

Finite Complement Clauses in Shakespeare's English. II*

TERESA FANEGO

3. THE SEMANTICS OF THE COMPLEMENT CONSTRUCTIONS

This section will examine the semantic features of the predicates listed in Part I, as well as the type of verb phrase used in the complement clause. These are closely interrelated topics, in that the selection of the inflectional subjunctive or, alternatively, of a periphrastic form, is determined in many cases by the presence of a matrix predicate of the appropriate kind. Considering that the subjunctive as a morphological category was clearly on the decrease by Shakespeare's time, it has been thought worthwhile to investigate its use in detail, though no attempt has been made to analyse every aspect of the internal meaning and modality of the complement clause. This implies that assertions such as "this type takes only indicative forms", which will often be repeated in the following pages, are meant to allow for the presence of modal auxiliaries in senses and functions other than those relevant to the specific aspects under analysis; e.g. *would* in *Wiv* 2.3.10 "he knew that your worship would kill him".

Various taxonomies of predicates have been proposed in the literature over the past few years; of these, Michael Noonan's (1985: 110 ff.) appeared to be the most adequate for the description of the semantic types found in the plays, and, therefore, it has been adopted here with a few minor changes. We are well aware that some of the classifications that follow may be open to debate, but this is a risk that cannot easily be avoided when dealing with semantic issues.

As shown in table 6, utterance predicates are the most numerous, both in the corpus as a whole and in each individual play. In addition to this class, four other important ones emerge, namely II (propositional attitude), III (commentative), IV (of knowledge), and VIII (desiderative); altogether, they make up 86.29% of the total. Somewhat surprisingly—at least to the present writer, who had expected greater stylistic diversity—the various types are fairly evenly distributed among the four plays. The main exceptions in this respect are the low incidence of Class III (commentative) in *Wint*, and the figures for desiderative predicates. In the latter case the disparities result, in large measure, from the frequency (= 14 occurrences) in *Wiv* of *would* structures of the type [I] *would I were* . . . Because of their formulaic and idiomatic nature, these are in keeping with the colloquial language characteristic of that play, where, not unexpectedly, they are often found in the idiolect of such inane and naive speakers as Mistress Quickly, Slender, or Simple. The following lines will, we believe, serve to illustrate this point:

- (1) *Wiv* 3.4.102 ff. *Quickly*. But yet I would my master had Mistress Anne; or I would Master Slender had her; or, in sooth, I would Master Fenton had her. I will do what I can for them all three.

3.1. Utterance predicates

Utterance predicates "are used in sentences describing a simple transfer of information initiated by an agentive subject. The complement represents the transferred information, and the CTP (= complement-taking predicate) describes the manner of transfer, the illocutionary force of the original statement, and can also give an evaluation of the

* Continued from the preceding issue.

speaker's (...) view of the veracity of the proposition encoded in the complement'' (Noonan, 1985: 110). In the corpus, this class comprises the following predicates:

Rom confess (2), cry out "proclaim", promise, protest, say (15), swear (3), tell (8), testify, write, signal sb.

Wiv acquaint, confess, notify, object (2), protest, say (20), swear (5), be sworn, take upon one's honour "protest by one's honour", tell (10), be told (S), be the very yea and the no (C_s), report sb., tale, word.

Lear know, answer, confess, maintain, proclaim, promise, protest, say (12), swear (2), teach, tell (11), my very deed of love, letters "message", notice (in *give notice* "inform"), oath (in *take one's oath*).

Wint confess, say (9), swear (4), tell (2), be told (S), intelligence "information".

Note: Here and in succeeding sections the following abbreviations have been used: *S* = the predicate in question takes a clause in subject function (cf. 2.1); *C_s* = the clause is a subject complement (cf. 2.6); *AdjP* = the clause is a dependent in AdjP structure (cf. 2.7). Predicates without any special symbol are followed by an object clause, if verbs (cf. 2.2-5), or by an appositive clause, if nouns or nominals (cf. 2.8).

As in PE, utterance predicates take indicative complements. The one exception might be (2):

(2) *Wiv* 4.5.66 *Host*. They are gone but to meet the Duke, villain. Do not say they *be* fled. Germans are honest men.

Even in OE, where the subjunctive was used much more extensively than in EMODE, utterance predicates generally preferred the indicative, though OE *secgan* "say" often occurred with the subjunctive (cf. Mitchell, 1985: 2,019-25), and continued to do so in ME; the last quotation in Visser (Part II: 874) is from 1476.¹ (2) could thus provide a late example, though we feel more inclined to view *be* there as the old indicative plural (<OE *beo-*); this was frequent in EMODE, and is used by the *Host* himself only a few lines before:

(3) *Wiv* 4.5.61 *Host*. Where *be* my horses?

3.2. Propositional attitude predicates

These predicates express an attitude, which may be positive (e.g. *believe*, *think*) or negative (e.g. *not believe*, *deny*) regarding the truth of the proposition expressed as their

Table 6. *Semantic classes of predicates*

		<i>Rom</i>	<i>Wiv</i>	<i>Lear</i>	<i>Wint</i>	Total
I	Utterance	34	48	37	18	137
II	Propositional attitude	26	37	27	15	105
III	Commentative	18	19	24	2	63
IV	Of knowledge and acquisition					
	of knowledge	17	15	21	9	62
V	Of perception	8	3	1	-	12
VI	Of fearing	3	5	4	1	13
VII	Manipulative	5	6	6	1	18
VIII	Desiderative	14	29	10	8	61
IX	Ensuring predicates	3	2	-	-	5
X	Other	5	5	10	-	20
Total		133	169	140	54	496

complement. Animate subjects of such predicates are experiencers,² as opposed to the agentive subjects of utterance predicates; experiencers, however, need not be overtly realized, as in *it seems that ...*, *it is certain that ...*, and similar structures.

Rom believe (2), not deny, seem (S), suppose, be supposed (S), suspect, think (8), think "seem" (3) (S), be thought (S), warrant (2), be like(ly) (3) (S), be sure (2) (AdjP).

Wiv think (18), think "seem" (4) (S), warrant (4), be most certain (S), be not doubted (S), be impossible (S), be a thing impossible (S), be positive "be certain" (S), be not so "be not true" (S), be sure (2) (AdjP), belief, thought sb., be the truth (C_s).

Lear deny, hold true (S), seem (S), think (13), think "seem" (10) (S), be sure (AdjP).

Wint seem (S), think (9), think "seem" (S), be thought (S), be sure (2) (AdjP), be of the mind "be of the opinion".

The indicative is the unmarked mood with this class. Notable exceptions are the negative predicates *be impossible* / *be a thing impossible*, which are both followed by meditative *should*; they will therefore be considered in the next section, where that use of the auxiliary will be duly examined.

Outside the corpus, propositional attitude predicates can also be found with subjunctive complement clauses, as in (4):

(4) *Othello* 3.3.389 /I think my wife *be* honest, and think she is not/

The only comparable structure in our selection of plays is the *be* clause in (5), which, however, has not been included in the figures given elsewhere for complement clauses, since, strictly speaking, it exhibits every feature of main clauses, except for the subjunctive verb form:

(5) *Rom* 1.5.131 *Juliet*. What's he that now is going out of door? *Nurse*. Marry, that, I think, *be* young Petruccio.

In such cases, as also after predicates of hoping and fearing, which behave in much the same way (cf. Sections 3.6 and 3.8 below), it is usually assumed that the subjunctive weakens the claim to truth that would have been implied by a simple indicative. See in this connection Franz (1939: 526), James (1986: 32), Traugott (1972: 101), and Visser (Part II: p. 850): "the modally marked form expresses the speaker's opinion that what is said to be believed is not, or hardly, true". So also Blake (1983: 88): "In certain subordinate clauses the subjunctive is used, because its function is to express something which is not necessarily true or which is not known to be true. Thus it is usual to find it (...) after verbs expressing hope, thought or fear."

