

4.1 Introduction

In the course of the Middle English period, a number of major changes took place in the structure of English. The most important of these were the reduction of the system of inflectional endings, the reorganisation of the patterns of word order and the trend toward the use of analytic constructions instead of synthetic ones. These developments were related, and their roots can be found in Old English.

The effects of these changes on English syntax can be clearly seen in the first two centuries of the Modern period, from about 1500 to about 1700. At that time, the structure of the language was gradually established so that eighteenth-century standard written English closely resembles the present-day language. The language of most sixteenth-century authors still reflects the heritage of Middle English, whilst it is possible to read long passages from eighteenth-century novels or essays and find only minor deviations from present-day constructions.

It is thus obvious that a description of English syntax from the late fifteenth to the late eighteenth century should pay constant attention to change. It is equally obvious that the description will mainly focus on the first two Early Modern centuries. Sixteenth-century texts are characterised by a richness of variant forms and constructions, inherited from Middle English and, to a lesser extent, influenced by Latin. In seventeenth-century writing, the abundance of variants was gradually reduced.

Thus it is no wonder that an account of Early Modern syntactic developments easily creates an impression of a movement from greater variability and lack of organisation towards a more regulated and orderly state. This is mainly due to the fact that the establishment of the written standard which had been developing mainly in the London area since late

Middle English (see Lass, Görlach, Adamson this volume) necessarily forms the backbone of the discussion. The description of the shaping of the standard is bound to be closely concerned with systematic structural aspects and with acceptable and less acceptable variants. References to the early grammarians' normative statements may enhance this impression. It must be emphasised, however, that the regularising trend is typical of written language only; informal spoken English has retained a richness of variants throughout the centuries.

It is a constant source of frustration for the language historian that all observations and analyses of the early periods have to be based on written evidence only, while the importance of speech in the development of the language is self-evident. In Early Modern English, the situation is somewhat less problematic than in Old or Middle English as there is no shortage of texts representing a wide variety of styles and registers. It is, of course, a truism that no written text, be it dialogue in a comedy or novel, a sermon or a record of a debate or discussion, will ever give a faithful reproduction of spoken language. But by a careful comparison of texts which stand at different distances from spoken language (judging by the discourse situation, the purpose of the text, the educational level of the author and other extralinguistic criteria), it is possible to present hypotheses about whether a certain construction is favoured or avoided in the spoken language of the period. Hypotheses of this kind may help us in our attempt to trace the typical domain of certain syntactic features either to the oral level of language, as 'changes from below', or to the literate end of the scale, as 'changes from above'.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are marked by an enormous change in the cultural and social life in England. We need only mention the art of printing, the revived focus on classical literature and learning, advances in science and the expanding world view which brought forth an interest in the languages of the world and the character of human language in general. On the social side, the weakening of family ties, urbanisation and the general mobility of the population and movements along the social scale are to be noted.

These external aspects are no doubt of greater importance to developments in vocabulary than in syntax. It is also important to keep in mind Lass's warning in chapter 1, that language 'itself' and its change should not be confused with language users' choices between the resources of language and with the mechanics which lie behind the emergence and spread of changes. But it is equally obvious that change in language cannot be adequately analysed or discussed without an awareness of the speakers' or

writers' (conscious or unconscious) choices, or of the factors, linguistic or extralinguistic, affecting these choices. Unfortunately, in the present chapter, it has not been possible to pay systematic attention to these aspects, which form the basis for the variationist approach to change. All too little variationist research has been done in Early Modern syntax so far; furthermore, a reliable quantificational discussion of syntactic variation would have lengthened this chapter beyond reasonable limits.

One external influence, frequently referred to with respect to Early Modern English syntax, is foreign, particularly Latin models. The constructions mentioned in this context include, for example, absolute clauses and *wh*-relativisers. In general, however, foreign models only support the spread and establishment of syntactic elements ultimately derived from native resources. Classical ideals no doubt exercised an important influence on stylistic developments in renaissance English writing, and this increased the popularity of certain constructions, particularly those related to the formation of complex sentences with various types of subordination, non-finite clauses, etc.

In the present chapter, I have attempted to discuss the most important syntactic constructions in Early Modern English, with particular attention to the features which underwent major changes. As mentioned above, the roots of these can be found in Middle or even Old English; in the Modern period, transitional stages were followed by the establishment of the system. The most dramatic developments are connected with verb syntax: the auxiliaries indicating future or (plu)perfect, the progressive (*be* + *-ing*) and *do*-periphrasis. In the formation of noun phrases, the use of the articles becomes more systematic than in Middle English, and the possibility of using adjectives or the adjectival forms of indefinite pronouns as heads more restricted. Subject–verb order is established in statements, and impersonal constructions with no ‘nominative’ subject disappear. At the level of the composite sentence, the distinction between coordination and subordination becomes more clearcut than in Middle English and that between the personal relative link *who* and the impersonal *which* becomes fixed. There are, in fact, very few major syntactic changes after the end of the eighteenth century, although change in language is of course an ongoing and never-ending process. The passive of the progressive (the type ‘The house is being built’ instead of the older ‘The house is building’) is probably the most conspicuous of these.

Unfortunately, many Early Modern English syntactic features and their developments are still unsatisfactorily explored; this concerns particularly the domain of text linguistics. The present chapter does not discuss, for

instance, new ways of topicalisation necessitated by the greater rigidity of word order; in many other cases, too, my suggestions based on available evidence remain inconclusive or inaccurate.

The majority of the examples illustrating the syntactic constructions and their development are taken from the Early Modern English section of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts (see Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 1989, Rissanen *et al.* 1993, Kytö 1996). This consists of samples from some eighty texts (counting letter collections, etc. as one text only), all in all more than half a million words of English, mainly prose, dating from about 1500 to about 1700. In addition, I have collected examples from primary texts, from standard treatises of Early Modern English and the history of English and from monographs and articles dealing with particular syntactic problems. My examples come mainly from prose, the most notable exception being the early dramatic texts. Most sixteenth-century plays were written in verse, and the prestigious position of such authors as Shakespeare, Jonson and Marlowe in earlier studies of Modern English has led me to quote passages from their verse plays. I have, however, tried to avoid quoting verse instances in contexts where poetical form would clearly have influenced the syntax.

Using the structured Helsinki Corpus [HC] material has made it possible to draw conclusions concerning the frequencies of the variant constructions. Quantitative considerations are important in diachronic syntax, because developments are more often describable in terms of increasing or decreasing frequency than in the emergence of new constructions or the complete disappearance of old ones. It is also useful to be able to comment, in quantitative terms, on the effect of the internal or external factors on the popularity of a construction. I have, however, in most cases avoided giving absolute frequencies, mainly because estimating their value as evidence would require more knowledge of the character and limitations of the Helsinki Corpus than can be given in this chapter. Instead, notoriously vague expressions such as 'rare', 'common', or 'occurs occasionally' have been preferred; these statements are, however, in most cases based on the figures yielded by the Helsinki Corpus.

Needless to say, this chapter owes a great debt of gratitude to Elizabeth Closs Traugott's chapter on Old English syntax in vol. I of the *Cambridge History of the English Language*, and particularly to Olga Fischer's discussion of Middle English syntax in vol. II. Dr Fischer's chapter provides an excellent background and model of treatment for most topics discussed here. At many points I have applied a less theoretical level of discussion and analysis than hers. This is mainly because I have found it unnecessary to

repeat the general theoretical considerations in her chapter. Furthermore, in view of the very extensive general interest in the literature and culture of the period covered by the present volume, I have wished to make my chapter easy to approach even for those readers who are not necessarily well versed, or even particularly interested, in the more theoretical aspects of historical linguistics.¹

4.2 The noun phrase

The central element of a noun phrase is the head, which can be noun, pronoun, adjective or quantifier. The head can be preceded by nouns (e.g. genitives), adjectives, quantifiers and pronouns, and followed by adjectives, appositive nouns, prepositional phrases and clauses. Noun phrases can be definite or indefinite; the most common way of marking this is with articles.

The basic principles of noun-phrase formation are the same in Early Modern English as in Middle English. Certain changes can, however, be traced. The use of adjective heads becomes more restricted than earlier; there is also less freedom in combining various premodifying elements such as demonstrative and possessive pronouns.

The most important development in the use of the pronouns in Early Modern English, the substitution of the second person plural forms *ye, you* for the singular form *thou*, is discussed by Lass in chapter 3 in this volume.

4.2.1 Articles

As in the other Germanic languages, the articles develop late in English. In Old English the numeral *an* (>*one, a, an*) and the demonstrative *se, seo, þæt* ‘that’ are used in a way which approaches the usage of articles, but these words can hardly be called true articles. In Middle English the use of the articles becomes more systematic (see Fischer *CHEL* II 4.2.2), and by the end of the period an article came to be used regularly even with singular nouns with generic reference, the type ‘A/The cat loves comfort’, as against the older type ‘Cat loves comfort’.

In Early Modern English the articles are used roughly in the same way as in Present-Day English. The long and slow process of development means, however, that there is still considerable variation at the beginning of this period. The following discussion concentrates on the contexts in which the non-expression of the article (zero) is more common than in Present-Day English. Attention is also called to some special uses of the articles.

Zero is common particularly when the marking of (in)definiteness or reference is of minor importance. This is the case, for instance, with many abstract nouns:

- (1) Nay sweete Hodge say *truth*, and do not me begile.
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* V.ii)
- (2) and yet if the matter were proued, they be not greatly materiall in *Lawe*.
([HC] Throckmorton 71 Cii)

Cf.:

- (3) Thou dost *the truth* tell ([HC] Udall III.iv)
- (4) adjudged by *the Lawe* a principal Traytoure ([HC] Throckmorton 75 Ci)

Zero is common when the noun is a subject complement, as in the expression '*Tis pity/marvel/shame*:

- (5) *It is pitie* that anie man should open his mouth anie way to defend them
([HC] Gifford B2v)

As in Middle English and Present-Day English, the indefinite article can be used with abstract nouns when a particular event or state is in focus:

- (6) I would never have any one eat but what he likes and when he has *an appetite*
([HC] Locke 46)
- (7) some of ye Justices was in *a rage* & said whoe has donne this
([HC] Fox 80)

Cf.

- (8) I did heare that it had done much good, . . . as to prouoke *appetite*
([HC] John Taylor 131 Ci)
- (9) although present and privat Execution was *in rage* done upon Edric
([HC] Milton *History* 279)

Zero is often used in less concrete prepositional phrases like *in presence of*, *at mercy of*, and *in name of*, as well as in locative expressions such as *at gate*, *at door*, *at town's end*. Notice the variation in the use of the article with *sanctuary* in the following example:

- (10) Then may no man, I suppose take my warde fro me oute of *sanctuarye*,
wythout the breche of *the sanctuary*. ([HC] More *Richard III* 39)

Zero can be found with adjectives used as nouns as late as the eighteenth century:

- (11) the Infection kept chiefly in the out-Parishes, which being very populous, and fuller also of *poor*, the Distemper found more to play upon
(Defoe *Plague Year* 17)

As in Present-Day English, zero occurs with coordinated nouns:

- (12) what it is that, being borne without *life, head, lippe, or eye*, yet doth runne roaring through the world till it dye
([HC] Armin 45)

Cf.:

- (13) there are five organs or instruments of speech . . . viz. *the lips, the teeth, the tongue, the roof of the mouth, and the throat*
([HC] Hoole 3)

With geographical names, the most conspicuous difference from present-day usage is the frequent occurrence of river names with zero. In Shakespeare's time this usage is still more common than the definite article:²

- (14) This yere, all the Weares [= weirs] in *Thamis* [= the Thames] from the Towne of Stanes in the Weast, vnto the water of *Medway* in the East, . . . were destroyd
([HC] Stow 566)

Cf.:

- (15) and afterward went into *the tems* [= the Thames] ([HC] Edward 273)

The definite article can be used in some contexts in which zero prevails today, e.g. with the names of languages and fields of science. Zero is, however, more common.

- (16) Let not your studying *the French* make you neglect *the English*
(1760 *Portia, Polite Lady* [OED s.v. *the* 7])

- (17) He understood *the mechanics* and phisic ([HC] Burnet *History* I 167)

Cf.:

- (18) an inscription about it yn *French* ([HC] Leland I 77)

- (19) He had the dotage of *astrology* in him ([HC] Burnet *History* I 172).

- (20) he hath neither *Latine, French*, nor *Italian*, & you will come into the Court and sweare that I haue a poore pennieworth in *the English*.
(Shakespeare *Merchant of Venice* I.ii)

In (20), zero is used with coordinated nouns.

Before nouns indicating parts of the body, Present-Day English normally uses the possessive pronoun in non-prepositional noun phrases. In Early Modern English, the definite article is possible in these contexts.³

- (21) Thou canst not frowne, thou canst not looke a sconce, Nor bite *the* lip, as
angry wenches will (Shakespeare *Taming of the Shrew* II.i)

In Early Modern English as in Present-Day English the definite article is occasionally used with complement nouns (Jespersen's 'typical *the*'): ⁴

- (22) I mervaille that you, that have bine alwaies hitherto taken for so wise a
man, will now so *play the foole* to lye heare ([HC] Roper 82)
- (23) Olivia, on her side, *acted the coquet* to perfection
(Goldsmith *Vicar of Wakefield*: 283–4 [Jespersen *MEG* VII 14 2 1])
- (24) whether you are perfectly *the man* of sense, and *the gentleman*, is a question
(Cowper *Letters* I 176 [Jespersen *MEG* VII 14 2 2])

4.2.2 *Demonstrative pronouns*

In Early Modern English, as in present Scots, there are three demonstrative pronouns, *this*, *that* and *yon* (*yond*, *yonder*). The same tripartition of deictic expressions can be traced in the corresponding set of local adverbs, *here*, *there*, *yond(er)*.

This implies 'near the speaker', *yon* 'remote from both speaker and hearer', and *that* 'remote from the speaker', with no implications about the position relative to the hearer (Barber 1976: 227). Thus *that* can be used with referents both close to (25) and remote from (26) the addressee:

- (25) Thou look'st like Antichrist, in *that* leud hat. (Jonson *Alchemist* IV.vii)
- (26) 'Tis so: and *that* selfe chaine about his necke, Which he forswore most
monstrously to haue. (Shakespeare *Comedy of Errors* Vi)

Yon 'that (visible) over there' combines the perspectives of both the speaker and the hearer. The originally adverbial forms *yond*, *yonder* came to be used both as determiners and as pronouns (i.e. with or without a following head) in Middle English.

In Early Modern English *yon(der)* is more common in determiner position (27)–(28) than as the head of a noun phrase (29). The shorter forms become archaic in the course of the seventeenth century. *Yonder* can be frequently found in Restoration comedy; the rare occurrences of *yon* are put into the mouths of non-standard speakers. In later centuries, these forms occur in dialects and in poetic or otherwise marked contexts (30):

- (27) Belike then master Doctor, *yon* stripe there ye got not?
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* V.ii)

- (28) and I doubt not but at *yonder* tree I shall catch a Chub,
 ([HC] Walton 215)
- (29) What strange beast is *yon*, that thrusts his head out at window
 (1616 Marlowe *Faustus* [*OED* s.v. *yon* B])
- (30) Save that from *yonder* ivy-mantled tower The mopeing owl does to the
 moon complain (Gray 'Elegy written in a Country Churchyard' 10)

In Present-Day English, the pronominal (i.e. non-determiner) *this* referring to a person sounds natural only in introductory contexts, as in 'This is my brother John'. In Middle and Early Modern English *this*, like many other pronouns, can more freely be used in pronominal positions.⁵

- (31) Thys Symon leprosus . . . was aftyр warde made Bushoppe, And he was
 namyd Julian. And *thys* ys he that men call vpon for good harborowe.
 ([HC] Torkington 54)
- (32) I woulde wytte whether *this* be she that yow wrote of.
 ([HC] More *Letters* 564)

In Early Modern English the singular *this* occurs in expressions of time of the type *this two and twenty years*, *this six weeks*, *this fourteen days*. According to Franz (1939: §316), *this* here goes back to the Middle English plural form. In the sixteenth century, *this even* can mean 'last evening', and *this other day* occurs in contexts where Present-Day English would use *the other day*.

The examples quoted above imply that in Early Modern English *this* is less clearly demonstrative than today and can be used as a fairly neutral referential counterpart of *that*, with emphasis on proximity, as in

- (33) Sir Walter Blunt, new lighted from his horse, Staind with the variation of
 each soil Betwixt *that* Holmedon and *this* seat of ours:
 (Shakespeare *1 Henry IV* 1.i)

It is perhaps the loss of *yon(der)* that later gives *this* a more marked demonstrative force.

The Early Modern English period is characterised by a great variety of means of intensification. It is of interest that the expression of emphasis is extended even to closed-system elements, such as the demonstrative pronouns. The model of Latin and French may have favoured this trend, but parallels in the other Germanic languages suggest a native development.

In Middle English, the combination of *this* or *that* and *ilke(e)*, *self* or *same* was used for intensified anaphoric reference. *Ilke* becomes obsolete in the South in the sixteenth century.

- (34) I neuer saw any of that *selfe* Nation, to begge bread.
(1632 Lithgow *Travayles* [*OED* s.v. *self* B I 1a])

- (35) Why did Cobham retract all *that same*? ([HC] Raleigh 208.C2)

- (36) I shall wait upon thee too *that same* day, ([HC] *Penny Merriments* 118)

The same is fairly often used with a demonstrative force in sixteenth-century texts, mainly with non-human reference. It is probably more emphatic than *this* or *that*, owing to its original meaning. It readily accepts a preposition (37) and can be placed at the end of the sentence (37)–(38).

- (37) They ought to preyse and love the chirche and the commaundements of
the same (Caxton *Aesop* iii 7 [quoted in Mustanoja 1960: 176])

- (38) ‘I meane,’ quod I, ‘to hide *the same*, and neuer to discover it to any.’
([HC] Harman 68)

- (39) what in the wife is obedience, *the same* in the man is duty.
([HC] Jeremy Taylor 19)

4.2.3 Indefinite pronouns

4.2.3.1 Pronouns in *-one* and *-body*

In Old and Middle English, the simplex forms of the indefinite pronouns *some*, *any*, *every*, *no*, *many*, *such*, could be used as both heads and determiners. With the loss of the inflectional endings, some distinctions, such as that between the singular and the plural, were no longer obvious in these pronominal forms; to indicate these, nouns with a weak semantic content, such as *man*, *thing*, or *body*, or the pronominal *one*, became common with these indefinites. With adjectives the same tendency results in the rise of the so-called propword *one*.⁶

In Early Modern English, simplex forms of these indefinite pronouns can still be found as heads, but they are rare and mainly restricted to constructions in which an *of*-phrase follows the pronoun:

- (40) but *some* [sing.] that ouer-heard their talk, hindered his journey and laughed at the jest ([HC] Armin 42)

- (41) who diuided the Diameter into 300. partes . . . and *euery of those parts* into 6’0. ([HC] Blundevile 48r)

According to Lowth (1775 [1979]: 25), ‘*every* was formerly much used as a pronominal adjective, standing by itself’, but ‘we now commonly say *every one*’. He gives the following example:

- (42) The corruptions and depredations to which *every* of these was subject.
(Swift *Contests and Dissentions*)

In the sixteenth and early seventeenth century *one* is more common than *body* as the second element of indefinite pronouns with a human referent (with the exception of *no*), but by the end of the seventeenth century *body* has become the more common of the two. It seems to be popularised first with *any* and *no*, and latest with *every* (Raumolin-Brunberg & Kahlas-Tarkka 1997).

The combination of indefinite pronoun + *one* can be used with a following noun in emphatic contexts (43)–(44). Instances of this usage are attested as early as Old English.

- (43) yf we wyll afferme that *any one epistle* of saynt Paule. or *any one place* of his epistles. perteyneth not vnto the vnyuersall chirche of chryst. we take away all saynt Paules authoryte.
([HC] Fisher 314)
- (44) And for *euery one thorne*, that he suffred in his head, thou hast deserued a thousande.
([HC] Fisher 399)

The question of when the combination of indefinite pronoun + *body* or *one* can be regarded as a compound pronoun is difficult to answer. It seems that lexicalisation is completed in the course of the seventeenth century. In the sixteenth, these forms still compete with the simple pronoun or the combination of pronoun + *man* (= ‘human being’); cf. Raumolin-Brunberg 1994a:

- (45) so were it good reason that *euery man* shoulde leaue me to myne.
([HC] More *Letters* 507)

4.2.3.2 Indefinite *one*

In Middle English, the numeral *one* develops various indefinite pronominal uses.⁷ In the earliest instances, it refers to persons. These uses are well attested in Early Modern English. The reference may be specific, ‘a certain’, as in (46) and (47), or non-specific, ‘someone/anyone’ (48):

- (46) And therfore the great kynge Alexander,. . . beinge demaunded of *one* if he wold se the harpe of Paris Alexander, . . . he thereat gentilly smilyng, answered
([HC] Elyot 26)
- (47) there was amongst them *one* who bare greate Sway, the Buyshop of Winchester . . .
([HC] Perrott 41)
- (48) if a gouernour of a publike weale, iuge, or any other minstre of iustice, do gyue sentence agayne *one* that hath transgressed the lawes . . .
([HC] Elyot 150)

In the fifteenth century *one* develops the generalising or generic pronominal use that gives us the indefinite subject *one* (cf. *OED*, s.v. *one* pron. 21):

- (49) . . . Staid it long?
Horatio. While *one* with moderate hast might tell a hundred.
 (Shakespeare *Hamlet* I.ii)

This use is common from the sixteenth century on; its rapid popularisation is perhaps accelerated by the loss of the indefinite subject *man* in late Middle English.

In the course of the seventeenth century, *one* with specific reference, and with non-generic/non-specific reference (as in 48), is gradually replaced by the combinations with *some* or *any*. Elphinston (1765: II 17) still accepts the specific pronominal *one* but only gives a quotation from the Bible ('We saw one casting out devils').

The anaphoric pronominal *one* (substitute *one*), as in 'He rents a house, but I own one', develops in Middle English and is common in Early Modern English:

- (50) let oure kynge, what tyme hys grace shalbe so mynded to take a *wyfe* to chose hym *one* whych is of god.
 ([HC] Latimer 34)

In late Middle English, the pronominal *one* came to be used with adjectives. Its development is in accordance with the tendency to avoid simple adjectives as heads of noun phrases (see 4.2.4 below). Its origin can be found in the pronominal uses described above; like the indefinite pronoun *one*, it mainly refers to human antecedents in its early uses. From the sixteenth century on it is common in both anaphoric (51) and non-anaphoric (52) contexts, not only with adjectives but also with demonstrative pronouns (53):

- (51) my hood is a *fayre one*.
 ([HC] Deloney 71)
- (52) *Ka*. . . What shall we do with our Ale.
Jo. Sell it *my sweet one*.
 ([HC] Penny Merriments 117)
- (53) amongst diuers good and notable Reasons . . . I noted *this one*, why the said Maxime ought to be inuiolable:
 ([HC] Throckmorton 73 Cii)

Through its frequent use as the head of a noun phrase with premodifying elements, the propword is given characteristics more typical of nouns than pronouns. It can be used in the plural⁸ and be preceded by the numerical *one*:

- (54) for I perceiue the Net was not cast only for little Fishes, but for *the great ones*.
 ([HC] Throckmorton 70 C1)

- (55) That's thousand to *one good one* (Shakespeare *Coriolanus* II.ii)

From the sixteenth century on, we find instances of the propword preceded by *such*, *many* and *what* + the indefinite article:

- (56) She layeth the fault in *such a one*, as I know was not there.
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* V.ii)
- (57) I doubt not but it had long before this beene comparable to *many a one* of our greatest Townes.
([HC] John Taylor 130 Cii)
- (58) *what an one* is this, for the windes and the sea obey him.
(Rheims Bible Matthew 8.27; cf. King James Bible *what manner of man*)

The combination *so* + adj. + *a one* appears in the seventeenth century:

- (59) *Miss*. . . I shall give you a Civil Answer.
Y. Fash. You give me *so obliging a one*, it encourages me to tell you . . .
([HC] Vanbrugh IV.i)

When one of two coordinated adjectives follows the head, the propword is normally not used in sixteenth- or seventeenth-century texts (60); in the eighteenth century it gains ground even in these contexts (61); cf. Jespersen *MEG* II 10.961–2:

- (60) And said it was a goodly cry and *a ioyfull* to here.
([HC] More *Richard III* 76)
- (61) 'Tis an old observation and a *very true one*.
(Sheridan, quoted in Jespersen *MEG* II 10.961)

4.2.3.3 *Every* versus *each*

The distinction between *every* and *each* is established in Early Modern English, though *every* is still occasionally used with reference to two:

- (62) Hath the Cat do you thinke in *euery* eye a sparke
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* I.v).

4.2.4 *Adjectives*

Throughout the history of English, adjectives have been used as heads in noun phrases.⁹ In Old and Middle English, the adjective head had a more extensive sphere of reference than today; it could refer, for instance, to a single person or to a specific group of persons or things (see Fischer *CHEL* II 4.2.3.1). It could not, however, express the distinction between human and non-human referents, or, after the loss of inflectional endings, between the singular and the plural. It was probably for this reason that

(pro)nominal heads came to be preferred with adjectives, except in certain well-defined cases (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.2.3.1). This development resulted, among other things, in the establishment of the propword *one*; the rise of the compound forms of indefinite pronouns is closely related (see 4.2.3.1 above). In Present-Day English adjective heads mainly refer to abstract concepts (*the mystical*) or generic groups or classes of people (*the rich*).

In Early Modern English adjective heads can still be used with reference to a single individual (63)–(64), or non-generically, (65), although these uses are becoming infrequent:

- (63) 'Tis not enough to help *the Feeble* [sing.] vp, But to support him after
(Shakespeare *Timon of Athens* I.i)
- (64) *The younger* [sing.] rises when *the old* [sing.] doth fall
(Shakespeare *King Lear* III.iii)
- (65) I cannot but be serious in a cause . . . wherein my fame and the reputations of diverse *honest, and learned* are the question;
(Jonson *Volpone* Epistle)

Comparative adjectives referring to persons can be used as heads with the indefinite article or (in the plural) without an article:

- (66) Whiles they behold *a greater* then themselues. (Shakespeare *Julius Caesar* I.ii)
- (67) *meaner then my selfe* haue had like fortune. (Shakespeare *3Henry VI* IV.i)

Even the use of an adjective to indicate an abstract concept is more varied than today. It can be modified by a restrictive relative clause or an *of*-genitive:

- (68) Proud Saturnine, interrupter of *the good* That noble minded Titus means to thee!
(Shakespeare *Titus Andronicus* I.i)
- (69) it is past *the infinite* of thought. (Shakespeare *Much Ado about Nothing* II.iii)

Special mention may be made of the use of the premodifying *only*, in genitive expressions. Despite its position, *only* may focus on the genitive modifier, *whose* in (70) and *inhabitants* in (71).

- (70) Vppon *whose onlye reporte* was Sir Thomas Moore indicted of treason
([HC] Roper 86)
- (71) for *the only Use of the Inhabitants* of those Islands ([HC] *Statutes* VII 455)

The meaning of (70) is 'by the report of whom (= that person) alone', and that of (71) 'for the use of the inhabitants only'. The focus of *only* is narrow (cf. e.g. Nevalainen 1991: 201–2).

4.2.5 *Genitive*

Old English nouns had four cases and adjectives and pronouns as many as five. In the course of the Middle English period, with the loss of the inflexional endings, most case distinctions disappeared. But even today, many pronouns distinguish between the subjective, objective and possessive forms, and the nouns have a specific singular form indicating possession and various other relations between two nouns.¹⁰ Although the justification for calling this form ‘a case’ in Present-Day English has been questioned (cf. Lass 1987: 148), the traditional term ‘genitive’ is certainly useful.

4.2.5.1 Synthetic and analytic genitive

In Old and Early Middle English the synthetic genitive (henceforth, *s*-genitive)¹¹ could link NPs not only to nominal heads but also to verbs and adjectives. It could indicate a variety of relations between the head and the modifier: possessive, objective, subjective, partitive, etc. In Middle English, the analytic *of* construction (henceforth, *of*-genitive) replaced the *s*-genitive as a link with verbs and adjectives as well as in many functions when linked with a noun.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the distribution of the *s*-genitive and the *of*-genitive developed roughly to what it is today. The former is favoured with human nouns and in functions in which the modifier stands in a subjective relation to the head, as in *the boy's arrival* ‘the boy arrives’ (72). Furthermore, it is regularly used in certain quantifying expressions (73)–(74). The *of*-genitive is favoured with inanimate nouns and when the modifier stands in an objective relation to the head: *the release of the boy* ‘somebody releases the boy’ (75). The use of the objective *s*-genitive, as in (76), is exceptional.

(72) *A Prince's love* is like the lightnings fume. (Chapman *Bussy D'Ambois* III.i)

(73) we haue *an houres talke* with you. (Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* II.i)

(74) somewhat more then *four miles distance* from Carlile
([HC] John Taylor 128 Cii)

(75) You were also (Iupiter) a Swan, for *the loue of Leda*
(Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* V.v)

(76) would no more worke upon him, Then *Syracusa's Sack*, on Archimede:
(Jonson, *Magnetic Lady* I.vi)

Fischer (*CHEL* II 4.2.4) points out that the survival of the *s*-genitive to indicate a subjective relation and the preference for the *of*-genitive to indicate an objective relation can be explained by the natural order of the elements in the sentence: the subject normally precedes and the object follows the verb (cf. the paraphrases given above and Altenberg 1982: 210ff.; Quirk *et al.* 1985: 17.41–43).

As Altenberg convincingly shows, the factors affecting the choice of the two genitive types are far from straightforward. Stylistic and communicative aspects are of importance: in the seventeenth century, the *s*-genitive seems to be favoured in informal and personal modes of communication and it is more persistent in poetry than in prose, probably for metrical reasons. The overall structure of the noun phrase must also be taken into consideration: if the head has other post-modifying elements, the *s*-genitive is favoured.

One of the interesting findings in Altenberg's study is that there is no remarkable alteration in the overall distributional pattern of the two constructions in the seventeenth century, although changes in the influence of individual factors can be noted. This clearly implies that the present-day distribution was reached early, although no doubt eighteenth-century normative tendencies contributed to the final establishment of the system.

4.2.5.2 Group genitive

In the early periods of English there was a greater range of combinations of a nominal head with a genitive modifier consisting of a prepositional phrase than in Present-Day English. The two heads – that of the prepositional phrase and that of the entire noun phrase – can either be brought close to each other as in (77) or separated by the prepositional phrase (78).

(77) but Thornbury he deceyved Besse, as *the mayor's daughter of Brachy*, of which Ephues writes, deceyved him. (IHC] Forman 12)

(78) they met two of *the king of Spaines armadas or Gallions*. (Chamberlain 94)

In (77) the head (*daughter*) 'splits' the prepositional phrase (*the Mayor of Brachy*), while in (78) the prepositional group (*the king of Spain*) is felt to be so closely knit that the genitive ending is attached to its last element. This type is often called the group genitive.

The split construction is typical of Old and Middle English; it gradually gives way to the group genitive in the sixteenth century. Wallis (1653 [1972]) does not give any examples of the older construction; the latest examples

quoted by Altenberg (1982: 62) date from the second half of the seventeenth century.¹²

The group genitive can occur in the so-called double genitive, which combines the *of*-genitive and the *s*-genitive (the type *a friend of my sister's* see 4.2.5.4):

- (79) sum thinke it is a rifled (=plundered) *ship of the kinge of denmarkes*
 ([HC] Katherine Paston 61)

When the genitival group consists of an appositive construction, the same alternatives are available from Middle English on: the older 'split' type (80) and the group genitive pattern (81):

- (80) he . . . Is now in durance, at *Maluolio's suite, A Gentleman, and follower* of my Ladies.
 (Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* V.i)
- (81) Jug Altham longes much for *hir cosin Jobane Mewexe's company*
 ([HC] Barrington *Family Letters* 92)

In the split group, which is the less common of the two in Early Modern English, the appositives following the head (*gentleman* and *follower* in (80)) do not normally have the genitive ending. The split construction is preferred when the apposition is non-restrictive, particularly if it is long or encumbered with additional modifiers as in (80) and the following instance (Altenberg 1982: 63):

- (82) I . . . passed by *Mr St Johns house son to Oliver Lord St John*.
 ([HC] Fiennes 161)

4.2.5.3 Absolute genitive

In the so-called absolute genitive, which is recorded from Middle English on, there is no expressed head to the genitive modifier. In the majority of the instances, the absolute genitive expresses locality; the genitive regularly refers to a person related to the place in one way or another:

- (83) Where did he lodge then? . . . At *Mr. Jyfford's, or Mrs. Harwell's*.
 ([HC] Oates 82 Ci)

In most instances, the genitive is preceded by a preposition indicating locality, but there are also instances of non-prepositional contexts:¹³

- (84) 'tis she Sir, Heire to some nineteene Mountaines. . . And all as high as *Pauls*.
 ([HC] Middleton 5)

Closely related to the preceding type is the one in which the genitive is used independently without a clearly definable noun to be understood after it

(Altenberg 1982: 68–9). The meaning of the genitive seems to be vaguely, ‘belonging to the household, property, sphere or influence of’. The implication of locality is present in most instances:

- (85) I can construe the action of her familier stile, & the hardest voice of her behauior (to be english’d rightly) is, I am *Sir Iohn Falstafs*.
(Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* I.iii)

4.2.5.4 Double genitive

The double genitive, the type *a friend of mine/John’s* arose in Middle English (see Fischer *CHEL* II 4.2.4). This construction seems to be called forth by the incompatibility of the indefinite article and the *s*-genitive (**a John’s friend*), in NPs in which there is a need to express the indefiniteness of the head.¹⁴

In Early Modern English the double genitive is common; it occurs mostly with indefinite heads (86) but also with heads preceded by a demonstrative pronoun (87) or the definite article (88):

- (86) bottle-ale is *a drinke of Sathan’s, a diet-drinke of Sathan’s*.
(Jonson *Bartholomew Fayre* III.vi)
- (87) ... *This speede of Caesars* Carries beyond beleefe
(Shakespeare *Antony and Cleopatra* II.vii)
- (88) he keeps her the prettiest pacing Nag with *the finest Side-saddle of any Womans* in the Ward.
(Shadwell 128)

4.2.6 Structure of the noun phrase

In Early Modern English, the basic structure of the NP is the same as in Present-Day English. The possible constructions are, however, more varied, in regard both to the ways of combining determiners and quantifiers and to the order of the elements. This freedom was inherited from Middle English, and many patterns go back to Old English. The structure of the noun phrase seems to be less compact than in Present-Day English. Constructions with only post-head elements are more common and so are relative clauses in comparison to prepositional phrases (Raumolin-Brunberg 1991: 275, 278).

In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the structure of the NP becomes more fixed: the use of adjectives as heads of NPs is restricted to certain semantic types (4.2.4 above), pre- and post-modifying elements are not often connected with pronominal heads, and two

determiners (e.g. a demonstrative and a possessive pronoun) can less freely be combined.

