Finite Complement Clauses in Shakespeare's English. I*

TERESA FANEGO

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper—which forms part of a larger study of complement clauses in Shakespearian English—is to provide a syntactic description of finite complement types—with the exclusion of dependent interrogatives—in *Romeo and Juliet, The Merry Wives of Windsor,* and *King Lear,* as well as in the prose scenes of *The Winter's Tale.*

As this is primarily a surface description rather than a transformational one, we might have retained the more traditional label "noun clause" for the structures to be examined. Yet this has obvious shortcomings: so-called noun clauses are certainly not nouns, nor, unlike noun phrases, do they have nouns as their head; while, on the other hand, alternative designations such as Jespersen's "content clause"[1] do not seem to be familiar enough. "Complement clause" was therefore judged the best choice. For much the same reason, both here and in succeeding papers we have found it convenient to subsume under the category "complementizer" *that, to, wh*-words, and other particles associated with various complement types in English, though not, however, affixes such as English *-ing*.

As stated above, the structures we will analyse in the following pages are finite complement clauses, with the exception of indirect questions. In the corpus, most such clauses are either unintroduced (so-called "zero" clauses) or introduced by *that,* though, on occasion, other complementizers occur:

(1) *Wint* 4.4.778 Some say he shall be stoned;
(2) *Wint* 4.4.214 Forewarn him *that* he use no scurrilous words in's tunes.
(3) *Wiv* 4.4.43 /Well, let it not be doubted *but* he'll come./

For the analysis of these and similar constructions the descriptive framework of Quirk et al. (1985) has been used in the main, but we have felt free to depart from it as circumstances demanded.

1.1. *Survey of the corpus*

The selection of Shakespearian English as the basis for study needs, we believe, little justification; despite its undeniable attractions, much remains to be done in this field, especially from the point of view of syntax. As for the plays mentioned in the opening paragraph, they form part of the set on which we have based our investigation of complement clauses in Shakespeare. Their specific choice for this preliminary analysis was recommended by the fact that they date back to two distinct periods within Shakespeare's dramatic career, *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* being representative of an earlier phase, *King Lear* and *The Winter's Tale* of a later one. For a while, it was believed that this variable would prove stylistically significant, though in the end such was not generally the case.

Since prosodic requirements are likely to influence clause syntax, it was felt necessary that prose should be well represented, hence our decision to include only the prose scenes from *The Winter's Tale*. This brought prose lines to a total of 4336, as opposed to 5306 lines of verse.

---

* Part II, including works of reference, will follow in the next issue of this journal.

The modern-spelling text of *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), under the general editorship of Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, has been used throughout. On occasion, to better clarify the grammatical structure of a sentence, we have found it necessary to depart from the modern punctuation of the editors, and have adopted instead that of the volume in old spelling.

In *The Oxford Shakespeare* figures for prose and verse lines in each individual play are as follows:

a) *Romeo and Juliet*
According to Wells and Taylor, p. 377, "probably [Shakespeare] wrote it in 1594 or 1595".
Prose lines   376
Verse lines 2 623

b) *The Merry Wives of Windsor*
Probable date of composition: early in 1597.
Prose lines 2 417
Verse lines   316
About some of the characters in this play—Sir Hugh Evans, Doctor Caius, Mistress Quickly, and several others—one may say with Sir John Falstaff that they "make fritters of English" (5.5.142). The most salient non-standard features of their idiolects have often been commented upon, and in the following pages we will call attention to a few cases in which the grammar of their complement clauses appears to be equally deviant. Yet it is not amiss to anticipate here that such instances are very rare, indeed much more so than might have been expected.

c) *The History of King Lear*
This title corresponds to the text of *King Lear* which first appeared in print in a quarto of 1608, as distinct from *The Tragedy of King Lear*, the heavily revised version of the same play printed in the 1623 Folio. According to Wells and Taylor, p. 1 025, "the 1608 quarto represents the play as Shakespeare originally wrote it, and the 1623 Folio as he substantially revised it."
Prose lines   737
Verse lines 2 367

d) *The Winter's Tale*
This play "is usually thought to have been written after *Cymbeline*, but stylistic evidence places it before that play, perhaps in 1609–10" (Wells and Taylor, p. 1 241).
Prose lines 806, out of a total of 3 108.

Conflation of the figures for all four works yields the following results:
Prose lines   4 336 (=44.97%)
Verse lines   5 306
Total   9 642

Given the restricted size of this body of writings, the present analysis does not claim to be statistically representative, either of Shakespeare's usage or of the usage of his time. Therefore, its primary aim is only to offer those interested in Shakespeare's grammar some new evidence on the topic under study, although we will certainly not abstain from making reference to previous work on the development of English complement clauses. Despite its important transitional character, Early Modern English (henceforth EMODE) is, oddly enough, a neglected period as far as the study of this area of syntax is concerned;[2] it is our belief that comparison of our findings with those of other scholars will prove interesting, especially as our investigation reveals trends that have also been found to

affect finite complement clauses at both earlier and later stages of their history. Indeed, it will become apparent in the following pages that we are greatly indebted to, among others, McDavid (1964), Huddleston (1971), Warner (1982), and Elsness (1981, 1982, and 1984). In passing, we would like to mention that some of these studies were based on corpora not far removed in size from our own, which we estimate to lie in the region of 78 000 to 85 000 words.[3] McDavid, for instance, examined "100 000 words of non-fiction" (p. 103) and Warner about 60 000 words of Wyclifite English, which constitute, in fact, a smaller batch than ours. Huddleston's corpus ran to 135 000 words; Elsness's to 128 000.

In what follows we will first look at the various constructions found in the plays. Topics such as the semantic classes of predicates, the distinctions of mood within the complement clause, or the factors governing the distribution of *that* and *zero* clauses will be given separate treatment in later sections.

2. COMPLEMENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE CORPUS

Both in PE and in EMODE, finite complement clauses may function as nuclear elements of clause structure or, alternatively, as dependents in AdjPs or NPs:

(1) *Lear* 1.275 I think our father will hence tonight.
(2) *ibid.* 22.13 I am doubtful / That you have been conjunct and bosomed with her, /
(3) *ibid.* 8.36 / For confirmation that I am much more / Than my out-wall, open this purse

In addition, since at least the late thirteenth century (cf. OED *That* conj. II.3.c) *that*-clauses have been used alone, independently of their matrix construction, with the illocutionary force of exclamations, as in (4):

(4) *Lear* 12.12 O heavens, that his treason were not, or not I the detector!

Tables 1*a* and 1*b* give the separate figures for the four categories of clauses just mentioned. It will be seen that clauses serving as verb complementation are far more numerous than any other, as indeed they have been throughout the history of English. Also worthy of mention is the high incidence of *zero*-clauses, in comparison with those introduced by *that;* in this respect, however, the corpus behaves atypically, as we shall find occasion to confirm later in this article.

Table 1*a*. *Overall figures for* that- *and* zero-*clauses*

	As verb comp	As adj. comp	As noun comp	Exclamatory	Total
That	88	12	17	15	132
Zero	341	22	11	--	374
Total	429	34	28	15	506

Table 1*b*. *Clauses with other complementizers*

	As verb comp	As adj. comp	As noun comp	Total
But	3	–	--	3
How	1	–	–	1
Lest	–	–	1	1
Total	4	–	1	5

Table 2. *Distribution of complement clauses per play*

	Verb comp	Adj comp	Noun comp	Exclamatory	Total	Frequency per line
Rom	119	10	4	10	143	1 : 20.97
Wiv	145	12	12	1	170	1 : 16.08
Lear	120	9	11	3	143	1 : 21.71
Wint	49	3	2	1	55	1 : 14.65

Note: *1 : 20.97* signifies "1 clause every 20.97 lines of prose or verse".