Such a hypothesis sounds attractive, and might well prove correct, at least for older stages of the language. It is certainly tempting to account in this way for the two different moods in a sentence like (4), and thus go on to assert, as analysts have often done, that it is *Othello's* distrust of *Desdemona* that is uppermost in his mind. However, further evidence is needed before a definitive conclusion can be reached on the true status of this use of the subjunctive in EMODE. A fact which is significant, but usually overlooked, is that practically all the examples adduced in the literature for the 16th and 17th centuries involve the form *be*. This suggests that its frequent appearance after *think*, *hope*, and a few other predicates of the same description may have been conventional, rather than functionally determined, since high-frequency words such as *be* will often resist developments affecting the rest of the vocabulary.³ At any rate, in a case like (5) above there can be no question of the subjunctive having been selected on functional grounds, given the fact that it stands in a main clause; it is merely its proximity to *think* that has, so to speak, automatically triggered off the marked form. Lastly, in the oft-quoted line from *Othello* the

shift from *be* to *is* has probably been determined by metrical factors, as the scansion of the line will show:

(4b) /I think / my wife / be hónest, / and think / she (i)s nó/

Another noteworthy feature in connection with propositional attitude predicates is the invariable use of the hypothetical past perfective to express wrongness of a supposition in the past (cf. Visser, Part III:2,039). Thus (6) and (7) contrast with, for instance, (8), in which the proposition embodied in the complement was later proved to be true:

- (6) *Wiv* 5.5.183 If I did not think it *had been* Anne Page, would I might never stir; and 'tis a postmaster's boy.
 (7) *Lear* 1.1 *Kent*. I thought the King *had more affected* the Duke of Albany than Cornwall. *Gloucester*. It did always seem so to us, but now (...) it appears not which of the Dukes he values most.
 (8) *Rom* 5.2.9 the searchers of the town, / Suspecting that we both *were* in a house / Where the infectious pestilence did reign, / Sealed up the doors, and would not let us forth

Cf. also *Wiv* 4.1.21.

3.3. Commentative predicates

Commentative predicates "resemble propositional attitude predicates in that, when an overt animate subject appears, the subject is an experiencer, since the predicate gives information about mental attitudes. They differ from propositional attitude predicates in that they provide a comment on the complement proposition which takes the form of an emotional reaction or evaluation (*regret*, *be sorry*, *be sad*) or a judgement (*be odd*, *be significant*, *be important*)" (Noonan, 1985: 117).⁴ As will become apparent from the list below, there is a strong preference across languages for coding commentative predicates as adjectives, a corollary of which is that, at the syntactic level, complements to commentatives will usually surface as subjects and subject complements or, alternatively, as dependents in AdjP structure.

Rom count dangerous, think best, wonder v. (cf. 3.5.118, p. I 18), blest (2) (AdjP), be enough (S), be glad (AdjP), be as good as (S), be poor (AdjP), (be) proud (AdjP), be sorry (AdjP), (be) thankful (AdjP), be well (S), be a prodigious birth (S), *be one's heaven* "be one's supreme felicity" (S), be pity (S), *be a lamentable thing* (S), grief.

Wiv apply well "suit well" (S), marvel v., please (cf. 3.3.168, p. I 17), suffice (S), be better (S), *be content* (AdjP), *be not convenient* (S), be glad (7) (AdjP), be not good (2 ex., one with *should*) (S), be not meet (S), be sorry (AdjP), be his worst fault (C_s).

Lear be censured "be judged (to be of a certain kind)" (cf. 12.2, p. I 18), maintain (sth.) to be fit (2 ex., one with *should*), marvel v., please (S), take ill "resent, dislike", be ashamed (2) (AdjP), (be) better (2) (S), be glad (AdjP), be lawful (S), be much (S), *be strange* (2) (S), *be most strange* (S), be sorry (AdjP), be sorrow "be sorrowful" (AdjP), be vain (S), be well (S), *be the fashion* (S), be wonder (S), be the wonder (C_s), *sorrow* sb.

Wint elevated "full of joy" (AdjP), be well (S).

Notes:

1. Predicates in italics take clauses with meditative *should*, as defined below. The remaining predicates are followed by: a) neutralized forms (e.g. *we/you have*) (30 ex.); b) indicative clauses (19 ex.); c) subjunctive forms (2 ex., after *count dangerous* and *maintain to be fit*).
2. Eight out of the 15 exclamatory *that*-clauses discussed in 2.9 may be viewed as embedded in a covert commentative matrix; accordingly, meditative *should* is also found with them (6 ex.), as well as indicative forms (2 ex.). Cf. quotations (54)–(56) in that section.

Complements to commentative predicates remained for a long time one of the strongholds of the inflectional subjunctive; see in this connection Mustanoja (1960:458–61), Visser (Part II: 863, 866), Ando (1976:207 ff.), and Warner (1982:191). However, indicative forms were also found from OE times, while in the course of ME both indicative and subjunctive came to be encroached upon by the auxiliary *should* in that usage which scholars have variously termed “emotional” (Jespersen, Part IV:336 ff.), “meditative-polemic” (Behre, 1950), “putative” (Quirk et al., 1985:14.25), “pure quasi-subjunctive” (Coates, 1983:68), or, simply, *should*₂ (Jacobsson, 1988). Quirk et al.’s label—as also Coates’—applies solely to PE, and subsumes the modal construction that will be the concern of Section 3.7. Since there is evidence that in EMODE this was still distinct from the use of *should* which will now be discussed, we have adopted Behre’s “meditative” (i.e. commentative) for the latter, whereas the former will be referred to as *should* of obligation and determination.

In PE, meditative *should* as used in commentatives appears to be little more than a semantically empty marker of the discourse dependency of all such constructions, in the sense that they embody propositions which constitute part of the background to a discourse (cf. Noonan, 1985:98 ff.). As Bengt Jacobsson (1988:83) points out in this connection, “in terms of ‘given’ and ‘new’, the *should*₂-clause represents given information which is syntactically and psychologically subordinated to the new information conveyed by the matrix clause”. In some languages, such as French and Spanish, this twofold subordination is signalled by the inflectional subjunctive, and it can be assumed that such was also the function of this mood when used with commentative constructions in older stages of English.

Historically, however, meditative *should* evolved from the past tense of *shall* signifying fatal necessity. Behre (1950) has traced its origins to such ME sentences as (9) and (10):

- (9) but y wote that rueth me that y shall (= must needs) departe fro the (*Assumption of Our Lady* 243, c. 1250)
 (10) A! lauerd, gret herming was þar, þat all suld (= were fated to) dei, bath less and mare (*Cursor Mundi* 9,386, c. 1300)

In (10), the *should*-form has, according to Behre, a dual function, “namely: (1) on the objective side, to indicate necessity in the past; (2) on the subjective side, to express or suggest an attitude of reluctance on the part of the subject to accept the thing represented as fated to occur. It is sometimes one, sometimes the other of these factors that is more prominent” (p. 99). To that attitude of reluctance, or “psychological resistance” (p. 121), Behre attaches the label “polemic”.

From about the middle of the fourteenth century *should* came to be used “in *that*-clauses regardless of the tense of the governing clause (...) What had happened was that *should* had become a more or less ‘timeless’ modal auxiliary used to emphasize the speaker’s (or the subject’s) attitude of reluctance to accept something” (p. 120).

In view of this historical development, it is not surprising that the *should*-form first appeared after expressions of sorrow and displeasure, since “what causes grief, sorrow, shame, pity, anger, etc. is felt as something imposed upon us against our will” (p. 121). Little by little, as the original sense of necessity faded, *should* spread to other types of commentatives, including those denoting positive emotions, as in PE “I’m pleased you *should* class me with him”. In Behre’s opinion, the element of psychological resistance can be detected even in such cases, in that the speaker considers the proposition embodied in the complement clause as unexpected, or too good to be true.⁵ Lastly, Behre outlines his findings concerning the status of meditative *should* by Shakespeare’s time; he observes that “if we compare the usage of the period round about [1400] with the usage of Shakespeare, we become acutely aware of the far greater number of *should*-forms used by

the latter (. . .) But syntactically speaking the use of meditative-polemic *should* seems to have been very much the same in late Middle English as at the time of Shakespeare. In both we find it used with expressions of sorrow and displeasure (A) and expressions of surprise and wonder (B), and more often with the former than with the latter; in both it occurs after the past subjunctive (II); in both there is an abundance of exclamatory *should*-clauses introduced by *alas that*, *that ever*, etc. (C); in both, lastly, the use of *should* after expressions of joy and pleasure (D) and with sentences without any emotional colouring (F) is conspicuous by its almost complete absence" (p. 122).

