

Subject Control Infinitive Constructions in Early Modern English

Oleksandra Tuhai¹

¹Department of Germanic Philology, Institute of Philology, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Correspondence: Oleksandra Tuhai, Department of Germanic Philology, Institute of Philology, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University, Tymoshenka Marshala 13B street, 04212, Kyiv, Ukraine.

Received: February 9, 2022

Accepted: March 9, 2022

Online Published: March 14, 2022

doi:10.5430/wjel.v12n1p367

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n1p367>

Abstract

This study aims to analyze and describe infinitive sentences with *verbs of volition* such as *desire, wish, want, hope, intend, promise, determine, command* in Early Modern English within a generative framework. It is argued that the infinitival clauses have a thematic subject PRO controlled by the matrix subject. It is proved that complex sentences with infinitive complements of *matrix predicates of volition* obtain *subject control* function. The findings show syntactic peculiarities of infinitive complementation of monotransitive *verbs of volition* as *subject control infinitive constructions* in the studied period of English. Having taken into consideration subject control properties of matrix *verbs of volition*, direct object monotransitive infinitive function, complementary nature of infinitives, it has been assumed that an infinitive clause generates in a complementizer phrase CP domain, putting forward three possible variants of syntactic analysis of the infinitive types' configurations as: SVOd (*to / bare* INF clause), SVOd (NP *to / bare* INF clause), SVOd (*wh- to* INF clause) with 'two-argument arrangement' of matrix verbs and the infinitive clause as an object predicative complement.

Keywords: subject control, infinitive complementation, verbs of volition, Early Modern English

1. Introduction

In this paper, complex infinitive sentences with *verbs of volition* in Early Modern English (EModE) are suggested as *subject control infinitive constructions* supported by the data taken from literary works of the studied period. Before commencing on the research, it is reasonable to provide a brief overview of main concepts used within the framework of theory and syntactic representation of control structures in terms of formal and generative linguistics in Germanic languages. Investigations of non-finite sentences are closely linked to the topic of control constructions that are typically explained either on traditional or generative grounds both nowadays and historically.

Namely, traditional description of non-finite sentences has received a comprehensive analysis in English present-day studies (Huddleston & Pullum, 2005, 2012; Kochergan, 2006; Pollard & Sag, 1994; Quirk et al., 1985; Tesniere, 1988; Testelets, 2001). Generative outline of English clause structure has been deeply highlighted in plenty of authoritative researches (Chomsky, 1993, 2002, 2015; Gelderen, 2013; Haegeman, 1994; Haegeman & Gueron, 1999; Hale & Keyser 1992; Radford, 1988, 1997, 2009). Control and raising non-finite clauses have been repeatedly discussed in general aspects of Germanic languages (Høyem, 2019; Landau, 2000; Mucha et al., 2021; Osborne & Reeve, 2017; Rickman & Rudanko, 2018; Stowell, 1982) and specifically in particular languages (Giurgea & Cotfas, 2021; Leung & Halefom, 2017; MacDonald & Vázquez-Lozares, 2021; Zorić, 2019).

In English historical studies, syntax of Germanic languages has been intensively investigated and analyzed within a formal framework at different levels of its interpretation from morphology to syntax, from lexicon to pragmatics, both in diachrony and synchrony (Buniyatova, 2021; Gentens & Rudanko, 2019; Horodilova, 2021; Ivanova et al., 1999; Yartseva, 1940).

However, all these proceedings do not provide a thorough analysis of the subject control of infinitive sentences with *verbs of volition* in the history of English from the standpoint of generative syntax. In my view, the process of infinitive subject PRO control was best suggested by Comrie (1984), Sag & Pollard (1991) with their ground position of PRO control properties by matrix subject in a complex infinitival sentence. Moreover, following their insight, the main hypothesis of the current study is to analyze and prove that complex infinitive sentences with *matrix predicates of volition* generate and syntactically function as *subject control infinitive structures* in Early Modern English.

In this study, it is highlighted syntactic peculiarities of monotransitive infinitive complements that subcategorize

matrix verbs of volition such as *desire, wish, want, hope, intend*, etc. in EModE, based on the developed versions of X-bar theory (Chomsky, 1993), Control Theory (Sag & Pollard 1991) within the framework of generative grammar. Thus, by corpus data (400 infinitive sentences) from EModE writers (William Shakespeare (Rowse, 1988), Thomas Middleton (Taylor & Lavagnino, 2007), John Milton (Eliot, 1909)), it was evidenced that *matrix predicates of volition* as *desire, wish, want, hope, intend, promise, determine, command* took as their complements infinitive clauses in the verbal post position to implement main verbs' actions. Sentence generations with *matrix verbs of volition*, complemented by the infinitive clauses, were claimed as *control constructions*, contrasting them to the raising infinitival clauses.

The *main focus* of this research is to accomplish profound syntactic analysis that concerns matrix volitional verbs features, generation of lingual constituents, examination of various complement types in monotransitive infinitival complexes in EModE. I pursue the following *tasks*: 1. to define *control properties of verbs of volition* in EModE; 2. to examine *syntax of monotransitive infinitive complementation with matrix predicates of volition*; 3. to highlight *generation of infinitives* in control infinitive sentences; 4. to analyze *syntactic derivation* of PRO / controlling elements; 5. to describe *theta-grid paradigm* of infinitive constructions.

2. Methods and Materials

2.1 Methods and Approaches

The current study methodology was based on *several methods and approaches*, which were relevant to the investigation of language phenomenon, generation of infinitive clauses in complex constructions of EModE. Therefore, *the method of componential analysis* is one of modern methods of semantic research. It attempts to reduce the meaning to its smallest components (Sukhorolska & Fedorenko, 2005). This method was introduced to define semantics of *verbs of volition* in infinitive complexes, combining them into particular groups, as well as to show coherence of matrix predicates with other constituents in a superordinate clause. In consequence, the infinitival structures with *matrix verbs of volition* were compared to the infinitives with *raising verbs* and, hence, were considered as *subject control infinitive constructions* with the matrix subject as the controlling element.

In this paper, infinitive sentences were analyzed within the framework of generative linguistics. We followed Chomsky's theory of transformational grammar as a synthetic method of 'generating' (constructing) utterances. The main assumption of transformational grammar is that any language consists of a limited number of kernel (basic) sentences and an unlimited number of other sentence structures derived or generated from them. They are generated through transformations, which constitute a transformational mechanism, the very important area in a language system (Sukhorolska & Fedorenko, 2005; Chomsky, 2002). *The method of transformational-generative analysis* enabled to characterize syntactic peculiarities of derivation and generation of infinitival clauses as well as category status of clausal elements. Namely, it was investigated and proved that the infinitive subject PRO generated in [Spec, VP] location of the lower clause and must be syntactically controlled by its antecedent — subject of the main volition predicate, but semantically unbound. The infinitive clause as the complementizer phrase CP was determined as an independent reduced clause of complementary nature with the unrealized tense form.

