Abstract: The present paper explores the semantics of Hemingway’s ‘plain style’ in *The Sun Also Rises* by combining corpus linguistic methodology with event semantics theory. The focus of the study is on how the narrator of the novel segments experienced situations in terms of semantic events. Corpus linguistic analysis shows that the ‘plain style’ of the narrative section of the novel is realized by means of coordinated clauses and that the narrator’s event segmentation is associated with a small set of preferred lexical items. These results are interpreted in terms of event semantics to show that preferred lexical items are indicative of event types typical of the narrative section. The semantic analysis of relations between coordinated clauses indicates that these relations are not simply about the juxtaposition of disjoined events. Finally, the study demonstrates that an approach combining corpus linguistic methodology with insights from event semantics can offer new understanding of the propositional meaning of literary texts, and the way narrators encode experienced situations.
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1 Introduction

Hemingway’s style has often been described as “plain” (e.g. Berman 2003; Hays 2011) or “paratactic” (e.g. Baldwin 1993; Lanham 2003; Pavloska 2001). According to Lanham (2003: 29), “[p]erhaps the most consistent, philosophically reasoned paratactic style in our time has been written by Ernest Hemingway.” In Hemingway’s own words: “I sometimes think my style is suggestive rather than direct. The reader must often use his imagination or lose the most subtle part of my thought” (quoted in Wagner-Martin et al. 1987: 16). The main feature of this style is that
“It results in bare depiction of action and situation free from the writer’s sentiments, emotions, and comments. It helps in the dramatization of the narrative reducing summary to the barest minimum. Reader-participation is necessary here, for this method demonstrates, in a way, the classical concept of showing only the ‘elbows of action’ to intensify effect.” (Rao 2007: 66)

The key notions discussed here are the “bare depiction” of actions or situations and the active involvement of the reader. In addition, Levin (in Broer 2009: 88) argues that Hemingway’s use of factual language in narrative creates an impression of “immediacy” and “actualness”, while Benson (1990) talks about verisimilitude being “the effect Hemingway had been striving for, and achieving, since the early-twenties vignettes” (Benson 1990: 366).

These studies contribute to better understanding of Hemingway’s style by identifying its main features described in terms of literary stylistics. Their main shortcoming is that their claims are based on selective examples. In addition, they do not address the linguistic nature of those features. The purpose of the present paper is to address these two issues by applying a corpus linguistic method and exploring cognitive and semantic aspects of the features in question. The focus will be on *The Sun Also Rises* (henceforth *Sun*). In addition to providing a better support for the claims mentioned above, corpus methodology can also reveal some fine-grained patterns that have not been observed in previous studies.

I start from the assumption that the style of writing is indicative of thought style and knowledge. Thought style, introduced by Fleck (1935), refers to the selective perception and assimilation of perceived objects and events, as a result of which specific kinds of thought styles emerge. I regard here the notion of *knowledge* as part of semantics and I assume that this knowledge consists of two elements: semantic objects and events, and the relations between the two. In particular, I will assume that *Sun* is a collection of semantic objects, events and their relations, that reflect the cognitive style of the main narrator. The narrator’s knowledge is based on the event segmentation processes which will be discussed in more detail in the next section. I regard the narrator as one of the participants in the discursive world associated with semantic objects and events denoted by the language of the narrative. I adopt here a simple and, I believe, uncontroversial view on narrative as a sequence of events (e.g. Todorov 1972). The focus of the present study will be on the types of semantic events denoted in the narrative of *Sun*.

As will be illustrated in Section 4 (the systematic corpus-informed investigation), the cognitive and semantic aspects of a literary text are related. The empirical analysis demonstrates that there are certain lexical items and types of lexical item that occur with high frequency in the narrative part of *Sun*. Since the types of events are denoted by individual lexical items, it follows that certain types of event are
preferred to others. Finally, if we assume that cognitive style is grounded in semantic events it can be concluded that identified event structures are indicative of the narrator’s knowledge.

With the current study I would like to re-affirm the view advocated by Thorne (1981) that linguistic studies of literary texts should explore their structural properties. And can reveal the author’s preference for certain structures. Although I here follow Thorne’s argument I approach the problem from a different perspective: where his main concern was for syntactic structures, the current approach focuses on lexical and semantic structures.

I will begin by discussing the theory of event segmentation and semantic event structures in Section 2 and will then consider the semantics of conjunctive clauses in Section 3 because it is through such clauses that Hemingway’s style is realized. This will be demonstrated in Section 4, which is also concerned with the analysis of event types in Sun.