This summary is only partly borne out by the corpus. It is true that expressions of sorrow and displeasure with *should* (i.e. *be a lamentable thing*, *be not convenient*, *be not good*, *take ill*,⁶ *sorrow*) slightly outnumber those of surprise and wonder with the same auxiliary (i.e. *be strange* (3 ex.), *be the fashion*); but this, in itself, is of little statistical significance, since on the whole the first class of expression is far more common in the corpus, as a brief glance at the predicates listed on p. 132 will confirm. On the other hand, while it is basically correct that predicates denoting positive emotions seem to be less liable to take *should*-clauses, instances to the contrary are not almost completely absent; witness (11) and (12):

- (11) *Rom* 4.4.99 The most you sought was her promotion, / For 'twas your heaven she should be advanced, / And weep ye now, seeing she is advanced / Above the clouds (. . .)?
 (12) *Wiv* 2.2.229 Would it apply well to the vehemency of your affection that I should win what you would enjoy? Methinks you prescribe to yourself very preposterously.

Cf. also *be content* in *Wiv* 2.2.6.

In general, in the light of the evidence afforded by the corpus, it would seem that Behre's characterization of the distribution of meditative *should* in Shakespeare ought to be modified as follows:

a) *should* is preferred, though not exclusively, where the matrix has negative or unfavourable associations, a tendency which, according to Quirk et al. (1985: 1,223), is still at work in PE. Under that heading would fall the predicates mentioned above as well as the impersonal expressions of disbelief *be impossible* / *be a thing impossible* (cf. p. 131), which have in common with commentatives their strong emotional component.

b) *should* often appears in association with exclamatory environments. These can take the form of exclamatory *that*-clauses properly speaking (6 ex.), or, more subtly, of full sentences surfacing as exclamatory questions and the like (3 times; cf. examples (12), (15), and (19)). This aspect of the distribution of meditative *should*—which is not explicitly mentioned by Professor Behre, except as regards exclamatory *that*-clauses—follows naturally, just like a), from the original meaning of the auxiliary; i.e. in a ME example like (10) above, the more or less exclamatory nature of the larger construction was meant to throw into relief the speaker's feeling of sorrow when confronted with harsh necessity.

Finally, the question of the role played by *should* in commentative constructions must now be addressed, since we cannot concur with Behre on the alleged polemic character of the auxiliary. The element of mental resistance that he detects is inherent in the matrix predicates themselves, and seems to be quite independent of the presence or absence of *should*, as will be apparent from (13)–(14):

- (13) *Lear* 4.290 I am ashamed / That thou hast power to shake my manhood thus,
 (14) *Lear* 20.249 He's dead; I am only sorrow / He had no other deathsmen

Whereas Behre associates meditative *should* with reluctance, not a few analysts consider it to be bound up with nonfactuality, at least as far as PE is concerned. With *should*-clauses, "even though it is implied that the event took place, this actuality is itself not

particularly important" (Palmer, 1979: 162); so also Jespersen (Part IV: 336 ff.), Leech (1971: 108), Quirk et al. (1985: 1,014), and Ando (1976: 6.2.2.6 and 9.5.6.5), who adopts a similar stance in his discussion of Marlowe's usage. As has been pointed out by another commentator, in this approach the indicative is seen as merely stating "a fact, whereas [meditative *should*] is more 'theoretical' or 'abstract', representing the fact as an idea or conception".⁷

This subtle distinction may well be valid today, but in the Shakespeare corpus it cannot be so easily discerned. A good many of the *should*-examples are factual and, moreover, it is their very actuality that seems to be of special importance; consider, for instance, (15)–(16). The same holds true for the subjunctive clause in (17), while, somewhat paradoxically, the indicative in (18) refers to a future event (Kent's punishment in the stocks) and is thus nonfactual:

- (15) *Rom* 2.3.29 The pox of such antic, lipping, affecting phantasimes, these new tuners of accent! "By Jesu, a very good blade, a very tall man, a very good whore". Why is not this a lamentable thing, grandsire, that we *should be thus afflicted* with these strange flies, these fashion-mongers, these "pardon-me's" (...)?
- (16) *Lear* 7.188 'Tis strange that they should so depart from home / And not send back my messenger. i.e. *should have departed*; the reference is to past time.
- (17) *Rom* 4.1.10 Immoderately she weeps for Tybalt's death, / And therefore have I little talked of love (...) / Now, sir, her father counts it dangerous / That she *do give* her sorrow so much sway, / And in his wisdom hastes our marriage / To stop the inundation of her tears
- (18) *Lear* 7.140 *Gloucester* (to Cornwall). Let me beseech your grace not to do so (...) Your purposed low correction / Is such as basest and contemnèd wretches (...) Are punished with. The King must take it ill / That *he's* so slightly valued in his messenger, / *Should have* him thus restrained.

When every aspect is taken into account, it would seem that in several of its occurrences *should* has already become a colourless marker of subordination, along the lines discussed on p. 133; consider, for instance, (11), (12), and (16). But, on occasion, its early meaning of fatal necessity is still discernible; a case in point is (15) and, perhaps, the second clause in (18), though here the shift from the indicative to the *should*-form could also have been partly determined by metrical factors. Further examples are (19) and (20); in the latter, *should* appears to underscore the inevitability of the fate awaiting elderly parents, while the subjunctive form *manage* merely marks its own clause as dependent:

- (19) *Lear* 11.65 *Lear* (alluding to Edgar as a Bedlam beggar). Nothing could have subdued nature / To such a lowness but his unkind daughters. / Is it the fashion that discarded fathers / *Should have* thus little mercy on their flesh? / Judicious punishment: 'twas this flesh begot / Those pelican daughters.
- (20) *Lear* 2.72 *Edmund* (referring to his half-brother Edgar). I have often heard him maintain it to be fit that, sons at perfect age and fathers declining, his father *should be* as ward to the son, and the son *manage* the revenue.

3.4. Predicates of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge

Predicates in this class take experiencer subjects and "describe the state or the manner of acquisition of knowledge (...). They include *know*, *discover*, *realize*, *find out*, and *forget*, as well as perception predicates such as *see* and *hear* when used in a sense other than that of immediate perception" (Noonan, 1985: 118).

Rom hear (2), know (8), not know, be known (S), see "perceive with the mind" (5).

Wiv hear (3), know (6), perceive, see (4), understand.

Lear find (3), hear (2), know (10), mark "take notice of, perceive", perceive (2), see, be seen (2) (S).

Wint know (6), note, see (2).

As in PE, all the above predicates take indicative complement clauses.

3.5. Perception predicates

These include not only forms such as *see* and *hear*, but also others like *dream*, where the event and its perception are entirely mental. Complement clauses to such predicates are typically coded in the indicative.

Rom dream (3), see (4 ex.; cf. 2.4.30, 4.4.100-3, 5.1.59), be one's dream (C_s).

Wiv witness sb. (3).

Lear witness v.

3.6. Predicates of fearing

Rom fear v., misgive "have doubt or apprehension", be afeard (AdjP).

Wiv care v. "be uneasy or anxious", doubt v. "fear", fear v., be afraid (AdjP), fear sb.

Lear fear v., not fear v., be doubtful "be fearful" (AdjP), grow fearful (AdjP).

Wint fear v.

The indicative, as in (21), is the unmarked mood:

(21) *Lear* 21.60 I fear I am not in my perfect mind.

In Old and Middle English, the subjunctive was also found, doubtless with the same function that was mentioned on p. 131 in connection with predicates of propositional attitude; namely, signalling a lesser degree of certainty than the indicative concerning the realization of the complement proposition. In EMODE, subjunctive clauses remained possible as a marginal category (cf. Visser, Part II: 872), as is attested by the corpus, where only one occurs. The verb form involved is, once again, *be*, and the remarks made in Section 3.2 on its likely status in Elizabethan English apply here as well:

(22) *Wiv* 1.4.38 Go, John, go enquire for my master. I doubt he *be* not well, that he comes not home.