The structural method referred to the synchronic analysis of language phenomenon, based only on the bounds and the relations between lingual elements. Its aim was the study of the language as a holistic functional structure, which elements and parts were correlated and linked by a strict system of linguistic relations (Kochergan, 2006). This method was realized in such approaches as *distributional and Immediate Constituents (IC) ones*. *The distributional analysis* aimed at analyzing linguistic elements in terms of their distribution. It was directed at setting up of elements, statements of distribution of these elements as relative to each other. The distribution of an element was given by the distributional formula, which was the contextual pattern of the environment characteristic of the specific occurrence of a linguistic unit. *The method of Immediate Constituents (IC)* was originally elaborated as an attempt to determine the ways, how lexical units were relevantly related to one another. The fundamental aim of the IC analysis was to segment a set of lexical units into two maximally independent sequences or ICs, thus, revealing the hierarchical structure of this set (Sukhorolska & Fedorenko, 2005). In particular, the distributional analysis helped us describe the structural organization of each infinitive sentence unit based on the particular verbs syntactic features. The IC analysis was promoted to outline phrasal categories of sentence units, namely verb phrases and infinitive phrases. As a result of this, it was found out lexical projections as VP (verb phrase), assumed as dependent clauses, and functional projections as CP (complementizer phrase), which were posited as independent reduced clauses.

2.2 Materials of Research

The study of syntactic, semantic, functional peculiarities in complex sentences with clausal infinitive

complementation of *verbs of volition* was based on the typology of particular verbs of volition according to Roget's II: The New Thesaurus dictionary (Roget, 1995), due to which there were chosen eight particular *verbs of volition* such as *desire, wish, want, hope, intend, promise, determine, command*, which actualize monotransitive infinitive complementation. From literary works of Early Modern English writers such as William Shakespeare (Rowse, 1988), Thomas Middleton (Taylor & Lavagnino, 2007), John Milton (Eliot, 1909), there were compiled special corpus data of the infinitival sentences with *verbs of volition* as: total 400 infinitival sentence constructions or units (Appendix A, Table 1).

3. Theoretical Background

3.1 Control Versus Raising Infinitive Constructions

In a generative framework, infinitival clauses in the function of a direct object and with the status of a verbal complement are characterized as subject control constructions. In syntactic structures, the control problem is interpreted with the reference to a non-overt or implicit subject of infinitival complement in verbal postposition (Comrie, 1984). Notably, Sag and Pollard (1991) highlight this issue by the claim that, with complement taking matrix verbs in a verb phrase, the controller of an unexpressed subject of that complement is realized as the matrix verb's subject (Sag & Pollard, 1991; Giurgea & Cotfas, 2021).

Hereby, it is argued that the controller assignment is of semantic matter and must be realized within a verb phrase VP of a higher clause, but not within a complementizer phrase CP of a lower clause. In generative scholarship, there is optional and obligatory control of crucial elements of a sentence, where the latter one presumes that the controller c-commands over the controlled element (Haegeman, 1994). The controller choice is also of thematic matter and it is predetermined by the semantic class of the verb (Landau, 2000; Tuhai, 2019).

Following Pollard and Sag's Control Theory, the studied *verbs of volition* were defined as the lexical group of the subject controlling element with verbs of *the subject control*, namely (Pollard & Sag, 1994): 1) verbs of willing and expecting (*want/expect type*) — *want, wish, desire, hope*; 2) verbs of promising (*promise type*) — *promise, intend*; 3) verbs of commanding (*command type*) — *determine, command*.

As far as the Control Theory is concerned, control structures should be properly identified and distinguished from subject-to-subject raising constructions. In theoretical grammar, raising infinitival sentences with *raising verbs* such as *seem, appear, prove, happen* are interpreted separately from control infinitive constructions with *verbs of the controlling element* as *want, wish, desire, intend, command*, etc. In raising structures, matrix predicates have not got their thematic subject, but obtain the latter one by the movement of an external infinitive argument to the matrix subject position. Subjects of raising verbs generate internally in [Spec, VP] of the infinitival complement, and then move to [Spec, IP] of the lower and then to [Spec, IP] 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 (Radford, 2009; Tuhai, 2021).

In control constructions, the matrix subject is semantically connected with the main verb and it refers to the infinitival subject that is realized as implicit PRO element. A raising subject does not directly refer to the main verb. Syntactically, it is located in the matrix clause, but semantically it entirely belongs and relates to the embedded clause (Huddleston & Pullum, 2005; Osborne, & Reeve, 2017).

It should be reminded that sentences of '*verb+(NP)+to+infinitive structure*' have got the derivation, in which some element (PRO) raises from the infinitival complement to the subject position of the main clause. Defined constructions are represented not as raising structures, but as control structures that differ from the latter ones by their arguments' pattern formation as well as by semantics of the main predicates with shades of volitional desire, intention, command as *want, wish, command*, etc. Hence, matrix *verbs of volition* with *to*-infinitive complements are assumed as control predicates, which take the infinitive complement with implicit subject PRO that must be controlled by the matrix subject and referred to it (Leung & Halefom, 2017; Radford, 2009).

As far as the *VP-internal Subject Hypothesis* is concerned, a subject should generate in the position [Spec, VP] with further movement to [Spec, IP] for checking its morphological features and obtaining a case. In *control infinitival structures*, the subject PRO of the infinitive generates in [Spec, VP] and syntactically remains there as the trace *ti*, but semantically it moves further to [Spec, IP]. In *raising structures*, an infinitive subject syntactically raises to the matrix subject position [Spec, IP], but semantically it remains in [Spec, VP] of the infinitive clause. The moved element leaves the trace *ti* due to which PRO is controlled by the appropriate element (antecedent) that is by the subject of the main sentence in order to preserve phrasal constituents identity structure (Haegeman & Gueron, 1999; Osborne & Reeve, 2017; Radford, 2009; Radford, 1997).

(1) Gloucester: 'If I unwittingly, or in my rage, Have aught committed that is hardly borne By any in this presence, I desire To reconcile me to his friendly peace' (Shakespeare, 'King Richard III', ii, i, 56-59) (Rowse, 1988).

The surface structure of sentence (1) may be represented in the following way:


(1') [CP If I unwittingly, or in my rage, Have aught committed that is hardly borne By any in this presence, [IP [Spec Ii [VP [Spec ti [V', V desire [CP [IP [Spec PROi [I, I To [VP [Spec [PRO] ti [V', V reconcile [NP [N', N me [PP to his friendly peace]]]]]]]]]]].

In scheme (1') of sentence (1), matrix predicate *desire* has two arguments: an external argument subject Spec NP *I* and an internal argument the infinitival clause CP *To reconcile me to his friendly peace*. Subject PRO as the infinitive external argument generates in [Spec, VP] of the infinitival clause, syntactically raises to [Spec, IP] NP *I*, merging with the latter one. Semantics of the verb *desire* determines its connection with the subject Spec NP *I*, which takes control over the implicit subject of the infinitival trace [PRO] *ti*.

In derivation tree-scheme below (2'), it is evidenced that Spec NP *I* controls PRO_i and, hence, trace [PRO] *ti*. In the framework of The Projection Principle, the infinitive complement of the control verb *desire* is a complementizer phrase (CP). Additionally, it must be noticed that an infinitive control clause includes C position, hence, the projection CP as well as the inflection operator IP, which belongs and refers to this C location due to its linear relationship between them. A complementizer phrase position CP is that one, where inflection operators [I, I'] must appear on a certain level of the grammatical representation (Stowell, 1982).

Derivation tree-scheme (2') represents generation of sentence (1) and syntax of PRO control:

(2')




(3) The Duke of York: 'Then, as I said, the duke, great Bolingbroke, Mounted upon a hot and fiery steed Which his aspiring rider seem'd to know, With slow but stately pace kept his course, Whilst all tongues cried 'God save thee, Bolingbroke!' (Shakespeare, 'King Richard II', v, ii, 7-11) (Rowse, 1988).