2 Event segmentation and event structures

Event segmentation is a cognitive process that involves boundary making between perceived phenomena. Zacks and Tversky (2001: 3) regard an event as “a segment of time at a given location that is perceived by an observer to have a beginning and an end”. This definition suggests that humans have the ability to establish a structure in what otherwise seems to be continuity, chaos, randomness and flux (Bar-Hillel and Wagenaar 1991; Zacks and Tversky 2001; Zhao, Hahn and Osherson 2014). Prior experience plays a decisive role here. The human perceptual system groups selectively observed segments into larger units and creates expectations of what can be observed in the future (Zacks et al. 2007). Previously perceived events are stored to memory. Perceptual processing is therefore biased and, over time, this bias becomes a source of perceptual stability. Occasionally, when situations are encountered that do not correspond to anything from prior experience, new event models (Zacks et al. 2007) are created to accommodate them. This accounts for the diversity of segmented events.

In psycholinguistics, various experimental methods have been used to study event segmentation by humans. Such methods are, for example, applied to the study of reading and they show how readers segment events in a text. For the purposes of the present paper, which is concerned with the semantics of a narrative text, the focus is on the narrator’s segmentation of events. Since the narrator of Sun is a fictional character, such an experimental method is not possible here. Instead, a semantic approach is proposed with the aim of understanding the event
structures. It is assumed that such structures reflect patterns of observations and event segmentation.

In event semantics, events are defined not only in terms of time but also in terms of space (Kim 1976). Events depicted in a narrative that uses factual language contain facts. Following Carnap (1966), facts can be regarded as singular statements about directly observed particular events. These singular statements contrast to universal statements that are used when we talk about abstract laws and generalizations, but also to the statements that involve writers’ opinions or attitudes towards observed fact. Some authors have proposed alternative views, however (e.g. Brand 1977; Davidson 1970; Montague 1969). Montague, for example, argues that we should distinguish between instantaneous generic events and instantaneous individual events. One example of a generic event would be the proposition *Rising of the sun* which denotes a daily recurrent moment which is a property of time when the sun rises. Individual events would be such that every single sunrise would be associated with different properties (e.g. personal experiences that we as individuals attach to them).

To understand the view advocated in the present paper let us first consider some examples from *Sun*. For all the examples given in pairs below it could be said that they denote particular events because the events occur at different times and locations [1a] and [1b], or because different participants are involved [2a], [2b], [3a] and [3b]. However, it is obvious for example that [1a] and [1b] are more similar to each other than [4a] and [4b]. It seems therefore that we cannot treat the events that contain the same expressions in the same way as those that contain different expressions. Following Goldman (1971), and slightly modifying his proposal, I will distinguish between particular events (in his terminology *act tokens*) and typed events (*act types* in his terminology). What linguistically distinguishes the latter from the former is that they contain certain expressions of the same type. [1]–[3] are sentences that exemplify those that share at least one expression of the same type.

1a. He opened his eyes and looked at me.
1b. He turned his head and looked at me.
2a. When I woke in the morning I went to the window and looked out.
2b. We sat and looked look out.
3a. The bed went sailing off and I sat up in bed and looked at the wall to make it stop.
3b. I laid them [fish] out, side by side, all their heads pointing the same way, and looked at them.
4a. He opened his eyes and looked at me.
4b. The driver put the car in gear and went down the street.
Typed events are familiar forms in event semantics. Parson (1990), for example, extended the original Davidson (1967a) logical representation of events by including thematic roles that can be regarded as typed forms. A comparison between Davidson’s and Parson’s representations of the sentence *Brutus stabs Caesar* is shown in [5] and [6] respectively.

5. \( \exists e \text{ stab}(e, \text{ Brutus, Caesar}) \)
6. \( \exists e \text{ stab}(e) & \text{Agent}(e, \text{ Brutus}) \& \text{Patient}(e, \text{ Caesar}) \)

As can be seen, in Parson’s proposal the participants are represented in terms of types and other elements are given at the ‘surface’ level. A typed representation can also be developed for other kinds of semantic entities, and since the verb phrase, time and location are key ingredients of event structures in the model that I propose here, these units will be represented as typed elements. As will be seen in Section 4.4, in the representation of verb types I will mainly rely on Levin’s (1993) categorization of verbs.

### 3 Conjuncts

As will be demonstrated in Section 4.1, Hemingway’s plain style is realized linguistically through coordinated clauses.

