Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

The Distribution of Bare Infinitives in English

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Autorka: Iva Honajzrová

Studijní obor: Anglická filologie a Španělská filologie
Vedoucí bakalářské práce: Doc. PhDr. Ludmila Veselovská, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2015

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované literatury.

V Olomouci dne ..……..… ……..

Ráda bych tímto poděkovala vedoucí mé bakalářské práce Doc. PhDr. Ludmile Veselovské, Ph.D. za vstřícný přístup, zájem, ochotu, a za poskytnutí cenných připomínek, rad a podnětů, které mi pomohly tuto práci vypracovat. Ráda bych také poděkovala Mgr. Michaele Martinkové, PhD. za uvedení do problematiky jazykových korpusů.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

Verb as such is considered a very complex term in general, for no general characteristics are universally valid for all the members of the class in linguistic sciences. Authorities suggest there are numerous from morphological, syntactic and semantic classifications. This thesis will, however, deal with a description of a verbal form not very deeply and most importantly only topically discussed in grammar books, and that is the distribution of *bare* infinitives.

In order to outline the concept of a *bare* infinitive, the terminology of Huddleston and Pullum (2002) will be used. *Bare* infinitival construction—together with to-infinitival, subjunctive and imperative constructions—is a VP with a verb in a secondary plain form and belongs among non-finite constructions, which means that it lacks inflection and that it cannot serve as root of independent clauses.

Despite this already complex classification, its syntactic distribution is varied and not very well defined nor covered in any of the authoritative grammar manuals, so a person interested in this topic must search throughout all the materials in order to find complex information and definitions, which brings us to the topic of this thesis.

For illustration Huddleston and Pullum (2002) describe the morphological classification of *bare* infinitives among verbal forms, morphological properties among infinitival structures, the syntactic characteristics only vaguely among non-finite verb constructions, and their distribution occasionally throughout the manual. Firstly, there does not seem to be a pattern in the distribution, and secondly, all the information is scattered all over the manual. Similarly, the topic is not covered in one place nor entirely neither by Quirk et al. (1985) nor by Biber et al. (2007).

The intention of this thesis is to define what *bare* infinitive actually is, situate it in the established verb classifications and describe it from morphological, lexical and mainly syntactic point of view. The main body of the thesis will be devoted to the specific environments in which *bare* infinitival constructions occur that Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985) and Biber et al. (2007) supply in their manuals.

We expect to find not only the prototypical environment for *bare* infinitival constructions as for instance a complement of modal verbs, but also a number of other lexical verbs apart from e.g. *verbs of sensory perception* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1236) which admit this form of verb complement.

In essence, we will compile and critically comment on the available information about *bare* infinitives found in Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985), Biber et al. (2007) and few other authoritative sources relevant to the topic of the thesis.

2 VERB

2.1 Formal characteristics of English verb

In order to introduce the principal matter of this paper—*bare* infinitives—it is convenient to start with a general formal classification of English verbs, specifically with a morphological classification of all the inflectional forms which a prototypical English verb has, and so get to the substance. This will be done by providing a different views of Quirk et al. (1985) and Huddleston & Pullum (2002), as these have the most diverse perspectives. It is necessary to remark that Biber et al. (2007)—the third most important source we are using—proceed from the concepts developed by Quirk et al. (1985), and so their classifications discussed in this section are parallel.

2.1.1 Quirk et al.'s taxonomy of verbs

Quirk et al. (1985, 96) introduce the verb class as comprising of three types of verbs: FULL VERBS, PRIMARY VERBS, and MODAL AUXILIARY VERBS. Full (or lexical) verbs belong to the open class of lexical items which act only as *main verbs*.

Main verbs have the ability to function as a complete VP in contrast to *auxiliary verbs* which appear together with a *main verb*. This does not apply on exceptions like stranding, reduced questions, etc., where, however, the *main verb* can be omitted and interpreted on the basis of context. Because Quirk et al. provide only a concise definition of *main verbs*, we took this definition from Biber et al. (2007, 72, 358), for Biber et al. (2007, 7) depart from and follow the terminology and descriptive framework established by Quirk et al. very intimately.

The majority of full verbs have regular morphological forms. Quirk et al. remark that the regular number of morphological forms is four, however, it can vary from three (e.g. *read*) up to eight (e.g. *be*). Nonetheless, in the final classification there are five prototypical forms which appear in different syntactic environments (1).

(1) **Verb forms according to Quirk et al.** (1985, 96)[1]

Form	**Regular Verb**	**Irregular Verb**	**Be**
BASE	*kick*	*read/speak*	*be*
-*S* FORM	*kicks*	*reads/speaks*	*is/?am/?are*
-*ING* PARTICIPLE	*kicking*	*reading/speaking*	*being*
PAST FORM	*kicked*	*read/spoke*	*was/were*
-*ED* PARTICIPLE	*kicked*	*read/spoken*	*been*
Number of forms	4	3	8

Table 2.1: Verb forms according to Quirk et al. (1985, 96)

[1] Biber et al. (2007, 57) differentiate between the same forms, nevertheless, partly under different designations. These are respectively: *base*, *third person singular present indicative*, *-ing participle*, *past tense* and *past participle*.

Table 2.1 in (1) apply only to the class of full verbs, and therefore contains full verb forms' terminology of how Quirk et al. present it together with one example of a regular verb, another two of irregular verbs, and the verb *be*. This classification is, however, largely based on morphology of regular verbs and the designations of the forms do not relate much to the irregular verb forms. The most striking example is the *–ed* participle, as none of the irregular verbs get this inflection. The verb *be* is an example of its own, as in general it rarely fits any universal rules.

The forms in Table 2.1 in (1) concern only full verbs, as according to Quirk et al. (1985, 96, 136) the members of the second most numerous class—modal auxiliary verbs—are in general preferred to be looked upon as *invariable words,* not as verbs with various inflectional forms, although they admit that in some cases modal verbs can be considered verbs which dispose of the base and past form.[2]

The remaining class of primary verbs contains only three verbs: *be, have,* and *do*. These are special in their behaviour as they can function both as main and auxiliary verbs (2). As an auxiliary verb *have* is involved in the expression of aspect and *be* in the expression of aspect and voice, but *do* is semantically empty and is required in fewer constructions.[3] Given this, the verbs *be* and *have* dispose of all of the forms in Table 2.1 (1), but *do* has only base, *–s*, and past form (Quirk et al. 1985, 120).

(2) (a) *I [$_{Aux}$ am] [$_{Main}$ being] a fool*.
(b) *I [$_{Aux}$ have] never [$_{Main}$ had] sushi for breakfast.*
(c) *I [$_{\text{Aux}}$ didn't] [$_{Main}$ do] anything wrong.*

In (2) we can observe the double function of the primary verbs. All of them can function either as auxiliary verbs or as full verbs, the auxiliary being always the first element of the TP.

2.1.2 Huddleston & Pullum's taxonomy of verbs

Unlike Quirk et al. (1985), Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 74) initially classify English verbs into two large groups: LEXICAL and AUXILIARY VERBS. Auxiliary verbs are further divided into two groups: MODAL and NON-MODAL (*do, be, have*). This classification is already analogous to that of Quirk et al. and is based as well on the classification of the distinctive syntactic and morphological properties of English verbs. These two classifications are contrasted in Table 2.2 (3).

[2] More on modal auxiliary verbs in 5 Modal auxiliary verbs, page 24.
[3] More on the supportive do in 4 Do-support, page 21.

(3) **Verb forms by Quirk et al.** (1985) **and Huddleston & Pullum** (2002)

Quirk et al.	Full		*eat, like, take, …*
	Primary		*do, be, have*
	Modal auxiliary		*can, will, may, must, …*
Huddleston & Pullum	Lexical		*eat, like, take, …*
	Auxiliary	Non-modal	*do, be, have*
		Modal	*can, will, may, must, …*

Table 2.2: Verb forms by Quirk et al. (1985) and Huddleston & Pullum (2002)

Focusing mainly on the lexical verbs, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 74) state that a prototypical English verb has six inflectional forms within its paradigm which are thus used accordingly in context. This classification can be seen in Table 2.3 (4).

(4) **Classification of verb infectional forms by Huddleston & Pullum** (2002)

		Examples		
PRIMARY	PRETERITE	*broke*	*liked*	*cut*
	PRESENT: 3RD SG	*breaks*	*likes*	*cuts*
	PRESENT: PLAIN	*break*	*like*	*cut*
SECONDARY	PLAIN	*break*	*like*	*cut*
	GERUND-PARTICIPLE	*breaking*	*liking*	*cutting*
	PAST PARTICIPLE	*broken*	*liked*	*cut*

Table 2.3: Classification of verb inflectional forms by Huddleston & Pullum (2002)

Huddleston & Pullum's classification in Table 2.3 in (4) is more complex than Quirk et al.'s classification in Table 2.1 in (1). First, it makes a significant distinction between PRIMARY and SECONDARY forms. As Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 88) argue, the aim is to distinguish tensed forms used in canonical clauses from those employed in non-canonical clauses, i.e. mainly subordinate clauses (leaving apart the verb *be*). This means their classification is not based only on verb morphology, but as well on its syntactic distribution. Moreover, it does not count only with one verb class, but with all of them, including auxiliary modal verbs (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 106).

Lexical verbs possess both primary and secondary forms, whereas with auxiliary verbs it is not so straightforward. Even though non-modals *have* and *be* have all of the forms from the Table 2.3 in (4)—both primary and secondary; modals[4] and auxiliary *do*, however, have merely primary forms, which is reflected primarily in their distribution as we can see in (5).

[4] Modal auxiliaries in general are considered *defective*, as certain infllectional forms (present: 3rd sg) are not applicable to them, and some of them, e.g. *must*, neither possess a preterite form (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 106).

(5) (a) *He **can** speak English.*
(b) **I would **can** speak English.*

As modal verbs and non-modal *do* have only primary forms—as listed in (4) above, it can operate merely in the position of the first auxiliary, which is tensed (5a). Never can two primary forms/modals follow each other directly as in (5b).

Additionally, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 75) add that primary forms of the modal and non-modal auxiliaries have their negative counterparts, which lexical verbs do not as seen in (6).

(6) (a) *He does not/doesn't speak Italian.*
(b) *He cannot/can't speak Italian.*
(c) **I speak not/speakn't Italian.*

In (6) we can observe the negative counterparts of the auxiliaries' primary forms: non-modal auxiliaries in (6a)—represented by the verb *do*—and modal auxiliaries in (6b)—demonstrated on the verb *can*. As stated above, lexical verbs do not carry negation themselves, so the non-existing forms shown in (6c) on the verb *speak* are ungrammatical.

The centre of our interest is, nevertheless, inside the PLAIN FORM. The only difference between Huddleston & Pullum's *plain form* and Quirk et al.'s *base form* resides in their syntactic distribution. If we eliminate the use in *the present tense except for the 3rd sg*, which Huddleston & Pullum classify among primary forms as present plain form, we will get the plain form.

According to Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 50), plain form appears in three different clausal constructions,[5] one of which has two subtypes: IMPERATIVE, SUBJUNCTIVE and INFINITIVAL: *TO*- and *BARE* as in (7) below. As these are types of clausal constructions having as their head a verb in a secondary plain form, according to Huddleston & Pullum none of the inflectional forms of English verb can be called 'infinitive'. Nevertheless, there is no reason for a form not to have more designations if used in various contexts, so as a widely used term we intend to keep it and use it throughout this thesis.

(7) **Constructions with a plain form according to Huddleston & Pullum** (2002)

	Construction		Example
1.	IMPERATIVE		*Do your homework!*
2.	SUBJUNCTIVE		*It is necessary [that he do his homework].*
3.	INFINITIVAL	*TO*-INFINITIVAL	*I told him [**to** do his homework].*
		BARE INFINITIVAL	*I made him [do his homework].*

Table 2.4: Constructions with a plain form according to Huddleston & Pullum (2002)

[5] In contrast to Huddleston & Pullum's view, Quirk et al. (1985, 1067) do not use the term *construction*, but the term *clause*.

In (7) there is also an illustration of the possible environments in which the secondary plain form can appear. The square brackets signal individual subordinate clauses which Huddleston & Pullum define in terms of finiteness.

2.2 Finiteness

Both Huddleston & Pullum (2002) and Quirk et al. (1985) attribute great importance to the concept of FINITENESS. It plays an important role in the syntactic distribution of verb forms and it is at the same time another way of approaching the *bare* infinitive.

To begin with, Quirk et al. (1985, 149), Leech and Svartvik (2003, 193) or Biber et al. (2007, 127) all agree with the application of terms FINITE and NON-FINITE to verb forms,[6] verb phrases and clauses at the same time. The supportive argument for that is the assertion that already the non-finite verb forms[7]—as the designation suggests—do not reflect any grammatical categories of tense or mood nor person/number concord, which finite forms do, and therefore the distinction should be also made on the basis of a word form and not only on the basis of a whole clause (Quirk et al. 1985, 149).

In contradiction to it, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 51) claim that the terms *finite* and *non-finite* relate to clauses and by extension to VPs, to which they provide the same argument as for the non-existence of the 'infinitive' form, that is that the form is called plain and other designations are not desirable. Regardless of this, as we have declared earlier, we will not accept this argument and follow to apply the terms finite and non-finite on verb forms as well.

Correspondingly, Huddleston & Pullum suggest that finite clauses take as head a verb in a primary form or plain form in case of imperative and subjunctive constructions, while non-finite clauses take as head a verb in a gerund-participle, past participle, or a plain form in case of infinitival constructions. This taxonomy is illustrated in Table 2.5 in (8) below.

(8) **Forms and constructions in terms of finiteness**

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="5">FINITE</td><td colspan="2">PRIMARY FORMS</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">PLAIN FORM</td><td>IMPERATIVE CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td>SUBJUNCTIVE CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">NON-FINITE</td><td rowspan="2">PLAIN FORM</td><td>TO-INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td>BARE INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">GERUND-PARTICIPLE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PAST PARTICIPLE</td></tr>
</table>

Table 2.5: Forms and constructions in terms of finiteness

In addition, Quirk et al. (1985, 149), being more specific, describe finiteness on the level of phrases. They claim that the first word in a finite verb phrase is always a verb in a finite form, while the remaining verbs are non-finite, and similarly all of the

[6] Leech and Svartvik (2003, 193) also use a term *VP element* both for verb forms and VPs apart from the *verb form*.

[7] Quirk et al. (1985), Leech and Svartvik (2003, 284), or Biber et al. (2007) use not only the term *non-finite verb form*, but also simply *non-finite verb*.

verbs in a non-finite verb phrase (overlooking the VP subordinator *to*[8]) are non-finite. Additionally, although it is not possible for a finite VP to be subordinated to a non-finite VP, Leech and Svartvik (2003, 275) remark that it is possible that a finite clause be subordinate to a non-finite clause. However, regarding *bare* infinitival structures are found only examples with a finite clause subordinated solely to a non-finite VP. Therefore, we consider the later a better formulation for the topic focused on *bare* infinitives. In (9) we can observe the distribution of various types of VPs together with an example of a finite clause subordinated to a *bare* infinitival VP.

(9) (a) *I* [*would* [***have*** [***loved*** [***to come***]]]], *but I could not.*
(b) *All I wanted to do was* [***catch the bird*** [*before it flies away*]].

In order to simplify the analysis within the example (9), the finite elements are marked by underlining and the non-finite ones we put in bold. In (9a) we can see that the clause comprises four verb phrases. As Quirk et al. observe, three of the VPs are non-finite, while the one comprising all of the VPs is finite. From the left within (9a), the present verb forms are preterite for *would*, *bare* infinitive for *have*, past participle for *loved*, and *to*-infinitive for *to come*. The structures in square brackets in (9b) represent that a finite clause can be subordinate to a non-finite VP, though it is impossible for a finite VP to be subordinate to a non-finite one.

In sum, infinitival constructions are therefore non-finite VPs or clauses with head in a plain form. This criterion is important as non-finite VPs and clauses are commonly subordinate parts of larger constructions and do not tend to appear on their own. In addition, this classification helps with its further syntactic differentiation from the imperative and subjunctive constructions as well as with its syntactic distribution discussed in the following section.

2.3 Formal properties of *bare* infinitive

We have already learned how different authors classify so called *BARE* INFINITIVE.[9] In this section it is intended to develop its previous morphological classification by means of comparison with *to*-infinitive form, at least enumerate the syntactic functions which *bare* infinitival clauses can carry out, discuss the influence of passivization on *bare* infinitival complements and consider the impact of finiteness on the lexical selection and distribution.

