COMPLEMENTATION IN EARLY MODERN ENGLISH:
FINITE COMPLEMENTS AS OBJECTS IN LYLY'S *EUPHUES*

INDICE

Juan Carlos García Lorenzo
Universidad de Santiago de Compostela

This corpus-based study describes some aspects of the syntax of finite complement clauses as objects in the Early Modern English period. A well-known Renaissance text: *Euphues. The Anatomy of Wyt* (1578), a single homogeneous corpus of c60,000 words, forms the basis of the analysis.

Sections 2, 3 and 4 deal with the presentation and description of the various constructions found in the text: monotransitive, ditransitive and complex transitive structures. The fifth section focuses on some of the most relevant issues concerning finite complements as objects, to wit, extraposition and frequency of anticipatory elements. Extraposition is found to be possible, but very restricted and difficult to account for except in complex transitive structures, in which it is generally the norm. When extraposition does take place, the slot vacated by the clause is always filled by a heralding pronoun: *this* in monotransitive structures, *it* in complex transitive ones.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to offer a description of the syntax of finite complement clauses as objects (OBCLs) in Early Modern English[1] (1500-1700)[2], being also an overview of some of their main distinguishing features. It is part of a larger project on complementation in EMODE, a period which, notwithstanding its importance for the history of the English language, has been greatly neglected by historical linguistics.

Although in the following study I generally adhere to the descriptive framework and terminological conventions laid down in Quirk et al. (1985), I have made frequent exceptions as circumstances demanded. In this connection, the term *complement clause*, originally coined by transformational grammarians, has been preferred to more traditional labels such as *nominal clause* (Quirk et al. (1985)) or *substantive clause*, as these clauses are certainly not nouns; and also to less widespread designations as *content clause* (Jespersen (1909-49)). *Complement clause* is a potentially less confusing label for constructions which act as central constituents within sentence structure.

Like its predecessor, "Aspects of the Syntax of Finite Complement Clauses as Subjects in John Lyly's *Euphues. The Anatomy of Wyt*" (García Lorenzo, 1993), the present study is corpus-based, as this seems to be the most adequate approach for grammatical descriptions. Corpus linguistics has undergone a rapid development since the 1960s, with the advent of the first machine-readable corpora[3]. The importance of this research paradigm as a source of reliable information about the grammar of a language is now beyond

---

[1] The following abbreviations will henceforward be used: OE = Old English; ME = Middle English; EMODE = Early Modern English; PE = Present-day English.

[2] On alternative delimiting dates for the EMODE period cf. Görlach (1991, 9-11).

[3] On the historical background and development of English corpus linguistics cf. Halliday (1991) and Leech (1991).

question and this method is currently being applied to different fields of linguistic study. Previous corpus-based studies of finite complement clauses in English include McDavid (1964) and Elsness (1981) (on present-day American English), Warner (1982) (on ME) and Fanego (1990) (on EMODE). To all of them I am heavily indebted.

The selection of John Lyly (b. 1554?, Kent - d. November 1606, London) is justified by the fact that his work represents a type of style not adequately reflected in available corpora such as the Helsinki Corpus.[1] Prose has been preferred to avoid the distorting effects of verse on clause syntax.

Euphues. The Anatomy of Wyt[2], a variant of the popular Reformation theme of the Prodigal Son, the story of the moral progress of a young Athenian "of more wit then wealth and yet of more wealth then wisdome", was published in 1578 and it became an immediate - though temporary - success[3]. Lyly's exquisitely elegant style, characterized by the use of structural devices such as parallelism, rhetorical questions and verbal repetition; sound patterns such as alliteration, assonance and rhyme; and ornamental devices such as allusions to classical mythology, natural history and proverbs; cannot possibly be more *artificial* - indeed a term of praise in Renaissance England.

I have followed the text of *The Complete Works of John Lyly* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), published in 3 volumes in 1902 (reprinted 1967, 1973), under the editorship of R.W. Bond, analyzing the text of *Euphues* and also the letter "To my very good friends the Gentlemen Scholers of Oxford" (Vol. I, 179-326). I estimate, then, that the size of my corpus approximates 60,000 words, similar to Warner's corpus of Wyclifite English (c60,000 words) and not far in size to the corpora used by Fanego (1990): (78,000-85,000 words) and even by McDavid (1964): (100,000 words).

The presentation and analysis of the data from the corpus will be divided into four different sections, dealing first with the various constructions found in the text (monotransitive, ditransitive and complex transitive structures in sections 2, 3 and 4 respectively) and secondly with a more detailed analysis of the syntax of object clauses (section 5), whereas the concluding sixth section will summarize the major results.

2. OBJECT CLAUSES IN THE CORPUS. MONOTRANSITIVE STRUCTURES

Type 1: V-OBCL (335 examples, 340 predicates) (61.8%).

Type 2: *it*-V-OBCL[4] (12 examples) (2.22%).

Percentage in corpus: 64.02%.

TABLE 1. OVERALL FIGURES FOR OBJECT CLAUSES (MONOTRANSITIVE STRUCTURES)

	V-OBCL	*It*-V-OBCL	TOTAL
THAT	159	12	171
ZERO	176	0	176
TOTAL	335	12	347

---

[1] Cf. Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (1989) on the compilation of the early Modern British English subcorpus of the Helsinki Corpus.

[2] On Lyly and *Euphues* see Hunter (1962).

[3] Cf. Burnley (1992, 212).

[4] The presence of an anticipatory element is represented by *it*.