According to Culicover (1970, 1972) and Culicover and Jackendoff (1999), the semantics of relations between coordinated clauses are not as straightforward as one might expect. This is because there is no one-to-one mapping between syntax and semantics. Such clauses may, for example, be associated with both syntactic coordination and semantic subordination. Culicover (1970) demonstrates this with the following examples.

7. One more can of beer and I’m leaving.
   
   Readings:
   a. If you drink one more can of beer I’m leaving.
   b. After I drink one more can of beer I’m leaving.
   c. In spite of the fact that there is one more can of beer here, I’m leaving.

Culicover argues that the meaning of sentences is here determined by the conjunction *and*. He distinguishes between “consequential”, “sequential”, and “juxtapositional” readings. The elements which are involved in the interpretation of such sentences are (i) some kinds of events that involve a noun phrase (*John and Bill*), (ii) a sentence that describes an event (*John came in*) and (iii) a link between events (*and*).
In the present paper, I assume that each coordinated clause denotes one event, as illustrated in [8].

An analysis of relations between such clauses should offer insights into the narrator’s event segmentation.

8. We sat and drank it, and the girl looked sullen.
   Event 1 = We sat; Event 2 = drank it; Event 3 = the girl looked sullen

In line with Davidson (1967b), I will assume that the following logical form underlies the relations between temporal and consequential relations.

Temporal relations: There exist times $t$ and $t'$ such that a state of affair $A$ occurred at $t$, another state of affair $A'$ occurred at $t'$, and $t$ preceded $t'$.

Causal relations: There exist events $e$ and $e'$ such that $e$ is a state of affairs $A$, $e'$ is another state of affairs $A'$, and $e$ caused $e'$.

The juxtapositional relations do not involve any of the two types of relations. Thus, the two interpretations for [9] would be [10] and [11] respectively.

9. Jack fell down and (Jack) broke his crown.
   10. Temporal: Jack fell down before Jack broke his crown.
       Logical form: There exist times $t$ and $tt'$ such that Jack fell down at $t$, Jack broke his crown at $tt'$, and $t$ preceded $tt'$.
   11. Causal: Jack fell down, which caused it to be the case that Jack broke his crown.
       Logical form: There exist events $e$ and $e'$ such that $e$ is a falling down of Jack, $e'$ is a breaking of his crown by Jack, and $e$ caused $e'$.

Finally, following Peterson (1989), I will assume that such sentences with temporal and causal relations construe complex events. The sentences with juxtaposition relations will be treated as a sequence of simple events.

4 Empirical linguistic analysis of event structures in *Sun*

To investigate the patterns of event segmentation in the narrative section of *Sun*, it is necessary first to identify the relevant linguistic units and observe their

---

1 Not everyone agrees with such an interpretation but it will suffice for the purposes of the present study.
2 Since the term ‘causal relations’ is more often used in event semantics it will be adopted here.
distribution. The present approach employs corpus linguistic methodology. Such an approach, called corpus stylistics, has been used in the study of literary texts (e.g. Mahlberg 2013; Starcke 2006; Wynne 2012), the advantage being that it is more systematic. The approaches that choose only those examples that support the arguments of an analyst have been severely criticized in the literature (e.g. Fish 1973).

In section 4.1, I will first use corpus linguistics methodology to identify the distribution of different types of sentences in Sun. Since the focus of the present paper is on the narrator’s perception of situations, only the narrative (i.e. not dialogue) sections of the novel will be considered. I assume here that dialogue is not part of the world perceived by the narrator. For the sake of simplicity, I regard it as perceived and recorded communication. Although communication might be, and usually is, about observed situations, they are not necessarily experienced by the observer since they can be mediated through communication. In section 4.2, I will encode relevant sentences in terms of Levin’s taxonomy of verbs and will explore their distribution. In section 4.3, I will explore in more detail the event structures associated with one of the most frequent types of semantic events. Finally, in section 4.4 I will explore the three types of readings associated with coordinated sentences that occur in Sun.

4.1 Types of clauses and clause relations in Sun

Since, the focus of the present paper is on narrator’s event segmentation in the first step, I separated the narrative section from dialogue by means of a Python script. To explore how events segmentation is linguistically encoded I focused on the relationship between clauses. The relevant sections of the novel were first tagged with the parts-of-speech categories by means of TreeTagger (Schmid 1994) and then the distribution of coordinated and subordinated clauses was examined. Only the verbs that follow conjunctions were considered because this position indicates the beginning of a new clause. The TreeTagger tag set contains individual tags for co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions. Since subordinating conjunctions and prepositions are put into the same category in this tag set the former had been filtered out. In addition, the grammatical categories are available only for individual words, and since some conjunctions are multiword units (e.g. even if, as if) they were examined separately.