In the seventeenth century, personal pronouns can be modified by adjectives, often in the superlative, or by prepositional phrases:

(89) Lady, you are *the cruellst shée* aliue (Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* I.v)

(90) M. Wyat and *wée of Kent* do much mislike the Mariage with Spaine
([HC] Throckmorton 67 Ci)

4.2.6.1 Compatibility and order of the determiners

Instances of the sequence of the quantifiers *some* or *any*, or a numeral, and the definite article, common in Middle English, can be found even in Early Modern English, although mainly with superlatives or (with *any*) in the language of law:

(91) if any Prisoner . . . shall in pursuance of the same take the Oaths for *any the* Purposes hereby or by *any the* before mentioned Actes appointed shall . . . himselfe.
([HC] *Statutes* VII 76)

(92) *some the greatest States-men* o'the kingdom. (Jonson *Magnetick Lady* I.i)

(93) my father . . . was reckon'd *one The wisest prince* that there had reign'd by many A year before. (Shakespeare *Henry VIII* II.iv)

(94) therfore there lacketh Eloquution and Pronunciation, *two the principall partes* of rhetorike.
(Elyot [Scolar Press] 57r)

One preceding a superlative phrase (93) is no doubt intensifying (Mustanoja 1958). This combination is rare and was soon replaced by the partitive *one of the* + superlative.

Indefinite or relative pronouns can precede possessive pronouns:

(95) Wherunto Sir Thomas Moore, *among many other his humble and wise sayengs* not nowe in my memory, awneswered ([HC] Roper 39)

(96) . . . do sighe At *each his needlesse beaungs* (Shakespeare *Winter's Tale* II.iii)

(97) wch curtesie yor honor would alwaies kindlie acknowledge towards himselfe & *anie his frendes* as they should haue anie neede to use yor honors fauor.
([HC] Edmondes 393)

(98) That I haue said to *some my standers by*
(Shakespeare *Troilus and Cressida* IV.v Quarto; Folio: *unto my standers by*)

(99) And what thei intended further, was as yet not well knowen. *Of whiche their treson* he neuer had knowledge before x. of the clock
([HC] More *Richard III* 53)

They can also be used with the *of*-genitive:

- (100) I shall be so ashamed that I shall not looke vpon *any of my neighbors* for blushing
 ([HC] Deloney 70)
- (101) I answer thee, I shall send it to *some of our Friends* at Clapham
 ([HC] Penny Merriments 151)

An *of*-phrase, (100), (101), was more common in these contexts and it seems that partitivity is often implied even in the construction without *of*. But the determiner position gives the indefinite pronoun less prominence than the *of*-phrase: from the discourse point of view the Early Modern English structure may express a nuance lost in Present-Day English.

A common construction, related to the previous one, is the combination of *this* (or, rarely, *that*) and the possessive pronoun:¹⁵

- (102) *This his goodnes* stood not still in one or two ([HC] Ascham, 280)
- (103) your Highness will be as good a Lord to *that your Monastery*, as your noble Progenitors have been ([HC] Wolsey 19)
- (104) So far from complying from *this their inclination* (Fielding *Tom Jones* I.ix 73)

This combination of two pronouns was superseded by the type ‘this X of mine (yours, etc.)’ by the end of the seventeenth century, although Fielding uses it (104) and Elphinston (1765) accepts it, with a quotation from the Bible (*these thy servants*). Gil mentions the two constructions side by side in the 1621 edition of his *Logonomia anglica* (1619 [1972]: II 142).

When *all* or *both* precede a possessive pronoun and a noun, they may focus on the possessive instead of the noun (cf. the use of *only* discussed in 4.2.4 above). Thus (105) means ‘the consciences of all of us’ and (106) ‘the blessings of both of us’. As can be seen in (106), this construction can be found even in eighteenth century writing:

- (105) wee haue founde him not guiltie, agreeable to *all our Consciences*.
 ([HC] Throckmorton 77 Cii)
- (106) I charge you, my dear child, on *both our blessings*, poor as we are, to be on your guard (Richardson *Pamela* I.ix)

In sixteenth-century texts *all* sometimes precedes a personal pronoun subject:

- (107) he dyd quyte all the resydue of the apostles. for *all they* were conteyned in hym. bycause he was theyr mayster. And as *al they* were conteyned in our sauour. So after our sauour *all they* were conteyned in Peter. For christ made hym the heed of *them all*. Here note of saynt Austyn that saynt Peter

bycause he was heed of theym all. & *all they* were conteyned in hym. therefore this trybute . . .
 ([HC] Fisher 318)

- (108) And *al we* that be heare present, wil loue you much the better
 ([HC] *Gammer Gurton* V.ii)

The sequence personal pronoun + *all* (or *both*) is well-attested (cf. the use of *of them all* in 107 above). It would be tempting to assume that the present-day American English (Southern) *you all*, to distinguish the plural *you* from the singular, ultimately goes back to this Early Modern English construction:

- (109) your grandmother hath sent you a token, and your mother hath sent you another, and *wee all* do ioyne in prayer to God that it will please . . .
 ([HC] R. Oxinden 30)

- (110) but to remember [= remind] you of that I trust *you all* be well instructed in
 ([HC] Throckmorton 64 Ci)

- (111) we come to the botome of the Vale of Josophat and begynnnyth the Vale of Siloe, And *they both* be but on [= one] vale. ([HC] Torkington 27)

Other can precede the quantifying *some* or a numeral (*other some*, *other two*). According to Strang (1970: 137), there is a semantic distinction between this order and the reverse one (*some other*): the initial *other* marks the meaning as indefinite. The available evidence does not unexceptionally support a clear-cut semantic distinction; the reference in (113) does not seem less specific than in (112):

- (112) But Edwi afterwards receav'd into favour as a snare, was by him or *some other* of his false freinds, Canute contriving it, the same year slain.
 ([HC] Milton *History* 10 275)

- (113) . . . the scurby, the bubo and such lyke beastly stuffe, which he browght to me to correct as he sayd, but when I had altered some and stryken owt *other some* he cold not endure to have yt soe. ([HC] Madox 139)

The placement of the article between *such* or *many* and a noun is well attested since Middle English:

- (114) *Many a truer man* than he, hase hanged vp by the halse.
 ([HC] *Gammer Gurton* V.ii)

- (115) The Maryorners seyng to vs they never see nor hard of *such a nynde* in all their lyffs.
 ([HC] Torkington 62)

With *what*, in exclamations, the inserted article seems to be established in Early Modern English; the *OED* quotes instances from the second half of the fifteenth century. But instances of exclamations without an article (117)

can be found as late as the eighteenth century, e.g. in Richardson's novels, and the article can be used after *what* in questions (118):

- (116) Fye, *what a trouble* haue I rid my Hands on. ([HC] Middleton 19)
- (117) *Prospero* to sigh To th' windes, whose pittie sighing backe againe Did vs but louing wrong.
Miranda Alack, *what trouble* Was I then to you?
Prospero O, a Cherubin Thou was't that did preserue me.
 (Shakespeare *Tempest* I.ii)
- (118) Martin Luther . . . finding *what a Prouince* he had vndertaken against the Bishop of Rome . . . was enforced to . . . ([HC] Bacon 1 17 v)

4.2.6.2 Position of the adjective

The order of the elements of the noun phrase is freer in the sixteenth century than in late Modern English. The adjective is placed after the nominal head more readily than today (see Raumolin-Brunberg 1991, Raumolin-Brunberg and Kahlas-Tarkka 1997; for Middle English usage, Fischer *CHEL* II 4.2.1). This is probably largely due to French or Latin influence: most noun + adjective combinations contain a borrowed adjective and the whole expression is often a term going back to French or Latin:

- (119) Whiche they call *a tonge vulgare and barbarous* (More *Complete Works*: VI 333)
- (120) This Neville lakkid *heires males*, wherapon a great concertation rose bytwixt the next *beire male* and one of the Gascoynes. ([HC] Leland 72)
- (121) And he that repeth receaveth rewarde, and gaddereth frute vnto *life eternall*. ([HC] Tyndale John 4.36)¹⁶

As in Present-Day English, factors pertaining to style, symmetry and cohesion may cause postposition of the adjective phrase. In the following passage, the order seems to be determined by rhetorical emphasis:

- (122) Truly no *impedyment ertbly* dooth more styfly & strongly withstande very contrycyon [= 'contrition'], than dooth ouer many worldly pleasures whiche be shrewed & noysome to the soule. ([HC] Fisher 34)

Note also 'a thinge vncertain and doubtfull' in (123).

When two adjectives modify a noun head, the ambilateral placement, adj. + noun + *and* + adj. is common in Old English and Middle English. It can also be found in Early Modern English texts:

- (123) I did not take it for *a very sure thinge and a certaine . . .* but rather as *a thinge vncertain and doubtfull*. ([HC] More *Letters* 505)
- (124) and will make of the [= thee] *a greater nacion and a mightier* then they. ([HC] Tyndale Numbers 14.12)

In general terms, there seems to be a trend from postmodification to premodification in the course of the Early Modern English period (cf. Raumolin-Brunberg 1991: 267–8, 275). Further research on usage in various text types and individual authors will no doubt clarify the details of this development.

There is also more freedom in the position of the adjective with determiners. The adjective can precede a possessive pronoun:

- (125) *good my Lord* (sayd he) I hope you know . . . ([HC] Perrott 37)
- (126) he hard the E. of Essex cry for all your *good my maisters*, that . . . ([HC] Trial of Essex 21)

Cf. also, *vnto diuers other his Freinds* (Roper 104). This construction is rapidly disappearing in Early Modern English and mostly restricted to formulas of address.

The indefinite article fairly regularly follows an adjective preceded by *so/as* or *too*:

- (127) of *so clere a hyght* of the holy gospels. ([HC] Fisher 321)
- (128) *Too low a Mistres* for *so high a seruant*.
(Shakespeare *Two Gentlemen of Verona* II.iv)

The absence of the article is exceptional:

- (129) I mocke at death With *as bigge heart* as thou (Shakespeare *Coriolanus* III.ii)

The placement of the indefinite article after an adjective not preceded by *so/as* and *too* is so rare that it can hardly be regarded as a regular syntactic pattern in Early Modern English, although it is not uncommon in Middle English.¹⁷

4.3 The verb phrase

At the end of the Middle English period, the structure of the verbal group (i.e. the main verb with auxiliaries) is, on the whole, somewhat simpler than in Present-Day English. Groups of two or more auxiliaries are less common than today; subjunctive forms, adverbials, etc. are still possible in

contexts in which we normally use auxiliaries. Consequently, in Early Modern English, many verb forms have a potential for a wider range of meaning than they have today (Blake 1983: 81).

The Early Modern English period, particularly the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, witnesses developments that result in the establishment of the Present-Day English verbal system. The most noticeable of these affect the subjunctive and the modal auxiliaries, tense auxiliaries (future and [plu]perfect), passive, and the progressive (*be* + *-ing*). At the end of the eighteenth century, a fairly high degree of paradigmatic symmetry exists in the verbal group: various combinations of tense, mood, voice and (to a certain extent) aspect can be systematically expressed by sets of auxiliaries and endings.

The basic tense forms in English are traditionally labelled ‘present’ (or ‘non-past’) and ‘preterite’ (or ‘past’). Many recent grammarians do not accept ‘future’ as a tense because it is expressed periphrastically with auxiliaries and because its meaning is partly modal. In the present discussion, however, ‘future’ is used as a shorthand term instead of the clumsier ‘*shall/will* + inf.’.

The form most obviously marking aspect is the ‘progressive’ (or ‘continuous’), i.e. the *be* + *-ing* form. ‘Perfect’ and ‘pluperfect’ (or ‘present perfective’ and ‘past perfective’) are alternatively defined as tense or aspect forms in grammars of English. The distinction is vague, and, according to Quirk *et al.* (1985: 4.17), ‘little more than a terminological convenience which helps us to separate in our minds two different kinds of realization’; see also Brinton (1988). In this section, the use of *be* + *-ing* and the (plu)perfect forms are discussed in connection with the basic tense distinctions.

The roots of the periphrastic forms for the future, perfect and pluperfect can be found as early as Old English. These were established in Middle English, although the simple present and preterite forms were still possible in contexts in which Present-Day English would use periphrastic constructions.

Passive voice is expressed with an auxiliary + past participle periphrasis from Old English on.

4.3.1 *Periphrastic forms indicating tense, voice or aspect*

4.3.1.1 Future: *shall/will* + verb

The periphrastic expression of future with *shall* and *will* goes back to Old English, although these verbs develop into ‘real’ auxiliaries only in Early

Modern English. In the earlier periods they retained much of their modal meaning of obligation or volition. This inherent modal colouring can be seen in the choice of the two auxiliaries even in Modern English.

It has been suggested (e.g. Jespersen *MEG* IV 18.1; Strang 1970: 206) that the divided use of the two auxiliaries to indicate future time might go back to the model set by the Wycliffite Bible translation, which used *shall* for unmarked and *will* for volitionally marked future. This practice would have been copied by the schools in their translation exercises. This theory certainly gives a much simplified picture of the development; yet it seems that *will* developed its pure (predictive) future use later than *shall*, in colloquial speech, as a ‘change from below’.

The peculiar pattern of distribution in which *shall* is the future auxiliary used with the first-person subject while *will* is used in the second and third persons can be first traced in Early Modern English. The grammarian Mason states this rule in 1622, and Wallis in 1653 (Visser §1483), but the tendency can be traced in texts as early as the sixteenth century. This distributional pattern has been called ‘linguistically abnormal’, but, in fact, it reflects a development typical of a transitional period, particularly if we accept the existence of two simultaneous trends: *shall* as the auxiliary of written language and the literate mode of expression and *will* as the auxiliary favoured in colloquial language and the oral mode of expression. In the second and third persons, the modal use of *will* was obviously less frequent than that of *shall* – volition was less easily projected to other persons than obligation or necessity. For this reason, the purely predictive *will* was easily established in the second and third person. When the referent of the subject was the speaker himself, the opposite situation was characteristic: obligation was probably a less natural and less frequently expressed motivation for the speaker’s own action or state than volition or intention; therefore *shall* resisted the tendency to be superseded by *will* longer in non-modal contexts. In questions, the situation is reversed: it is less common to inquire about the volition or intention of the speaker than of the addressee. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the normative tendencies of the grammarians no doubt contributed to the establishment of this distinction in the Southern standard. Their opinion is succinctly summarised by Lowth in the second half of the eighteenth century:

Will, in the first person singular and plural, promises or threatens; in the second and third persons, only foretells; *shall* on the contrary, in the first person, simply foretells; in the second and third persons, promises, commands, or threatens. But this must be understood of explicative

sentences; for when the sentence is interrogative, just the reverse for the most part takes place (1775 [1979]: 41–2)

In the early sixteenth century, both *shall* and *will* are freely used to indicate pure future (epistemic or predictive use; Lowth's 'foretelling'), although there is a slight bias in favour of *shall* in the overall figures. Evidence drawn from the texts dating from 1500–70 in the Helsinki Corpus shows no obvious tendency to use *shall* in the first person and *will* in the second and third (Kytö 1991: 323, table 22). These results differ from earlier studies (cf. Fridén 1948: 137); this may be due to the fact that Kytö's corpus has extensive coverage and consists of both formal and informal, speech-based and non-speech-based texts. At the formal/literate end of the text scale (official letters, histories, etc.), the distribution is more clear-cut.

In late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century texts, the distribution in the first and second persons is still fairly even, but in the third person *will* predominates, and in the second half of the seventeenth century, even second-person subjects clearly favour *will*, while *shall* is more common in the first person (Kytö 1991). The role played by colloquial language is particularly obvious in tracing the history of the supremacy of *will* over *shall* in the third person: this development is seen in, for instance, private correspondence (Kytö 1991: 324).

As the use of *will* is common even in the first person from the early sixteenth century on, it is easy to understand why the *shall/will* distinction was never established, in the form of a 'rule', in colloquial or regional varieties. One reason for this may well have been the early development of the contracted form *//* in speech.

The following late seventeenth-century instances show that the *shall/will* 'rule' was not too strictly followed – at least not on all levels of the formality and orality/literacy scales. In these instances, underlying modality would not seem to influence the choice of the auxiliary:

- (130) For aught I know *I will* continue with her in the winter and in the meantime I can see her often. ([HC] Elizabeth Oxinden 333)

- (131) *Mrs. Sull.* What are you, Sir, a Man or a Devil?
Arch. A Man, a Man, Madam.
Mrs. Sull. How *shall* I be sure of it?
 ([HC] Farquhar V.ii)

- (132) *Vén.* Yet I begin to be weary; . . .
Pisc. Well Sir, and *you shall* quickly be at rest.
 ([HC] Walton 216)

- (133) to make your children . . . secretly to say dayly within themselves, when
will you die, father. ([HC] Locke 54)
- (134) *He* that *shall* diligently examine the Phaenomena of this Experiment, *will*,
 I doubt not, find cause to believe, that . . . ([HC] Hooke 45)
- (135) *Bo.* What *will* follow then? ([HC] Boethius Preston 180)

Note the variation between *shall* and *will* in (134).

The choice between *should* and *would* in the so-called modal preterite use (see section 4.3.4.2) follows, in principle, the same pattern as *shall* and *will*. Yet it is easy to find Early Modern English instances of *should* even in the 2nd and 3rd person:

- (136) I would be loth, for my sake *you should* receave harme at his hande.
 ([HC] Harman 71)
- (137) If he should nowe take any thinge of them, he knewe, *he should* do them
 greate wronge. ([HC] Roper 41)

4.3.1.2 (Plu)perfect: *be* versus *have*

From Old English on, both *be* and *have* can be used as (plu)perfect auxiliaries. In Old English, as in present-day German and Dutch, *have* was mainly linked with transitive verbs and *be* with intransitives, although *have* could also be found with intransitives. In Middle English, *have* gradually extends its domain, and in the sixteenth century it is the sole auxiliary with transitive verbs and the predominant one with non-mutative intransitives. It varies with *be* with mutatives.

There are a variety of factors which affect the choice of the auxiliary with intransitive verbs in the transitional Early Modern English period. Individual authors may favour one or the other, depending on the conservativeness or progressiveness of their language.¹⁸ As to the linguistic factors, the general tendency is to prefer *have* when attention is focussed on the action indicated by the verb (138); with *be*, the emphasis is on the state following or the result achieved by the action (139). In many instances with *be*, the verbal group merely functions as a copula-like link between the subject and the post-verbal elements.

- (138) fel in into the wast, and their dyd stycke, and I had bene drowned if the
 tide *had come*, and espyng a man a good waye of, I cried as much as I
 could for helpe. ([HC] Harman 68)
- (139) after diner I went abroad, and when I *was come* home I dresed some sores:
 after, I hard Mr Rhodes read. ([HC] Hoby 171)

Of the more detailed analyses reported in the literature, the following observations are worth mentioning:

1 *Have* is used with mutatives when duration of the action is expressed or clearly implied, e.g. with an adverbial expressing time:

(140) Since when, my watch hath told me, toward my graue I *haue* *tranail'd* but
two houres (Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* V.i)

(141) I *haue* *gone* all night: 'Faith, Ile lye downe, and sleepe.
(Shakespeare *Cymbeline* IV.ii)

2 *Have* is the preferred auxiliary when a non-prepositional adverbial indicating distance, route, goal, etc. follows the mutative:

(142) that day the good old man *had* *come* three and twenty miles on foot.
([HC] Armin 42)

(143) we tooke the way to Biany, because Iohn Midnall *had* *gone* the way to Lahor
before. ([HC] Coverte 42)

But cf.:

(144) after I *was* *entr'd* the little Cove, it [= the raft] overset.
(Defoe *Robinson Crusoe* 65)

3 In conditional clauses and other hypothetical contexts (145), the result or state is probably more seldom focussed on than action; for this reason *have* is preferred. Conversely, *be* seems to be retained longer with the perfect (146) than with the pluperfect (147): to indicate present state as the result of past action is one of the typical uses of the perfect:

(145) if the king himself . . . *had* *come* ashore, there cou'd not have been greater
expectation by all the whole plantation. ([HC] Behn 186)

(146) it was scarce possible to know certainly whether our Hearts *are* *changed*,
unless it appeared in our lives. ([HC] Burnet *Life of Rochester* 147)

Cf.

(147) God and his holy angels knew that he *had* never *changed*, but that he had
gone among them on purpose to betray them.
([HC] Burnet *History* II 162)

The following instances taken from late seventeenth-century texts may further illustrate the variation between *be* and *have*:

- (148) My respects . . . to my brother and sister Johnson, whom I understand *are now returned*, and I hope in good health. ([HC] Strype 182)
- (149) I was glad to find . . . that he had so entirely overcome that ill habit of Swearing; Only that word of calling any ‘damned’, which *had returned* upon him, was not decent. ([HC] Burnet *Life of Rochester* 153)
- (150) it had quite lost its colour being burnt quite black, and though it *were grown* strangely brittle in comparison of Amber, . . . Yet this Caput mortuum was . . . ([HC] Boyle 25)
- (151) that shrub, many millions of times less in bulk then several trees (that *have* heretofore *grown* in England . . .). ([HC] Hooke 114)
- (152) I *am faln* into this Discourse by accident. ([HC] Walton 294)
- (153) shaking together all the filings that *had fallen* upon the sheet of Paper underneath. ([HC] Hooke 46)

In the eighteenth century *have* gains ground steadily at the expense of *be*, although even at the end of the century *be* is the more common auxiliary with intransitives. The final establishment of *have* as the auxiliary of the (plu)perfect takes place in the early nineteenth century.

The reasons for the loss of *be* are fairly easy to find. The functional load of *be* was heavy as this verb was not only used as the copula but also in the *be* + *-ing* structure and in the passive. It was particularly the last-mentioned function that easily caused ambiguity in expressions such as *was grown*, *was developed*, etc. (cf. Fischer *CHEL* II 4.3.3.2). It is worth noting that German, which does not form actional passives with *sein*, retains the *sein/haben* dichotomy in the (plu)perfect while standard Swedish, with passives formed with *vara* ‘be’, has *ha* ‘have’ as the sole (plu)perfect auxiliary. Many eighteenth-century grammarians regard *be* + past participle, which they, indeed, call the passive form, as less appropriate for indicating (plu)perfect.

One problem with the use of *be* as the auxiliary of the (plu)perfect is that it is temporally ambiguous – the verb form can refer to either past action or present state resulting from the action. To avoid this ambiguity, the form *have been* + past participle occurs in Middle and Modern English, probably to stress the resultative aspect (Rydén & Brorström 1987: 25):

- (154) he *has been come* over about ten days (Swift *Journal to Stella* II 625)

4.3.1.3 Passive: *be* versus *have* and *get*

From Old English on, the unmarked passive auxiliary has been *be*.¹⁹ In Early Modern English *have* and *get* came to be used to form a kind of passive in certain contexts (Moessner 1994):²⁰

- (155) If they *had* any parte of their liberties withdrawne
(1568 Grafton *Chron.* II 141 [OED s.v. *have* 18])
- (156) Another had one of his hands . . . burnt.
(Defoe *Robinson Crusoe* II 10 [OED s.v. *have* 18])
- (157) Insteade of mentioninge his name: Jo: fox the presbyterians *gott* his name
changed: & putt in George ffox ye quaker. ([HC] Fox 155)

The role of the subject is here more active than in *be*-passives and it is normally not the direct or indirect object of the corresponding active sentence. The expression is often causative. Moessner (1994) suggests that the *have*-passive was triggered by the subjectivisation of the indirect object (see 4.4.1.2 below). These two constructions have in common the topicalisation of the person-denoting noun phrase: the types *He was given a book* and *He had a book given to him*. Moessner points out that in the latter type there is no risk of even momentary ambiguity as to the semantic role of the subject; theoretically speaking, *be* in the former construction could be analysed either as the direct or the indirect object of the corresponding active clause until the post-verbal elements are heard or seen. (For the subject of the passive, see 4.4.1.2 below.)

4.3.1.4 Progressive: *be* + *-ing*

The combination of *be* and the present participle goes back to Old English, but its meaning then was not necessarily aspectual. The progressive proper develops in Middle English (for details of its development and various theories concerning its rise, see Fischer, *CHEL* II 4.3.3.1). It can be regarded as a grammaticalised aspectual indicator in the verbal system by 1700 (Strang 1982: 429). The set of progressive forms in all tenses, active and passive, is fully developed around the end of the eighteenth century.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the use of the progressive is still unsettled. In Shakespeare's plays, for instance, it is easy to find simple verb forms in contexts in which Present-Day English would use the progressive. Polonius asks, *What do you read, my Lord?* (*Hamlet* II.ii), while Achilles uses *What are you reading?* in *Troilus and Cressida* (III.iii).

As with so many syntactic developments, the seventeenth century is the crucial period in the development of the progressive. According to Elsness (1994), the number of instances found in the Helsinki Corpus texts dating from 1640–1710 is three times the number found in the texts from 1570–1640 (100 as against 33). Strang (1982: 430) has found few instances of the simple form in eighteenth-century texts in contexts where Present-

Day English would use the progressive, but Elsness points out that the frequency of the progressive is significantly lower in texts dating from 1750–1800 than in PDE. The first grammarian to call attention to this construction is Cooper (1685: 146–7).

Some earlier scholars (e.g. Jespersen *MEG* IV: 168–9) espouse the theory that *be* + *-ing* goes back to the combination of the preposition *on* > *a* + the verbal noun ending in *-ing* (*I am on reading* > *I am a-reading* > *I am reading*). The available evidence makes it more likely, however, that the verbal type without a preposition and the nominal type with one represent two separate constructions which lived side by side from Old English on. In the course of the Modern English period, the verbal type superseded the nominal one. In the seventeenth century the nominal type can be found even in formal and educated writing, but it becomes non-standard in the course of the eighteenth (Nehls 1974: 169–70). There are only half a dozen Helsinki Corpus instances of the nominal type dating from 1640–1710, all of them in fiction, private correspondence or comedies. Lowth (1775 [1979]: 65) gives the following comment on the participles preceded by *a*: ‘The phrases with *a* . . . are out of use in the solemn style; but still prevail in familiar discourse . . . there seems to be no reason, why they should be utterly rejected.’

The full form of the preposition *on* is much less common than the weakened *a* in Early Modern English. Also other prepositions are possible; instances with *upon* can be found as late as the eighteenth century (159):

- (158) the Milke-mayd whilst she *is in milking* shal do nothing rashly.
([HC] Markham 108)
- (159) I was just *upon sinking* into the ground. I was just *upon resolving* to defy all the censures of the world. (Richardson [Cited in Åkerlund 1936/37: 5])

In Early Modern English the most common progressive tense forms are the present and the past, but this construction can also be found in other tenses, with modal auxiliaries and in non-finite constructions (160)–(164). The (plu)perfect progressive was ‘a well-established and not infrequently used idiom’ as early as the fifteenth century (Visser §2148); non-finite forms, too, are attested in Middle English.

- (160) For often hee *hath bene tempering* [= interfering improperly] with me.
([HC] Harman 70)
- (161) This is a Creature . . . so impudent, that it *will be intruding itself* in every ones company.
([HC] Hooke 21)
- (162) boeth the ploughes *muste styll be doynge*, as mooste necessarrye for man.
([HC] Latimer 26)

- (163) . . . which shoulde bee on the Inquest to trie the Partie arreygned, guiltie or not guiltie, and nothing *to be bewraying* of the Offence by another Man's act. ([HC] Throckmorton 73 Ci)

- (164) *Let's be going* with all my heart. ([HC] Walton 212)

In Middle and Early Modern English the active progressive was used to express the passive (*The house is building* 'being built'). There is, in fact, little risk of confusion between the active and passive meaning (the transitive or the intransitive use), as the subject is normally animate in the former case and inanimate in the latter:

- (165) nothing understanding of the bancquet that *was preparing* for him after supper. ([HC] Harman 72)

- (166) Your gowne and things *are a making*, but will not be done against whittsunday. ([HC] Knyvett 57)

The simple passive, *the house is built*, is also common in these contexts. The passive form of the progressive (*The house is being built*) only emerges at the end of the period; the earliest unambiguous instances date from around 1800.

Visser's (§2158) suggestion that this new construction first appears in the spoken idiom of educated people ('in familiar or unceremonious conversation with their intimate friends and the members of their family') is not in accordance with the observation that passives in general are more common in neutral or formal written styles than in speech. It is, however, supported by early nineteenth century textual evidence (Denison 1993b; cf. also Åkerlund 1913/14: 335–6).

The use of the active progressive for the passive is commented on either neutrally or condemningly by eighteenth-century grammarians. They are, however, favourably disposed towards the construction which is disambiguated by *on/a* from the structure with active meaning. Dr Johnson writes (1755[1997]:8), 'The grammar is now printing, brass is forging . . . This is, in my opinion, a vitious expression, probably corrupted from a phrase more pure, but now somewhat obsolete: The book is a printing, The brass is a forging.'

The construction *being* + *-ing* occurs from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century (Denison 1985c):

- (167) any Land . . . lyeng and *being adjoining* to the forsaide Streates. ([HC] Statutes III 910)

- (168) I know not whether stale Newes may offend his eares *being so long a drawing* towards him. ([HC] Gawdy 26)

4.3.2 *Time sphere and tense forms*

One possible way to discuss tense forms is in relation to the concept of deixis. In a speech situation, the speaker is the ‘centre’; the other persons or objects, as well as space and time relations, are defined from his point of view (see e.g. Lass 1987: 156–8). The most important deictics are personal pronouns, temporal and local adverbs (*here/there, now/then*) and the tense forms indicating present (proximal ‘now’), or past or future (distal ‘then’). To illustrate the types and extent of variation in the use of the tense forms, the present discussion is not organised in terms of the various forms but by the concepts of present, past and future time.

Each time sphere and relation is typically indicated by a certain tense form, but other forms can be used in special contexts. The ‘typical’ form will be called ‘unmarked’ in the following discussion; the less typical are referred to as ‘marked’. Table 1 gives a rough outline of the distribution of the tense forms in Early Modern English. In this table, the ‘modal preterite’ or ‘modal pluperfect’ (4.3.3.2) have not been taken into account.

Table 1. *Main uses of tense forms in Early Modern English*

Time	Tense	
	Unmarked	Marked
Unspecified	present	preterite perfect future
Present	present	
Past	preterite	present perfect
Past linked with present	perfect	present preterite
Past preceding past (‘prepast’)	pluperfect	preterite
Future	future	present
Future preceding future	future perfect	perfect

4.3.2.1 Unspecified or present time

As indicated in Table 1, the unmarked tense to indicate action²¹ taking place at the moment of speaking, or including the moment of speaking, is the present. This form is also normally used to denote action unspecified in time, as in general truths, or habitual or repeated action:

- (169) Aetius *writeth* that the causes of the stone *are* continuall crudities or rawnesse, or vndigested humors wherof *is gathered* together great plenty of vndigested and raw matter, when a burning *riseth* about the kidneys and bladder, which *burneth* them and *maketh* them go together in one, and *maketh* therof an hard stone. ([HC] Turner B7r–B7v)

Preterite tense is less natural in generalising statements:

- (170) somewhat it was *alway* that the cat *wynked* whan her eye *was* out.
(More *Complete Works* 331)

It seems that instances of the type that Visser (§2009) calls the ‘perfect of experience’ and describes as a ‘stylistic peculiarity’ are closely related to expressions of general truth. In the following instances *some* and *many* in the subject NP suggest generalisation; the perfect implies that the cause and effect relationship observed in the past still pertains at the present moment:

- (171) Some man *hath shined* in eloquence, but ignorance of naturall thinges *hath dishonested* him. Some man *hath flowred* in the knowlage of diuers straunge languages, but he *hath wanted* all the cognicion of philosophie. Some man . . .
(More *Picus* [1557] 5 E4)
- (172) Many an Infant *has been plac’d* in a Cottage with obscure Parents, ’till by chance some ancient Servant of the Family *has known* it by its Marks.
(Steele *Tender Husband* II.i)

The perfect *have got*, which is almost a rule, instead of the present tense *have*, in colloquial present-day British English, is attested from the end of the sixteenth century. The periphrastic form here is possibly due to a tendency to increase the weight of the verbal group, particularly in sentence-final position. The association of *have* with the auxiliaries may have supported the development of the two-verb structure.

- (173) Some *have got* twenty four pieces of ivory cut in the shape of dice, . . . and with these they have played at vacant hours with a childe ([HC] Hoole 7)
- (174) *Bon.* What will your Worship please to have for Supper?
Aim. What *have you got*?
Bon. Sir, we *have* a delicate piece of Beef in the Pot . . .
Aim. *Have you got* any fish or Wildfowl? ([HC] Farquhar I.i)

As in Present-Day English, the *shall/will* + inf. construction is occasionally used in contexts with unspecified time (cf. Traugott 1972: 52):²²

- (175) He that is inclining to a burning feuer *shall dreame* of frayes, lightning and thunder . . . He that is spiced wyth the gowte or the dropsie, frequently *dreameth* of fetters and manacles
(Nashe *Terrors of the Night* 369)

- (176) In deed it is a most true saying: That fish which is bred in the durt *will alwaies taste* of the Mud. (IHC] Clowes 16)

Notice the variation between *shall dreame* and *dreameth* in (175) above. The establishment of the grammatical category ‘auxiliary’, which dramatically increases the frequency of two-verb combinations in Early Modern English, probably favoured the auxiliary + infinitive group even when this combination had no obvious temporal or modal function.

The simple present is fairly often used in contexts in which the progressive would normally be used today:

- (177) *Pol.* What doe you reade my Lord.
Ham. Words, words, words. (Shakespeare *Hamlet* II.ii)
- (178) Am I a Lord, . . . Or *do I dream?* or haue I dream'd till now? I *do not sleep*:
 I see, I heare, I speake (Shakespeare *Taming of the Shrew* I.ii)
- (179) *Jul.* You *jest*, Lydia! (Sheridan *Rivals* I.ii)

See also the discussion of the use of the progressive in 4.3.1.4.

The present progressive is often used when the action forms a frame around another, shorter action (180), but this kind of ‘framing action’ is not a necessary prerequisite for the use of the progressive. On the contrary, instances without an expressed frame (181) are in the majority:

- (180) as you *are fishing*, chaw a little white or brown bread in your mouth, and cast it into the pond (IHC] Walton 298)
- (181) Here's the Ring ready, I *am beholding* vnto your Fathers hast, h'as kept his howre (IHC] Middleton 28)

The progressive can also indicate habitual or iterative action, with the adverbs *always*, *ever*, *continually*, etc. The subjective/emotive force of the progressive has to be taken into account as a possible factor causing its use in contexts exemplified by (182)–(185).

- (182) The very little ones . . . would require a whole man, of themselves, *to bee alwaies hearing, poasing & following* them. (IHC] Brinsley 13)
- (183) For better fall once then *be ever falling*. (Webster *Duchess of Malfi* V.i)
- (184) She *is* always *seeing* Apparitions, and hearing Death-Watches (Addison *Spectator* no. 7: I 34)

The present progressive is uncommon with verbs indicating state; it may emphasise the temporary character of the state, or call the attention to the more actional features of the verb:

- (185) whiche at the time of Araignment of the Parties so accused (if they *be then living*) shall be brought in Person before the said Partie accused.
([HC] Throckmorton 68 Cii)

With *be* and *have*, the progressive seems to be established only at the end of the eighteenth century, although Visser (§§1834, 1841) quotes isolated instances from the late fifteenth.