As might be expected, and fully in keeping with the results obtained in related studies, *that-* and *zero-*clauses in object function clearly predominate in the corpus.[1] Thus the percentage I have obtained for monotransitive structures (64.02%) is similar, and even higher, than the one reported by Fanego (1990, 9): (57.26%) for her EMODE corpus. Moreover, this clear predominance of object clauses is found throughout the history of English, cf. Mitchell (1985, §1967) for OE, Warner (1982, 100ff.) for ME, McDavid (1964, 108) and Elsness (1981, 282) for PE.

High as it is, the percentage of object clauses in the corpus would have increased had I included a number of instances of difficult classification which are potentially direct speech clauses, an area of complementation which does not form part of the present study. Besides, the overall lack of consistency in the punctuation of the text adds to that difficulty. Thus, examples such as the following have not been included in my count:

(1) ... retourninge home hee was asked howe all things stoode in *Athens*, to whome hee aunswered, *all thinges are honest there...* (275, 28-9).

(2) We reade in the seconde of *Exodus*, that when *Moses* desired of God to knowe what hee should name him to the children of *Israell*, hee aunswered, thou shalte saye, *I am that I am.*[2] (294, 11-2).

(3) Be not lyke the hipocrites whiche honour God with their lips, but be farre from hym with their heartes, neyther lyke ye foole which sayth in his heart, *ther is no God.* (295, 33).

2.1. Type 1: V-OBCL

2.1.1. With *that*-clauses (159 examples, 164 predicates)

ADDE (2 examples), e.g. (312, 8-9)[3]: "Thou addest moreouer y^t she being in great credite with the states, died in great beggerie in the streetes..."; ALLEADGE NOT (192, 8-9); ALLOWE NOT = "(not) to accept as true or valid; to acknowledge, admit, grant" [OED *Allow* v.4]. See *Conclude (not)* below for the only example to be found in the corpus; ARGUE (190, 19-20); AUNSWERE (3 examples), e.g. (256, 37): "If thou saye to mee, Phisition heale thy selfe, I aunswere, that I am meetly well purged of that disease..."; BEHOLDE = "to regard (with the mind), have regard to, attend to, consider" [OED *Behold* v.6a], (252, 3-10): "Heere shalt thou beholde as it were in a glasse, that all the glorye of man is as the grasse, that all thinges vnder heauen are but vaine, that our lyfe is but a shadowe, a warfare, a pilgrimage, a vapor, a bubble, a blast, of such shortnesse that *Dauid* sayth it is but a spanne long, of such sharpnesse, that *Iob* noteth it replenished with all

---

[1] The percentages obtained for the different constructions in the corpus offer the following breakdown: subject clauses (14.95%), object clauses (monotransitive) (64.02%), object clauses (ditransitive) (6.64%), object clauses (complex transitive) (0.92%), copular constructions (0.37%), complements to adjectives (2.96%), complements to nouns (9.23%), other constructions (0.91%).

[2] Cf. Exodus 3. 13ff.

[3] In the relation of predicates that follows the subsequent points should be noted: references to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) and illustrating examples are given only if there exists a significant deviance in meaning with respect to present-day usage or to specify the exact meaning of a predicate in a given context; only one example of each predicate has been found in the corpus unless otherwise stated; bracketed numbers refer to the page(s) and line(s) where the relevant complement clause (or group of coordinate clauses) is to be found in the text if there is only one instance or, if there are more than one, where one significant example - the one given - can be found; additional information is included when it serves the purpose of further clarifying aspects of the syntax of the predicates.