Figure 1 summarizes the distribution of the clauses in the narrative section of Sun per 1000 words in terms of the co-occurrence of individual conjunctions with finite verbs. As can be seen, the vast majority of clauses (73%) are coordinated clauses. The most frequent of all conjunctions is and, which amounts to 92% of all
**Figure 1**: Distribution of coordinated and subordinated clauses in SAR.
Figure 1: Continued.
occurrences of conjunctions. If we add to this figure the clauses that include asyndetic coordination (signalled by a comma) we arrive at the figure of 76%. It follows, therefore, that the narrator’s event segmentation is linguistically encoded mainly in terms of conjuncts.

4.2 Types of events in conjuncts

In the present section, the types of events encoded in and-conjuncts will be explored. First, the distribution of verb phrases that occur in these conjuncts is explored by means of corpus linguistic tools. Second, verbs identified are encoded in terms of Levin’s (1993) verb types by using the information from VerbNet (Kipper et al. 2006). Relevant categories are filtered out by means of a Python script and are then assigned to individual verbs. Space limitations prohibit detailed discussion of Levin’s taxonomy, which comprises 104 verb types. The interested reader is referred to Levin (1993) and Kipper et al. (2006). As will be seen below, the names of categories are in most cases self-explanatory.

Most of the sentences in the narrative section of Sun consist of two conjuncts (83%). On average there are 2.17 conjuncts per sentence. For an analysis concerned with the relations between events it is worth exploring the distribution of verbs across individual conjuncts. For example, of 133 distinct verbs occurring in the first conjunct there are only 27 that do not also occur in the subsequent conjunct. Similarly, of 125 verbs that occur in the second conjunct only 20 verbs do not occur in the first conjunct. If we further focus on the verbs that occur with higher frequency (e.g. those that occur at least 10 times) it can be observed that there 30 verbs that make up around 70% of all verbs in both conjuncts. These results indicate that the narrator employs a restricted set of lexical items to encode situations he observes in terms of events. It follows that some kind of repetition is involved in the narrator’s events segmentation. A closer inspection of this set indicates that some of the verbs are semantically related, indicating that events are encoded not only in terms of the re-used individual linguistic items but also in terms of certain types of linguistic items.

Before looking in detail at the distribution of types of verbs, we should also consider whether any important differences can be observed between events in which the narrator is involved and those in which he acts only as an observer. In other words, we should examine whether any potential differences can be observed in event segmentation between situations when the narrator serves as an agent and those when he is an observer. The number of verbs in the observed situations is slightly higher than in that of agent situations (ratio 1:1.3). A closer inspection of the first 100 most frequent verbs (they make up 84% of verbs
associated with the agent situations and 73% of those associated with the observer situations) reveals that around 90% of those verbs occur in both types of situations. It follows that no significant differences can be observed in event segmentation in the two types of situations.

After the verbs that occur in the narrative sections had been identified, the complete list was annotated with the VerbNet categories. VerbNet in most cases ascribes more than one category to a verb. For this reason, at the next stage the actual use of verbs in *Sun* was investigated and non-relevant categories were removed. This task cannot be carried out automatically, as the occurrence of each verb must be observed in its context. Since this is a time-consuming process, the focus was only on the first 30 most frequent verbs that occur in both aforementioned situations. These verbs can be regarded as representative because they amount for 69% of all verbs that occur in conjoined conjuncts. Finally, it should be pointed out that for two reasons it was not always possible to follow the original VerbNet taxonomy. First, certain senses of the verbs as they occur in *Sun* could not be matched with any of the available senses from the VerbNet taxonomy. Second, some of the categories used in VerbNet were not specific enough. In both cases, I included the categories from FrameNet (Baker et al. 1998), which is also based on thematic roles, to acquire a more accurate description.

The following graph summarizes the distribution of verb types that occur in the narrative part of *Sun*. Figure 2 indicate the number of verbs in each VerbNet category.