(4) Deep structure: ... Which ec seem'd [his aspiring rider to know, With slow but stately pace kept his course, Whilst all tongues cried 'God save thee, Bolingbroke!'] (5) Surface structure: ... Which his aspiring rideri seem'd [PRO_i to know, With slow but stately pace kept his course, Whilst all tongues cried 'God save thee, Bolingbroke!']

In example (3), it is witnessed that the raising verb *seem'd* has not got the external argument in the deep structure (4), not requiring its generation in [Spec, VP] and not theta-marking it. In the surface structure (5), it is Spec NP *his aspiring rider* that, as an external argument of the infinitive *to know*, generates in [Spec, VP] of the lower VP 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 *know*.

Derivation tree-scheme (3') represents generation of sentence (3) as the raising construction with verb *seem'd* and syntax of subject Spec NP *his aspiring rider*:

(3')



The surface structure of sentence (3) may be as in (6'):

(6') [CP Then, as I said, the duke, great Bolingbroke, Mounted upon a hot and fiery steed [CP Which [IP [Spec his aspiring rideri [I, I 'd [VP [V', V seem [IP [Spec PROi [I, I to [VP [Spec PROti [V, V know, [PP With slow but stately pace kept his course, [CP Whilst all tongues cried 'God save thee, Bolingbroke]]]]]]]]]]]]]

Whereas Spec NP *his aspiring rider* is not thematically connected with verb *seem'd* (Spec NP *his aspiring rider* is not the thematic subject of matrix raising predicate *seem'd*), it is preserved semantically in the embedded infinitival clause as the thematic subject of the infinitive. Hence, it can not take control over its trace PROti. The verb *seem'd* chooses the CP functional projection as its further complement clause.

Sentences (7) — (12) have exemplified complex infinitive sentences with matrix control and raising predicates:

- (7) Lord: 'The queen desires you to use some gentle entertainment to Laertes before you fall to play' (Shakespeare, 'Hamlet', v, ii, 214) (Rowse, 1988). (8) Prospero: 'Now I want Spirits to enforce, art to enchant' (Shakespeare, 'The tempest', Epilogue, 13-14) (Rowse, 1988). (9) Shortyard: 'The happiest good that ever Shortyard felt, I want to be expressed, my mirth is such' (Middleton, 'Michaelmas Tearme', iv, iii, 7-8) (Taylor & Lavagnino, 2007). (10) Beatrice: 'He cannot be ignorant of that, sir: I have not spared to tell him so; and I want To help myself' (Middleton, 'The changeling', i, i, 132-134) (Taylor & Lavagnino, 2007). (11) Cerimon: 'The diamonds of a most praised water Do appear, to make the world twice rich' (Shakespeare, 'Pericles', iii, ii, 102) (Rowse, 1988). (12) Abbot of Westminster: 'My lord, Before I freely speak my mind herein, You shall not only take the sacrament To bury mine intents, but also to effect Whatever I shall happen to devise' (Shakespeare, 'King Richard II', iv, i, 326-330) (Rowse, 1988).

Therefore, it is crucial to conclude that in EModE period infinitival sentences with matrix verbs of volition as *desire*, *wish*, *want*, *hope*, *intend*, *promise*, *determine*, *command* are assumed as subject control constructions, where a subject as the controlling element refers to the main clause both syntactically and semantically. In raising constructions with verbs *seem*, *appear*, *prove*, *happen*, the infinitive subject PRO syntactically raises from the subordinate clause to the main one, but semantically it is preserved in the infinitival clause. Subject control matrix predicates have got a thematic subject and an infinitival complement CP, but raising verbs do not theta mark a subject, and their infinitive complement is IP.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Monotransitive Infinitive Complementation in Early Modern English: A General Overview

In traditional grammars, constructions of non-finite predication are regarded as the subordinate sentences or the complement infinitival clauses. In the current study, it has been highlighted the basic characteristics of main syntactic types of monotransitive infinitive complements with matrix verbs of volition as *desire*, *wish*, *want*, *hope*, *intend*, *promise*, *determine*, *command*. Paying attention to verbal control properties and lexical nature, the infinitive sentences with the studied matrix predicates are claimed as subject control infinitive constructions in Early Modern English.

Namely, based on the inflectional form of the verb, in Germanic studies, infinitival clauses were distinguished from other types of non-finite predication (gerund/past participial clauses), having determined all of them as complements of the preceding verbs (Huddleston & Pullum, 2012). It is worth clarifying that the infinitive involves both verbal and substantive features. It occupies an intermediate position between the category of a verb and a noun, where it is

obliged to the noun its ability to serve as an actant in a sentence. And this ability to obtain the actant role had spread into Latin and Greek, where the first actant of the objective infinitival complex (Complex Object) must be kept in an accusative case (Tesniere, 1988; Tesniere, 1976). Consequently, the objective infinitive clause is a sentential actant in the complex sentences in the function of an object (Testelet, 2001). Subcategorization and selectional information are predictable from thematic information of the predicates. Theta-marking properties of predicates influence a theta-grid in specifying a particular theta-role of external and internal arguments of the main verbs. Thus, syntactic types of sentences with *verbs of volition* of non-finite infinitive complementation are defined as of ‘two-argument structure’ (Radford, 1988).

As far as the infinitive construction analysis is concerned, I followed the generally adopted conventional transitive characteristics of *verbs of volition*, which take in their postposition one or two elements. Following Quirk et al. (1985) as to predicative transitive functions and valency peculiarities, I have examined *three typological configurations* of the monotransitive infinitive complementation of matrix predicates of volition in Early Modern English.

It has been determined that infinitive predication of *verbs of volition* was actualized in *monotransitive infinitive complementation* as a direct object by (Quirk et al., 1985): 1. *to / bare* infinitive clause — SVOd (*to / bare* INF clause); 2. *to / bare* infinitive clause with a subject — SVOd (NP *to / bare* INF clause); 3. *wh*-infinitive clause — SVOd (*wh- to* INF clause). So, *the monotransitive infinitive complementation* was defined as SVOd pattern with the direct word order.

As far as the statistics data are concerned, quantitative indicators of subject control infinitive sentences with *verbs of volition* and monotransitive infinitive complementation types in Early Modern English are as follows: 1) total 400 infinitival sentence units of subject control infinitives with *volitional verbs* — *desire* (154 units), *wish* (40 units), *want* (43 units), *hope* (48 units), *intend* (58 units), *promise* (20 units), *determine* (20 units), *command* (17 units) (Appendix A, Table 1); 2) total 279 infinitive sentence units of SVOd (*to / bare* INF clause) model — 273 *to* infinitive clauses, 6 *bare* infinitive clauses (Appendix B, Table 2); 3) total 119 infinitive sentence units of SVOd (NP *to / bare* INF clause) model — 110 NP *to* infinitive clauses, 9 NP *bare* infinitive clauses (Appendix B, Table 2); 4) total 2 infinitive sentence units of SVOd (*wh- to* INF clause) model — 2 *wh- to* infinitive clauses (Appendix B, Table 2).

4.2 Monotransitive Infinitive Complementation of SVOd (*to / bare* INF clause) Configuration Type

The first configuration type has been defined as model SVOd (*to / bare* INF clause) — subject, verb, direct object realized as the infinitive. It was testified that *to / bare* infinitive clauses complemented monotransitive *verbs of volition* as *desire, wish, want, hope, intend, promise, determine, command* (total 279 infinitive sentence units — Appendix B, Table 2). The argument arrangement of the studied verbs was outlined as of ‘two elements’ with the matrix subject of the main action and the matrix object in the form of an infinitive clause.