4.3.2.2 Future time

In Early Modern English the unmarked construction for referring to future action is the periphrasis formed with the auxiliaries *shall/will*. Its development has been discussed in 4.3.1.1. above. For examples, see (130)–(135) above.

As in Middle English and Present-Day English, the simple present may be used to indicate future time, e.g., in conditional clauses (186) and (187), in threats or in expressions implying certainty (186), in schedules or timetables, or when the meaning of the verb or the presence of an adverb or some other element in the sentence clearly implies futurity (187):

- (186) If you *go* out in your owne semblance, *you die* Sir Iohn, vnlesse you go out disguis'd.
(Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* IV.ii)
- (187) if you *please* to be at my House on Thursday next. I *make* a Ball for my Daughter, and you *shall see* her Dance (Steele *Spectator* no. 466. IV 148)

Notice the variation in tense form between *make* and *shall see* in (187). Bullokar (1586 [1980]: 26) gives the following example of the use of the present in these contexts:

- (188) as I *ride* ten days hence, and my man *cometh* after me.

As in Present-Day English, the present is also used in adverbial clauses and in nominal clauses where the context implies futurity:

- (189) We shall find the Charms of our Retirement doubled, when we *return* to it.
([HC] Vanbrugh II.i)
- (190) I left them in health and hope they *do so continue*. ([HC] Deloney 83)

This variation implies that the grammaticalisation of the periphrastic future was not quite completed in Early Modern English. Even in Present-Day English the simple form of the verb can be used in certain contexts with future reference.

Both the present progressive (191), (192), and the construction

shall/will + be + -ing (193) can refer to future time in Early Modern English. The last-mentioned type is relatively uncommon in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The present progressive mainly occurs with verbs of motion, when the action is ‘planned’ or ‘arranged’ in advance (Visser §1830).

- (191) To-morrow . . . Don Alphonso With other Gentlemen of good esteeme,
Are iourning to salute the Emperor
 (Shakespeare *Two Gentlemen of Verona* I.iii)
- (192) Tell my Brother Bradenham I have given them to Mr. Sam. Hawkes, who
is comeing with them. ([HC] R. Haddock Sr. 15)
- (193) But if we will in good earnest apply our selves to the practice of Religion,
 . . . his Grace *will never be wanting* to us. ([HC] Tillotson 452)

In this period, other means of expressing futurity develop, such as the constructions *I am to* and *I'm going to*; it seems that the implications of obligation or intention are present even in early instances. The roots of these phrases can be traced back to Middle English and they become fairly common by the end of the seventeenth century:

- (194) . . . hir Hyghnesse hath not onely Power ouer hys Bodye, Lands, and
 Goodes, but ouer his Lyfe also.
Stanford. Yea, the Exceptions *are to be taken* agaynste the Jury in that case.
 ([HC] Throckmorton 69 Ci)
- (195) he plays about his room, and to morrow *is to take* phisick.
 ([HC] Anne Hatton 211)
- (196) *Walt*. How now, I aske?
All. I *am going to bid* Gossips for your Worships child Sir.
 ([HC] Middleton 19)
- (197) Sir John Walter *is going to be married* to my Lady Stoel.
 ([HC] Anne Hatton 214)

Simple *go to* is also attested:

- (198) nay, he *goes to prove* the truth of Sanchoniathons History by the agreement
 of it with that of Moses. (Stillingfleet *Origines sacrae* 1 2 §2 27)

Be about to seems to have a particular aspectual implication even in its earliest occurrences. The instances quoted below refer to planned action:

- (199) For lyke as a workeman conceyuing in his mynde the forme or fashyon
 of the thyng that *he is about to make*, moueth . . . euen so certayne god
 . . . disposeth ([HC] Boethius Colville 106)

- (200) But in the meane tyme, whill I *am about to come*, another steppeth doune before me. ([HC] Tyndale John 5 7; King James Bible: *am coming*)

Action which precedes a certain moment in the future is expressed either by the perfect (201) or by the future perfect:

- (201) I will track you out before I *have done*. ([HC] Raleigh 208 Ci)
 (202) But it will be starke nyght before I *shall haue done*. ([HC] Udall I.iii)
 (203) he *will have been* 5 weekes there next Wednesday or Thursday noone. ([HC] H. Oxinden 281)

Cooper (1685: 142) gives both constructions side by side, pointing out that *shall* is sometimes omitted (*aliquando omittitur*).

4.3.2.3 Past time

The unmarked tense referring to past events, states or action is the preterite. Its uses are roughly the same as in Present-Day English, although it can be found in contexts in which either the perfect or pluperfect is preferred today. The main function of simple preterite tense forms is to express an action completed in the past, often in narrative contexts (cf. Fischer *CHEL* II: 4.3.2.1).

Preterite and perfect tense forms vary when the clause contains an adverbial connecting the time of the action with the time of speaking:

- (204) Sirs, quod she, I *sawe* no man entre into this house *this nyght*. ([HC] Berners *Froissart* III 320)
 (205) I *saw* the man *today*: his names Parrolles. (Shakespeare *All's Well that Ends Well* V.iii)
 (206) *Oates*. Were you at the five Jesuits' Trial?
 Mr. *Stanley*. No, I *was not* in London since, till the last Term. ([HC] Oates 82 Cii)

Examples with perfect follow:

- (207) instead of one half-penny Loaf, you *have eaten* two; and instead of one pint of Ale, you *have had* a quart, and all this you *have had* today already. ([HC] Penny Merriments 267)
 (208) Worthy Menenius Agrippa, one that *bath* always *loved* the people. (Shakespeare *Coriolanus* I.i)

Rainer's (1989) study, based on late Middle and Early Modern English letters, suggests that the distribution between the present, preterite and perfect tense had developed by the fifteenth century, although the system

of tense forms was probably not established until the end of the seventeenth.

Some scholars (e.g. Curme 1931: 360) suggest that the use of the preterite in these contexts is a marker of a lively tone; if this is true, the effect must be due to the focussing on the quality of the action instead of its duration. It has also been pointed out (Vanneck 1955; see also Visser §806) that this ‘colloquial preterite’ is common in American English. More semantic and (con)textual study is, however, necessary on this topic.

When the sentence is negative or, in more general terms, non-assertive, there is probably less need to indicate the connection of the action with the time of speaking. This, together with increased emphasis, may explain the use, common even today, of the preterite with *never* and *ever* (cf. Jespersen *MEG*: IV 5.1.6):

(209) the fayerst groundes that *ever I saw* in my lyff. ([HC] Torkington 63)

(210) London *was neuer* so yll as it is now. ([HC] Latimer 23)

The perfect is less common than the preterite in these contexts:

(211) Gogs woundes, Tyb, my gammer *has neuer lost* her Neele?
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* 9)

(212) Other baits there be, but these . . . will do it better than any that I *have ever practised*.
([HC] Walton 298)

Unlike in present-day British English, the perfect can be used with an adverbial of time linking the action with the past:

(213) which I *have forgot* to set down in my journal *yesterday*
([HC] Pepys 11 April 1669)

The preterite can also be used with reference to action which takes place in the ‘prepast’ or ‘before past’, i.e. before the time in which another past action happened. In Middle English, the preterite predominates in these contexts, while in Present-Day English the pluperfect is used. In Early Modern English both are common. The choice between the two may be determined by subtle aspectual and stylistic factors:

(214) Also, Ser, on the Frydday after ze [= ye] *departyd* come John Sayville.
([HC] E. Beaumont 3)

(215) After the Prince *got* to the keepers lodge / And *had been* iocand in the house a while: / . . . straight he fell into his passions.
(Greene *Frier Bacon* 1)

Note the variation of preterite and pluperfect in (215).

As the use of the progressive forms in all tenses only developed in Early Modern English, the simple preterite varies with the preterite progressive:

- (216) So happid it on a tyme, that his wife and he together *dynid* or *souppid* with that neybour of theirs, And than she made a mery quarell to hym, for making her husband . . . (More *Dialogue against Tribulation* 81)
- (217) they herd the voyce of the Lorde God as he *walked* in the garden ([HC] Tyndale Genesis 3.8; King James Bible: *God, walking* . . .)

The progressive:

- (218) it happenyd onis that as my wyfe *was making* a chese vppon a fryday I . . . toke a lytyll of the whey ([HC] *Merry Tales* 28)

In Early Modern English, as in Present-Day English, present tense forms are occasionally used instead of perfect forms with reference to an action or state which has its beginning in the past but continues up to the present moment.

- (219) He that *cometh* lately out of France, wil talke Frenche English, & neuer blushe at the matter. (1553 Wilson *The Arte of Rhetorique* Fo. 86 [quoted in Görlach 1991: 220])
- (220) I *evade* of late all violent exercises. (Sterne 211)

The historical present, i.e. the use of present-tense forms in the narration of past events, is first evidenced in Middle English (see Fischer *CHEL* II 4.3.2.1 for a discussion of the theories of the rise of this use). Fischer criticises Visser's view that the historical (Visser's 'substitutive')²³ present was merely a metrical device in poetry with no other function attached to it. She points out that many of the verbs found in the historical present are inherently imperfective and suggests that this use of the present may have had an aspectual function which was later taken over by the progressive form. It might be related to the use of the present denoting an action which began in the past but still continues at the moment of speaking, see (219) and (220).

In Early Modern English, it is difficult to find evidence of the aspectual use of the historical present, but there is no shortage of instances of what Visser (§779) calls the vividly reporting present, used 'as a means to represent in a vivid way the suddenness, unexpectedness, importance or oddness of an incident witnessed in the past':

- (221) *Len.* Sent he to Macduffe?
Lord. He did: and with an absolute Sir, not I,
The cloudy Messenger *turnes* me his backe,
And *hums*; (Shakespeare *Macbeth* III.vi)

- (222) He did leere so on me . . . When suddainly He *cuts* me a backe caper with his heeles, And *takes* me iust o' the croupper. Downe *come* I . . .
(Jonson *New Inn* III.i)
- (223) Mark me, Sir Lucius, I *fall* as deep as need be in love with a young lady – her friends *take* my part – I *follow* her to Bath – *send* word of my arrival; and *receive* answer, that the lady *is* to be otherwise disposed of.
(Sheridan *The Rivals* III.iv)

Note the use of other markers of vivid narration, such as the ethical dative *me* in (221) and (222); cf. Section 4.4.2.2 below.

In indirect speech, in narrative text, the subordinate clause containing the reported utterance has its verb in the preterite if the corresponding direct utterance would have the present; the pluperfect in indirect speech corresponds to the preterite in direct speech (sequence of tenses). This arrangement is fairly consistently followed in Early Modern English although there is variation:

- (224) so they said that these matters *bee* Kynges games.
([HC] More *Richard III* 81)
- (225) whan the bushope came home, one of hys spyallyes [= spies] tolde hyme, that he *sawe* me stand yn Chepsyede whan the quene ryd [= rode] throwe the sytye [= city].
([HC] Mowntayne 210)

4.3.3 *The subjunctive*

The English verb can formally distinguish three ‘moods’: indicative, subjunctive and imperative. There are, however, only a few forms which effect the distinction between the indicative and the non-indicative. This section deals with the subjunctive; the imperative will be discussed under directives, section 4.5.4 below.

In the following discussion, ‘subjunctive forms’ refer to verb forms distinguishable from the indicative in the grammatical context in which they occur, e.g. the 3rd pers. sing. pres. without the endings *s/th*.²⁴ The choice of these forms is regulated by certain modal characteristics of verbal action, such as unreality, wish, etc. In the earliest periods of English, the subjunctive was used even in factual statements in some contexts, particularly in certain types of subordinate clauses.

From Old English on, there have been alternative ways to express modality (for a useful summary, see Görlach 1991: 112). Besides the subjunctive, various (pre)modal auxiliaries are the most important. In this section, examples will be given of the variation between subjunctive forms

and auxiliary periphrasis. The discussion concentrates mainly on the use of the subjunctive in main clauses; for the use in various types of subordinate clauses, see the sections of 4.6.2 below.

Owing to the loss of inflexional endings, in Early Modern English distinctive subjunctive forms are restricted to the verb *be* and to the second and third person singular of non-auxiliary verbs (*thou lovest/love; he loves (loveth)/love; thou lovedst/loved*). Also, preterite forms referring to present or future time or to action neutral with respect to time can be regarded as markers of mood (the modal preterite of the type 'If he sold his apartment, he would get a nice sum of money'; cf. 'When he sells his apartment, he will get a nice sum of money'). The same is true of the use of the pluperfect in contexts in which preterite would be used in modally unmarked contexts ('If he had sold his apartment last year, he would have got a nice sum of money'; cf. 'When he sold his apartment last year, he got a nice sum of money'). In these instances, the first alternative indicates uncertain or unfulfilled hypothesis.

The loss of distinctive endings was probably the main reason for the replacement of the subjunctive forms by auxiliary periphrasis. This development was supported by the general trend towards analytic constructions in Middle English. As is well known, the subjunctive forms are still current, for instance, in wishes, hypothetical conditional clauses and even in other contexts, both in main and in subordinate clauses, particularly in formal language.

Judging by textual evidence, it would seem that the use of subjunctive forms might even have increased in the course of the eighteenth century. Strang (1970: 209) attributes this tendency to hypercorrection; it may be more accurate to say that the eighteenth-century grammarians' favourable attitude to the morphological distinction between subjunctive and indicative forms enhances the use of the subjunctive particularly in formal style. It is possible, too, that this increase is only apparent, an impression given by a larger number and greater variety of texts available.

4.3.3.1 Present subjunctive

As in Present-Day English, the present subjunctive expresses a realisable wish (optative subjunctive) or exhortation (hortative or mandative).²⁵ In Early Modern English the optative subjunctive is largely restricted to formulaic contexts, such as *God forgive him, Lord help our understandings, Heaven grant, God save, long live*, etc. But also in less formulaic wishes:

(226) For (sayeth he) curssed *be* he that kepeth backe hys sworde frome shed-dynge of bloud. ([HC] Latimer 21)

(227) Come on, (poore Babe): Some powerful Spirit *instruct* the Kites and Rauens To be thy Nurses! (Shakespeare *Winter's Tale* II.iii)

The hortative or mandative subjunctive is less stereotyped:

(228) Who hateth him and honors not his Father . . . *Shake* he his weapon at vs, and *pass* by. (Shakespeare *2Henry VI* IV.vii)

The optative subjunctive is often replaced by a periphrasis with *may* and the hortative subjunctive with *let*:

(229) 'A god *rewarde* you,' quoth this roge; 'and in heauen *may* you *finde* it.' ([HC] Harman 39)

(230) *Let* him *love* his wife even as himself: That's his Duty. ([HC] Jeremy Taylor 24)

Note the variation between the subjunctive *rewarde* and the periphrastic *may* . . . *finde* in (229).

Of these two periphrases, the one replacing hortative subjunctive seems to develop more rapidly: in Marlowe, at the end of the sixteenth century, the hortative periphrasis clearly outnumbers the subjunctive, particularly in the 1st pers. pl. (Ando 1976: 8.2.8; 6.3.13.2), while the optative periphrasis is less common than the subjunctive.

4.3.3.2 Preterite and pluperfect subjunctive

The term 'preterite subjunctive' here refers to preterite forms of the verb used in non-past contexts and thus calling attention to the modality of the action. The term 'modal preterite' is often used for these. 'Pluperfect subjunctive' refers to the pluperfect in contexts of past time sphere in which the preterite would be used in modally unmarked cases (see above).

The form *were* (and *had* in some phrases) seems to resist best the replacement by auxiliary periphrasis; in Dryden's writings, for instance, no other non-auxiliary verb occurs in preterite subjunctive in the main clauses of conditional sentences (Söderlind 1951: 180).

In clauses indicating wish, preterite or pluperfect subjunctive can mainly be found in exclamations which are actually subordinated, with *I wish* . . ., etc. understood:

(231) Ah *had* some bloudlesse furie *rose* (= risen) from hell . . . When I was forst to leavue my Gaveston (Marlowe *Edward III* I.iv)

- (232) O that I *knew* where I might find him (Addison *Spectator* no. 565: IV 532)

Were and *had* with a personal subject occur with *as good/lief* or *better/best*:

- (233) let her be what she will . . . but if shee come any more in my house, shee
were as good no. ([HC] Deloney 73)

- (234) I *were* better to bee married of him then of another.
(Shakespeare *As You Like It* III.iii)

- (235) Doutfull in her mynde what she *were best* to do. ([HC] Fisher 292)

With *have*:

- (236) I *had as lieue* Helens golden tongue had commended Troylus for a copper
nose. (Shakespeare *Troilus and Cressida* I.ii)

- (237) Indeed the witch at last *had better* haue wrought hard. ([HC] Gifford EI V)

- (238) If you follow this advice, you *had best* wrap some broad leaves . . . about
the stock. ([HC] Langford 38)

The preterite or pluperfect subjunctive is fairly common in the apodosis, i.e. the main clause in a conditional sentence. As late as the eighteenth century, Elphinston (1765: II 87) accepts this use.

- (239) I *were* a verie vnworthye man to hold that place . . . if I were to be touched
in that sorte. ([HC] Essex 16)

- (240) If diccon had not playd the knaue, this *had ben* sone amend
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* V.ii)

Also in other contexts:

- (241) *Leonato* . . . she mocks all her wooers out of sute.
Don Pedro She *were* an excellent wife for Benedick.
(Shakespeare *Much Ado about Nothing* II.i)

- (242) Faire Abigall the rich Jewes daughter Become a Nun? . . .
Tut, she *were* fitter for a tale of loue Then to be tired out with Orizons.
(Marlowe *The Jew of Malta* 611)

The periphrasis with *should/would* is, however, more common than the preterite or pluperfect subjunctive (see 4.3.4.2 below). Note the variation in the following sentence:

- (243) Gladly *she wolde haue sene* the duke . . . to haue attaygned to the crowne of
Fraunce / she *had nat cared* howe (Berners *Froissart* II 270)

The pluperfect subjunctive seems to resist replacement by *should/would* periphrasis in the apodosis longer than the preterite subjunctive (cf. Söderlind

1951: 109 for the figures in Dryden's writings). This is natural as the pluperfect as such contains an auxiliary, and the development of a three-element verbal group was slower than that of the two-verb *should/would* + infinitive construction. Also, the pluperfect subjunctive (*had* + past participle) offers a rhythmic parallel to the modal preterite constructions of auxiliaries (*should/would/could/might* + infinitive).

The use of the pluperfect subjunctive in the apodosis is particularly common when the protasis (the subordinate conditional clause) has inverted word order instead of the *if*-link; this can be explained by the symmetry of the two verbal groups:

(244) *Had not* such a peece of Flesh *been* ordayned, what *had* vs Wiues *been* good for?
([HC] Middleton 1)

(245) *Had I been* in your place, my Tongue, I fancy, *had been* curious too;
([HC] Vanbrugh II.i)

4.3.4 *Modal auxiliaries*

As early as Old English, a group of verbs signalling modal characteristics of action share morphosyntactic and semantic features which later result in the formation of the category of modal auxiliaries. The modal meaning of these verbs can be roughly divided into two types: they indicate either 'some kind of human control over events' ('permission', 'obligation', 'volition'), or 'human judgement of what is or is not likely to happen' ('possibility', 'necessity', 'prediction'). The former 'root' meaning is often called intrinsic or deontic, the latter extrinsic or epistemic (there is some variation in the terminology). For introductory discussion of the character and classification of the modals see e.g. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 4.49–4.51); Lass (1987: 165–9).

The 'central' modal auxiliaries are *can/could*, *may/might*, *(mot)/must*, *shall/should* and *will/would*. The most important syntactic developments which distinguish them from other verbs are the following: (1) they lost their non-finite forms and their ability to take non-verbal objects; (2) the preterite forms came to be used in present, future or timeless contexts; (3) they did not develop the *to*-link with an infinitive (in the Southern standard); (4) they became more and more uncommon in contexts where they were not followed by an infinitive.

Lightfoot's (1979) theory that the category of modal auxiliaries emerged suddenly in the Early Modern English period has been questioned by later scholars, most thoroughly by Plank (1984; see also Fischer & van der Leek

1981, Warner 1983, 1990, Goossens 1984). The development was gradual and the modal auxiliaries differed, to a certain extent, from other types of verbs as early as Old English. Furthermore, the development is due to semantic factors as well: the (pre)modals lost their notional meanings and gradually developed modal meanings. The syntactic and semantic changes resulting in the auxiliary category did not necessarily coincide chronologically, but the development culminated and came to a conclusion in Early Modern English.

In addition to the central ones, some verbs have been defined as ‘marginal’ modal auxiliaries: *dare/durst*, *need*, *ought (to)*, and *used (to)*. In Old and Middle English the syntactic use of *dare* was similar to that of the central modals, but semantically it differs from them. Perhaps because of this, it came to be used with *to* + inf. in the sixteenth century. The new preterite *dared* (246) appears roughly at the same time, but the construction without *to* and the preterite *durst* (247) are by far the more common types in Early Modern English.

(246) She *darde to brooke* Neptunus haughty pride.

(Greene *Frier Bacon* [OED s.v. *dare* v1, A4])

(247) Turn this way, Villains; I *durst engage* an Army in such a Cause.

([HC] Farquhar V.iii)

Need and the preterite form *ought* develop characteristics of modal auxiliaries in late Middle and Early Modern English. After *need* the infinitive without *to* becomes common in the seventeenth century; with *ought*, the infinitive with *to* remains more popular, although there is variation. *Need* is mostly used without the 3rd pers. pres. sing. ending (most often impersonally or in negative contexts, 248), and *ought* loses its reference to past time sphere (249):

(248) she is a Papist, she *need not trouble* her head to answer it.

([HC] Oates 83 Ci)

(249) And other dispisethe more then they *oughte*, the thyng that they cannot suffer.

([HC] Boethius Colville 110)

4.3.4.1 Non-auxiliary features of the modals

That the modal auxiliaries were originally full verbs can be seen in certain ‘non-auxiliary’ features in their use as late as Early Modern English. (Constructions of this type occur in non-standard varieties of English even today.) The modals can be used in non-finite forms and without a

following infinitive, although these uses are restricted both syntactically and collocationally. The use without an infinitive, excluding post-auxiliary ellipsis, is common only in (concrete or metaphorical) expressions of motion:

- (250) Sister farewell, I *must* to Couentry (Shakespeare *Richard III* I.ii)
 (251) *I will* againe to my sewyng now. ([HC] Udall I.iii)
 (252) This good mans goodnes . . . *shall* neuer out of my remembrance
 ([HC] Ascham 280)

This use wanes in the seventeenth century but can occasionally be found even today, in archaising contexts.

The establishment of the auxiliary uses of *can* and *will* also means a differentiation between these auxiliaries and the corresponding full verbs *con/cun* and *will* (*willed*). The full verb uses were probably supported by the existence of the weak verbs which go back to OE *cunnian* ‘learn to know, inquire into, explore’, and *willian*, *wilnan* ‘wish, desire, direct by one’s will’:

- (253) Tunes, Measures . . . als’ hee *kons*. (Sylvester *Du Bartas* [OED s.v. *con* v1])
 (254) The lord Straung confessid how the duke *willed* him to sturre me to mary his third daughter the lady Jane, and *willed* him to be his spie in al mat-tiere. ([HC] Edward 361)

Examples of *can* and *will* with a (pro)nominal object can be found even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while the latest instances of *may* are recorded from the end of the sixteenth. It seems, however, that only *will* is common in this use: amongst the approximately fourteen hundred instances of *can/could* in the Helsinki Corpus there are only a handful with a (pro)nominal object, all in sixteenth-century texts. Although Visser (§551) quotes a number of later instances, this use of *can* is probably archaic even in Early Modern English.

- (255) as he was an honest man & one that *could* his good. ([HC] More *Richard III* 55)
 (256) *M. Mumbl.* Nay I can not tel sir, but what thing *would* you. ([HC] Udall I.iii)
 (257) If it had beene the pleasure of him who *may* all things.
 (1597 Morley *Introduction to Musicke* 2 [OED s.v. *may* v1 9c])

Will is often used in negations (258) and it has a clausal object in the majority of the later instances (259). This kind of restriction in syntactic environment is typical of constructions which are becoming obsolete:

(258) *I'll* none of that. (Dryden *All for Love* V.i)

(259) whether ye *wold*, that your owne son, should cum to wisdom and hap-
pines. ([HC] Ascham 214)

As the category of modal auxiliaries was not yet fully established, the ellipsis of the main verb (gapping) is more flexible than today (Plank 1984: 334). The verb can be left out even when a non-verbal object follows, as in

(260) She has deceiu'd her father, and *may thee*. (Shakespeare *Othello* I.iii)

(261) You shall ha' some will swallow A melting heire, as glibly, as your Dutch
Will pills of butter. (Jonson *Volpone* I.1)

Also, the ellipsis of *be* after a modal is freer than now:

(262) He is not yet executed, nor I hear not when he *shall*
(1615 J. Chamberlain in *Crt. & Times Jas. I* 362 [OED s.v. *shall* 24])

The use of an auxiliary as the second in a group of three verbs becomes obsolete in Early Modern English, except in Scottish English and some American varieties.²⁶ The latest instances quoted in the *OED* come from the sixteenth century:

(263) before my letters *shall may come* unto your grace's hands
(1532 Cranmer *Misc. Writings* 2 233 [OED s.v. *may* A1])

(264) Thenne he *bad nat mow say* one only word
(1500 *Melusine* 27 [OED s.v. *may* A6])

Note also the use of the auxiliary in the position of a past participle:

(265) You *haue mought* oftentimes, & yet maie desceyue me
(More *Picus* [1557] 7 G3)

(266) He might wel escaped [sic!], if he *bad wolde* (Berners *Froissart* II 402)

Furthermore, the occasional use of the *-ing* form shows that the modal auxiliary category is not yet quite established at the beginning of the Modern period:

(267) *Maeyinge* suffer no more the loue & deathe of Aurelio.
(1556 *Aurelio & Isab.* [OED s.v. *may* A5])

The development of the modal auxiliaries as a category with special syntactic features increased the use of periphrastic modal expressions such as *have to* and *be able to* in contexts in which non-finite forms of modal verbs were needed. These constructions did not, however, emerge only to fill the

systemic gaps which were left by modal auxiliaries; they can be traced back to Old or Middle English.

- (268) werke every webbe of wollen yerne whiche he *shall have to walke* fulle
thikke (HC] *Statutes* III 28)
- (269) I would have neither of you *to have to doe* with her at all. (HC] J. Pinney 58)
- (270) That Schollers be taught to do all things with understanding; and *to be able*
to give a reason of every matter which they learne. (HC] Brinsley 41)

4.3.4.2 Modal preterite

One of the characteristics of the modal auxiliaries is the development of the purely modal, non-past use of the preterite forms *would*, *should*, *might*, *could* and *must*. The weakening of the notional meanings of these verbs (volition, obligation, ability, etc.), and the consequent focussing on their non-factual implication probably enhanced this development, which began in Old English and is of course related to the modal non-past use of the preterite forms of all verbs.

In Early Modern English, there are instances of the use of the preterite forms of the modals in past time sphere in factual contexts, although they are giving way to periphrastic expressions such as *had to*, *wanted/wished to*, *was/were going to*, etc.:

- (271) he follow'd Horace so very close, that of necessity he *must* fall with him
(Dryden *Poems: Essay on Satire* 2.661)
- (272) when hee sported in the fragrant lawnes, Gote-footed Satyrs and vpstar-
ing Fawnes *Would steale* him thence (Marlowe *Hero and Leander* 2.201)

The use of the modal preterite *should/would* with reference to present or future time or in timeless contexts develops in Old English, as a variant of subjunctive forms. This use is grammaticalised in Early Modern English, although as late as the seventeenth century, Wallis (1653 [1972]: 340–1) suggests that *would* implies intention or inclination, while *should* simply indicates futurity.

Should, in all persons, occurs in contexts indicating possibility based on outward circumstances (epistemic possibility):

- (273) So *should* a murtherer *looke*, so dead, so grimme.
(Shakespeare *A Midsummer Night's Dream* III.ii)

According to Visser (§1533), the polite or diffident use of *should*, mostly with a first-person subject, is recorded from the mid-seventeenth century

on; *would* in similar contexts occurs as early as Middle English (Visser §1605):

- (274) I *should be* glad to see you at my house
(1675 Wycherley *Country Wife* I.i 253 [Visser §1533])
- (275) I *woulde* wene . . . he may lawfullye . . . take her out of S. Peters church
by the arme. ([HC] More *Richard III* 33)

The auxiliary originally indicates volition in *will/would rather*, recorded from Old English on and common in Early Modern English. Its variation with the later *should/had/d rather* from the fifteenth century onwards shows that it rapidly loses its volitional implication and only indicates non-factuality:

- (276) Oh fie no, I will not ask him, he will take it for an affront, I *will rather ask*
old father Bandol. ([HC] *Penny Merriments* 119)
- (277) he feared that should he continew at Court, . . . the Lord-Protector, and
the Privey-Counsell, might gaynsay it, and soe he *should rather* runne into
farther Arrearages, than recover his decayed Fortunes. ([HC] Perrott 33)
- (278) he . . . answered that it was nat the thyng that he moche desired, but that
he *had rather* se the harpe of Achilles. ([HC] Elyot 26)

Would referring to the past can be used in contexts indicating habitual action:

- (279) One time I was an Hostler in an Inne, And in the night time secretly *would*
I steale To travellers Chambers, and there cut their throats
(Marlowe *The Jew of Malta* 971)

The use of modal auxiliaries with the tense auxiliary + past participle to indicate modal (plu)perfect (*be should have gone*) goes back to Old and Middle English; the use seems to be established in Modern English. It varies with the type in which the modal is directly linked with the past participle:

- (280) I *would hane sworne* the puling [=whining] girle, *would* willingly *accepted*
Hammon's loue. (Dekker *Shoemaker's Holiday* III.i 60)
- (281) the wynde was so strayght a yens [=against] vs that we *myght not Kepte* the
Ryght wey in no wyse. ([HC] Torkington 59)

Note the varying use in (280).

This construction becomes obsolete in the seventeenth century in the Southern standard, but survives in regional varieties, notably in Scots. It has been suggested (Plank 1984: 332–3) that the apparent past participle in these constructions would be ‘a tensed infinitive’, i.e., the type ‘would went’ rather than ‘would gone’. This non-systemic usage seems to result from the

simultaneous development and fluctuating state of the modal and tense auxiliary system. This suggestion is supported by Bullokar's sixteenth century comment (1586 [1980]: 33) that the auxiliaries 'may be used in all moods, and both numbers, taking their tense and time of their Infinitive-signification.' He gives as examples *thou mihtst loued*, *we would had loued*, etc.

4.3.4.3 *Can, may and must*

In Early Modern English *may* can be found in contexts in which it replaces the earlier subjunctive. This is the case mainly in exhortations and wishes, and in clauses indicating purpose (see 4.3.3.1 and 4.6.2.3.2). But in most instances *may* expresses possibility, with various shades of meaning relating to the circumstances which make the action possible.

The distinction between *may* and *can* indicating possibility is, generally speaking, the same as in Present-Day English. *Can* predominates in contexts related to ability; *may* occurs in these contexts in Middle English and in the sixteenth century (282), but this use becomes obsolete in the course of the seventeenth century.

(282) he hard me, and repaired as fast to me as he *might*, ([HC] Harman 68)

May is the sole auxiliary in contexts related to permission (in negative contexts prohibition (283)); the use of *can* in expressions of the type *You can go now* is a nineteenth-century development. In addition, both verbs indicate 'root' or 'neutral' possibility.

(283) though I *may not* take more than I borrowed, yet I *may give* more than I borrowed. ([HC] Smith E6r-v)

The epistemic use of *may* develops in Middle English; in Early Modern English it is still less common than the use indicating neutral possibility:

(284) As that thing *may be* true, so rich folks *may be* fooles. ([HC] Udall III.iv)

Can, on the other hand, is only used epistemically in negations and interrogations (epistemic necessity):

(285) This *cannot be* but a great folly. ([HC] Brinsley 45)

(286) And Nicodemus answered and sayde vnto him: how *can* these thinges *be*? ([HC] Tyndale John 3.9)

Can is used, along with *may*, in contexts indicating 'neutral possibility' in Middle English. In the early sixteenth century it is favoured, in particular, in texts close to spoken language, such as diaries, private correspondence,

trials and, to some extent, sermons. It gains ground, at the expense of *may*, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The preterite *could* seems to become popular earlier than the present *can*; this may be due to the more emphatic tentativeness expressed by *might*. (For a discussion of the developments of *can* and *may* in Early Modern English, see Kytö 1991.) *Can* also predominates in negative sentences, probably because the auxiliary in these contexts often has the additional implication of ability.

May and *might* are used, almost to the exclusion of *can/could*, in clauses indicating purpose, wish, etc. The choice between the present and preterite in non-past contexts seems to depend on the emphasis given to the tentativeness of the proposition (Kakietek 1970: 33):

(287) Pees and beanes wolde be set on the rydge of the lande, thre sheues together, . . . that they *maye* the better *wyddre*. ([HC] Fitzherbert 38)

(288) but I speake yt of good wyll, to thys end that yow *myghte be callyd* yn to a beter remembrance and knowlege of your duetye.
([HC] Mowntayne 201)

In the sixteenth century, *mot*, the present of *must*, disappears. It is possible that this loss is caused by the overlapping meaning of permission or possibility of *mot* and *may*. The latest instances (except for archaising or poetic ones) date from the sixteenth century:

(289) The father of heauen *mote strenght* thy frailtie, my good daughter
([HC] More *Letters* 545)

Must not, indicating ‘denied permission’, varies with *may not* in Early Modern English and gains in popularity in the course of the period:

(290) the Denial of a Defendant *must not* move the Jury. ([HC] Raleigh 216 Ci)

(291) But before I leave this Description, I *must not* forget to take notice of . . .
([HC] Hooke 46)

Wallis (1653 [1972]: 340–1) mentions the preterite use of *must* ‘on some rare occasions . . . as if contracted from *must’d* or *must’t*’ (Kemp’s translation). He gives the example ‘*be must (or must’t) be burnt*’ (it was necessary for him to be burnt)’.

The earliest instances of epistemic *must* indicating the speaker’s inference or logical conclusion are recorded in Middle English, and this becomes common in Early Modern English.

(292) these small Cells placed end-ways in the eighteenth part of an Inch in length, whence I concluded there *must* be neer eleven hundred of them.
([HC] Hooke 114)

4.3.5 *Do-periphrasis*

One of the most intriguing questions in the history of English syntax is the emergence and development of the auxiliary *do*. This took place in Middle and Early Modern English; by the end of the eighteenth century, *do* had become an obligatory element in the grammatical structure of English. (Cf. the so-called NICE properties: the use of *do* in negative sentences, in sentences with subject/verb inversion, as a substitute verb ('code') and for the sake of emphasis.) Traces of similar periphrastic uses can be found at the early stages of other Germanic languages as well, but in those languages the periphrasis has not grammaticalised in the same way as in English. Corresponding constructions are, however, still current in some German, Dutch and Frisian dialects (Tieken 1990).