Table 2 above shows the breakdown of complement clauses in each individual play. No very significant differences in frequency emerge from play to play, and those found cannot be related to the variable early *versus* late date of composition, but rather to the type of discourse, i.e. the two "prose" plays—*The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *The Winter's Tale*—have the highest frequencies. This provides an interesting contrast to the distribution of infinitive clauses and dependent interrogatives, both of which become more common in the later plays, to judge at least from our investigations so far.

Though the notion of sentence complexity is an elusive one, which linguists are understandably reluctant to define, it has sometimes been claimed that in certain respects Shakespeare's syntactic structures moved from complexity to simplicity in the course of time. Commenting on clause types in *Richard II* and *Antony and Cleopatra,* Dolores M. Burton (1973: 109) concludes that "The most obvious change shown in Table 20 is the decline of embedding in *Antony.* On the assumption, already invoked, that the looser the relation between clauses the simpler the syntax, parataxis is the simplest construction, hypotaxis second, and embedding the most complex. The decrease in embedding, then,

Table 3

	I SUCL V That P	I SUCL V That V	I SUCL V Zero P	I SUCL V Zero V	II (it) V SUCL That P	II (it) V SUCL That V	II (it) V SUCL Zero P	II (it) V SUCL Zero V	III V OBCL That P	III V OBCL That V	III V OBCL Zero P	III V OBCL Zero V	IV V it OBCL That P	IV V it OBCL That V	IV V it OBCL Zero P	IV V it OBCL Zero V	V V Oᵢ OBCL That P	V V Oᵢ OBCL That V	V V Oᵢ OBCL Zero P	V V Oᵢ OBCL Zero V
Rom					2	2	2	12		14	3	60	1				2	8		9
Wiv					7	1	10	1	7	3	85	8					3		11	2
Lear	1					11	1	18	1	9	13	41	2					3	9	5
Wint							5		3		34						2		5	
Total	1				9	14	18	31	11	26	135	109	3				7	11	25	16

Notes:

1. In accordance with the terminology of Quirk et al. (1985), the symbol O_i includes prepositional objects, such as *to John* in "Mary told the secret to John". A denotes an obligatory adverbial, required for the complementation of the verb; C_S and C_O stand, respectively, for Subject and Object Complement; P and V for "prose" and "verse".

2. The presence (or absence) of an anticipatory pronoun is represented by *it*.

strengthens the information in Table 18 that, to the extent that the presence of embedded clauses is an index of complexity, the lower levels of sentence composition in *Antony* are simpler than those of *Richard II*''.

In the corpus, however, the very reverse is true: the complement clauses recorded become more complex in the late plays, at least when examined in terms of depth of embedding. Thus, only 18 (=12.59%) out of the 143 clauses in *Romeo and Juliet* function within matrix clauses that are themselves embedded in another construction, as in (5)

(5) *Rom* 3.5.122 I will not marry yet; and when I do, I swear / It shall be Romeo—whom you know *I hate*— / Rather than Paris.

The percentage in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is even lower, namely 8.23% (=14 clauses), whereas it rises to 18.88% (=27 clauses) in *King Lear,* and to 25.45% (=14 clauses) in *The Winter's Tale*. Not surprisingly, 9 of the 27 instances in *Lear* are produced by Edmund, a character whose grammar strikes me as notoriously complex. In *The Winter's Tale* 6 of the 14 clauses occur in another difficult passage—Act 5, Scene 2—in which the three Gentlemen relate the meeting of the kings and the recognition of Perdita.

Table 3 gives the surface constructions in which *that*- and *zero*-clauses serving as verb complementation are found. Here and elsewhere, unless otherwise stated, coordinate constructions have been counted as separate clauses provided they each contained a subject and a predicate.

For reasons of space, exemplification in the sections that follow will be kept to a minimum. In general, only obsolete or rare uses will be accorded special attention.

2.1. *Types I and II: SUCL V (1 example) and (it) V SUCL (72 examples)*

Percentage in corpus: 14.72%[4]

McDavid (1964) and Elsness (1981), who worked with corpora of modern American English, obtained similar percentages, respectively 12.25% and 11.49% (cf. their Tables 8.1–3 and 1 *a*).

VI				VII				VIII				IX				
V it C_O OBCL				V A OBCL				V it A OBCL				V C_S				
That		Zero		That		Zero		That		Zero		That		Zero		
P	V	P	V	P	V	P	V	P	V	P	V	P	V	P	V	Total
	1		1										1			118
						1				1		1		1	1	143
1	1	1						1							1	119
																49
1	2	1	1			1				1	1	1	1	1	2	429

2.1.1. *Predicates in an active matrix (64 examples)*

i) with *that*-clauses (22):

APPLY WELL "adapt or suit itself well" (OED *Apply* v. 21), *Wiv* 2.2.229 p (= prose) "Would it apply well to the vehemency of your affection that I should win what you would enjoy?"; BE BETTER, *Wiv* 1.1.38 p; BE NOT GOOD, *Wiv* 2.2.124 p; BE LIKE, *Rom* 4.3.44; BE MUCH, *Lear* 11.6; BE POSITIVE, *Wiv* 3.2.42 p; BE SO, *Wiv* 3.3.105 p; BE STRANGE (2), e.g. *Lear* 1.245; BE MOST STRANGE, *Lear* 1.203; BE VAIN, *Lear* 24.288; BE WELL, *Lear* 20.270; BE A PRODIGIOUS BIRTH, *Rom* 1.5.139; BE THE FASHION, *Lear* 11.65; BE A LAMENTABLE THING, *Rom* 2.3.29 p; BE ONE'S WILL, *Lear* 4.253; BE WONDER, *Lear* 21.38; HOLD TRUE, *Lear* 21.84; MAKE, *Lear* 16.63; *PLEASE, Lear* 21.15; REST "remain to be done" (OED *Rest* v.[2] 3. Obs), *Wiv* 4.6.47 "And here it rests that you'll procure the vicar / To stay for me at church"; SUFFICE, *Wiv* 2.1.9 p.

ii) with unintroduced clauses (42):

BE MOST CERTAIN, *Wiv* 3.3.106 p; BE NOT CONVENIENT, *Wiv* 4.5.75 p; BE ENOUGH, *Rom* 2.5.8; BE AS GOOD AS "be to as little purpose as", *Rom* 3.5.224; BE NOT GOOD, *Wiv* 1.4.107 p; BE IMPOSSIBLE, *Wiv* 3.5.134 p; BE LAWFUL, *Lear* 1.244; BE LIKE(LY) (2), e.g. *Rom* 4.1.73; BE NOT MEET, *Wiv* 1.1.32 p; BE WELL (2), e.g. *Rom* 1.1.30; BE ONE'S HEAVEN, *Rom* 4.4.99; BE PITY, *Rom* 1.2.5; BE A THING IMPOSSIBLE, *Wiv* 3.4.9; CHANCE (2), e.g. *Lear* 7.230 "How chance the King comes with so small a train?"; COME "happen", *Lear* 16.47; FOLLOW "occur as a consequence", *Lear* 2.125 p; SEEM (3), e.g. *Rom* 1.5.44; THINK "seem" (18), e.g. *Wiv* 2.2.231 p "Methinks you prescribe to yourself very preposterously".

On two occasions the copula had been ellipted and the predicates appeared verbless:

BETTER (2), e.g. *Lear* 20.274 "Better I were distraught".

