Didko yeyo beri! / Дидько ее бери! [5, с. 89] = *didko yiyi zabyrai! / дідько її забирай! + bolyachku v bok! / болячку в бок!*

Summing it up we may draw the following conclusion: Odessa cursings mainly contain the concepts of *a physical inability*, *pain*, *disease* and even *death, a problem*, *a misfortune*, *a trouble* etc. The parts of a human body are the components of Odessa cursings. In the analyzed sample of Odessa cursings the so called Russian-Ukrainian phraseological hybrids are fixed.

References:

1. Бабель И. Э. Избранное / Исаак Эммануилович Бабель. – Минск : Мастацкая літаратура, 1986. – 272 с.

2. Львов А. Л. Крах патента : [рассказы об Одессе] / Аркадий Львович Львов. – Одесса : Маяк, 1966. – 220 с.

3. Паустовский К. Г. Время больших ожиданий : [повесть] / Константин Георгиевич Паустовский. – Одесса : Одес. кн. изд-во, 1961. – 212 с.

4. Пойзнер М. Б. С Одессой надо лично говорить … (Из подсмотренного и подслушанного) / Михаил Борисови Пойзнер. – Одесса : Друк, 2001. – 392 с.

5. Рабинович О. Мориц Сефарди : [повесть] / Осип Рабинович // Литературные вечер. – Одесса: Н.Фумели, 1849. – Ч. 1. – С.121-153.

6. Силуэты : литература, искусство, театр, кино : [журнал]. – Одесса, 1922–1923.

7. Смирнов В. П. Операция «Гиппократ» : [роман] Валерий Павлович Смирнов. / Одесса : Полиграф, 2008. – 96 с.

TO/BARE INFINITIVE AS COMPLEMENTATION MARKERS OF VOLITIONAL VERBS IN XV-XVII CENTURIES

Tuhai O. M.
Postgraduate, Institute of Philology,
Lecturer of the Department of Law and International Relations
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
Kyiv, Ukraine

Historical cognitive linguistics is nothing without evidential empirical research and the apparent results of historical data description. This paper analyzes the influence of *to/bare* infinitive on sentence semantic structure and factors controlling volitional verbs infinitive marking complementation in the development of historical paradigm in Early Modern English. By the Elizabethan period it became clear that the infinitive marking and its distribution

in complex constructions have been largely standardized. In spite of the fact that the possibilities of *bare* infinitive occurrence have been drastically reduced at this period with the enhance of *to*-infinitive marker some finite verbs depending on its lexical meaning, thus, in our paper the volitional verbs – *desire, command, entreat, force, pray, persuade, ask, demand, promise* and others – were still complemented either by *bare* or *to* infinitive marker [1, p. 34].

Notably, in Early Modern English period verbs of volitional determination, such as *wish, intend, regret, bear* and others which express emotions directed to the object, were complemented predominantly by *to* infinitive with non-overt subject of the infinitival complement clause. On the contrary, verbs of will with another volitional functions like *order, obligation, request, prohibition* occur with *bare* infinitive in post-position with overt subject of the complement clause [3, p. 9].

Traditional functional grammar divides all English verbs into intransitive and transitive (monotransitive, ditransitive, complex-transitive) [4, p. 54]. Present paper analyzes syntactic patterns of sentences with volitional verbs of ditransitive *to-/bare*-infinitive complementation opening the position to two complements [2, p. 41].

In our research on the basis of W. Shakespeare corpus analysis we define the main controlling factors of *to/bare* infinitive marking in Early Modern English period, namely: 1) lexical notion of the verb; 2) grammatical function of the clause – either it is an object or a complement clause; 3) grammatical category of pronominal and non-pronominal elements between the main governing verb and the infinitive; 4) semantic factor – direct/indirect participation of matrix subject in the event expressed by *to-/bare*-infinitival objective complement.

