

higher than the average, thus, as the answer is close to what we expected to find and given that the majority of the 3rd year students as experiment participants did not understand the value of the research (they did not think their answers over, but tried to fill in the questionnaire as fast as possible), the participants' age will be taken into account in further experiments.

References:

1. Haug L. The End of Me. The Female Voice of Depression in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *The Yellow Wallpaper*, Jean Rhys's *Good Morning, Midnight* and Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* : thesis for the MA degree : Literature, Area Studies and European Languages department / Linn Kristin Runar Haug. – Oslo, 2010. – 93 p.
2. Schmidt S. J. *Foundations for Empirical Study of Literature: Components of a Basic Theory* / Siegfried Johannes Schmidt. – Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1982. – 207 p.
3. Van Peer W. *Scientific Methods for the Humanities* / W. van Peer, F. Hakemulder, S. Zyngier – Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012. – 317 p.

CONTROL INFINITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN EARLY MODERN ENGLISH

Oleksandra Tuhai

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University

Historical linguistics is concerned with the scientific study of language changes in the course of time, that is diachronically, and gives the overall deep concepts of language development trends. [2, p. 1-2]. The division of the history of a language into different periods implies that we have a rather clear picture of what language we are dealing with [1, p. 20]. A synchronic analysis views linguistic phenomena at a given time of speech evolution. The aim of the present paper is to characterize infinitive sentences in dynamic synchrony of Early Modern English period. Principles and rules that govern sentence constructions in the process of grammaticalization are those criteria which define language development and present norms of lingual analysis. In our research paper we highlight syntactic peculiarities of infinitive constructions in sentence patterns with verbs of will such as want, desire, wish, intend etc. in Early Modern English period.

We found out that within the investigated period the main volitional verbs of complex structures tended to be subcategorized

by non-finite clauses in the postposition. From our corpus data of W. Shakespeare and T. Middleton such verbs of will like want, desire, wish, hope, intend, choose, require, command, order, persuade take as their complements only infinitive clauses in order to implement their own actions. In historical linguistics such infinitive sentences are regarded as Accusativus cum Infinitive (a.c.i.).

These constructions are already witnessed even in Anglo-Saxon language with further usage in Middle and Early Modern English when being applied to express a single action [7, p. 73-110]. In theoretical linguistics they are mostly analyzed and considered as subject and object raising constructions. So, the paper preferably deals with characteristics of the complex sentence derivations with volitional verbs complemented by infinitive clauses as control structures where an implicit infinitival subject PRO is controlled by a subject or an object of the matrix predicate and focuses on contrasting them to the raising ones using generative grammar rules.

According to the Control Theory we define all volitional verbs from the investigated corpus data into three semantic groups of controlling element, namely [4, p. 286-287]:

1. Verbs of willing and expecting (want/expect type) – verbs of subject/object control such as want, desire, wish, hope, expect;
2. Verbs of promising (promise type) – verbs only of subject control such as promise, intend, choose, refuse, determine, attempt, offer, aim;
3. Verbs of ordering and permitting (order/permit type) – verbs only of object control such as require, command, order, persuade, induce, forbid, allow, permit, force.

Control sentences should be correctly identified and interpreted as well as distinguished from subject-to-subject/object raising constructions. Theoretical grammar separates raising infinitival sentences with raising verbs such as seem, appear, believe, happen and control infinitive constructions with verbs of controlling element as want, wish, desire, intend, command etc. In raising structures matrix predicates have not got their own thematic subject, but obtain the latter by movement of an external infinitive argument to the matrix subject/object position. Subjects of raising verbs originate internally in [Spec, VP] of the infinitival complement and then move to [Spec, TP] of the lower and then to [Spec, TP] of the higher matrix clause respectively. Control infinitives have got a special kind of a null pronominal subject as “big PRO” which is

denoted as a thematic infinitive subject with the theta role of an agent [5, p. 264-272].

In control constructions matrix subject or object is semantically connected with the main verb and referred the infinitival subject that is realized as PRO. Raising subject or object is not directly referred to the main verb. Syntactically it is located in the matrix clause, but semantically it entirely belongs and relates to the imbedded clause [3, p. 216].