    A few words seem in order concerning the impersonal verbs *chance* and *think* (<OE *ðyncan* "seem"). Though historically they belong in the pattern under discussion, there is every indication that by Shakespeare's time they were no longer apprehended as ordinary verbs. The two occurrences of *chance* are in the fixed expression "How chance …?", presumably a reduction of "How chances (it) that …?"; as the OED (*Chance* v. 5) remarks, "here *chance* takes no inflexion, and almost assumes the character of an adverb". As for *think,* the Shakespearian forms look like fossilized relics of an earlier impersonal verb, about whose actual status there seems to have been uncertainty. In the first place, both within the corpus and outside it, it is restricted to collocation with the objective pronoun *me,* sequences like *him thinks* or *them thinks* not being recorded; in the second, some of the forms adopted by the verb appear to be attempts to make it conform to more familiar syntactic patterns. Thus, alongside *me thinks* "it seems to me" and *me thought* "it seemed to me", the variant *me thoughts* occurs in *Lear* 20.69:

(6) As I stood here below, me thoughts his eyes / Were two full moons.

Here the /-s/ has been variously interpreted as either due to analogy with the present tense *me thinks* or as "an adverbial ending (as in *needs* 'necessarily', *betimes* 'early', etc.)" (see Barber, 1976: 286). Outside the corpus a fourth form, *me think'st,* is recorded in *All's Well That Ends Well* 2.3.251:

(7) Me think'st thou art a general offence.

This may represent an effort—either of Shakespeare himself or of the Folio compositor—to bring the verb into agreement with the following *thou*.[5]

2.1.2. *Predicates in a passive matrix (9 examples)*

i) with *that*-clauses (2):
TELL, *Wiv* 4.5.80 p; WRITE, *Rom* 1.2.37 p.

ii) with unintroduced clauses (7):
KNOW, *Rom* 1.1.28 p; SEE (2), e.g. *Lear* 15.17; SUPPOSE, *Rom* 5.3.51; TELL, *Wint* 3.3.114 p; THINK (2), e.g. *Wint* 4.4.277 p.

2.1.3. *Extraposition in subject clauses*

As will be clear from Table 3 above, extraposition is the norm when the clause is a subject; it takes place in all but the following instance:

(8) *Lear* 15.63 Here, take this purse, thou whom the heavens' plagues / Have humbled to all strokes. *That I am wretched* / Makes thee the happier.

Metrical factors have probably influenced the choice of construction, yet it is tempting to correlate it with the fact that the content of the complement clause is given, and well-known to the audience; by positioning it initially the normal information pattern given + new is attained.[6]

In most of the remaining clauses *it* fills—as in PE—the position vacated by the extra-posed clause; for two examples, see the quotations under APPLY WELL and REST above. The pronoun *this* is similarly used on two occasions, as was often the case in Old, Middle, and Early Modern English:[7]

(9) *Rom* 2.3.29 is not this a lamentable thing, grandsire, that we should be thus afflicted with these strange flies (. . .)?
(10) *Lear* 1.204 This is most strange, that she that even but now / Was your best object (. . .) / Should in this trice of time commit a thing / So monstrous

It is generally assumed that the difference between *it* and *this* in such cases is one of emphasis and stress, but other factors probably intervened as well. Thus in (11), which occurs only a few lines later than (10), and contains the same matrix predicate (i.e. *be strange*), the pronoun *it* seems to have been preferred over *this* because of its ability to undergo aphesis and so constitute a syllable together with the following verb:

(11) *Lear* 1.245 Gods, gods! 'Tis strange, that from their cold'st neglect / My love should kindle to inflamed respect.

The frequency with which extraposed subject clauses require in the corpus such anticipatory subjects is no doubt commensurate with the trend towards obligatory subjec-tivalization that had already started in medieval times and that was widespread by the EMODE period.[8] The only exceptions in the plays are the impersonal constructions with *how chance . . .?, think* "seem", and *please,* all of which may be considered idiomatic to a greater or lesser extent. We have already alluded to the fossilized character of the first two, which is also shared by *please* in its use in deferential expressions of address such as (12):

(12) *Lear* 12.15 So please your majesty / That we may wake the king?

2.2. *Types III and IV: V OBCL (281 examples) and V it OBCL (3 examples)*
Percentage in corpus: 57.26%

Throughout the history of English, the object function has remained the most common with *that*- and *zero*-clauses; cf. Elsness (1981: 282), Warner (1982: 100 ff.), and Mitchell (1985: 1,967). The corpus constitutes no exception in this respect and, indeed, the figures for Types III, IV and V (V O_i OBCL) would increase if we had not excluded from the

count a number of potential direct speech and comment clauses. Though direct speech no doubt forms part of the complementation of many predicates, it falls, strictly speaking, outside the domain of this investigation, so we have left out clauses of uncertain status, such as (13):

(13) *Wiv* 3.3.72 I beseech you heartily *some of you go home with me to dinner.*

Given the haphazard punctuation of early editions of Shakespeare, we may have here an unintroduced clause after *beseech* or, as is more likely, a direct speech clause in imperative form.

In their turn, the syntactic effect of comment or parenthetical clauses is to make the complement the main clause:

(14) *Wiv* 2.2.125 Old folks, *you know,* have discretion.

When such clauses are given initial position, the dependent or non-dependent nature of the following unit cannot always be clearly established, so cases like (15) have also been omitted from our discussion:

(15) *Wiv* 2.2.50 I warrant thee *nobody hears.*

2.2.1. *Type III: V OBCL*

i) predicates in an active matrix with *that*-clauses (37):

APPOINT "ordain authoritatively" (OED *Appoint* v. 8), *Wiv* 4.6.27 "her mother (...) hath appointed / That he shall likewise shuffle her away"; BEG, *Lear* 7.313; BELIEVE (2), e.g. *Rom* 5.3.103; CARE, *Wiv* 3.4.27 p; CONFESS (2), e.g. *Lear* 7.312; DREAM, *Rom* 5.3.139; FIND, *Lear* 4.302; HEAR, *Lear* 6.105; INTEND, *Wiv* 4.6.37; KNOW (2), e.g. *Wint* 5.2.165 p; LOOK "take care", *Rom* 4.1.91; MAINTAIN, *Lear* 24.110 p;
NOTIFY, *Wiv* 2.2.82 p "she gives you to notify that her husband will be absence from his house between ten and eleven". This is probably intended as Mistress Quickly's blunder for *gives you notice that ...,* an expression which occurs in Shakespeare eleven times, three having a finite clause as complementation. The verb *notify,* on the contrary, is only recorded here and in *Othello* 3.128, where it is also employed by a comic character (the Clown);
OBJECT, *Wiv* 3.4.5; PERCEIVE, *Wiv* 5.5.118 p; PRAY (2), e.g. *Lear* 23.2; SAY (3), e.g. *Rom* 3.3.43; SEE (5), e.g. *Rom* 2.4.30; SUSPECT, *Rom* 5.2.9; SWEAR, *Rom* 1.1.214; THINK (4), e.g. *Lear* 1.139; WITNESS, *Lear* 24.75; WOULD, *Wint* 3.3.59; WRITE, *Rom* 5.3.287.

ii) predicates in an active matrix with *zero*-clauses (243):