The frequently-occurring verbs in *Sun* are associated with 24 types. The categories with the highest number of items are Verbs of Motion, Verbs of Perception and Verbs of Force that contain seven, four and three items respectively. A closer look at the actual frequency of verbs shows that these three categories make up 71% of the studied verbs. What is even more surprising is that every second verb from the list of 30 most frequent verbs belongs to Verbs of Motion (e.g. *go, come, get into, get out, walk, turn around, turn away* and *leave*). Other types of verbs which are closely related to the idea of motion such as Verbs of Appearance, Disappearance, Verbs of Assuming a Position, Traversing and Aspectual Verbs, also occur frequently here. For example, *sit* and *start* which are assigned to the verb type Verbs of Assuming a Position involve also some kind of motion. These facts emphasize the role of motion and changing location in the narrator’s framing of events. It follows from this that the narrator’s events segmentation in carried out in terms of a few kinds of events and by means of a restricted number of lexical items.

It is not possible to calculate exactly the distribution of types of verbs per conjunct, but at least 23% and at most 50% of all sentences are encoded in terms of Motion events. The first figure here is based on every conjunct in a set of sentences containing a Motion verb, whereas the latter figure assumes that at least one
conjunct in the corpus contains a Motion verb. This is only an approximation, and an actual figure could only be obtained by analyzing all the sentences for event types, which is the beyond the scope of the present paper. However, these figures already indicate that in this novel, event segmentation considerably relies on Motion Verbs. At the next stage, the information obtained through the above analyses was used to represent typical features of the narrator’s event segmentation. Verbs are the key elements of events, and verb types with frequently-occurring verbs are considered indicators of recurrent events in the narrative. The following event structure represents in neo-Davidsonian formalist terms two events that frequently occur together in *Sun*.

\[ ∃e[\text{VERBS OF PUTTING(e) & SUBJECT(e, Agent) & OBJECT(e, Theme) & LOCATION(e,l) & TIME(e,t)}] \land ∃e[\text{VERBS OF MOTION(e) & SUBJECT(e, Agent) & OBJECT(e, Theme) & LOCATION(e,l')}]] \]

This structure indicates that there is a set of sentences that express events denoted by Verbs of Putting in the first conjunct and Verbs of Motion in the second. The thematic roles associated with subject and object positions are Agents and Themes, respectively. The structure indicates that second event mentioned occurs after the
first, and that the Agents change their location. Indexed subjects are used to signal that the same Agents are involved in both events. VerbNet does not distinguish between different types of Verbs of Putting. In the present case, these verbs might indicate putting clothes on or placing some objects. Here are three examples of the former sub-type with the verb ‘go’. They are realizations of the above event structure.

12. I put on a coat of Cohn’s and went out on the balcony.
13. I put on a dressing-gown and went to the door.
14. I put on a bathrobe and slippers and went to the door.

The advantage of such a representation is that it captures important semantic information about the sentences and narrative in general. Notice that the order of events and co-reference relations between subjects are important here. The above structure, for example, is ill-formed for the following examples. In [15], the event with Verbs of Motion precedes Verbs of Putting. In [16] the subjects of the first and the second event do not have the same referent.

15. I went over to the bed and put my arms around her.
16. Bill put the pack against one of the trees and we jointed up the rods...

A comprehensive description of the narrator’s event segmentation is beyond the scope of the present paper, but in the next section I will discuss this issue in more detail, focusing on the example of the verb ‘go’.

### 4.3 Event segmentation with Verbs of Motion

This part of the analysis is concerned with the co-occurrence of various types of verbs with the verb ‘go’, which is the most frequently occurring Verb of Motion. Firstly, all the sentences in which ‘go’ occurs in one of conjuncts were identified, then all the other verbs that occur with them in co-joined conjunct(s). Finally, using the same method as above, I classified those verbs with VerbNet categories and filtered out irrelevant senses. Figure 3 displays the distribution of the verb types that co-occur with ‘go’. Although as many as 18 different verb types are observed here, more than half of all verbs (54%) belong to the group of Motion verbs (e.g. ‘go’, ‘come’, ‘leave’, ‘get into’). In addition, the next two most frequently-occurring types are also associated with motion (Aspectual Verbs and Verbs of Assuming a Position).

It is worth discussing in some detail the semantics of the structure associated with ‘go’ in Sun. Both VerbNet and FrameNet treat the lexical items that occur in the specifier position as Themes. If ‘go’ co-occurs with a proposition it may be associated either with Trajectory [17–20] or Destination (21–22). The difference between
the two is that Destination only indicates the final location to which Theme was moved, whereas Trajectory is an area or region within which movement takes place. For example, over to in [17] indicates that there is a distance between the initial and the final positions. In contrast, no initial position is indicated by went to in [20]. Both these types were encoded as Direction. Although at the level of individual events the combination of verbs and prepositions may or may not explicitly denote location, a closer look at events reveals that location is actually indicated. Thus, in [21] the first event takes place along the path upstairs and the second in the room which are two distinct locations. The Time element is not usually signalled by adverbials in such sentences and is lexically invisible.