In Early Modern English period ditransitive *bare*-infinitive complementation is represented by the following volitional verbs such as *bid, beg, entreat, pray, persuade, command, charge, force, enforce, forbid* that take *to*-infinitive or *bare*-infinitive markers under certain governing rules. We also distinguish the verbs of ditransitive *to*-infinitive complementation such as *advise, ask, beg, bid, beseech, command, counsel, entreat, instruct, invite, order, persuade, pray, charge, request, urge*.

The structure of ditransitive *to/bare*-infinitive complementation is determined as: SV+Oi(NP)+Od(to/bare Inf) – indirect object with direct objective *to/bare*-infinitive clause in the function of a direct object. In terms of traditional grammar ditransistive verbs take indirect object NP with *to/bare* direct objective infinitive [4, p. 1208, 1215]. The group of ditransitive volitional verbs with to/*bare* infinitive in our research period has the same syntactic structure and undergoes similar controlling factors.

(1) ANTIPHOLUS of Ephesus: «To what end did I **bid** <u>thee</u> <u>*hie*</u> thee home?» (THE COMEDY OF ERRORS Act IV Scene IV, 15)

We consider matrix verb **bid** as a ditransitive verb because of the *bare* infinitive complement <u>*hie*</u> after indirect object NP *thee*. This *bare* infinitive is

that specific marker which determines the whole pattern of the sentence as well as its semantic structure. Thus, the function of the infinitive *hie* is a direct object but not a complement infinitival clause. Semantic structure of the sentence is also determined by the meaning of matrix verb **bid**. From example (1) we observe that volitional verb **bid** is complemented by a subject as an indirect object NP *thee* and *bare*-infinitive direct object VP *hie* expresses more *«command»*, *«persuade»* than *«ask»* [6, p. 111]. Subject I of matrix verb **bid** is the direct participant in the event of the verb *hie* even influencing on it. So, this semantic factor explains objective infinitive V *hie* tendency to occur with *bare* infinitive marker.

In syntactic structure of this sentence overt subject NP thee of the infinitival objective clause at the same time occurs in the function of an indirect object of matrix verb **bid**. This phenomenon in times of W. Shakespeare may be explained by the predominance of *bare*-infinitive marker occurrence with its overt subject complementing volitional matrix verbs. The evidence from the analysis of the W. Shakespeare corpus of sentences with volitional governing verbs shows that such verbs as *bid, beg, entreat, pray, persuade, command, charge, force, enforce, forbid* are preferably complemented by *bare* infinitives with overt or non-overt subjects. Follow examples (2), (3) of *bare*-infinitive complements:

(2) TAILOR: «You **bid** me make it orderly and well, According to the fashion and the time.» (THE TAMING OF THE SHREW Act IV Scene III, 94-95)

(3) GLOUCESTER: «Let me **persuade** you take a better course». (KING HENRY VI Part I Act IV Scene I, 132)

We follow T. Fanego's claim that pronominal and non-pronominal elements intervening between the governing verb and the infinitive influence on infinitive marking especially in Early Modern English. Thus, she assumes that pronominal elements have the tendency to correlate with *bare* infinitive and non-pronominal elements trigger to the usage of *to*-infinitive marker. The frequent selection of *bare* infinitive after a pronominal NP tends to signal about the close integration between matrix verb and infinitive. And with decrease of this association because of a nominal or some other additional material interference a stronger and more categorical infinitive marker *to* tends to be preferably occurred [1, p. 32-42].

As our research evidences in Early Modern English our corpus of analyzed volitional verbs with non-pronominal elements do not take exclusively *to* infinitive. Thus, the following instances prove our assumption:

(4) CLARENCE: «I **pray** thee, gentle keeper, *stay* by me». (KING RICHARD III Act I Scene IV, 73) (5) QUEEN: «He hath a drug of mine; I **pray** his absence *Proceed* by swallowing that» (CYMBELINE Act III Scene V, 58).