miseries, of suche vncerteintie, that we are no sooner borne, but wee are subiecte to death, the one foote no sooner on the grounde, but the other ready to slippe into the graue."; BELEEUE (2 examples), e.g. (292, 14-5): "... thou arte not onely one of those which beleeue that ther is a god..."; CONCLUDE (NOT) (4 examples), e.g. (192, 6-7): "Doth not *Cicero* conclude and allowe, that if wee followe and obey Nature, we shall neuer erre?"; CONFES(SE) (3 examples), e.g. (253, 23-5): "I must of force confes, that it is a corasiue to the stomacke of a louer, but a comforte to a godly lyuer, to runne through a thousande pykes, to escape ten thousand perills."; CONFIRME NOT (192, 8-9); CONIECTURE (197, 31-2); CONSIDER (3 examples), e.g. (277, 35): "We must consider that all our lyfe is deuided into remission and study."; DEEME = "to form the opinion, to be of opinion; to judge, conclude, think, consider, hold" [OED *Deem* v.6] (2 examples), e.g. (218, 28-9): "... but seeinge women when one praiseth them for their desertes, deeme that hee flattereth them to obteine his desire..."; DENIE (294, 3); DESIRE (318, 25-6); FORGET (NOT) (2 examples), e.g. (192, 30): "... or els you haue quite forgotten y^t you your selfe were young, or euer knew young dayes..."; GATHER = "to collect (knowledge) by observation and reasoning; to infer, deduce, conclude. (= Latin *colligere)*" [OED *Gather* v.10] (179, 17-8): "... whereby I gather, that in all perfect workes aswell the fault as the face is to be showen."; GRAUNTE = "to admit, confess, acknowledge. Now only in a more restricted use: To concede to an actual or hypothetical opponent (a proposition) to be used as a basis of argument." [OED *Grant* v.7] (310, 26): "But thou grauntest that she shold haue dyed, & yet art thou grieued y^t she is dead."; HEAR(E) (NOT) (6 examples), e.g. (228, 28-30): "I cannot but smile to heare, that a marriage should bee solemnized, where neuer was any mention of assuringe, and that the woeing should bee a day after the weddinge."; HOPE (2 examples), e.g. (237, 32-3): "... but I hope that such hot loue cannot be so soone colde, neyther such sure faith, be rewarded with so sodeyne forgetfulnesse."; IMAGINE (NOT) (3 examples), e.g. (206, 33-4): "... if he perceiue thee to be wonne with a Nut, he will imagine that thou wilt be lost with an Apple..."; KNOW(E) (NOT) (23 examples), e.g. (186, 29-31): "... for hee well knewe that so rare a wytte woulde in tyme eyther breede an intollerable trouble, or bringe an incomperable Treasure to the common weale..."; LAMENT (285, 23-4); LEARN NOT (197, 17-20); MARUEL (272, 1-2); MEAN (275, 29-30); MIND (219, 35-6); MUSE (*neede not muse, muse*) = "to be affected with astonishment or surprise; to wonder, marvel. Now rare (poetic)" [OED *Muse* v.3b] (2 examples), e.g. (231, 18-9): "You neede not muse that I shoulde so sodeinely bee intangled, loue giues no reason of choice, neither will it suffer anye repulse."; NOTE probably = "to set down in writing; to put down as a memorandum; to write, indite." [OED *Note* v.^{2}3] or, perhaps, = "to observe or mark carefully; to give heed or attention to; to notice closely." [OED *Note* v.^{2}1] (314, 9-10): "*Plato* would neuer accompt him banished y^t had the Sunne, Fire, Aire, Water, & Earth, that he had before, where he felt the Winters blast and the Summers blaze, wher y^e same Sunne & the same Moone shined, whereby he noted that euery place was a countrey to a wise man, and all partes a pallaice to a quiet minde."; OBSERUE (223, 18-9); PERCEIUE (spelt: *perceiue, perceyue*) (9 examples), e.g. (194, 35-6): "*Euphues* hauing thus ended his talke departed leauing this olde gentleman in a great quandarie: who perceiuing that he was more enclined to wantonnesse, then to wisedome, with a deepe sigh the teares trickling downe his cheekes, sayde..."; PERSWADE (216, 30-2); PRAY (2 examples), e.g. (235, 1-7): "... I will pray that thou mayst be measured vnto with the lyke measure that thou hast meaten vnto others: that as thou hast thought it no conscience to betray me, so others may deeme it no dishonestie to deceiue thee, that as *Lucilla* made it a lyght matter to forsweare hir olde friend *Philautus*, so she may make it a mocke to forsake hir new pheere *Euphues*."; PROMISE (304, 1-2); PROUE (300, 1-2); READ(E) (NOT) (7 examples), e.g. (197, 4-7): "I haue red (saith he) and well I beleeue it, that a friend is in

prosperitie a pleasure, a solace in aduersitie, in griefe a comfort, in ioy a merrye companion, at all times an other I, in all places ye expresse Image of mine owne person...";
REIOYCE (2 examples), e.g. (227, 28-9): "And surely I reioyce the more, that thou shalt be linked to him in marriage, whome thou hast loued as I heare beeinge a mayden...";
REMEMBER (NOT) (7 examples), e.g. (260-1, 29-02): "Let them both remember that the *Estrich* disgesteth harde yron to preserue his healthe, that the souldiour lyeth in his harnesse to atchieue conquest, that the sicke patient swalloweth bitter pilles to be eased of his griefe, that youth shoulde indure sharpe stormes to finde reliefe."; REPENT (200, 8);
SAY(E) (NOT) (17 examples), e.g. (189, 15-7): "But thou wylte happely saye, that although there bee many thinges in *Naples* to bee iustlye condemned, yet there are some thinges of necessitie to bee commended..."; SEE (NOT) = "(not) to perceive mentally (an immaterial object, a quality, etc.); to apprehend by thought (a truth, the answer to a question), to recognize the force of (a demonstration)" [OED *See* v.3], (10 examples), e.g. (181, 7-8): "We cõmonly see that a black ground doth best beseme a white counterfeit."
SET DOWNE = "to put down in writing or in print; to put on paper; to enter in a catalogue or account; to write out, compose; to put on record; to record, relate, give an account of" [OED *Set* v.143e], (314, 15): "How can any part of the world bee distant farre from the other, when as the *Mathematicians* set downe that the earth is but a pointe being compared to y^e heauens." SHEWE = "variant of SHOW" [OED *Shew*], (239, 28): "... if the Princesse of beautye *Venus*, and hir heyres *Helen*, and *Cornelia*, shewe that our affection standeth on our free wyll..."; SHIELDE = "in deprecatory phrase *God shield*, usually with a clause or sentence as direct object, rarely with addition of an indirect object; also absolutely as an exclamation: = God forbid. Obsolete" [OED *Shield* v.5], (221, 8-9): "But God shielde *Lucilla*, that thou shouldest be so carelesse of thine honour as to commit the state thereoff to a stranger."; SUPOSSE (206, 37); SUSPECT (262, 8); SWEARE (2 examples), e.g. (312, 15-6): "... and I durst sweare that for beastlines she might be the Monster of *Italy*." TESTIFIE (301, 19-20); THIN(C)K(E) (12 examples), e.g. (187, 11-5): "... so that I am enforced to thincke that either thou dyddest want one to giue thee good instructions, or that thy parentes made thee a wanton wyth to much cockeringe, either they were too foolishe in vsinge no discipline, or thou too frowarde in reiecting their doctrine, eyther they willinge to haue thee idle, or thou wylfull to bee ill employed."; VNDERSTANDE (NOT) (2 examples), e.g. (294, 25-6): "Besides this, thou shalt well vnderstande that hee is such a God as wil punish him whosoeuer he be y^t blasphemeth his name..."; WEEN: Past tense and past participle *weened*. "The word seems to have gone out of general use in the 17th century. It has survived as an archaism, especially in the parenthetic formula *I ween*. In regard to what is present or past: To think, surmise, suppose, conceive, believe, consider. In ME often with *well*." [OED *Ween* v.1], (205, 25-6): "Weenest thou that he will haue no mistrust of thy faithfulnesse, when he hath had tryall of thy fycklenesse?"; WEEPE NOT = "(not) to shed tears over, (not) to lament with tears." [OED *Weep* v.6], (311, 9-10): "Thou shouldst not weepe that she hath runne fast, but that thou hast gone so slowe..."; WISH(E) (318, 23-4); WOTTE = "variant of *Wit* v.^{1}, due to the carrying over of the preterite-present stem *wot* (earlier and northern *wat*) into other parts of the verb. The substitution occurs first in the 2nd person singular (*wat, wot* for *wast, wost*) and the plural (for *witen*) of the present tense, and appears in northern texts from the end of the 13th century. In the 14th century the new forms *wotest* and *woteth* (*wotis*) appear. The infinitive *woten* occurs early in the 15th century, and *wotte, wote, wot* in the 16th, together with the present participle *wotting*. The past tense *wotted* is an archaism of the 19th century." [OED *Wot* v.]. "To have cognizance or knowledge of; to be aware of; to know (as a fact or an existing thing)." [OED *Wit* v.^{1}1], (232, 27-30): "Ah well I wotte that a newe broome sweepeth cleane, and a new garment maketh thee leaue off the olde thoughe it be fitter, and newe wine causeth thee