2.3.1 Distinctive features of infinitival VPs

Huddleston & Pullum describe 'infinitive' as a verb in *plain form* which stands as a head in an *infinitival clause construction*. Since plain form verb can occur in three different types of constructions–imperative, subjunctive and infinitival, we need to distinguish the infinitival one from the others. So far the only syntactic criterion seemed

[8] Further discussed in 2.3
Formal properties of bare infinitive, page 13.
[9] Quirk et al.'s (1985) and Huddleston & Pullum's taxonomies of verbs are discussed in 2.1 Formal characteristics of English verb, page 8.

to be finiteness of the forms, constructions, verb phrases, and by extension clauses.[10] That is to say that we have learned that subjunctive and imperative constructions are finite while infinitival constructions are non-finite (see Table 2.5 in (8)). To make the distinction more noticeable, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1173) enumerate five characteristics that make the infinitival construction discernible from the finite ones:

(10) (A) presence of VP subordinator *to*[11]
(B) absence of supportive *do* in negative constructions
(C) preference of being part of a larger clause
(D) generally no overt subject but when present, then in accusative or plain form[12]
(E) special subordinator *for*

In practice, however, *bare* infinitival VPs are not characterized by all of these features, as the rules apply in a great part merely to *to*-infinitives. In (11) we can observe how precisely the characteristics reflect *to*-infinitival VPs.

(11) *It is necessary **(for her/Janet) (not) to** run faster.*

The *to*-infinitival VP in (11) has the VP subordinator *to* (10A), it does not need the supportive *do* to negate the *to*-infinitival VP (10B), it is subordinated to a larger construction (10C) and it can either have no subject or have one in the accusative case (10D) introduced by the subordinator *for* (10E). Therefore, the example (11) representing the *to*-infinitival VP demonstrates all of the characteristics described by Huddleston & Pullum as characteristic to infinitival constructions.

Now let us demonstrate to which extent *bare* infinitival VPs comply with the characteristics own to the infinitival constructions on the example (12).

(12) (a) *Rather than **him/Paul (not)** be caught, I would go to the jail myself.*
(b) ***Kate/Him** be hungry! That's not possible.*

We will consider (12a) a prototypical example of *bare* infinitival VP. As we compare the example (12a) with the characteristics introduced in (10), we can see that in (12a) neither the subordinator *to* (10A) nor the subordinator *for* (10E) are present.[13] However, *do*-support (10B) is not required when negated and the *bare* infinitival VP forms part of a larger structure (10C). Additionally, so as to cover the feature (10D) to

[10] Finiteness is further discussed in 2.2 Finiteness, page 12.

[11] (a) Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 22) regard *subordinator* as in opposition to *coordinator*, both of which are classified as *conjunctions* by traditional grammar. *Coordinators* connect elements in coordinated structures; *subordinators* connect superordinate elements with subordinate elements inside the syntactic hierarchy. Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1185) argue that the *to*-element has a function analogous to that of *that* or *whether*, as otherwise it would have to serve as a head of the VP and so be a kind of a strange auxiliary verb, which they refuse.
(b) Quirk et al. (1985, 68) denote the *to*-element *an infinitival marker.*

[12] What follows from this feature is that the subject must be a NP, as Biber et al. (2007, 125) aptly emphasize.

[13] Quirk et al. (1985, 1003) claim that the only subordinator a *bare* infinitival clause can be introduced by is the subordinator *rather*/*sooner than*.

the smallest detail, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1187) mention that they managed to find only two structures where the subject is present: the first one is in (12a), and the second one in (12b)[14]—both subjects being in accusative or plain form.[15] To put it another way, without the subject present in the clause the *bare* infinitival construction remains a mere VP with head in a plain form. But generally speaking, as the characteristics (10B), (10C) and (10D) were satisfied, we can certainly incorporate them among the morpho-syntactic properties of *bare* infinitives.

2.3.2 Syntactic functions of bare infinitival VPs

By the same token, it is useful to at least enumerate the number of structures in which the *bare* infinitival construction appears. It can occupy all different functions, as Quirk et al. (1985; 127, 1067) list; these are subject, subject complement, verb complement, object complement, or complement of a preposition. Apart from these, Huddleston & Pullum (2002; 874, 1187) add one more function: a main VP, i.e. predicate. All the possible syntactic functions where a *bare* infinitival VP occurs are seen in (13) below.

(13) (a) ***Be*** *diligent was all I did.*
(b) *What people do is* ***arouse*** *fear in others.*
(c) *Animals can* ***feel****, too.*
(d) *The teacher let the student* ***share*** *his birthday cake during the lesson.*
(e) *John does nothing but* ***spend*** *all his time in the gym.*
(f) *John* ***be*** *irresponsible! That's impossible.*

In the example (13) we can observe that *bare* infinitival VP can function as subject (13a), subject complement (13b), verb complement (13c), object complement (13d), complement of a preposition (13e) or as a whole predicate as in (13f).

Notwithstanding all the possible functions, it is essential to take into consideration that the distribution of *bare* infinitive is restricted to very specific environments which will be further discussed in the next chapter.[16]

2.3.3 Role of passivization in bare infinitival constructions

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1244) remark that constructions with *bare* infinitives are practically restricted to active clauses. What happens is that the majority of verbs which take *bare* infinitive in the active take *to*-infinitive in the passive. One of the traditional examples is the verb *make* in (14).

[14] Nevertheless, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1187) acknowledge that the example (12b) is considered informal.

[15] Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1187) mention that although the accusative form is more usual and the nominative very improbable in both (12a) and (12b), the (12a) construction is generally very uncommon, which results in an inclination to use *subjectless construction* like: *Rather than have him caught, I would go to the jail myself.*

[16] 3 Distribution of bare infinitives in English, page 20.

(14) (a) *Richard made his friend **take up** crossfit.*
(b) *Will was made **to take up** yoga.*

On the example (14) we can observe that the verb *make* is subcategorized for a *bare* infinitival complement when the clause is active (14a), but for a *to*-infinitival complement when it is passive (14b). This behaviour is prototypical for the majority of verbs which subcategorize for a *bare* infinitival complement.

Verbs which do not change the form of the complement after passivization are rare. However, one of the examples is the verb *let* which occurs in fixed expression such as *let go* or *let fall* (Quirk et al. 1985, 1205). These expression are invariable with respect to the form as can be seen in (15).

(15) (a) *My mum let me **go** to see the movie.*
(b) *I was let **go** to see the movie.*

Let in construction like *let go* or *let fall* (15a) does not change the form of the complement when passivized (15b). It is, nevertheless, an exceptional case.

Another class of verbs which take *bare* infinitival complement in the active do not admit passivization at all. This class can be demonstrated on the verb *have* in (16).

(16) (a) *I had my brother **prepare** me some dinner.*
(b) **My brother was had **(to) prepare** me some dinner.*

This variant of *have* used in (16) is called *dynamic have*. Although *bare* infinitival complement is not the only verb complement it is subcategorized for, *dynamic have* does not undergo passivization with any of them (16b).

In conclusion, the distribution of *bare* infinitives is prototypically restricted to clauses where the voice is active. If the verb subcategorized for a *bare* infinitival complement in the active allows passivization, then the complement prototypically changes to *to*-infinitival in the passive.

2.3.4 Lexical restrictions on bare infinitives

Finally, the selection of verbs which can morphologically form *bare* infinitives and hence be distributed accordingly is somewhat restricted.[17]

Among the verbs which cannot form *bare* infinitives are definitely modal auxiliary verbs as seen in (19).

(17) (a) **I must **can** do the homework.*
(b) **I shall **may** do it for you.*
(c) **I can **will** come.*

[17] As can be inferred from 2.1 Formal characteristics of English verb, page 8, and 2.2 Finiteness, page 12.

Modal auxiliaries (19) have only primary forms and therefore are restricted to finite uses. In other words, they can occupy only the first tensed position in a finite VP. In consequence, there can never be more than one modal auxiliary in one clause.

Another verb which cannot be distributed as *bare* infinitive is the non-modal auxiliary *do* as can be seen in (18).

(18) (a) **Can I **do** speak?*
(b) **I may **do not** go to school.*
(c) **I will **do** text him.*

The non-modal auxiliary *do* (18) has only primary forms and so has a distribution similar to modal auxiliaries. Apart from this, it is employed solely under two conditions. Firstly, in so called NICE constructions, that is, when lexical verbs cannot form grammatical sentences on their own,[18] and secondly, when no other auxiliary is present. For these reasons, the supportive *do* is excluded from the distribution in place of *bare* infinitives.

The rest of the non-modal auxiliary verbs *have* and *be* remain unaffected in the distribution as *bare* infinitives, as they have both primary and secondary inflectional forms. See (19).

(19) (a) *I could **have** been there.*
(b) *I should **be** going.*
(c) *She might **be** tired.*

The auxiliaries *have* and *be* can accompany other auxiliaries (19), because they have all the primary and secondary forms and a significant role in the expression of voice and aspect. Auxiliary *have* and *be* occur in various positions in a VP except main verb position.

Similarly, there are no morpho-syntactic restrictions for lexical verbs that would prevent them from being distributed as *bare* infinitives, as lexical verbs possess all the available forms as well. This is exemplified in (20) on the verbs *suffer* and *eat*.

(20) *Rather than **suffer** from hunger, I would even **eat** the donuts.*

[18] NICE constructions are discussed in 4 Do-support, page 21.

2.4 Summary

In this section we wanted to summarize and contrast the basic taxonomies of English verbs by Quirk et al. (1985)—whose terminology of the matter corresponds in a great part with that used by Leech and Svartvik (2003), and Biber et al. (2007)—and Huddleston & Pullum (2002) in order to find how many possible verb forms a prototypical verb can have, whether all of the verb types (inside the auxiliary and lexical class) have the same inventory of verb forms, and finally see how it effects the main concept of this thesis: *bare* infinitive.

Afterwards, we discussed the role of finiteness on the distribution of *bare* infinitival constructions in order to delimit their distribution more in detail and differentiate them from subjunctive and imperative constructions.

Further, we focused on the *bare* infinitive itself and described it from various perspectives. We considered the syntactic characteristics of *bare* infinitival construction through differentiation from the *to*-infinitival construction, its possible syntactic functions, the role of passivization on its distribution, lexical selection and restrictions on the *bare* infinitive form.

Even though we have decided to use Huddleston & Pullum's (2002) terminology and concepts throughout the thesis, we have additionally adapted the terms *finite/non-finite form* and *infinitive (form)* which are commonly used by Quirk et al. (1985), Leech and Svartvik (2003) and Biber et al. (2007).

Focusing on *bare* infinitives, we have concluded that *bare* infinitive is a verb in a plain form which is employed in a *bare* infinitival construction. *Bare* infinitival constructions are the only non-finite VPs or clauses which have as a head a verb in a plain form, the remaining imperative and subjunctive constructions being finite. In (21) we can observe the *bare* infinitival construction within a larger framework of the remaining forms and finiteness with the relative terms in bold.

(21) **Inflectional forms of English verbs in terms of finiteness**

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">FINITE</td><td colspan="2">PRIMARY FORMS</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">PLAIN FORM</td><td>IMPERATIVE CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td>SUBJUNCTIVE CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">NON-FINITE</td><td rowspan="2">PLAIN FORM</td><td>TO-INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td>BARE INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">GERUND-PARTICIPLE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">PAST PARTICIPLE</td></tr>
</table>

Table 2.6: Inflectional forms of English verbs in terms of finiteness

What *bare* infinitival and *to*-infinitival constructions have in common is that they do not need the supportive *do* for the negation, they are preferably parts of larger constructions and they more likely occur without a subject, but when the subject is present, it is either in the accusative or in a plain form. Equally important, *bare*

infinitival constructions are differentiated from *to*-infinitival constructions by not having the subordinators *to* and *for* as in (22).

(22) (a) *It is necessary **for** her/Janet not **to** run faster.*
(b) *Rather than (*for) him/Paul not (*to) be caught, I would go to the jail myself.*

Although *to*-infinitival constructions occur in a larger number of structures, the distribution of *bare* infinitival constructions is not as limited as could be expected. It can carry out various syntactic functions as we can see in (23). Namely it is subject (23a), subject complement (23b), verb complement (23c), object complement (23d), complement of a preposition (23e) and even predicate (23f).

(23) (a) ***Be** diligent was all I did.*
(b) *What people do is **arouse** fear in others.*
(c) *Animals can **feel**, too.*
(d) *The teacher let the student **share** his birthday cake during the lesson.*
I *John does nothing but **spend** all his time in the gym.*
(f) *John **be** irresponsible! That's impossible.*

Further, we have found out that the *bare* infinitival construction is in most cases restricted to the active voice, while in the passive the *to*-infinitival is employed. This is illustrated by the construction *make* + NP + *bare* infinitive which always takes *bare* infinitival complement in the active and *to*-infinitival in the passive as in (24).

(24) (a) *Richard made his friend **take up** crossfit.*
(b) *Will was made **to take up** yoga.*

Finally, the lexical selection for the *bare* infinitive form is also restricted as can be seen in (25), as modal verbs and non-modal *do* do not possess *bare* infinitive form as we can observe in (25a) and (25b). Therefore this structure is reserved for lexical verbs (25c) and non-modal *be* and *have* which play a significant role in the expression of aspect and in the case of *be* also voice as can be observed in (25d), (25e) and (25f).

(25) (a) **I must **can** do the homework.*
(b) **I may **do not** go to school.*
(c) *I heard the dog **bark**.*
(d) *I could **have** been there.*
I *I should **be** going.*
(f) *She might **be** tired.*

To sum up, so far we have described in detail the concept of *bare* infinitive which we will expand in the following section with the collected data about its syntactic distribution and the environments where it can occur.

3 DISTRIBUTION OF BARE INFINITIVES IN ENGLISH

3.1 Introduction

As already mention above, the *bare* infinitival construction—a non-finite VP with a head in a plain form—has a rather limited its syntactic distribution. Not only it can under very restricted circumstances carry out various syntactic functions, but prototypically it can follow only a small number of various lexical items. In fact, there is only one verb class about which it can be asserted that is always complemented by *bare* infinitival constructions, and that is the class of modal auxiliary verbs.

Neither Huddleston & Pullum (2002), nor Quirk et al. (1985) or Biber et al. (2007) provide a complete list of constructions in which the *bare* infinitival appears. For this reason we will dedicate this section to the representation and discussion of all the specific syntactic environments in which the *bare* infinitival construction participate.

We will use Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985), Leech and Svartvik (2003) and Biber et al. (2007) as core sources in search of all the relevant information, and check the selected data in the British National Corpus (BNC).

4 DO-SUPPORT[19]

The supportive *do* is one of the few verbs which can be most frequently complemented only with a *bare* infinitive. It is a semantically empty auxiliary verb whose existence is conditioned by its unique function within a couple of syntactic processes (Quirk et al. 1985, 120, 776). More specifically, when there is no other auxiliary present in the same clause—as the presence of dummy *do* is excluded by the presence of any other auxiliary—the supportive or dummy *do* [20] 'help' lexical verbs in canonical clauses form grammatically correct sentences particularly when it comes to negative, interrogative and emphatic constructions (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 93-4).

In this occasion, Huddleston & Pullum mention the so called NICE constructions[21] which constitute four non-canonical constructions characteristic of auxiliary verbs but not of lexical verbs, that is to say that it is in these constructions where the auxiliary *do* is employed.

(26) **The function of auxiliary *do* illustrated via NICE constructions**

NICE	LEXICAL VERB STRUCTURE	AUXILIARY *DO* STRUCTURE
(a) NEGATION	(i) **I <u>met</u> not John.*	(ii) *I <u>did</u> not **meet** John.*
(b) INTERROGATION	(i) **<u>Met</u> I John?*	(ii) *<u>Did</u> I **meet** John?*
(c) CODA	(i) **I <u>met</u> John and Henry <u>met</u> too.*	(ii) *I <u>met</u> John and Henry <u>did</u> too.*
(d) EMPHASIS	(i) **You don't think I met John but I <u>MET</u> him.*	(ii) *You don't think I met John but I <u>DID</u> **meet** him.*

Table 4.1: The function of auxiliary do illustrated via NICE constructions

Table 4.1 in (26) is an illustration of the auxiliary function of the supportive *do*. The examples (26ai), (26bi), (26ci) and (26di) demonstrate that lexical verbs are unable to stand alone in the NICE constructions. This means that without the auxiliary *do* these sentences are ungrammatical, as can be seen in (26aii), (26bii), (26cii) and (26dii).

In reality, our interest resides solely in three of the NICE constructions, namely Negation, Interrogation and Emphasis constructions. The reason for this is that only in these three constructions the auxiliary *do* disposes of the verb complementation, which is, as has been stated above, constituted by a *bare* infinitival construction highlighted in examples (26a)', (26b)' and (26d)' by bold print.

[19] Quirk et al. (1985, 133) use also the term '*DO-periphrasis'*; Biber el al. (2007, 73) employ the term *do-insertion* as well.

[20] Both *supportive* and *dummy do* are terms used by Huddleston & Pullum (2002). Quirk et al. (1985) uses solely '*empty'* or '*dummy' operator.*

[21] Quirk et al. (1985, 133) do not use the NICE constructions, but the occurrences of *do*-support they list are analogous to them.