ACKNOW "admit, acknowledge" (OED *Acknow* v. 2; last quotation: 1561), *Lear* 1.218 "I yet beseech your majesty, / (...) that you acknow / It is no vicious blot, murder, or foulness, (...) / That hath deprived me of your grace and favour";[9] CONFESS, *Wiv* 3.4.13; CRY OUT, *Rom* 3.3.108; DENY, *Lear* 7.25 p; DOUBT "be afraid", *Wiv* 1.4.39 p; DREAM (2), e.g. *Rom* 5.1.6; FEAR (4), e.g. *Lear* 21.60; FIND (2), e.g. *Lear* 1.66; HAD RATHER (2), e.g. *Wiv* 1.1.181 p; HAD AS LIEF "prefer", *Wiv* 3.1.58 p "I had as lief you would tell me of a mess of pottage"; HEAR (6), e.g. *Wiv* 2.1.208 p; HOPE (12), e.g. *Rom* 3.5.63; KNOW (27), e.g. *Wint* 5.2.164; LOOK "take care" (3), e.g. *Rom* 3.3.147;
LOOK "expect" (OED *Look* v. 3.c), *Wiv* 2.3.62 "By Gar, me do look he shall clapper-de-claw me, for, by Gar, me vill have it". Though Dr. Caius's broken English makes this an unlikely example, parallels may be found in Shakespeare for this sense of *look* with a clause; cf. *Henry VIII* 5.1.118 "My lord, I looked / You would have given me your petition";

MARK, *Lear* 24.36 "Mark I say instantly, and carry it so / As I have set it down"; MARVEL (2), e.g. *Lear* 16.1; MEAN (2), e.g. *Rom* 1.4.45; MISGIVE, *Rom* 1.4.107 "my mind misgives / Some consequence yet hanging in the stars / Shall bitterly begin his fearful date / With this night's revels"; NOTE, *Wint* 4.2.31 p; OBJECT, *Wiv* 3.4.4; ORDAIN, *Wiv* 3.5.97 p; PERCEIVE (2), e.g. *Lear* 12.5 p; PRAY, *Wint* 4.4.711 p; PROTEST, *Rom* 3.1.67; PROVE, *Lear* 24.137; SAY (51), e.g. *Rom* 1.3.70; SEE "perceive" (11), e.g. *Wiv* 3.2.7 p; SEE "make sure", *Rom* 5.3.24; SHIELD "forbid", *Rom* 4.1.41 "God shield I should disturb devotion!"; SHOW, *Lear* 16.77; SUPPOSE, *Rom* 1.1.202; SWEAR (9), e.g. *Wint* 5.2.31 p; TESTIFY, *Rom* 4.1.98; THINK (44), e.g. *Rom* 1.3.53; UNDERSTAND, *Wiv* 2.2.161 p; WARRANT (6), e.g. *Wiv* 2.1.71; WILL "desire, wish", *Wiv* 1.4.59 p "Dere is some simples in my closet dat I vill not for the varld I shall leave behind" (see on this sentence the entry for DESIRE, Section 2.3.2); WISH, *Rom* 2.1.35; WOULD (34), e.g. *Wiv* 1.1.92 p.

iii) predicates in a passive matrix (1):

The following is a transform of a ditransitive construction (V O$_i$ OBCL) at the pre-passive level:

SWEAR, *Wiv* 1.4.140 p "I'll be sworn on a book she loves you." This was in EMODE a common formula for expressing strong affirmation (cf. OED *Swear* v. II.10.f.); though fossilized, it had its origins in the ditransitive use of the verb *swear* as "put a person upon his oath, cause a person to take an oath". Compare *Julius Caesar* 5.3.37 "In Parthia did I take thee prisoner, / And then I swore thee, saving of thy life, / That whatsoever I did bid thee do / Thou shouldst attempt it".

2.2.2. *Type IV: V it OBCL*

As Bruce Mitchell points out when discussing preparatory pronouns in OE (1985: 775–6), the demonstratives *ðæt* or *ðis* and the neuter pronoun *hit* were frequently used to anticipate object clauses in monotransitive constructions; cf. (16) and (17):

(16) eac we magon oncnawan *ðæt,* ðæt ða earman and ða untruman sient to retanne
(17) ðæt is micel wundor, ðæt *hit* ece god æfre wolde ... ðolian, ðæt wurde ðegn swa monig forlædd

This pattern continued to be used during the Middle and Early Modern English periods, but little by little authors seem to have grown aware of the redundancy of such heralding pronouns, with the result that in PE they have largely disappeared.[10] As for the corpus, examples are not numerous:

(18) *Rom* 2.2.63 When and where and how / We met (...) / I'll tell thee as we pass; but *this* I pray, / That thou consent to marry us today.
(19) *Lear* 6.60 The noble Duke my master, / My worthy arch and patron, comes tonight. / By his authority I will proclaim *it,* / That he which finds him shall deserve our thanks,
(20) *Lear* 24.30 thou dost make thy way / To noble fortunes. Know thou *this* that men / Are as the time is.

In all probability, there was originally little or no difference between the various anticipatory pronouns, though commentators have tended to view the two demonstratives as distinctly more emphatic than *it,* an assumption which seems correct in cases like (18) above. It must be borne in mind, however, that the pronoun *it* could formerly be more emphatic than at present, and hence was capable of carrying strong stress in much the same way as *this* or *that.* In contexts such as the following, where it occurs in a position of metrical stress, the distinction must have been tenuous, if any:

(21) *Much Ado About Nothing* 4.1.206 Your daughter here the princes left for dead, / Let her a while be secretly kept in, / And públish *ít,* that she is déad indéed. /

(22) *Richard III* 4.5.52 Cóme hither, Cátesby. Rúmour *it* abróad / That Anne, my wife, is very grievous sick.

2.3. *Type V: V O$_i$ OBCL (59 examples)*

Percentage in corpus: 11.89%

For the same type, McDavid's percentage reached only 5.05% (cf. her Tables 5.2 and 5.3, p. 110). Such disparity must probably be put down to the nature of her material, which was drawn largely from periodicals and other publications of general interest; since ditransitive constructions involve an indirect object, which is typically animate and the recipient of the action, they are more likely to appear in plays or in other texts containing substantial amounts of dialogue. The same factor no doubt accounts for the scarcity of ditransitive clauses in Rodney Huddleston's corpus of written scientific English (cf. 1971: 91).

2.3.1. *Predicates with that-clauses (18)*

BESEECH NP OBCL, *Lear* 1.215; BESHREW "curse or blame greatly" (OED v. 3. Obs.), *Rom* 5.2.25 "Within this three hours will fair Juliet wake. / She will beshrew me much that Romeo / Hath had no notice of these accidents"; CONFESS TO-NP OBCL, *Rom* 4.1.25; CONJURE "appeal solemnly to, beseech", *Rom* 2.1.17 "I conjure thee by Rosaline's bright eyes (...) / That in thy likeness thou appear to us"; DENY TO-NP OBCL, *Rom* 4.1.24; DESIRE, *Wiv* 3.1.110 "*Evans.* I desire you that we may be friends" (see entry for DESIRE, Section 2.3.2); FOREWARN NP OBCL, *Wint* 4.4.214 p "Forewarn him that he use no scurrilous words in's tunes"; PERSUADE NP OBCL, *Lear* 7.275; SAY TO-NP OBCL, *Rom* 2.4.32;

SET UP ONE'S REST OBCL "firmly resolve" (a figurative expression from the card game primero; cf. OED *Rest* sb.[2] 7.c), *Rom* 4.4.33 "Sleep for a week, for the next night, I warrant, / The County Paris hath set up his rest / That you shall rest but little". Although included in this section by reason of its surface form, the combination *set up one's rest* (originally, "to venture one's final stake") was fully idiomatic, and should thus be viewed as a composite predicate,[11] with the *that*-clause as one of its arguments.

SWEAR TO-NP OBCL, *Wint* 5.2.163 p; TELL NP OBCL (6), e.g. *Rom* 2.3.167 p; WRITE TO-NP OBCL, *Rom* 5.3.245.