3.7. Manipulative predicates

Manipulatives "include the closely related causative and permissive predicates, both involving an element of causation (...) Manipulative predicates express a relation between an agent or a situation which functions as a cause, an affectee, and a resulting situation. They may be simple (*cause*) or, when lexical structures in a language permit, they may in addition encode information about the manner of causation (*force, tell, let*), sometimes including an illocutionary act (*command, request*)" (Noonan, 1985: 125-6). To this characterization we would add that the affectee or addressee need not be overtly realized, as in PE "I ordered that the photographs be destroyed".

Rom conjure "appeal solemnly to, beseech", pray, *shield* "forbid", *write* "ordain in writing", *be written* "be decreed or ordained in writing" (S). In the case of *shield* and other predicates of negative meaning, the agent influences the affectee *away from* realizing what is embodied in the complement clause (cf. Rudanko, 1985: 152 ff.).

Wiv *appoint* "ordain authoritatively" (OED *Appoint* v. 8), desire "request" (2), *ordain*, pray (2).

Lear beg, beseech, make (S), pray (as used in 7.308), make one's boon "request" (cf. Section 2.4), leave sb. "permission".

Wint forewarn.

Note: Predicates in italics take complement clauses with *shall* or *should*.

With the exception of *make* (*Lear* 16.63) and *leave* (*Lear* 10.2), the predicates listed above divide up semantically into two classes, according as they involve a command or merely a request or recommendation. In either case, as with manipulative predicates in

general, the complement clause has determined time reference (henceforth DTR), that is, future relative to the time reference of the predicate,⁸ since the uttering of an order or of a request necessarily comes prior to its eventual realization or non-realization. Accordingly, from OE times predicates representing commands, requests, and the like were followed by a complement clause in the subjunctive, which is in many languages—among them Spanish—the usual mood for DTR structures.

In addition to the subjunctive, a number of periphrastic forms with appropriate modals were also found from OE; cf. for some of these Mitchell (1985, II: pp. 45ff.). In commands, where the agent imposes an obligation on the affectee, **sculan* "must / ought to" was naturally common, probably as an emphatic or more redundant indication of the order, while with requests **motan* "may" and **willan* "will, be willing to" were both found (on the distinction between these cf. below). To our knowledge, the exact patterns of distribution of the subjunctive and its various OE alternatives have not yet been ascertained, but, as Bruce Mitchell points out, it is hard to believe that they were all used indiscriminately. At any rate, for late ME the preponderance of the past form *shulde* in the expression of dependent commands has been well established by Anthony Warner (1982: 193ff.); he finds that in the Wyclifite sermons *shulde* is generally used "when an order has been issued, particularly one which is to be fulfilled by the subject of the subordinate clause. In reported direct speech we might have expected a second person imperative. The subjunctive, on the other hand, is typically found in requests, or where the subject of the subordinate clause is not placed under an obligation. In reported direct speech we would not have expected an imperative. This distribution is preponderant, but the distinction drawn is not absolute."

It is unfortunate that Warner has not similarly investigated the function of *shall*, a modal also recorded in his corpus after manipulative predicates, but which he appears to consider as due solely to the influence of Wyclif's Latin original (cf. p. 194). Yet *shall*, historically the past tense of *should* and formerly the usual auxiliary to denote obligation imposed from outside, must have shared the distribution outlined above. It does so in the Shakespeare corpus, where the contrast found in Wyclif as regards the choice of verb form in dependent commands and requests may also be observed.⁹ The former are associated with *shall* (1 ex.) and *should* (4 ex.), while the latter contain *may* (1 ex.), *will* (2 ex.), or the present subjunctive (5 ex.), as well as neutralized forms (3 ex.).

Thus in (23) *shall* is used to suggest that the higher-clause subject is in authority, a shade of meaning which remains prominent in (24a) and (24b), where the matrices are themselves past and *should*, therefore, can still be analyzed as the past tense of *shall*:

- (23) *Wiv* 4.6.28 Her father hath commanded her to slip / Away with Slender, and with him at Eton / Immediately to marry. She hath consented. / Now, sir, her mother, ever strong against that match / And firm for Doctor Caius, hath appointed / That he *shall* likewise shuffle her away
 (24a) *Rom* 5.3.246 Meantime I writ to Romeo / That he should hither come as this dire night / To help to take her from her borrowed grave
 (24b) *Wiv* 3.5.97 I quaked for fear lest the lunatic knave would have searched it, but fate, ordaining he *should* be a cuckold, held his hand.

From at least the thirteenth century (cf. Visser, Part III: 1,546), *should* had been generalized to clauses embedded in superordinate constructions with nonpast. In this way it became an independent option, a sort of "weaker *shall*", as Jespersen puts it (cf. Part IV: 20.2.4), whose original sense of obligation soon faded, as in (25)–(26):

- (25) *Rom* 1.2.37 It is written that the shoemaker should meddle with his yard and the tailor with his last
 (26) *ibid.* 4.1.41 God shield I should disturb devotion!

In manipulative constructions amounting only to a request, a recommendation or the like, the affectee is free to comply with whatever is expected of him. This accounts for the appearance of *will* in the complement clause, which explicitly indicates the speaker's deference to the will of the person addressed, and his hope that it may coincide with his own:

- (27) *Lear* 7.314 *Lear* (to Regan). Dear daughter, I confess that I am old. / Age is unnecessary. On my knees I beg / That *you'll* vouchsafe me raiment, bed, and food. /
 (28) *Wiv* 3.1.9 *Evans*. I most feheemently desire you you *will* also look that way.
Simple. I will, sir.

Considering that in the latter example Sir Hugh Evans is speaking to a servant, the ceremoniousness of his address seems out of place, and must have been intended as yet another of his many linguistic oddities.

(29) to (32) below illustrate the other verb forms used in the corpus in similar environments; namely, *may*—which had come to replace obsolete *mote* in some of its functions—and the subjunctive (or neutralized forms):

- (29) *Wiv* 3.1.110 I desire you that we may be friends
 (30) *Rom* 2.2.63 but this I pray, / That thou consent to marry us today.
 (31) *ibid.* 2.1.17 *Mercutio* (jocularly to Romeo). I conjure thee by Rosaline's bright eyes (...) / That in thy likeness thou appear to us.
 (32) *Lear* 21.10 *Kent* (to Cordelia). Pardon me, dear madam (...) / My boon I make it that you *know* me not / Till time and I think meet.¹⁰

3.8. Desiderative predicates

Desiderative predicates are characterized by having experiencer subjects and by "expressing a desire that the complement proposition be realized" (Noonan, 1985: 121).

Rom hope (2), *set up one's rest* "firmly resolve", wish, would (10).

Wiv *find in one's heart*, had as lief, had rather (2), hope (7), *intend*, look "expect", *mean*, *will*, would (14).

Lear hope (2), *pray* (as used in 23.2), would (4), hope sb. (2), *be one's will* (S).

Wint hope, *pray*, would (6).

Notes: 1. Predicates in italics are members of Class C, as defined below.

2. *Pray* is generally a manipulative, but as used in *Lear* 23.2 or *Wint* 4.4.711 it amounts to little more than a vague expression of wish; cf. OED *Pray* v. 3 and examples (40) and (41) further on.

As Michael Noonan points out in his typological study of complementation, desiderative predicates divide up semantically into three classes, which, with reference to PE, could be conveniently symbolized by *hope* (henceforth class A), *wish* (class B), and *want* (class C). This distinction also applies to the corpus, except that neither *wish* nor *want* could there be considered as the central, most characteristic members of their respective classes. The place of the former ought to be taken up by *would*; that of the latter—which did not become available in English as a desiderative until the early eighteenth century (cf. OED *Want* v. 5)—probably by *wish* itself. In EMODE, this did double duty as both a B- and C-class predicate, in which latter function it was very common.

Complements to predicates in class A—of which *hope* is the sole member in the corpus—embody propositions "whose status is, for whatever reason, unknown, but which could turn out to be true" (Noonan, p. 122). They are followed by indicative forms (6 ex.) or, if the reference is to the future, by non-hypothetical auxiliaries such as *will* (5 ex.) or *shall* (2 ex., both with first person subjects). Still another alternative is the present subjunctive of *be*, whose sole occurrence is (33); on what we take to be its most likely interpretation in EMODE, cf. Sections 3.2 and 3.6.