From examples (4), (5) we observe that non-pronominal elements NP thee, gentle keeper, and NP his absence follow by *bare* infinitive, but not by *to*-infinitive marker. But it is necessary to confirm the fact that in Early Modern English volitional verbs of order, inducement, request, desire and others are

predominantly complemented by indirect object NP with *bare* infinitive as a direct object. We witness our claim by the following examples: (6) PETRUCHIO: «Sirrah Gromio, go to your mistress; Say, I **command** her *come* to me.» (THE TAMING OF THE SHREW Act V Scene II, 95) (7) TRANIO: «Father Baptista, I **charge** you *see* that he be forthcoming.» (THE TAMING OF THE SHREW Act V Scene I, 96) (8) Rain added to a river that is rank Perforce will **force** it *overflow* the bank. (VENUS AND ADONIS, 71-72) (9) YORK: «The treason that my haste **forbids** me *show*» (KING RICHARD II Act V Scene III, 50).

Now we analyze ditransitive *to*-infinitive complementation with volitional verbs.

(10) EGLAMOUR: «This is the hour that Madam Silvia **Entreated** me *to call and know* her mind» (THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA Act IV Scene III, 1-2).

In sentence (10) lexical notion of the verb **entreat** influences slightly on the choice of infinitive maker in infinitival clause. Matrix verb **Entreated** means *«ask earnestly»* with indirect object in accusative me and *to*-infinitive clause *to call and know* [6, p. 368]. Matrix volitional verb **Entreated** is complemented by indirect object NP me with *to*-infinitival clause *to call and know* in the function of direct object. Subject NP *Madam Silvia* of matrix verb **Entreated** is not the direct participant in the event of VP *to call and know* and can't influence on it. So, this semantic factor explains the tendency of objective infinitival clause VP *to call and know* to occur with *to* infinitive marker.

Pronominal element accusative NP me between the governing verb **Entreated** and the infinitive *to call and know* taking the function of indirect object loses the tendency of *bare* infinitive marking correlation and occurs with *to* infinitive. So, we assume that pronominal elements as indirect objects with direct objective infinitives decrease close integration between matrix verbs and the infinitives hence following by *to*-infinitive marker.

In our W. Shakespeare corpus we evidence examples of ditransitive *to*-infinitive complementation with the following volitional verbs:

(11) KING: «To-morrow shall I **beg** leave *to see* your kingly eyes: … .» (HAMLET Act IV Scene VII, 44-45) (12) Caius Marcius Coriolanus: «I **request** you *To give* my poor host freedom.» (CORIOLANUS Act I Scene X, 87) (13) FIRST LORD: «he hath sent me an earnest inviting, which many my near occasions did **urge** me *to put off*.» (TIMON OF ATHENS Act III Scene VI, 10-11) (14) VALENTINE: «I now **beseech** you, for your daughter's sake, *To grant* one boon». (THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA Act V Scene IV, 149-150) (15) ANTIOCHUS: «Here *they* stand martyrs, slain in Cupid's wars; And with dead cheeks **advise** thee *to desist*» (PERICLES Act I Scene I, 38-39).

In the long run of our research we come to the conclusion that in Early Modern English period there are certain controlling factors determining the tendency for occurrence in sentences with objective infinitival clauses of *to* or *bare* infinitive markers. We witness volitional verbs of ditransitive

complementation with indirect objects and direct objective infinitives occurring with *to/bare* infinitive marker in Early Modern English language.

References:

1. Fanego T. Infinitive complements in Shakespeare's English: synchronic and diachronic aspects / Teresa Fanego. – Santiago de Compostella: Universidade. Servicio de Publicacions e Intercambio Cientifico, 1992. – 170 p.

2. Haegeman L. Introduction to Government and Binding Theory / Liliane Haegeman. – Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1994. – 725 p.

3. Maetzner E. An English grammar: methodical, analytical, and historical. Volume III / By Professor Maetzner. – London : J. Murray. Boston: Roberts, Brothers, 1874. – 576 p.

4. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language // Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. London and New York: Longman Group Limited, 1985. – 1779 p.

5. 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.

6. Schmidt A. Shakespeare Lexicon: A completed dictionary of all the English words, phrases and constructions / Alexander Schmidt. – 3d ed. Vol. I. – Berlin, 1902. – 678 p.