EA3 654	Why a particular adjustment or radical change is made, and by what sectors of a society, depends on the conjuncture of number of factors. When this process becomes revolutionary upheaval is not always easy to identify and the decision as to whether it was a radical reinterpretation rather than simply an adjustment depends on the observer's standpoint. This, then, makes for serious definitional and methodological problems in identifying and pursuing Goody's distinction between the two kinds or levels of thought.
A036	EDD 230 ₃	Stopping only to emphasize that this is not because we belong to different disciplines and that several other final positions are open to anyone from either discipline, we then leave readers to make up their own minds, or else to decide that there is no monopoly of wisdom to be had . The Growth of a Discipline International Relations emerged as a separate discipline in the aftermath of the First World War.

A039	F9S 710 ₁	Members of a Biraderi who come to Britain act as informants, sponsors and contacts. They help with the provision of housing, food and employment and give continuing support with money, perhaps to set up a business, go on a visit to Pakistan or to cope with unforeseen disasters . Ceremonial occasions such as births, deaths, weddings or circumcisions, would involve the Biraderi.
A041	FDV 430 ₁	Act 1991, which will come into force on 1 October 1992, he will presumably not seek to depart from this policy in the meantime. Procedural fairness: It is convenient to consider the third and fourth issues together : has the prisoner the right to make representations before the Secretary of State sets the date for the first review, and has he a right to be told the judicial view of his tariff?
A046	H88 199	The tables show the relatively short school careers of some children. For many it is not long enough to become literate or numerate in any real sense . They also show that in all classes fewer girls attend than boys. Schooling is sometimes seen as yet another burden on scarce family.
A049	GVG 924 ₂	Unlike a winding-up, the board of directors does not become functus officio on the appointment of a receiver but the directors' powers are substantially superseded since they cannot act so as to interfere with the discharge by the receiver of his responsibilities and accordingly their powers are suspended 'so far as is requisite to enable a receiver to discharge his functions .' Given the extent of the powers of the administrative receiver, the directors will have a miniscule aperture within which they are free to exercise their powers.
A051	FT0 1157	Since one of the preparations given to the first patient contained up to 187 mg of arsenic trioxide per dose, there is a potential for fatal poisoning. To prevent further cases the Indian community in the United Kingdom should be made aware of the risks associated with the use of ethnic remedies, and their distribution and sale should be monitored.
A058	CRS 1255	The teacher was brusque and busy. She brushed aside Mrs Singh's assertions that her son was not making progress by telling her repeatedly that it was unreasonable to expect anything more ; she used phrases like 'He is well below average', 'He is slow', 'He is in the bottom set, you must accept that. You can't put it there if it's not there.'
A067	FD0 151 ₂	It is their long-term removal to England to which he objects. 'As to the ability to determine that issue between the parents, it appears to me that there is little to choose between the family court in England and that in Australia . There is no contentious issue between the parties as to the suitability of the mother to look after the children or as to the suitability of the father to have contact with them.
A072	EEE 1032	Certainly one of the shakiest parts of Mancini's account is his attempt to explain why, if Edward wanted a protector, the council sought to overturn his wishes. His suggestion that the council feared a usurpation displays the hindsight to be expected from someone writing after June 1483 , when Gloucester had indeed used the protectorship as a stepping-stone to the throne. It is difficult to believe that anyone in April seriously feared that Gloucester had designs on the crown.

A076	GV0 731	The first is that drowned valleys down to about 90 m (300 ft) are explicable as features related to low glacial sea levels and later drowned, but if they are deeper then this subsidence must have taken place. This is true, but even Daly would not exclude preglacial subsidence and it is very difficult to demonstrate the date of subsidence in many examples . Daly himself mentions coral islands which have been elevated and others which have subsided, for his theory does not exclude local subsidence.
A085	FT1 1356	In particular a given league table is unlikely to contain all the relevant comparisons of programmes of the appropriate intensity or scale to enable a budget to be allocated. To approach this in a more formal sense would also require mathematical programming techniques. Conclusions: Although league tables of costs per QALY may help decision makers in the allocation of resources, potentially they can also mislead.
A096	G3L 1379 ₂	First, there is a concern to limit prime ministerial patronage in a number of areas (and the concern to abolish the House of Lords is in part born of a desire to deny the Prime Minister the constitutional right to create peers). Second, instead of continuing with the constitutional convention whereby the Prime Minister has the right to choose a government and a Cabinet, there is a concern to transfer this to Members of Parliament when Labour is in office, giving them the right to elect Cabinet ministers. 5 The proposed abolition of the House of Lords, and the concern to limit the powers of the Prime Minister, the government, and the civil service, would place a greater burden on the House of Commons.
A099	CS3 589 ₂	More conservative writers see a tendency for power to diffuse out of government to interest group elites making policy in continuous negotiation with executive agencies, under the remit of wide ‘enabling’ legislation passed by the legislature and thereafter incapable of being controlled (Lowi, 1969). This bargaining process is likely to take place in secluded agencies where the state and societal elites can work out deals, sheltered from any formalized and universally applicable legislation which might make bargains too difficult to achieve . Only long-agreed norms between governing elites and major economic interests are easily formalized in law, because introducing law which coerces one of the interest blocs may destabilize corporatist patterns of bargaining.
F044	F9C 2638	Only because he wanted to get his leg over.’ His mum giggled. ‘Preston!’ Shock waves from the rear seat. ‘That’s no way to speak of the Dead . And don’t you be laughing at him, our Nell. It only encourages him.’ ‘That’s what he told me, said Preston.
F055	GUE 1392	About what happened on the yacht the other day. ‘Why do we need to talk about that?’ Her voice was icy. ‘It was a little too hot to ignore , don’t you think?’ ‘I thought we’d both done an extremely good job of ignoring it!’ she retorted haughtily, willing her heartbeat to stop its idiotic racing.