The roots of *do*-periphrasis may go back to Old English, although the earliest instances in writing date from Early Middle English. At the earliest stages of development, up to the fifteenth century, it was mainly used in affirmative statements (the type illustrated, for example, by (293) below); in questions and negations, it becomes common as late as the sixteenth century.

The theories of the origin of *do*-periphrasis have been discussed by Fischer (*CHEL* II 4.3.3.5). The main theories are the following: (1) *do*-periphrasis develops from the causative use of the verb (*He did write a letter* = 'He caused a letter to be written'), or (2) it developed from the 'substitute' or 'vicarious' use of *do*, through the weakening of its basic meaning. French and Celtic influences have also been referred to, but these contacts may, at best, have supported native developments. A synthesis of the two principal theories is presented by Denison (1985b), who suggests that the meaning of the earliest Middle English *do* + infinitive construction might have been either causative or factitive or a combination of both; the feature distinguishing the two is whether the subject of *do* and the underlying subject of the infinitive are coreferential or not. Denison points out (53–4) that the great majority of the early instances are compatible with a perfective meaning of *do*.

The suggestion (e.g. Langenfelt 1933) that the periphrasis has its roots in colloquial expression has been rejected by scholars supporting the causative origin of *do*, mainly because the causative use probably goes back to translations from Latin or other literary/formal environments.

Tieken (1990) links the development of *do* with spoken language and the oral mode of expression suggesting that the language of children and second-language learners may have played an important role in the development of the periphrasis.

Wright (1989a, b, and cf. Stein 1985b: 295–9) calls attention to text linguistic aspects in the development of *do*-periphrasis. In the course of the Middle English period, *do* in auxiliary position loses its lexical meaning and begins to function mainly textually, i.e. to contribute to the cohesion of the text. It also conveys the speaker's attitude towards the speech situation, topic, the addressee and even the text itself.

Although it may be impossible to find a decisive answer to the question of the origin of *do*-periphrasis, the role of spoken language seems important in accounting for its later development. Textual evidence implies that the periphrasis has always been favoured in discourse situations more typical of speech than of writing (Rissanen 1991a). These situations do not, however, necessarily coincide with a colloquial or relaxed way of expression.

4.3.5.1 Affirmative statements

In the sixteenth century, *do*-periphrasis in affirmative statements is favoured in the records of court trials, which consist mainly of dialogue, and, to a somewhat lesser extent, in sermons. Both text types are based on argumentative spoken discourse in highly formal situations. The following extract shows the typical use of *do* in a trial text; the periphrasis is a marker of argumentative expression which aims at influencing the audience's views and opinions. *Do* in itself is not necessarily emphatic, but it adds to the intensity and emphasis of the utterance.

- (293) *Throckmorton*. I confess I *did* mislike the Queenes Mariage with Spain, and also the comming of the Spanyards hither: and then me thought I had reason to doe so, for I *did* learne the Reasons of my misliking of you M. Hare, M. Southwell, and others in the Parliament House; there I *did* see the whole Consent of the Realm against it; and I a Hearer, but no Speaker, *did* learne my misliking of those Matters, confirmed by many sundry Reasons amongst you: but as concerning any sturre or vprore against the Spanyards, I neuer made any, neyther procured any to be made. ([HC] Throckmorton 66 Cii)

In the second half of the sixteenth century, the use of *do*-periphrasis in affirmative statements reaches a peak. In some texts, the frequency of the periphrasis, in contexts in which it can vary with the simple verb form, can be over ten per cent (Ellegård 1953: 161–2; Rissanen 1985, on early American English material). The periphrasis is common in most text types.

It is worth asking whether the general tendency to develop a system of auxiliaries in Middle and Early Modern English contributed to the increased popularity of *do*. This development meant a radical decrease in the frequency of one-verb groups (cf. Frank 1985: 11–12) and may have

created a tendency to use an aux. + verb structure even in contexts where no modal or tense auxiliary was needed.

The factors influencing the choice of the *do*-construction in Early Modern English texts have been a topic of lively scholarly discussion in recent decades. If the importance of discursal aspects and spoken (not necessarily colloquial) expression in the history of *do*-periphrasis is accepted, it may be easier to understand the role played by some of these factors. It seems, indeed, that some are typical of spoken language, some of written and highly literate expression.

In earlier scholarship, sometimes one, sometimes another set of factors has been given preference. Among these are the tendency to avoid ambiguity with certain verb forms (*do set*, *did set* versus *set* [pres.], *set* [pret.]); phonotactics (*Thou didst imagine* versus *Thou imaginedst*); ordering and linking the elements of the sentence (placement of adverbials, linking subject and verb); pragmatic and stylistic considerations (emphasis, intensity of feeling, demands of balance and rhythm), etc.

The surface effect of *do*-periphrasis, in comparison with the simple verb form is, of course, that it lengthens the verbal group and thus makes it weightier. The most important factor deriving from the lengthening effect of the periphrasis is no doubt its discourse function: it may mark particularly important points in the treatment of the topic of discourse and it may also signal the end of a topic or the beginning of a new one (cf. Nevalainen & Rissanen 1986, Stein 1985b, 1990). As this function of *do* is probably more common in speech than in writing, its importance in the history of *do*-periphrasis is difficult to estimate.

The usefulness of the lengthening effect can also be seen in the tendency to use *do*-periphrasis when a simple form of a short verb would otherwise be placed alone at the end of the clause, particularly if it is preceded by a long and heavy subject NP (294). The periphrasis is also favoured when the verb, even in other positions, is short and weightless in comparison with the other elements of the sentence (295). Factors of this type are typical of writing and planned speech in the rhetorical vein, produced by writers or speakers conscious of stylistic demands. In all probability, this group of factors connects the sudden increase in the popularity of the periphrasis with the new stylistic ideals of the Renaissance.

(294) thou must take hede howe thy hennes, duckes, and geese *do ley*, and to
gather vp theyr egges. ([HC] Fitzherbert 96)

(295) Kynge Philip, whan he harde that his sonne Alexander *dyd synge* swetely
and properly, he rebuked him gentilly, saynge . . . ([HC] Elyot 27)

Do-periphrasis makes it possible to split the verbal group into two parts. The grammatical information carried by the finite auxiliary can be given early in the sentence while the semantic information contained in the main verb is given closer to the end. This structuring effect probably accounts for the frequent use of *do* with adverbials:

- (296) Helias the holy prophete of god *dyd his owne handes put* to deth the prestes
of the Idol Baal. ([HC] Elyot 150)
- (297) the self same noble Citie of Athenes, iustlie commended of me before,
did wiselie and vpon great consideration, appoint, the Muses, Apollo, and Pallas,
to be patrones of learninge to their yougthe. ([HC] Ascham 216)

It seems, indeed, that the general Early Modern English tendency to place adverbials before the verb (see 4.5.1.3 below) favoured the increase of *do*-periphrasis. Even at the time when the decline of *do* is obvious in other contexts in affirmative statements, it is still frequent in this syntactic environment.

The capacity of finite *do* to convey grammatical information also made it a handy tool for avoiding consonant clusters, (298), (299), and in disambiguating between the present and preterite forms of such verbs as *put*, *set*, *cast*, etc. The first tendency would seem to take us back to the level of spoken language; it is also worth noting that *didst*+inf. was particularly common with long borrowed verbs. In this way, the periphrasis may help integrate loan words in the native English grammatical pattern. The role played by disambiguation is only subsidiary – avoiding homonymy is probably not one of the foremost factors for syntactic or morphological change.

- (298) thou shewedst it to me before, when thou *didst endeavour* to open to me
the Causes of its Counterfeit ([HC] Boethius Preston 127)
- (299) evil Men, who as thou *didst complain* went unpunished
([HC] Boethius Preston 181)

The decrease in the popularity of *do*-periphrasis in affirmative statements was as rapid as its rise. The decline took place in the seventeenth century; Bunyan's frequent use of the periphrasis (Widholm 1877: 49) is probably due to the influence of the Bible. We may assume that in the eighteenth century *do*-periphrasis was used more or less in the same way as today. (In spoken language the periphrasis retained its status as a useful syntactic alternative to the simple verb form, for expressing emphasis, intensity or discourse focus.) It is worth noting, however, that many seventeenth- and even some eighteenth-century grammarians give the simple form and *do*-periphrasis as equal alternatives, without any comment on differences in

meaning or usage. The first grammarians to point out that this periphrasis would be emphatic or otherwise marked are Gill (1619 [1972]: 48–9) and Wallis (1653 [1972]: 338); in eighteenth-century grammars comments on the emphatic quality of the periphrasis are frequent. There are some critical statements, the most eminent perhaps by Dr Johnson (1755 [1979]: 8), who calls the ‘superfluous’ use of *do* ‘a vitious mode of speech’.

While the rise of periphrastic *do* was perhaps supported by the general increase of the aux. + verb constructions in Early Modern English, its decline may have been due to the regularisation of the auxiliary system which gave each auxiliary a functional slot or slots in the overall syntactic-semantic pattern of the verb phrase. In this system, the sequence *do* + inf. was redundant. It is also worth pointing out that by the eighteenth century, the progressive *be* + *-ing* was established, and the need for the use of *do*-periphrasis to avoid one-verb constructions was diminished.

By the sixteenth century causative *do* had largely given way to *let*, *make* and *cause*; only sporadic instances are recorded:

- (300) often tymes he vysited a churche. . . and *dyd make* therin many costly
warkes (Berners *Froissart* II 507)

In late Middle English and in the early sixteenth century, the causative *do* occurs as the second element in three-verb groups:

- (301) my lorde abbot of westmynster *ded do shewe* to me certayn euydences
(Caxton *Eneydos* Prologue 2)

Note the following instance in which *do* is used with *let* in a causative context:

- (302) he *dyd let swere* al his people, that they shulde chaunge no part of his lawes.
([HC] Elyot 152)

In Present-Day English, *do*-periphrasis in affirmative statements is mostly connected with emphasis (cf., however, Nevalainen & Rissanen 1986). Some scholars, notably Engblom (1938), have even claimed a different origin for emphatic and unemphatic periphrastic *do*. As appears from the preceding discussion, many of the early uses of *do* may have had some emphatic or intensifying force. Furthermore, the intensifying effect of the periphrasis does not necessarily presuppose emphasis on the word *do* itself, as this effect often seems to be based on the repetition of *do*-constructions in rapid succession in a passage of text, (293) above. Particularly in view of the multiplicity of factors that may have affected the choice of the periphrastic construction, it is unnecessary to regard the emphatic and unemphatic uses of *do* as two separate constructions.

4.3.5.2 Questions

The earliest recorded instance of *do*-periphrasis in interrogative clauses occurs in Chaucer's verse (Mustanoja 1960: 607), but it remains uncommon throughout the fifteenth century. The rapid increase in the occurrence of *do*-questions in the sixteenth century is parallel to the development of *do* in affirmative statements. Note the use of both non-periphrastic inversion and *do*-periphrasis in the following instance:

- (303) what became of the kynge of Castell . . . *made he* ony recovery, or *dyd he*
close hymselfe in ony of his townes. (Berners *Froissart* IV 282)

In the second half of the sixteenth century, the majority of *yes-no*-questions are formed with *do*. Non-periphrastic inversion continues longer in *wh*-questions; the periphrasis is first used to avoid awkward consonant clusters, (304), or when an unstressed object pronoun follows the verb, (305), (see Salmon 1966; Stein 1985a, 1990: 179–94). By the eighteenth century the use of *do* in questions is very close to Present-Day English. Yet it is easy to find non-periphrastic questions, particularly with such high-frequency verbs as *know*, *think*, *say*, *write*, *speak*, *come*, *go*, (306)–(308).

- (304) What *didst thou loose* Iacke? (Shakespeare *1Henry IV* III.iii)

- (305) What *doe you call* him? (Shakespeare *Henry V* III.vi)

Cf.:

- (306) *Think'st thou* so Nurse, What *sayest* to Wat and Nicke? ([HC] Middleton 20)

- (307) What *say'st thou*? ([HC] Lisle 122 Ci)

- (308) In the Name of Wonder, Whence *came ye*? ([HC] Farquhar V.ii)

The use of the non-periphrastic structure is also a marker of archaic style: it is particularly common in the King James Bible. As late as the eighteenth century many grammarians point out that *do* can be omitted in questions; see, for example, Tieken (1987: 207–8), point out that *do* can be omitted in questions.

Most scholars have regarded the tendency to avoid inversion of the subject and the main verb as the primary reason for the use of *do* in questions. It has been shown (e.g. Salmon 1966: 122) that periphrasis is more frequent with transitive verbs with a following object: non-periphrastic inversion would mean placing both the subject and the object after the verb and, consequently, separating the verb from its object.²⁷ The slower development of *do*-periphrasis in *wh*-questions may be due to the fact that the object is often the initial interrogative pronoun ('What sayest thou, Jack?'),

and the problem of post-verbal subject + object sequence does not occur.

Stein (1985a, 1990) argues that phonotactics might provide an important factor for the use of *do* in questions. His statistics show that periphrasis was most common in questions with the second person singular pronoun as subject; in these the inversion might easily result in an awkward consonant cluster. From this environment, periphrasis first spread to contexts with the second-person plural pronoun subject and then to other interrogative structures.

It is probable that both word order and phonotactic factors contributed to the establishment of *do* in questions; it is difficult, however, to determine which of the two was more important. The combined effect of many factors seems, all in all, to be characteristic of the development of *do*-periphrasis.

4.3.5.3 Negative sentences

The earliest unambiguous instances of *do*-periphrasis in negative sentences appear in the late fourteenth century. The rapid increase in *do*-negation in the sixteenth century is parallel to the development of *do* in questions, although it is probably somewhat later. From the seventeenth century on, its proportionate share increases steadily in comparison with the combination of the simple verb + negative, and the usage is established in the following century. Non-periphrastic negation is, however, not uncommon even in the eighteenth century, particularly with certain high-frequency verbs (cf. the formation of questions without *do*, above). It seems that combinations of these verbs with *not* were idiomatic and resisted the introduction of the periphrasis.

(309) I *speake not* nowe to simple men. ([HC] Essex 14)

(310) The way I have mentiond, if I *mistake not*, is the only one to obtaine this.
([HC] Locke 54)

But also with less common verbs, probably for stylistic reasons:

(311) As fair Grimalkin, who, though the youngest of the feline family, *degenerates not* in ferocity, from the elder branches of her house,
(Fielding *Tom Jones* II.iv 97)

According to Lowth (1775 [1979]: 41), *do* is ‘of frequent and almost necessary use in interrogative and negative sentences’.

It is natural to assume that the use of *do* in negative sentences is connected with the tendency to locate the negative particle *not* before the verb; the combination (subj.+) *not*+verb was probably never common (see 4.5.2 below):

- (312) Dolores mortis *not touched* him or pynched hym. ([HC] Fisher 277)

The construction *do* + *not* + verb is parallel to the use of *do* in affirmative statements with pre-verbal adverbials (see above). It is possible that the need for emphasis in negative expressions played a role in the establishment of *do*-periphrasis in this context;²⁸ the high frequency of *not*-negations also has to be taken into account. The early cliticisation of *not*, as in *isn't*, *cannot*, may have contributed to the regularisation of *do* with *not*: enclitic forms are mostly appended to auxiliaries or *be/have* (see Rissanen 1994).

The most favourable environment for the Early Modern English occurrence of *do*-periphrasis is in negative questions (Ellegård 1953: 162, Salmon 1966: 283–4).

- (313) Whye *do you not reade* Wiat's Accusation to him ([HC] Throckmorton 71 Ci)

- (314) *Do not our eies behold*, how God every day overtaketh the wicked in their iourneies . . . ([HC] Hooker 38)

The order of the subject and the negative particle is discussed in 4.5.2 below.

4.3.5.4 Imperative

In affirmative imperatives, periphrasis occurs as early as Old English. In its oldest use, *do* precedes the finite form of the verb instead of the infinitive, although in some instances the construction is ambiguous because of the loss of the infinitive ending *-n*. Even in Early Modern English, a comma may be placed between *do* and the following verb, as if to imply that the two forms are in coordination:²⁹

- (315) come, come, let's retire –
Do, make a disturbance and ruin yourself and me, *do!*
 (Otway *Friendship in Fashion* IV.i)

Punctuation does not of course offer reliable evidence of the character of the construction, but the fact that *do* can intensify the imperative in post-position (as it can even in Present-Day English) supports the suggestion of its independent status. The postpositive *do* can be seen in (315) and in

- (316) Giue me the Lye: *doe*: and try whether I am not now a gentleman borne.
 (Shakespeare *Winter's Tale* V.ii)

It is not unlikely that in Early Modern English there were two types of imperatives formed with *do*, one going back to *do* preceding the imperative

(317) *Man* Haue? I haue nothing.
 1 Prom. No, *doe you tell* vs that, what makes this lump^e stick^e out then, we
 must see Sir. ([HC] Middleton 23)

The high frequency of *do*-periphrasis in these combinations can be attributed to its tendency to be used as a variant of the verb + subject sequence in questions, and its frequent use with pre-verbal adverbs in statements.

(319) Come, *do be* a good girl, Sophy. (Fielding *Tom Jones* XVI.ii 744)

In negative imperatives, *do* was proportionately less common than in negative statements in the sixteenth century, but in the seventeenth it gains ground rapidly (Ellegård 1953: 178) and is established by the end of the century, both with and without the subject pronoun:

(320) *Fid.* Doubt it not, sir -
Man. And do not discover it. (Wycherley *Plain Dealer* III.i)

(321) hold thy tongue, and *do not thou scold* at me too. ([HC] *Penny Merriments* 271)

Note the use of both the simple form and *do* in (320). White (1761) gives both types as alternative expressions of command

The first-person exhortation seems to be later than the second-person one to take the periphrasis, possibly because of the idiomatic quality of the phrase 'Let's not'. Visser (§1448) gives the earliest example of 'Don't let us' from 1696:

(322) Good, good, hang him, *don't let's talk* of him. (Congreve *Way of the World* I.i)

The reason for this order seems to be the wish to emphasise the prohibition by an early placement of the negative particle. This tendency is related to negative raising discussed in 4.5.2 below.

4.4 Elements of the clause

In this section some characteristics and developments of (syntactic) subject, object, complements and adverbials are discussed. In Early Modern English an expressed subject became obligatory in most contexts and there was a movement from impersonal to personal subjects. There were also changes in the transitivity of verbs, i.e. in the capacity of the verb to take a direct object. The expression of reflexivity, with a pronoun appended to a verb (the types 'He dressed himself'; 'He went him home'), became less common. Finally, there was a tendency to replace the subject form of the post-verbal complement pronoun by the oblique (objective) form (the type 'It's me' replacing 'It's I' in colloquial expression).

4.4.1 *Subject*

At a theoretical level, the question of the expression of the (syntactic) subject in English, particularly at the earliest stages of the language, is a complicated problem closely connected with the semantics of the verb. Simplifying, we can say that certain predicate verbs did not earlier need any noun phrases linked with them (predicates with zero arguments, e.g. 'weather verbs', in Modern English construed with the dummy subject *it*). The majority of predicates, however, require the presence of either the subject (which can be the dummy *it*) or, in the case of impersonal verbs, at least one non-subject noun phrase. At a more pragmatic level, this question, like all matters of non-expression, ultimately pertains to maintaining the balance between economy of expression and the avoidance of ambiguity. The more easily the subject can be understood from the form and position of the other elements of the sentence, the more readily it can be left unexpressed.

From its very beginnings, English has been a subject-expressing language, and in the course of its history the development has been towards a more and more regular expression of the subject. The most obvious exceptions are the imperative ('Come here!' 'Look at me!' see 4.5.3 below) and the ellipsis of the coreferential subject in the second of two coordinated clauses ('The man took his umbrella and went home').

In Old and Middle English, it was possible to leave the personal subject unexpressed. There are instances of this kind of non-expression even in Early Modern English, mainly in set phrases:

(323) *Pray* let me see it. ([HC] Middleton 3)

(324) *Woulde* I might . . . spende a thousande pound land. ([HC] Udall III.iv)

(325) *Beseech* you, Father. (Shakespeare *Tempest* I.ii)

Also in less stereotyped expressions when the subject is obvious from the context, often in the second of two coordinated clauses:

(326) that done they ledde hym faste bounde in chaynes of yren in to Babylone,
and *there was* set in pryson ([HC] Fisher 134)

In questions with a second person singular subject, the contraction of the subject pronoun is common, as evidenced by dramatic texts or other quotations of direct speech:

(327) hast thou neuer an eie in thy heade? *canst not heare?* . . . *hast no faith in thee?*
(Shakespeare *1Henry IV* II.i)

(328) as he spide [= saw] a knaue [the playing card] – Ah, knaue, *art there?* quoth he. . . . If he spied a queene – Queene Richard *art come?* quoth he;
([HC] Armin 8)

4.4.1.1 Impersonal verbs

The most interesting aspect of the development of the English subject is the gradual decline of the so-called impersonal verbs. Particularly in later periods, the term ‘impersonal’ is inaccurate as ‘person’ is in many cases involved in the action, and many of these verbs can vary between ‘personal’ and ‘impersonal’ uses.

It has been argued (Fischer & van der Leek 1983, 1987, cf. Allen 1986, Denison 1990) that from Old English on verbs with an impersonal use have one basic meaning which is modified according to three different types of subject assignment: (1) without an expressed subject, with the participants of the action (agent, patient, means, source) expressed in other ways in the sentence (e.g. (330)–(333) below); (2) with a non-experiencer (often inanimate) subject, which can be either the ‘dummy’ pronoun (*h*)*it*, or a noun or pronoun referring, for example, to the cause or source of the action (e.g. (334), (335), (337), (338), (340), (341) below); or (3) with an animate experiencer subject (e.g. (336), (339), (342) below).³⁰

The development throughout the history of English has been from type (1) to (3). An exception is provided only by the cases in which the semantics of the verb does not allow its use in all the three constructions (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.3.1.2; see also, e.g. Ogura 1990, Palander-Collin 1997).

The purest type of impersonal verbs are the weather verbs (predicates with zero-arguments). In Early Modern English they are always used with the dummy subject *it*; non-expression of the subject is rare even in Old and Middle English.

(329) *it rayned* pel mel and blew hilter skilter ([HC] Madox 139)

In Old and early Middle English, impersonal constructions without a syntactic subject were common. In Middle English even new verbs construed in this way were borrowed from Old French (*me remembreth* by the side of *it remembreth me*), and some native personal verbs developed impersonal uses (*must*, *ought*). Towards the end of the Middle English period, however, the subjectless use is on the wane, and the use of the dummy subject *it* increases, particularly in contexts of the type 'It happened that . . . '.

In Early Modern English, there is still a good deal of variation in the subject arrangement of the verb. Most of the verbs used without a subject or with the dummy *it* belong to one of the following semantic groups:

- (a) Events or happenings (*chance*, *happen*, *befall*, etc.)
- (b) Seeming or appearance (*seem*, *think*, *become*, etc.)
- (c) Sufficiency or lack (*lack*, *need*, *suffice*, etc.)
- (d) Mental processes or states (*like*, *list*, *grieve*, *please*, *repent*, *rue*, etc.)

Of the three subject arrangements mentioned above, the structure with no subject is the least common and rapidly disappearing in the sixteenth century: the type *me repenteth* is being replaced by either *it repenteth me* or *I repent*. Instances can be found mainly in set phrases, (330), (331), in poetry or in texts with an archaic quality:

(330) *howe chance* they did not Imprison ye booke ([HC] Fox 82)

(331) this *me semeth* shuld be sufficient instruction for the husbände
([HC] Fitzherbert 101)

To this group belong also *may be*, *may hap(pen)*, and *methinks*, *methought*, which acquire a more or less adverbial status in Early Modern English:

(332) *May-be*, some fairy's child . . . Has pissed upon that side
(Massinger *Old Law* [OED s.v. *maybe* A])

(333) *Bon. Going to London, may hap?* ([HC] Farquhar *The beaux Stratagem* I.i)

Methinks, *methought* obviously become stereotyped by the sixteenth century; the types **him thinks* or **them thought* do not occur in Early Modern English. That this adverbial was probably no longer clearly understood as a combination of the objective form *me* and the verb is indicated by the appearance of such forms as *my think(s)*, *my thought(s)* and *methoughts*, formed on analogy of *methinks* (examples are given in *OED*, s.v. *methinks*).

The phrase *how chance* (330) also seems to approach the status of an adverb, but it becomes obsolete by the end of the seventeenth century. Other subjectless phrases with a longer lease of life are *meseems* and combinations with *please*, such as *so please you*, *please God*, etc.

Structures with the dummy subject *it* and other types of personal or impersonal subject occur side by side in Early Modern English, as can be seen from the following:

- (334) *It chanced* one of the Justices . . . said to another
([HC] Throckmorton 64 Cii)
- (335) But as *the matter chaunsed*, with greater hast then speede
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* V.ii)
- (336) And being a boy, . . . *I chanced* amonges my companions to speake against the Pope
([HC] Ascham 279)
- (337) sythe *it bathe lyked* hym to sende vs suche a chaunce, we muste . . . be glade of his visitacion.
([HC] More *Letters* 422)
- (338) *the lykor liked them* so well, that they had pot vpon pot ([HC] Harman 37)
- (339) *I liked* well his naturall fashion. ([HC] More *Letters* 564)
- (340) I doubt not but you of the Jurie will credit as *it becommeth you*.
([HC] Throckmorton 73 Ci)
- (341) some Messages *which* very well *became* a dying Penitent.
([HC] Burnet *Life of Rochester* 146)
- (342) *Blanch* O well did *he become* that Lyons robe, That did disrobe the Lion of that robe.
(Shakespeare *King John* II.i)

Please shows a bias towards *it*; Weijl (1937: 159) reports that this verb never has a personal subject in Fisher's sermons. Some, e.g. *need*, *seem*, *like* and *repent*, are more likely to take the personal subject; cf. Palander-Collin (1997: 388–97), Ando (1976: 41) on Marlowe's usage. Mair (1988: 215–18) shows that *like* favours the personal subject with a nominal object (339), while with a clausal object (337) *it* is preferred.

The loss of the subjectless construction can also be seen in the replacement of the type *me were* and *me had as good/better/best* by phrases with a personal subject (see (233)–(238), above). Also with *have rather*, which is first recorded in the second half of the fifteenth century, the personal construction prevails (343), only isolated instances can be found of the impersonal one (344):

(343) he . . . answered that . . . he *had rather* se the harpe of Achilles . . .
([HC] Elyot 26)

(344) *Me rather had* my hart might feele your loue Then my vnpleased eie your
curtesie
(Shakespeare *Richard II* III.iii)

The reasons for the loss of the subjectless impersonal constructions have been adequately summarised in earlier discussions, (see Fischer *CHEL* II 4.3.1.2). The loss of the system of inflectional endings of nouns and personal pronouns blurred the distinction between oblique and subjective forms. At the same time, the loss of verbal endings supported the presence of a syntactic subject. The semantics of the impersonal verbs and analogy with the majority of the verbs – the personal ones – must also be taken into account. In Middle and Early Modern English word order was fixed in a way which made it natural to regard the preverbal noun phrase as the subject of the sentence. On the basis of these developments, expressions of the type ‘The plants need water’, originally analysable as ‘Water is necessary to the plants’ was reanalysed with ‘plants’ as the syntactic subject. It is worth noting that in German the subjectless type (*mir scheint*, etc.) is still common.

4.4.1.2 Subject of the passive

In Old and Early Middle English, the direct object of the active sentence becomes the subject of the corresponding passive sentence (‘A story was told to him’). In Middle English, the subject position could also be allotted to the indirect or prepositional object of the active sentence (‘He was told a story’; ‘He was laughed at’). The latter type is first recorded in thirteenth-century texts; the former is rare even in Late Middle English. According to Mustanoja (1960: 440; cf. van der Wurff 1990: 35–42; Moessner 1994; Denison 1985a) the subjectivisation of the indirect or prepositional object was made possible by the disappearance of the formal difference between the accusative and the dative, but it must be pointed out that similar structures have not developed in, for example, Swedish, which also underwent a loss of case distinctions.

In Early Modern English, in the majority of the instances with two objects, the direct (pro)nominal object is preferred as the subject of the passive clause. But if the direct object is a finite or non-finite clause, either the indirect object (345) or *it, this, there* (346), (347), is made the subject of the clause. The subjectless construction is also possible (348); it is common in expressions of the type *as shall be declared, as had been said*, etc. (see Moessner 1994).

- (345) *they are taught* to doe certain things, ([HC] Gifford E4 r)
 (346) *It was told the knight* where the foole was eating it. ([HC] Armin 14)
 (347) but *this* is to be noted, that though it rained not all the day, yet it was my fortune to be well wet twice, ([HC] John Taylor 128 Cii)
 (348) to assigne unto hym a tutor, whiche shulde be an auncient and worshipfull man, *in whom is aproued to be* moche gentilnes, mixte with grauitie, ([HC] Elyot 23)

The subjectivisation of a prepositional object, with a stranded preposition, was probably supported by the development of phrasal verbs of the type *to give up*. In these constructions the link between the particle/preposition and the following noun is loose, and their separation is more natural than in the case of prepositional phrases proper.

- (349) the passage for the sap in the stock and Scion . . . will not meet together . . . which should be *aimed at*. ([HC] Langford 41)
 (350) A consultation was now *entered into*, how to proceed
 (Fielding *Tom Jones* Liv 60)
 (351) my life was *despaired of* (Smollett *Roderick Random* XXXIV 192)

4.4.2 *Object*

4.4.2.1 Transitive and intransitive verbs

One of the central concepts in the discussion of the object is transitivity, i.e. whether or not the verb can be construed with a direct object. In the course of the history of English, there has been constant fluctuation between the transitive and intransitive use of verbs. As this variation belongs primarily to the domain of semantics (see Nevalainen this volume 5.6.3.2), it will be only briefly discussed here.

Different types of development may result in the emergence of transitive uses with inherently intransitive verbs. One is the loss of the ‘original’

preposition after a verb, particularly with verbs indicating motion (cf. PDE *enter*, *cross*, etc.):

(352) Snail^s there *had crawl'd the Hay* (Suckling *Poems* [OED s.v. *crawl* 1b])

(353) And every creeping thing that *creeps the ground* (Milton *Paradise Lost* VII 523)

Other verbs, too, show variation between uses with and without a preposition:

(354) many a man *wonderinge the bewtye* of a straunge woman haue bene cast out.
(Coverdale *Ecclus.* 9 8)

(355) it is better they should *wonder at* your good fortune ([HC] Deloney 71)

(356) *Smoile you my speeches*, as I were a Foole? (Shakespeare *King Lear* II.ii)

(357) she came into W-hall as to a Wedding . . . *smiled upon* & talked to every body;
([HC] Evelyn 902)

The variation between the prepositional and non-prepositional construction does not entail any basic change in the meaning of the verb. There are, however, instances of such changes as well; mostly from non-causative to causative meanings:

(358) Meet me to morrow . . . Ile *flie my Hawke* with yours
([HC] Heywood *Woman Killed with Kindness* 1)

(359) The old man . . . demands if there were not a gentleman in the court dwelling . . . The courtier answered, . . . Ile help you to him straight; . . . Hee [the old man] *was walkt* into the parke,
([HC] Armin 43)

(360) After *swim him* and apply bathes
(T. de Grey *Compl. Horsem.* [OED s.v. *swim* v. 13])

(361) They likewise *grow some Rice* and Tobacco
(J. Campbell *Pol. Surv. Brit.* [OED s.v. *grow* v. 14])

In general, the transitive uses of the verbs of the type quoted above are less common than the intransitive ones, particularly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³¹

Many factors, most of them effective in Old English and Middle English, contributed to the easy shift from intransitive to transitive use (see e.g. Mustanoja 1960: 429; Visser §134ff.). In Early Modern English, it is possible that the declining use of *be* + past participle to indicate (plu)perfect with intransitives contributed to the development of transitive uses: instances such as *the potatoes are grown* can be interpreted either as 'the potatoes have grown (well)' or as passives with the transitive use of *grow*

‘the potatoes are grown (by X)’, cf. also (358), in which *was walked*, out of context, could be interpreted as ‘had walked’.

But the development was not only from intransitive to transitive. There are also a number of older transitive verbs which came to be used intransitively. This phenomenon, too, can be found as early as Middle English. According to Visser and the *OED*, *cure*, *shape*, and *sell*, for example, first occur in intransitive use in Early Modern English:

- (362) One desperate greefe *cures* with an others languish:
(Shakespeare *Romeo and Juliet* I.ii)
- (363) Let vs like Marchants shew our fowlest wares, And thinke perchance,
theile [= they’ll] *sell*;
(Shakespeare *Troilus and Cressida* I.iii)
- (364) After your mares have beene covered, . . . you shall let them rest three
weeks, or a moneth, that the substance may *knit*.
(1614 Markham *Cheap Hush*. 45 [*OED* s.v. *knit* 5b])

In many instances the verb has a reflexive implication; it is possible that the decreasing frequency of reflexive pronouns (see below) supports the development of intransitive uses of originally transitive verbs.

4.4.2.2 Reflexive and reciprocal use of verbs

By reflexive verbs – or the reflexive use of verbs – we mean constructions in which the subject and the personal pronoun object, or, with intransitive verbs, the subject and the objective form of a following personal pronoun, are coreferential, as in *We drieue our self in sickness*, or in *the good manne goeth him home* (both examples from Thomas More).

With transitive verbs, reflexive use is current even today, although its popularity has decreased from Early Modern English. In Middle English, many transitive verbs could be used either reflexively or intransitively (*make we us merie*, *William of Palerne*; *þay maden as mery as any men moȝten*, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Mustanoja 1960: 431)). The same variation can be seen in Early Modern English:

- (365) I would I were worthie to bee with you when you *dress* your selfe . . .
([HC] Deloney 71)
- (366) They . . . *Dress’d* at Her, danc’d and fought, and . . . did all that Men could
do to have her. (1703 Rowe *Ulyss*. Prol. 15 [*OED* s.v. *dress* v. 7c])
- (367) I *prepared* my self to be redye. ([HC] Madox 84)
- (368) so the Frenchmen *prepared* to interrupt his Arrivall
([HC] Throckmorton 66 Cii)

In Old English, the simple accusative or dative form of the personal pronoun was used reflexively. The word *self* could be added after the pronoun for emphasis. In Middle English the combination of personal pronoun and *self* gains ground; the simple form is in the minority in most texts in the second half of the fifteenth century. In the sixteenth century, the two forms are still in variation; the choice of the form seems to be determined, among other things, by matters of euphony and rhythm. Ben Jonson (1640 [1954]: 538) gives the shorter forms as alternatives to *-self* without further comment. In the course of the seventeenth century, they fall into disuse. They seem to be retained longest in imperatives; the fairly common occurrence of the subject pronoun after the verb in imperatives no doubt supported the reflexive construction (see 4.5.4 below).