4.1 Do-support in imperative constructions

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 94) specify that only primary verb forms[22] take *do*-support. This also means that *do*-support can only mediate a clausal negation, but not a phrasal negation, for which only the negative particle *not* is required. Quirk et al. (1985, 133-4) assert that the *do*-support is not required in subjunctive and all non-finite constructions.

At the same time, we can observe that *do* is employed in imperative constructions as well. See the example (27).

(27) ***Don't*** *eat all the bananas!*

However, imperative constructions belong among the structures with the main verb in a secondary form. According to Huddleston & Pullum's statement above—that only verbs in primary forms take *do*-support—supportive *do* in imperative clauses violates this rule.

In addition, Quirk et al. (1985, 833) mention another violation of the distributional rules of supportive *do*. As we have mentioned above, the auxiliary *do* is never accompanied by any other auxiliary verb. Nonetheless, in imperative clauses it can occur with *be* as can be seen in (28).

(28) (a) *Do* ***be*** *seated!*
(b) *Don't* ***be*** *shy!*

The example (28) demonstrates that although the supportive *do* is never present with another auxiliary verb within one clause in non-imperative clauses, in imperative clauses it occurs together with the auxiliary *be.*

This is why Quirk et al. (1985, 833) claim that this *do* and *don't* are more likely the *introductory imperative markers* and only marginally accept that the emphatic *do* and negating *don't* appearing in imperative constructions belong to *do*-support.

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 94) consider it an exception among secondary forms and state that *do*-support is necessary when negating imperative clauses, even if the head of the VP is another auxiliary verb.

In conclusion, although *do* support with its prototypical *bare* infinitival complement prototypically applies solely to primary verb-forms, we will consider the imperative construction an extension of this rule.

4.2 Emphatic constructions with 'do'

With respect to the third of the NICE constructions—CODA, it is used to emphasize the positive polarity of a sentence. When no other auxiliary is present, the insertion of *do*-support is demanded (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 98) (Quirk et al. 1985, 1371-2). See (29).

[22] Huddleston & Pullum's classification on primary and secondary forms is discussed in 2.1.2 Huddleston & Pullum's taxonomy of verbs, page 9, see also Table 2.3 in (4).

(29) (a) *I'll/will lose weight.* (a)' *Really, I WILL lose weight.*
(b) *I lost weight.* (b)' *Really, I DID **lose** weight.*

The examples (29a) and (29b) represent the unemphatic contexts, (29a) with the modal auxiliary *will* and (29b) without any auxiliary present. In order to emphasize the clausal positive polarity, in (29a)' we put the emphasis on the modal auxiliary *will*, while in (29b)' it was necessary to insert and emphasize the supportive *do*. What is emphasized in (29a)' and (29b)' is the veracity of the statement, that is that what is said really happened. Notice that the supportive *do* in (29b)' takes *bare* infinitival complement.

The emphasis on the clausal polarity is not to be confused with the emphasis on the lexical content (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 98) as contrasted in (30).

(30) (a) *I know you DID **speak** with JIM.*
(b) *I know you SPOKE with Jim.*

Again, in (30a) we have an example of emphatic polarity in which a presence of an auxiliary is required. What the speaker wants to communicate is that the interaction between the hearer and Jim really happened. On the other side, the example (30b) represents the emphasis on the lexical context which is put on the very lexical verb *spoke*. This speaker wants to let know that the hearer 'spoke' with Jim, he did not 'write him a letter'.

To sum up, the supportive *do* is also employed in positive emphatic polarity clauses when no other auxiliary is present and when the emphasized element is the veracity of the statement.

5 MODAL AUXILIARY VERBS

Modal auxiliary verbs constitute an established closed class of verbs with very special morpho-syntactic properties, one of which is that they subcategorize for a single type of complement: *bare* infinitival.

Quirk et al. (1985, 137) distinguish between central modal auxiliaries and marginal modal auxiliaries, central modal auxiliaries being: *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *shall*, *should*, *will*/*'ll*, *would*/*'d*, *must*; marginal modal auxiliary verbs being: *dare*, *need*, *ought*, *use*;[23] while Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 115) do not explicitly classify modal verbs into these two groups, but rather situate them on a scale from the central ones to the most marginal ones; the verb *used to* is placed on a border between the auxiliary and lexical verbs. For our convenience we will use the classification by Quirk et al (1985).

Quirk et al. (1985, 96) prefer to look upon modal auxiliaries as on *invariable words* rather than distinguish between present and preterite forms, for their semantic meaning is not always in accordance. On the other hand, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 92) characterize modal auxiliaries as verbs with exclusively primary forms which means that modals have present as well as preterite forms. The only obvious exception is *must* with no preterite counterpart.

So that we could later critically discuss the group of marginal modal auxiliary verbs, it is necessary to include the distinctive properties of modal auxiliary verbs. To begin with, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 108) list eight distinctive properties which distinguish auxiliary verbs from lexical verbs.[24] In other words, it is also an extended list of the so called NICE properties [25] which are satisfied both by non-modal auxiliary verbs and modal auxiliary verbs. We can see the properties together with the corresponding examples in Table 5.1 in (31).

All the examples in Table 5.1 in **Chyba! Nenalezen zdroj odkazů.**(31) represent the distinctive properties of auxiliary verbs with respect to lexical verbs. (31a) demonstrates that auxiliary verbs can alone form grammatical negative clauses only with a particle *not*. (31b) shows that by inverting subject and the first auxiliary verb they form grammatical interrogative clauses. (31c) represents that they can bear stress in emphatic polarity constructions. (31d) illustrates that in code they can appear in a reduced sentence while preserving the meaning of the whole. (31e) underscores that the auxiliary *do* cannot substitute another auxiliary in code. (31f) explains that adverbs and quantifiers usually follow auxiliary verbs which does not apply to lexical verbs. (31g) displays that auxiliary verbs dispose of a special set of negative primary forms, and finally (31h) shows they also have reduced forms.

[23] We used the forms of *ought* and *use* as introduced by Huddleston & Pullum (2002), as Quirk et al (1985) use the verb forms as they most frequently appear in practise, but unfortunately do not cover all of the possible variants, e.g. *ought* without *to* or *use* without *–ed*.

[24] Verb taxonomies are discussed in 2.1 Formal characteristics of English verb, page 8.

[25] The NICE properties were discussed in 4 Do-support, page 21.

(31) **Distinctive properties of auxiliary verbs**

PROPERTY	AUXILIARY VERBS	LEXICAL VERBS
(a) Primary verb negation	(i) *It will not be a disaster.*	(ii)' **It rain not this week.*
(b) Subject-auxiliary inversion	(i) *Is it Friday already?*	(ii)' **Shines the sun all the year round?*
(c) Emphatic polarity	(i) *I CAN do it for you.*	(ii)' **I WANT to help you.*
(d) Stranding	(i) *He won't listen, but I will _.*	(ii)' **We aim high and you aim _ too.*
(e) Exclusion of 'do' in code	(i) **I can sing and he does too.*	(ii)' *He drives well, but I do too.*
(f) Precede adverb/quantifier	(i) *We have luckily/all passed.*	(ii)' **They think still/all about themselves.*
(g) Negative forms	(i) *He mustn't become involved.*	(ii)' **I liken't your attitude.*
(h) Reduced forms	(i) *I've forgiven a lot.*	(ii)' **We'ke chocolate bars. (like)*

Table 5.1: Distinctive properties of auxiliary verbs[26]

All of the distinctive properties of auxiliary verbs characterize non-modal (*be, do, have*) as well as modal (*can, could, may, might, shall, should, will/'ll, would/'d, must*) auxiliaries. In order that we could distinguish modal auxiliaries from non-modal auxiliary verbs, it is necessary to add five additional properties distinctive of modal auxiliary verbs introduced by Huddleston & Pullum (2002). Not to describe exhaustively all of the properties, we will demonstrate them on a set of examples in Table 5.2 in (32) below.

(32) **Distinctive properties of modal auxiliary verbs**[27]

PROPERTY	MODAL AUXILIARY VERBS
Only primary forms	(a) **There seems to should be hope.*
No agreement	(b) *He might/*mights be waiting for a miracle.*
Only *bare* infinitival complement	(c) *The sun will rise/*to rise soon.*
Can appear in remote apodosis	(d) *If you listened more carefully, you would know my thoughts by now.*
Modally remote preterite in main clause	I *Could you make me some coffee?*

Table 5.2: Distinctive properties of modal auxiliary verbs

[26] Quirk et al. (1985, 121-127) employ analogous distinctive features of auxiliary verbs, although under different names, plus add one more entitled *Independence of subject*. As it is more a semantic than syntactic matter, we will omit it and stick to the classification by Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 108).

[27] Quirk et al. (1985, 127-128) describe analogous distinctive features of modal auxiliary verbs, but firstly under different names, and secondly they do not include the *Can appear in remote apodosis* in the list. Nevertheless, they discuss it separately.

Table 5.2 in (32) together with Table 5.1 in (31) show the distinctive properties of modal auxiliary verbs. Modal auxiliary verbs have only primary forms,[28] so the (32a) is ungrammatical as *to*-infinitive belongs among secondary forms. The example (32b) shows that there is no person-number agreement on modal auxiliaries in present tense. In (32c) we can see that modal auxiliaries take exclusively *bare* infinitival complement. (32d) displays that the first verb in the main clause of a remote conditional must be a modal in a preterite form,[29] and at last (32e) illustrates that the preterite form of a modal verb can be used with *modal remoteness*[30] meaning without any grammatical restrictions even in the main clause, while lexical verbs have the possibility only in a low number of subordinate structures.

As we have already covered the general distinctive properties of modal auxiliary verbs, we can focus more closely on the central and marginal modal auxiliaries with the related complementation.

5.1 Central modal auxiliary verbs

For the general classification has been already covered in the previous section,[31] here we will dedicate solely to the complementation of central modal auxiliary verbs, namely of *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *shall*, *should*, *will*/*'ll*, *would*/*'d*, and *must*.

Both Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 107) and Quirk et al. (1985, 127) agree that the central modal auxiliaries take only one kind of verb complement—*bare* infinitival—as seen in (33). [32]

(33) (a) *Boys can* ***run***/****to run*** *faster than girls.*
(b) *Could he* ***stop***/****stops*** *laughing?*
(c) *May I* ***have***/****having*** *a look at your notes?*
(d) *I think you might* ***consider***/****considered*** *your behaviour.*
I *I shall* ***live***/****to live*** *a much healthier life.*
(f) *Shouldn't you* ***help***/****helping*** *her?*
(g) *I'll*/*will* ***find out***/****to find*** *what's behind that.*
(h) *He'd*/*would* ***have helped***/****helped*** *but he didn't know how.*
(i) *They must* ***be abandoning***/****abandoning*** *smoking.*

All the examples in (33) show that the only possible complement of modal auxiliary verbs is a verb in a *bare* infinitive form. No other form—neither primary nor secondary—is applicable. Note the employment of perfective bare infinitive in (33h) and progressive bare infinitive in (33i).

---

[28] Primary and secondary forms are discussed in 2.1.2 Huddleston & Pullum's taxonomy of verbs, page 9.
[29] Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 148) define remote conditional ('If he was here, he'd be upstairs.') in contrast to open conditional ('If he is here, he'll be upstairs.'), stating the difference between remote and open possibility.
[30] Term used by Huddleston & Pullum (2002).
[31] 5 Modal auxiliary verbs, page 24.
[32] In spite of that, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 108) state an exception in form of the central modal *would* and its use in modal idioms *would rather*, *would sooner*, and *would as soon*, which can also take complement in form of a finite clause, but we will not consider these idioms a central use of modal auxiliary verbs and treat them apart in the section on modal idioms: *6 Modal idioms*, page 33.

For the only possible verb complement modal auxiliary verbs admit is *bare* infinitival, they cannot combine with each other for modals have neither a *bare* infinitival not a *to*-infinitival form. More specifically, they cannot be complemented by other modals, as they have only primary forms and so they can occupy only the first place in a finite VP. See (34) for the examples.

(34) (a) **You should **can** leave earlier from school.*
(b) **He will **must** train harder.*
(c) **They could **would** like to stay longer at the party.*
(d) **I wanted **to may** the school earlier.*

The examples in (34) demonstrate the impossibility of combining more modal auxiliaries in one clause as they lack the secondary forms. This means they cannot occur where the *bare* infinitive is required as in (34a-c). Simultaneously, neither they possess the *to*-infinitival form as in (34d). In other words, modal auxiliary verbs occupy a unique position in the English predicate and this position is the very initial.

To sum up, modal auxiliary verbs admit exclusively *bare* infinitival complements. As a restriction which comes with this is among others that they cannot be complemented by other modals as they do not dispose of the secondary forms and so they do not form *bare* infinitives nor any other secondary forms themselves.

5.2 Marginal modal auxiliary verbs

We have already named the verbs which belong to the class of marginal modal auxiliary verbs: *dare*, *need*, *ought* and *use*. Quirk et al. (1985, 137-8) regard them as verbs of the greatest similitude to the central modal auxiliary verbs. However, as they cannot be differentiated from central modals by any identical shared property, i.e. each of them differ from modal auxiliaries by a different property, we will not include their collective characteristics here, but separately below. Apart from this, we will not discuss the verb *used to* for although it belongs to this class, it is never followed by the *bare* infinitival complement and therefore it is no longer of our interest here.

5.2.1 Ought

Ought is considered a marginal modal for more reasons: it has no reduced forms, it doesn't have a preterite form, it can very scarcely appear in a remote apodosis construction and its most frequent complement is *to*-infinitive (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 109). Quirk et al. (1985, 140) even claim that it can be regarded as a detached homonymous lexical verb in some dialects and require *do*-support.

In spite of the properties which relocate the non-lexical variant of the verb *ought* into the class of marginal modals, one property draws it nearer to the central modal auxiliaries. Although *ought* appears predominantly complemented with *to*-infinitival complement, both Huddleston & Pullum and Quirk et al. state that it becomes more acceptable and even preferable to use *bare* infinitival complement in non-affirmative contexts.

(35) (a) *I ought **to eat** more bananas.* (a)' **I ought **eat** more bananas.*
(b) *I oughtn't/ought not **to eat** sweets.* (b)' *I oughtn't/ought not **eat** sweets.*

The examples in (35) demonstrate the possible complementation of the marginal modal auxiliary *ought*. In (35a) we observe that in an affirmative clause the only possible complementation is the *to*-infinitive. (35b) represents the non-affirmative contexts and shows that both *to*-infinitival and *bare* infinitival complements can be employed.

We have searched the BNC in order to find whether the *bare* infinitive is a possible complement of the verb *ought*. In the Table 5.3 in (36) we can observe that *ought* together with *bare* infinitive indeed occurs in non-affirmative contexts, although the *to*-infinitival complements are much more frequent.

(36) ***Ought* and its verb complementation in the BNC**

CONSTRUCTION	+ *TO*-INFINITIVE (NUMBER OF TOKENS)	+ *BARE* INFINITIVE (NUMBER OF TOKENS)
(a) *ought*	4173	0
(b) *ought not*	245	4
(c) *oughtn't*	16	0
(d) *ought* + pronoun	14	1
(e) *ought* + pronoun + *not*	6	0
(f) *oughtn't* + pronoun	10	0
TOTAL NUMBER OF TOKENS	4464	5

Table 5.3: *Ought* and its verb complementation in the BNC

Nevertheless, as we did not find any tokens where the *bare* infinitive would directly follow *oughtn't* as in (36c) and (36f), we can assume that the negative particle *not* in (36b) belongs to the verb complement of *ought*, not to *ought* itself. However, this presupposition was not confirmed in (36e) as we expected. Also, we found only one token where *ought* + *bare* infinitive appears in an interrogative construction, so this construction is questionable as well.

Additionally, Quirk et al. add that *ought* can optionally occur without *to* in stranding constructions while Huddleston & Pullum consider them more common with the VP subordinator *to*. On the other hand, *ought* without the stranded *to* would only support the expanding tendency of it to require the *bare* infinitival complementation.

(37) *We don't prepare our meals at home, but we ought **(to)**.*

In the example (37) we can observe that in the stranding construction the marginal modal auxiliary *ought* can appear with the stranded *to* as well as without it.

Quirk et al. (1985, 140) also remark that in Modern English *ought* also occurs with *do*-support as a lexical verb. However, in this environment its complement is always *to*-infinitival as in (38).

(38) (a) *They didn't ought* ***to get*** *drunk in the morning.*
(b) *Did they ought* ***to confirm*** *their presence?*

In (38) we can see the lexical variant of *ought* which requires the supportive *do* to form negative (38a) and interrogative (38b) structures. In its lexical form it takes the *to*-infinitival complement all the time.

To sum up, *ought* can be either a modal verb which subcategorizes predominantly for a *to*-infinitive and in very few cases for *bare* infinitive or it can be a lexical verb which complies with all the usual properties of lexical verbs and requires support in so called NICE constructions.[33] The lexical *ought*, therefore, exclusively requires a *to*-infinitival complement.