17. I went over to/TRAJECTORY the bed and put my arms around her.
18. They were not there, and I went over to/TRAJECTORY the Dingo.
19. The train stopped for half an hour at Bordeaux and we went out through/TRAJECTORY the station for a little walk.
20. I went out onto/TRAJECTORY the sidewalk and walked down toward…
21. I put on a dressing-gown and went to/DESTINATION the door.
22. I followed them up-stairs and went into/DESTINATION my room.
Here is the logical form of an event type associated with the verb go.

$$\exists e[go(e) \land SUBJECT_i(e, Theme) \land OBJECT(e, Destination) \land LOCATION(e,l) \land TIME(e,t)]$$

In words: There is an event $e$ such that $e$ was movement of Theme at a particular time into a Direction which has a specific location.

What would then be a logical representation of a sentence that consists of two conjuncts? Below is an example for the sentence that contains the verbs go and come [23].

23. Cohn came down, finally, and we all went out to the car.

$$\{\exists e[go(e) \land SUBJECT_i(e, Theme) \land OBJECT(e, Destination) \land LOCATION(e,l) \land TIME(e,t)]\} \land \{\exists e[come(e) \land SUBJECT_j(e, Theme) \land OBJECT(e, Destination) \land LOCATION(e,l') \land TIME(e,t')]\}$$

Curly brackets are used to separate the two conjuncts. Two different locations and times are indicated with the prime sign. Since the sentence involves two different subjects I also indicated co-reference relations. A typed representation of the above sentence that encodes go and come in terms of verb types is:

$$\{\exists e[Motion Verbs(e) \land SUBJECT_x(e, Theme) \land OBJECT(e, Direction) \land LOCATION(e,l) \land TIME(e,t)]\} \land \{\exists e[Motion Verbs(e') \land SUBJECT_x(e', Theme) \land OBJECT(e', Direction) \land LOCATION(e',l') \land TIME(e',t')]\}$$

In words: There is an event $e$ such that $e$ was movement of a Theme at a particular time into a Direction which has a specific location, and there is another event $e'$ such that $e'$ was a movement of a Theme at a particular time into a Direction which has a specific location.

Aspectual Verbs that co-occur in a conjunct with go include those that denote the beginning, such as go on, start [24], or the end of an event, such as stop [25], but VerbNet does not differentiate between the two sub-types. The two roles associated with the participants are Agents in the specifier position and Thema in the direct object position. Events associated with Aspectual Verbs involve both Location and Time elements and the same relation applies as above. Thus, in the two conjuncts from [24] we have the same location (the location where Bill went and where he played is the same) but different times. On the other hand, in [25] the locations and times in the two conjuncts are different.

24. … Bill went over and started to play.

25. The train stopped for half an hour at Bordeaux and we went out through the station for a little walk.
The following structure is the logical representation of the co-occurrence of go with Aspectual Verbs:

$$\{\exists e [\text{Motion Verbs (e)} \& \text{SUBJECT}_x(e, \text{Theme}) \& \text{OBJECT}(e, \text{Direction}) \& \text{LOCATION}(e, l) \& \text{TIME}(e, t)] \} \& \{\exists e' [\text{Aspectual Verbs}(e') \& \text{SUBJECT}_x(e', \text{Agent}) \& \text{OBJECT}(e', \text{Theme}) \& \text{LOCATION}(e', l') \& \text{TIME}(e', t')]\}$$

In words: There is an event $e$ such that $e$ was the movement of a Theme at a particular time into a Direction which has a specific location, and there is another event $e'$ such that $e'$ was the start or ending of a Theme by an Agent at particular time.

$sit$ and $stand$ are two Assuming a Position Verbs that co-occur with go. Participants in such events are Agents that occur in the subject position, and Location is realized as a complement, as in [26–28]:

26. Bill went up and Robert sat beside Bill …
27. Brett sat between Mike and me at the barrera, and Bill and Cohn went up above.
28. We went inside the station and stood with a crowd of people just back of the gates…

Here is the respective logical representation for these relations:

$$\{\exists e [\text{Motion Verbs (e)} \& \text{SUBJECT}_x(e, \text{Theme}) \& \text{OBJECT}(e, \text{Direction}) \& \text{LOCATION}(e, l) \& \text{TIME}(e, t)] \} \& \{\exists e' [\text{Verbs of Assuming a Position}(e') \& \text{SUBJECT}_x(e', \text{Agent}) \& \text{LOCATION}(e', l') \& \text{TIME}(e', t')]\}$$

In words: There is an event $e$ such that $e$ was movement of a Theme at a particular time into a Direction which has a specific location, and there is another event $e'$ such that $e'$ was the movement of an Agent to Location $l$ at a particular time.