In further analysis from Early Modern English corpus data, there have been examined structural and semantic features of *to / bare* infinitival sentence formations as well as their generation within the framework of the Control Theory (Sag & Pollard, 1991; Leung & Halefom, 2017) and the Minimalist Program by Chomsky (2015).

(13) *Buckingham: ‘Madam, we did: he desires to make atonement Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers, And betwixt them and my lord chamberlain; ...’* (Shakespeare, ‘King Richard III’, i, iii, 36-38) (Rowse, 1988).


In example (13), it is witnessed the two-argument arrangement of matrix verb *desires* with its external argument Spec NP *he* and the internal argument infinitive clause *to make atonement Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers, And betwixt them and my lord chamberlain*. Within the theta-theory, an external argument takes from the predicate the agent role, while an internal actant is determined as a patient, whom the main action is intended to. The infinitive *to make* also designates their theta roles to its arguments, namely the role of an infinitival agent to the implicit subject PRO as its external argument and the role of a patient to Spec NP *atonement Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers, And betwixt them and my lord chamberlain* as the internal actant.

At this point, it is necessary to stress that the above presented analysis needs to be specified with regard to generation of the internal constituents for approving the relevant structure of a sentence (13).

In next tree-scheme (13'), it is exemplified that the implicit subject PRO of the infinitive action generates in the position [Spec, VP] of the lower verbal projection and moves on left up to next location in [Spec, IP] for *null case* assignment, which it obtains from flection *to* in [I, I'] of the infinitive *make*. PRO can take its minimal *null case* or leave without the case (*zero case*). As a rule, the case is assigned to the arguments by the verb or the pronoun through the direct adjustment between the specifier and the head of the complementary phrase CP (Haegeman & Gueron, 1999).

Derivation tree-scheme (13') represents generation of sentence (13) in the following way:

(13')



In derivation tree-scheme (13'), existence of intervening projection [C, C'] makes it impossible for the verb *desire* to assign a case to PRO and govern the latter one. Hence, the main predicate *desires* does not c-command and can not appoint a case to the PRO element of this sentence. In its turn, subject Spec NP *he* of the matrix verb *desire* also generates in the position [Spec, VP] of the higher verbal projection and moves to the higher location [Spec, IP] for obtaining the *nominative case*, which is assigned by the main predicate. While PRO is moving further on to [Spec, IP] position of the subject Spec NP *he* of the higher matrix clause, the infinitival subject PRO leaves the trace [PRO] *ti* in its basic canonical location and merges with Spec NP *he*. Relationship between PRO and Spec NP *he* is designated as the coreferential one, where the antecedent controls its anaphora the trace [PRO] *ti*.


It is worth noting that the *to*-infinitives, as a rule, function as the internal complements or the modifiers / adjuncts of the main predicates. Traditionally, infinitive clauses are the non-finite sentences with the head verb in a plain form without the primary tense. That means that they are tenseless (Huddleston & Pullum, 2005; Rickman & Rudanko, 2018).

Hence, in a structural configuration, infinitives form the projection CP as a complementizer phrase that turns out to become *an independent clause* with an unrealized tense form. Unlike full finite CPs, the embedded clauses with independently realized verb tense forms of the infinitival complements are smaller than full CP clausal projections, and they are considered as the reduced CPs (Gelderen, 2013).

As far as lexical categories and projections are concerned, the constitutional relationships of the c-commanding and the complementation are regarded as unambiguous or synonymous. In addition to the structural relationships, associated with projections, there exist elementary semantic relations, which are also unambiguous and fully determined by the LRS (Lexical Relational Structures) rule of categories projections, according to which a matrix verb governs another predicate, namely the head of its complement (Hale & Keyser, 1992). In tree-scheme (13'), the relationship between the matrix verb *desire* and the infinitive clause *to make atonement Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers, And betwixt them and my lord chamberlain* is outlined as the c-command coherency, where the verb V *desire* in its higher category VP c-commands over the complementizer phrase CP, governing and choosing it as its complement.

It is worth reminding that the sentence generation applies such basic transformational grammar rules as *Merge*, *Agree*, *Move*. Merge operation forms larger units out of the already existed constructed elements A and B, making a new object K. This operation is an asymmetrical one and composes projections A or B, which form the object head. The following scheme (14') represents this operation (Chomsky, 2015):

(14')



Following Radford (1997), two VP components merge to obtain the verbal implementation of a verb phrase (Radford, 1997). In derivations tree-scheme (13'), each constituent of the particular category phrase in functional projections IP, VP, CP syntactically merges, forming intermediate projections I', V', C', and maximal projections IP, VP, CP.

Thus, NP *atonement Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers, And betwixt them and my lord chamberlain* merges with V *make*, forming projection V', which merges with Spec subject PRO *ti* composing maximal projection VP, which, in its turn, combines with flection *to* [I], forming further on by way of the internal elements unification the maximal projection of a complementizer phrase CP. The latter one correlates with the matrix V *desire* and forms its projection V' that in the combination with Spec NP *he ti* constitutes projection VP, which merges with present tense inflection [I] -s and forms projection I'. Then, in such way, all other IP, CP higher projections are composed, where projection I' is not marked by the specifier, leaving this position empty. Hence, the syntactic agreement between V *desire* and the infinitive clause *to make atonement Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers, And betwixt them and my lord chamberlain* also designates complementary character of the infinitive clause, defining it as an object complement of the matrix predicate.

The surface structure of sentence (13) may be represented in the following way:

(15') [CP Madam, we did: [IP [Spec *hei* [I', I -s [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V *desire* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V *make* [NP *atonement Betwixt the Duke of Gloucester and your brothers, And betwixt them and my lord chamberlain; ...]]]]]]]]].*

The identical constituents' derivation of SVOd (*bare* INF clause) model has been witnessed in sentence (16) with the similar signs of generation of subject PRO control. However, null infinitive flection in position domain [T, T'] does not mark PRO with an accusative case, thus PRO obtains from bare or null infinitive flection *zero case* (16'):

(16) *Sicinius: 'I wish no better Than have him hold that purpose and to put it in execution'* (Shakespeare, 'Coriolanus', ii, i, 255) (Rowse, 1988). — (16') [CP [IP [Spec *Ii* [I', I [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V *wish* [NegP [Spec [Neg', Neg *no* [AdvP [Spec [Adv', Adv *better Than* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V *have* [NP *him hold that purpose and to put it in execution]]]]]]]]].*

Hence, it has been proved that *to / bare* infinitive sentences (13), (16) with matrix verbs of volition *desire, wish* was of 'two-argument structure' with the infinitive clause as its internal argument and an object complement. The infinitive clause took its generation in the framework of the complementizer phrase CP. Control of the infinitive implicit subject PRO was fulfilled by the matrix subject. The thematic role paradigm was defined as 'agent — patient'.

Next examples (17) — (22) represent the same surface structure (17') — (22') of subject control infinitive sentences' generation with matrix verbs of volition as *wish, want, hope, promise, intend*:

(17) *Wolsey: 'Speedily I wish To hear from Rome. The Marchioness of Pembroke!'* (Shakespeare, 'King Henry VIII', iii, ii, 89-90) (Rowse, 1988). — (17') [CP [AdvP [Spec *Speedily* [IP [Spec *Ii* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V *wish* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I To [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V *hear* [PP *from Rome*]]]]]]]]].

(18) *'Yet eyes this cunning want to grace their art'* (Shakespeare, 'The sonnets', xxiv, 13) (Rowse, 1988). — (18') [CP [AdvP [Spec *Yet* [IP [Spec *eyes this cunningi* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V *want* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V *grace* [NP *their art*]]]]]]]]].