5.2.2 Need and dare

Another pair of marginal modal verbs to discuss are *need* and *dare*. These verbs are subject of dual distribution since they can behave both like lexical and modal auxiliary verbs. Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 110) regard them as two different verbs for the dissimilar distribution in the negative, interrogative and elliptical structures as in (39).

(39) **The differentiation of lexical and modal *need* and *dare* through different distribution in negative, interrogative and elliptical structures**

NICE [34]	MODAL VERBS STRUCTURE	LEXICAL VERBS STRUCTURE
(a) NEGATION	(i) *I needn't/daren't* ***cook*** *myself.*	(ii) *I didn't need/dare* ***to cook*** *myself.*
(b) INTERROGATION	(i) *Need/Dare I* ***cook*** *myself?*	(ii) *Do I need/dare* ***to cook*** *myself?*
(c) ELLIPTICAL STRUCTURES	(i) *I needn't/daren't* ***cook*** *myself and he needn't/daren't either.*	(ii) *I didn't need/dare* ***to cook*** *myself and he didn't either.*

Table 5.4: The differentiation of lexical and modal *need* and *dare* through different distribution in negative, interrogative and elliptical structures

In (39) we can observe the distinct distribution of lexical and modal variants of the verbs *need* and *dare*. In the left column we can observe the distribution characteristic for modal auxiliary verbs: in (39a) it is primary verb negation, (39b) shows subject-auxiliary inversion and (39c) is an example of the stranded modals in code. Most importantly, all the modals in (39a-c) are complemented by a *bare* infinitival. In the right column we can see *need* and *dare* distributed as lexical verbs: we can notice *do*-support in all of the constructions and *to*-infinitival construction in place of the second complement.

In addition, modal and lexical *dare* and *need* also differ morphologically as in (40). While the modals take the negation themselves and so the negative inflectional

[33] The NICE constructions were discussed in 4 Do-support, page 21.
[34] The NICE properties were discussed in 4 Do-support, page 21.

morpheme *n't* (40a) which lexical verbs cannot acquire (40a)', the lexical verbs, on the other side, take the 3rd person singular morpheme *–s* (40b)' incompatible with modal verbs as in (40b).

(40)	MODAL VERBS	LEXICAL VERBS
	(a) *I <u>needn't/daren't</u>* ***whoop***.	(a)' **I <u>needn't/daren't</u>* ***to whoop***.
	(b) **No one <u>needs/dares</u>* ***whoop***.	(b)' *No one <u>needs/dares</u>* ***to whoop***.

Apart from this, we can also observe that *need* as modal verb has not preterite form **needed*, while *dare* as a perfectly regular preterite form *dared* which is identical to the preterite form of its lexical counterpart (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 110). Quirk et al. (1985, 138) also state that *dare* can appear without limitations of tense.

Nevertheless, modal and lexical *need* and *dare* do not differ only in morphology. An important aspect of the distribution of modal *need* and *dare* is that they can occur solely in non-affirmative contexts. As a consequence, the affirmative context is reserved merely for their lexical counterparts as in (41).

(41) (a) **He <u>need/dare</u>* ***end*** *the game.*
(b) *He <u>needs/dares</u>* ***to end*** *the game.*

In (41) we can observe that only the lexical variants of *need* and *dare* occur in affirmative contexts as in (41b) while the modal *need* and *dare* are excluded from this environment (41a).

So far, we have outlined the verbs *need* and *dare* as either strictly modal or lexical verbs with the respective types of complements. As modals they subcategorize for *bare* infinitival complements and as lexical verbs they require *to*-infinitival complementation.

However, Quirk et al. (1985, 138) do not completely agree that *need* and *dare* should be regarded as two different verbs as then they would be expected to behave as proper modals on one side and proper lexical verbs on the other, which mainly the verb *dare* often does not which we will discuss in the following sections.

5.2.2.1 Dare

First, let us show some of the irregularities typical for the constructions which Quirk et al. (1985, 138) consider as 'blends' of the modal and lexical variant of *dare*. See the examples in (42) and (43).

(42) (a) *Jeremy <u>dares</u>* ***be*** *stronger.*
(b) *Does Jeremy <u>dare</u>* ***be*** *stronger?*
(c) *Jeremy <u>didn't dare</u>* ***be*** *stronger.*

(43) *Only Jeremy <u>dared</u>* ***be*** *stronger.*

What we can see in (42) are supposedly the 'blends' of the modal and lexical variants of *dare*. All the verbs *dare* in (42) are complemented by a *bare* infinitival

which is a property characteristic of the modal auxiliary verbs in general. Nonetheless, in (42a) the preceding *dare* has an *–s* inflection typical for lexical verbs and the examples (42b) and (42c) contain the *do*-support in an interrogative and negative construction respectively which is also attributed to lexical verbs. Additionally, in (43) *dare* has a regular preterite form same for its lexical and modal variant while the context is non-affirmative, so we cannot decide whether the *dare* in this construction is modal or lexical.

Veselovská (2001) presents a corpus study about the verb *dare* and proves that *dare* in what Quirk et al. (1985) consider a 'blend' is in fact a lexical verb both morphologically and syntactically. In the first place, Veselovská demonstrates that *dare* which is verifiably a modal auxiliary never takes *to*-infinitival complement as in (44).

(44) (a) *Eva daren't/*liken't (*to)* ***wear*** *a skirt on her motorbike.*
(b) *Dare/*Likes Eva (*to)* ***wear*** *a skirt on her motorbike?*
(c) *None of the bikers dare (*to)* ***wear*** *a skirt on the motorbike, dare (*does) she?*

That the *dare* in (44) is modal can be seen in that it is the first auxiliary which takes the negative morpheme *n't* in (44a), it can form a question without the supportive *do* and so inverts with the subject in (44b) and finally it is repeated in the question tag together with the personal pronoun referring to subject in (44c). These are the properties of modal auxiliary verbs as lexical verbs never succeed in these constructions. Additionally, we can observe the modal verb *dare* is never complemented by a *to*-infinitival complement.

On the other hand, Veselovská (2001) supply examples from her corpus findings from which it is obvious that in the rest of the discussed constructions it is the lexical *dare* that is employed. Let us review it in (45).

(45) (a) *Hillary doesn't dare* ***(to) enter*** *the fitness studio.*
(b) *Does Hillary dare* ***(to) enter*** *the fitness studio?*
(c) *None of Hillary's friends dares* ***(to) enter*** *the fitness studio, do (*dare) she?*

In (45) it was shown that the pattern *dare + to/bare* infinitive is associated with the lexical *dare* as it requires *do*-support not only in negative (45a) and interrogative (45b) structures, but also in question tags as in (45c) and other elliptical constructions. Modal auxiliary verbs never occur with the supportive *do* in the same clause, so all the *dare* in (45) are lexical.

In brief, although Quirk et al. (1985) claim that a clear line between the modal and lexical verbs *dare* does not exist, Veselovská (2001) proves this view wrong. On the basis of her corpus research we have shown the distinctive features of modal and lexical verbs *dare.* All things considered, we have learned that modal *dare* occurs solely in non-affirmative contexts together with a *bare* infinitival complement while lexical *dare* is employed with *bare* infinitival as well as with *to*-infinitival complement irrespective of the context as in (46).

(46) (a) *The soldier daren't (*to)* ***say*** *anything, dare he?*

(b) *The soldier <u>doesn't dare</u> (to) **say** anything, <u>does</u> he?*

In sum, the modal *dare* which can be seen in (46a) has its proper negative counterpart (39a), forms the interrogative structures by inversion with subject, appears in elliptical constructions (39c) and takes a *bare* infinitival complement. The lexical *dare* in (46b) has none of the mentioned NICE properties from the Table 5.4 in (39) and subcategorizes either for a *bare* infinitival or for a *to*-infinitival complement.

5.2.2.2 Need

First of all, we need to remind that modal *need* which requires a *bare* infinitival complement occurs exclusively in non-affirmative contexts. Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 111) even claim that the lexical *need* occurs predominantly in affirmative contexts, so according to them their distribution should be almost complementary.

Huddleston & Pullum state that the distribution of *need* is much straighter than the distribution of *dare*, nevertheless, they admit that the lexical *need* can occasionally appear complemented with a *bare* infinitive. In addition, Quirk et al. add that the lexical *need* with the *–s* inflection forms blend constructions with *bare* infinitives most frequently which they illustrate with the example in (47).

(47) *One <u>needs</u> only **reflect** for a second.*

Quirk et al. claim that even though the lexical verb *need*—which we detect in (47) for its 3rd person singular *–s* inflection—takes prototypically *to*-infinitival complement, it can possibly take a *bare* infinitival complement, too, as in (47) where we can clearly decide that the superordinate verb *need* is a lexical verb, not a modal.

On the other side, as we found in the BNC, *need* does not appear complemented with a *bare* infinitive when accompanied by the supportive *do* but only with a *to*-infinitive as in (48).

(48) (a) *I <u>don't need</u> *eat/**to eat** breakfast.*
(b) *<u>Do</u> I <u>need</u> ***eat/to eat** breakfast?*

The lexical *need* in (48) cannot take *bare* infinitival complements in all the relevant constructions as the lexical *dare* does as in (45) and does not occur in constructions with *do*-support at all.

In conclusion, the modal *need* is virtually restricted to non-affirmative contexts together with the *bare* infinitival complementation while the lexical *need* occurs mainly in affirmative contexts complemented by a *to*-infinitival complement, even though it can appear with *bare* infinitival complement as well, but if the supportive *do* is present.

6 MODAL IDIOMS

Quirk et al. (1985, 141) describe modal idioms as multi-word verbal constructions that have an auxiliary verb[35] as their first member, have no non-finite forms and are complemented with an infinitive,[36] and classify *had better, would rather, have got (to), be (to)* and some other verb constructions of very little use in this verb group. Apart from these, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1227) also mention an idiomatic *can but* and verb compounds with the subordinator *to*[37] integrated into the lexical base―*wanna, gotta, gonna,* etc.―as members of this group.

The denomination of the constructions—modal idioms—proceeds from the first present auxiliary verb which is a modal auxiliary verb that behaves with respect to the properties of modal verbs discussed in (31) and (32). It is therefore not the whole construction which is modal, but only the first auxiliary verb. In addition, because the structures in question are distributed as whole complexes that also have specific semantic and not always transparent interpretations, we have decided to follow the term and call them modal idioms as well.

Presently we will pay attention to modal idioms which require *bare* infinitival complementation. These are *had better, would rather* and *can but.* We will also discuss the verb compounds with the subordinator *to* integrated into the lexical base.

6.1 Had better/best

Had better/best is a modal idiom which includes the auxiliary *had*, has only primary forms and is always followed by a *bare* infinitive (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 113). Contrary to all expectations, this *had* has a present meaning which, according to Huddleston & Pullum, makes the connection with the non-idiomatic auxiliary *have* weak. Nevertheless, they do not explicitly claim that *had* should be considered an independent lexeme as it adds the *modal remoteness* meaning to the regular *have*. Apart from that, it has the same negative and reduced forms as the preterite of *have*: *hadn't* and *'d*. Moreover, the reduction can go so far as to the complete abandonment of *had* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 113). See the example (49) for the use and distribution of *had better/best*.

(49) (a) *I hadn't better/best ***to) stay** sober.*
(b) *I 'd/had better/best ***to) stay** sober.*
(c) *I _ better ***to) stay** sober.*

The examples in (49) show the distribution of the modal idiom *had better/best* followed by a *bare* infinitival but not by a *to*-infinitival complement. By comparison of the examples (49a) and (49b) we can observe that the complementation of the idiom

[35] Quirk et al. (1985, 141) use the term *operator* for what Huddleston & Pullum (2002) accepted the term *auxiliary*. More in Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 104) in the note 15.
[36] Neither Huddleston & Pullum (2002) nor Biber et al. (2007) provide any definition for *modal idioms*.
[37] The subordinator to is discussed in 2.3 Formal properties of bare infinitive, page 13.

stays identical regardless of the context, (49a) representing the non-affirmative and (49b) the affirmative context. (49c) demonstrates that even after the complete elimination of the auxiliary *had* the rest of the idiom remains intact.[38]

6.2 Would rather, would sooner, would as soon[39]

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1128) suggest the existence of three semantically identical modal idioms derived from modal auxiliary *would*: *would rather, would sooner* and *would as soon*. Also, they claim that these idioms act as semantic alternations of *would prefer*. The difference between the idiomatic and the semantically analogous *would prefer* constructions resides in their complementation. In (50a) it can be seen that the idiomatic constructions take *bare* infinitival complement while *would prefer* in (50b) takes *to*-infinitival complement.

(50) (a) *I would rather/sooner/as soon **(*to) stay** myself.*
(b) *I would prefer **Ø/to stay** myself.*

Apart from the *bare* infinitival complement, these idioms can be also complemented with finite clauses. The contrast is reflected in the example (51).

(51) (a) *He would rather/sooner/as soon **(*to) leave** now.*
(b) *I would rather/ sooner/as soon you **left** now.*

In the example (51) we can observe that *would rather, would sooner* and *would as soon* can complemented either with a *bare* infinitival complement as in (51a) or with a finite clause as in (51b).

In addition, both these constructions serve as "term comparisons" when together with *than* whose complement can be either whole as in (52) or partial (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1128).

(52) (a) *She would rather **(*to) open** the window than **(*to) open** the door.*
(b) *I would rather you **open** the window than that you **opened** the door.*

In (52) we can observe that after *than* comes exactly the same form of the complement as the one which follows the idiom when full: *bare* infinitival in (52a) and finite clause in (52b). The partial complementation would be *than the door* for (52a) as well as for (52b).[40]

To sum up, the modal idioms *would rather*, *would sooner* and *would as soon* opt for either a *bare* infinitival complement or finite clause complement. Both of these variants can occur also in complex structures with *than* as in (52) in which case *than* is

[38] (a) Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 113) mention that in non-standard speech (49c) can be even reanalysed as *better* being the auxiliary verb, as mainly in children speech it can be found in question tags: "*We better go in, bettern't we?*".
(b) Quirk et al. (1985, 141) supplement more about negation of *had better/best.*

[39] Other constructions with *rather* are discussed in 8.1 *Rather*, page 51.

[40] Quirk et al. (1985, 141) supplement more about the negation of *would rather/sooner/as soon*.

followed by a complement structurally identical to that taken directly by the modal idiom.

6.3 Can (help) but

Can help, can help but and *can but* are idiomatic constructions treated exclusively by Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1227, 1232). Important to say, all of these occur solely in non-affirmative contexts.

Moreover, *can help* and *can help but* are not to be confused with each other. Although identical in meaning, they differ in their complementation. See the example (53).

(53) (a) *I can't/*can help **thinking/ *to think/ *think** about what you told me about Jim.*
(b) *I can't/*can help but **eat/ *to think/ *thinking** ice cream even though it is unhealthy.*

The examples (53) illustrate the non-affirmative idioms *can help* and *can help but*. The asterisks with *can* in both (53a) and (53b) demonstrate the unacceptability of these idioms in affirmative contexts. More importantly, *can help* as can be seen in (53a) takes only gerund-participial complement and *can help but* (53b) only *bare* infinitival complement.

Can but just as *can help but* requires *bare* infinitival complement and is similarly limited solely to non-affirmative contexts. Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1227) explain that *but* in these constructions acquires a specific idiomatic meaning 'not', so the resultant *can(not) 'not'* or *can(not) help 'not'* are far easier to understand.[41] See the examples of this phenomenon in (54).

(54) (a) *The dinosaurs couldn't but (***to**) **become** extinct.*
(b) *Peter couldn't help but (***to**) **eat** the ice cream alone.*

In (54) we can observe the non-affirmative *can but* and *can help but* take *bare* infinitival complements. If we consider the idiomatic transcription of *but*, we can transcribe (54a) as *The dinosaurs couldn't not become extinct* or *The dinosaurs had to become extinct* and similarly (54b) as *Peter couldn't help not eating the ice cream alone.*

In conclusion, the modal idioms *can but* and *can help but* occur exclusively in non-affirmative contexts and require a *bare* infinitival complement. Besides, the modal idiom *can help but* have its semantically identical counterpart *can help* which, however, does not take *bare* infinitival but gerund-participial complement. The special thing about them is that the preposition of exception *but* acquires a specific idiomatic

[41] At the same time, the non-affirmative *can but* is not to be mistaken with *but* used in conditionals meaning 'only' as in *If we could but live forever* meaning *If only we could live forever* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1227).

meaning “not” in these constructions which helps with the interpretations of the idiomatic structures.

6.4 Verb compounds with incorporated subordinator *to*

Bare infinitival also follows constructions in which the subordinator *to* is morphologically incorporated to the head word it follows (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1616). These are typical for certain varieties of English, most importantly for AmE, and are considered informal. In (55) we can see all the morphological compounds in exemplary sentences together with their full equivalents.