to forsake the olde though it be better..."; WO(U)LD(E) (NOT) = "I wish" (OED *Will* v[1].36) (3 exam ples). See 2.1.2. below for examples and detailed information about the complementation of this predicate. WRITE (2 examples), e.g. (311-312, 36-01): "Thou writest that she was shamefull in hir trade and shamelesse in hir ende."

2.1.2. WITH UNINTRODUCED CLAUSES (176 EXAMPLES)

AUNSWERE (179, 9); BEHOLDE: See *Beholde* in section 2.1.1. above. (3 examples), e.g. (300-301, 38-01): "... beholde I set a curse before you to daye if you shall not harken to the commaundementes of the Lorde..."; BELEEUE (2 examples), e.g. (293, 32-4): "... the sight whereof might sufficiently induce vs to beleeue they proceede not by chaunce, by nature, or destinie, but by the eternall and diuine purpose of some omnipotent Deitie."; DEEME: See *Deeme* in section 2.1.1. above. (245, 12); FEARE (4 examples), e.g. (196, 20): "... I feare I haue committed Idolatry agaynst wisedome ..."; GESSE (2 examples), e.g. (206, 35): "... he wil gesse thou wilt be wauering when thou art wedded."; HAD RATHER (2 examples), e.g. (230, 24-6): "For I had rather thou shouldest leade a lyfe to thine owne lykeinge in earthe, then to thy greate tormentes leade Apes in Hell."; HOPE (14 examples), e.g. (179, 21-2): "I hope I shal not incur the displeasure of the wise, in that in the discourse of Euphues I haue aswel touched the vanities of his loue, as the vertues of his lyfe."; IUDGE = "to form the opinion, or hold as an opinion; to come to a conclusion, infer; to apprehend, think, consider, suppose." [OED *Judge* v.11], (284, 22): "... a blemish whereby one maye iudge the hearte hathe bene stayned."; KNOW(E) (NOT) (8 examples), e.g. (183, 8-10): "I know gentlemen wil fynde no fault without cause, and beare with those that deserue blame..."; PERCEIUE (241, 13-4); PROTEST (217, 25-6); PROUE (296, 32-3); REMEMBER (291, 23-4); SAY(E) (19 examples), e.g. (200, 15-6): "... I must needes say the custome is strange and the countrey barbarous..."; SEE (63 examples), e.g. (182, 21): "But a fashion is but a dayes wearing, and a booke but an howres reading, which seeing it is so..."; SUPPOSE (325, 26); SWEARE (NOT) (3 examples), e.g. (318, 27-8): "Thou swearest thou arte not couetous..."; THIN(C)K(E) (NOT) (17 examples), e.g. (180, 15-7): "And certes I thinke ther be mo speaches which for grauitie wil mislyke the foolish, then vnsemely termes which for vanitie may offêd the wise."; WISH(E) (4 examples), e.g. (235, 10-1): "... I wish my wish were as effectually ended as it is heartely looked for."; WO(U)LD(E) (27 examples)

Special mention can be made of the complementation of this predicate, which may appear preceded by the personal pronoun *I*, as in (204, 7-9):

> And I would ye gentlemen here present wer as ready to credit my proofe, as ye gentlewomen are willing to heare their own prayses, or I as able to ouercome as Mistres *Lucilla* would be côtent to be ouerthrown.

or may be part of a structure in which this personal pronoun is left out, as in (209, 6-7):

> Ah my *Lucilla*, wold thou wert either lesse faire or I more fortunate, eyther I wiser or thou milder...

this latter case being an example of what Jespersen (1909-49, 3: 11.861) calls *prosiopesis*, i.e., the loss of one or two syllables at the beginning of an utterance when the speaker produces no audible sound as he begins to articulate what he is going to say. The subsequent loss is not confusing to the hearer, as the ellipted elements are always pieces of well-known information, as the subject pronoun in the above example. Moreover, it is not uncommon for these reduced constructions to become set phrases, as *thank you* or *pray*.

In all the examples found in the corpus, *(I) wo(u)ld(e) (not)* is used as an expression of longing, equivalent to "I wish", "O that" [OED *Will* v[1].36], in structures with or without the presence of the complementizer, although it should be noted that examples with the complementizer are far less common and are always correlated with the presence of the subject, as can be seen in table 2 below:

TABLE 2. COMPLEMENTATION OF *WO(U)LD(E) (NOT)*.