(19) *Fifth Citizen: 'We hope to find you our friend; and therefore give you our voices heartily'* (Shakespeare, 'Coriolanus', ii, iii, 11-12) (Rowse, 1988). — (19') [CP [IP [Spec *Wei* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V *hope* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V *find* [NP *you our friend; ...*]]]]]]]]].

(20) *Pompey: 'Why, very well; I hope here be truths'* (Shakespeare, 'Measure for measure', ii, i, 131) (Rowse, 1988). — (20') [CP [Spec *Why*, [Adv [Spec [Adv', Adv *very well*]; [IP [Spec *Ii* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V *hope* [CP [Adv [Spec [Adv', Adv *here* [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V *be* [NP *truths*]]]]]]]]]]].

(21) *Caius: 'By gar, with all my heart. He promise to bring me where is Anne Page; by gar, he deceive me too'* (Shakespeare, 'The merry wives of Windsor', iii, ii, 125-127) (Rowse, 1988). — (21') [CP *By gar, with all my heart.* [CP [IP [Spec *Hei* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V *promise* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V *bring* [NP *me*

[CP where is Anne Page; ...]]]]]]].

(22) King: 'Go, call our uncle' to our presence straight; Say we intend to try his grace to-day, If he be guilty, as 'tis published' (Shakespeare, 'King Henry VI', Part II, iii, ii, 15-17) (Rowse, 1988). — (22') [CP Go, call our uncle' to our presence straight; [CP Say [IP [Spec *wei* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V intend [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V try [NP his grace to-day, ...]]]]]]]]].

4.3 Monotransitive Infinitive Complementation of SV_{Od} (NP to / bare INF clause) Configuration Type

The second configuration type of infinitive monotransitive complementation has been defined as model SV_{Od} (NP to / bare INF clause) — subject, verb, direct object, which is actualized by a noun phrase with the infinitive, which subcategorizes monotransitive verbs of volition of longing and intention as *desire, want, wish, hope, intend* (total 119 infinitive sentence units — Appendix B, Table 2). Due to their monotransitivity, these verbs can take exclusively one direct object, which function is implemented by a noun phrase in combination with the infinitive clause, forming, as a result, the united *infinitival predicative complement*.

It is worth highlighting that the second configuration type of monotransitive infinitive complementation has got the special diverse matrix verbs' peculiarity, namely: a noun phrase in the initial position of the infinitive clause can not function as a subject of the main clause because the studied verbs of volition have been never used in the passive voice (Quirk et al., 1985). Therefore, the *infinitive subject* is expressed in an *accusative case* in the function of a matrix direct object having formed with the infinitive an 'A.C.I. construction' (*accusative cum infinito*) (Ivanova et al., 1999; Giurgea & Cotfas, 2021; Zorić, 2019).

Additionally, in historical linguistics, infinitive sentences were regarded as *Accusativus cum Infinitive* (a.c.i.). These constructions were already witnessed in Anglo-Saxon language with further usage in Middle- / Early Modern English (Yartseva, 1940). Hence, in this study, both the infinitival subject and the infinitive itself are used in the accusative case that stipulates the definition of the *post-verbal complement* as the conjoint word combination of 'two-argument arrangement' in this configuration type of monotransitive infinitive complementation.

In example (23), it is exemplified the second monotransitive complementation as SV_{Od} (NP to INF clause) model.


(23) Biron: 'Cut me to pieces with thy keen conceit; And I will wish thee never more to dance, ...' (Shakespeare, 'Love's labour's lost, v, ii, 399-400) (Rowse, 1988).

In sentence (23), the coordinated clause *And I will wish thee never more to dance* demonstrates the two-actant structural arrangement of matrix verb *will wish*. The subject of the main action Spec NP *I* occurs to be its external argument with the agent theta-role and controls the implicit subject PRO of the infinitive *to dance*. The monotransitive function of the matrix predicate opens a position only for one actant, where the position of the internal argument is occupied by the whole infinitival clause along with Spec NP *thee*, namely *thee never more to dance* with the theta-role of the patient of the main action. Thus, the thematic role paradigm of sentence (23) is defined as 'agent — patient'.

In derivation tree-scheme below (23'), generation of the matrix subject NP *I* and the infinitive subject PRO takes place in the canonical positions of the particular verbal phrases in [Spec, VP]. PRO as the implicit subject of V *dance* obtains its thematic agent role in the lower VP internally in [Spec, VP] domain, while Spec NP *I* is theta marked in the internal specifier position [Spec, VP] of the higher VP. For case marking, these elements move locally left up to [Spec, IP] of their category phrases, where Spec NP *I* receives the nominative case from V *wish*, but the main verb can not assign the case to PRO because of the overt intervening projections IP, NegP, AdvP and CP. Thus, the implicit subject PRO is marked with *the null case* from inflection *to*. The matrix object Spec NP *thee* takes from V *wish* its accusative case due to the coreferential relationship between the head V *wish* in [V, V'] of the higher VP and the specifier Spec NP *thee* in [Spec, IP]. For obtaining control properties, PRO moves from [Spec, IP] further through the nearest occupied position Spec NP *thee* to the specifier Spec NP *I*, merging with it and leaving behind the co-indexing traces (*ti, i*), where the specifier Spec NP *I* controls the implicit subject PRO. As follows, the external implicit argument PRO of the infinitive *dance* is identified and controlled by its antecedent Spec NP *I*. It is worth noting that, since the paradigmatic position 'anaphora — direct object' is unavailable for PRO identification, the direct matrix object Spec NP *thee* can not be the antecedent of PRO (Chomsky, 2015). This fact also proves the semantic implementation of V *dance* to the group of the subject control verbs.

Derivation tree-scheme (23') represents generation of sentence (23) in the following way:

(23')



Additionally, in linguistics the potential governors are regarded to be such categories as [+/-N; +/-V; INFL], where the particular category governs its complement in the construction of which it is the head (Chomsky, 1993). Consequently, no controlling element can govern the trace *ti*, hence, *ti* is governed by V *dance*, which is the head of the infinitival projection. Merge operation of all sentence's constituents (23) forms the corresponding intermediate and maximal projections of the phrasal categories and stipulates the agreement of the elements in appropriate phrases for checking the morphological features. The hierarchy structure of the exemplified sentence (23) defines c-command relationships between its constituents. Thus, I assume that V *wish* c-commands over its functional projections IP, CP, choosing them as its clausal predicative complement.

The surface structure of example (23) can be represented in the following scheme (24'):

(24') [CP Cut me to pieces with thy keen conceit; And [IP [Spec Ii [I, I will [VP [Spec ti [V, V wish [IP [Spec theei [NegP [Spec [Neg', Neg never [AdvP [Spec [Adv', Adv more [CP [IP [Spec PROi [I, I to [VP [Spec [PRO] ti [V, V dance, ...]]]]]]]]]]]]]]].

(25) Claudio: 'I hope he be in love' (Shakespeare, 'Much ado about nothing', iii, ii, 17) (Rowse, 1988).

In example (25), the second montransitive complementation type of SVOd (NP bare INF clause) model is exemplified as an EModE sentence with montransitive matrix verb *hope*, which is subcategorized by *bare* infinitive clause *be in love* without particle *to*. Nevertheless, the absence of *to* marker in sentence structure (25) constitutes the crucial difference in generation of the second montransitive complementation sub-type with *bare* infinitival predication.