- (369) you, Madam, says he to me, go up and dress *you*, and come down
(Defoe *Roxana* 27)

Cf. (365), (366) above.

With intransitive verbs, the simple form of the pronoun is used to indicate reflexivity. Semantically, there is little or no difference between the intransitive and the reflexive use, and as early as Old English, instances with the reflexive pronoun are in a clear minority. In Middle English, the reflexive use of intransitive verbs further decreases (Mustanoja 1960: 431).

Instances of the reflexive use of intransitives can be found in sixteenth-century texts, mainly with verbs of motion. It seems to be particularly favoured in imperatives with no expressed subject (371). It is possible that borrowings from French supported this construction.

In the course of the seventeenth century, the use decreases. In Visser's list of examples (§331) the only eighteenth-century instances are with *hie* 'hasten' (372). As its frequency declines, this use is probably more and more clearly associated with involvement and emphasis. Elphinston (1765: 47) points out that the reflexive use occurs 'in the poetic, and in the very familiar stile'.

- (370) wyth such good hope the good manne *goeth hym* home.
(More *Apology* 159)

- (371) Good Margaret *runne thee* to the parlour
(Shakespeare *Much Ado about Nothing* III.i)

- (372) The Bees *higb* [= hasten] *them* home as fast as they can.
(1713 Warder, *True Amazons* 124 [OED s.v. *hie* v. 3])

Related to the reflexive use of the verb is the occurrence of the so-called ethic dative of a personal pronoun with verbs. In this use, the pronominal

element and the subject are generally not coreferential (note, however, (375)). In typical instances, the subject is in the third person and the objective pronoun in the first or second. The ethic dative first appears in Middle English and becomes common in Early Modern English. It can be found even in the eighteenth century, in the writings of Addison, Steele, Swift, Fielding, etc. (Visser §695):

- (373) he cannot . . . *bring you* forth a bederoll [= catalogue] of theyr namys
([HC] More *Supplication of Souls* 120)
- (374) He did; and with an absolute Sir, not I! The clowdy messenger *turnes me*
his backe
(Shakespeare *Macbeth* III.vi [the speaker did not participate in the event
he describes])
- (375) I seeing that, tooke him by the leg, and neuer rested pulling, till I had *pul'd*
me his leg quite off (Marlowe *Faustus* [1616 edn] 1248)
- (376) as wholesome as the best champagne in the kingdom, . . . and they *drank*
me two bottles (Fielding *Tom Jones* X.iii 475)

This use adds to the vividness and intensity of the expression and brings the narration or description to an intimate or personal level. It is very common in early Modern English drama and can be regarded as one of the conventional ways for authors to give their dialogue a colloquial flavour. Shakespeare uses this construction for punning:

- (377) *Petruchio* . . . Heere sirra Grumio, knocke I say.
Grumio Knocke sir? whom should I knocke? . . .
Petruchio Villaine I say, *knocke me* heere soundly.
Grumio Knocke you heere sir? . . .
Petruchio Villaine I say, *knocke me* at this gate,
And *rap me* well, or Ile knocke your knaues pate.
Grumio My master is grown quarrelsome: I should knocke you first,
And then I know after who comes by the worst.
Petruchio Will it not be?
'Faith sirrah, and [= if] you'l not knocke,
Ile ring it, Ile trie how you can *Sol-Fa*, and sing it.
He rings him by the eares. (Shakespeare *Taming of the Shrew* I.ii)

Note also the expressions *ring it*, *sing it*, and cf. (397), (398) below.

In reciprocal use the action indicated by a transitive verb has at least two actors which are also the patients of the action, as in *Jack and Jill love each other* 'Jack loves Jill and Jill loves Jack.' In Middle English, reciprocity is normally expressed with the pronominal combinations *each/every/either/one*

(. . .) (*an*)*other*. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the elements of the *each* (. . .) *other* types of structure were still often separated (378); the second element could also be preceded by a preposition (379):

- (378) we may reioyce and enioy *ech others* company, with our other kynsefolke,
 . . . and . . . with good counsaile and prayer *ecbe* help *other* thitherwarde.
 ([HC] More *Letters* 545)
- (379) . . . to write *one to another*, or speak *one to another* during the time of their
 Imprisonment. ([HC] Raleigh 213 Ci)

From Old English on, it is possible to use *self* or *together* to indicate reciprocity. In Early Modern English these means of indicating reciprocity exist, although they are rarer than the pronominal expressions quoted above.

- (380) Get thee gone, tomorrow Wee'l heare *our selues* agayne.
 (Shakespeare *Macbeth* III.iv)
- (381) God knoweth when we shal *kis together* agayne. ([HC] More *Richard III* 42)

Non-expression of reciprocity is possible when it is implied by the meaning of the verb and thus obvious from the context. Such verbs are e.g. *see* 'meet', *embrace*, *greet*, *hug*, *kiss*, *love* and *marry*:

- (382) How haue ye done Since last we *saw* in France?
 (Shakespeare *Henry VIII* I.i)
- (383) They *loved* after, as two brethren, during their naturall lyues.
 (1568 Grafton, *Chronicle* 1 173 [OED s.v. *love* v1, 3b])

4.4.2.3 Prepositional objects

Some of the most common verbs in Present-Day English are followed by a prepositional object (*think of*, *listen to*, *look at/for*, etc.). With some, the prepositional object varies with the non-prepositional one, often with a fine semantic distinction: *meet* (*with*), *hit* (*at*), etc. On the other hand, some inherently intransitive verbs indicating motion, most notably *enter*, can be followed by a noun expressing locality without a prepositional link just as if this noun were a direct object (see (352), (353) above).

In Old English, the case of the direct object was normally the accusative and that of the indirect object the dative, although (pro)nouns in the dative, genitive or even instrumental could be linked with the verb in a relation which, from the present-day point of view, resembles that of the direct object.

With the loss of the inflexional endings in Middle English, there were

two possibilities for linking old dative, genitive or instrumental objects with the verb. The ‘common case’ of the noun or the objective form of the personal pronoun could be used, or the link could be indicated by a preposition.

Old English verbs construed with the dative include, for instance, *helpan*, *losian* and *þancian*. While these verbs tend to become ‘ordinary’ transitive verbs as a result of semantic developments and the loss of the formal distinction between the dative and the accusative, in Middle English there emerges a new set of verbs, mainly French loans, which are followed by the preposition *to* instead of the direct object. Many of these verbs take the dative object or the preposition *à* in Old French (‘we obey to the king’/ *nous obéissons au roi*). Other such verbs are, for instance, *avail*, *command*, *escape*, *favour*, *pardon*, *please*, *profit*, *serve*, *suffice* (Visser §312.325).

In Early Modern English many of these verbs show variation between the prepositional and non-prepositional link.

- (384) I graunted hym that I would *obeye to* his wyll: ([HC] Harman 69)
- (385) the devil doth bewitch men . . . *to obey* his wil ([HC] Gifford B3r)
- (386) Wherfor, *pray to God*, and desire Jesus Christ to pray for you
([HC] R. Plumptre 232)
- (387) Therefore I *pray god* both the king and also we his people maye . . . walke
in his wayes . . . ([HC] Latimer 33)
- (388) Agayne they went aboute to take him: but he *escaped out* of their hondes,
and went awaye agayne beyonde Iordan, ([HC] Tyndale John 10.39)
- (389) his enimies . . . understanding that the King was *escaped* theyr hands, . . .
they withdrewe from Windesore ([HC] Stow 545)
- (390) Howe moche *profited hit to* kynge Philip, father to the great Alexander, that
he was deliuered in hostage to the Thebanes? ([HC] Elyot 24)
- (391) the dyligence of the orators should either holye cesse, or els if they would
profyte offenders, their diligence shoulde be turned into the habyte of
accusation. ([HC] Boethius Colville 102)

With most verbs the prepositionless type prevails in later English. This is in accordance with the simplification of the verb phrase discussed in connection with the personification of the impersonal verbs.

Many Old English verbs were construed with an object in the genitive. Visser (§§370–93) calls this construction the causative object, because the object here often indicates the cause or reason for the action or state indicated by the verb, as in *Bona weorces* (gen.) *gefeah* ‘The destroyer rejoiced at

the work.’ The genitive can also be used with verbs in non-causative contexts and in expressions in which the link between the action and its goal is less direct.

As early as Middle English, the old genitive objects have either developed into direct objects (as with *forget*) or prepositional objects (as in the case of *think of*). In Early Modern English a prepositional object can be linked even with *fear*, *like*, etc.:

(392) Alas, why, *fearing of* times tirannie,
Might I not then say Now I loue you best, (Shakespeare *Sonnet* 52)

(393) if you and your freinde do *like of* them. ([HC] Pettit 14)

Prepositional objects with *of* can also be found with a number of French loan verbs, such as *complain* or *conceive*. Many (but not all) of these verbs had the preposition *de* in Old French.

4.4.2.4 Instrumental objects and adverbials

Instances of the so-called instrumental object, the type ‘he beat his fist on the table’, can be found in Middle and Modern English:

(394) I shall stay here the forehorse to a smock, *Creaking my shoes* on the plain
masonry, (Shakespeare *All's Well that Ends Well* I.i)

(395) Dick . . . *slapp'd his Hand* upon the Board
(1717, Prior *Alma* 1 346 [OED s.v. *slap* v1 3])

Related to this construction is the prepositionless instrumental adverbial, which can be found in Middle English and as late as the sixteenth century:

(396) Though he god wold *his owne mouth* commaund them the contrary
([HC] More *Heresies* 123)

See also (296).

The sixteenth-century instances quoted by Visser or found in the Helsinki Corpus contain only the phrase possessive pronoun + *own hand(s)/mouth*; this implies that the construction was no longer productive.

4.4.2.5 Empty and anticipatory *it*

The use of *it* as object deserves a special mention. This pronoun has been used as a highly indefinite ‘empty’ object since Old English. In Middle English, the instances are few, but in Early Modern English the construction is common, particularly with phrasal verbs (397), (398). One possible

factor supporting this increase in popularity is the wish to avoid the use of transitive verbs without an expressed object – a tendency connected with the overall change of English from synthetic to analytic.

- (397) *Ford*. Well said Brazon-face, *bold it out*.
(Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* IV.ii)
- (398) You haue cozend me . . . of a good Dinner, we must *make it vp* now With Herrings.
([HC] Middleton 23)

From the use with transitive verbs, *it* extends its sphere to intransitive verbs:

- (399) So we fairly *walked it* to White Hall (Pepys 23 August 1662)

It can often be found with verbs recently converted from adjectives or nouns. The dummy object probably made it easier to analyse the new derivative as a verb:

- (400) Ile goe *braue it* at the Court (Shakespeare *Titus Andronicus* IV.i)
- (401) the Turks could not *French it* [= ‘speak French’] so handsomely
(1639 Fuller *Hist. Holy Warre* [OED s.v. *French* v. 1])
- (402) Shewing how base and womanlike he was, in *tonguing it*, as he did.
(1624 *Good News from New England* 571 [OED s.v. *tongue* v. 2])
- (403) See how they *cocquet it*! Oh! there’s a look!
(1701 Farquhar *Sir H. Willdair* 3 1 [OED s.v. *coquet* v. 1])

The use of *it* as an anticipatory object, followed by an object clause can be found from Old English on. It is common in Early Modern English:

- (404) I holde *it* expedient that he be taken from the company of women:
([HC] Elyot 23)

Also with a non-finite clause:

- (405) there is a combination of rogues in the town that do make *it* their business to set houses on fire
(Pepys 3 July 1667)

4.4.3 Predicate nominal

The ‘grammatically correct’ form of the predicate nominal (i.e. subject complement) is the subjective. In Early Modern English, however, objective forms emerge in this position (the variant types ‘It’s I’ and ‘It’s me’).

The construction with the objective case, with the subject *it*, first appears in Early Modern English. In Middle English the structures indicating this

meaning were of the type ‘I it am’ or, later, ‘It am I’ and ‘It is I’. In the last-mentioned type, the form of the copula (*is*) reveals that the impersonal *it* has become the subject, with *I* as its complement.

By the beginning of the Modern period the type ‘It is I’ had superseded the others:

(406) *It was I* and none other: ([HC] Udall I.iii)

(407) *it is we* our selves that shut ourselves out. ([HC] Tillotson 452)

This development is related to that of the impersonal constructions discussed above: the preverbal NP is reanalysed as the subject of the sentence.

At the end of the sixteenth century, the objective form appears in the complement position by the side of the subjective, although it is still uncommon in Shakespeare (Franz §282):

(408) Oh, the dogge is *me*, and I am my selfe
(Shakespeare *Two Gentlemen of Verona* II.iii)

(409) But sure *it can't be him*; he's a profess'd woman hater.
(Vanbrugh *Provoked Wife* II.i)

Eighteenth-century grammarians are concerned about this use – a proof of its popularity. The following statement by Priestley (1762: 47) is revealing: ‘All our grammarians say, that the nominative cases of pronouns ought to follow the verb substantive as well as precede it, and the example of some of our best writers would lead us to make a contrary rule; or at least, would leave us at liberty to adopt which we liked best.’

As to the origin of this construction, it is unlikely that French influence (the type *c'est moi*) was its main source, as it emerges at a time in which the contact with French was not intimate enough to affect the syntactic structure of English (Mustanoja 1960: 133; Visser §268). This development was probably a change ‘from below’, i.e. initiated by a natural colloquial trend at the level of speech. The tendency to give, in statements, all preverbal pronouns the subjective form and the postverbal ones the objective form was no doubt one factor contributing to the increasing popularity of this construction. Furthermore, particularly in the case of the first person singular, the need to use an emphatic form in the postverbal position may in part account for the choice of *me*. The grammarian Cooper (1685: 121) gives a simple rule according to which the forms *I, thou, he, she, we, ye, they* precede the verb while *me, thee, him, her, us, you, them* follow verbs and prepositions.

An interesting development connected with the predicate complement is the emergence of the construction ‘subject + *be* + *right/wrong*’ which

supersedes the older construction with *have* + noun, (410), in Early Modern English. The other Germanic and Romance languages favour the structure with ‘have’ even today (German *Recht haben*; Swedish *ha rätt*; French *avoir raison*, etc.).

(410) the Divill should *haue right* ([HC] Roper 42)

(411) You *are right*, Iustice; and you weigh this well
(Shakespeare, *2Henry IV* V.ii)

(412) there you *are wrong*, Amanda ([HC] Vanbrugh II.i)

4.4.4 *Agent*

The simplest definition of ‘agent’ is to describe it as the constituent in a passive clause which realises the subject function in a corresponding active construction, as in ‘The house was built *by John*/John built the house’ (cf. e.g. Moessner 1994). In Middle and Early Modern English, there is considerable variation in the preposition of the agent; some of this variation can still be seen in Present-Day English. According to the *OED*, *by* is popularised in Early Modern English, but Peitsara (1993) shows that it is clearly favoured as early as the fifteenth century with animate agent nouns. Of the other agentive prepositions occurring in Early Modern English, *of* is the most common, (413); *with* is mainly used with concomitative verbs or with verbs inflicting pain (414) and *from* with reference to a distant source of action, (415):

(413) god is therby chiefly knowen and honoured both *of aungell and man*.
([HC] Elyot 149)

(414) I was enforced to rise, I was so stung *with Irish musketaes* [= ‘mosquitoes’],
a creature that hath sixe legs, ([HC] John Taylor 134.Cii)

(415) The duke of Norffolke, in Audiens of all the people there assembled,
shewed that he was *from the kinge himself* straightly charged
([HC] Roper 39)

4.5 The simple sentence

The most important Early Modern developments in the structure of the clause are the establishment of the subject–verb order in most statement types and the regularization of *do* in questions and negations (see 4.3.5 above). In negations, the particle *ne* disappears and double negation becomes unacceptable in formal contexts. In imperatives the subject is less often expressed than earlier.

4.5.1 *Word order in statements*

In the course of the Middle English period, the structure of the simple sentence underwent a thorough change. This affects the order of the subject, finite verb and object; the placement of adverbials and subject complements also becomes more fixed than in Old English.

Old English word order has often been described as ‘free’. This is not quite true; there was a fairly high degree of regularity in the placement of sentence elements. Yet there was more freedom than in Middle or Modern English; constituent order was probably determined by textual and discourse factors to a larger extent than in later English. In this respect, Old English word order may well have resembled that of present-day Slavonic languages or other languages with no article system. It seems, indeed, that the development of the articles, which was fairly late in English, is related to the development of syntactic rules of word order.

Most scholars agree that the basic principle in the change of English word order is from an essentially verb-final to a clearly verb non-final language (see e.g. Fischer *CHEL* II 4.8). The major developments are the shift of the finite verb of subordinate clauses from final to non-final position and the establishment of subject–verb–object order in declarative sentences. In Old English and Early Middle English, the object often preceded the verb. Inversion was also common, particularly with sentence-initial adverbials. The word order change in subordinate clauses began in Old English and was established in Middle English. By the end of the Middle English period, the postverbal position of the object seems to be the rule, although it is occasionally placed between the auxiliary and the main verb (*I may no rest haue*, Margery Kempe [Fischer *CHEL* II 4.8.1]). The inversion is still as common as subject–verb when the sentence begins with an adverbial.

4.5.1.1 *Inversion of the verb and the subject*

In the texts studied by Jacobsson (1951), there is inversion after sentence-initial *then*, *now*, *there*, *here*, *so*, *yet* and *therefore* in almost half of the instances in 1370–1500 and even in the following century in one-third. There is a sudden drop in the frequency to about seven per cent in Jacobsson’s seventeenth century material (96).³²

The relative ‘weight’ of the finite verb and the subject had an influence on their mutual order: the heavier element tends to follow the lighter. This means that, on average, nominal subjects can be found in a postverbal

position (416) in later texts than light-weight pronominal subjects. For the same reason, the subject is more easily placed after an auxiliary or the copula (417), than after weightier verbs. There are also certain verbs (*have*, *say*, *come* and *stand*) which favour inversion even in seventeenth century texts.

(416) *Then came in a Scotch Archbishop* ([HC] Evelyn 896)

(417) *There did I finde the truely Noble and Right Honourable Lords*
([HC] John Taylor 135 C1)

A late example comes from Elphinston (1765):

(418) *Hence is our language*, far from being defective, more rational than those
which . . . (II 73–4)

Examples can also be found in Richardson's novels (Uhrström 1907: 77).

In this transition period, the frequency of inversion after non-negative adverbs is probably influenced by both the type of text and the author's idiolect. In Jacobsson's sixteenth-century samples, More and Roper favour inversion (eighty-five and seventy per cent, respectively). The lowest percentages occur in Berners' translation of Froissart (three per cent), Boorde's *Dietary of Health* (nine per cent) and Harvey's letters (thirteen per cent), i.e. in matter-of-fact texts with little stylistic flourish (in the case of Berners, the French original may have influenced the order). In Jacobsson's seventeenth-century samples, the proportion of the inversion is high only in Browne's *Religio Medici* (forty-six per cent) and in Raleigh's writings (forty per cent).

In Present-Day English inversion occurs after sentence-initial adverbs with a negative force. In Early Modern English, the order varies in the same way as with non-negative adverbials. With negative particles and adverbs, such as *never*, *neither*, *nor*, (419)–(421), the inverted order seems to become a rule in the seventeenth century, with other adverbials with a negative force, such as *seldom*, *hardly*, etc., (422) and (423), somewhat later. According to Jacobsson this development takes place in a relatively short time.

(419) *Never was there* anye man that layed anye thyng to my charge.
([HC] Mowntayne 207)

(420) I am not noble, yet I am a gent: *neither am I* a sword man. ([HC] Essex 15)

(421) I do repeat it, my Lord, . . . I never did know Nelthorp, nor never did see him before in my Life, *nor did I know* of any body's coming, but Mr. Hicks . . .
([HC] Lisle 122 Cii)

- (422) *Seldom is shooting* named, and yet it dyd the moste good in warre
(Ascham *Toxophilus* 76)

- (423) *hardly can we* discerne the things that are on earth . . . ([HC] Hooker 5)

Also in clauses introduced by *not only*:

- (424) *Nott only was this couple* unfortunate in the chilldren, butt in one another . . .
(Halkett 19)

Jacobsson (1951: 16) suggests that the close connection between the sentence-initial negative element and the predicate verb might account for the retention of the inversion in these contexts, after a period of vacillation in Early Modern English. It seems, however, that the development is due to a number of factors. Expressions with a sentence-initial negative adverb may have been felt to be more emphatic than those with a non-negative adverbial (cf. e.g. (423) above), and that may have favoured the retention of marked word-order.

Inversion is also possible after a sentence-initial object (425)–(427) particularly when negation is involved, (426), and after sentence-initial subject complements (428)–(429). The factors influencing the order seem to be the same as with sentence-initial adverbs: the weight of the subject, auxiliary predicate, stylistic and rhythmic factors, etc.:

- (425) *Thys dyd I* here hym saye ([HC] Mowntayne 210)

- (426) But *none did I* so much admire as an Hospitall for their lame . . . soldiers
([HC] Evelyn 24)

- (427) And *one Cock onelie haue I* knowne, which . . . doth passe all other
([HC] Ascham 274)

- (428) A Wilde Roge *is he* that is borne a Roge ([HC] Harman 41)

- (429) For *loth am I* any thyng to medle agaynst any other mannys wrytynge
(More *Apology* 130)

Cf.

- (430) *Loth I am* to compare these things togyther (Ascham *Toxophilus* 51)

When the sentence-initial *so* is a complement or precedes an adjectival complement, a noun subject follows the copula (431)–(432), unless special syntactic or rhythmic circumstances support the SV order. With a pronoun subject, the usage is divided (433)–(436); the post-copula pronoun is often the focussed element in the clause, as in (433):

- (431) euen *so is the mouable order of destinye* ([HC] Boethius Colville 108)

- (432) *so great is His Mercy*, that He will receive him
([HC] Burnet, *Life of Rochester* 148)
- (433) you are merry, *so am I*: ha, ha, then there's more simpathe: you loue sacke,
and *so do I*: (Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* II.i)
- (434) the new Wines . . . heat nothing at all, *so farre are they* from helping of men
to digest their meates ([HC] Turner B3 v)
- (435) one of them asked me, whether the Duke of Monmouth was beheaded;
and I told them, yes, for *so he was* before I came out of Town
([HC] Lisle 123 Cii)
- (436) and *so sensible I am* of the kindnes that I desir you to help me to thank him
for it. ([HC] E. Hatton 2 50)

In existential clauses, the logical subject is in complement position. When the verbal group consists of an auxiliary, as for example in passives and the progressive, the normal position of the subject is between the auxiliary and the non-finite verb form (436). The postverbal position (437) is less common (Moessner 1994).

- (437) *There were other divers bisshops buried* ther. ([HC] Leland 144)
- (438) whiche answeere receiued, *there was thrown in riche ieuels of golde and precious stone*. ([HC] Elyot 153)

Note the position of the subject after the first of two auxiliaries in the following passage:

- (439) there will *a reason* be look'd for in this subject. (Jonson *Volpone*, Epistle)

Inversion in conditional clauses ('Were he here' = 'If he were here') is discussed in 4.6.2.3.4.

4.5.1.2 Placement of the objects

In Early Modern English, as in Present-Day English, the object is regularly placed after the verb, except when it begins the sentence, as in relative clauses or topicalisation. Instances of its placement between the subject and the verb are exceptional and probably due to the demands of rhythm and emphasis:

- (440) 'Conuay', *the wise it call!* (Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* I.iii)

The pronominal object is occasionally found between the auxiliary and the non-finite form of a verb:

(441) *I can thee thanke that thou canst suche answers deuise. But I perceyue thou doste me thoroughly knowe* ([HC] Udall I.ii)

(442) This drab she kepes away my good, the deuil *he might her snare* ([HC] *Gammer Gurton* 59)

In both instances, the author's choice of the order is probably influenced by the demands of the metre.

The order of the direct and the indirect object (*He gave a book* [direct object] *to my sister* [indirect object] as against *He gave my sister a book*) underwent some development in the early history of English. In Old English the two objects were distinguished by case, the accusative normally being the case of the direct object and the dative that of the indirect object. As the formal distinction supported the semantic interpretation of the two objects, their order was relatively free. In Middle English, a new analytic type of indirect object emerged, in which the (pro)noun was preceded by the preposition *to* or *for* (see e.g. Fischer *CHEL* II 4.8.4.1). The analytic type seems to develop first with noun objects.

The sequence direct object + synthetic (= non-prepositional) indirect object (443) is possible in Early Modern English³³ and so is the sequence of analytic indirect object + direct object (444):

(443) in case you do not pay *it them* againe in good time, they to have the benfit of it. ([HC] H. Oxinden 275)

(444) Bycause ye haue not gyuen *to me your tythes, and your fyrste-fruytes*, therefore ye be cursed. ([HC] Fitzherbert 37)

4.5.1.3 Placement of adverbials

Throughout the history of English, the placement of adverbials has been highly variable. To a large extent, the position of the adverbial depends on its semantics and its relationship to the other elements of the sentence. From Old English on, a typical position for so-called sentence adverbials has been the beginning of the sentence, while most other adverbs are typically placed in mid- or end-position, either before or after the predicate verb.

In the present context it is possible to make only some general comments on adverbial positioning. In Early Modern English there develops a tendency to avoid placing an adverbial between a transitive verb and its object. This is no doubt largely due to the regularisation of word order: the loss of morphological marking of the object fixes its position close to the

verb. The elements most easily tolerated between the verb and its direct object are the indirect object (see 4.5.1.2 above) and restrictive adverbs (the type ‘He wrote only three letters’). As a result of this development, light-weight adverbs tend to be placed before the verb (or after the first auxiliary) while heavier ones move towards the end of the clause.

When the verbal group contains an auxiliary, many so-called preverbs (*always, often, probably, quickly, also*, etc., cf. Jacobson 1981: 8) can be placed either before or after the first auxiliary. In Early Modern English, the position of these adverbs is established after the first auxiliary. In Jacobson’s material, this position occurs in about ninety per cent of the instances as early as the sixteenth century (85). There is, however, positional variation in Early Modern English, just as in Present-Day English:

- (445) conteynyn that the lord Hastings with diuers other of his traytorous purpose, had *before* conspired the same day, to haue slaine the lord pro-tector
([HC] More, *Richard III* 53)

- (446) of which she *before* had most misse ([HC] More *Richard III* 55)

The adverb is occasionally placed after the second auxiliary:

- (447) These calumnies might have *probably* produced ill consequences
(Fielding *Tom Jones* I. ix 73)

The position of the object in relation to prepositional adverbs linked with phrasal verbs (‘They turned the light on’/‘They turned on the light’, Quirk *et al.* 1985: 16.4) follows the same rules as in Present-Day English: the pronominal object normally precedes the particle (448) while with noun objects the order is influenced by the length of the object, discourse factors, etc. (449), (450). In most cases, however, the noun object follows the preposition.

- (448) and she . . . ran to *get it in* again ([HC] Behn 189)

- (449) we must not take care only for sleeping places, but a place to *get mony in*.
([HC] *Penny Merriments* 117)

- (450) shee will make it up 50 l when shee can *get in the mony* . . .
([HC] J. Pinney 18)

4.5.2 Negation

In Old English, the unmarked negative particle was *ne*. As a sentence-negator, its position varied; in most instances it was placed before the predicate verb and not infrequently at the beginning of the sentence. In the

course of the Middle English period the emphasising negative particle *nawiht* (*nowiht*, *nau(g)ht*/*nou(g)ht*) > *not* became more and more common and the preverbal weakly stressed *ne* gradually disappeared.

In Early Modern English, *ne* is obsolete, although instances can be found as late as the seventeenth century, mainly in conjunctive use, introducing both phrases and clauses. According to Jonson (1640 [1954]: 549) ‘... for *nor* in the latter member, *ne* is sometime used’:

- (451) Twenty thousand infants that *ne* wot The right hand from the left.
(1592 Greene *Looking-glass*, Works 144/2 [OED s.v. *ne* adv. & conj. 1])
- (452) to take good hede that he contende nat agayne equitie, *ne* that he upholde none iniurie.
([HC] Elyot 148)

Nother, *nor* and *ne(i)ther*, *ner* occur as conjunctive links in late Middle English and replace *ne* in Early Modern English. Both can be used in multiple negations; with *nor* this is more common than with *neither*, probably because of the greater length and emphasis of the latter:

- (453) thou nedest not to begge *nor* borowe of *noo* man ([HC] Fitzherbert 100)
- (454) For every one that doth evil hateth the light, *neither* cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved
([HC] Tillotson 420)
- (455) Youre besecher never receyved of hym *ner* of none other to this use the value of xij. d.
(a1500 C. Trice-Martin *Chanc. Proc. fifteenth C.* 2 [OED s.v. *ner* conj.])

In Early Modern English, the conjunctive *neither* can occur in clauses with an ellipted subject:

- (456) pleadid for hir honestie as well as she could; *neither would give* anie signification of graunting his request.
([HC] Harvey 145)

In correlative clauses, the introductory and linking negative element was *ne* ... *ne* in Old and Early Middle English. Instances can be found even in Early Modern English (457), but this simple pair was probably felt to be an archaism and it was soon replaced by more emphatic expressions, mostly formed with the particles *neither* and (*n*)*or*:

- (457) They *ne* could *ne* would help the afflicted.
(1581 Marbeck *Book of Notes* 666 [OED s.v. *ne* adv. & conj. B1])
- (458) they evidently perceived, that *neither* the Marshall of England, *ne* the Steward of your most honourable household, *ne* also the office of Clerk of the Markets, shall be exercised with the said liberties ...
([HC] Wolsey 19)

- (459) They dare not trye hyt by the sworde, *nothor* with us, *nor* with the saide
Emparours Subiectes.
(1523 Cromwell in Merriman *Life and Letters* 1 34 [OED s.v. *nothor*
adv. & conj. 1])
- (460) meaning thereby wine of middle age that is *neither* verie new, *neither* verie
olde . . .
([HC] Turner B4v)

The position of *not* was originally postverbal. This was natural as *not* strengthened the preverbal *ne* (cf. French *ne* + verb + *pas*). In Early Modern English, after the loss of *ne*, there is a tendency to place *not* before the verb, possibly associated with a wish to express negation early in the sentence (cf. the preverbal position of *ne*, and see Blake 1983: 90). Furthermore, the general movement of adverbs to a preverbal position mentioned in 4.5.1.3 probably affected the position of *not*. This development was no doubt accelerated by the simultaneous development of *do*-periphrasis, which made it easy to place *not* between the operator (*do*) and the first non-finite form of the verb. (Conversely, it can be said that new developments in adverbial placement may have had an effect on the increasing popularity of *do*-periphrasis, not only with *not* but also with other preverbal adverbs; see 4.3.5.3).

The construction subject + *not* + verb (461), (462) is first attested in late Middle English. In the early sixteenth century it is rare, but it becomes somewhat more common by the end of the century, and can be found a number of times, for example in Shakespeare. In the seventeenth century it gives way to *do*-periphrasis, although instances can be found in eighteenth-century texts (462). In non-standard English it survives even later. This construction may well have been a usage typical of spoken language; Puttenham (1589 [1970]: 262) regards it 'a pardonable fault', and Lowth (1775 [1979]: 85) notes that it can have 'antiently been much in use, though now grown altogether obsolete' (see Jespersen 1917: 13, Tiekens 1987: 45–7, 118, Ukaji 1992).

- (461) I *not doubt* He came alieue to Land (Shakespeare *Tempest* I.i)
- (462) They . . . possessed the island, but *not enjoyed* it.
(1740 Johnson *Life Drake*; Works 4 419 [OED s.v. *not* adv. & subst. 1b])

Emphatic negation can be expressed by *never* (463) or, occasionally, by *nothing*, used adverbially (464). Both uses go back to Middle English. *Never so* is common as an intensifier, (465):

- (463) wherfore these freres for anger wold ete *neuer* a mossel . . .
([HC] *Merry Tales* 26)

- (464) Sweete mistresse where as I loue you *nothing* at all, ([HC] Udall III.iv)
 (465) the forgetting of god is . . . the fontayne of folishnes . . . althoughe it be
neuer so politike . . . ([HC] Latimer 35)

Double or multiple negation was common in the sixteenth century. The second of two conjoined negative clauses particularly often has the so-called global negation, i.e. the negative element is repeated in every possible constituent in the sentence.

- (466) They coud *not fynd no* londe at iiij score fadom ([HC] Torkington 62)
 (467) that the Capper *nor none other persone shalnot* take by hym self or any other
 persone to his use . . . ([HC] Statutes III 34)
 (468) I am not asham'd of my Name – *nor* my Face *neither*.
 ([HC] Vanbrugh II.iii)
 (469) that no woman has; *nor neuer none* Shall mistris be of it,
 (Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* III.i)

Double negation seems to decline in writing in the second half of the seventeenth century. Richardson and other eighteenth-century authors use it, however, in the dialogue of even upper class characters. Not surprisingly, early grammarians condemn this use as illogical: two negations are claimed to make an affirmative statement.

The pronoun *any* is uncommon in explicit negative clauses in Middle English (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.5). In Early Modern English, *no(ne)* and *not any* stand in variation as in Present-Day English, but *no*-negation is still the favoured expression (cf. Tottie 1994).

- (470) be it furthermore ordeyned . . . that the Kyng . . . or eny other persones
 take *not any* advantage or profuyt of any penalties ([HC] Statutes III 29)
 (471) I tell you, *not any* in the court durst but haue sought him . . .
 ([HC] Armin 43)
 (472) I trust there is *no* true crysten man but that he wyll be moued . . .
 ([HC] Fisher 321)
 (473) I was so well acquainted with them, that I can name *none* of them
 ([HC] Throckmorton 66 Cii)

Not any no doubt gives more emphasis to the negation. Its development may be connected with the obsolescence of the double negative type *not none* in written English.

The movement of the negative element from the subordinate to the main clause (negative raising: the type ‘I don’t think he’s here’ versus ‘I think

he's not here') goes back to Old English. In Early Modern English it is less common than in Present-Day English. In (474) both raising and the non-raised construction occur:

- (474) He had a very ill opinion both of men and women; and *did not think* there was either sincerity or chastity in the world out of principle, but that some had either the one or the other out of humour or vanity. He *thought* that *nobody* served him out of love ([HC] Burnet *History* II 167–8)

Complement clauses (finite or non-finite) which are subordinated to verbs with a negative implication, such as *doubt* and *deny*, are normally non-negative in Present-Day English. Early Modern English usage varies, although negative clauses are in a clear minority:

- (475) it is like (for me) to stand where it doth, for I *doubt* such another profer of remouall *will not bee* presented to them. ([HC] John Taylor 130 C2)
- (476) Wilt thou *denye* that all wycked folk *be not* worthy ponishment. ([HC] Boethius Colville 102)

4.5.3 Interrogatives

Questions and answers are typically features of spoken discourse; consequently, observations on these sentence types must be based essentially on texts which, in one way or another, reflect spoken dialogue: drama, trial records, etc.

Interrogative clauses are traditionally divided into *yes-no* questions and *wh*-questions. The first type expects affirmation or negation; the second, an open-range reply (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 11.4). *Wh*-questions begin with an interrogative pronoun or adverb (*who, what, which, when, where, how, why*, etc.).