2.3.2. *Predicates with zero-clauses (41)*

ANSWER NP OBCL, *Lear* 4.51 p; ASSURE NP OBCL, *Rom* 2.2.39; CONFESS TO-NP OBCL, *Wint* 4.3.106 p;

DESIRE, *Wiv* 3.1.8 p "*Evans.* I most fehemently desire you you will also look that way". Evans's repeated use of this construction (see Section 2.3.1) might seem suspect, yet *to desire a person (that)* ... is documented in the OED, and occurs as well in other Shakespearian passages, where it is employed by more orthodox speakers:

(23) *Julius Caesar* 3.1.53 *Brutus.* I kiss thy hand, but not in flattery, Caesar, / Desiring thee that Publius Cimber may / Have an immediate freedom of repeal
(24) *Henry V* 4.3.84 *Montjoy.* (to the King) The Constable desires thee thou wilt mind / Thy followers of repentance

It is noteworthy that both the latter example and *Wiv* 3.1.8 appear to contain a redundant object. This was frequent with manipulative predicates, i.e. those like *make, command,* or *desire* above, which typically encode situations where the agent attempts to manipulate the affectee into performing some action; in such constructions, deletion of one of the two co-referential noun phrases was formerly less common than it is

today.[12] Cf. (25) and, for other examples in the corpus, the entries for CONJURE and FOREWARN, Section 2.3.1.

(25) *Henry V* 2.4.77 He wills you, in the name of God Almighty, / That you divest yourself and lay apart / The borrowed glories that by gift of heaven (...) 'longs / To him and to his heirs

Equi-deletion could similarly fail to apply when the relation of co-reference involved the matrix and complement subjects. See in this connection the quotation under WILL, Section 2.2.1.

LAY, *Rom* 1.3.14 p "I'll lay fourteen of my teeth (...) she's not fourteen"; PAWN DOWN NP OBCL, *Lear* 2.86; PERSUADE NP OBCL, *Wiv* 3.3.63 p; PRAY NP OBCL, *Wiv* 4.2.102 p; PROMISE NP OBCL (2), e.g. *Rom* 3.4.6; PROTEST TO-NP OBCL, *Wiv* 4.2.28 p; SAY TO-NP OBCL, *Rom* 1.2.34; SWEAR TO-NP OBCL (3), e.g. *Wint* 5.2.155 p; TEACH NP OBCL, *Lear* 7.234; TELL NP OBCL (25), e.g. *Rom* 3.3.160.

2.4. *Type VI: V it C_o OBCL (5 examples)*
Percentage in corpus: 1.01%

In clauses with an object complement, it is now the rule to shift the OBCL to the right of the sentence, *it* then coming to fill the vacated slot,[13] as in

(26) He found it strange that no one else had arrived.

Absence of the preparatory pronoun was allowed in the earlier stages of the language, and seems to have been normal with some authors. According to Anthony Warner (1982: 79), there are no signs of it in the Wyclifite sermons, but simple reordering of the complement clause:

(27) Cristen men taken as bileve, þat Crist is Lord and spouse of þe Chirche;

A good many parallel examples, some dating back to the sixteenth century or even later, are listed by Visser (1970: I, 523 ff.). Yet in our material the rare cases of this construction all follow the PE pattern:

(28) *Rom* 4.1.9 Now, sir, her father counts *it* dangerous / That she do give her sorrow so much sway,
(29) *Rom* 3.5.217 I think *it* best you married with the County.
(30) *Lear* 2.75 p 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. (On this structure, where the C_o is itself clausal, namely, *to be fit*, cf. Quirk et al., 1985: 16.50).

The following is a variant of the type under discussion, with the predicative complement moved to the front of the clause for emphasis:

(31) *Lear* 21.10 My boon I make *it* that you know me not / Till time and I think meet.

2.5. *Types VII and VIII: V A OBCL (1 example) and V it A OBCL (2 examples)*
Percentage in corpus: 0.6%

The most characteristic adjuncts to occur in these two types denote place, goal, source, and other related notions: *put the book on the table, slip the key into the lock,* etc. Since complement clauses can only refer to abstractions, their occurrence in such patterns is restricted to metaphorical contexts where verb and adjunct constitute an idiomatic unit devoid of its literal meaning, as they do in, for instance, *cast in a person's teeth, bear in mind* or *take to heart*. In such cases, extraposition of the clause and preparatory *it* are now mandatory; see in this connection Visser (1970: I, 512 and 522), and Quirk et al. (1985: 18.35). Formerly, however, usage wavered, as the rare examples in the corpus—with *it* absent once—clearly testify:

(32) *Wiv* 4.2.203 If they can find in their hearts[14] the poor, unvirtuous, fat knight shall be any further afflicted, we two will still be the ministers.
(33) *Wiv* 2.2.13 And when Mistress Bridget lost the handle of her fan, I took'*t* upon mine honour thou hadst it not.
(34) *Lear* 7.139 The King must take *it* ill / That he's so slightly valued in his messenger.

2.6. *Type IX: V C_s (5 examples)*

Percentage in corpus: 1.01%

This figure is very close to the 0.90% that Warner (1982: 107) obtained for the same type in the Wyclifite sermons. It contrasts markedly, however, with the percentages of Elsness and McDavid for Modern American English, both of which were considerably higher, namely 3.31% and 6.89%.[15] Aside from this, there was nothing remarkable in the rare occurrences of this complement construction; BE served as copula in all five cases, while the subject noun phrases were the following:

i) with *that*-clauses (2):

[MY DREAM], *Rom* 1.4.52; HIS WORST FAULT, *Wiv* 1.4.11.

ii) with *zero*-clauses (3):

THE TRUTH, *Wiv* 5.5.215; THE WONDER, *Lear* 24.311; THE VERY YEA AND THE NO, *Wiv* 1.4.90.

2.7. *Type X: That- and zero-clauses as complements to adjectives (34 examples)*
Percentage in corpus: 6.85%.

A few of the complement-taking adjectives were participial; on the distinction between these and the *-ed* participle of the passive construction cf. Ando (1976: 160 ff), Huddleston (1984: 322 ff.), and Quirk et al. (1985: 3.75 ff. and 7.15 ff.).

i) predicates with *that*-clauses (12):

ASHAMED (2), e.g. *Lear* 4.291; BLEST (2), e.g. *Rom* 3.5.164 "we scarce thought us blest / That God had lent us but this only child"; DOUBTFUL "full of fear or apprehension", *Lear* 22.13 "I am doubtful / That you have been conjunct and bosomed with her";
ELEVATED "full of joy", *Wint* 5.2.75 "But O, the noble combat that 'twixt joy and sorrow was fought in Paulina! She had one eye declined for the loss of her husband, another elevated that the oracle was fulfilled". As J. H. P. Pafford rightly observes in his edition of *The Winter's Tale* (The Arden Shakespeare, London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1963: p. lxxxviii), "a modern interpretation (...) of the description of Paulina with,

Table 4. *Clauses as adjective complementation*

	That		Zero		
	Prose	Verse	Prose	Verse	Total
Rom	–	5	1	4	10
Wiv	2	–	10	–	12
Lear	–	4	–	5	9
Wint	1	–	2	–	3
Total	3	9	13	9	34

simultaneously, 'one eye declined' and 'another elevated' could easily treat the account
as ludicrous and might even lead to jocular comment on Paulina's ocular gymnastics.
But this would be wrong interpretation of a phrase which simply meant 'with a·mixture
of grief and happiness'''. Shakespeare's lines constitute his personal version of the
Elizabethan proverb *To cry with one eye and weep with the other;* compare also *Hamlet*
1.2.11 "With an auspicious and a dropping eye".