4.4 Semantics of relations between conjoined conjuncts

The previous sections were concerned with the investigation of types of sentences and events associated with the narrative section of Sun. The present section explores the interpretation of relations between conjuncts. As was said in Section 3, three types of interpretations can be associated with relations between conjuncts: juxtaposition, temporal and causal interpretations.

For the juxtaposed relation I will assume the following: two conjoined conjuncts that denote events can stand by themselves and the order of events is irrelevant. It means that the events involved do not depend on each other and the semantic interpretation corresponds to the syntactic structure. The test I use here is to switch the order of events, and transform the sentences in terms of asyndetic coordination.
As for temporal relations, Culicover (1970) argues that here the second event takes place at a later point than the first one (t1 > t2). The test I use to identify temporal relations is whether they can be transformed into a sentence with a temporal adverbial such as in [29b], or whether *then* can be added to *and* as in [29c].

29a. The cab stopped in front of the hotel and we all got out...
29b. After the cab stopped in front of the hotel we all got out...
29c. The cab stopped in front of the hotel and then we all got out...

Causal relations between events seem to be of a more complex nature. Culicover (1970) argues that causal relations are based on temporal relations. This sounds a reasonable argument given the fact that no event can cause another event unless it precedes it. In addition, Culicover and Jackendoff (1999) propose that both clauses must be used in the simple present or simple past. I would also add to this that there should be an element in the first event that gives rise to the second event. It means that the first event in some way must control the occurrence of another element. Typically, it controls the scope of possible events that might follow it. If there is no such control then consequential relations do not arise.

A few tests can be used for causal relations between conjuncts. I followed Peterson’s (1989) proposal to use nominalized phrases and extended it by adding the expression ‘Otherwise Y would not happen’ as exemplified in [30b]. Another test for this relation is to rephrase the original sentence as the construction ‘the fact that X happens caused Y’ [30c], in order to check whether, for example, the second event from [30] (‘our starting toward the table where the count sat’) is within the scope of possible outcomes of the first event (‘the stopping of music’). Of course, this is not the only possible outcome, but what is important here is whether it is a probable one. In [31a] the event ‘my going out’ is not caused by the first event (‘my explanation’). It is probable that in the present circumstances the person could also have left the room without the first event. It follows that the second event is not within a scope of probable events that would follow from the first event.

30a. The music stopped and we started toward the table where the count sat.
30b. The stopping of music caused our starting toward the table where the count sat. Otherwise, we wouldn’t have done it. (= Otherwise, we would have stayed on the dance floor.)
30c. The fact that music stopped caused our starting toward the table where the count sat.
31a. We would probably have gone on and discussed the war and agreed that it was in reality a calamity for civilization, and perhaps would have been better avoided. I was bored enough. Just then from the other room someone called: “Barnes! I say, Barnes! Jacob Barnes! It’s a friend calling me,” I explained, and went out.
31b. *My explanation caused my going out. Otherwise, I wouldn’t have done it.
I investigated the distribution of the types of relations in *Sun* on the sample of 100 randomly selected go sentences, and looked into the most likely type of reading by considering the context, and by following the criteria and tests discussed above. The results show that the most common cases are sentences associated with temporal relations (46), followed by those with juxtaposal (34) and causal relations (20). Two conclusions can be derived here. First, given the definition of relations from Section 3 it follows that in the majority of cases the narrator’s perception of the world is signalled in terms of complex events. Second, syntactic coordination in *Sun* typically does not correspond with semantic coordination because most of the sentences denote semantic subordination.

5 Conclusion

The purpose of the paper was to provide linguistic evidence of Hemingway’s plain style in *Sun* and to explore the semantic structures associated with the narrator’s observation of the experienced situations. The findings indicate that:

- The linguistic evidence for the plain style is the dominant use of coordinated clauses in the narrative part of *Sun*;
- Coordinated clauses are typically associated with complex events which are denoted by certain recurrent linguistic items and verb types;
- The recurrent linguistic items are mainly associated with Verbs of Motion, Verbs of Perception and Verbs of Force;
- These verb types are indicators of how the narrator perceives and segments experienced situations in terms of semantic events;
- Although the syntactic information indicates that this segmentation process is based on observation of facts, the semantic information shows that observation also includes some kind of interpretative work.