	WOULD	S-WOULD	WOULD (TO) GOD	S-WOULD TO GOD	TOTAL
THAT	0	2	0	1	3
ZERO	10	14	0	3	27
TOTAL	10	16	0	4	30

I have also found a few instances of the structure "I would(e) to God", both with and without the complementizer, e.g.:

> ... I woulde to God that eyther I had neuer bene borne, or thou neuer bredde. (243, 18-9).
>
> But I would to God *Euphues* woulde repaire hether, that the sight of him might mittigate some part of my martirdome. (207, 31-3).

which, according to the OED, is due to confusion with the set phrase "would God" - "O that God would", "O that it were God's will" [OED *Will* v[1].37] - an expression of earnest desire or longing, now obsolete or used as a rare archaism, which seems to be the older one (cf. Visser 1963-73, I: §327). All my examples have the pronoun *I* as subject and there are no instances of the older structure "would God", but they were nevertheless quite common and examples of both types can be found in the OED:

> (4) This news I picked up at Bet's door. Would to God we had peace! (1777, Miss M. Townshend, in: Jesse *Selwyn & Contemp.* (1844) III, 260).
>
> (5) Ah my sweete home Hierusaleme Would god I were in thee. (c1600, Hymn *Hierusalem my happie home* xi).

2.2 TYPE 2: IT-V-OBCL

ADDE (*must adde*) (320, 6); AGREE (246, 2-5); LET (2 examples), e.g. (221, 35-6): "... neither let this comfort thee, that at his departure he deputed thee in *Philautus* place."; NOTE = "to observe or mark carefully; to give heed or attention to; to notice closely." [OED *Note* v.[2]1], (196, 24-8): "But this I note, that for the most part they stande so on their pantuffles, that they be secure of perills, obstinate in their owne opinions, impatient of labour, apte to conceiue wrong, credulous to beleeue the worst, ready to shake off their olde acquaintaunce without cause, and to condempne them without colour."; OBIECT (218, 32-6); REMEMBER (233, 30-1); SAY(E) (2 examples), e.g. (317, 26-30): "... for this say they all (which is the chiefest note of a gentleman) that thou shouldest as well desire honestie in thy lyfe as honour by thy lynage, that thy nature should not swerue from thy name, that as thou by duetie woldest be regarded for thy progeny, so thou wouldest endeauour by deserts to be reuerenced for thy pietie."; THIN(C)K(E) (2 examples), e.g. (250, 6-10): "Thinke this with thy selfe, that the sweete songes of *Calipso*, were subtill snares to entice *Vlysses*, that the Crabbe then catcheth the Oyster, when the Sunne shineth,

that *Hiena*, when she speaketh lyke a man deuiseth most mischiefe, y^t women when they be most pleasaunt, pretend most trecherie."; VOW (225, 28-9).

3. OBJECT CLAUSES IN THE CORPUS. DITRANSITIVE STRUCTURES

Type 3: V-O$_i$-OBCL (36 examples, 37 predicates).
Percentage in corpus: 6.64%.

The percentage of object clauses in ditransitive structures reported by McDavid (1964, 110): 5.05% is not dissimilar to my own 6.64%. However, Fanego's study (1990, 12) does yield a substantially higher number: 11.89%. This difference is probably due to the specific characteristics of the material used. Fanego's corpus of Shakespearian plays contains a considerable proportion of dialogue, hence the relatively high frequency of indirect objects. McDavid examined 100,000 words of nonfiction, half of which came from periodicals, so less dialogue can be expected. As far as the present corpus is concerned, *Euphues* comprises a mixture of both narrative and dialogue, which certainly explains the results obtained.

3.1 WITH THAT-CLAUSES (24 EXAMPLES, 25 PREDICATES)

ADMONISHE + NP + OBCL = "to put (a person) in mind of duties; to counsel against wrong practices; to give authoritative or warning advice; to exhort, to warn." [OED *Admonish* v.1], (267, 5-6): "*Plato* that deuine Philosopher admonished all nurses and weaners of youth, that they should not be to busie to tell them fonde fables of filthie tales..."; ASSURE + NP + OBCL (5 examples), e.g. (198, 23-5): "Which if I may obtein, assure your selfe y^t *Damon* to his *Pythias*, *Pylades* to his *Orestes*, *Titus* to his *Gysippus*, *Theseus* to his *Pyrothus*, *Scipio* to his *Lælius*, was neuer fowd more faithfull then *Euphues* will be to his *Philautus*."; BESEECHE + NP + OBCL (229, 15-6); COMMAUND + NP + OBCL: See *Desire* below for the only example to be found in the corpus; COUNSELL + NP + OBCL (203, 21-3); DESIRE + NP + OBCL (4 examples), e.g. (318-319, 36-05): "In the meane season I desire thee, yea, & in Gods name commaund thee that if neither the care of thy parents whom thou shouldest comfort, nor the counsaile of thy friends which thou shouldest credit, nor the rigor of the lawe which thou oughtest to feare, nor the authority of the Magistrate which thou shouldest reuerence, can allure thee to grace: yet the lawe of thy Sauiour who hath redeemed thee, and the punishment of the almightie who continually threatneth thee, draw thee to amendement..."

This type of construction was most frequent with manipulative predicates, such as *Desire* above and it deserves notice that the object is apparently redundant. Similar instances from Shakespeare can be found in Fanego (1990, 12):

> (6) I kiss thy hand, but not in flattery, Caesar, / Desiring thee that Publius Cimber may / Have an immediate freedom of repeal. (*Julius Caesar* 3.1.53).