FEARFUL, *Lear* 4.200; GLAD, *Wiv* 5.5.226 p; POOR, *Rom* 1.1.212 "O, she is rich in
beauty, only poor / That when she dies, with beauty dies her store"; SORRY (2), e.g. *Wiv*
3.5.114; THANKFUL, *Rom* 3.5.146.

ii) predicates with *zero*-clauses (22):

AFEARD, *Rom* 2.1.181; AFRAID, *Wiv* 3.3.172 p; CONTENT, *Wiv* 2.2.6 p "I have been
content, sir, you should lay my countenance to pawn"; GLAD (8), e.g. *Rom* 1.1.114;
PERSUADED "convinced", *Lear* 4.228; PROUD, *Rom* 3.5.146;
SORROW, *Lear* 20.249 "He's dead; I am only sorrow / He had no other deathsman".
    According to the OED, the only recorded use of *sorrow* as an adjective dates back to
    1470 (cf. *Sorrow* sb. 7); to it must be added the quotation above, as well as *Cymbeline*
    5.6.299 "I am sorrow for thee";
SORRY, *Lear* 1.237; SURE (7), e.g. *Wint* 4.4.259 p.

2.8. *Type XI: That and zero-clauses as complements to NPs (28 examples)*

Percentage in corpus: 5.65%

    Warner's percentage for the same type in Wyclifite English came to 13.45%, a figure
very similar to those obtained by Elsness (14.61%) and McDavid (15.00%) for Modern
American English.[16]
    That and unintroduced clauses may occur in restrictive apposition to a noun phrase, as
in (35) and (36):

(35) *Wiv* 3.4.13 Albeit I will confess thy father's wealth / Was *the first motive that I wooed thee,*
    Anne, / Yet, wooing thee, I found thee of more value
(36) *Wiv* 4.2.121 God be *my witness you do,* if you suspect me in any dishonesty.

As has often been noted, the close relationship between such clauses and their head nouns
resembles that which binds together verbs or adjectives, and their dependent clauses.[17]

Table 5. *Clauses as NP complementation*

| | That | | | | Zero | | |
| | Restrictive | | Nonrestrictive | | Restrictive | | |
	P	V	P	V	P	V	Total
Rom	–	2	–	1	–	1	4
Wiv	2	2	1	–	5	1	11
Lear	1	5	1	1	1	2	11
Wint	–	–	1	–	1	–	2
Total	3	9	3	2	7	4	28

Thus, an example like (36) above provides a neat parallel to (37), where the clause complements the verb *witness:*

(37) *Lear* 24.75 *Witness* the world *that I create thee here / My lord and master.*

In addition to their use in restrictive apposition, *that*-clauses—but not those unintroduced—can also function nonrestrictively, as though expanding or explaining a preceding noun phrase:

(38) *Wint* 4.2.37 I have eyes under my service which look upon his removedness, from whom I have this intelligence: that he is seldom from the house of a most homely shepherd,

Broadly speaking, the grammar of both types of apposition has not varied significantly from EMODE to PE, though, as will become apparent in the following pages, there are a few differences of detail.

2.8.1. *Unintroduced clauses*

There were 11 examples of this category, with the following items as head nouns:

HOPE (2), e.g. *Lear* 7.300;

MIND (2), this occurs in two separate set expressions: 1) *be of the mind* "be of the opinion, believe", *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". 2) *put a person in mind* "bring to his memory, remind him", *Rom* 1.1.228 "These happy masks that kiss fair ladies' brows, / Being black, puts us in mind they hide the fair". Viewed historically, the human NP (i.e. *us*) in this construction represents the old dative of "pertinence" or "possession"[18] which was common in Old and Middle English to specify the possessor of a following noun (*mind* in this case). For another occurrence in Shakespeare of the same expression, cf. *Richard III* 4.2.113 "I am thus bold to put your grace in mind of what you promised me".

OATH, *Lear* 13.42 p; PROOF, *Wiv* 4.2.94; REPORT, *Wiv* 1.3.47 p; THOUGHT, *Wiv* 5.5.121 p; WITNESS (2), e.g. 2.3.33 p; WORD, *Wiv* 4.4.17 p.

2.8.2. *That-clauses*

i) restrictive (12):

BELIEF, *Wiv* 5.5.124 p; BLAME, *Lear* 24.250 "He hath commission from thy wife and me / To hang Cordelia in the prison, and / To lay the blame upon her own despair, / That she fordid herself"; CONFIRMATION, *Lear* 8.36; GRIEF, *Rom* 2.1.47; LEAVE "permission", *Lear* 10.2 "When I desired their leave / That I might pity him, they took from me / The use of mine own house" (for other occurrences of this noun with the same complement type, cf. *Measure for Measure* 1.1.60 and *Twelfth Night* 2.1.6);

LETTERS, *Lear* 7.341 "This approves her letters / That she would soon be here". Despite the plural number, it is clear from the context that only one letter is meant; on this use, cf. OED *Letter* sb.[1] 4.b "A missive communication in writing. Plural with singular meaning, after Latin *litteræ*", and compare also *All's Well That Ends Well* 4.5.85 and 5.3.30;

MOTIVE, *Wiv* 3.4.13; NOTICE, *Lear* 6.3 p; SIGNAL, *Rom* 5.3.8; SORROW, *Lear* 4.169 "And I for sorrow sung, / That such a king should play bo-peep"; TALE, *Wiv* 4.4.27; WITNESS, *Wiv* 2.3.33 p.

ii) nonrestrictive (5):

Two distinct nonrestrictive types were found. One corresponds to Quirk et al.'s partial weak nonrestrictive apposition (1985: 17.65 ff.); that is, the appositives belong to different

syntactic classes (''weak apposition''), and only one of them can be omitted without affecting the acceptability of the sentence, or its extralinguistic reference (''partial apposition''). Thus in

(39) *Wiv* 3.3.168 I know not which pleases me better: that my husband is deceived or Sir John

omission of the first appositive, *which,* results in an unacceptable sentence, even if we reposition the clause:

(39b) *I know not that my husband is deceived, or Sir John pleases me better.

The same holds true for *Wint* 4.2.37, which was quoted above as example (38), and for *Lear* 1.65 ff.:

(40) *Regan.* Sir, I am made / Of the self-same mettle that my sister is, / And prize me at her worth. In my true heart / I find she names *my very deed of love,* / Only she came short, *that I profess / Myself an enemy to all other joys, / Which the most precious square of sense possesses,*

Most modern editors[19] take *that* as ''in that'' and depart from the quarto punctuation—which we reproduce above—to read as follows:

(40b) (...) I find she names my very deed of love; / Only she came short: that I profess / Myself an enemy (...)

In this modified form the *that*-clause is linked syntactically and semantically to what immediately precedes it, rather than to the line before, and specifies the respect in which Goneril ''came short''. But, in our view, such an interpretation stems from the propensity of Shakespearian scholars to attribute adverbial function to uses of *that* which now sound odd, but which, in all probability, ought to be accounted for in some other way. We believe the clause to be in apposition to *my very deed of love,* an expression meaning, to adopt Delius's paraphrase, ''the formal legal definition of my love''. After the parenthetical *only she came short,* Regan proceeds to elaborate on the nature of her filial love; this she does by means of the *that*-clause, where the choice of the verb *profess* ties in with the formal terminology of the first appositive.