In derivation tree-scheme (25'), it has been evidenced that the implicit subject PRO of the infinitive V *be* generates in its canonical position [Spec, VP] of the lower VP within the CP category phrase. Further on, for its subject control and the case assignment, PRO moves left up to the nearest specifier position [Spec, IP] of the phrase IP of the lower complementizer CP phrase, leaving behind it the trace *ti*. Yet, it is witnessed that, due to the *bare* infinitive structure, the canonical inflection *to* position [I, I'] is empty (*ec*), thus, it becomes unoccupied; so, the *bare* inflection is considered to be the null infinitive inflection. Phonologically empty position I in the IP phrase can not assign case to PRO element. In derivation tree-scheme (25') null infinitive inflection (*ec*) in position [I, I'] does not mark PRO with the case, hence, PRO obtains zero case, which becomes unrealized in sentence (25).

For the subject control realization, PRO moves further on left up to the nearest occupied specifier position [Spec, IP] of the direct object NP *he*, and then PRO moves to the occupied specifier NP I position [Spec, IP], merging with this

subject NP *I*, which occurs to be the controller of PRO due to its natural verbal controlling features. Thus, it is fixed that the implicit subject PRO of the infinitive *be* is controlled by the Spec NP *I* and not by the object Spec NP *he*.

Derivation tree-scheme (25') represents generation of sentence (25) in the following way:

(25')



In sentence (25), it has been defined the two-argument structure of matrix predicate *hope*, which was surrounded by two arguments, namely by the external argument subject NP *I* as the agent of the main action and by the single internal argument direct object *he be in love*, consisting of the object NP *he* and the infinitive clause *be in love* as the patient of the main action. C-commanding and coreferential relationships between V *hope* and both of its inflectional object phrase IP *he* and its complementizer phrase CP *be in love* defined the complementary character of the latter categories, where the predicate *hope* chose them as its clausal predicative complement.

Therefore, the thematic role paradigm of sentence (25) was also defined as ‘agent — patient’.

The surface structure of example (25) can be represented in the following scheme (26'):

(26') [CP [IP [Spec *Ii* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V hope [IP [Spec *hei* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V be [PP [Spec in love]]]]]]]]]]]]]]].

Similar generation of subject control infinitive sentences with matrix predicates of volition as *desire*, *want*, *wish*, *hope*, *intend* of the presented second sub-type of monotransitive infinitive complementation has been evidenced in the next examples with their surface structures (27) — (32') from Early Modern English corpus data:

(27) *Jaques*: ‘*I do not desire you to please me; I do desire you to sing*’ (Shakespeare, ‘*As you like it*’, ii, v, 17-18) (Rowse, 1988). — (27') [CP [IP [Spec *Ii* [I', I do [NegP [Spec not [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V desire [IP [Spec you_i [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V please me]]]]]]]]]]]; [CP [IP [Spec *Ii* [I', I do [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V desire [IP [Spec you_i [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V sing]]]]]]]]]]]]].

(28) *Livia*: *And, knowing this, I hope 'tis at your choice To take or refuse, niece* (Middleton, ‘*Women beware women*’, ii, i, 82) (Taylor & Lavagnino, 2007). — (28') [CP [Spec And, knowing this, [IP [Spec *Ii* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V hope [IP [Spec 'tis at your choice_i [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I To [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V take or refuse, [NP [Spec niece]]]]]]]]]]].

(29) *Voice Divine*: ‘*I, ere thou spak'st, Knew it not good for Man to be alone, And no such company as then thou saw'st Intended thee — for trial only brought, To see how thou couldst judge of fit and meet*’ (Milton, ‘*Paradise Lost*’, Book VIII) (Eliot, 1909). — (29') [CP [Spec *Ii*, ere thou spak'st, Knew it not good for Man to be alone, And no such company as then [IP [Spec thou_i [I', I saw'st -ed [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V Intend [IP [Spec thee_i — PP [Spec for trial only brought, [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I To [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V see [CP [Spec how thou couldst judge of fit and meet]]]]]]]]]]].

(30) *Silvia*: ‘*I do desire thee, even from a heart As full of sorrows as the sea of sands, To bear me company and go with me*’ (Shakespeare, ‘*The two gentlemen of Verona*’, iv, iii, 32-34) (Rowse, 1988). — (30') [CP [IP *Ii* [I', I do [VP

[Spec *ti* [V', V desire [IP *theei*, [PP [Spec even from a heart As full of sorrows as the sea of sands, [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I To [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V bear me company and go with me]]]]]]]]].

(31) *Proteus*: 'And he wants wit that wants resolved will To learn his wit to exchange the bad for better' (Shakespeare, 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona', ii, vi, 12-13) (Rowse, 1988). — (31') [CP [Spec And he wants wit [CP [IP [Spec *thati* [I', I -s [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V want [IP [Spec resolved *willi* [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I To [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V learn his wit to exchange the bad for better]]]]]]]]].

(32) *Adversary*: 'At least, if so we can, and by the head Broken be not intended all our power To be infringed, our freedom and our being In this fair empire won of Earth and Air' (Milton, 'Paradise Regained', Book I) (Eliot, 1909). — (32') [CP [Spec At least, if so [CP [IP [Spec *wei* [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V can, and [PP Spec by the head Broken [IP [I', I be -ed [NegP [Spec [Neg', Neg not [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V intend [IP [Spec all our power_i [CP [IP [Spec PRO_i [I', I To [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V be infringed, [NP our freedom and our being In this fair empire won of Earth and Air]]]]]]]]].

4.4 Monotransitive Infinitive Complementation of SVO_d (*wh-* to INF clause) Configuration Type

The third configuration type of monotransitive infinitive complementation has been represented by verbs of volition as *command*, *determine*. It was characterized as SVO_d (*wh-* to INF clause) model — subject, verb, direct object as a *wh*-phrase with a *to*-infinitive. It has been testified that this pattern occurred very rarely in EModE with these verbs of volition (total 2 infinitive sentence units — Appendix B, Table 2).


(33) *Hermione*: 'For Polixenes, With whom I am accused, I do confess I loved him as in honour he required, With such a kind of love as might become A lady like me, with a love even such, So and no other, [as yourself] commanded: Which not to have done] I think had been in me Both disobedience and ingratitude To you and toward your friend, whose love had spoke, Even since it could speak, from an infant, freely That it was yours' (Shakespeare, 'The winter's tale', iii, ii, 62-72) (Rowse, 1988).

In sentence (33), it has been exemplified the EModE complex sentence structure with the embedded infinitive sentence [*as yourself commanded: Which not to have done*] with the matrix verb of volition *commanded*, where this complex infinitival sentence requires special analysis of its generation to be highlighted in terms of a generative grammar.

In next tree-scheme (33'), it has been characterized general generation of sentence (33), where CP clauses are formed and generated by way of *Merge* and *Agree* generative operations with c-commanding, coreferential relationships between category phrases; as well as it is specifically defined the special generation of the embedded complex sentence [*as yourself commanded: Which not to have done*] by way of *Merge*, *Agree* and *Move* generative operations.

Derivation tree-scheme (33') represents generation of sentence (33) in the following way:

(33')



In the process of the embedded infinitival sentence's generation [*as yourself commanded: Which not to have done*], first of all, it has been fixed the generation of principal and infinitive clauses' subjects NP *yourself* and PRO, respectively, in their VP specifier positions [Spec, VP]. In its turn, the subject NP *yourself* generates in [Spec, VP] of the higher VP phrase and moves left up to the position [Spec, IP] for obtaining the nominative case from matrix verb *command* and for checking its nominative features after the phonological spell-out. The infinitive implicit subject PRO moves, primarily, to the nearest position [Spec, IP] of the lower projection CP as a complementizer phrase for taking a null case from the inflection *to* due to the coreferential relationship between its head [I, I'] and the specifier [Spec, IP]. The control functions are obtained by way of PRO further moving up leftward, where its landing site is the matrix subject NP *yourself* Spec position [Spec, IP] as its antecedent and the controlling element of PRO.