(55) (a) *It’s gonna* ***rain***.
(a)’ *It’s going to* ***rain***.
(b) *I’ve gotta* ***buy*** *myself a present.*
(b)’ *I’ve got to* ***buy*** *myself a present.*
(c) *You hafta* ***bring*** *the candy.*
(c)’ *You have to* ***bring*** *the candy.*
(d) *You oughta* ***repair*** *the car.*
(d)’ *You ought to* ***repair*** *the car.*
(e) *He’s supposta* ***wear*** *a suit.*
(e)’ *He’s supposed to* ***wear*** *a suit.*
(f) *We usta* ***walk*** *for hours.*
(f)’ *We used to* ***walk*** *for hours.*
(g) *They wanna* ***stay*** *together.*
(g)’ *They want to* ***stay*** *together.*

These constructions are limited in use as there are only seven of them. Regarding the distribution, they can enter only into a simple catenative construction. In the *simple catenative construction* has the main verb directly followed by the subordinate verb, while in the *complex catenative construction* an intervening NP is inserted between the two. (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1194, 2000).

Since the subordinator *to* is already inside the compound so it is impossible to insert an NP between this compound and its *bare* infinitival complement. On the examples in (56) below we compare the distribution of a verb with usual *to*-infinitival complementation with the respective reduced structure.

(56) (a) *She* ***wants to marry*** *a girl.*
(a)’ *She* ***wanna marry*** *a girl.*
(b) *She* ***wants*** *me* ***to marry*** *a girl.*
(b)’ **She* ***wan*** *me* ***na marry*** *a girl.*
(c) **She* ***wants to*** *me* ***marry*** *a girl.*
(c)’ **She* ***wanna*** *me* ***marry*** *a girl.*

(56a) is completely coherent in both cases. In (56a) as well as in (56a’) the verbs entered into a simple catenative construction and no NP precedes the verbal complement. (56b) shows an analogous distribution of an inserted NP which directly follows the verb. The result is ungrammatical in (56b’) as we would have to separate the compound *wanna* in order to insert the NP before the subordinator *to*. In (56c) we can see another incorrect distribution of the inserted NP. It can never separate the subordinator *to* from the *to*-infinitival. That is why it is equally ungrammatical in (56c’).

Although the examples above show why it is ungrammatical to insert an NP between the compound and the complementing verb in declarative sentences, it still results incorrect to front the NP in interrogative sentences and leave the compound directly precede the verb as in (57).

(57) (a) *Who do you want _ to marry?* (a)' **Who do you wanna _ marry?*

Although the NP complement does not directly follow the respective verb in (57), it is still ungrammatical in case of the discussed compounds for the NP to be present as in (57a'), because even when the NP is preposed in the interrogative sentence, it returns to its usual position in the corresponding response and makes the construction ungrammatical anyway.

In conclusion, solely *bare* infinitival complements constructions in which the subordinator *to* is morphologically incorporated to the head word it follows, namely *gonna, gotta, hafta, oughta, supposta, usta* and *wanna.* The constructions are, nevertheless, limited in the distribution as they are employed solely in the simple catenative constructions. This means that no NP can be inserted between the compounds and the complementing structure.

7 LEXICAL VERBS

In this section we have gathered all the environments which Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985) and Biber et al. (2007) mention where *bare* infinitival construction complement lexical verbs. Therefore, we can observe that *bare* infinitival complementation is not only a matter of non-modal auxiliaries, modals or modal idioms—as suggested in (32c)—which all belong to the auxiliary class, but a matter of lexical verbs as well.

7.1 Verbs of sensory perception

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1236) classify the verbs *feel*, *hear*, *notice*, *observe*, *overhear*, *see*, *watch*, and *smell* as verbs of sensory perception and subsequently state that all of them except *smell* take *bare* infinitives as their second complement, the first being an NP. Quirk et al. (1985, 1205) advocate that this group of verbs which take *bare* infinitives be called *perceptual verbs of seeing and hearing*. Nevertheless, as *feel* does not fit this grouping, these are actually verbs of sensory perception of seeing and hearing + *feel* (further only "verbs of sensory perception") which belong to this verb category.

Nonetheless, these verbs can take other types of complements as well, largely with a change in the perception of the event. This change relates to gerund-participial complement, past-participial complement, *to*-infinitival complement, and finite clause complement, each of which contribute to different understanding of the event. Notwithstanding, not all these verbs can take all of these complements. The most flexible is probably the verb *see* on which these constructions are exemplified in (58) (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1236).

(58) (a) *I saw my brother **play** Tetris.*
(b) *I saw my brother **playing** Tetris.*
(c) *I saw my brother **defeated** in Tetris.*
(d) *I saw my brother **to play** Tetris.*
I *I saw that my brother **played** in Tetris.*

According to Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1236) the most striking distinction among the types of verb complementation of *see* divides the examples semantically in two halves. (58a-c) represent the primary sense of *see*, that is sensory perception, which require the presence of an experiencer and a stimulus. In contrast to it, (58d-e) demonstrate the secondary sense of *see*, "mental interference", so that it does not the count with the employment of sight but rather with the engagement of mental cognition (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1236-7).

The major distinction, however, is to be drawn between (58a) and (58b). The *bare* infinitival complement in (58a) delivers the information that the experiencer witnessed the entire event. On the other hand, the gerund-participle in (58b) expresses that the

experiencer perceived only a part of the event. Finally, the interpretation of (58c) towards the event reflects its result (Huddleston & Pullum 2002).

Considered the semantic delimitations of *bare* infinitives as complements of verbs of sensory perception, it is necessary to establish the syntactic restrictions of this matter, specifically the influence of passivization. First of all, *feel* and *watch* cannot passivize and *overhear* and *notice* only marginally (Quirk et al. 1985, 1205), so these are left aside here. More importantly, the rest of the verbs never appear followed by a *bare* infinitival complement when passivized as in (59a).

(59) (a) **The painting was seen* ***fall*** *to the ground.*
(b) *The painting was seen* ***to fall*** *to the ground.*

In this environment the prototypical substitute for the *bare* infinitival complement is the *to*-infinitival complement as seen in (59b). However, as mentioned above, the meaning transmitted by these two constructions is different and in consequence it results improbable that this pair could constitute the corresponding counterparts. See the example (60).

(60) (a) *I had seen Anna* ***cook****, so I decided to buy my own lunch instead.*
(b) *Anna had been seen* ***to cook****, so I decided to buy my own lunch instead.*

In (60a) we can see two main clauses, first of which obtains active *see* complemented by a *bare* infinitive. The entire sentence is fully meaningful, as after having witnessed the way of Anna's cooking the speaker decided not to eat it and rather buy his own lunch. The example (60b) shows two main clauses as well, but in the first clause *see* is passivized and followed by *to*-infinitive. Notwithstanding, the result sounds pragmatically unacceptable as only because the speaker noticed Anna's activity would not be the reason that could possibly lead him to buying his own lunch (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1237). Thus it can be concluded that (60a) does not have its passivized semantically identical counterpart, and so in this sense it can exist only in the active voice.

In conclusion, all of the verbs of sensory perception admit *bare* infinitival complements in active clauses if it is intended to deliver the information that the experiencer perceived the entire event. However, it is necessary to remind that not all the verbs of sensory perception mentioned in the introductory paragraph have the same syntactic behaviour as *see*. Although *feel* is practically the same, *hear* and *overhear* are feasible solely in active clauses. In addition, although the discussed clauses allow passivization with *to*-infinitival complement, the resulting structures are not semantically identical as the *bare* infinitival complement conveys the sensory perception meaning while *to*-infinitival complement communicate the perception by "mental interference".

7.2 Causatives: *have, let, make, help*

Huddleston & Pullum classify *have*, *let* and *make* as "causative verbs" (2002, 1244), Quirk et al. (1985, 1205) as "verbs of coercive meaning" and Biber et al. (2007, 708) together with the verb *help* as "verbs of facilitation and causation," which seems to fit best to all of them. Moreover, all these four verbs can take *bare* infinitival complement. For these common properties we will consider them in this section together.

7.2.1 Dynamic have

Dynamic have is one of the three variants of *have* Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 111) distinguish. As noticeable from the designation, this *have* is not static but covers rather dynamic processes and it is treated as a lexical verb with respect to the criteria listed in (31). Most frequently it takes past participial complement, however, *bare* infinitival is also possible. For examples see (61).

(61) (a) *My neighbour has his garden* ***mown*** *every week.*
(b) *My neighbour has his dog* ***bring*** *him newspapers every morning.*

The example (61a) represents the most common structure with *dynamic have*. It follows the model *have* + something + *done*. The example (61b) represents an exemplary structure with *dynamic have* subcategorized for a NP and a *bare*-infinitival complement, the model being: *have* + someone + *do* something.

Additionally, *have* is never passivized, and so appears only in active clauses as in (61) (Quirk et al. 1985, 1206).

(62) (a) **His garden was had* ***mown*** *every week.*
(b) **His dog was had* ***bring*** *him newspapers every morning.*

Dynamic have just as no other *have* never appears in the passive voice, so both (62a) and (62b) are ungrammatical, no matter what the complementation is.

Furthermore, Biber et al. (2007, 708) remark this construction of *have* is viewed more usual in AmE than in BrE, even though in both these dialects it is quite rare.

In summary, *dynamic have* is a lexical verb which appears with two types of verb complements: past participial being the more common and *bare* infinitival being the less common. When complemented by the past participial, it follows the model *have* + something + *done* and when complemented by *bare* infinitival, the model is *have* + someone + *do* something. Finally, *dynamic have* as well as no other *have* is never passivized.

7.2.2 Make

What is exceptional about *make* within this group is that it takes solely *bare* infinitival complement and no other at all in the active voice and only *to*-infinitival complement in the passive, which is a prototypical behaviour of verbs which subcategorize only for a *bare* infinitive in canonical active clauses. This is what all

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1244), Quirk et al. (1985, 1205) and Biber et al. (2007, 694) agree on. This behaviour we can observe in (63).

(63) (a) *A man should know how to make his girlfriend **feel** like a woman.*
(b) *These flowers are made **to survive** even in extreme conditions.*

The example (63a) shows how *make* performs in the active, i.e. it is followed by a *bare* infinitival complement. When in the passive as in (63b), *make* subcategorized for a *to*-infinitival complement.

Moreover, we can observe this behaviour even in idiomatic constructions with *make*. Quirk et al. (1985, 1168) give such examples as *make do with* or *make* + NP + *do*.

Altogether, *make* represents a prototypical verb which subcategorizes for a NP and a *bare* infinitival complement when active and for a NP and a *to*-infinitival complement when passive.

7.2.3 Let

Let is a very questionable lexical item in terms of its syntactic analysis. Both Huddleston & Pullum and Quirk et al. vary in their conceptions about this matter. Nevertheless, to begin with, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 924) as well as by Quirk et al (1985, 148) distinguish two different verbs *let* which not only differ in the distribution but also in the semantic interpretation. While the first *let* is a transitive verb whose meaning is analogous to "allow" and which can be employed in various types of sentences, the other *let* can have more syntactic and semantic interpretations and is restricted to so-called *let*-imperatives.[42] With this in mind, in the following paragraphs we will consider the two verbs separately.

The first *let* can be described as a main transitive verb and a semantic counterpart of "allow" or "permit". It can take a subject and is subcategorized for an object NP and a *bare* infinitival complement. Also, it is not restricted to any particular type of sentence. Examples can be seen in (64).

(64) (a) *Kate let him **eat** her portion of pie.*
(b) *Let your husband **go out** with his friends once a week!*

In (64) we have prototypical examples of the verb *let* with the sense of "allow" or "permit". We can observe that *let* takes NP and *bare* infinitival complement in both (64a) and (64b). An important contrast that needs to be considered is that the sentence in (64a) is declarative and in (64b) imperative. This property draws a difference between the already discussed *let* and the second *let* which occurs solely in imperative constructions.

The other *let*, as we have already mentioned, can have more syntactic and semantic interpretations and occurs only in *let*-imperative clauses—which stand in opposition to ordinary imperative clauses.[43] Our intention will be to present Quirk et

[42] *Let-imperatives* is a term used by Huddleston & Pullum (2002).
[43] *Let*-imperatives and ordinary imperatives are terms used by Huddleston & Pullum (2002).

al.'s and Huddleston & Pullum's differing views on this matter and try to determine whether there is a relation between the syntactic structure around the *let* meaning "allow" and the other *let* which is only employed in different types the *let*-imperative constructions.[44]

First, we will focus on Quirk et al.'s conception of *let*-imperative clauses. Quirk et al. (1985, 829) differentiate two types of *let*-imperatives: 1st person and 3rd person *let*-imperative. Quirk et al.'s justification for the denominations is that they reflect the grammatical person of subjects which follow *let* in the objective case. Accordingly, they state that 2nd person imperatives with *let* do not exist.

Quirk et al. (1985, 148) think of this *let* as of a *pragmatic particle of imperative or optative mood* and compare it with modal verbs which can possibly appear in a parallel construction to express a wish. The syntactic similarity of the constructions is seen in (65).

(65) (a) *Let the Earth/him/me avenge us.*
(b) *May your teachers appreciate your talent.*

Quirk et al. (1985, 148) claim that the underlined elements in (65) lost their original meaning and became further unanalysable *pragmatic particles*. Nevertheless, they admit that because of the pronouns which follow *let* in the objective case syntactically it is still a main transitive verb. According to this statement the example (65a) should be analysed as: *let* + NP in the objective case + *bare* infinitival complement.

By the same token, Quirk et al. (1985, 830) remark that the form *let's* cannot be analysed as a transitive verb with a NP in objective case, because of such uses as in (66).

(66) (a) *Let's **not** have the same opinion.*
(b) *Do**n't** let's trick the teachers.* <esp BrE>
(c) *Let's do**n't** use soap anymore.* <AmE>
(d) *Let's you/us create a new order.* <AmE>

Quirk et al. argue that because of the whole range of possible placements of negative elements in clauses containing *let's* (66a-c)—the example (66c) being the most salient for the negative element being situated just before the following main verb and after *let's*—it should be considered an unanalysable pragmatic particle and an imperative marker. As an additional evidence they suggest the structure (66d) in which we can observe that a NP in the objective the objective case follows the lexical item *let's*. For these reasons Quirk et al. suggest that *let's* be a mere pragmatic particle. However, under the influence of this interpretation they do not state anything about the form of the following main verb. The only example about which it is clear that the verb complement is *bare* infinitival is (66c) as the verb *use* complements a supportive-*do*.

[44] However, the focus will be drawn away from the overall semantic interpretations of the structures. See Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 924-37) or Quirk et al. (1985, 147-8 and 829-30) for more.

In comparison to Quirk et al., Huddleston & Pullum offer a more complex perspective on *let*-imperatives. To begin with, first we will outline the conceptual differences in the classification, and then discuss the matter in terms of syntactic analysis.

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 924-5) oppose Quirk et al.'s classification of *let*-imperatives and develop a new classification adjusted to their findings; they distinguish between *1st person inclusive* and *open let*-imperatives. This classification, same as Quirk et al.'s one, also departs from the NP that follows *let*, however, Huddleston & Pullum do not consider it the subject of *let*, but its object. In addition, they supply examples of the whole range of person-number variations including the *2nd person let*-imperatives for which they adapted the *open let*-imperatives type. Under those circumstances, Quirk et al.'s claim that there are no 2nd person imperatives with *let* results implausible.

When it comes to *1st person inclusive let*-imperatives, their exceptionality resides in that they never take subjects and the NP of 1st person plural in objective case can occur reduced to *'s*. Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 934) point out a divergence in their grammaticality and possible analyses in two further unspecified dialects—a more conservative Dialect 1 and a more informal Dialect 2. We can notice two model sentences and the distinction in the acceptability in these English dialects in Table 7.1 (67).

(67) **Acceptability of model *let*-imperative sentences in Dialect 1 and Dialect 2 according to Huddleston & Pullum (2002)**

	Dialect 1	Dialect 2
(a) *Let's prepare some dinner.*	✓	✓
(b) *Let's* ***you and I/me*** *eat the pie alone.*	*	✓

Table 7.1: Acceptability of model *let*-imperative sentences in Dialect 1 and Dialect 2 according to Huddleston & Pullum (2002)

In Table 7.1 (67) we can observe that while in Dialect 1 only one of the constructions (67a) is considered grammatical, in Dialect 2 both the constructions (67a) and (67b) are perfectly acceptable. The rationalization for this phenomenon is in their different syntactic analyses.

(67a) is a *1st person inclusive let*-imperative where *let* is a catenative verb followed by an object NP and *bare* infinitival complement. As a matter of fact, it is the only case where the *'s* is still parsed as *us*. In order to demonstrate the validity of this analysis, we shall examine it in the process of negation in (68).