In addition to the appositional type we have just examined there occur in the corpus two instances of full weak nonrestrictive apposition. In this, a) both appositives can be substituted for the whole; b) each fulfils the same syntactic function in the resultant sentence; c) it can be assumed that there is no difference between the original sentence and either of the resultant sentences in extralinguistic reference (cf. Quirk et al., 1985: 17.66). As a rule, such conditions are not met by *that*-clauses in PE, except perhaps after general nouns like *fact* or *circumstance,* whose function is to prop up the clause, rather than to contribute information of their own. Contrast (41 a–c), for example, with (42 a–c):

(41a) the fact that she would not betray her friends is very much to her credit
(41b) the fact is very much to her credit
(41c) that she would not betray her friends is very much to her credit
(41a) the reason he gave, that he didn't notice the car till too late, is unsatisfactory
(42b) the reason he gave is unsatisfactory
(42c) that he didn't notice the car till too late is unsatisfactory

Both (42b) and (42c) are grammatical, but, as Quirk et al. point out, (42c) is different from both (42a) and (42b) ''since it does not assert that a particular *reason* is unsatisfactory, but that a particular *fact* is unsatisfactory''; it thus fails to meet condition c) above.

More commonly, omission of the first appositive will merely yield an unacceptable sentence:

(43a) they tore up the announcement that Bill was leaving
(43b) they tore up the announcement
(43c) *they tore up that Bill was leaving

The above restrictions do not hold, however, in the following passages, which contain clauses expanding or explaining a preceding noun phrase. Both the nominal and the clause would have been omissible in EMODE:

(44) *Rom* 3.5.118 I wonder at this haste, that I must wed / Ere he that should be husband comes to woo.

(45) *Lear* 12.2. How, my lord, *I* may be censured, *that nature thus gives way to loyalty,* something fears me to think of.

Though Edmund's syntax in the latter example is involved, he might be paraphrased as "[it] somewhat frightens me to think, my lord, of how I may be judged (= *censured*), [how it may be judged] that my natural feelings as a son (= *nature*) thus give way to loyalty to you". For *censure* as "judge"—the current sense in Elizabethan English—cf. OED *Censure* v. 2.

As will be clear from (44) and (45), full apposition between NP and clause can take place only if the superordinate verb allows both phrasal and clausal complementation. Such was the case with *wonder* and *censure,* as also with the verbs in the following parallel examples:

(46) *Richard III* 3.7.89 *Catesby*. He fears, my lord, you mean no good to him. *Buckingham*. Sorry I am my noble cousin should / Suspect *me, that I mean no good to him.*

(47) *The Tempest* 4.1.9 O Ferdinand, / Do not smile at *me, that I boast of her,* / For thou shalt find she will outstrip all praise,

Indirect interrogatives could be used in the same way; (48) offers a passive equivalent, to be compared with (45):

(48) *Cymbeline* 1.1.54 *his virtue* / By her election may be truly read, / *What kind of man he is.* i.e. "his virtue, what kind of man he is, may be inferred from her having elected him".

The appositional type under discussion was by no means rare in OE; see in this connection Mitchell (1985: 1,968). For the ME period the only extensive analysis, as far as we are aware, is Anthony Warner's, who lists 13 such instances in his corpus: 4 with *that*-clauses, 7 with *wh*-clauses, and 2 with infinitives.[20] In the Shakespeare corpus, the overall frequency of this construction has decreased, but the relative proportion of each clause type seems to remain constant; as in Wyclif, *wh*-clauses, such as *Lear* 1.259 "I know you, what you are", tend to appear in full apposition more frequently than do the others.

2.8.3. *The position of appositive clauses*

Clauses in restrictive and nonrestrictive apposition, whether with initial *that* or unintroduced, can freely occur separated from their matrix noun phrases; witness (40) above and also (49) and (50):

(49) *Lear* 13.42 I here take my oath before this honourable assembly she kicked the poor King her father.

(50) *Wiv* 1.3.47 the report goes, she has all the rule of her husband's purse.

The latter quotation illustrates the set structure *the story/tale/report, etc. goes (that) ...;* with this, extraposition is mandatory in the corpus (cf. also *Wiv* 4.4.27) and elsewhere in Shakespeare, as it is today, due to the principle of end weight: heavy material is moved to the end to avoid concluding the sentence with a short predicate.[21]

In cases like (45) and (48) above, in which a clause in full apposition is embedded in a passive matrix, extraposition seems also to have been normal since OE times, to judge from all the parallel examples known to us. Witness, for instance, the following Old and Middle English passages:

(51) *Beowulf* 1,970ff. Higelace wæs / *sið Beowulfes* snuðe gecyðed, /*ðæt ðær on worðig wigendra hleo, / lindgestealla lifigenda cwom, / heaðolaces hal to hofe gongan* "to Hygelac was the arrival of Beowulf quickly made known, that there in the precincts the defence of fighting-men, his shield-companion, came walking alive to the court, safe from the game of war"

(52) and *many þingis* ben hid to us: *how þei weren speciali done*

(53) But he þat doiþ treuþe: comeþ to liht· þat *his werkes* be shewid: *þat þei ben maad in God*[22]

Once again, factors related to end weight and structural balance have probably played a part in the selection of such syntactic arrangements. These constitute, in fact, still another manifestation of the widespread resistance of complement clauses to occur before the matrix predicate in earlier stages of the language; cf. the discussion in Section 2.1.3 above.

2.9. *Type XII: Exclamatory that-clauses (15 examples)*

According to the OED (s.v. *That* conj. II.3.c), the earliest recorded example of a *that*-clause used alone, independently of its matrix clause, dates back to the late thirteenth century; recently, however, a few scattered examples have been traced in OE (cf. Mitchell, 1985: II, pp. 23–4). In the corpus, this complement type is used fifteen times to convey such interrelated meanings as surprise, disapproval, regret, or longing:

(54) *Rom* 3.2.84 O, that deceit should dwell / In such a gorgeous palace!

(55) *Lear* 7.70 That such a slave as this should wear a sword, / That wears no honesty!

(56) *Wint* 4.3.49 O, that ever I was born!

(57) *Wiv* 2.1.95 O that my husband saw this letter! It would give eternal food to his jealousy.

Not unexpectedly, two thirds of these exclamatory clauses—10 out of 15—occur in *Romeo and Juliet,* in keeping with the rhetorical strain that permeates this early play.

2.10. *Clauses with complementizers other than* that *(5 examples)*

As shown in Table 1*b*, p. 5, these constitute a very restricted group. Clear examples include one *lest*-clause, three with *but* "that not", and one with *how* "that".

2.10.1. *But-clauses*

According to the OED, from the late fourteenth century *but* became common as a negative complementizer "after various (...) negative and interrogative constructions", on the model of Latin *quin* (s.v. *But* conj. [xxxx]19ff.). It must be pointed out, however, that complement clauses with *quin* (<*qui-+-ne*) were semantically affirmative in the vast majority of cases; cf., for instance, *non dubitari debet quin fuerint ante Homerum poetae* "it ought not to be doubted that there were poets before Homer"[23]. The use of the Latin conjunction to express real negation in its own clause seems to have been largely restricted to a handful of set expressions, such as *non possum facere quin ...*, *fieri non potest quin ...* "it is impossible that ... not ...", etc. English *but,* on the contrary, came to be used much more extensively in clauses with real negation,[24] notably after certain negated verbs of believing, knowing, saying, or perceiving. Apart from these, other negative constructions with which *but* also became common included: a) negated predicates of doubting, fearing, denying, and preventing; b) predicates of impossibility and the like; c) predicates of forbidding, these not necessarily in negative form.