In derivation tree-scheme (33'), it has been evidenced that the special diversity of SVOd (*wh- to* INF clause) pattern's formation is the generation of the complementizer *Which*, namely: the functional projection's specifier position CP [Spec, CP] is filled by the complementizer *Which* by way of its generation in the canonical position [Spec, AdjP] of the adjunct of infinitive V *have done* as the predicative object and its further movement to the specifier position [Spec, CP] of the complementizer phrase CP for checking the interrogative features [+wh/-that] of the infinitive complement CP. The interrogative features of CP are coded with the positive interrogative marker [+wh] and the negative declarative marker [-that]; they have already been realized in the head position [C, C'] of the projection CP and they are assigned by the head-specifier Spec in [Spec, CP] after the phonological spell-out of the utterance. After the movement to [Spec, CP] position, the complementizer *Which* leaves behind it the trace *ti* in its generation canonical position [Spec, AdjP]. The relationships between the specifiers of Spec *wh*-phrase in [Spec, CP] and the trace *ti* in [Spec, AdjP] are determined as the antecedent ones, where the complementizer *Which* controls its trace *ti*. As follows, it is proved that the *wh*-element moves to [Spec, CP] of the CP phrase for its phonological expression on the surface level.

The surface structure of sentence (33) may be represented in category phrases in detail as in (34):

(34) [CP [Spec [PP [Spec For Polixenes, [PP [Spec With [CP [Spec whomi [IP [Spec I am accused, [AdjP [Spec ti [CP [Spec [IP [Spec I do confess [CP [Spec [IP [Spec I loved him [CP [Spec as [PP [Spec in honour [IP [Spec he required, [PP [Spec With such a kind of love [CP [Spec as might become A lady like me, [PP [Spec with a love even such, [AdjP [Spec So and no other, [CP [Spec as [IP [Spec yourselfi [I', I -ed [VP [Spec ti [V', V command: [CP [Spec Which [NegP [Neg', Neg not [IP [Spec PROi [I', I to [VP [Spec [PRO] ti [V', V have done [AdjP [Spec ti [CP

[Spec [IP [Spec I think had been [PP [Spec in me Both disobedience and ingratitude [PP [Spec To you and toward your friend, [CP [Spec whosei [IP [Spec love had spoke, [AdjP [Spec *ti* [CP [Spec Even since [IP [Spec it could speak, [PP [Spec from an infant, [CP [Spec That [IP [Spec it was yours]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]].

The surface structure of the embedded infinitival sentence with the verb *command* may be represented as in (35'):

(35') [CP [Spec as [IP [Spec yourselfi [I, I -ed [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V command: [CP [Spec Whichi [NegP [Neg', Neg not [IP [Spec PROi [I, I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V have done [AdjP [Spec *ti*]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]].

The Projection Principle defines the governing relationships between the constituents in the hierarchic configuration. In derivation tree-scheme (33'), it has been witnessed that the matrix verb *command* c-commands and governs its lower projections CP, NegP, IP, VP, AdjP, where it selects the complementizer phrase CP *Which not to have done* along with the complementizer *Which* as its predicative complement in the function of a direct object.

The embedded infinitival sentence [*as yourself commanded: Which not to have done*] with the matrix verb of volition *commanded* of example (33) is outlined with 'two-argument arrangement' of the verb *V command*, which assigns a nominative case to its external argument NP *yourself* with the agent theta-role, whereas the direct object infinitival clause *Which not to have done* as the main verb internal argument is granted the thematic role of a patient. The theta-role paradigm of sentence (33) is defined as 'agent — patient' as well.

In next sentence (36), it has been shown similar SVOD (*wh- to* INF clause) structural pattern of EModE complex infinitival sentence with the matrix verb of volition *determine*, which is subcategorized by the infinitive clause *How to cut off some charge in legacies* with the complementizer *How*.

(36) Antony: '*But, Lepidus, go you to Cresar's house; Fetch the will hither, and we shall determine How to cut off some charge in legacies*' (Shakespeare, '*Julius Ceasar*', iv, i, 7-9) (Rowse, 1988).

The surface structure of sentence (36) represents similar generation pattern of *wh- to* infinitive clause as in (36'):

(36') [CP [Spec But, Lepidus, go you to Cresar's house; [CP [Spec Fetch the will hither, [CP [Spec and [IP [Spec wei [I, I shall [VP [Spec *ti* [V', V determine [CP [Spec Howi [IP [Spec PROi [I, I to [VP [Spec [PRO] *ti* [V', V cut off [PP [AdvP [Spec *ti* some charge in legacies]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]].

Hereby, it has been exemplified and witnessed that syntactic configuration types of *infinitive complementation* with monotransitive *matrix verbs of volition* in EModE had demonstrated complex infinitive sentences as *subject control infinitive constructions* with 'two-argument arrangement' of matrix predicates with the noun phrase as a direct object in an accusative case, where the infinitival clauses have been interpreted as the objective predicative complements. The thematic role paradigm of the represented infinitives has been defined as 'agent — patient'.

5. Conclusion

Based on the above findings, the current study has proved my main hypothesis that complex infinitive sentences in the Early Modern English period function as *subject control infinitive constructions*. According to such controlling verbal properties as the lexical characteristics and propositional orientation of the matrix predicates, *verbs of volition* have been claimed as *the subject control predicates* of infinitive subject PRO control. The controller choice was defined of thematic and semantic manner. Main factors, influencing predicate control options, have turned out to be 'coreferential agreement' among the constituents and the referential thematic roles. It has been grounded and proved that the PRO category was functionally controlled, but syntactically ungoverned because of the obtained pronominal and anaphoric features. The argument status of PRO has been highlighted in both external and internal argument positions. *Subject control infinitives* have been claimed as complementizer phrases' (CP) clauses with an independent unrealized tense form.

The results of the current study have shown the diverse configurations of *the monotransitive infinitive complementation of verbs of volition* as structures of *subject control*. It has been evidenced that the studied infinitival sentences demonstrated the tendency to appear with *two-argument placement* due to the transitive peculiarities and the lexical nature of the matrix *verbs of volition*. In such control infinitive structures, *a direct noun phrase* as a direct object has been assigned *an accusative case*. The infinitive clauses generated in the framework of the complementizer phrase CP that was governed by another predicate of a higher verbal phrase VP. It has been witnessed that structural and semantic relations in projections of the particular categories established unambiguous constitution relationships of c-commanding and complementation that had proved the complementary nature of the infinitival clauses. It has been confirmed that the complementary infinitive clause predication was realized in the function of a direct object. *The theta-grid paradigm* with various semantic types of *verbs of volition* in Early Modern English has been distinguished as 'agent — patient'.

Further studies can use the findings of the current study and can be performed within the generative paradigm in terms of syntax control of non-finite (gerund / participle / adverbial) sentence structures of Old-, Middle-, Early Modern-, Modern Germanic languages in diachrony in the historical perspective.