EXHORT + NP + OBCL (284, 5-8); FEARE + NP + OBCL (213, 35-7); PERSWADE + NP + OBCL (4 examples), e.g. (198, 34-5): "... since you your self haue vsed so little curiositie, perswading my selfe, that my short answere wil worke as great an effect in you, as your few words did in me."; PROTEST + TO-NP + OBCL (212, 4-5); TEACH + NP + OBCL (2 examples), e.g. (202, 10-3): "Doth not experience teach vs that in the most curious Sepulchre are enclosed rotten bones? That the Cypresse tree beareth a fayre leafe but no fruite? That the Estridge carryeth fayre fethers, but rancke flesh?"; TELL + NP + OBCL (250, 16-7); WARNE + NP + OBCL (238, 31-2); WITNESSE + TO-NP + OBCL (300, 18).

3.2. With Unintroduced Clauses (12 examples)

ASSURE + NP + OBCL (2 examples), e.g. (214, 9-10): "... in that thou crauest my aide, assure thy selfe I wil be the finger next the thumbe..."; FEARE + NP *(ME(E))* + OBCL (9 examples), e.g. (215, 11-2): "... I feare mee I haue bene tedious, with the bare discourse of this rude historic."; PERSWADE + NP + OBCL (207, 31).

4. Object Clauses in the Corpus. Complex Transitive Structures

Type 4: $V\text{-}C_o\text{-}OBCL$[1] (1 example) (0.18%).

Type 5: $V\text{-}it\text{-}C_o\text{-}O_i\text{-}OBCL$ (1 example) (0.18%).

Type 6: $V\text{-}it\text{-}A\text{-}OBCL$ (3 examples) (0.56%).

Percentage in corpus: 0.92%.

For the same types, Fanego (1990, 13) reports a similar percentage (1.61%), of which 5 examples (1.01%) correspond to clauses with an object complement and 2 examples (0.6%) to clauses with an adjunct.

For further information concerning types 4,5 and 6, the reader is referred to section 5 below.

4.1. Type 4: $V\text{-}C_o\text{-}OBCL$

THIN(C)K(E) GOOD (257, 23-5):

> ... I thought good that this my faythe shoulde be set downe to finde fauour with the one, and confute the cauils of the other.

4.2. Type 5: $V\text{-}it\text{-}C_o\text{-}O_i\text{-}OBCL$

MAKE COMMON (251, 13-6):

> Doth not common experience make this common vnto vs, that the fattest grounde bringeth foorth nothing but weedes if it be not well tilled? That the sharpest wit enclineth onely to wickednesse, if it bee not exercised?

4.3 Type 6: $V\text{-}it\text{-}A\text{-}OBCL$

According to Fanego (1990, 13), the most characteristic adjuncts to be found in this type "denote place, goal, source, and other related notions ..."; and she adds that "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". My scarce findings confirm this point:

CAST IN ONE'S HEAD (219, 33-5):

> ... yet wisely did she cast this in hir head, that if she should yeelde at the first assault he woulde thinke hir a lyght huswife, if she should reiect him scornefully a very haggard...

---

[1] The following terminological conventions should be noted: (i) *A* denotes an obligatory adverbial; (ii) C_o stands for *object complement*.

TAKE BY THE WAY (224, 16-8). Cf. OED *Take* v.41b = "to accept as true or correct; to believe (something told to one)" and cf. also OED *Way* sb[1]31c for *By the way* = "figuratively with reference to the tenor of discourse: incidentally, in passing, as a side-topic":

> ... but take this by the way that although as yet I am disposed to lyke of none, yet when-soeuer I shall loue any I will not forget thee...

TAKE HEAUYLYE (313, 23-5) Cf. OED *Take* v.34b = "to receive (something inflicted); to have (something) done to one; to suffer, undergo, submit to" and cf. also *Heavily* adv.3 = "with sorrow, grief, displeasure, or anger; grievously. Now obsolete or archaic":

> Thou takest it heauylye that thou shouldest bee accused without colour, and exiled wythout cause...

Additional examples of this type of structure can be found in Visser (1963-73: §512). He states that in constructions of this kind the adverb is nowadays regularly preceded by *it* and that no OE instances have been met with, though examples without this anticipatory element were allowed and are attested from the ME period.

5. ASPECTS OF THE SYNTAX OF FINITE COMPLEMENT CLAUSES AS OBJECTS

In García Lorenzo (1993) I considered the different positions that a subject complement clause may occupy within the superordinate structure in English and concluded that the structure *it*-V-SBCL has always been the unmarked option throughout the history of the language. Many authors, from Jespersen to recent practitioners of generative grammar, have used the term *extraposition* to indicate the replacement of a postponed element by an anticipatory pronoun and, despite the evident inadequacy and shortcomings of the theories of extraposition, I will retain the label for convenience's sake.[1]

As can be seen in the literature, extraposition of object complements is also possible and is indeed reasonably common in such SOV languages as those of the Middle East; examples from Persian, Armenian and Uzbek can be found in Noonan (1985, 84-6). However, in PE, which, as is well known, is not an SOV language, extraposition of object complements, though available, is fairly restricted, many predicates not allowing this kind of process:

> (7a) My boss thinks (*it) that I'm indispensable.
>
> (7b) Ted denies (?it) that he had a fight with his wife.
>
> (7c) Smith conjectures (*it) that Japanese is a Dravidian language.[2]

McCawley (1988, I: 97) indicates that, in some cases, extraposition, though certainly possible, makes a difference with regard to the meaning of the sentence. He adduces the following examples (p. 97):

---

[1] The term *extraposition* is first used by Jespersen (1909-49, III: 2.13), who states that "when for some reason or another it is not convenient to put a content-clause in the ordinary place of the subject, object, etc., the clause is placed at the end in extraposition and is represented in the body of the sentence itself by *it*". This label is later retaken by practitioners of generative grammar - cf. Rosenbaum (1967), McCawley (1988) or Haegeman (1991) - and also by non-generativists such as Huddleston (1984) or Quirk et al. (1985).On the opposing theory of *intraposition*, see Emonds (1970). A critical account of both extraposition and intraposition can be found in López Couso (1994).