- (33) *Wiv* 2.1.104 *Ford*. Well, I hope it be not so. *Pistol*. Hope is a curtal dog in some affairs. Sir John affects thy wife.

In the corpus, and presumably also in Elizabethan English, *would* (34 ex.) was the most common desiderative in class *B*. Other predicates in the same class are *wish* (1 ex.), *had as lief* (1 ex.) and *had rather* (2 ex.). Unlike *hope*, they all take clauses with a contrafactive interpretation; that is, their status is not simply unknown, but rather implied to be false. This is clearly reflected in the verb phrase itself, which signals such hypothetical implications by the use of appropriate forms. Namely, the hypothetical past perfective (4 ex.), for unrealized events in the past, as in (34); for wishes about the present or future, the *were*-subjunctive (12 ex.), the hypothetical past (10 ex.), and periphrastic constructions with *might* (5 ex.), *would* (5 ex.), or *could* (3 ex.). The indicative form *was*, as in PE *I wish I was ...*, is not found as an alternative to the *were*-subjunctive, which is thus firmly entrenched in this category. Examples with some of the forms mentioned above follow here:

- (34) *Wint* 3.3.105 Would I *had been* by to have helped the old man!
 (35) *Rom* 2.1.35 Now will he (...) wish his mistress *were* that kind of fruit / As maids call medlars
 (36) *Wiv* 3.4.102 I would my master *had* Mistress Anne
 (37) *ibid.* 1.1.238 I would I *might* be hanged

Complements to desiderative predicates in class *C* differ from the other two in that they have determined time reference, i.e. future relative to the time reference of the matrix; consider (38)–(39):

- (38) *Wiv* 4.2.203 If they can find in their hearts the poor, unvirtuous fat knight shall be any further afflicted, we two will still be the ministers.
 (39) *ibid.* 4.6.37 Her mother hath intended, / The better to denote her to the Doctor (...) / That quaint in green she shall be loose enrobed

The event or state that is wished for may be envisaged as lying outside the control of the higher-clause subject; very often, in fact, some lack of confidence concerning its ultimate realization may be implied, as in some of the following examples:

- (40) *Lear* 23.2 pray that the right *may thrive*. / If ever I return to you again / I'll bring you comfort.
 (41) *Wint* 4.4.711 *Old Shepherd*. Well, let us to the King. There is that in this fardel will make him scratch his beard (...) *Clown*. Pray heartily he *be* at' palace.
 (42) *Cymbeline* 4.2.109 I wish my brother *make* good time with him, / You say he is so fell.¹¹

The converse is illustrated by (38) and (39) above. Here the higher-clause subject is represented not merely as wishing for something, but as being capable of influencing its realization. As a consequence, these and similar constructions bear a strong resemblance to manipulatives representing commands, except, of course, that neither overtly nor covertly do they assume an addressee; typically, the *shall* of obligation and determination is associated with them, as it was also with indirect commands. In the corpus, this applies to all *C*-class predicates except *pray*.

By contrast, (40)–(42) have much in common with requests, and show, accordingly, the same range of verb forms, namely the subjunctive or non-authoritarian auxiliaries such as *may*. Although relevant examples in the corpus are few, this point can be confirmed by examining the verb phrases found elsewhere in Shakespeare after *wish*, in its use as a *C*-class predicate:

- a) subjunctive forms 6
- b) periphrases with *may* 10
- c) periphrases with *should* 2

All the a) and b) clauses embody wishes of the type exemplified in (40)–(42) above. With regard to the *should*-forms, it is difficult to determine the exact force of this auxiliary in the ambiguous passage in *Macbeth* 1.5.24 ff.; its other occurrence is in *Cymbeline* 5.1.1 ff., where Posthumus apostrophizes the bloody garment which (as he believes) testifies to Imogen's murder:

(43) Yea, bloody cloth, I'll keep thee, for I once wished / Thou *shouldst* be coloured thus. You married ones, / If each of you should take this course, how many / Must murder wives much better than themselves / For wrying but a little!

Analysis of the previous scenes makes it abundantly clear that *should*, as used above, is no mere substitute for the subjunctive, but rather the past tense of the *shall* of determination, as in (38) and (39). Cf. the following lines, in which Pisanio reads the letter where he is ordered by Posthumus to kill his mistress:

(44) 3.2.10 ff. How? That I should murder her, / Upon the love and truth and vows which I / Have made to thy command?

3.9. Ensuring predicates

We have attached this label to a few predicates of restricted occurrence such as *look* "make sure" and its synonym *see*. Throughout the history of English, complement clauses to such predicates have been coded in the subjunctive,¹² which is also the mood invariably found in the corpus.

Rom look (2), *see*.

Wiv look (2).

Examples:

(45) *Rom* 3.3.147 look thou stay not till the watch be set, / For then thou canst not pass to Mantua
(46) *ibid.* 5.3.24 Hold, take this letter. Early in the morning / See thou deliver it to my lord and father.

The dependent clause in all such sentences is necessarily future relative to the matrix, but it is hard to tell whether this factor alone might account for the subjunctive. Alternatively, many analysts have correlated that mood with the imperative character of the higher clause in most ensuring constructions. This may well be correct, but it must be pointed out that in the Shakespeare corpus the majority of imperative clauses are followed by indicative forms; cf. for a few examples *Lear* 3.8, 24.33 and 118 etc.

3.10. Other predicates

Rom assure, beshrew "blame", lay "bet", mean "intend to convey (a certain sense) in speaking", put in mind "remind".

Wiv chance v. (S), persuade "convince", rest "remain to be done" (S), motive, proof.

Lear chance v. (S), come "happen" (S), follow "occur as a consequence" (S), persuade "convince", pawn, prove, show, be false persuaded "be wrongly convinced" (AdjP), blame sb. (in *lay the blame*), confirmation.

All the above predicates take indicative complements.

3.11. Other uses of the subjunctive

The selection of the subjunctive in complement clauses may be quite independent of the semantics of the matrix predicate. We have noted at least two other uses:

a) the *were*-subjunctive is found signalling hypothetical meaning, as it would do had it been a main clause. On this use, now superseded by a periphrasis with *would be*, cf. Visser (Part II: 859).

(47) *Wiv* 2.1.64 I think the best way *were* to entertain him with hope

b) the subjunctive seems to be triggered off by the presence in the superordinate clause of another subjunctive or of a hypothetical form.¹³

(48) *Rom* 2.1.53 *Romeo*. It is my lady, O, it is my love. / O that she knew she *were*!
i.e. "that she knew she is (my love)"

(49) *Wint* 4.4.210 You would think a smock *were* a she-angel, he so chants to the sleeve-hand and the work about the square on't.

Cf. also *Rom* 2.1.64, *Lear* 2.63 and *Wint* 4.4.681.

The regularity of this subjunctive concord is striking, at least with past forms. Elsewhere in Shakespeare examples of a similar spread of the present subjunctive from a higher to a lower clause can be found, as in (50); but, by contrast, the sole instance in the corpus meeting the requisite conditions contains a present indicative form; cf. (51).

(50) *The Merchant of Venice* 4.1.348 It is enacted in the laws of Venice, / If it *be* proved against an alien / That by direct or indirect attempts / He *seek* the life of any citizen (...)

(51) *Wint* 4.4.839 If he *think* it fit to shore them again, and that the complaint they have to the King *concerns* him nothing, let him call me rogue

3.12. Summary

Aside from the two constructions that have just been discussed, the subjunctive, as used in the corpus, can be characterized in the following terms:

a) the past subjunctive, which at this time was distinct from the past indicative only in the verb *be*, is largely restricted to the expression of hypothetical meaning, its chief stronghold being desiderative constructions with a contrafactive interpretation. Here it holds sway, since the indicative type *I wish I was* ... is not recorded.

b) The present subjunctive, on the other hand, is firmly associated with determined time reference, i.e. future relative to the time reference of the matrix, and hence with nonfactuality. Both are essential components of commands, requests, intentions, desires, and the like, and it is therefore with some of these that the central domain of the subjunctive lies. Even here, however, a number of auxiliaries are found in functions which had originally been the province of the subjunctive; some—such as *may* in requests or wishes—could reasonably be considered as pure subjunctive substitutes, but others—notably *shall* and *should*—seem to retain traces of their early meaning of obligation, and thus constitute a sort of periphrastic subjunctive of "coercion" which effectively contrasts in distribution with the inflectional subjunctive (cf. 3.7–8). Such characterization is valid for the corpus, but further evidence is needed to ascertain whether it can also be extended to the whole of Shakespeare.

c) The subjunctive occurs as well in commentative constructions, though here it is clearly on its way to being replaced by both the indicative and by meditative *should*. The latter appears to be preferred in exclamatory environments or where the matrix has negative or unfavourable associations.

d) Lastly, the subjunctive is also found in clauses which are truth-value dependent, in that their matrix predicates (e.g. *think*, *hope*, *doubt* "fear") involve "an explicit qualification of commitment to the truth of the proposition that such clauses embody" (cf. Noonan, 1985: 95 ff.). In this category, *be* is the only subjunctive form recorded, and its use seems to be largely conventional and fossilized.