As can be seen, the plain style reflects Hemingway’s preference for certain syntactic and semantic structures. It follows from the findings that the plain style is realized by means of paratactic sentences that consist of coordinated clauses. The analysis of verb types demonstrates that the content of these sentences is associated with only a few types of events. Recurrent linguistic expressions are indicative of how the perceived situations are encoded by the narrator in terms of event structures. These expressions also reflect the recurrent nature of the perceptive process.

Coordinated clauses can potentially be associated with three semantic interpretations, and following the results in only 34% of the investigated sentences was one-to-one matching between syntax and semantics observed. This is
linguistic evidence of what Hemingway referred to as suggestive style; despite being underlined by a simpler syntactic form, the relations between events are of a complex nature. Hemingway’s juxtaposition of clauses suggests pure perception, and the ordering of events as they are directly observed and encoded. It follows that although the depiction of experienced situations is realized on the surface in terms of the factual language, and observations that do not involve interpretative work, on another level such interpretative work is included as well.

The findings obtained here correspond to some previous observations. To name just a few, Grebstein (1973), Lodge (1993), Eby (1999), Tyler (2001) and Rao (2007) discuss at length structural repetition, *déjà vu* and parallelism in *Sun* and other Hemingway short stories or novels. Mosher (1971: 267) argues that these effects create a staccato style of narrative which “is often used in *The Sun* to suggest restrictions, boredom, or monotony.” The following statement provides a similar interpretation:

“The strongest feeling in the book is that for the people in it (and one gets the distinct impression that other people do not matter very much) life is futile, and their motions like the motion of the sun of the title (as it appears to our eyes): endless, circular, and unavailing.” (Young in Bloom 2007: 59).

The present study, therefore, provides empirical support for such claims. I would also like to suggest that Hemingway’s style in *Sun* is indicative of what Lotman (1990) termed *I–I communication* or *autocommunication*. Unlike in 1-s/he communication, where the speaker and the hearer are two different persons and the purpose of communication is transferring new pieces of information from the speaker to the hearer, in *I–I communication* the speaker and the hearer are the same person, and what is transferred has the status of a known piece of information. Such pieces of information are redundant from the purely communicative point of view. Lotman argues that such texts have one code at the syntagmatic level and an additional one at the semantic level and that they usually contain repetitive patterns that in some way govern the surface structure of the sentences and text. Such texts activate associations that resemble those that arise when one observes wallpaper patterns. *I–I communication* has a psychological effect on the addressee (speaker = hearer) because it “leads to a reconstructing of the actual ‘I’ itself” (Lotman 1990: 22).³ Typical examples of texts that serve this purpose are poems, prayers or oaths (for some other types of ‘texts’ see Lindström 2010). The elements

³ I make here no claim with regard to the area of personality psychology which is also concerned with narrative study (e.g. Schiff 2012) although I do not deny that one type of self-reconstruction can be achieved through recorded biographical memories (Fischer and Goblirisch 2007). Having said that, I believe that the model proposed here could find a use in psychological approaches to narrative studies.
discussed by Lotman were also identified through the above analyses in Sun, and it could be argued that the novel presents a kind of contemplation concerned with an almost ritualistic account of personal reminiscences. Accordingly, the narrator and the reader constitute here the same person, and unlike in non-autocommunication, the narrator’s and the reader’s segmentation of events becomes identical.

Given the fact that the results obtained through the model confirm previously observed stylistic features of Hemingway’s style, one might assume that it can only serve to replicate previous studies. But, although replication studies are of great value, I would like to argue that the present analysis is more than that, as it synthesizes issues that have previously been addressed in various separate papers, and locates individual lexical items and their contribution to the overall language style of the novel, including the conjunct and certain specific verb classes. In particular, the analysis demonstrates that Hemingway’s style is built on the recurrent use of conjuncts. Finally, whereas in previous studies, corpus linguistics has been combined with various literary theories, the present investigation demonstrates that new insights can be gained if corpus stylistics is informed by linguistic and semantic theories. Corpus linguistics can provide empirical evidence for previous observations or assumptions, and semantic theories such as the theory of event semantics provide the theoretical foundations for the interpretation of such evidence.
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