(68) (a) ***Don't*** *let's follow the orders.*
(b) *Let's* ***not*** *follow the orders.*

We can observe that *let* in these circumstances requires *do*-support in case of clausal negation in (68a) which is a typical property of lexical verbs, or in case of partial negation the negative particle *not* is placed before the *bare* infinitival complement as in

(68b). Nevertheless, unlike in ordinary imperatives, the difference between (68a) and (68b) is perceived solely on the syntactic level as semantically they are equal. As a result, the (68) examples support the suggested analysis of (67a) and so form the evidence that *let* performs as a verb which requires non-finite complementation, in this case *bare* infinitival. In this aspect it is similar to the first *let* meaning "allow".

Yet for the example (67b) it is impossible to be analysed just as (67a), because, as Huddleston & Pullum remark, we could not replace *'s* in (67b) with *us*, but think of the unit *let's* as further indivisible marker of the *1st person inclusive let*-imperative construction, and of *you and I/me* as of a subject of the following verb. Nevertheless, Huddleston & Pullum do not examine the form of the verb in question, thus we will leave it without conclusion.

The other type of *let*-imperative clauses—*open let*-imperatives—employ other than 1st person plural objects. Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 936) state that there are only two differences which separates them from ordinary imperatives. The first is that they are not directive and do not address any of the speech act participants which means that they cannot take 2nd person subjects nor any question tags, and the second is that *open let*-imperatives, unlike ordinary imperatives, do not differentiate semantically between syntactically clausal and partial negation. Otherwise, they are structurally identical. In consequence, even in this structure the verb *let* takes a NP object and a *bare* infinitival complement. See (69).

(69) (a) *(You) Make the students **come** to the classroom. (will you?)*
(b) *(*You) Let the students **come** to the classroom. (*will you?)*

The example (69) demonstrates the syntactic similarity of ordinary imperative and *open let*-imperative structures. (69a) represents an ordinary 2nd person imperative with a subject and a question tag which can be optionally present, while (69b) illustrates an *open let-imperative* which according to Huddleston & Pullum does not allow 2nd person subjects nor any question tags at all. Otherwise, the syntactic structure of (69a) and (69b) is treated analogous having the form: Verb in a plain form of imperative mood + object NP + *bare* infinitival complement.

To sum up, although Quirk et al. and Huddleston & Pullum differ conceptually and present their syntactic analyses in an unlike manner mainly regarding the verb/particle/marker *let('s)*, we can conclude that they draw similar conclusions regarding the distribution of *bare* infinitives after the verb *let.* Firstly, a *bare* infinitive always follows *let* meaning "allow" or "permit". Secondly, in constructions with *let's* where *'s* can be still parsed as *us* and the employment of *bare* infinitival complement applies as well. Thirdly, we cannot determine whether the verb following *let's* is a *bare* infinitive in some of the negative constructions or if *let's* is no longer analysable as a verb with its object. Finally, *open let*-imperative constructions count with *bare*-infinitival complements as well.

7.2.4 Help

Although the verb *help* can be followed by a *bare* infinitival complement, the circumstances seem to be difficult to define. Both Quirk et al. (1985, 1205) and Biber et

al. (2007, 708) solely mention that *help* can take two types of verb complements—*bare* infinitival and *to*-infinitival, but none of them state how *help* followed by a *bare* infinitive differs from *help* followed by a *to*-infinitival complement, so there seems to be no difference in the distribution of the two complements.

In spite of that, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1244) try to explain the distinction between *bare* and *to*-infinitival complement of *help* acknowledging that virtually no clear boarder line can be drawn between the two. Still, they claim that it is semantics that matters, as in case of the *bare* infinitival complement a direct participation of the helper is required in the event for which the help is needed as in (70).

(70) (a) *They helped me **(to) prepare** the decoration by colouring the lanterns.*
(b)*They helped me **to prepare** the decoration by not interrupting me.*

In (70a) it is clear that the helpers participated in the activity for which the help was desired and so, according to Huddleston & Pullum, it is possible to use either *bare* or *to*-infinitive. On the other side, (70b) shows that the help was achieved by enabling the speaker to do it himself and thus, as Huddleston & Pullum claim, the only admissible complement is *to*-infinitival.

7.3 Go

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1225) remark that the lexical verb *go* can behave rather untypically for a lexical verb in that it can take a *bare* infinitival complement under certain grammatical conditions: In (71a) we can observe the verbs *go* and *get* coordinated by the coordinator *and* which represents the prototypical use of *go*. By comparing (71a) and (71b) we can see that this construction is not limited by tense. The example of our interest (72a), however, is an exceptional case of *go* complemented by a *bare* infinitival.

(71) (a) *Go and **get** me some coffee.*
(b) *I went and **got** him some coffee.*

(72) (a) *Go **get** me some coffee.*
(b) **I went **get** him some coffee.*

According to Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1225) for this structure to work it is necessary that *go* together with the following verb (e.g. get) be in a plain form,[45] which (72b) does not satisfy, so this construction is not applicable here and is ungrammatical.

7.4 Know (in BrE)

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1244) point out that even the verb *know* can be followed by a *bare* infinitival complement under certain circumstances, which means

[45] The relevant verb taxonomy is discussed in 2.1.2 Huddleston & Pullum's taxonomy of verbs, page 9.

only when in the perfect aspect and when the experiencer has more or less personal knowledge of the situation as in (73).

(73) (a) *I'd never known her* ***(to) be*** *hysteric.*
(b) *I know her* ***to stay/*stay*** *calm in every possible situation.*

As seen above, it is an option not an obligation to employ *bare* infinitive in (73a). Huddleston & Pullum claim that what allows the *bare* infinitive to appear in (73a) is exactly the perfective environment alongside the personal awareness of the situation. In contrast, the absence of the perfective aspect in (73b) results in the ungrammaticality of the sentence, no matter how semantically convenient it is.

Apart from this, Huddleston & Pullum state that this construction is possible solely in BrE, as in AmE the only possible complement is *to*-infinitival.

7.5 Find (in BrE)

Apart from *know* Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1244) mention there is another verb which can optionally take *bare* infinitival complement. The lexical verb *find*, however, has to carry the meaning of "see" or "notice" as in (74).

(74) *In library you can find a lot of people* ***(to) read*** *books they cannot borrow.*

The example (74) satisfies the criteria for *find* to be able to accept the *bare* infinitival complement. In this context it acquires the meaning "see" or "notice" and so both variants with *bare* or *to*-infinitive result grammatical.

Same as *know*, the authors state that the verb *find* with *bare* infinitival complement is possible only in BrE, but not in AmE.

7.6 Bid

Quirk et al. (1985, 1206) only marginally mention that the slightly archaic verb *bid* subcategorizes for a *bare* infinitival complement in the active and *to*-infinitival in the passive, therefore it constitutes another prototypical example of a verb with *bare* infinitival complementation. See the examples in (75).

(75) (a) *John bids/bade me (**to) **avoid** the patio.*
(b) *I was bidden* ***to avoid/ *avoid*** *the patio.*

The examples (75a) and (75b) demonstrate that the verb *bid* takes obligatorily *bare* infinitival complementation in the active (75a) and *to*-infinitival in the passive (75b). Therefore it follows a pattern typical for verbs which solely admit *bare* infinitival complement.

7.7 Idioms try and be sure

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1302) observe that the lexical predicates *try* and *be sure* can appear in a very special idiomatic construction when followed by '*and* + non-finite VP with verb in a plain form' as in (76).

(76) (a) *Try and **make** it count!*
(b) *Be sure and **make** it count!*

The uniqueness of this construction resides in that the prototypically coordinative *and* acts more like a subordinator here. In consequence, '*and* + non-finite VP with verb in a plain form' is treated as an unidentified non-finite complement.

As *and* is treated as a subordinator, the question is what kind of complement it takes. According to Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1225) it is a special kind of non-finite plain form complement which does not belong in any of the established ones.[46] At the same time they compare the subordinator *and* to the subordinator *to*, *and* being more informal. However, they do not supply any arguments for why it should not be considered an infinitival complement. Therefore, we will try to demonstrate the possibility of the VP complement to be *bare* infinitival.

First of all, we supply the properties of this idiomatic construction on the verb *try* as Huddleston & Pullum enumerate them in (77). The first thing necessary to mention is that although there are three examples marked with an asterisk in (77), they are not ungrammatical when analysed as standard. They are examples of coordination, so their purpose here is to help us with the definition of the discussed subordinative structure.

(77) (a) *I always try and **smile**.*
(b) **He always tries and **smiles**.*
(c) **I always try and I **smile**.*
(d) **I always try hard and **smile**.*

In (77a) we can notice the discussed construction with the two verbs in a plain form connected by the subordinator *and.* The example (77b) shows that the idiomatic *try* as well as the subordinate verb needs to be in a plain form, either primary (present except for 3rd person singular) or secondary. In consequence, as is demonstrated in (77c), the presence of a pronoun which would govern the subordinate verb is forbidden. Then, in (77d) we can see that the main verb *try* cannot take adjuncts unless it loses its idiomatic meaning at the same time.

Although all these rules apply to '*be sure* + *and* + non-finite VP with verb in a plain form' subordinative construction too, it is influenced by the constriction on inflection from (77a). Unlike *try*, *be* (*sure*) is bound only to the use of secondary plain form in this construction as it has an exceptional set of inflected present forms and does not possess the primary present plain form at all. For an example see (78).

[46] The elementary verb form classification is discussed here in section 2.1 *Formal characteristics of English verb*, page 8.

(78) (a) *Be sure and finish the assignment tonight.*
(b) **I **am** sure and finish the assignment tonight.*

The result of the constriction can be seen in (78). It shows that the '*be sure* + *and* + non-finite VP' subordinative construction is not applicable in present indicative (78b), but solely when the mood is imperative (78a). Furthermore, (78b) would be even a very improbable example of coordination.

Supposedly, it would be more practical to consider the subordinated verb's form *bare* infinitival introduced by the subordinator *and*. In our opinion, we could consider this structure to be comparable to the subordinator *rather than* which also require *bare* infinitival complement,[47] or to the construction '*do everything/nothing* + *but* + *bare* infinitive' where—as we can observe in the relevant section—the *bare* infinitival complement is triggered not only by the preposition of exception *but*, but also by the preceding VP in which no lexical modifications are allowed. For comparison see the examples in (79).

(79) (a) *I like to run rather than (not) **do** yoga.*
(b) *I do nothing/*pursue nothing/*do it but (*not) **eat** chocolate.*
(c) *I try and (not) **jump** to the pool.*
(d) *Be sure and (not) **turn** the light on.*

On the examples in (79) we wanted to demonstrate that '*try/be sure* + *and* + non-finite VP with verb in a plain form' has a structure similar to other constructions which require *bare* infinitival complementation.

On one side, we can observe that same in (79c) and (79d) as with *rather than* in (79a): the discussed constructions have the plain-form VP negated by the negative particle *not* tightly adjoined to it.

On the other side, what *try/be sure and* share with *do nothing but* in (79b) is that both the discussed structures are limited lexically as we could not change *do nothing* to *pursue nothing* or to *do it*. As a matter of fact, it is also the combination of limited lexical items which characterize the structures complemented by *bare* infinitives. Even if *and* has a unique interpretation here and is not employable as a subordinator in any other syntactic environment, it is worth considering the whole *try/be sure and* to be a specific structure which require non-finite plain-form complementation, specifically *bare* infinitival for no other established form-type would satisfy the criteria.

In essence, in order for the construction '*try/be sure* + *and* + non-finite VP with verb in a plain form' to be grammatical, it is necessary that the two verb elements be in a plain form. This means that *try* and *be sure* occur solely in the imperative mood and *try* also in the present indicative except for the 3rd person singular. As shown above, we chose to regard the "non-finite VP with verb in a plain form" as a *bare* infinitival VP, so on the basis of it the final pattern of the construction is: '*try/be sure* + *and* + *bare* infinitival complement'.

[47] *Rather than* + *bare* infinitive is discussed here in section 8.1 *Rather*, page 51.

7.8 Do everything/nothing + preposition of exception

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1263) suggest that a *bare* infinitival complement can be required in case when the main clause contains a specific lexically invariable verbal construction followed by a preposition of exception; the term they use is *matrix-licensed complement* and their examples are as follows:

(80) (a) *He does nothing but/save/except **waste** people's time.*
(b) *I couldn't help hut **notice** her embarrassment.*

As a matter of fact, Huddleston & Pullum claim that only two such constructions exist: *do nothing but/except* and non-affirmative *can help but* already discussed among modal idioms.[48] Notwithstanding, Quirk et al. (1985, 709), despite not covering this topic, use an example with *do everything + but/except* followed by a *bare* infinitive, too. Therefore *do nothing* and *do everything* are the constructions to discuss below.

To begin with, we will focus on *do nothing but/except* followed by a *bare* infinitival complement as Huddleston & Pullum see it. It is treated as a lexically fixed structure as can be seen in (81).

(81) (a) *He does nothing but/except **talk** about his work.*
(b) *He loves nothing but/except ***talk/talking** about his work.*
(c) **He does excellent barrel rolls but/except **talk** about his work.*

According to Huddleston & Pullum it is solely acceptable to use this expression as lexically invariable in order to take *bare* infinitival complement as in (81a), otherwise it becomes ungrammatical and it is necessary to provide a different kind of complement. The example (81b) shows the change of the superordinate verb which results in the unacceptability of the *bare* infinitive which has to be replaced by gerund-participle instead. In the example (81c) the first NP complement changed from *nothing* into *excellent barrel rolls*. In this case, the only possible complementation of the whole structure would be a finite clause.

Quirk et al. also confirm the existence of *do everything + but/except + bare* infinitival complement as in (82).

(82) *We did everything but/expect **worry** about the consequences.*

In addition, we have also searched for the construction *do anything but/except* in the BNC the results of which can be seen in Table 7.2 in (83).

[48] See section 6.3 Can (help) but, page 35.

(83) ***Do anything but/except + bare* infinitive searched in the BNC**

CONSTRUCTION	TOKENS
do anything but + bare infinitive	BNC: 36/40
do anything except + bare infinitive	BNC: 16/22

Table 7.2: *Do anything but/except + bare* infinitive searched in the BNC

In the BNC we have found that also the construction *do anything but/except* takes predominantly *bare* infinitival complement.

In summary, *do nothing/anything/everything + but/except* is a more or less fixed expression which takes a *bare* infinitival complement. In order to keep the *bare* infinitival complementation, none of its components can be substituted or modified.

8 OTHER ENVIRONMENTS

As we have discussed in the section about *bare* infinitives,[49] these constructions can appear not only as complements of a verb, as we have seen in large measure in the previous sections, but also in other environments. Here we will discuss *bare* infinitival construction as a predicate, subject, predicative complement and complement of a coordinator/subordinator *rather (than).*

8.1 Rather

There are four uses of *rather* that Huddleston & Pullum compile out of which three are connected with *bare* infinitives. Quirk et al. (1985, 1003-4) mention all of them as well.

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1128) explain that historically, *rather* comes from *rath*, with the original meaning "soon", and the inflectional comparative suffix *–er* which nowadays functions as a single morpheme. This is why apart from *would rather* there is also *would sooner* and *would as soon (as)* and similarly, as Quirk et al. remark, besides *rather than* we have *sooner than* as well.

In fact, in all these uses, which Huddleston & Pullum describe, *rather* appears with *than*, which itself indicates relation to comparative constructions. Moreover, with different syntactic environments it also adopts different semantic meaning. However, this will be further discussed in the corresponding paragraphs below.[50]

Both Huddleston & Pullum and Quirk et al. agree in all aspects on the second use of *rather* with tightly adjoined *than.* Here it behaves as a subordinator and acquires the meaning "in preference". In this construction *than* is obligatory and it cannot be complemented by any other complement but *bare* infinitival as shown in (84).

(84) (a) *Numerous teachers went on strike rather than (*to)* ***work*** *on Saturday.*
(b) *Rather than (*to)* ***work*** *on Saturday, enjoy your life as well.*
(c) **Numerous teachers rather went on strike than* ***work*** *on Saturday.*
(d) **Numerous teachers rather went on strike.*

The behaviour of *rather than* expressing preference can be seen in (84). In (84a) and (84b) we can see the possible positions towards the superordinate clause. It can either precede it or follow it. Nevertheless, the construction *rather than* cannot be separated as in (84c), nor can *than* be left out without any change in meaning as in (84d). Additionally, as can be observed in (84a) and (84b), only *bare* infinitival complement is acceptable.

[49] See section 2.3.2 Syntactic functions of bare infinitival VPs, page 15.
[50] The first use of rather in the modal idioms would rather, would sooner and would as soon we have discussed in section 6.2 Would rather, would sooner, would as soon, page 34. Therefore it will not be repeated here.

Huddleston & Pullum consider *rather than* in its third use a coordinator meaning "not, instead of" which functions as one unit. Generally speaking, it can be followed by various verb forms including past participles or finite VPs as in (85).

(85) (a) *She **whispers** rather than **speaks** loud.*
(b) **Rather than **speaks** loud, she **whispers**.*

In (85a) we can see two finite clauses coordinated by *rather than*. We can observe that the order of the clauses is fixed, so that unlike the earlier *rather than* meaning "in preference", this coordinator *rather than* cannot appear in the sentence-initial position (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1317), which explains the ungrammaticality of (85b).