References

- Buniyatova, I. (2021). Elimination of grammatical redundancy in the history of English: The case of negative constructions. In R. Kiełtyka (Ed.) *Studies in linguistics, anglophone literature and cultures: Studies in the evolution of the English language*, 32, 97-109. Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). *Lectures on government and binding: The Pisa lectures* (7th ed.). J. Koster & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884166>
- Chomsky, N. (2002). *Syntactic structures* (2nd ed.). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218329>
- Chomsky, N. (2015). *The minimalist program: 20th anniversary edition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts/London, England: The MIT Press.
- Comrie, B. (1984). Subject and object control: syntax, semantics, pragmatics. *Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Berkeley linguistics society*, 450-464. <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v10i0.1957>
- Eliot, C. W. (Ed.). (1909). *The complete poems of John Milton. Volume 4*. New York: P. F. Collier and Son Corporation.
- Gelderen, E. (2013). *Clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139084628>
- Gentens, C., & Rudanko, J. (2019). The great complement shift and the role of understood subjects: The case of fearful. *Folia linguistica*, 53(1), 51-86. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2019-2004>
- Giurgea, I., & Cofas, M. A. (2021). Agent control in passives in Romanian. *Linguistik aktuell*, 270, 83-106. Amsterdam / Philadelphia, the Netherlands / USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.270>
- Haegeman, L. (1994). *Introduction to government and binding theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Haegeman, L., & Gueron, J. (1999). *English grammar: A generative perspective*. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Hale, K., & Keyser, J. (1992). Lexical categories and the projection of argument structure. In J. A. Lakarra & J. O. de Urbina (Eds.), *Syntactic theory and Basque syntax*, 147-173. San Sebastian: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia. Retrieved from <https://ojs.ehu.eus/index.php/ASJU/article/view/9388/8616>
- Horodilova, T. M. (2021). Syntactic implementation of the negative clitic *nicht* in the modern German language. *Scientific bulletin of KSU: Series Germanic studies and intercultural communication*, 1, 38-44. <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2663-3426/2021-1-6>
- Høyem, I. F. (2019). Event-controlled adjuncts in German [Ereigniskontrollierte Adjunkte im Deutschen]. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik*, 47(3), 507-534. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zgl-2019-0023>
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2012). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2005). *A student's introduction to English grammar*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815515>
- Ivanova, I. P., Chakhoyan, L. P., & Belyayeva, T. M. (1999). *History of the English language*. Saint-Petersburg: Lan Press.
- Kochergan, M. P. (2006). *General linguistics* (2nd ed.). Kyiv: Publishing Center 'Academia'.
- Landau, I. (2000). *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Leung, T., & Halefom, G. (2017). The theory and syntactic representation of control structures: An analysis from Amharic. *Glossa: A journal of general linguistics*, 2(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.277>
- MacDonald, J. E., & Vázquez-Lozares, A. (2021). Spanish impersonal se in control infinitivals and the ungrammaticality of se se sequences. *Issues in Hispanic and Lusophone linguistics*, 33, 135-155. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ihll.33.7mac>
- Mucha, A., Hartmann, J. M., & Trawiński, B. (Eds.). (2021). *Non-canonical control in a cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, the Netherlands/USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.270>
- Osborne, T., & Reeve, M. (2017). Control vs. raising in English. A dependency grammar account. *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on dependency linguistics (Depling 2017), September 18-20 2017*, 176-186. Pisa, Italy: Linköping University Electronic Press. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/W17-6521.pdf>
- Pollard, C., & Sag, I. A. (1994). *Head-driven phrase structure grammar (Studies in contemporary linguistics)*. Goldsmith, J., McCawley, J. D., & Sadock, J. M. (Eds.), Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London, New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational grammar: A first course*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511840425>
- Radford, A. (1997). *Syntax: A minimalist introduction*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139166898>
- Radford, A. (2009). *Analysing English sentences. A minimalist approach*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801617>
- Rickman, P., & Rudanko, J. (2018). Corpus-based studies on non-finite complements in recent English (pp. 1-108). Palgrave Pivot, Cham: Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72989-3>
- Roget, P. M. (Ed.). (1995). *Roget's II: The new thesaurus by the editors of the American heritage dictionaries* (3rd ed). Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rowse, A. L. (Ed.). (1988). *The annotated Shakespeare: Three volumes in one illustrated: the comedies, the histories, sonnets, and other poems, the tragedies and romances*. New York: Greenwich House.
- Sag, I. A., & Pollard, C. (1991). An integrated theory of complement control. *Language*, 67(1), 63-113. Washington, DC: Linguistic Society of America. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415539>
- Stowell, T. (1982). On tense of infinitives. *Linguistic inquiry*, 13(3), 561-570. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Sukhorolska, S. M., & Fedorenko, O. I. (2005). *Methods of linguistic analysis*. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University Lviv Press.
- Taylor, G., & Lavagnino, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Thomas Middleton. The collected works*. Oxford, NY: Clarendon Press.
- Tesnière, L. (1976). *Eléments de syntaxe structurale*. Paris: Librairie C Klincksieck.
- Tesnière, L. (1988). *Foundations of structural syntax: Translation from French*. Moscow: Progress.
- Testelefs, Y. G. (2001). *Introduction to general syntax*. Moscow: Russian State Humanitarian University.
- Tuhai, O. M. (2019). Object control interpretations with volitional verbs in infinitive complexes of Early Modern English. *Science and education a new dimension. Philology*, 210(VII(61)), 70-76. Hungary: Budapest. <https://doi.org/10.31174/SEND-Ph2019-210VII61-14>
- Tuhai, O. M. (2021). *Complex sentence with verbs of volition in Early Modern English: Structure and function*. Thesis for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Philology. Kyiv: Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University.
- Yartseva, V. N. (1940). *The development of complex sentence in the English language*. Leningrad: Leningrad State University Press.
- Zorić, M. (2019). Exceptional case marking clauses and implicitly controlled clauses in the Croatian language. *Rasprave instituta za Hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 45(2), 695-711. Croatia: Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.45.2.22>

APPENDIX A

Table 1. Quantitative indicators of subject control infinitive sentences with verbs of volition in Early Modern English

Subject control infinitive sentences with verbs of volition in Early Modern English		
Verb of volition of subject control	Quantity of subject control infinitive sentences	Percentage from total corpus data (400 infinitival constructions)
1. <i>desire</i>	154	38,5 %
2. <i>wish</i>	40	10 %
3. <i>want</i>	43	10,75 %
4. <i>hope</i>	48	12 %
5. <i>intend</i>	58	14,5 %
6. <i>promise</i>	20	5 %
7. <i>determine</i>	20	5 %
8. <i>command</i>	17	4,25 %
Total:	400	100 %

APPENDIX B

Table 2. Quantitative indicators of monotransitive infinitive complementation in Early Modern English

Verb of volition	Configuration types of monotransitive infinitive complementation					Total
	SVOd (<i>to</i> INF clause)	SVOd (<i>bare</i> INF clause)	SVOd (NP <i>to</i> INF clause)	SVOd (NP <i>bare</i> INF clause)	SVOd (<i>wh- to</i> INF clause)	
1. <i>desire</i>	97	1	53	3	0	154
2. <i>wish</i>	19	1	17	3	0	40
3. <i>want</i>	6	0	37	0	0	43
4. <i>hope</i>	45	2	1	0	0	48
5. <i>intend</i>	52	1	2	3	0	58
6. <i>promise</i>	20	0	0	0	0	20
7. <i>determine</i>	19	0	0	0	1	20
8. <i>command</i>	15	1	0	0	1	17
	273	6	110	9	2	400
Total:	279		119		2	400

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).