4. THE DISTRIBUTION OF *THAT* AND UNINTRODUCED CLAUSES

As shown in Table 1 a (p. I 5), unintroduced clauses and clauses with *that* are for the most part distributionally parallel, except that the first cannot occur as exclamatory clauses. As a

consequence, this marginal category has been excluded from consideration in the following pages, where the factors that govern the choice of *that* and *zero* will be examined. Table 7 indicates the frequencies of either type.

Writing about the conjunction *that* in PE, Dwight Bolinger (1972: 14) observes that "with noun clauses it seems at first as if the only safe generalization is that the uses of *that* outnumber the omissions (. . .). Of course it is to be expected that written sources will use *that* more often than speech, but even so it is likely that instances of required use of *that* are more frequent than instances of required omission".

In the light of the table below, the very reverse is true of Shakespeare, whose figures for *zero* considerably exceed those obtained for that type by other analysts working on various periods of the language. Thus, according to Anthony Warner (1982: 169), the Wyclifite sermons yield the following frequencies for our categories *A* and *B* (complements to verbs and adjectives) taken together:

that-clauses 558

zero-clauses 21=3.6%¹⁴

Among those who have concerned themselves with PE, Virginia McDavid examined about 100 000 words of non-fiction, all written in the United States since 1950, while Rodney Huddleston dealt with 135 000 words of modern scientific English. Their findings resemble Warner's, but differ radically from our own:

a) McDavid (1964: 104 ff.):

that-clauses in categories *A* and *B* 509

zero-clauses in categories *A* and *B* 46=8.3%

that-clauses in category *C* 91

zero-clauses in category *C* 3=3.19%

b) Huddleston (1971: 178 ff.):

that-clauses in categories *A* and *B* 652

zero-clauses in categories *A* and *B* 24=3.55%

Several factors have been claimed to condition the choice between clauses with and without *that*. Some of the most important are: a) style, formal varieties of English being said to show a preference for *that*; b) frequency of the matrix predicate; c) presence of elements between predicate and clause; and d) nature of the lower-clause subject, pronominal subjects having been found to favour *zero* (cf. Elsness: 1984). Apparently, all these factors were already at work in as early a writer as Wyclif (cf. Warner, 1982: 170 ff.), yet in the Shakespeare corpus we find conclusive evidence only of the first three, which will now be taken up in order.

4.1. Style

The influence of the stylistic factor on the choice between *that* and *zero* has been clearly established by Johan Elsness (1984) in his detailed study of object clauses¹⁵ in Modern

Table 7

	A: As verb comp	B: As adj. comp	C: As noun comp		Total
			Ca: Restrict.	Cb: Nonrestrict.	
That	88=20.51%	12=35.29%	12=52.17%	5=100.00%	117=23.83%
Zero	341=79.49%	22=64.71%	11=47.83%	–	374=76.17%

American English. Taking as a basis four different categories of texts in the Brown Corpus which could be considered to range from a more formal to an informal style, he obtained the following frequencies for *zero*:

- Text category *J* "Learned and Scientific Writings" 1.3%
- Text category *G* "Belles Lettres, Biography, etc." 14.6%
- Text category *A* "Press: Reportage" 52.1%
- Text category *N* "Fiction: Adventure and Western" 58.1%

A similar analysis can be applied to the plays, on the assumption that verse generally represents the formal variable and prose the less formal one. As Table 8 shows, *zero* does in fact correlate with prose and *that* with verse, yet it is noteworthy that in either medium the incidence of *zero* is much higher than even in the most informal of Elsness's categories. Such predilection for *zero* may have been peculiar to Shakespeare, or, perhaps, to Elizabethan English more generally, since this is often claimed to favour loose syntactic structures.

Separate consideration of the various plays shows that only in *Romeo and Juliet* is the rate of *zero* lower in prose than in verse. However, given the small number of complement clauses found in the prose of this drama, not much significance should be attached to that apparent exception. On the diachronic dimension, Table 9 reveals that, interestingly enough, there is a slight increase of *zero* in prose, whereas the opposite is true of verse, as though in this particular the syntax of prose became looser with chronology, and that of verse less so.

The test of style can also be applied to the characters themselves, depending on whether they belong to the serious or comic worlds, since those in the latter should presumably occupy the lowest positions on a scale of formality, and thus use a higher proportion of

Table 8. *Distribution that/zero according to type of discourse*

Prose	Verse
That 38 Zero 202=84.17%	That 79 Zero 172=68.53%

Table 9. *Distribution that/zero per play*

		<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>		
Prose	that 4 zero 6=60.00%		Verse	that 35 zero 87=71.31%
Prose	that 23 zero 124=84.35%	<i>The Merry Wives of Windsor</i>	Verse	that 6 zero 13=68.42%
Prose	that 4 zero 25=86.21%	<i>King Lear</i>	Verse	that 38 zero 72=65.45%
Prose	that 7 zero 47=87.04%	<i>The Winter's Tale</i>		

zero-clauses. But, contrary to expectation, the plays do not provide very conclusive evidence in this respect, as will be clear from Table 10.

4.2. *The matrix predicate*

High frequency of the matrix predicate has long been recognized as one of the factors favouring *zero*; see in this connection Jespersen (Part III:33), McDavid (1964:108), Bolinger (1972), Warner (1982:171), Elsness (1984), and Kilby (1984:176). It is also conspicuous in the corpus, especially with regard to object clauses and to those complementing adjectives. Table 11 lists the matrix verbs that occur with object clauses five times or more, a figure which, following Elsness (1984), was chosen as the dividing line between high and low frequency.

Figures for low-frequency verbs (four occurrences or less) are shown in Table 12. As might have been expected given the greater formality of verse, such predicates are more numerous in the poetry.

The correlation between *zero* and high frequency of the matrix predicate can also be established for the other clause categories, with the exception of appositive clauses, since no head noun is found more than once or twice. With subject clauses the only predicate occurring in significant numbers is *think* "seem" (18 ex.), which, as might have been expected, invariably selects *zero*. As for the adjectival predicates, the high-frequency ones, i.e. *glad* and *sure*, confirm the same trend:

glad 1 *that*-clause / 8 *zero*-clauses

sure 7 *zero*-clauses.

4.3. *Elements between predicate and complement clause subject*

That-clauses are often said to be preferred when one or more constituents separate the subject of the complement clause from its matrix predicate, since selection of *zero* in such cases might lead to ambiguity. As Bolinger puts it, "a *that* clause that is separated from the main verb by intervening complements or interpolations tends to require *that* to preserve the identity of the clause" (1972:38). In the corpus, this factor accounts for the

Table 10. *Distribution that/zero among comic characters*

<i>Rom</i> (Juliet's Nurse, several servingmen)
That 7 (=17.95% of all <i>that</i> -clauses in the play)
Zero 12 (=12.90% of all <i>zero</i> -clauses in the play)
<i>Wiv</i> (Bardolph, Pistol, Nim, Sir Hugh Evans, Doctor Caius, Mistress Quickly, Slender, Shallow, Simple, several servants)
That 10 (=34.48%)
Zero 44 (=32.12%)
<i>Lear</i> (Fool) ¹⁶
That 1 (=2.38%)
Zero 4 (=4.12%)
<i>Wint</i> (Old Shepherd, Clown, several shepherdesses and servants)
That 3 (=42.86%)
Zero 25 (=57.45%)
Totals
That 21 (=17.95% of all <i>that</i> -clauses in the corpus)
Zero 85 (=22.73% of all <i>zero</i> -clauses in the corpus)

comparatively high incidence of *that* (30.51%) in ditransitive constructions, since with these the indirect object necessarily intervenes between verb and clause:

(1) *Rom* 2.3.194 I anger her sometimes, / And tell *her* that Paris is the properer man.