Huddleston & Pullum claim that the employment of *bare* infinitive in this construction is conditioned by another *bare* infinitive on the opposite side of the *rather than* construction which is seen in the example (86).

Similar to (85a), the coordinated verbs in (86a) have the same form, in this case *bare* infinitival. Different from (85b), in this case it is feasible to swap the clauses and so get a grammatical sentence as in (86b).

(86) (a) *She would **die** of a broken heart rather than **bring** herself to reality.*
(b) *Rather than **bring** herself to reality, she would **die** of a broken heart.*

However, what happens is that the meaning changes as the *rather than* construction transforms from the coordinative "not, instead of" type into the subordinative "in preference" which obligatorily accepts only *bare* infinitival complements. In consequence, clauses coordinated in this construction can exchange its places only when the verbs coordinated are *bare* infinitives, although it results in change in meaning.

Apart from this, Quirk et al. (1985, 1003) also provide an example with *to*-infinitive in the main structure coordinated with *bare* infinitive after *rather than*.

(87) *She wanted **to live** rather than **(to) lag** behind.*

On the example (87) we can observe that it is not necessary for the correspondence between the coordinated verb forms to be there in such cases. Accordingly, *rather than* in sense "instead of, not" can be followed by a *bare* infinitive, even if the coordinated verb is *to*-infinitive.

In conclusion, we have discussed three different environments in which the construction *rather than* occurs together with *bare* infinitive. The first one with *would rather, would sooner* and *would as soon* has already been discussed separately,[51] the second one acquires the meaning "in preference" and takes solely *bare* infinitival complement, and the third one which expresses "instead of, not" is followed by *bare* infinitive only when the coordinated verb in the main structure is *to*-infinitive or *bare* infinitive as well.

[51] 6.2 Would rather, would sooner, would as soon, page 34.

8.2 Bare infinitive in interrogative clauses

Both Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 874) and Quirk et al. (1985, 820) mention only one interrogative construction in which *bare* infinitive has such a significant role that it operates as a whole VP in a main clause. Huddleston & Pullum remark that *bare* infinitive in this function is restricted predominantly to subjectless interrogative clauses introduced with *why*. Examples of the construction can be seen in (88).

(88) (a) *Why* ***eat*** *dairy products if they make you sick?*
(b) *Why* ***not try*** *foreign cuisine from time to time?*

We can observe that both the examples in (88) begin with *why* followed by a subjectless main verb in a *bare* infinitive form, (88a) representing a positive and (88b) a negative clause. As we have already mentioned, non-finite clauses do not need any auxiliary for the negation as in (88b).

These interrogatives interpret the attitude of the speaker and express that there is no reason for doing what is said. Exemplarily, Huddleston & Pullum compare these sentences to indirect directives: *I suggest that you not eat dairy products/try foreign cuisine* and treat them as semantically equal. In other words it is a good way of providing semantic alternatives to this construction.

The discussed construction disposes of its finite counterpart as well. However, the authorities hold different opinions on this matter. While Huddleston & Pullum claim that only the negative construction of this type can have its finite counterpart, Quirk et al. give examples only of the positive ones. Both are exemplified in (89).

(89) (a) *Why* ***not let*** *him ask you out?* (a)' *Why* ***don't you let*** *him ask you out?*
(b) *Why* ***discuss*** *it with her?* (b)' *Why* ***do you discuss*** *it with her?*

First we will dedicate our attention to the example (89a). Huddleston & Pullum advocate that only the negative construction of the discussed type (89a) possesses its finite counterpart (89a)', although the later can have another reading as well, which is asking for reasons. Quirk et al. makes the same distinction between the positive structures—(89b) being a directive while (89b)' either a directive or an inquiry—but they do not state whether it is possible to make this distinction with their negative counterparts as well.

Apart from this *why bare* infinitival interrogative construction, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 874) observe that this type of construction exists introduced by *how* as well, however, it is of marginal acceptability. An example can be seen in (90).

(90) *How* ***escape*** *from the responsibilities?*

It can be seen that the construction in (90) is syntactically identical to the interrogative construction with *why* discussed above. In contradistinction to it, the sentence in (90) is not a directive and Huddleston & Pullum suggest a different manner

of its possible transcription: *I suggest that there is no way in which one could escape from the responsibilities.*

We have searched for this interrogative construction *how + bare* infinitive in the BNC and in the COCA in order to see how often it is used. However, we found only one example of an analogous construction and semantic meaning in the COCA. See (91).

(91) *He just couldn't figure out how **do** it.* [COCA:1996:NEWS Atlanta]

We consider the example in (91) semantically analogous to the example in (90) as the speaker does not know how to solve the problem. Nevertheless, it is the only example from the COCA that we found, so we can confirm that this construction is very rare.

In conclusion, only one type of interrogative clause exists that employs a *bare* infinitival VP as its predicate. Most frequently, it is *why* which introduces these clauses. By merging Huddleston & Pullum and Quirk et al.'s views, all the discussed clauses can have their finite counterparts as well. Nonetheless, the interpretations of the later are ambiguous and largely depend on the context.

8.3 Pseudo-cleft sentences

Another environment in which *bare* infinitival constructions occur are *pseudo-cleft* sentences—or "reversible specifying *be* constructions" as Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1414-15) also denominate them—of which they differentiate two types: *basic* and *reversed*. What exactly a *pseudo-cleft* sentence is and how we distinguish the two types will be explained in the example (92).

(92) (a) *I draw* | ***a tree of life***.
(b) *What I draw was* ***a tree of life***.
(c) ***A tree of life*** *was what I draw.*

A cleft can be formed basically by splitting the clause in two parts: *I draw* and *a tree of life* (92a). The focus of this clause is the object: *a tree of life* which stays highlighted even in the pseudo-clefts. In a basic pseudo-cleft sentence it turns into an internal complement of the specifying verb *be* as in (92b) and in the reversed pseudo-cleft sentence it becomes a subject which can be seen in (92c). In both examples, (92b) and (92c), the remaining element *I draw* becomes part of a relative clause introduced by *what*.

Bare infinitive appears both as an internal complement and as a subject in pseudo-cleft sentences (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1254-1255). First of all we will focus on *bare* infinitival clauses in the subject position. Both Huddleston & Pullum and Quirk et al. (1985, 1067) mention this construction, nevertheless, as they admit, it is used only in an informal language and the *bare* infinitive is employed merely if the relative complement contains the verb *do*. The examples of the *bare* infinitival construction in the subject position can be seen in (93).

(93) (a) ***Try*** *to improve is what you can do.*
(b) ***Look*** *exhaustively beautiful is all you can do.*

What the examples in (93) have in common is that both of them contain pseudo-cleft sentences the subjects of which are formed by *bare* infinitival VPs and the internal complements of the specifying *be* are relative clauses having *do* as the main verb. In other words, the sentences in (93) comply with the conditions under which *bare* infinitives are allowed to occur in the function of subject.

The incorporation of the *bare* infinitival clause into the internal complement of a pseudo-cleft sentence is discussed by Huddleston & Pullum as well as by Quirk et al. (1985, 1388), too. Equally to the *bare* infinitive in the subject position, the relative clause which forms a part of the subject has to contain the verb *do*. In addition, these *bare* infinitival constructions can be *to*-infinitival as well. Examples of this construction can be observed in (94).

In (94) all the *bare* infinitival clauses have function of the internal complements of the specifying *be* construction. By the same token, all the *bare* infinitival clauses could be substituted by *to*-infinitival clauses as well. The subjects of these sentences are relative clauses which obligatory employ *do* as the main verb.

(94) (a) *All I did was (to)* ***step out*** *from the circle.*
(b) *What he's done is (to)* ***think*** *only for himself.*

However, the *bare* infinitival complement is not applicable in this construction if the verb *do* in the relative clause takes progressive aspect. In this case the gerund-participial complement is required as the *bare* infinitival complement would be ungrammatical (95) (Quirk et al. 1985, 1388).

(95) *What you are doing is* ***joining*** *(**__join__*) the army.*

In conclusion, *bare* infinitival clauses can be employed in pseudo-cleft sentences either as subjects—although considered informal—or as internal complements of the specifying *be* construction, every time when *do* is a main verb in the other part of the construction. The only case when the *bare* infinitival clause is not acceptable as the internal complement of the pseudo-cleft construction is when *do* has the progressive aspect.

9 CONCLUSION

We commenced the thesis with the proposition that the authoritative grammar manuals do not dedicate too much attention to the topic of *bare* infinitives and that their morpho-syntactic and mainly distributional characteristics is never found in one place. Also, no rules have been stated about the distribution of *bare* infinitives, although it is a well-known feature of modal auxiliary verbs that they prototypically subcategorize for this verb form.

The intention of the thesis was to define what *bare* infinitive is, situate it in the established verb classifications and describe it from morphological, lexical and mainly syntactic point of view in order to delimit its distributional behaviour with respect to other syntactic elements.

Then we focused on the distributional data provided by mainly by Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985) and Biber et al. (2007) in order to explore the different environments in which *bare* infinitives occur.

9.1 Verb

First of all, we summarized and contrasted the basic taxonomies of English verbs by Quirk et al. (1985)—whose terminology of the matter corresponds in a great part with that used by Leech and Svartvik (2003), and Biber et al. (2007)—and Huddleston & Pullum (2002) in order to define *bare* infinitive within the classificatory frame of English verb forms.[52]

Then, we discussed the role of finiteness on the distribution of *bare* infinitival constructions and delimited their distribution more in detail in order to differentiate them from subjunctive and imperative constructions.[53]

Further, we focused on the *bare* infinitive itself and described it from various perspectives. We considered the syntactic characteristics of *bare* infinitival construction through differentiation from the *to*-infinitival construction, its possible syntactic functions, the role of passivization on its distribution, lexical selection and restrictions on the *bare* infinitive form.[54]

Even though we have decided to use Huddleston & Pullum's (2002) terminology and concepts throughout the thesis, we have additionally adapted the terms *finite/non-finite form* and *infinitive (form)* which are commonly used by Quirk et al. (1985), Leech and Svartvik (2003) and Biber et al. (2007) so that we could refer easily to particular forms, not only to whole phrases or constructions.

Focusing on *bare* infinitives, we have concluded that *bare* infinitive is a verb in a plain form which is employed in a *bare* infinitival construction. *Bare* infinitival constructions are the only non-finite VPs or clauses which have as a head a verb in a plain form, the remaining imperative and subjunctive constructions being finite. In (21)

[52] The topic is discussed in *2.1 Formal characteristics of English verb*, page 8.
[53] The topic is discussed in *2.2 Finiteness*, page 12.
[54] The topic is discussed in *2.3 Formal properties of bare infinitive*, page 13.

we can observe the *bare* infinitival construction within a larger framework of the remaining forms and finiteness with the relative terms in bold.

(96) Inflectional forms of English verbs in terms of finiteness

FINITE	PRIMARY FORMS	
	PLAIN FORM	IMPERATIVE CONSTRUCTION
		SUBJUNCTIVE CONSTRUCTION
NON-FINITE	**PLAIN FORM**	*TO*-INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION
		***BARE* INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION**
	GERUND-PARTICIPLE	
	PAST PARTICIPLE	

Table 9.1: Inflectional forms of English verbs in terms of finiteness[55]

What *bare* infinitival and *to*-infinitival constructions have in common is that they do not need the supportive *do* for the negation, they are preferably parts of larger constructions and they more likely occur without a subject, but when the subject is present, it is either in the accusative or in a plain form. Equally important, *bare* infinitival constructions are differentiated from *to*-infinitival constructions by not having the subordinators *to* and *for* as in (22).

(97) (a) *It is necessary **for** her/Janet not **to** run faster.*
(b) *Rather than (*for) him/Paul not (*to) be caught, I would go to the jail myself.*

Although *to*-infinitival constructions occur in a larger number of structures, the distribution of *bare* infinitival constructions is not as limited as could be expected. It can carry out various syntactic functions as we can see in (23). Namely it is subject (23a), subject complement (23b), verb complement (23c), object complement (23d), complement of a preposition (23e) and even predicate (23f).

(98) (a) ***Be** diligent was all I did.*
(b) *What people do is **arouse** fear in others.*
(c) *Animals can **feel**, too.*
(d) *The teacher let the student **share** his birthday cake during the lesson.*
(e) *John does nothing but **spend** all his time in the gym.*
(f) *John **be** irresponsible! That's impossible.*

Further, we have found out that the *bare* infinitival construction is in most cases restricted to the active voice, while in the passive the *to*-infinitival is employed. This is illustrated by the construction *make* + NP + *bare* infinitive which always takes *bare* infinitival complement in the active and *to*-infinitival in the passive as in (24).

[55] Table 9.1 is more closely described and explained in sections *2.1.2 Huddleston & Pullum's taxonomy of verbs*, page 9 and *2.2 Finiteness*, page 12.

(99) (a) *Richard made his friend **take up** crossfit.*
(b) *Will was made **to take up** yoga.*

Finally, the lexical selection for the *bare* infinitive form is also restricted as can be seen in (25), as modal verbs and non-modal *do* do not possess *bare* infinitive form as we can observe in (25a) and (25b). Therefore this structure is reserved for lexical verbs (25c) and non-modal *be* and *have* which play a significant role in the expression of aspect and in the case of *be* also voice as can be observed in (25d), (25e) and (25f).

(100) (a) **I must **can** do the homework.*
(b) **I may **do not** go to school.*
(c) *I heard the dog **bark**.*
(d) *I could **have** been there.*
I *I should **be** going.*
(f) *She might **be** tired.*

To sum up, so far we have described in detail the concept of *bare* infinitive which we will expand in the following section with the collected data about its syntactic distribution and the environments where it can occur.

9.2 Distribution of *bare* infinitives

As in the first half of this thesis we characterized the *bare* infinitival construction as a whole morphologically, lexically and syntactically, in the second half of this thesis we wanted to demonstrate the specific environments in which the *bare* infinitival construction occurs with respect to other syntactic members.

First, we focused on the most prototypical environment in the distribution of *bare* infinitives: complement of auxiliary verbs. Apart from the non-modal auxiliary *do* in (101a), which requires exclusively *bare* infinitival complement, this kind of complement is tightly connected with the presence of modal auxiliaries.

(101) (a) *Did I **meet** John?*
(b) *Boys can **run** faster than girls.*
(c) *Jeremy daren't/didn't dare **be** stronger.*
(d) *I 'd/had better/best **stay** sober.*

We can observe it in that all central modal auxiliaries (i.e. *can, could, may, might, shall, should, will/'ll, would/'d* and *must*) as in (101b) admit solely the *bare* infinitival complement and marginal modals (i.e. *dare, need, ought)* (101c) together with some modal idioms (*had better/best, would rather/sooner/as soon, can but, can help but* and *gotta, wanna, etc.*) in (101d) take it too, even though under restricted conditions as discussed in the corresponding sections.[56]

[56] The topic is discussed in *4 Do-support*, page 21, *5 Modal auxiliary verbs*, page 24 *a 6 Modal idioms*, page 33.

However, the *bare* infinitival complement is not merely a matter of auxiliary verbs' complementation. All Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985) and Biber et al. (2007) mention that also lexical verbs subcategorize for a *bare* infinitival VP, although predominantly under somehow restricted circumstances, both syntactically and semantically.[57]

Verbs like *make* and *bid* subcategorize exclusively for a *bare* infinitive in the active voice (Quirk et al 1985, 1205-6).[58] Other verbs we included in this section either require *bare* infinitival complementation only in specific situations—e.g. the discussed verbs of sensory perception take the *bare* infinitive as their complement only if the experiencer perceived the whole event (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1206)—or have it as an alternative for another kind of complement—*help* subcategorizes almost interchangeably for either a *bare* infinitive or for a *to*-infinitive (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1244).

In addition, *bare* infinitival construction does not occur merely as a complement of verbs. It can also appear as a complement of a coordinative/subordinative construction *rather (than)*, as a predicate in interrogative clauses most frequently beginning with *why* or as a subject or a predicative complement in pseudo-cleft sentences.[59]

As we might have observed, the distribution of *bare* infinitival construction is quite varied and is not restricted to a single position or a single sentence function. Although it is most frequently a complement of quite a varied number of verbs, it can be also employed as subject, complete predicate or various types of complements.

All the environments with the *bare* infinitival construction we compiled in the thesis can be observed in Table 9.2 in (102).

[57] The topic is more closely discussed in *7 Lexical verbs*, page 38.

58 As a matter of fact, only a small number a verbs take bare infinitival complementation when the superordinate verb is in the passive construction as discussed *in 2.3.3 Role of passivization in bare infinitival constructions*, page 15.

[59] The topic is discussed in *8 Other environments*, page 51.