4.5.3.1 Structure of the interrogative clauses

Although the present section mainly deals with characteristics of the simple sentence, both main and subordinate interrogative clauses will be discussed here.

In main clauses, questions normally have inverted word order unless the interrogative pronoun is the subject of the clause. In subordinate clauses, no inversion takes place. (The use of *do*-periphrasis instead of the simple verb–subject inversion is discussed in 4.3.5.2.)

In negative questions, the position of the particle *not* is determined by the properties of the subject. In sixteenth-century texts *not* normally follows a personal pronoun subject or the existential *there* (477), (478) and

precedes a noun subject or the demonstrative pronoun *this*, *that*, (479), (480); cf. Salmon (1966: 128–9), Rissanen (1994). This distribution pattern is based on the weight of the subject: when the subject is an emphatic pronoun or consists of two coordinated pronouns, the order is the same as with a nominal subject (481), (482):

- (477) Why was *it not* as lawful for me to confer with Wyat, as with you[?] ([HC] Throckmorton 66 Ci)
- (478) why is *there not* a schole for the wardes as well as there is a courte for their landes? ([HC] Latimer 28)
- (479) contrary wyse was *not Peter* the mouthe of christ. ([HC] Fisher 317)
- (480) do *not this* truely appere to be a thyng moste ioyfull. ([HC] Boethius Colville 69)
- (481) Shall *not thou and I* . . . compound a Boy . . . (Shakespeare *Henry V* vii)
- (482) *Sir John* . . . I haue suffer'd more for their sakes; . . .
Mistris Quickly O Lord sir, . . . and haue *not they* suffer'd?
 (Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* IV.v)

There are, however, late fifteenth- and sixteenth-century examples of *not* preceding an apparently unemphatic pronominal subject:

- (483) knowe *not ye* how ye mysdeled on the plays / whiche he threwe doun fro the carre ([HC] *Reynard* 9)
- (484) Nay canst *not thou* tel which way, that nedle may be found ([HC] *Gammer Gurton* 66)

The placement of *not* between the verb and the pronominal subject may reflect the gradual development of the enclitic [*nɪ*] in spoken language: the type 'isn't he?' may support the presubject position of the negative particle even in writing. This order increases in popularity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (compare also (485), from 1539, and (486), from 1685).

Tag questions are common throughout the Modern period (cf. Salmon 1966, 1967, Wikberg 1975). The most common tag type is affirmative statement + negative tag.

- (485) The Cat would lie, *would she not?* ([HC] Gifford EI v)
- (486) They and you were taken there together, *were not you?* ([HC] Lisle 114 Ci)

The expected reply is affirmative. According to Wikberg (1975: 128), there is only one instance in Shakespeare's plays of a negative response:

- (487) 5. *Sold.* It signes well, *do's it not?*
 4. *Sold.* *No.* (Shakespeare *Antony and Cleopatra* IV.iii)

It is obvious that this form of response has great stylistic–pragmatic significance.

The least common type is the negative statement + negative tag, which does not occur in Salmon's Shakespeare corpus. The combination affirmative statement + affirmative tag is stylistically marked: it indicates irony, annoyance or impatience (Salmon 1966: 133; 1967: 55):

- (488) You vse me well, M. Ford? *Do you?*
 (Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* III.iii)
- (489) Thou wot [= wilt], *wot thou?* Thou wot, *wot ta?*
 (Shakespeare *2 Henry IV* II.i)

In Early Modern English as in all periods of English, questions are frequently expressed by sentences with no inversion. In spoken language these so-called assertive questions must have been much more common than is evidenced by written texts. Questions of this type normally expect an affirmative answer. There are, in fact, utterances which can be interpreted as questions although they can only be expressed by an assertion (Wikberg 1975: 131). This is the case, for example, when the question contains a parenthetical remark:

- (490) *Wid.* *You came I thinke from France?*
Hel. I did so. (Shakespeare *All's Well that Ends Well* III.v)

Assertive questions are also common with certain epistemic qualifiers, such as *belike* and *perchance*:

- (491) *Silvia* *Perchance you think too much of so much pains?*
Valentine No (Madam) (Shakespeare *Two Gentlemen of Verona* II.i)

The use of *wh(e)(the)r* to introduce main clause questions, normally rhetorical and expressing doubt, and with the verb often in the subjunctive mood, is common in Old English (Traugott *CHEL* I 4.5.9) but rare in Middle English (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.4). This use disappears in Early Modern English – understandably as the subordinating use of the word is established and the lexical distribution between coordinators and subordinators becomes stricter:

- (492) If God wyl not alowe a king to much. *Whither wyl he alowe a subiect to much?* no, Yat he wil not *Whether haue any man* here in England to much?
 ([HC] Latimer 38)

The latest (Scottish) example in the *OED* dates from 1588.

Whether introducing a disjunctive direct question is more common in Middle English (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.4), and is well attested in Early Modern English as well:

- (493) Heere Galen demaundeth a question, which is this, *Whether* that feeling and mouing bee brought to Nerues by one or by diuers? *or whether* the aforesayde thing be brought substantially or radically. ([HC] Vicary 33)

As in Middle English, both *whether* and *if* are used as subordinators in EModE questions. The combination of two coordinated subordinate questions can be introduced either by the same subordinator (*if* . . . *or if*, *whether* . . . *or whether*), or the subordinator may be changed as in (495):

- (494) it remain'd somewhat doubtful to me, *whether* the ignited Corpuscles . . . were attracted; *or whether* the immediate objects of the Attraction were not the new form'd ashes. ([HC] Boyle 15)
- (495) iudge, (great lords) *if* I haue done amisse: *Or whether* that such Cowards ought to weare This Ornament of Knighthood.
(Shakespeare *1Henry VI* IV.i)

4.5.3.2 Interrogative pronouns

In the discussion of the development of the pronominal paradigms, particularly relative and interrogative, attention should be called, among other things, to the role of the pronoun in the NP (head or determiner), the type of referent (human or non-human), and the possible limitation on the number of the referents.

In Early Modern English, the pronouns and adverbs introducing *wh*-questions are roughly the same as in Present-Day English. The only exception is *whether* 'which of the two':

- (496) *Laf.* *Whether* doest thou professe thy selfe, a knaue or a foole?
Clo. A fool, sir, (Shakespeare *All's Well that Ends Well* IV.v)

In Shakespeare, *which* is the favoured pronoun even with two referents (Brook 1976: 81). Jespersen (*MEG* II 7.741) believes that *whether* in this use was obsolescent by about 1600 and that the Shakespearean examples are closer to interrogative particles than pronouns. There are, however, instances in the King James Bible, and in Bacon.³⁴

In Middle English, *what* was the interrogative pronoun normally used as a complement with personal referents, even when the identity of the referent is the topic of the question. This use of *what* can still be found in

sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts (note the use of both *what* and *who* in the following example:

- (497) ‘Tell me, I prey the,’ quoth I, ‘*who* was the father of thy childe?’ She stodyd a while, and sayde that it hadde a father. ‘But *what* was hee?’ quoth I. ‘Nowe, by my trouth, I knowe not,’ quoth shee. (HC] Harman 69)

Instances of *who* in these contexts appear from the fourteenth century on. The total replacement of *what* by *who* in referential use may reflect the growing attention paid to the personal/non-personal distinction in pronominal usage in the polite upper-class expression of the Renaissance period. (A similar development can be seen in the relative use of *which* and *who*, though the set of factors to be taken into account is more complicated; see 4.6.2.2.1)

The emphasis given to the distinction between personal and impersonal referents can also be seen in the choice of the subject pronoun in

- (498) *Who* of my Servants wait there . . .
(1703 Rowe, *Fair Penit.* 4 1 [OED s.v. *who* 1])

The distinction between *which* (reference to definite number) and *what* (reference to indefinite number) seems to be established in Early Modern English (Jespersen *MEG* III 6.8.2). The *OED* gives the latest example of *which* as a ‘general interrogative’ from the mid-eighteenth century but the use was no doubt uncommon much earlier:

- (499) In some congratulatory poem prefixed to some work, I have forgot *which*.
(1752 *Chesterfield Letters* 296 4 6 [OED s.v. *which* 2a])

4.5.4 *Directives*

Commands and exhortations are typical of spoken discourse in the same way as questions, and therefore written texts only give inadequate evidence. In addition to dramatic dialogue, the only writings in which directives (imperatives) are likely to occur in abundance are works containing instructions and directions, such as medical-recipe collections, cookery books, rules, etc.

The most interesting questions in the syntax of the imperatives are the use of *do*-periphrasis (see 4.3.5 above), the presence or absence of the subject pronoun, and the position of the expressed pronoun. In Early Modern English the second-person subject of the imperative is more often expressed than in Present-Day English. All early grammarians give the imperative with the subject. Wallis (1653 [1972]: 348) points out, however,

that the subject is very often left out (*saepissime omittitur*). Its normal position is after the verb:³⁵

- (500) But *bear you* Gossip, I pray you tell mee . . . ([HC] Deloney 69)

Also with *do*:

- (501) We must see what you haue vnder your Cloake there.
Man Haue? I haue nothing.
1 Prom. No, *do you tell* vs that, what makes this lumpe sticke out then, we must see Sir.
Man. What will you see Sir, a paire of Sheets . . . ([HC] Middleton 23)

The expression of the postverbal subject pronoun is, to a considerable extent, regulated by the other elements following the verb. The postverbal unstressed object pronoun prevents the expression of the subject pronoun, as is shown by the variant usage in the following instance:

- (502) *Beate hym* not Hodge but help the boy and *come you* two together.
 ([HC] Gammer Gurton I.iv)

The following passage implies that the expression of the subject pronoun is particularly common with some verbs. As early as the seventeenth century, *look you*, sometimes spelt *look'ye*, is probably idiomatic (note the absence of the pronoun with *come*):

- (503) *Come*, Gentlemen, *come* all, let's go to the place where we put down the Otter. *Look you*, hereabout it was that she kennel'd; *look you*, here it was indeed, for here's her young ones, no less than five; *come* let's kill them all.
 ([HC] Walton 212)

In negative imperatives the focussed subject pronoun is placed after the negative particle:

- (504) hold thy tongue, and *do not thou* scold at me too, for I must expect a Lesson from her . . . ([HC] Penny Merriments 271)

Not only the subjective but also the objective form of the second-person pronoun can appear after the verb (cf. the reflexive use discussed in 4.4.2.2 above). The frequent use of the objective forms *thee*, *you* as subjects in Early Modern English no doubt supported the emergence of these imperative constructions. The imperatives followed by *thee* can be divided into three groups: (1) verbs of attention (*bark*, *bear*, *look*, *mark*), (2) verbs of motion (*come*, *fare*, *get*, *haste*, *hie*, *return*, *run*, *speed*), and (3) verbs taking a reflexive direct or indirect object (Millward 1966: 11; based on Shakespeare):

- (505) But *bearke thee* Charmian (Shakespeare *Antony and Cleopatra* V.ii)

(506) Go *hie thee* tib, and run thou hoore ([HC] *Gammer Gurton* I.iv)

(507) *take thee* that too. (Shakespeare *Macbeth* II.i)

According to Millward, in group (1), the objective form only occurs with the imperatives and is almost obligatory. The choice is regulated by a number of factors: the subject form is favoured, for instance, if the verb is followed by another object or a heavy adverbial:

(508) *marke thou* my words. (Shakespeare *Winter's Tale* IV.iv)

(509) Go with me to my house, And *beare thou* there how many fruitlesse
pranks This Ruffian hath botch'd vp. (Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* IV.i)

Observations of this kind emphasise the importance of rhythm, balance and discourse factors in the author's choices between variant constructions.

First person exhortations are most commonly expressed by *let me/us* + verb:

(510) Set me a candle, *let me* seeke and grope where euer it bee.
([HC] *Gammer Gurton* I.iv)

(511) When . . . we are well settled and establish'd in our Religion, *let us* hold fast
the profession of our Faith. ([HC] Tillotson 451)

The type with the verb in the base form also occurs (cf. the discussion of the hortative subjunctive in 4.3.3.1 and particularly note 25):

(512) *retyre we* to our Chamber. (Shakespeare *Macbeth* II.ii)

The distinction between the two constructions may once again depend on the elements following the verb, and, consequently, on the discourse focus. If the action or state indicated by the verb is in focus, *let* + pronoun is probably preferred; if the focus is on the elements following, the inverted structure is more likely.

The same variant structures exist in the third person:

(513) Nowe that all these cornes before specyfied be shorne, . . . *lette the hous-*
bande take hede of goddes commaundement, and *let hym* goo to the ende
of his lande, . . . and *let hym* caste out the .x. shefe in the name of god.
([HC] Fitzherbert 37)

(514) *Our lorde encrease* your honour and estate (More *Lament* [1557] St. 10)

(515) A curse vpon him, *die he* like a theefe (Shakespeare *Pericles* IV.vi)

As can be seen from (514) the word order need not be inverted, particularly if the subject is a noun. The construction without *let*, both in the first and in

the third person, can be found throughout the Early Modern period, although it is no doubt stylistically marked. Coote says as late as 1788: 'In the third person of either number, as well as in the first person plural, of this mode, we generally make use of the auxiliary *let*, rather than adopt the simple form . . . In poetry, the uncompounded form is sometimes used; as, "*Improve we these. Three cat-calls be the bribe of him*" . . .' (108–9 [Visser §846]).

4.6 Composite sentences

Composite sentences consist of two or more clauses. Compound sentences contain only main clauses; a sentence with one or more subordinate clauses is called 'complex'.

In compound sentences the clauses stand in coordination. In most cases, the link between the clauses is a conjunction, such as *and*, *or* or *but* ('syndetic co-ordination'). 'Asyndetic coordination', with no overt linking word, is less common. It is possible, however, that asyndetic co-ordination was an important linking method at the earliest stages of English, and the so-called zero-link of relative clauses (*The man I saw*) and complement clauses (*I could see he was happy*) may ultimately reflect asyndetic co-ordination.

The role played by subordination has increased in the course of the history of English. In Early Modern English one important factor influencing the structure of composite sentences is classical rhetoric, whose ideals made themselves clearly felt in this period. Subordination is typical of the sentences imitating the Ciceronian period, coordination of sentences written in 'the Senecan style' (cf. Gordon 1966: 77–83, 105–11). On the whole, classical models brought coherence and organisation to the written styles of English.

In the late seventeenth century, the development of stylistic ideals, combined with normative trends setting greater demands on clarity and logic in writing, results in sentence patterns which do not essentially differ from Present-Day English.

With the exception of relative clauses, the structure of Modern English composite sentences has not been extensively studied. Thus many interesting aspects of the structure and linking of the subordinate clauses can be discussed only sketchily in the present context.

4.6.1 Co-ordinate clauses

In Early Modern English writings, with the increase of the degree of standardisation, both asyndetic and polysyndetic (conjunctive link appearing

between each of three or more coordinate clauses) coordination appear less often than in Old or Middle English texts; asyndeton may be used in marked contexts, for stylistic reasons, and polysyndeton in documentary texts, for example, to ensure that the items listed are kept distinct.

The main semantic types of co-ordination are copulative, adversative and causal. In affirmative sentences, copulative coordination is mostly expressed with *and*, adversative with *or*, or *but* and causal with *for*.³⁶ In correlative contexts, the most common copulative link is *both . . . and*, and the adversative *either . . . or*.

In sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century texts the use of *and* was freer than in Present Day English. Among other things, it can link a statement with an imperative, indicating, roughly, ‘so’, ‘and therefore’:

- (516) Thou art inclinde to sleepe: ‘tis a good dulnesse, *And* giue it way
(Shakespeare *Tempest* I.ii)

At the earliest stages of English, the difference between coordination and subordination was not as clearcut as today. *And* could introduce conditional or concessive clauses which in Present-Day English would be regarded as subordinate. This conditional/concessive use of *an(d)* may have arisen from a simplified correlative use in which *and* loosely expresses various relations between two clauses. The earliest instances go back to early Middle English homilies, which are often copies of Old English originals.³⁷ In Early Modern English this *and* is less common than in Middle English. It is particularly favoured by dramatists, and often combined with *it* (*an’t*); this implies that it was regarded as a colloquial feature.

The accepted spelling *an* (while regarded as vulgar with the copulative conjunction *and*) is probably due to an attempt to mark the conditional/concessive use as separate from the simple copulative one.

- (517) *An’t* be any way, it must be with valour
(Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* III.ii; the Folio edition reads *and’t*)

- (518) He shall go without his *and* [= even if] he were my brother.
([HC] Udall I.ii)

In non-finite clauses indicating temporal simultaneity, concessiveness, etc. (cf. Klemola & Filppula 1992):

- (519) they nere car’d for vs yet: suffer vs to famish, *and* their Store-houses [= ‘although their store-houses are . . .’] cramm’d with Graine
(Shakespeare *Coriolanus* I.i)

Although this usage is never common in written texts, it is recorded throughout the Modern English period and occurs even in colloquial

Present-Day English. Klemola & Filppula (1992: 315–17) refer to Celtic influence in their discussion of this construction.

In intensive expressions *and* and *if* can be combined (cf. the PDE non-standard *nif*):

(520) a Sheepe doth very often stray, *And if* the Shephard be awhile away.
(Shakespeare *Two Gentlemen of Verona* I.i)

(521) *If an* she be a rebel, I suppose you intende to betray her . . .
(Fielding *Tom Jones* XI.ii, 514)

4.6.2 Subordinate clauses

Subordinate clauses are traditionally divided into three main categories. Terminology varies greatly; I use the names ‘nominal clause’, ‘relative clause’ and ‘adverbial clause’ in the following discussion (cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985: 15.2).

It is fairly easy to make a distinction between coordination and subordination in Early Modern English, unlike Old and Middle English. Borderline cases can, however, be found in relative clauses beginning with *who* or *which*; furthermore, clauses introduced by causative *for* lose some of their subordinator characteristics. The use of *an(d)* in subordinating contexts (see above, 4.6.1) can be regarded as a relic of older, less specific ways of linking.

In Early Modern English writings the number of anacoluthic expressions, which are typical of spoken language and were still common in Middle English texts, becomes rarer. This is no doubt due to the gradual development of the written standard and to the normative tendencies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

4.6.2.1 Nominal clauses

Nominal clauses can function as subjects, objects, complements or appositives. By far the most common type is the object clause, which occurs typically with *verba dicendi et sentiendi*, i.e. verbs indicating saying, thinking, knowing or other mental activities.

The use of a nominal clause in subject position is rare in Middle English. In addition, many clauses which are traditionally labelled as subject clauses appear postverbally, in the position of a subject complement (*bet is that a nyghtes tonge reste*, literally ‘better is that a person’s tongue should remain quiet’, Chaucer quoted by Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.2.1). In the following

sixteenth-century instance, however, there is a series of unquestionable subject clauses in a pre-verbal subject position:

- (522) the brayne is a member colde and moyst of complexion, . . . and a principal member, and an official member, and spermatike. And fyrst, *why he is a principal member, is*, because he is the gouvernour or the treasurie of the fyue wittes: And *why he is an official member, is*, because he hath the effect of feeling and stering: And *why he is colde and moyst, is*, that he shoulde, by his coldnes and moystnes, abate and temper the exceeding heate and drought that commeth from the harte: Also, *why he is moyst, is*, that it should be . . .
 ([HC] Vicary 32–3)

This text is, however, heavily influenced by Latin.

Constructions in which the subject of the main clause is *it* and the finite or non-finite nominal clause follows the verb are much more common:

- (523) And *necessary it is that a kyng haue a treasure* all wayes in a redines
 ([HC] Latimer 37)
- (524) *It may be objected, That very wise men have been notoriously avaricious*
 (Fielding *Tom Jones* VI.iii 262)

There are also instances where the resumptive subject *it* follows the sentence-initial (finite or non-finite) subject clause:

- (525) *To lothe and dyspyse them, it is* no holynes, but pryde.
 (1548 Udall etc. *Erasmus upon the New Testament* 58a [OED s.v. *it* 4a])
- (526) *That I remaine in fiede it is* to me greate fame
 (1567 Painter [OED s.v. *that* conj. 1])

In these instances the nominal clause is topicalised. It is possible, on the whole, that the use of the nominal clause in the subject position, which has always been a marked construction, originates in topicalised contexts.

In Middle English, nominal clauses are not very common with adjectival predicates except in expressions of the type (*it*) *is bet that* . . . (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.2.1). The Early Modern usage is more varied, cf. also (523):

- (527) yff ye thyncke *yt good that we kepe* the grounde ([HC] More *Letters* 423)
- (528) I should thinke my selfe most *happy, to obtaine this knowledge* . . .
 ([HC] Brinsley 45)

As in Middle English, the nouns governing appositive complements are abstract and ‘convey an experience or the content of a statement, fact, etc.’ (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.2.1):

- (529) After that Raleigh had *Intelligence that Cobham had accused him*, he endeavour'd . . . ([HC] Raleigh 208 Cii)
- (530) after all his impertinent talk; after all his *Motives of Credibility to persuade me* to believe him, ([HC] Tillotson 449)

4.6.2.1.1 Links introducing nominal clauses

The most common links introducing nominal clauses are *that*, in negative contexts *lest*, and in interrogative clauses the *wh*-pronouns. *Lest* also occurs with verbs of fearing or clauses indicating apprehension or danger:

- (531) *yt was feared lest* he had doen much hurt in our provision for he had bowght green billet, ([HC] Madox 138)

The zero link, i.e. combining the matrix and the nominal clause without an expressed conjunction, occurs as early as Old English and becomes common in late Middle English. It is first attested with verbs indicating saying or mental activity (*say, tell, think, know, hope*, etc.) and is most frequent in object clauses. In the sixteenth century, zero gains ground rapidly; it is common in speech-based text types (trials, sermons) or in texts representing the oral mode of expression (fiction, comedies). The use of zero seems to be related to the cohesion and clarity of the sentence: it is favoured when the subject of the subordinate clause is a personal pronoun (532), which, by its subject form, clearly marks the clause boundary; it is avoided when the matrix clause verb and the object clause are separated or when the matrix clause verb is in a non-finite form.

- (532) Thys good kyng . . . would not assent there vnto, *but sayde, he had rather be sycke* euen vnto death then he wold breake his espousals ([HC] Latimer 36)

In the seventeenth century the use of zero in object clauses increases steadily and reaches a peak at the end of the century (Rissanen 1991). It is possible that the change in the basic structure of English which tends to restrict the variety in the order of sentence elements diminishes the risk of ambiguity with zero.

In present-day written English, zero is less common than at the end of the seventeenth century. This may be due to the normative tendencies in the eighteenth century which probably favoured the expressed link. But as late as mid-eighteenth century, Fielding uses zero linking in two subsequent object clauses:

- (533) He *said*, *he knew many held* the same principles with the captain
(Fielding *Tom Jones* II.ii 90)

It is worth pointing out that Lowth (1775 [1979]: 102–3, 109) is more emphatic in condemning the zero relative than the zero conjunction, and Elphinston (1765: II 27) comments favourably on zero: ‘Nothing indeed is more common and sometimes nothing more elegant, than the suppression of either the conjunction . . . or the relative.’ He gives the example *I know it was*, for, *I know that it was*.

4.6.2.1.2 Subjunctive in nominal clauses

In view of the modally marked character of the subjunctive forms, it is only natural that they occur in nominal clauses indicating wish, request, exhortation, doubt, etc. (cf. Trnka 1930: 69). In reported speech, the subjunctive forms are also common, particularly in contexts in which uncertainty (question, assumption, etc.) is indicated. (Cf. the Old English and Middle English usage as described e.g. in Traugott *CHEL* I 4.5.3.1, and Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.2.1.)

As in main clauses, subjunctive forms vary with auxiliary periphrasis in subordinate clauses. As early as Middle English, the periphrasis predominates in object clauses. The typical Middle English auxiliary in these contexts is *shall/should*. In Early Modern English, *will/would* gains ground; *may/might* is used in expressions of uncertain wish or expectation.

In the following, examples are given of the use of the subjunctive, the auxiliary periphrasis, and the indicative in nominal clauses:

Subjunctive

- (534) I do intreat you, not a man *depart*, Saue I alone,
(Shakespeare *Julius Caesar* III.ii)
- (535) I doubt he *be* not well that hee comes not home:
(Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* I.iv)
- (536) there is a doubt made, whether the woman *were* created according to
Gods Image;
(Donne *Sermons* 9 8 190)

Auxiliary periphrasis

- (537) I began to think, How if one of the Bells *should fall*? (Bunyan *Grace* §33)
- (538) Than the provost was in dout of hym, that he *wolde* in the nyght tyme *come*
and overron the cytie of Parys
(Berners *Froissart* 1 405)

- (539) and thereupon I made sute that Edward Wyat *might* either *be* brought face to face to me, or otherwise be examined. ([HC] Throckmorton 68 Ci)

Indicative

- (540) I am afferd lest the said offer beinge so specious at the first heringe *was* oonly made to get therby sum money of your Grace . . .
([HC] Tunstall 137)
- (541) For I thynke ther ys no man so wythout yes [= 'eyes'] but he seeth playnly the grete pouerty
(Starkey *England* 88)

As in Middle English (Mustanoja 1960: 454), the pluperfect subjunctive can be used by the side of the preterite subjunctive to indicate the non-factualness or non-fulfilment of a wish, fear, supposition, etc.:

- (542) a brute [= rumour] ranne in Fraunce, that the quene of Aragon . . . had in prison . . . a knyght that no man knewe his name: men supposed it *had* *ben* syr Peter of Craon
([HC] Berners *Froissart* 6 63)
- (543) I thought, quoth my father (rubbing his chin), you *had known* nothing of calculations, brother Toby
(Sterne *Tristram Shandy* 203)

4.6.2.1.3 Non-finite nominal clauses

The most common non-finite nominal clauses are infinitival constructions of various kinds. As in Old and Middle English, the infinitive can be preceded by (*for*) *to* or zero (bare infinitive) in Early Modern English. One factor which affects the choice of the construction is whether the infinitive immediately follows the finite verb (*He wanted to see her*) or whether the two verbs are separated, often by the object of the finite verb which also serves as the subject of the infinitive (*I wanted him to see her*).

In the early sixteenth century, the bare infinitive in object position is more common than in Present-Day English, but later it becomes largely restricted to positions after auxiliaries *shall*, *will*, *can*, *may*, *must*, *do*, and, occasionally, *need* and *dare*), to combinations with certain verbs indicating causation or physical perception (*make*, *see*, *hear*), and adjectives (*lief*, *better*, *best*, etc.).

In Early Modern English, variation between (*for*) *to* and the bare infinitive can be seen both when the infinitive immediately follows the finite verb and when the two are separated. In the first mentioned type, the *to*-construction is more common than the bare infinitive. Instances of the bare infinitive can, in addition to modal auxiliaries, be found with such verbs as *help*, *hear* (with verbs indicating saying, with a passive meaning,

(545)), *let* (particularly when this verb is in a non-finite form (546) and in imperatives) and *make*. According to Wallis (1653 [1972]: 336) *to* is sometimes (*nonnunquam*) omitted after *let*, *bid*, *dare*, *help*, ‘and perhaps some others’ (*et fortasse alia nonnulla*).

- (544) Yet is hee still . . . bound to *help maintaine* his Minister, if he be in want.
(1625 Burges *Pers. Titbes* 18 [OED s.v. *help* v. B4])
- (545) I haue *bearde say*, I am right well aduised, That . . . ([HC] Udall I.ii)
- (546) he dyd *let swere* al his people, that . . . ([HC] Elyot 152)
- (547) I will *make cease* from me the grudgynges of the childern of Israel
([HC] Tyndale Numbers 17.5)

Fischer (1990: 226–309) divides the constructions where the finite verb and the infinitive are separated by the object of the finite verb (accusative and infinitive: aci) into groups according to the semantics of the matrix clause verb: causative and perception verbs; verbs of persuasion and command; and *verba sentiendi et declarandi* (wishing, saying, etc.: ‘learned’ aci). The two first-mentioned types are common from Old English on; the learned aci develops in Middle English. With verbs of perception the construction without *to* predominates. Examples with *to*:

- (548) he desyred no lenger to lyue / than to *see his Lordes & commons to haue* hym
in as great awe and drede as . . . ([HC] Fabyan 168V Ci)
- (549) I have *heard some foreiners to blame* us English-men for neglecting . . .
([HC] Hoole 3)

Visser (§2067) points out that *to*-infinitive is common with *see* in the writings of e.g. Rastell, Spenser, Ben Jonson, Lyly, Herrick and Pepys. His contention that *hear*, too, mostly takes *to*-infinitive is not supported by the evidence derived from the Helsinki Corpus: of the approximately fifty examples of *hear*+inf., only three have *to*.

Let – approaching an auxiliary in Early Modern English – is used without *to*. With the causative *make*, the two constructions vary (550), (551); the bare infinitive is more common even in the sixteenth century.

- (550) it is neyther French King nor Emperoure that can *make me sell* my country
. . . ([HC] Throckmorton 65 Cii)
- (551) god ledethe them into experience of them selfe, that is to saye: *makethe*
them to knowe themselfe by aduersities. ([HC] Boethius Colville 110)

As in Present-Day English, *to* is used with *let* and *make* when the matrix clause verb is in the passive:

- (552) *it ys let us to understand* that thers [= there is] other tenaunts
 ([HC] Agnes Plumptre 167)
- (553) The usual way to begin with a child, . . . is to teach him to know his letters
 in the Horn-book, where *he is made to run over* all the letters
 ([HC] Hoole 4)

In 'learned' aci, the object of the matrix verb (*them* in (554)) does not receive its semantic function from this verb (*wish*), but from the infinitival construction (*renounce*) (Fischer 1990: 226).³⁸ In these constructions *to* clearly predominates. The same is true of aci with verbs of commanding and persuasion and with *cause*. Examples without *to*:

- (554) I love the Presbyterians so well as not to *wish them renounce* their reason.
 (1657 J. Sergeant *Schism dispatch't* [OED s.v. *wish* v. 1e])
- (555) Say I *command her come* to me. (Shakespeare *Taming of the Shrew* V.ii)
- (556) These news would *cause him once more yeeld* the Ghost . . .
 (Shakespeare *1 Henry VI* I.i)

The variation between *to* and *for to* as infinitive markers goes back to Middle English (see e.g. Fischer 1988). *For to* originally indicates purpose, but in Middle English this meaning is weakened and the choice between the two infinitive markers is 'mainly a question of lexical preference or style' (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.2.2). In Early Modern English, *for to* becomes obsolete, although there is no shortage of sixteenth-century instances (see Fanego 1991, 1992).

- (557) it is necessarie *for to haue* thys ploughinge for the sustentacion of the bodye . . .
 ([HC] Latimer 25)

When the infinitive is in subject position, the sequence of (pro)noun + *to* + infinitive occurs in Early Modern English (558), (559); note the use of the subjective form in (559). This construction is still common in Shakespeare but it rapidly gives way to the one with *for* + (pro)noun in the seventeenth century (560):

- (558) the most verteous lesson that euer prince taughte his seruant, whose *high-ness to haue* of me now such opinion, is my greate heauines.
 ([HC] More *Letters* [1557] 1453 Fo 1)
- (559) *I to beare* this, that neuer knew but better, is some burden
 (Shakespeare *Timon of Athens* IV.iii)
- (560) *For vs to leuie* power Proportionable to the enemy, Is all vnpossible
 (Shakespeare *Richard III* II.ii)

The development is similar when the non-finite clause is governed by the complement noun or adjective: *for . . . to* (562) supersedes the construction without *for* (561) in Early Modern English:

(561) Knoweth anye manne anye place wherein it is laweful *one manne to dooe*
another wrong (IHC] More *Richard III* 32)

(562) why was it not as lawful *for me to confer* with Wyat, as with you
(IHC] Throckmorton 66 Ci)

The two constructions are in variation in Shakespeare's texts; the one without *for* is common in comparative clauses, after *than* (see Fanego 1992).

When the construction is in the position of a direct object ('I wanted for him to go'), *for* is uncommon before the nineteenth century (Visser §2064), except with verbs which also take *for* with (pro)nominal objects:

(563) So we *consulted for me to go* first to Sir H. Bennett
(Pepys 30 October 1662 241)

In Old English, the passive infinitive is mainly restricted to contexts after a (pre)modal auxiliary (the type *it can be found*; e.g. Fischer 1991: 143–151). In Middle English its use becomes more varied and in Early Modern English it is common after the verb *be* (564) after nouns (565) and adjectives (566) particularly when the subject of the sentence is, semantically, the object (patient) of the infinitive:

(564) Than fyrst *is to be knowen*, what tyme thou shalt put thy rammes to thy ewes;
(IHC] Fitzherbert 42)

(565) there be many *Exceptions to be taken* agaynst such Testimonies;
(IHC] Throckmorton 68 Cii)

(566) thys thyng . . . is soo *necessarye to be concluded*, of the thinges that be concluded before.
(IHC] Boethius Colville 99)

Constructions with the active forms also occur, and at least with adjectives, they remain the more common variant:

(567) The matter (sayth he) is so *harde to seache* and be vnderstoode, that it were much better to let it alone
(IHC] Vicary 33)

The passive replaces the older active *aci* construction in contexts where the 'accusative' noun or pronoun is the object of both the matrix verb and the infinitive ('I saw him greet' = 'I saw him being greeted'; see Fischer 1990):

(568) christ commaunded this *to be payed* for no moo. (IHC] Fisher 318)

- (569) Lord Cobham saith, that Kemish . . . did wish him *not to be dismay'd*,
 ([HC] Raleigh 214.Cii)

The development of the passive in these contexts may have been influenced by Latin. According to Fischer (1990: 210–11), the main cause for its use is, however, the general development of English word order: when SVO order was fixed, all preverbal noun phrases were interpreted as subjects rather than objects to the following active (finite or non-finite) verb.

The perfect infinitive, i.e. the type (*to have* + past pple, was uncommon in Old and Early Middle English. Instances become frequent from the fourteenth century on. Early Modern English instances support Fischer's argument (*CHEL* II 4.6.2.4) that the perfect infinitive is associated with the non-realisation of action rather than tense relations; hence it is common in clauses of unfulfilled condition, hypothesis, wish, intention, etc. (cf. the use of the pluperfect subjunctive in 4.3.3.2 above). The perfect infinitive can have the same functions in the sentence as the present infinitive:

- (570) . . . althoughe *to haue written* this boke either in latin or Greke . . . had bene more easier . . . neuerthelesse . . .
 (Ascham *Toxophilus* Dedication)

Lowth (1775 [1979]: 87), quoting eighteenth-century instances, condemns this usage.

'Preterite infinitive', i.e. the simple past participle form with *to*, is occasionally found in Early Modern English texts:

- (571) He was very anxious *to known* my opinion of a Death-Bed Repentance.
 ([HC] Burnet *Life of Rochester* 140)

This usage is no doubt related to the combination of modal auxiliaries with past participle forms (*would accepted*), discussed in 4.3.4.2 above.