Matrix clauses of the above description are not numerous in the corpus. I have noted only 13; of these, 6 are followed by *zero* clauses (after *not know, not say, not think* (3), and *shield* "forbid"), and 4 by *that*-clauses (after *not deny, not see,* and (twice) *not tell*), while the remaining three take clauses introduced by *but*. In two cases, namely (59) and (60), this signals real negation, i.e. "that ... not":

(58) *Wiv* 4.4.43 Well, let it not be doubted but he'll come, / And in this shape
(59) *Rom* 5.3.132 My master knows not but I am gone hence, / And fearfully did menace me with death / If I did stay to look on his intents.
(60) *Lear* 8.39 If you shall see Cordelia—/ As fear not but you shall—show her this ring

2.10.2. *Lest-clauses*

The single instance is *Wiv* 3.5.96:

(61) I quaked for fear lest the lunatic slave would have searched it.

As defined by the OED, *lest* was formerly common "after verbs of fearing, or phrases indicating apprehension or danger, to introduce a clause expressing the event that is feared; equivalent to the L. *nē*" (s.v. *Lest* conj. 2). In the corpus, however, this conjunction is clearly in the minority with predicates of fearing (cf. Section 3 below), which, apart from *lest* itself, select the following conjunctions:
a) *zero* 8 times, after BE AFEARD, BE AFRAID, DOUBT v., FEAR v. (4), and MISGIVE;
b) *that* 3 times, after CARE v., DOUBTFUL "fearful", and FEARFUL;
c) *but* 1, after NOT FEAR.

2.10.3. *How-clauses*

How has been found from OE times to introduce a declarative complement "after verbs of saying, perceiving and the like" (s.v. OED *How* adv. 10), as in the following (attested) PE sentences:

(62) He told us how he had a brother in Moscow.
(63) You know how in Lesotho they have those very fine weavers.

In the first case, a manner interpretation seems scarcely possible; in the second it must be definitely ruled out. *How* is thus employed without its distinctive interrogative force, as a close equivalent of *that*.[25] This also holds true for Shakespeare's English, where parallel examples can easily be adduced:

(64) *Two Gentlemen of Verona* 1.3.20 I have considered well his loss of time, / And how he cannot be a perfect man, / Not being tried and tutored in the world.
(65) *Titus Andronicus* 2.3.208 Now will I fetch the King (...) / That he thereby may have a likely guess / How these were they that made away his brother

Data are lacking concerning the overall frequency of this use of *how* in Shakespeare. In the corpus it is restricted to just one unambiguous instance, namely *Wiv* 2.2.107 and ff. Falstaff is anxious to confirm that the Windsor wives have not told each other of their (alleged) mutual love for him, thereby disclosing his duplicity:

(66) *Falstaff.* But I pray thee tell me this: has Ford's wife and Page's wife acquainted each other how they love me? *Quickly.* O God no, sir; that were a jest indeed! They have not so little grace, I hope.

(To be continued)

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

NOTES

1 O. Jespersen (Part III: 23 ff.). The term has recently been revived by R. Huddleston (1984: 120).
2 Brief discussions will be found in Cusack (1982) and Dekeyser (1984).

3 A calculation on the basis of 8 words per line would yield a figure of 77 136 words, but prose lines tend to be considerably longer than that.

4 All percentages are exclusive of exclamatory *that*-clauses (cf. Table 1 *a*), this with a view to making our group of complement clauses comparable with those of other analysts, none of whom take that marginal category into consideration.

5 For other EMODE examples testifying to the unstable structural character of such constructions, cf. Visser (Part I: 38).

6 On the concepts "given" and "new" cf., *inter alia,* Prince (1981); on extraposed and non-extraposed complement clauses in relation to the thematic organization of the sentence see Huddleston (1971: 176 ff.).

7 Cf. Mitchell (1985: 1,487) and Visser (Part I: 60), whose earliest example is from Milton.

8 On OE subjectless constructions and their development through and beyond ME see Elmer (1981).

9 *Acknow* is an emendation of the Oxford editors; the Quarto reading is *may know*. Cf. *The Oxford Shakespeare. A Textual Companion,* p. 511.

10 Cf. Visser (Part I: 501 ff.), Dekeyser (1984: 199–200), and for PE, Bolinger (1977: Chapter 4).

11 In the sense of Cattell (1984: 116): "a periphrastic expression that (. . .) need not have [a] related simple verb", and which is thereby distinguished from "complex" predicates such as *give . . . a kiss* (= *kiss*) or *make a bet* (= *bet*).

12 For OE examples see Mitchell (1985: 1,969); for later periods, Jespersen (Part V: 297 ff.).

13 Cf. Grosu and Thompson (1977) and Quirk et al. (1985: 18.35).

14 With this idiomatic combination, absence of *it* was the rule until about 1800 (cf. Visser, Part I: p. 472).

15 Cf. Table 1 *a* (syntactic function no. 11) in Elsness (1981), and Table 8.4 in McDavid.

16 Warner records 90 appositive clauses, out of a total of 669 (cf. pp. 112, 169, and 247 note 5). For McDavid and Elsness's figures see their Tables 1 and 1 *a* (syntactic functions nos. 2, 3, 6, 9, 12, and 15).

17 On appositive clauses cf., *inter alia,* Huddleston (1971: 197 ff.), Matthews (1981: 231 ff.), Warner (1982: 91 ff.), and Quirk et al. (1985: Chapter 17).

18 See on this Kisbye (1972: Part II, p. 80), Hickey (1984: 205–6), and Mitchell (1985: 304 ff.). Though *put in mind* is first recorded in the sixteenth century (cf. OED *Mind* sb.[1] 3), it seems to be analogous to expressions such as *come (a person) in mind;* compare Layamon's *Brut,* lines 6–7 "Hit *com him on mode* (. . .) ðet he wolde of Engle æðelæn tellen". As Kisbye points out, "from late ME onwards (. . .) there is a marked tendency to exchange the former object-case construction for one with the possessive pronoun", thus leading to the alternative pattern which is exemplified in *Richard III* 1.3.131 "Let me *put in your minds,* if you forget, / What you have been ere this." Here the *what*-clause has ceased to be a dependent of the nominal, to become instead the object of the verb *put.*

19 For instance, Furness (*A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare,* 1880: 12), Muir (*The Arden Shakespeare,* 1952: 7), and Blakemore Evans (*The Riverside Shakespeare,* 1974: 1,256).

20 Cf. pp. 93 and 111; in Warner's view, this appositional construction is restrictive: "It seems to be a type of apposition, probably restrictive in information structuring, which is distinct from those available in standard written English" (p. 93). However, considering that punctuation is of little use to distinguish between restrictive and nonrestrictive apposition in earlier stages of the language, the only valid criterion left is the semantic; according to this, restrictive units would be those "indicating a limitation on the possible reference of the head" (Quirk et al., 1985: 1,239), while nonrestrictive ones would provide "additional information which is not essential for identification" (*ibid.*). On this assumption, most of the examples cited in the body of our text are better categorized as nonrestrictive, and, in our opinion, the same is true of Warner's; cf. as well (51)–(53) below.

21 Cf. Huddleston (1984: 456 ff.) and Quirk et al. (1985: 1,397 ff.).

22 The two ME examples are Warner's (cf. p. 94).

23 On the meaning and distribution of this conjunction, cf. Ernout and Thomas (1951: 309 ff.) and Woodcock (1959: 141 ff).

24 Anthony Warner suggests, with some plausibility, that the spread of *but* as a negative complementizer was aided by the loss of the negative adverb *ne* in ME; while certain varieties of ME chose *þat . . . not* as an alternative to the earlier pattern of negation with *þat . . . ne* in complement clauses, others resorted to *but* "that . . . not". Cf. Warner, pp. 222-3.

25 Cf. on this use Huddleston (1971: 178), Warner (1982: 180 ff.), and Mitchell (1985: 1,961).