Environment	Specification of the environemnt	Lexical items present	Example	Conditions for employment of the *bare* infinitival structure in the active mood
c	*Do*-support	*do*	*I did not* ***(*to) meet*** *John.*	only *bare* inf complement
	Central modal verbs	*can , could , may , might , shall , should , will /'ll , would /'d , must*	*The sun will* ***(* to) rise*** *soon.*	only *bare* inf complement
	Marginal modal verbs	*dare , need , ought*	*I daren't / needn't* ***(*to) cook*** *myself.* *I dare / need not* ***(to) cook*** *myself.* *I ought not / n't* ***(to) cook*** *myself.*	modal *dare* - only *bare* inf complement lexical *dare* - either *to*- or *bare* inf complement modal *need* - only *bare* inf complement lexical *need* - only *to*- inf complement modal *ought* - either *to*- or *bare* inf complement lexical *ought* - only *to*- inf complement
Modal idioms		*had better/best*	*I 'd / had better / best* ***(*to) stay*** *sober.*	only *bare* inf complement
		would rather/ sooner/ as soon as	*I would rather / sooner / as soon* ***(*to) stay*** *myself.*	*bare* inf or finite clause complement
		can but	*The dinosaurs can't but* ***(* to)*** ***become*** *extinct.*	only *bare* inf complement
		can help but	*Peter can't help but* ***(* to)*** ***eat*** *the ice cream alone.*	only *bare* inf complement
	Verb compounds	*gonna, gotta, hafta, oughta, supposta, usta, wanna*	*It's gonna / supposta* ***rain*** *.*	only *bare* inf complement
Lexical verbs	Verbs of sensory perception	*feel , hear , notice , observe , overhear , see , watch*	*I saw my brother* ***(to) play*** *Tetris.*	*bare* inf, *to* -inf, gerund participial, past participial or finite clause complement differentiated semantically
	Causatives	*have, let, make, help*	*My son has his dog* ***(*to) bring*** *him pencils.* *I let him* ***(*to) stay.*** *Let's* ***(*to) cook!*** *Kim makes me* ***(*to) smile.*** *They helped me* ***(to) prepare*** *lunch.*	*have* - only in the construction *have* + someone + *do* something *let* "allow" - predominantly *bare* inf complement *let*- imperatives - only *bare* inf complement when *'s* is still analysable as *us* *make* - only *bare* inf complement *help* - *bare* and *to*- inf complement
	Idioms *try* and *be sure*	*try and, be sure and*	*Try / Be sure and* ***make*** *it count!*	only *bare* inf complement

Table 9.2: Compilation of the distributional environments of *bare* infinitives in English

	Construction *do everything/ anything/ nothing* + preposition of exception	*do everything/ anything/ nothing but/ except*	*He does nothing/ everything but **waste** people's time.* *He doesn't do anything but **waste** people's time.*	*bare* inf complement or gerund participial complement when *do* has the gerund participial form
	Other verbs	*go*, *know* (BrE), *find* (BrE), *bid*	*Go **(*to) get** me some tea.* *I'd never known her **(to) be** hysteric.* (BrE) *There you can find people **(to) read** books.* (BrE) *John bids me **(*to) avoid** the patio.*	*go* - only *bare* inf in this construction *know* -either *bare* or *to*-inf in this construction *find* - either *bare* or *to*-inf in this construction *bid* - only *bare* inf complement
Other environments	After *rather*	*rather + than*	1) *Teachers went on strike rather than **(*to) work** on Saturday.* 2) *She would die of a broken heart rather than **(*to) bring** herself to reality.* 3) *She wanted **to live** rather than **(to) lag** behind.*	depending on the construction either only *bare* inf, or *bare* or *to*-inf complement is employed in the mentioned examples BUT with *rather than* other verb forms or parts of speech can be coordinated or subordinated as well, e.g. *She wanted to be **pretty** rather than **clever.***
	Subject in pseudo-cleft sentences		***(*To) Try** to improve is what you can do.*	only *bare* inf VP
	Internal complement in pseudo-cleft sentences		*All I did was **(to) step out** from the circle.*	either *bare* or *to*-inf VP
	Predicate in interrogative clauses		*Why **eat** dairy products if they make you sick?*	only *bare* inf VP in the mentioned structure

10 RESUMÉ

Započali jsme tuto práci tvrzením, že autoritativní gramatické manuály nevěnují mnoho koncentrované pozornosti *holým* infinitivům, jejichž morfo-syntaktická charakteristika a syntaktická distribuce nejsou v žádné z nich shrnuty na jednom místě. Kromě toho nebyla stanovena pravidla, která by výskyt *holých* infinitivů vymezovala, ačkoli je známým faktem, že např. modální slovesa vyžadují komplement pouze ve formě *holého* infinitivu.

Záměrem této práce bylo *holý* infinitiv definovat jako koncept, situovat jej v rámci zaběhlých slovesných členění a charakterizovat jej z pohledu morfologického, lexikálního, ale hlavně syntaktického, a tak vymezit jeho distribuční chování ve vztahu k ostatním syntaktickým elementům.

Následně jsme se snažili shrnout veškerá data ohledně syntaktické distribuce *holých* infinitivů z gramatik autorů Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985) a Biber et al. (2007), abychom mohli postihnout, v jakých syntaktických prostředích se tato slovesná forma vyskytuje.

10.1 Sloveso

Nejdříve jsme shrnuli a porovnali základní taxonomie anglických sloves autorů Quirk et al. (1985)—jejichž terminologie odpovídá ve velké míře terminologii používanou autory Leech and Svartvik (2003) a Biber et al. (2007)—a autorů Huddleston & Pullum (2002), abychom definovali *holý* infinitiv v mezích formálního klasifikačního rámce anglických sloves.[60]

Následně jsme probírali roli finitnosti v distribuci konstrukcí s *holým* infinitivem a popsali tyto konstrukce detailněji tak, abychom je mohli odlišit od konstrukcí s konjunktivy a imperativy, které jsou stejně jako konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem nefinitní.[61]

Poté jsme charakterizovali *holý* infinitiv z vícero perspektiv. Vzali jsme v potaz syntaktické vlastnosti konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem prostřednictvím jejího odlišení od konstrukce s *to* infinitivem, vytyčením jejích možných větných funkcí, prozkoumáním vlivu pasivizace na její výskyt a stanovením lexikálních a jiných omezení pro tuto slovesnou formu.[62]

I když jsme se rozhodli používat terminologii, kterou používají autoři Huddleston & Pullum (2002), dodatečně jsme také přidali termíny *(ne)finitní tvar* a *infinitiv* (jako tvar slovesa), které obyčejně používají Quirk et al. (1985), Leech and Svartvik (2003) a Biber et al. (2007), abychom mohli jednoduše odkazovat k jednotlivým tvarům a ne pouze k frázím a jiným konstrukcím.

Holý infinitiv je tedy sloveso v jednoduchém tvaru (*plain form*), které se uplatňuje v konstrukci s *holým* infinitivem (*bare infinitival construction*). Konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem je jediná nefinitní VP (*verb phrase*), která má jako hlavní element (*head*)

[60] Více v sekci *2.1 Formal characteristics of English verb*, strana 8.
[61] Více v sekci *2.2 Finiteness*, strana 12.
[62] Více v sekci *2.3 Formal properties of bare infinitive*, strana 13.

sloveso v jednoduchém tvaru; konstrukce s imperativem a konjunktivem, kde se tento tvar také uplatňuje, jsou výhradně finitní. Na příkladu (103) můžeme vidět konstrukci s *holým* infinitivem znázorněnou tučně spolu s ostatními slovesnými tvary a jejich finitností.

(103) Flektivní tvary anglických sloves a jejich finitnost

FINITE	PRIMARY FORMS	
	PLAIN FORM	IMPERATIVE CONSTRUCTION
		SUBJUNCTIVE CONSTRUCTION
NON-FINITE	**PLAIN FORM**	*TO*-INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION
		***BARE* INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION**
	GERUND-PARTICIPLE	
	PAST PARTICIPLE	

Table 10.1: Flektivní tvary anglických sloves a jejich finitnost[63]

Konstrukce s *holým* a *to* infinitivem mají společné to, že nepotřebují pomocné sloveso *do* ke své negaci, jsou nejčastěji součástí větších syntaktických struktur a většinou nemají podmět, ale jestliže podmět mají, ten je pak buď v akuzativu nebo není vyskloňován vůbec (je v *plain form*). Stejně důležité je, že konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem se liší od konstrukcí s *to* infinitive tím, že se na jejich počátku nevyskytují částice *to* a *for* jako v příkladu (104).

(104) (a) *It is necessary **for** her/Janet not **to** run faster.*
(b) *Rather than (*for) him/Paul not (*to) be caught, I would go to the jail myself.*

Ačkoli jsou konstrukce s *to* infinitive častější, konstrukce s *holými* infinitivem nejsou tak zřídkavé, jak by se mohlo čekat. Ve větě můžou zastávat různé funkce jako v (105). Jmenovitě je to např. podmět (105a), doplněk (podmětu)/ *subject complement* (105b), komplement slovesa/ *verb complement* (105c), doplněk (předmětu)/ *object complement* (105d), předmět po předložce/ *complement of a preposition* (105e) a dokonce i hlavní element (*head*) přísudku (105f).

(105) (a) ***Be** diligent was all I did.*
(b) *What people do is **arouse** fear in others.*
(c) *Animals can **feel**, too.*
(d) *The teacher let the student **share** his birthday cake during the lesson.*
(e) *John does nothing but **spend** all his time in the gym.*
(f) *John **be** irresponsible! That's impossible.*

Dále jsme zjistili, že konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem je ve většině případů omezena pouze na věty, kde je hlavní sloveso nadřazené konstrukci s *holým* infinitivem v činném slovesném rodě, přičemž jestliže je toto sloveso v rodě trpném, podřazená

[63] Tabulka a termíny v ní uvedené jsou podrobněji popsány v sekcích *2.1.2 Huddleston & Pullum's taxonomy of verbs* na straně 9 a *2.2 Finiteness* na straně 12. Tabulka nebyla přeložena se záměrem ponechání původní terminologie.

konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem se nahradí konstrukcí s *to* infinitivem. Toto je znázorněno na struktuře *make* + NP + *holý* infinitive, kde *make* v činném rode potřebuje jako slovesný doplněk *holý* infinitiv a v trpném rodě *to* infinitiv, jak můžete vidět na příkladu (106).

(106) (a) *Richard made his friend **take up** crossfit.*
(b) *Will was made **to take up** yoga.*

Nakonec, slovesa, která mohou figurovat v konstrukcích s *holým* infinitivem, jsou také omezená na lexikální rovině (107), jelikož modální slovesa a pomocné sloveso *do* netvoří *hole* infinitivy, jak můžeme vidět na příkladech (107a) a (107b). Tudíž konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem je limitována na lexikální slovesa (107c) a na pomocná slovesa *be* a *have*, které mají hlavní roli ve vyjádření vidu a v případě *be* také rodu, což můžeme vidět v (107d), (107e) a (107f).

(107) (a) **I must **can** do the homework.*
(b) **I may **do not** go to school.*
(c) *I heard the dog **bark**.*
(d) *I could **have** been there.*
(e) *I should **be** going.*
(f) *She might **be** tired.*

Abychom to shrnuli, prozatím jsme *holý* infinitiv detailně formálně charakterizovali, což v následující sekci rozšíříme o jeho syntaktickou distribuci a prostředí, ve kterých se vyskytuje a je uplatňován.

10.2 Výskyt *holých* infinitivů

Jelikož jsme v první častí této práce charakterizovali konstrukci s *holým* infinitivem jako celek morfologicky, lexikálně a syntakticky, v její druhé části jsme chtěli shrnout specifická syntaktická prostředí, ve kterých se tato struktura vyskytuje.

Prvně jsme se zaměřili na prostředí, které je pro *holý* infinitiv nejpříznačnější, tj. komplement modálních sloves. Kromě pomocného slovesa *do* v příkladu (108), po kterém může následovat pouze slovesná konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem, tento druh komplementu je úzce spojen s přítomností modálních sloves (108b-d).

(108) (a) *Did I **meet** John?*
(b) *Boys can **run** faster than girls.*
(c) *Jeremy daren't/didn't dare **be** stronger.*
(d) *I 'd/had better/best **stay** sober.*

To můžeme pozorovat na faktu, že všechna centrální modální slovesa (tj. *can, could, may, might, shall, should, will/'ll, would/'d* a *must*), jak můžeme vidět na příkladu (108b), vyžadují komplement ve tvaru konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem a marginální modální slovesa (tj. *dare, need, ought*) (108c) společně s některými

modálními idiomy (*had better/best, would rather/sooner/as soon, can but, can help but* a *gotta, wanna, atd.*) v (108d) jej vyžadují taktéž, i když za omezených podmínek, jak je detailně popsáno v příslušných sekcích této práce.[64]

Nicméně, komplement s *holým* infinitivem se netýká jen modálních a pomocných sloves. Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985) a Biber et al. (2007) se shodují, že i lexikální slovesa vyžadují tento typ komplementu, i když převážně za omezených okolností, ať syntaktických či sémantických.[65]

Slovesa jako *make* a *bid* v činném rodě vyžadují jako komplement konstrukci s *holým* infinitivem (Quirk et al 1985, 1205-6). Ostatní slovesa, o kterých jsme se v této sekci zmínili, vyžadují komplement s *holým* infinitive pouze v určitých situacích—např. slovesa smyslového vnímání následuje *holý* infinitiv pouze když byl nositel stavu schopen vnímat celou událost (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1206)—nebo jej mají jako alternativu pro jiný druh komplementu—sloveso *help* může následovat jak *holý* infinitiv, tak infinitive s *to* téměř beze změny významu (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1244).

Vedle toho, konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem se nevyskytuje pouze jako komplement slovesa, ale jako může se také vyskytovat jako komplement souřadící struktury *rather (than),* jako hlavní sloveso v přísudku tázacích vět nejčastěji začínajících příslovcí *why* nebo jako podmět nebo komplement slovesa *be* v tzv. *pseudo-cleft sentences.*[66]

Jak jsme mohli sledovat, výskyt konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem je značně rozmanitý a není limitován na jedinou syntaktickou pozici nebo funkci. Ačkoli tvoří v převážné části komplementy různých typů sloves, vyskytuje se i jako komplement jiných slovních druhů a v různých syntaktických funkcích.

Veškerá prostředí, ve kterých dominuje konstrukce s *holým* infinitivem a která jsme popsali v této práci, najdete shrnuta v Table 9.2 v příkladu (102) na straně 59.

[64] Více v sekcích *4 Do-support*, strana 21, *5 Modal auxiliary verbs*, strana 24 a *6 Modal idioms*, strana 33.
[65] Více v sekci *7 Lexical verbs*, strana 38.
[66] Více v sekci *8 Other environments*, strana 51.
Více o tzv. pseudo-cleft sentences najdete v sekci *8.3 Pseudo-cleft sentences*, strana 54.

11 ANOTACE

Jméno a příjmení:	Iva Honajzrová
Katedra:	Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
Vedoucí práce:	Doc. PhDr. Ludmila Veselovská, Ph.D.
Rok obhajoby:	2015

Název práce:	Distribution of bare infinitives in English
Název práce v češtině:	Výskyt holých infinitivů v angličtině

Klíčová slova: morfologie, syntax, slovesa, holé infinitivy, finitní slovesa, pomocná slovesa, modální slovesa, lexikální slovesa, rather, podmět, přísudek

Anotace: Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá lingvistickou charakteristikou holých infinitivních tvarů v angličtině. Definuje je z hlediska morfologie a odlišností od jiných morfologicky podobných konstrukcí, a vymezuje jejich syntaktickou distribuci v souvislosti s ostatními syntaktickými elementy. Hlavní část této práce se věnuje konkrétním výskytům holých infinitivů v anglickém jazyce a popisuje vlastnosti syntaktického (a sémantického) prostředí, ve kterém se tyto konstrukce objevují.

Klíčová slova v angličtině: morphology, syntax, verb, bare infinitive, finiteness, auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, lexical verbs, rather, subject, predicate

Anotace v angličtině: The thesis is concerned with the linguistic characteristics of bare infinitival forms in English. It defines them in terms of morphology and their formal differences from other morphologically similar constructions, and it delimits their syntactic distribution in relation to other syntactic elements. The main section of the thesis is concerned with the particular occurrences of bare infinitival constructions in English and describes the characteristic features of the syntactic (and semantic) environment in which these structures appear.

Rozsah práce:	145 040 (včetně mezer)
Jazyk práce:	angličtina

12 REFERENCES

Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 2007. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Veselovská, Ludmila. 2010. "Classification of the verb *dare* in Modern English. In *"Theories and Practice: Proceedings of the First International Conference of English and American studies: September 7-8, 2010, Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Czech Republic*, edited by Roman Trušník, Katarína Nemčoková and Gregory Jason Bell. Zlín: Univerzita Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně.

The British National Corpus, version 3 (BNC XML Edition). 2007. Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. URL: http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/