Isolated examples of *that*-clauses with such high-frequency predicates as *would* or *glad* (cf. section 4.2) can be explained in the same way, as will be obvious from the following quotations:

(2) *Wint* 3.3.59 I would there were no age between ten and three-and-twenty, or that youth would sleep out the rest

(3) *Wiv* 5.5.227 I am glad, though you have ta'en a special stand to strike at me, that your arrow hath glanced.

In order to obtain an accurate picture of the extent to which interposed elements determine selection of *that*, all verse examples were excluded from consideration, since in that medium the distribution of *that* and *zero* is likely to be distorted by prosodic requirements of various sorts. The overall figures so obtained are set out in Table 13 below. This makes it clear that the presence of intervening material plays an important role in the selection of *that*. Yet it is equally obvious that Shakespeare's preference for *zero* will often assert itself regardless of interposed elements, or of the ambiguity which, without the assistance of *that*, their presence might bring about. As a result, practically

Table 11. *Matrix verbs occurring five times or more with object clauses, with respective that/zero distributions*

	That		Zero	
	Prose	Verse	Prose	Verse
(5) confess	–	3	1	1
(7) hear	–	1	3	3
(12) hope	–	–	10	2
(28) know	2	–	11	15
(56) say	2	2	30	22
(17) see	–	5	6	6
(15) swear	1	1	10	3
(31) tell	4	2	13	12
(49) think	2	2	28	17
(6) warrant	–	–	4	2
(34) would	1	–	20	13
Total	12	16	136	96

Percentage of *zero* in prose: 91.89%.

Percentage of *zero* in verse: 85.71%.

Table 12. *Object clauses with low frequency verbs, with that/zero distributions*

That (32)		Zero (58)	
Prose 8	Verse 24	Prose 26	Verse 32

Percentage of *zero* in prose: 76.47%.

Percentage of *zero* in verse: 57.14%.

any type of constituent can be found between the matrix predicate and the subject of a *zero*-clause; quoted below are a few instances that strike me as particularly noticeable, though many others could easily be adduced:

- (4) *Lear* 13.43 I here take my oath *before this honourable assembly* she kicked the poor King her father
 (5) *ibid.* 4.51 Sir, he answered *me in the roundest manner* he would not.
 (6) *Wint* 4.4.327 they themselves are o'th'mind, *if it be not too rough for some that know little but bowling*, it will please plentifully
 (7) *ibid.* 4.4.735 Thinkest thou, *for that I insinuate to toze from thee thy business*, I am therefore no courtier?

5. CONCLUSIONS

It would not be profitable to repeat here some of the major conclusions that have been reached in the preceding pages, such as, for instance, the status of the inflectional subjunctive and its various alternatives (Sections 3.11–2). Other important points can be summarized as follows:

1. The frequency of occurrence of *that*- and *zero*-clauses does not appear to vary from the early to the late plays, as noted on p. I 6. By contrast, as we shall find occasion to confirm in succeeding papers, infinitive clauses and dependent interrogatives become more common in the course of time.
2. Extraposition is preponderant among subject clauses: it takes place in 73 out of 74 instances (2.1.3, 2.10.1). It is also the rule in constructions with an object complement or with a nuclear adverbial (2.4–5). In all such cases, the slot vacated by the clause tends to be filled, as in PE, by a preparatory pronoun (generally *it*, though *this* is used on two occasions), exceptions to this trend being confined to a few fossilized structures with impersonal verbs (2.1.3); in this respect, the corpus has come a long way from the situation prevalent in Wyclifite English, in which, according to Warner (1982: 78–80), anticipatory pronouns are still rather uncommon. Finally, a few instances of so-called vacuous extraposition (i.e. V it OBCL) can also be found (2.2.2).
3. As in Old and Middle English, there are occasional instances of full apposition between a noun phrase and a clause (2.8.2). In PE, this type of apposition seems to be restricted to the spoken language, or to non-standard varieties.
4. Formerly, deletion of one of two co-referential noun phrases sometimes failed to apply in circumstances where it would now be required; for some Shakespearian examples, cf. 2.3.2.
5. Five classes of predicates emerge in all the plays as the most fundamental, namely utterance predicates, predicates of propositional attitude and of knowledge, commentatives, and desideratives (Table 6).
6. To judge from the data provided in other analyses of the English complement system,

Table 13. *Distribution that/zero in prose according to separation of complement clause subject from matrix construction*

	That	Zero
Nothing intervening	12	150=92.59%
One or more intervening elements, including the first of two coordinate clauses	26	52=66.66%

Shakespeare's predilection for *zero*-clauses is idiosyncratic, and seems to have no parallels in either earlier or later periods.

7. Throughout the corpus, three factors clearly control the presence or absence of *that* before the complement clause: a) type of discourse (verse vs. prose); b) frequency of the matrix predicate; and c) separation of the complement clause subject from the matrix predicate (Section 4).

8. It is sometimes assumed that the language of Shakespeare's comic characters differs considerably from that of his orthodox speakers. This view, however, is not clearly corroborated by the limited set of structures which have been examined in the preceding pages, though a few possible non-standard and informal uses have been pointed out here and there (cf. Sections Part I, Sections 2.2.1 and 2.3.2; Part II, Sections 3, 3.7 and 4.1); in general, however, it would seem as though Shakespeare's individualization of lower-class speakers was achieved by more obvious linguistic means, such as deviant pronunciations, malapropisms, garrulity, and the like. Thus in the following lines from *The Winter's Tale* it is the vice of *homilogia*,¹⁷ or tedious and inane repetition, that makes the Clown appear ludicrous, rather than the structure of his complement clauses when they are each considered separately:

5.2.161 ff. I'll swear to the Prince thou art a tall fellow of thy hands and that thou wilt not be drunk; but I know thou art no tall fellow of thy hands and that thou wilt be drunk; but I'll swear it, and I would thou wouldst be a tall fellow of thy hands.

This is certainly not to imply that syntactic features are of no consequence in Shakespeare's delineation of character; Edmund, for instance, is clearly associated in *King Lear* with a complexity of grammatical structure well above average (cf. Part I, Section 2), which seems intended to mirror at the linguistic level his habit of dissimulation and duplicity;¹⁸ but detailed analysis of the varied factors which make for that complexity—such as sentence and clause length, or order of the constituent elements—lies beyond the scope of this paper, and must therefore be left to future research.

Department of English and German
University of Santiago de Compostela
Santiago de Compostela
Spain

NOTES

- 1 In fact, Visser adduces a later example from More, c. 1522, "Which thing is the cause that our sauour Christ said it *were* as harde for the riche manne to come to heauen, as . . .". But this appears to illustrate the hypothetical use of the *were*-subjunctive, which stems from altogether different factors; cf. in this regard Section 3.11 below.
- 2 I.e. the entity which receives or accepts or experiences or undergoes the effect of an action (Fillmore, 1970).
- 3 Even in PE a clear tendency has been detected to choose the subjunctive more especially when the finite verb is *be*; e.g. in sentences such as "We insist that he *be* admitted". Cf. Turner (1980: 276) and Quirk et al. (1985: 157).
- 4 As some analysts have pointed out (cf., for instance, Terrell and Hooper, 1974: 491 ff.), there are many matrices which can be used as either value judgements, or with imperative force (e.g. *be important*, *be fitting*, etc.). However, all the predicates that we list above as commentative seem to be unambiguously intended as such in their respective contexts.
- 5 Cf. also Behre's longer treatise *Meditative-polemic should in modern English that-clauses* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1955) and, for a good summary of his views on this point, Jacobsson (1988: 76 ff.).
- 6 *Take ill* is followed by two coordinate clauses, the second of which takes *should* (cf. example (18) below); though it seems appropriate to list this here, elsewhere in the corpus we have not counted it as a separate clause, since it fails to meet the conditions mentioned in Part I, Section 2 (i.e. it lacks an overt subject).