The split infinitive first appears in Middle English and is very common in Pecoock's writings in the fifteenth century (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.2.6). Somewhat surprisingly, this construction is rare in Early Modern English and gains ground again only at the end of the eighteenth century. The most common elements appearing between the *to*-particle and the infinitive are the negative particle and adverbs of manner and degree:

- (572) tyll men . . . fell to forgete them . . . and then *to not bylene* them.
 (More *Confutation of Tyndale* 300)
- (573) To saye therefore that the whole worlde hath ben blinded many a hundred yere . . . is *to flatly gainsaye* the moste cleere . . . sayinges of the psalmes
 (Stapleton 23 r)

As in Present-Day English, the *ing*-form varies with the infinitive in Early Modern English. With most verbs, the accusative + *-ing* construction seems to become common only towards the end of the period; with some verbs, such as *see*, *bear* and *find*, this type is common even much earlier:

(574) Then I *saw ij. nakid imagis lying* a long, the one imbracing the other.

([HC] Leland I 141)

(575) He lay much silent: Once they *heard him praying* very devoutly.

([HC] Burnet *Life of Rochester* 157)

There are a number of factors, both linguistic and extralinguistic, which affect the variation between the simple infinitive and the *ing*-form in these constructions. More study is still needed; it is obvious, however, that the *ing*-form calls attention to the duration of the action or state indicated by the verb more emphatically than the infinitive.

In (574), (575), the *ing*-form is traditionally analysed as a present participle. It may also be used in functions typical of nouns, for instance as a subject or complement (*Seeing is believing*, *I intend to voice my objections to their receiving an invitation*, etc.; cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985 15.12). This *ing*-form is often called the gerund; this term will be used in the following discussion. Many gerundial constructions bear a resemblance to (non-finite) nominal clauses; they can also approach (non-finite) adverbial clauses, particularly when preceded by a preposition ((580), below). The gerund is very common in Middle English; it ultimately goes back to the Old English verbal noun ending in *-ung* or *-ing*, and the development of its verbal characteristics in Middle English has been a topic of lively discussion. Analogy and formal confusion with the present participle and the infinitive, Latin, French and Celtic influence, etc. have been mentioned in this discussion (see e.g. Mustanoja 1960: 567–73).

The noun phrase preceding the gerund (*their in to their receiving*, above), can be analysed as its logical subject. In view of the nominal origin of the gerund, it is no wonder that this ‘subject NP’ was originally in the genitive. In Middle English, with the development of the verbal characteristics of the gerund, the ‘subject’ could also have the endless form, as in (576); from late Middle English on, the objective form of the pronominal ‘subject’ was possible instead of the possessive form (577). The non-genitive noun seems to become common in written texts as late as the eighteenth century, the objective form of the pronoun even later (Visser §1102).

(576) it was true of *this light contynnyng* from day to daye.

(1536 John de Ponte, Ellis *Original Letters* I 2, 125)

- (577) I woulde haue no mans honestye empayred *by me tellynge*.
 ([HC] Latimer 160)

Because of the combination of nominal and verbal features in the gerund, mixed constructions are common in Early Modern English texts. The definite article may precede the gerund, even though it is followed by an object instead of an *of*-phrase:

- (578) for *the compassing or imagining the Queenes Death*. ([HC] Throckmorton 71 Ci)

According to Visser, these constructions become less common in the eighteenth century, possibly because of the influence of normative tendencies in the written standard. Lowth condemns them in his grammar (1775 [1979]: 83).

Passive forms of the gerund have been attested since the fifteenth century. Note the use of both the active and the passive form in (580):

- (579) a mad tale he told . . . Of his owne doores *being shut* against his entrance
 (Shakespeare *Comedy of Errors* IV.iii)
- (580) What is my gold The worse, for *touching?* clothes for *being look'd on?*
 (Jonson *Volpone* III.vii)

4.6.2.2 Relative clauses

Relative clauses can be divided into adnominal, nominal and sentential, with reference to the type of their antecedents. The most common are the adnominal clauses, which have a (pro)noun as the antecedent (581)–(583). In nominal relative clauses the relative pronoun ‘contains’ the antecedent, (584), and sentential relative clauses have an entire clause as the antecedent, (585).

- (581) Gorges I wish you shold speake any thinge *that* shold do your self good . . .
 ([HC] Essex 10)
- (582) to meete Maxentius, *whom* he overthrew at ponte Milvij, . . . at the very gates of Rome, *which* he entered & was received with Triumph . . .
 ([HC] Evelyn 899)
- (583) How now Perrott (quoth the Kinge) what is the Matter that you make this great Moane? *To whom* Sir John Perrott answered . . .
 ([HC] Perrott 33)
- (584) At my retorne into Essex house I did there *what* I could to hinder the shootinge . . .
 ([HC] Essex 11)
- (585) in somme places they mowe it, *the whiche* is not soo good to the hous-bandes profytte . . .
 ([HC] Fitzherbert 35)

This division is useful in the discussion of the development of the relative pronouns. Attention will also be paid to what Fischer (*CHEL* II 4.6.1.1) calls the animacy parameter and the information parameter. The former divides the antecedents into personal and impersonal; the latter classifies relative clauses as restrictive (581) and non-restrictive (582). As will be shown below, there is variation in the tightness of the link between the relative pronoun and its antecedent even within the restrictive and non-restrictive clauses: in the discussion of the spread of the *wh*-forms, it has proved useful to distinguish a special type of non-restrictive clause called ‘continuative’. In this type the two clauses stand in coordinating rather than subordinating relationship (583).

The verb of the relative clauses is in the indicative unless hypotheticality, unreality, etc. is involved. The subjunctive or auxiliary periphrasis is most common in generalising nominal relative clauses:

- (586) *whoso wel aduise* her visage, might gesse & devise which partes how filled,
wold make it a faire face. (IHCJ More *Richard III* 55)
- (587) sayde that whatsoever it *shulde coste* hym, he wolde do his devoyre to ayde
his sister (Berners *Froissart* 5 442)

4.6.2.2.1 Relative pronouns

At the end of the Middle English period, *that* was the most common adnominal relative link (its pronominal status is a matter of dispute), although there was a tendency to prefer *which* in non-restrictive clauses. The inflected forms *whom*, *whose* were common with personal antecedents in non-restrictive clauses. The subject form *who* was introduced later; in the second half of the fifteenth century it mainly occurs in letter-closing formulas, with reference to the Deity (Rydén 1983). The earlier development of the inflected forms may be due to the lack of these forms with *that* and to the frequent use of the nominative *who* as a generalising relative ‘whoever’ (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.1.1).

As early as the sixteenth century *wh*-pronouns are well established in all types of non-restrictive relative clauses, although *that* is still common in texts representing the oral mode of discourse (Dekeyser 1984: 62). There are, however, few unambiguous instances of *that* in continuative clauses.³⁹ *Wh*-pronouns are also finding their way into restrictive relative clauses (about twenty-five per cent in Rydén’s large collection of texts dating from 1520 to 1560).

In the course of the seventeenth century, the share of the *wh*-forms increases in restrictive clauses. They seem to be first introduced into

contexts with a noun antecedent; when the antecedent is a personal or indefinite pronoun, *that* prevails (Rydén 1966: 362 and *passim*). This is probably due to the fact that the link between the antecedent and the relative pronoun is tight in the last-mentioned contexts: in many cases the antecedent pronoun gets its entire meaning from the following relative clause. Consequently, the combination of the pronominal antecedent and *that* may have formed a kind of fixed collocation; there was also no risk of syntactic ambiguity with *that* in these contexts. On the other hand, the combination *that that* gradually gives way to *that which*, although instances can be found as late as the second half of the century:

(588) seeing Pronunciation is *that that* sets out a man . . . ([HC] Hoole 4)

(589) Is this *that that* is called the Protestant Religion . . . ([HC] Lisle 122 Ci)

At the beginning of the sixteenth century *which* could freely be used with reference to personal antecedents (590). The possessive *whose*, on the other hand, could refer to inanimate antecedents (591) mainly because neither *which* nor *that* had a possessive form.

(590) Your owne most louing obedient doughter and bedeswoman, *Margaret Roper, which* desireth . . . to do you some service.
([HC] Margaret Roper 511)

(591) all the lines that bee drawn crosse the circle, . . . are named *diameters, whose halfe* . . . is called the semidiameter . . . ([HC] Record B1 r)

The replacement of *which* by *who* in the nominative form first seems to take place with proper-name antecedents and with those referring to the Deity. The distribution along the animacy parameter is established in the course of the seventeenth century. In Rydén's sixteenth-century corpus, one-third of the occurrences of *which* have a human antecedent; in Dekeyser's seventeenth-century one, only one-tenth. Butler (1634 [1910]: 41) accepts *which* with human antecedents without reservations. Wallis adds to the fourth (1674) edition of his grammar a statement in which he regards *who* as more appropriate than *which* with personal antecedents.⁴⁰

This development is in accordance both with the tendency to systematise the use of various grammatical forms in the course of the Early Modern English period and with the polite and formal expression of Tudor and Stuart society, which probably emphasised the observation of the 'personality' of the referent. The present-day state of usage is reached in the eighteenth century, though the 'personal' *which* can still be found in uneducated usage at the end of the century (Austin 1985: 17–19). On the other hand,

the ‘dehumanising’ of *that* in restrictive clauses only seems to take place after the end of the eighteenth century (Dekeyser 1984: 71–2). According to Lowth (1775 [1979]:100) ‘*That* is used indifferently both of persons and things: but perhaps would be more properly confined to the latter.’ As early as the beginning of the eighteenth century, Addison corrects personal *that* relatives into *who* forms when editing the folio issues of the *Spectator*; note also his well-known ‘Humble Petition of *Who* and *Which*’ [1711], which is directed against the excessive use of *that*. (For a discussion, of the eighteenth century usage, see Bately 1964, Wright 1994a.)

There is little doubt that the spread of the *wh*-forms was supported by the heavy functional load of *that*. When the connection between the antecedent and the relative link was loose, the likelihood of ambiguity and misunderstanding of the meaning of *that* increased. Consequently, the *wh*-forms seem to be first established in contexts of loose relative link – in continuative and sentential relative clauses.

It has been suggested in a number of studies that the function of the relative pronoun in the clause played an important role in the choice of its form. A quantitative analysis shows that the *wh*-forms are first established in less common functions in the clause, in prepositional phrases and direct and indirect object positions (cf. Keenan & Comrie 1977, 1979a, Romaine 1982). *That* is most resistant to replacement by *wh*-forms in subject position (see, e.g., Dekeyser 1984: 73). This implies that the spread of the *wh*-forms is a ‘change from above’, from the formal and literary levels of the language. It seems, however, that the establishment of the present system is the sum total of a number of different tendencies: high frequency is probably not the only factor protecting *that* in subject position. For instance, the fact that *who* allows a distinction between the subjective and non-subjective forms, and that *who(m)* and *which* can be preceded by a preposition, must be taken into account in the discussion of the spread of these forms in various functions of the relative pronoun.

The model offered by the Latin relative pronoun paradigm, *qui, quae, quod*, etc., has been traditionally referred to as an important factor favouring the spread of the *wh*-forms. It is true that the rapidly increasing influence of classical literature and stylistic ideals on renaissance English coincides with this development. It seems, however, that Latin influence may only have had a supporting role. *Which*, and the inflected forms *whom*, *whose*, were in frequent use even in the Middle English period, and the same was true of the generalising *who*. Rydén (1966: 356) is no doubt right in pointing out that the influence of Latin and Latinate prose can mainly be seen in the increase of the number of loosely appended relative clauses,

often widely distanced from the antecedent, which strengthened the position of the *wh*-forms.

The use of the subjective form *who* for the objective *whom*, which is almost the rule in colloquial Present-Day English, is found as early as the sixteenth century; in the following centuries it is avoided in writing:

- (592) but wail his fall *Who* I my selfe struck downe: (Shakespeare *Macbeth* III.i)

In the sixteenth century, a ‘pleonastic’ *that* may be appended to the *wh*-relatives and relative adverbs. This use of *that*, which was common in Middle English, particularly with generalising pronouns, becomes obsolete in the seventeenth century (cf. the use of *that* with adverbial clause links, 4.6.2.3.1 below).

- (593) *Who that* redeth the boke of Exodi shall finde the charitie of this man wonderfull. ([HC] Elyot 151)

- (594) he can do no better than shew to hym the vttermoste of hys malycious mynde *whyb that* he beryth toward hym. ([HC] *Merry Tales* 25)

Which can be used both pronominally (i.e. without a following noun) and as a determiner. The determiner *which* is popular in late Middle English and Early Modern English. It always introduces non-restrictive – often continuative – clauses, mainly with non-personal antecedents. The origin of this usage has been attributed to foreign (primarily Latin) influence, but its development may also have been supported by the demand for structural clarity (Mustanoja 1960: 195), particularly in cases in which it ties together loosely connected clauses or sentences:

- (595) Amongst new wines only that kinde maye be safelye drunken, that is of a thin substaunce, as amongst Italian wines are Cauchanum & Albanum. &c. *which wines* in dede are thin, white, and waterish, and therefore are called Oligophora . . . ([HC] Turner B5 r)

- (596) Also whan hit was of hym demanded what auailed hym Plato or philosophy, wherein he had ben studious: he aunswered that they caused hym to sustayne aduersitie paciently, and made his exile to be to hym more facile and easy: *whiche courage and wysedome* consydered of his people, they eftsones restored him unto his realme and astate roiall . . . ([HC] Elyot 22)

The determiner *which* probably never extended beyond the literate mode of expression.

Along with *which*, the combination *the which* (pronominal or determiner) is common in sixteenth-century English. It first occurs in the North, in late Middle English, and slowly finds its way towards the South. Its rise is

attributed both to the French influence (*liques*, etc.) and to native constructions (OE *se þe, swa þmylc swa*, etc.). In Middle English it is used particularly in contexts in which an unambiguous link between the relative clause and the antecedent is needed, i.e. in continuative clauses and in clauses separated from the antecedent (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.1.1). In the sixteenth century, too, the typical domain of *the which* is continuative clauses, especially with inanimate nominal or clausal antecedents (see (585) above). It is rarer than the simple *which*, although favoured by certain authors. Later on in Modern English it falls into disuse: there are no instances in the Helsinki Corpus dating from the second half of the seventeenth century, and according to Elphinston (1765: II 7), it is no longer used in his time.

In Late Middle and Early Modern English, a finite or non-finite clause can be embedded into the relative clause. The relative pronoun is often used as a (push-down) clause element of the embedded clause (598), (599); for a discussion see Quirk *et al.* (1985:17.63–4); Moessner (1992). In some instances a ‘pleonastic’, recapitulating pronoun occurs in the relative clause (599); cf. (624).

(597) . . . directed to Bedingfield . . . *who, when he read them, carried* them to the duke . . .
 ([HC] Burnet *History* II 158)

(598) you haue a Duetie of God appoynted you how you shal do youre Office,
whiche if you excede, wil be greuously required at youre hands.
 ([HC] Throckmorton 65 Ci)

(599) he . . . shortly after founde out a Concealment, *which as soone as* he sought,
 the King bestowed *it* on hym. ([HC] Perrot 34)

This construction seems best explained by the use of *which* (or *who*) as a loose, almost coordinating link. This type of embedding becomes uncommon in the course of the eighteenth century. Visser (§534) refers to Latin models and to ‘writers of “polite” English’. Van der Wurff’s discussion (1989) also supports the strong Latin influence in examples like (598). It is not quite clear what Visser means by ‘polite English’, but it seems that this construction is not confined to formal styles exclusively. Visser quotes a number of examples from drama, and it can also be found in simple speech-based narrative style in seventeenth-century American English (Rissanen 1984: 423). French influence is probably at least as strong as Latin in the rise of this construction: it is to be noted that instances can be found as early as the late fourteenth century (Moessner 1992, Kytö and Rissanen 1993).

In addition to the three relative links discussed above, the relative clause

could be appended to the main clause by zero, i.e. without an expressed relativiser. In present-day written English, zero is mainly used when the relativiser is an object or complement or governed by a clause-final ('deferred' or 'stranded') preposition, as in *The house he bought/used to live in was white*. In subject position, zero is restricted to colloquial expression and mainly occurs after existential sentences (*There's a man likes his beer cold*).

The zero link is confined to restrictive relative clauses. Rydén (1966: 270) refers to Machyn's use of zero in non-restrictive clauses after certain expressions of time. This usage can be attributed to the author's idiosyncratic diary style:

- (600) The xij day of *Aprill, was Ester monday*, dyd pryche at Sant Mare spyttyll master Horne. ([HC] Machyn 304)

Zero in subject position occurs in Middle English, and it is common in the sixteenth century. It can be found in both formal and informal writings (Rydén 1966: 267).

- (601) But it is not *rumour can* make men guiltie, much lesse entitle me, to other mens crimes. (Jonson *Volpone* Epistle 18)

It is to be noted that even in this period the zero subject is most common in *there is/are* constructions (eighty-seven and a half per cent in Rydén's corpus).

- (602) I know *there is noe Man can doe more* than your selfe ([HC] Perrott 37)

It is possible that zero is favoured in existential clauses simply because the boundary between the matrix clause and the relative clause is obvious and the construction is therefore unambiguous (cf. Bever & Langendoen 1972, Erdmann 1980, Nagucka 1980). The number of instances in which the antecedent NP is separated from the zero-introduced relative clause is low:

- (603) Heere *they come will tell* you more (Shakespeare *All's Well that Ends Well* III.ii)

In the sixteenth century zero frequently occurs in other positions, too, particularly as the direct object or with a stranded preposition. The typical structural pattern with the zero relative in object position can be defined in some detail: the relative clause immediately follows the antecedent (cf., however, (606)); it is short and has a personal pronoun subject. The antecedent is mostly a noun although pronominal antecedents also occur, (605). All these features seem to diminish structural ambiguity.

- (604) that he . . . seeth every *trespasse we do* ([HC] Fisher 102)

- (605) he hathe bene otherwise enformed of *them be put in trust*
(Gardiner 424 [quoted in Rydén 1966: 272])

- (606) and resolved to make *the best use of it he was able*.
(Fielding *Tom Jones* II. v 100)

Zero is not necessarily a feature of colloquial language in the earliest Modern English. It occurs in the text of authors whose language can be regarded as formal, although it is avoided in the King James Bible.

In seventeenth-century texts zero in non-subject positions is more popular than in the subject position; in the eighteenth century it seems to become marked as a colloquialism. The grammarians' statements are illustrative while implying that the zero construction was still used even in formal writing at the end of the eighteenth century. Coote (1788: 215 [Visser §630]), states that the omission of the 'objective case' is less liable to objection than that of the 'nominative case'. Lowth (1775 [1979]: 103) rejects it as 'ungraceful' in solemn style and also condemns its excessive use in the colloquial.

Of the less common relative links, *as* and *but* are worth mentioning. *As* is mainly used with *such* and occasionally with *same*:

- (607) . . . that noe man might preach, but *such as* should be allowed by authority:
([HC] Hayward 5)

- (608) I suppose them to be longer then forty of *such miles as* are betwixt London and Saint Albanes . . .
([HC] John Taylor 128 Ci)

- (609) to use *such means as* you shall think fit for the effectuall suppressing all Preparations to such a Disorder *in the same manner as* you would doe any other Sedition
([HC] Letter by Charles II, I 198)

But has the force of a relative pronoun + *not*. It seems to retain much of its conjunctive meaning 'except':

- (610) I thynke there be no man *but* somtyme hath had thexperyence of the Ioye . . .
([HC] Fisher 43)

- (611) ther was no Englysshman of armes *but that* had ii. or iii. prisoners.
(Berners *Froissart* I 248)

- (612) What Townes of any moment, *but* we haue? (Shakespeare *1Henry VI* II.ii)

Note the combination *but that* in (611). The use of *but* in subject position (610), (611) is more common than in object position (612). Although this link was probably never common, it survives throughout the Modern English period.

4.6.2.2.2 Nominal relative clauses

Nominal relative clauses are used in the same functions as the noun phrases, as subjects, objects and complements. In addition to *who* and (*that*) *which*, these clauses can be introduced by *that* (613), and by *what* (614), which becomes common in the course of the seventeenth century (Kemp 1979):

(613) Let vs not inclyne our selues vnto the preceptes and tradycyons of oure fathers, nor let vs do *that* semes ryght in our eyes. ([HC] Latimer 37)

(614) Doe and say *what* ye lust, ye shall neuer please me ([HC] Udall 1077)

In the above instances the relative clause is generalising but nominal relative clauses can also be non-generalising, as in (615)–(616); cf. Fischer (*CHEL* II 4.6.1.1) for a discussion of the Middle English usage. It is not always easy, however, to keep these two types apart.

(615) There be also *whiche* ought to be used for necessitie only.
(Elyot [Scolar Press] 62 v)

(616) desyred him to take *that* they had brought him (Elyot [Scolar Press] 215 v)

From Old English on, the generalising reference has been the domain of *wh*-pronouns. When *that* introduces a nominal relative clause, it is mostly non-generalising, as in (616).

Butler (1634 [1910]) mentions *that* as an alternative to *that which* giving the example *I giv you that you ask*. There are also instances in Bunyan (Widholm 1877: 36). This use seems to become obsolete by the end of the seventeenth century. This is not surprising as the construction obviously deviates from the other uses of the *that*-relative. The heavy functional load of *that* certainly accelerated the loss.

That referring to a group of persons or things is less common:

(617) there are, *that* professe to have a key for the decyphering of euery thing
(Jonson *Volpone* Epistle 18–19)

The generalising relative pronouns could be strengthened by *ever*, *so*, *so ever* either spelt as a compound or as separate words, as in *who euer*, *what so euer*, *who so that*, etc. In *whatsomever* (e.g. Shakespeare, *All's Well that Ends Well* III.v), the intensifying element *so* may have been confused with the indefinite pronoun *some*.

As the pronoun of the nominal relative clause also contains the antecedent, it can be more readily placed before the main clause in the sentence:

(618) *Who receyueth you* receiueth me (sayed christ) ([HC] Latimer 90–1)

4.6.2.2.3 Adverbial relative links

From Old English on, *there* and *where* can introduce adnominal and nominal relative clauses. Like the *wh*-pronouns, both can be followed by *that* (620) or *as* (621)–(622) as late as the seventeenth century. The latest instances of *there* in this use are recorded in sixteenth-century texts:

- (619) Your laughing *there* you are, is the occasion I weep not *where* I am.
(1594 Bedingfeld transl. of *Machiavelli's Florentine Hist.* 182 [OED s.v. *there* 9c])
- (620) . . . departe out of the Kynges service without licence of the Kynges
leutenaut *there that* such departyng be takyn demed and adjudged felonie
([HC] Statutes III 27)
- (621) whan they waxe brodye, to sette them *there as* noo beastes . . . hurte them.
([HC] Fitzherbert 96)
- (622) he hade me home to hys owne howse, *where as* I had good yntertayne-
mente;
([HC] Mowntayne 209)

Note the variation between *there* and *where* in (619).

The antecedent of *where* can be *there*:

- (623) The mynde of a man is more *there where* it loueth than it is vpon hymselfe.
([HC] Fisher 29)

4.6.2.2.4 Resumptive pronouns

Personal pronouns occurring in relative clauses and coreferential with the relative pronoun are called resumptive:

- (624) I had . . . my Woman, Amy, *who* I now dress'd like a Gentlewoman and
made *her* my Companion . . .
(Defoe *Roxana* 165)

In Old and early Middle English these pronouns have a clearly definable syntactic function: they indicate the case, gender and number with indeclinable relative particles. After the introduction of the relative pronoun forms *whom*, *whose*, their use is sharply reduced (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.1.1). Instances can, however, be found until mid-eighteenth century (624). In late Middle English and Early Modern English resumptive pronouns may have been used for increasing textual cohesion (cf. Mustanoja 1960: 202–3). As they mostly refer to the object of the clause, Visser (§604) suggests that an additional reason for their use might be a more general tendency to repeat the sentence-initial object with a personal pronoun – a tendency which may be connected with the establishment of the basic SVO order.

4.6.2.3 Adverbial clauses

Adverbial clauses are traditionally classified on a semantic basis analogously to other adverbials. Typical classes are clauses of time, place, manner, purpose, result, condition, concession and comparison. As will be shown below, these distinctions are in no way clear-cut; many conjunctions introduce clauses of more than one semantic class. In most instances, however, the subordinators have one central and one or more peripheral meanings; thus, for instance, the core meaning of *when* is temporal, while its causal, concessive and conditional meanings are secondary.

In Early Modern English, as in Present-Day English, adverbial clauses can function either as predication adjuncts or as sentence adjuncts (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 15.22). Predication adjuncts normally occur in the same positions as direct objects or subject complements; consequently, they are mostly positioned after the matrix clause:

(625) The reason *is, because in this Cure, the vncleanenesse of the body is such, which feedes the matter of the disease.* ([HC] Clowes 9)

(626) that no hatt be worne of any Graduate or Scholer within the University, except it *be when he shall journey out of the Town . . .* ([HC] William Cecil 25)

Most often, however, the adverbial clause functions as a sentence adjunct; the majority of the examples quoted in the following discussion will be of that type.

In Middle English and even in Early Modern English the number and variation of conjunctions introducing subordinate clauses is more extensive than in present-day written or standard spoken language. To give a few instances, *without* and *an if, nif*, could introduce conditional clauses, *afore, or ere, sith, sithence* temporal clauses, *for because* and *for why* causal clauses and *howbeit (that), howsomever* concessive clauses. Some of these are still used in non-standard varieties of English. On the other hand, the sphere of use of some conjunctions, most notably *that*, was wider than today. For instance, when two subordinate clauses were coordinated by *and*, the second conjunction could be *that*:

(627) *Though yet of Hamlet our deere Brothers death The memory be greene: and that it vs befitted To beare our hearts in greefe*
(Shakespeare *Hamlet* I.ii)

(628) But *since* this has not been so, and *that* both yo and Lovelace call upon me to assume my own Estate, I will enter briefly into the subject.
(Richardson *Clarissa* II 56)

4.6.2.3.1 ‘Pleonastic’ *that*

In Old and early Middle English, subordinating links were often syntactic constructions consisting of a preposition, the demonstrative pronoun ‘that’ and a conjunctive element (*þæt* or *þe*), as in *for þam þe*, *for þy þæt* ‘for’, ‘because’. In addition, there are combinations of the simple conjunction and *þæt*, such as *op þæt* ‘until’. In Middle English, these groups are simplified, but *that* still often follows the conjunction, and can be appended even to conjunctions with which it did not occur in Old English texts. It is possible that Scandinavian influence supported the use of this ‘post-conjunctive’ *that*. Scholars have described *that* in these positions alternatively as a relative particle or as a more general marker of subordination; in early Modern English it is certainly identified with the nominal clause conjunction *that* rather than with the relative link.

In the sixteenth century, *that* can be found at least with *after*, *as*, *because*, *before*, *beside(s)*, *for*, *if*, *since*, *sith*, *though*, *(un)till*, *when* and *while* (see Rissanen 1989):

- (629) *yf that* yow can so doo, paye your chargys of the howsse,
 ([HC] Mowntayne 207)
- (630) *After that* I had told him many consideracions why he had no cause so to say: “Well,” said he, . . .
 ([HC] Roper 35)
- (631) I thought my self I might not well do so, *because that* in my conscience this was one of the cases, in which I was bounden ([HC] More *Letters* 505)
- (632) I received a Challenge from Sir Amias Preston, and *for that* I did intend to answer it, I resolved to leave my Estate settled . . . ([HC] Raleigh 213 Cii)

In addition, *that* can follow nominal and relative *wh*-connectors (4.6.2.2.1 above) and links going back to non-finite forms of the verbs, such as *notwithstanding*, *excepting*, etc.

‘Pleonastic’ *that* is relatively common in the sixteenth century. In the course of the seventeenth century its popularity decreases rapidly. Instances can, however, be found even in eighteenth-century texts, e.g. in Fielding. The only conjunction differing from the general trend is *for*: there are more instances of *for that* recorded in the 1570–1640 subperiod than in the 1500–70 one in the Helsinki Corpus (Rissanen 1989). Towards the end of the seventeenth century, however, even this combination becomes rare. The reasons for the deviant development of *for that* will be discussed below, in the section dealing with causal clauses.

In addition to *that*, the conjunction *as* can be used as the second element of a conjunction introducing adverbial clauses:

- (633) They drie vp the fast and sound members, and make the humor grosse, whereof *when as* it is burned or rosted in the kidneyes, stones are ingendred. ([HC] Turner, B7 r)

4.6.2.3.2 Final and consecutive clauses

Clauses indicating purpose (final) and result (consecutive) are similar in meaning and the links introducing them are partly the same. The main distinction is that, unlike consecutive clauses, final clauses normally indicate action which has not taken place, i.e. they are less factual. For this reason, the mood of the final clauses is mostly expressed by subjunctive forms or by modal periphrasis with *may/might*, *mot*, *shall/should* and *will/would*.

- (634) Therefore that infelicitie of our tyme and countray compelleth us to encroche some what upon the yeres of children, . . . that they *may sooner attayne* to wisdom and grauitie than . . . ([HC] Elyot 21)
- (635) that we ordeyne at the portes and havens of Englande suche provysyon and defence that our countrey *receive* no blame (Berners *Froissart* 4 314)

There is also a close semantic relationship between clauses of purpose and reason. Consequently, conjunctions normally introducing causal clauses can also introduce final clauses, particularly in negative contexts:

- (636) And *for* the time shall not seeme tedious, Ile tell thee what befell me . . . (Shakespeare *3Henry VI* III.i)

As can be used as a link in consecutive clauses, particularly when introduced by *such* or *so* in the main clause. These clauses show some resemblance to comparative clauses:

- (637) Loue's a mighty Lord, And hath *so* humbled me, *as* I confesse There is no woe to his correction . . . (Shakespeare *Two Gentlemen of Verona* II.iv)
- (638) *Such* attribution should the Douglas haue, *As* not a souldior of this seasons stampe, Should go so general currant through the world. (Shakespeare *1Henry IV* IV.i)

The simple *that* is a common link in both final and consecutive clauses. Because of its heavy functional load, this conjunction was often preceded by elements making the indication of purpose or result more obvious, such as *so*, *to the intent/end* (recorded since the fifteenth century), and *in order* (recorded since the eighteenth century).

Final clauses:

- (639) go to thy bedde and slepe, and be vppe betyme, . . . *that* thou mayste be
all the shorte wynters day about thy busynes. ([HC] Fitzherbert 101)
- (640) To do this, *to the end that* they may oft-times reade over these . . .
([HC] Brinsley 46)
- (641) *to the intent* that they might be ye [= the] easier had, Mr Speaker invited
them to dinner ([HC] Aungier 24)
- (642) *In order* . . . *that* the Resemblance in the Ideas be Wit, it is necessary . . .
(Addison *Spectator* no. 62 I 264)

In order (. . .) *that* probably originates in the prepositional expression indicating either purpose or, in a more general way, ‘in regard to’, ‘in reference to’, first attested in the sixteenth century:

- (643) The rychesse of ye worlde hath no goodnes, but *in order to* man
(1526 *Pilgr. Perf.* 6 [OED s.v. *order* sb. 28a])

Consecutive clauses:

- (644) Then Il’d shrieke, *that* euen your eares Should rift to heare me,
(Shakespeare *Winter’s Tale* V.i)
- (645) your eye may iudg without muche declaracion, *so that* I shall not neede to
make more exposition therof . . . ([HC] Record Fo. 2 r)

In negative final clauses *lest* is used if the intention or purpose to prevent or guard against something is expressed (OED s.v. *lest*). This usage goes back to the Old English combination *þy læs þe* and is common in ME (see Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.3.1):

- (646) which I denied, *lest* they should so recouer the swords . . . ([HC] Coverte 17)

4.6.2.3.3 Causal clauses

Causal clauses divide into those containing new and those containing given information (cf. Traugott *CHEL* I 4.5.5 and Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.3.2 for Old English and Middle English usages). In Early Modern English the most common conjunctions introducing causal clauses of new information are *for* (*that*) and *because* (*that*). Less frequently occurring links are *forbecause*, *as*, *for why* and *in that*. Clauses of given information are introduced by *that*, *now* (*that*), *since*, *sith* (note the connection of these conjunctions with temporality). The mood of the causal clauses is mostly indicative.

The most common Early Modern causal conjunction is *for*. It goes back to Old English groups in which it functions as a preposition

governing a demonstrative pronoun and, often, *bat* or *be* (see the discussion of ‘pleonastic’ *that* above, 4.6.4.1). According to Mitchell (1985: §§3014–18), causal clauses introduced by these Old English combinations could be either coordinating or subordinating. In Middle English, the combinations with *for* are simplified, but *that* is occasionally used after the (now conjunctive) *for* in the same way as with other conjunctions and certain pronouns (see above, 4.6.2.3.1).

In Early Modern English, *for* is still occasionally used in a way typical of the subordinators, before the main clause (647) and in combinations of two or more coordinated causal clauses (648); cf. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 13.9–13.10), Rissanen (1989). In most instances in these ‘subordinator contexts’ it is followed by *that*, as in (649) and with the second *for* in (648).

- (647) And *for* he felte hymself so syke he commaunded to aske if that Chambre had any specyall name ([HC] Fabyan 174 v)
- (648) the nether mouth of the stomacke is narrower then the vpper, and that for three causes: the first cause is, that the vpper receyeth meate great and boystrous in substaunce . . . The second is, *for* by him passeth al the meates . . . The thirde is, *for that* through him passeth al the drosse of the Stomacke to the guttes. ([HC] Vicary 68)
- (649) king Edwardes lyne shoulde not any longer reigne vpon them, both *for that* thei had so farre gone, that it was now no surety to retreate, as *for that* they thought it for the weale vniuersal to take that wai although they had not yet begonne it. ([HC] More *Richard III* 79)

In most instances the loose causal connection between the two clauses and the post-position of the *for*-clause make it possible to classify *for* as a coordinator:

- (650) he saide to Cyrus, O sir, from hensforthe loke that ye take me for a man of great substaunce. *For* I am highly rewarded with many great gyftes for bringing your letters. ([HC] Elyot 155)

This distinction between the coordinating *for* and the subordinating *for that* probably accounts for the fact that the last-mentioned combination increases frequency in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries while the other conjunction + *that* combinations rapidly fall into disuse. As mentioned above, even *for that* seems to become obsolete by the end of the seventeenth century.

Because (‘by cause’) emerges in the fourteenth century. In its earliest usage it is mostly followed by *that*; from the fifteenth century on, the majority of instances appear without *that*. The grammaticalisation of this conjunction

is remarkably rapid, and it is very popular in the sixteenth century: in texts dating from 1420–1500 in the Helsinki Corpus, the ratio between *because* and *for* is 1:15 (about fifty as against about seven hundred and fifty instances), while in the period between 1500 and 1640 it is 1:3 (about three hundred and fifty as against about a thousand). It is possible that this development is due to the gradual development of *for* towards a coordinating conjunction, a development which underlines its use as an indicator of fairly loose, explanatory cause–effect relationship. Conversely, it can be argued that the emergence of a new clearly subordinating causal link may have accelerated the coordinator development of *for*. It is worth mentioning that Wallis (1972 [1972]: 374) makes a clear distinction between *for* ‘nam’ and *because* ‘quia’.