[2] Examples (7a-c) have been taken from McCawley (1988, I: 97).

(8a) Harry predicted that the Yankees would win the pennant.

(8b) %Harry predicted it that the Yankees would win the pennant.[1]

He explains that while example (8a) "is neutral as to whether the Yankees actually won the pennant", (8b) "presupposes that they did in fact win it" (p. 97) and concludes that extraposition of object complements in PE is "irregular", though it is favoured by two factors:

i/ Factive interpretation of the complement (as seen in example (8b)).

ii/ Position of the complement in the middle of the VP (as seen in example (9) below):

(9) *He never gave that Bolshies are human beings a thought.[2]

Quirk et al. (1985, §18.35) also state that when the object is a finite clause in SVOC and SVOA clause types, extraposition is not only possible but indeed compulsory, cf. the following examples:

(10a) Something put it into his head that she was a spy.

(10b) *Something put that she was a spy into his head.

For Huddleston (1984, 453), however, extrapositon of object complements under the conditions stated above is not necessarily obligatory, since there are cases in which it is possible "just to shift the object to the right instead of inserting *it* as a new object". He gives the following example:

(11) He made (it) clear that he would not tolerate any dissent.

It is not easy to explain why this pattern should exist at all in PE, given the redundancy of such anticipatory elements. Williams (1980, 222) admits that his *Predication Theory* "is incapable of describing these cases", and he adds that "I offer no general solution, nor, in my opinion, should one be sought." Nevertheless, I shall try to shed some light on the problem by taking into consideration the pattern under study in earlier stages of the language and the information provided by my own EMODE corpus.

It has been noted in this connection that it is not uncommon for a finite complement clause to function as the object of a transitive verb in OE. The fact that OE was an SOV language makes the finite object complement internal, and thus necessarily extraposed. The following instance is taken from Mitchell (1985, §1967):

(12) Ic wat þæt þis Iudeisce folc micclum blissigan wile mines deaþes. (ÆCHom i.86.31).

Moreover, Visser (1963-73, §502) remarks that, in many cases, this clause is not added "without first having been heralded by the pronoun *þæt*", as in the following example:

(13) Ic þæt gehyre þæt þis is hold weorod.

He adds that it is remarkable - given the freedom in word-order in OE - that this anticipatory element "is almost exclusively placed immediately before the verb, so that its juxtaposition with the conjunction *þæt* ... does not occur", thus the ungrammaticality of the following example:

(14) *Ic gehyrde þæt þæt þis is hold weorod.

---

[1] McCawley uses the symbol % to indicate acceptability which varies dialectically.

[2] Example (9) has been taken from McCawley (1988, I: 97), where it appears as (9d) and has been renumbered here for convenience.

Visser finds it difficult to explain why this anticipatory element should have been used at all given its apparently redundant nature. In this respect he writes, "there may have been a tendency to hold the listener in suspense and thus to draw his attention more effectually on the most important part of the utterance (= the *þæt*-clause) by withholding this as long as possible after first having announced it by means of the stressed *þæt*." He includes examples from Beowulf and other OE poems as clear evidence that this heralding element was certainly stressed.

Alongside examples with *þæt*, instances with heralding *hit*, which was as a rule placed before the verb, are also found in OE, though, according to Visser, this usage "is still harder to account for than that of *þæt*" (§505) since this pronoun was probably not emphatic. It should, however, be borne in mind that in the overwhelming majority of cases no heralding pronoun at all was used in OE.

In ME, constructions without any anticipatory element are also the norm. Visser gives - among others - the following example (§506):

> (15) Þan he by-gan repentye sare þat he haþ greued his Eem (c1380 Sir Ferumbr. 261).

Yet he also gives numerous examples of the use of heralding *it*:

> (16) His herte may it nought forbere That he ne roreth as a bere (c1390 Gower, Conf. Am. (Morley) II, p.98).

and remarks that up to c1400 this anticipatory element is "almost regularly placed before the verb, unless the sentence represents a command or an exhortation".

That is also met, though not frequently, as a heralding element in this period, but a new anticipator, *this*, seems to take its place, cf. Visser (§504):

> (17) Þis iherde Coel þat icumen wæs Custance. (Layamon 10950).

Similar patterns continued to be used during the EMODE period, though examples with *this* and *that* became increasingly less numerous and "little by little authors seem to have grown aware of the redundancy of such heralding pronouns" (Fanego 1990, 11).

In my corpus, the rule for monotransitive structures is to do without such anticipatory elements: 334 examples out of 346 exhibit non-extraposed structures. In those 12 examples that do exhibit extraposition the only anticipatory element I have found is the demonstrative pronoun *this*, placed either before the verb (7 examples), e.g.:

> (18) ... but this I say, that I was as far from thinking ill, as I finde them from iudgeing well. (324, 13-4).

> (19) ... for this thincke courtiers, that to be honest is a certeine kinde of countrey modestie, but to bee amiable the courtly curtesie. (320, 8-9).

or after it (5 examples), e.g.:

> (20) Remember this that yet ther hath neuer bene any faithles to his friend, that hath not also bene fruitelesse to his God. (233, 30-1).