- 7 Cf. Jacobsson (1988: 75).
- 8 Cf. Noonan (1985: 92ff.).
- 9 Though Sadao Ando (1976) has not specifically investigated this aspect of Marlowe's syntax, to judge from the data provided in the relevant sections a similar, if less absolute, distinction holds for his plays and poems: a) requests are followed by the subjunctive (7 ex.) or by *may/might*; b) commands also by the subjunctive (7 ex.) or by *should* (9 ex.). Cf. Ando, Sections 6.2.2.1, 6.2.2.4, 8.2.8.2, 9.2.6, and 9.5.6.5.3.
- 10 *Wint* 4.4.214 might constitute an exception to the distribution outlined above for *should* and the subjunctive:
- Perdita* (alluding to Autolycus) Forewarn him that he *use* no scurrilous words in's tunes.
It is difficult to determine the exact force of *Perdita*'s words here, though at this point in the play she does not seem to be in a position to give orders to Autolycus. Cf. also Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* 1250, where *forewarn* is clearly used only to make a deferential suggestion, and is thus followed by the subjunctive:
- Faustus* (to Charles V, Emperor of Germany). My Lord, I must forewarn your Majesty, / That when my spirits present the royal shapes / Of Alexander and his paramour, / Your grace demand no questions of the King
- 11 I.e. "aggressive", "dangerous".
- 12 Cf. Visser (Part II: pp. 835 and 838), Ando (1976: 206), and Warner (1982: pp. 192, 237, and 239).
- 13 Brief references to this form of mood "copying" will be found in Abbott (1869: 267), Jespersen (Part IV: 157–8; Part VII: 643), and Warner (1982: 189).
- 14 These figures omit two minor subtypes which behave atypically from the point of view of the THAT/ZERO distribution, namely, coordinate clauses and clauses from which the subject has been raised into the matrix (for instance, by relativization, as in PE "the man [who] the President thought was responsible"); cf. Warner, p. 247, note 5. With similar exclusions, our percentage for zero in categories A and B would rise to 79.55% (there are 15 coordinate clauses—9 with *that* and 6 with *zero*—and 3 with fronted subjects).
- 15 Unfortunately, we have not had access to Elsness (1982), which deals with *that*- and *zero*-clauses in other syntactic functions.
- 16 Edgar's speeches as Poor Tom should probably also be included, but this would not significantly alter the figures for *that* and *zero*, since he uses only one complement clause in Scene 13, line 6.
- 17 Cf. Sister Miriam Joseph, *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1947, pp. 69ff.
- 18 In connection with Edmund and the subtleties of his characterization as a villain, cf. Stein (1987: 421–2): "there are also distinct uses of the [*eth*] form, i.e. distinct semiotic values to the form [of the third person singular]. One characteristic for the Shakespeare corpus is the comic use (...) Another typical use is the *eth* of villains and rogues, where of course Richard III comes first to mind as an exemplar. It is he who produces seven of the 18 occurrences [in the play], but he only produces *eth* in situations where he is feigning or trying to trick somebody (...) Not surprisingly then, two of the four occurrences in *Othello* are produced by Iago in his cynical rhetoric. In *King Lear* there are only two occurrences, one in a song, the other by Edmund who is at that moment telling lies to Edgar".

REFERENCES

- Abbott, E. A., 1869. *A Shakespearian Grammar*. London: Macmillan.
- Ando, S., 1976. *A Descriptive Syntax of Christopher Marlowe's Language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Barber, Ch., 1976. *Early Modern English*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Behre, F., 1950. "The Origin and Early History of Meditative-Polemic *Should* in *That*-clauses". *Göteborg Högskolas Årsskrift* LVI: 3, 275–309.
- Blake, N. F., 1983. *Shakespeare's Language. An Introduction*. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press.
- Bolinger, D., 1972. *That's That*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bolinger, D., 1977. *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.
- Burton, D. M., 1973. *Shakespeare's Grammatical Style. A computer-assisted analysis of Richard II and Antony and Cleopatra*. Austin & London: University of Texas Press.
- Cattell, R., 1984. *Syntax and Semantics. Volume 17: Composite Predicates in English*. Sidney: Academic Press.
- Coates, J., 1983. *The Semantics of Modal Auxiliaries*. London & Canberra: Croom Helm.

- Cusack, B., 1982. "Complements and Humours". In *Language Form and Linguistic Variation. Papers dedicated to Angus McIntosh*, ed. J. Anderson. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 29-42.
- Dekeyser, X., 1984. "Diachronic Dimensions of Subject and Object Complement Clauses". In *English Historical Linguistics: Studies in Development*, eds. N. F. Blake & Ch. Jones. CECTAL Conference Paper Series 3, University of Sheffield, 192-204.
- Elmer, W., 1981. *Diachronic Grammar. The history of Old and Middle English subjectless constructions*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Elsness, J., 1981. "On the Syntactic and Semantic Functions of *That*-clauses". In *Papers from the First Nordic Conference for English Studies*, eds. S. Johansson & B. Tysdahl. Oslo: University of Oslo, 281-303.
- Elsness, J., 1982. "*That* v. Zero Connective in English Nominal Clauses". *ICAME News* 6, 1-45.
- Elsness, J., 1984. "*That* or Zero? A Look at the Choice of Object Clause Connective in a Corpus of American English". *English Studies* 65, 519-33.
- Ernout, A., and F. Thomas, 1951. *Syntaxe Latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fillmore, Ch., 1970. "Types of Lexical Information". In *Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, ed. F. Kiefer. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Franz, W., 1939. *Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa*. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Grosu, A., and S. A. Thompson, 1977. "Constraints on the Distribution of NP Clauses". *Language* 53, 104-51.
- Hickey, R., 1984. "A Valency Framework for the Old English Verb". In *Historical Syntax*, ed. J. Fisiak. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton, 199-216.
- Huddleston, R., 1971. *The Sentence in Written English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R., 1984. *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobsson, B., 1988. "*Should* and *Would* in Factual *That*-clauses". *English Studies* 69, 72-84.
- James, F., 1968. *Semantics of the English Subjunctive*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Jespersen, O., 1909-49. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, I-VII. Heidelberg and Copenhagen.
- Kilby, D., 1984. *Descriptive Syntax and the English Verb*. London & Canberra: Croom Helm.
- Kisbye, T., 1972. *An Historical Outline of English Syntax*, I-II. Aarhus: Akademisk Boghandel.
- Leech, G., 1971. *Meaning and the English Verb*. London: Longman.
- Matthews, P., 1981. *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDavid, V., 1964. "The Alternation of '*That*' and Zero in Noun Clauses". *American Speech* 39, 102-13.
- Mitchell, B., 1985. *Old English Syntax*. I-II. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mustanoja, T. F., 1960. *A Middle English Syntax*. Helsinki: Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique XXIII.
- Noonan, M., 1985. "Complementation". In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume II: Complex Constructions*, ed. T. Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 42-140.
- Palmer, F. R., 1979. *Modality and the English Modals*. London & New York: Longman.
- Prince, E. F., 1981. "Toward a taxonomy of given-new information". In *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. P. Cole. New York: Academic Press, 223-55.
- Quirk, R., et al., 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Rudanko, J., 1985. "Towards Classifying Verbs Governing Object-Controlled Infinitival Equi in Modern English". *Studia Neophilologica* LVII, 145-55.
- Stein, D., 1987. "At the Crossroads of Philology, Linguistics and Semiotics: Notes on the Replacement of *TH* by *S* in the Third Person Singular in English". *English Studies* 68, 406-32.
- Terrell, T., and J. B. Hooper, 1974. "A Semantically Based Analysis of Mood in Spanish". *Hispania* 57, 484-94.
- Traugott, E. Closs, 1972. *A History of English Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Turner, John F., 1980. "The Marked Subjunctive in Contemporary English". *Studia Neophilologica* LII, 271-7.
- Visser, F. Th., 1963-73. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. I-III. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Warner, A., 1982. *Complementation in Middle English and the Methodology of Historical Syntax*. London & Canberra: Croom Helm.
- Woodcock, E., 1959. *A New Latin Syntax*. London: Methuen.

4568