(1) First Gentelman: “The great duke Came to the bar; ... which [CP [TP the duke i [VP desired [CP [TP [PRO i [VP ti To have brought viva voce to his face]].” (W. Shakespeare, King Henry VIII, ii, i, 11; 17-18) In sentence (1) the main predicate desired has two arguments, namely an external argument subject NP the duke and an internal argument the infinitival clause To have brought viva voce to his face. Subject PRO as the infinitive external argument originates in [Spec, VP] of the infinitival clause, syntactically raises to [Spec, TP] NP the duke merging with the latter.

Semantics of the verb desire determines its connection with subject NP the duke which takes control over the covert subject of the infinitival trace ti.

(2) Rosalind: “if I could meet that fancy-monger, would give him some good counsel, for [CP [TP he i [VP seems [TP [PRO i [VP ti to have the quotidian of love upon him]].” (W. Shakespeare, As You Like It, iii, ii, 381-384)

(3) Deep structure: ec seemed [he to have the quotidian of love upon him].

(4) Surface structure: he i seems [PRO ti to have the quotidian of love upon him]].

In example (2) we witness that the raising verb seem has not got the external argument in the deep structure (3), not requiring its generation in [Spec, VP] and not theta-marking it. In the surface structure (4) it is NP he that as an external argument of the infinitive to have originates in [Spec, VP] of the lower clause, further moves to the matrix subject position and then forms the united single thematic argument with the implicit subject PRO as the infinitival agent role appointed by the predicate have.

In the long run of our discussion we come to the conclusion that in Early Modern English period we regard infinitival sentences with volitional verbs as control constructions where controlling element is referred to the main clause both syntactically and semantically. In raising constructions PRO syntactically raises from the subordinate clause to the main one, but semantically it preserves in the infinitival clause. Control predicates have got

thematic subject and infinitival complement CP, but raising verbs don't theta mark subject, their infinitive complement is TP.

References:

1. Baldi P. *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 1 : Syntax of the Sentence* / Philip Baldi, Pierluigi Cuzzolin. – Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 2009. – 560 p.
2. Campbell L. *Historical Linguistics : An Introduction* / Lyle Campbell, . – Edinburgh, UK : Edinburgh University Press, 1999. – 396 p.
3. Huddleston R. D., Pullum G. K. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar* / Rondey D. Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum. – Cambridge, New York : Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 312 p.
4. Pollard C., Sag I. *Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar* / Carl Pollard, Ivan A. Sag *Studies in contemporary linguistics*. – Chicago and London : The University of Chicago Press, 1994. – 440 p.
5. Radford A. *Analyzing English Sentences. A Minimalist Approach* / Andrew Radford. – Cambridge, New York : Cambridge University Press, – 2009. – 526 p.
6. Rowse A. L. *The annotated Shakespeare: three volumes in one illustrated : the comedies, the histories, sonnets, and other poems, the tragedies and romances* / edited, with introductions, notes, a biography and bibliography by A. L. Rowse. – New York : Greenwich House, 1988. – 2479 p.
7. Yartseva V. N. *The Development of Complex Sentence in the English Language* / Victoria N. Yartseva. – Leningrad: Leningrad State University Press, 1940. – 116 p.

PRAGMA-COMMUNICATIVE ASPECTS OF DONALD TRUMP INAUGURATION DISCOURSE

Natalia Humeniuk

BorysGrinchenko Kyiv University

This paper focuses on the problem of pragma-communicative aspects of Donald Trump inauguration discourse, 01.20.17. Being the first official appeal of the newly elected president to his/her nation, the inauguration discourse is "the communication between the authority and society, where the speaker represents the authority; it's the strategic communication from the point of its future plans" [2: 195]. In this case Donald Trump inauguration discourse is the discourse which contains the information of the speaker's past-present-future, where his past is represented by his pre-election success, his present is determined by his presidential status and his future is connected with the strategic development of the country. In his inauguration speech Donald Trump tries not