> (21) Thinke this with thy selfe, that the sweete songes of *Calipso*, were subtill snares to entice *Vlysses*, that the Crabbe then catcheth the Oyster, when the Sunne shineth, that *Hiena*, when she speaketh lyke a man deuiseth most mischiefe, y[t] women when they be most pleasaunt, pretend most trecherie. (250, 6-10).

As for complex-transitive structures, I have only found 2 examples with the pattern SVOC, one with the heralding pronoun *this* and another in which this preparatory element is absent and hence does not follow PE usage:[1]

(22) Doth not common experience make this common vnto vs, that the fattest grounde bringeth foorth nothing but weedes if it be not well tilled? That the sharpest wit enclineth onely to wickednesse, if it bee not exercised? (251, 13-1).

(23) ... I thought good that this my faythe shoulde be set downe to finde fauour with the one, and confute the cauils of the other. (257, 23-5).

Complex-transitive structures with the pattern SVOA are not frequent either. I have found only 3 examples, two with *this* as anticipatory element and one with *i*:

(24) ... yet wisely did she cast this in hir head, that if she should yeelde at the first assault he woulde thinke hir a lyght huswife, if she should reiect him scornefully a very haggard... (219, 33-5).

(25) ... but take this by the way that although as yet I am disposed to lyke of none, yet whensoeuer I shall loue any I will not forget thee... (224, 16-8).

(26) Thou takest it heauylye that thou shouldest bee accused without colour, and exiled wythout cause... (313, 23-5).

Table 3 below offers a breakdown of the distribution of anticipatory elements.

It is also worth pointing out in passing that, in the corpus, the extraposition of a clausal object is always correlated with the presence of the complementizer.

TABLE 3. ANTICIPATORY ELEMENTS

	IT	THIS	THAT	TOTAL
MONOTRANSITIVE STRUCTURES	0	12	0	12
COMPLEX TRANSITIVE STRUCTURES (SVOC)	0	1	0	1
COMPLEX TRANSITIVE STRUCTURES (SVOA)	2	1	0	3
TOTAL	2	14	0	16

6. CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions reached in the preceding pages can be summarized as follows:

Clauses serving as verb complementation (87.63%) are far more frequent than those serving as noun complementation (9.23%) and adjective complementation (2.96%). Within verb complementation, the object function is far more common than any other, as has been the case throughout the history of English.

---

[1] Examples (22)-(23) and (24)-(26) below may be found in preceding sections and are repeated here for convenience.

Extraposition of object complement clauses, though possible, is very restricted and difficult to account for in EMODE. Moreover, it has never been the norm in English; instead, structures of the type V-OBCL have always been the unmarked option.

In monotransitive structures, the anticipatory elements *that* and *it* are found from the OE period, whereas *this* - the only anticipator found in the corpus - would seem to appear first in ME.

Only in complex transitive structures - both SVOC and SVOA - is extraposition generally the norm in English but, though not numerous, it is possible to find, at least in the earlier stages of the language, examples in which no heralding pronoun is necessary.

WORKS CITED

Burnley, David 1992. *The History of the English Language. A Source Book.* London and New York: Longman.

Elsness, Johan 1981. On the Syntactic and Semantic Functions of *That*-clauses. *Papers from the First Nordic Conference for English Studies.* Eds. S. Johansson and B. Tysdahl. Oslo: U. of Oslo. 281-303.

Emonds, Joseph 1970. *Root and Structure-Preserving Transformations.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Fanego, Teresa 1990. Finite Complement Clauses in Shakespeare's English. Parts I & II. *Studia Neophilologica* 62: 3-21 and 129-49.

García Lorenzo, Juan Carlos 1993. Aspects of the Syntax of Finite Complement Clauses as Subjects in John Lyly's *Euphues. The Anatomy of Wyt. Atlantis* XV: 135-52.

Görlach, Manfred 1991. *Introduction to Early Modern English.* Cambridge: CUP.

Haegeman, Liliane 1991. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1991. Corpus Studies and Probabilistic Grammar. *English Corpus Linguistics. Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik.* Eds. K. Aijmer and B. Altenberg. London and New York: Longman. 30-43.

Huddleston, Rodney 1984. *Introduction to the Grammar of English.* Cambridge: CUP.

Hunter, George K. 1962. *John Lyly. The Humanist as Courtier.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jespersen, Otto 1909-49. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles.* I-VII. London: Allen & Unwin.

Leech, Geoffrey N. 1991. The State of the Art in Corpus Linguistics. *English Corpus Linguistics. Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik.* Eds. K. Aijmer and B. Altenberg. London and New York: Longman. 8-29.

López Couso, María José 1994. Extraposition vs Intraposition: The Whys and the Wherefores. *Papers from the XVI Congreso de la Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos.* Ed. José M. Ruiz et al. Valladolid: U. de Valladolid.

McCawley, James D. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English.* 2 vols. Chicago & London: U. of Chicago P.

McDavid, Virginia 1964. The Alternation of "That" and Zero in Noun Clauses. *American Speech* 39: 102-13.

Mitchell, Bruce 1985. *Old English Syntax,* 2 vols. Oxford: OUP.

Nevalainen, Terttu and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg 1989. A Corpus of Early Modern Standard English in a Socio-Historical Perspective. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 90: 67-110.

Noonan, Michael 1985. Complementation. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description,* vol. II. Ed. Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: CUP. 42-140.

The Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: OUP.

Quirk, Randolph et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London and New York: Longman.

Rosenbaum, Peter S. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Visser, F. Th. 1963-73. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language.* 3 parts in 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Warner, Anthony 1982. *Complementation in Middle English and the Methodology of Historical Syntax.* London and Canberra: Croom Helm.

Williams, Edwin 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203-38.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

↑INDICE