Causal uses of *sith(ence)*, *since* (from the ME temporal *sithen(s)*, *sin*, < OE *sipþan*), and *as* emerge in Middle English (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.3.2). This use of *as* seems to develop slowly; there are no unambiguous instances in Shakespeare (Franz 1939: §578), and not many in the Early Modern English section of the Helsinki Corpus:

- (651) For *sith* almightie God the father woulde gyue hys moste dearely beloued sonne vnto suche an horrible death, . . . thou mayest bee sure that he hateth sinne very much. ([HC] Fisher 398)
- (652) they did not know whether he might not have stepped aside for debt, *since* at that time all people were calling in their money . . . ([HC] Burnet *History* II 164)
- (653) But when the king had abused her, anon her husband (*as* he was an honest man . . .) left her vp to him al together. ([HC] More *Richard III* 55)

It is often difficult to draw a distinct borderline between the causal and comparative uses of *as*:

- (654) for *as* she hath Been publickely accus’d, so shall she haue A iust and open Triall . . . (Shakespeare *Winter’s Tale* II.iii)

4.6.2.3.4 Conditional and concessive clauses

Like final and consecutive clauses, conditional and concessive clauses are closely related. In both clause types, a condition is involved. In conditional clauses the realisation of the action in the main clause depends on the fulfilment of the condition in the subordinate clause (‘If you come here, I’ll show you some pictures’), while in concessive clauses, the fulfilment of the condition does not affect the action of the main clause; on the

contrary, the main clause is often in adversative relation with it, as in ‘Although he asked me to, I didn’t show him any pictures’ (cf. Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.3.3).

The relationship between these two clause types can also be seen in the fact that, as in Middle English, the prototypical conditional conjunction *if* can be used in concessive clauses (655)⁴¹ and the prototypical concessive conjunction *though* in conditional clauses (656):

- (655) *If* Spirites of their owne accorde woulde gladly tell vs many thinges: yet wee must not giue eare vnto them
(1572 R. H. tr. Lauater’s *Of ghostes* 197 [OED s.v. *if* 4a])
- (656) *Though* a sprete or an angell hath apered to him, let vs not stryve agaynst God.
(Tyndale *Acts of Apostles* 23.9)

As in Present-Day English, subjunctive forms predominate in conditional clauses indicating hypothetical or rejected condition. Auxiliary periphrasis also occurs. In non-introduced conditional or concessive clauses (with inversion) the subjunctive or auxiliary periphrasis is the rule (660)–(663). *Would* in most of these contexts seems to imply volition (658):

- (657) and if euer it *came* soo to / that he shulde resygne his Kyngele mageste / he sayde his mynde was to resygne to the Duke of Herforde
([HC] Fabyan 168V Ci)
- (658) I might borrow, (if any man *would* lend) spend it I could get, begge if I *had* the impudence, and steale, if I *durst* aduenture the price of a hanging . . .
([HC] John Taylor 129 C1)
- (659) If he *should* nowe *take* any thinge of them, he knewe, he said, he should do them greate wronge . . .
([HC] Roper 41)

Besides the prototypical conjunctions *if* and (*al*)*though*, inversion without an expressed conjunction can indicate a conditional or concessive relationship between the subordinate and the main clause. This usage may go back to Old English (Mitchell 1985 II: §§3678–83), and is possible in formal contexts even in Present-Day English. The clause with an inversion either follows or (most commonly) precedes the main clause. In Present-Day English, verbs occurring in inverted conditional clauses are mainly *be*, *have* and *do*; in Early Modern English the selection of verbs is more varied:

Conditional

- (660) *Wist I* that it were trewe . . . I woulde well thynke, that . . . he hanged himselfe.
(More *Heresies* 327)

- (661) *Would I haue my flesh Torne by the publique hooke, these qualified hangmen Should be my company.* (Ben Jonson *Sejanus* II.iii)

Concessive

- (662) For how can that subject please his Liege Souerain, *keepe he* neuer so well his lawes, *obserue he* neuer so exactly his statutes, if with all this he acknowleadg him not for his Prince (Stapleton 5v)

Expressions of alternative or disjunctive concession

- (663) I charge thee . . . To do what ever Faustus shall command: *Be it* to make the Moone drop from her Sphere, *Or* the Ocean to overwhelme the world. (Marlowe *Dr. Faustus* I.iii)

The imperative is occasionally used in clauses which are either conditional or concessive in meaning (Ando 1976: §§6.3.9–6.3.10):

- (664) *Pursue* him quicklie, and he cannot scape (Marlowe *Edward II* II.iv)
 (665) *Live* godly, thou shalt die, though honour heaven, yet shall thy life be forcibly bereauen. (Marlowe Ovid's *Elegies* 3 8 37)

Conditional links no longer used in standard Present-Day English are *so* (*that*) 'if only', *if case* and, in negative contexts (in which Present-Day English normally uses *unless*), *without*. The conjunction *and* can also link the clauses of a conditional sentence (see 4.6.1).

- (666) I prethee go, and get me some repast, I care not what, *so* it be holosome foode. (Shakespeare *Taming of the Shrew* IV.iii)
 (667) and *without* they myght have it half for nought, they will bey [= buy] none; ([HC] Isabel Plumptre 198)

In case (*that*) emerges in Middle English and steadily gains ground in Early Modern English. The less common *if case* (669) may be regarded as an abbreviated variant of *if case be that* (cf. *OED* s.v. *case* sb1 11):

- (668) to which Scholars may be removed and kept apart, *in case* they be sick . . . ([HC] Hoole 226)
 (669) This speak I (Lords) to let you vnderstand, *If case* some one of you would flye from vs, That there's no hop'd-for mercy with the Brothers Yorke. (Shakespeare *3Henry VI* V.iv)

The main clause (apodosis) following a conditional clause is occasionally introduced by the correlative *so* or *then*:

- (670) *If* thou believe not . . . , *so* is it impossible that . . .
(1536 Tindale *Doct. Treat.* 433 [OED s.v. *so* 12])
- (671) *if* the Brayne be let, al other members be let: and if the Brayne be wel, *then*
al other members of the body be the better disposed.
([HC] More *Richard III* 42)

The use of *then* in (671) seems to be due to rhythm or emphasis.

The intensifying *all* plays an important role in the formation of concessive links. It is combined with *though* in Middle English, and by the end of the period it had lost most of its emphasising force. *For all (that)* and *all if* ‘even though/if’ are less common combinations indicating concessivity. The former phrase can be found throughout the Modern period; the latest instances of the latter are recorded in Barclay’s texts in the sixteenth century:

- (672) How many of this Citie *for all that* they are Vsurers, yet would be counted
honest men . . .
([HC] Smith B2 v)
- (673) *All if* I would, it were but shame.
(1514 Barclay *Cyt. & Uplandysbm.* 41 [OED s.v. *all* adv. C10b])

From early Middle English on, *all* can be used as an intensifying word even in non-introduced concessive clauses, with an inverted word order:

- (674) the holy water of . . . baptyisme strecheth to . . . all the actuall synne that
the man hath done, *All were he* neuer so olde eare he were baptysed.
(More *Conf. Tindale* 101)

The compound conjunction *albeit* develops in Middle English. Occasionally the pronominal element *it* is missing:

- (675) I [= ay], but his feare Would ne’re be masqu’d, *all-be* his vices were.
(Jonson *Sejanus* IV 478)

Concessive clauses can be introduced by *notwithstanding (that)*:

- (676) Milke, *notwithstanding that* it seemeth to be wholly of one substance, yet it
is compact, or made of severall substances.
(1584 Cogan *Haven Health* 176 [OED s.v. *notwithstanding* C. conj.])

4.6.2.3.5 Temporal clauses

Temporal clauses relate the time of the situation they denote to the time of the situation indicated in the main clause (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 15.26). They are related to causal and conditional/concessive clauses because in those adverbial clause types the action and state of the subordinate clause mostly

precedes that of the main clause. In the following instances, temporal conjunctions *whiles* and *when* are used in a causal (677) conditional (678) and concessive (679) clause:

- (677) [the horse] fell downe, and *whiles* hee was not able to endure the paine,
walloweth along, and happeneth to besprent his caparison
(Holland *Ammianus Marcellinus* 23 220 [Franz §555 note])
- (678) what a thing should I haue beene *when* I had beene swel'd!
(Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* III.v)
- (679) Dost thou coniure for wenches, that yu calst for such store, *When* one is
one too many? (Shakespeare *Comedy of Errors* III.i)

A clear proof of the closeness of temporal and causal clauses is the use of the conjunctions *since* and *as* introducing both classes (see examples (651)–(653) and (694)–(695).

The mood of the temporal clauses is mostly indicative; subjunctive forms appear when uncertainty, non-factuality or prospect are indicated. This is often the case in clauses referring to future time, introduced by *till*, *before*, etc.; see e.g. (697) below.

The time denoted by the main clause can be previous or subsequent to, or simultaneous with, the time denoted by the subordinate clause. Some subordinators (*until*, *since*, etc.) limit the duration of the time indicated by the main clause.

The temporal conjunction most extensive in its scope of meaning is *when*, which replaces the older *þa*, *þo*, *þonne*, in non-generalising contexts, in Middle English (see Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.3.4). *When* can be used both with reference to a single event or to repeated or habitual action. It can introduce a clause indicating time either simultaneous to (680), or preceding (681), that referred to in the main clause. It can also indicate a generalisation in time (682)–(683).

- (680) *When* I was a scholer in Cambridge, there was there a stinking butcherie
... (IHC] Turner D1 r)
- (681) *When* the childe bringeth it, turned into latin, the master must compare it
with Tullies booke ... (IHC] Ascham 183)
- (682) *when* a man is in good helth a little [wine] being delayed [= diluted] with
water, it maye be taken without harme. (IHC] Turner B3 v)

With a correlative *then*:

- (683) *when* your pot is filled, *then* couer the top thereof with salt.
(IHC] Markham 113)

The conjunction *where*, primarily local, is often used in a rather loose way in contexts in which *when*, for instance, would sound more natural:

- (684) this is like the mending of high wayes In sommer, *where* the wayes are faire enough?
(Shakespeare *Merchant of Venice* V.i)

In the generalising use (685), and in intensifying/indefinite contexts, (686)–(687), the compound forms *whenso*, *when(so)ever* are common. These originally emphatic forms emerge in Middle English. The form *whensomever* also occurs (687); cf. *whatsoever* commented on in 4.6.2.2.2 above:

- (685) *whensoever* they shall bee examined of a sudden, they shall be very ready,
([HC] Brinsley 46)
- (686) I do not yet know when I shall leave this twone. *Whenever* I do, twill be with less reluctancy then ever I did in my life. ([HC] Anne Hatton 212)
- (687) The next degree I expecte is some violent fryars and Jesuites inciting . . . Which *whensomever* it bee I confidently beleewe . . .
(1611 in *10th Rep. Hist. MSS. Comm.* App. 1 547 [OED s.v. *whensomever*])

These emphatic forms can occasionally be used in contexts in which a single event is referred to:

- (688) He gave me a good supper last night *when ever* I came within his doors.
(1655 *Sorel's Com. Hist. Francion* [OED s.v. *whenever* I 2])

The *OED* points out that this use of *whenever* is still current in Scots and Hiberno-English.

As in Present-Day English, simultaneous or overlapping time is mostly indicated by *while(s)*, *(the) whilst*. (For the etymology of these forms, see, e.g., Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.3.4.)

- (689) laboureth to lyue and not to die, *whiles* they may haue strengthe to contynue.
([HC] Boethius, Colville 79)
- (690) The Accuser may be drawn to Practice, *whilst* he is in Person.
([HC] Raleigh 212 Cii)
- (691) I saw a Smith stand with his hammer (thus) *The whilst* his Iron did on the Anuile coole . . .
(Shakespeare *King John* IV.ii)

The whilst is rare in Early Modern English. As in Present-Day English, *while* can be used adversatively, with a weakened temporal meaning:

- (692) now adaies beggars are gallants, *while* gentiles of right blood seeme tame ruffians;
([HC] Armin 42)

- (693) *whilst* every one of these is the same with the rest, whoever endeavours to obtain any of these without the other, loseth that which he desireth.
 ([HC] Boethius Preston 127)

See also the use of *while(s)* in instances of the type of (701).

In Early Modern English *as* indicates simultaneous action in more varied contexts than in Present-Day English:

- (694) I pray you, iest sir *as* you sit at dinner . . . (Shakespeare *Comedy of Errors* I.ii)

When the time denoted by the main clause follows the time denoted by the subordinate clause, the typical conjunctions are *after* and *sith(ence)*, *since* and, when immediacy or proximity between the events is indicated, *as soon as*. While *after* simply marks the sequence of the two clauses, the conjunctions going back to Old English *sīððan* normally mark the beginning of the period after which the situation in the matrix clause applies (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 15.29). In Early Modern English, however, even the last-mentioned conjunctions are occasionally used rather loosely:

- (695) *since* I came into this Hall, I hearde one saye (but I knowe him not) that Wiat . . .
 ([HC] Throckmorton 71, Ci)

From (that) is occasionally used as a connective, in the same contexts as *since*. According to Fischer (*CHEL* II 4.6.3.4), this use goes back to Middle English and may be due to the gradually developing causal meaning of *sith(ence)*, *since*:

- (696) Euery gilt . . . Done *frome* he passith the 3eris of Innocens.
 (c. 1500 *Lancelot* [OED s.v. *from*])

When the time denoted in the main clause precedes that of the subordinate clause, the most common conjunctions are *before* and (particularly in the sixteenth century) *ere*, (697). The combination *or ere*, (698), is uncommon:

- (697) forasmuche as they were coupled *ere* she wer wel ripe, she not very feruently loued, for whom she neuer longed. ([HC] More *Richard III* 55)
- (698) Thou shalt have somewhat of me, *or ere* I go.
 (1568 Fulwel [OED s.v. *or* adv. 1])

Afore is rare, in comparison with *before*, and seems more common in local than in temporal contexts. According to Franz (1939: §558 note), the temporal usage is ‘vulgar’ in Shakespeare (700) but it occurs in earlier sixteenth-century laws (699):

(699) Also be it enacted . . . that all other Statutes of array made *afore* the making of this present Statute, . . . be utterly voyde ([HC] *Statutes* III 9)

(700) ile [= I'll] forswaere keeping house, *afore* Ile be in these tirrits and frights
(Shakespeare *2 Henry IV* II.iv)

Until and *till* mark the time up to which the situation in the matrix clause applies (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 15.27). *While(s)* can occasionally be used with this indication:

(701) He shall conceale it, *Whiles* [= until] you are willing it shall come to note
(Shakespeare *Twelfth Night* IV.iii)

Against (that) can be occasionally found in a conjunctive use, roughly with the meaning 'by the time (that)'. An indication of purpose is often involved:

(702) And see them readie *against* their Mother comes.
(Shakespeare *Titus Andronicus* V.ii)

(703) Prepare a Child *against* he comes to be a Man
(1689 Selden *Table Talk* [OED s.v. *against* Bb])

Clauses introduced by *as soon as* and *no sooner* (. . .) *but/than* indicate the temporal proximity of two actions or events. According to Fischer (*CHEL* II 4.6.3.4), *no sooner* (. . .) *than* does not occur in Middle English. The earliest instances found in the Helsinki Corpus date from around 1600.

(704) *as soone as* he was gon in to the house this poller [= rogue] lad the horse awaye . . .
([HC] *Merry Tales* 147)

(705) a sodaine fire was raised towards eveninge in Lieth, which was *no sooner* espied by the Englishe, *but* they discharged their ordinance . . .
([HC] Hayward 61)

(706) the Portugals every Year are at the charge of a lusty Squadron in these Seas, . . . who were *no sooner* gone, *than* the Arabs sent their Fleet to do this Mischief here;
([HC] Fryer 193)

But can introduce a temporal clause even in other contexts if the main clause contains a negation, expressed either by an explicitly or implicitly negative adverb:

(707) I *scarce* had paid the Chair-Men, and was coming up after her, *but* I met her on the stair . . .
(Wycherley *Love in a Wood* IV.v)

(708) I beheld in my Dream, that they had *not* journied far, *but* the River and the way, for a time, parted.
(Bunyan *Pilgrim's Progress* 229)

4.6.2.3.6 Clauses of comparison

Clauses of comparison have traditionally been regarded as a semantic subclass of adverbial clauses. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 15.50, 15.63) make a distinction between two types of clauses indicating comparison. In ‘clauses of similarity and comparison’, the subordinate clause is a predication adjunct, and the focus of comparison is indicated by the main clause in its entirety. In ‘comparative clauses’, which are not regarded as a subtype of adverbial clauses by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 15.2) there is a ‘standard of comparison’ expressed by some element in the main clause; this element is, in most cases, an adjective or an adverb, but it can be any part of the sentence except the verb. The difference in the basic meaning of the two clause types need not, however, be great: the standard of comparison is implied in most clauses of similarity, as in, *It was just [as horrible] as I thought*.

Clauses of similarity or comparison

The most common subordinator introducing clauses of similarity is *as*. As shown above, this subordinator can introduce even other classes of adverbial clauses. In addition, it develops a use parallel to that of a relative pronoun as early as Middle English (Fischer *CHEL* II 4.6.3.5); see, 4.6.2.2.1.

As can be strengthened by *such* or *right*:

- (709) if his Highnes might inwardlie see my true minde *such as* God knoweth it is, it wolde (I trust) sone aswage his high displeasure.

([HC] More, *Letters* 509)

- (710) Farthermore euery thyng, kepethe that thyng, that is agreyng and according to it, *ryght as* the thynges that be contrarye, corrupteth and dystroyeth it.

([HC] Boethius, Colville 80)

In most instances, however, *such* is best analysed as the antecedent of *as* (notice the comma between *such* and *as* in (711)). It is not unlikely that constructions of this type contribute to the development of the relative link use of *as*:

- (711) if the matter be *such, as* both the parties may stande with saluacyon, then ...

([HC] More *Letters* 547)

Of the special uses of *as*, the evaluative–emphatic one is worth mentioning:

- (712) Do not laugh at me, (*as* [= as sure as] I am a man), I thinke this Lady To be my childe Cordelia.

(Shakespeare *King Lear* IV.vi)

- (713) *As* Im a Person, I am in a very Chaos to think I shou'd so forget my self
(Congreve *Way of the World* III.i)

Besides *as*, *like* can introduce clauses of comparison. It is, however, less common than *as*:

- (714) Ye have said *lyke* a noble lady ought to say.
(1530 Berners *Arth. Lyt. Bryt.* 520 [OED s.v. *like* adv. (conj.) B6a])

The OED (s.v. *like* a., adv., conj. B6) quotes the first instances of this use from the sixteenth century and suggests that it originates partly in an ellipsis of *as* in the conjunctive phrase *like as*, or an extension of the quasi-prepositional use of *like*, to govern a clause instead of a nominal, and partly in anacoluthic constructions of the following type:

- (715) *Like* to an Eagle, in his kingly pride, Soring through his wide Empire of the aire . . . by chance *hath spide* A Goshauke
(1596 Spenser *Faerie Queene* V iv 42 [OED loc. cit.])

The fact that *like as* is relatively common in fifteenth and sixteenth century texts supports the first mentioned alternative:

- (716) the lyuer . . . should be plicable to the stomacke, *like as* a hande dothe to an apple, to comforte her digestion; for his heate is to the stomacke *as* the heate of the fyre is to the Potte or Cauldron that hangeth ouer it.
([HC] Vicary 69)

Note the variation between *like as* and *as* in (716).

In the seventeenth century, *like as* becomes less common: there are no instances in the Helsinki Corpus from the second half of the century.

In Early Modern English the main clause and the clause of comparison were more often than today linked with an expressed correlative element in the main clause. This element is most often *so*, which appears particularly if the main clause follows the comparative clause:

- (717) *as* one starre differeth from another in glory, *so* every word of prophecy hath a treasure of matter in it . . .
([HC] Hooker 7)

With *as* strengthened by *such*:

- (718) *Such as* the mayster was *so* was the seruuant.
(a1533 Berners *Huon* 67 232 [OED s.v. *so* 22])

With the main clause preceding the subordinate clause (often in oaths and other solemn utterances):

- (719) *so* befall my soule *As* this is false he burthens me withall.
(Shakespeare *Comedy of Errors* V.i)

See also the discussion of correlative comparison in comparative clauses, with adjectives and adverbs, below.

When the basis of the comparison is hypothetical ('conditional clause of comparison'), the most common conjunctive links are *as if* and *as though*. If the comparison is hypothetical, the finite verb of the clause is in the subjunctive form, or a modal auxiliary. The simple *as* in this context survives past Early Modern English only with *it*, as in *as it were* ((721); cf. Visser §890):

(720) Which mater when I herd I lete *as* I nothyng had marked it,
([HC] Tunstall 135)

(721) besides the two obvious advantages of surveying, *as it were* in a picture,
the true beauty of virtue and deformity of vice
(Fielding *Jonathan Wild* 3 [quoted by Visser §890])

A special case of the use of *as* in clauses of comparison is the combination of *as* with *who/which*, in the phrase *as who say/says* 'as if somebody should say'. This phrase is first recorded in early Middle English; for a discussion of its origin, see Nevanlinna (1974). Both in Middle English and Early Modern English the subjunctive (722) or the modal auxiliary (723) varies with the simple indicative form (724):

(722) Walke before me, and be thou vpriht, and I will make my couenant
betweene me and thee. *As who say*, one condition . . . of the couenant is
our vpriht and good profession.
(a1586 *Answer Cartwright* 9 [OED s.v. *as* 12a])

(723) *As who should sai* it were a very daungerous matter.
(1551–6 Robinson, transl. More's *Utopia* 35 [OED *loc. cit.*])

(724) For as holy Dauid saith to this gailor . . . whither shal I fle fro thy face: *as
who saith* nowhither.
(More *Treatise vppon the last thinges* [1557] 84 E4 [quoted by Visser §890])

Comparative clauses

As mentioned above, comparative clauses indicate similarity in regard to some element expressed in the matrix clause. These can indicate either equality or inequality. The former are typically introduced by *as*, the latter by *than*. These comparative links can introduce clauses, words or phrases.

As in Present-Day English, the standard of comparison is in most cases marked with the correlative particle *as* or *so*:

- (725) thanne he taketh the barley or otes by the toppes, and pulleth out *as moche*
as wil make a band . . . ([HC] Fitzherbert 36)
- (726) my closet is so full stored and *so fine, as* I would never desire to have it
 better. ([HC] Pepys 7 409)

The *OED* (s.v. *as* 4) quotes a few Modern English instances with *as* in clauses indicating inequality. This usage is, however, exceptional; there are no Early Modern English instances in the Helsinki Corpus.

When the second element (the basis) of the comparison is expressed by a verbal group, a comparative clause of inequality can be introduced by the combination *than that* (727). The same construction is used in Present-Day English.

- (727) nothing can be more just *than that* evil Men should be punished, and unjust *than that* they should escape Punishment.
([HC] Boethius Preston 180)

That is not inserted when *than* follows *other*, *else*, or their compounds:

- (728) some for malice or ignorance will take things *otherwise than they are spoken* . . . ([HC] Smith E3 r)

Exceptionally, the words indicating inequality (*rather, more, other, else*, etc.) can be dropped:

- (729) He did verily believe that Job was torne and tortured by his interpreta-
tions, *then* ever he had been by his botches and ulcers.
(1647 Trapp *Comm. Epistles* 330 [OED s.v. *than* 3a])

In Old and early Middle English proportional comparatives could be expressed by the combinations *so . . . so* (OE *swa . . . swa*) or *the . . . the* (OE *þy/þon/þe*). By the end of the Middle English period, the latter construction has completely superseded the *so* construction.

- (730) So many synnes so much vnkyndnesse. And *the more haynous, and the more*
accustomable that they bee, *the more abhominable* is thyne vnkyndenesse.
([HC] Fisher 401)

In comparisons expressed by words or phrases, the types of linking are essentially the same as with clauses:

- (731) and if all these thynges be of greater losse, and may be all done in *as shorte space, as the other*, than doo thy many thynges fyrste. ([HC] Fitzherbert 97)
- (732) there is at this day better introductions, and more facile, than euer before were made, concernyng *as wel greke as latine*, if they be wisely chosen. ([HC] Elyot 22)

Note the splitting of the phrase *as well . . . as* in (732). The combination *so . . . as* is fairly uncommon in phrases and loses ground in the course of the Early Modern English period:

(733) No *so much as a bens turd* but in pieces I tare it ([HC] *Gammer Gurton* I.v)

(734) passing by the side of a hill, *so steepe as the ridge of a house . . .*
([HC] John Taylor 134 Cii)

So . . . so can be found in proverbial expressions:

(735) Quot capita tot sensus: *so many heades so many opinions.* ([HC] Clowes 34)

See also (730) above.

The introductory particle can be omitted more freely than in Present-Day English:

(736) That Woman's mind is *charming as* her person;
(Farquhar *A Constant Couple* V.iii)

4.6.2.3.7 Non-finite and verbless adverbial clauses

Non-finite adverbial clauses can be divided into four groups: (i) *to*-infinitives, (ii) bare infinitives, (iii) *-ing* forms, and (iv) *-ed* forms. All types can be used either with or without an expressed subject and linked with the main clause either with or without a subordinator.

The Early Modern English use of non-finite adverbial clauses does not essentially differ from present-day usage. As with noun clauses, the bare infinitive is, however, more common than today. *Go*, for instance, relatively often takes the bare infinitive, *come* somewhat more seldom. The present-day restriction of the plain infinitive to contexts in which *go* and *come* occur in the uninflected form (Lass 1987: 169) seems to prevail even in Early Modern English; none of the instances found in the Helsinki Corpus, or of those quoted by Visser (§1318), show the preterite, the 2nd or 3rd pers. ind. pres. sing. or the *ing*-form of *go* or *come*.

(737) yf thou wylt wade in to the water & go seke it & get it me agayne.
([HC] *Merry Tales* 149)

In instances of this type, the infinitives seem to indicate purpose. It is, however, difficult to define the exact meaning of the non-finite clause in these and many other contexts. One reason for this is that a subordinator indicating the relation between the matrix clause and the subordinate (non-finite) clause is absent. Furthermore, mood, voice and tense are not as clearly expressed as in finite clauses: the trend toward developing a

symmetrical system of verb forms is not extended to non-finite verbal groups.

With infinitives indicating purpose *for to* varies with the simple *to* (738)–(739). *In order to* becomes common in the seventeenth century (740):

(738) sith almightie God the father woulde gyue hys moste dearly beloued
sonne vnto suche an horrible death, onely *for to quenche* and *to extincite* sinne
... ([HC] Fisher 398)

(739) in as muche as I am come hither *to bee tried*, I pray you let me haue the Law
favourably. ([HC] Throckmorton 67 Cii)

(740) T'is said hee and his family comes up to London upon Wedensday next,
in order to go into Kent. ([HC] H. Oxinden 277)

When the infinitive combines present and future time reference, it can in some instances be regarded as an equivalent of a temporal, causal or conditional clause. Present-Day English would use constructions with an *-ing* form in many of these instances:

(741) Till thou canst raile the seale from off my bond, Thou but offendst thy
lungs *to speake* (= ‘because/when you speak’) so loud.
(Shakespeare *Merchant of Venice* IV.i)

(742) Ile giue you a pottle of burn’d sacke *to giue* (= ‘if you give’) me recourse
to him, and tell him my name is Brook.
(Shakespeare *Merry Wives of Windsor* II.i)

The infinitive, without the introductory subordinator *as*, is occasionally used in comparative clauses:

(743) open warning was geuen to all the felowes, none to be *so hardie to geue* me
his voice. ([HC] Ascham 280)

The use of the *-ing* and *-ed* forms in non-finite adverbial clauses does not differ much from Present-Day English. Temporal, conditional and concessive clauses are often (745), though not necessarily (744), introduced by the subordinators *when*, *till*, *if*, *though*, etc.

When the subject of these clauses is unexpressed, they are called unattached clauses (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 15.59). As in Present-Day English, the unexpressed subject of the subordinate clause is normally coreferential with the (expressed) subject of the matrix clause. Often, however, the subject of the non-finite clause is coreferential with the object, (744)–(745) or an adverbial (746) in the matrix clause, or it may be understood in the context (747). In many instances (748), a possessive pronoun in the matrix clause gives an indication of the subject. When the subject

of the matrix clause and that of the non-finite adverbial clause are not coreferential, misunderstanding is possible, at least in theory. It is worth noting, however, that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century grammarians do not make any condemnatory comments on constructions of this kind.

- (744) a certain poore weake man met *the bishop, riding* on his gelding, and craued an almes of him. (1565 Stapleton 90 v)
- (745) I wrote to *you, When rioting* in Alexandria;
(Shakespeare *Antony and Cleopatra* II.ii)
- (746) My dear master came to *me, at entering* the chapel, and took my hand.
(Richardson *Pamela* 315)
- (747) taken out and weigh'd . . . till at length, *looking* at it against the Sun, it appear'd transparent. (Dryden *Amboyna* II.i)
- (748) . . . nor could the attempts of Sophia . . . prevent his going.
When gone, we all regarded each other for some minutes with confusion.
(Goldsmith ch. 13)

Being could be used as a kind of temporal/causal introductory element; today, this is non-standard. The understood subject of the *ing*-form is indefinite:

- (749) And *being* we are, as I perceive, going some considerable way together, I will give you an account of the whole of the matter. (Bunyan 283)

The use of *that* after *being* shows the origin of this construction:

- (750) Air is a cause of great moment, in producing this, or any other Disease, *being that* it is still taken into our bodies by respiration
([HC] Burton I,2 5 81)

The *ing*-forms of many other verbs show a similar development:

- (751) Then drawe I a line from C. to D, and it is perpendicular to the line A.B, *accordyng as* my desire was. ([HC] Record C4 r)
- (752) *Concernyng* our feare, we haue the Apostle that sayth . . .
(More *Treatise upon the Passion* 166)
- (753) Horace . . . confin'd himself to the ridiculing of Petty Vices and common Follies: *Excepting* only some reserv'd Cases, in his Odes and Epodes
(Dryden Poems: Essay on satire 2 653)
- (754) Could not he, *seyng* [= seeing] he was god, as well make them as bidde them do it? (Basset 1102)

The roots of the grammaticalisation of these *ing*-forms go back to Middle English, but the final establishment of the prepositional and conjunctive uses seems to take place in Modern English.

In so-called absolute clauses the *ing*- or *ed*-form has an expressed subject. The origin of these constructions is somewhat uncertain; yet it can be safely said that Latin influence has played a considerable role in their establishment (see e.g. Mustanoja 1960: 114–15, and, most recently, Blake 1992). They are more common in the sixteenth century than in Middle English and seem to increase in popularity in the course of the Early Modern English period.

In Old English, the noun phrase indicating the subject of the absolute clause was in the dative case (with certain exceptions). When case distinctions disappeared in Middle English, it is only natural that the preverbal element came to be interpreted as the subject and was given the subjective form. The objective form is exceptional with pronominal subjects; this usage is probably a borrowing from Latin. Lowth (1775 [1979]: 79), quoting (756), considers it faulty.

- (755) Peter was one chosen out amongst twelfe to thentent that *he beyng* theyr heed al occasyons of schysmatyke dyuysyon sholde be take away . . .
([HC] Fisher 320)

- (756) . . . and *him destroy'd*, Or won to what may work his utter loss, For whom all this was made, all this will soon Follow . . . (Milton *Paradise Lost* IX 129)

The construction can be introduced by a conjunction (757), or preposition (758), to make the relationship between the matrix clause and the non-finite clause more explicit:

- (757) *after* certaine bokes of myne finished, I intende to geue out to poore folke.
(More *Picus* [1557] 8 D13)

- (758) The wise Phocion was so sensible how dangerous it was to be touched with what the Multitude approved, that *upon* a general Acclamation made when he was making an Oration, he turned . . .
(Steele *Spectator* no. 188, II 240)

As mentioned above there is a tendency towards a symmetric system of verb forms, finite and, to some extent, non-finite, in Modern English. This can be seen in the development of constructions in which the *ed*-form is preceded by *being* or *having been*, which seem to have roughly the same meaning as the simple past participle in these contexts:

- (759) the election *being done*, he made countenance of great discontentation thereat.
([HC] Ascham 280)

- (760) you were confident in London, *havings beene perswaded* by your sicophantes
that all the Cittie was of your parte ([HC] Essex 22)

NOTES

- 1 I am also most grateful to all colleagues who have read the whole or parts of my chapter and made valuable comments on it. I would particularly like to mention the names of John Algeo, Bengt Altenberg, Norman Blake, David Denison, Manfred Görlach, Matti Kilpiö, Merja Kytö, Roger Lass, Lilo Moessner, Terttu Nevalainen, Helena Raumolin-Brunberg, Mats Rydén, Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Laura Wright.
- 2 It is possible that the use of the article with river names goes back to the common EModE expression *the river X*, through the ellipsis of the noun *river*. The definite article first came to be used with *the Thames* (Reinicke 1915: 36). In his grammar dating from the mid-seventeenth century, Wallis (1653 [1972]: 286–7) states that the names of rivers and mountains are sometimes (*aliquando*) preceded by *the*.
- 3 Cf. Swedish *Han biter sig i läppen*, German *Er beisst sich auf die Lippen*.
- 4 According to Jespersen (*MEG* VII 14.2.1), the expression *play the fool* might originate ‘in the old drama, with its standing types’. It is more likely, however, that the use of the definite article is here due to the particularly prominent generic indication of the complement in these contexts.
- 5 See Poussa (1992) for the ‘comic–dishonourific’ connotations which seem to arise in the pronominal use of the demonstratives by the end of the seventeenth century.
- 6 In more general terms, we could assume that the weakening of the inflexional system supported the development of lexical means to mark the boundaries between the elements of the clause.
- 7 This development from numerical through individualising to pronominal uses seems to offer a good example of grammaticalisation through subjectification as outlined by Traugott (1989). In many of its uses *an/one* calls attention to the individual rather than to numerical contrast; this reflects the pragmatic–semantic process in which ‘meanings become increasingly based in the speaker’s subjective . . . attitude toward the proposition’ (35). This kind of subjectification gradually leads to a pronominal use of *one*: it comes to be reanalysed as having syntactic and morphological functions.
It is possible that the development of the pronominal *one* is supported by the fact that it was a handy way of increasing the cohesion of the text, after the weakening of the inflexional endings.
- 8 In fact, plural uses of the numeral *one* go back to Old English; cf. also *others*.
- 9 In the present context, no attention has been paid to the question of word-class change or conversion from adjective to noun in head position. For a discussion, see Nevalainen this volume.

- 10 Writing, of course, distinguishes even between the plural *-s* and the gen. pl. *-s'*.
- 11 In Early Modern English the possessive relation can also be expressed by the endingless form of the noun or by the so-called *his*-genitive (*Moses his meekness*). These types are discussed by Lass in this volume (see also Fischer's discussion of the origin and character of the *his*-genitive in *CHEL* II 2.4.1).
- 12 'Split' modification by prepositional phrases of non-genitival type is also possible:

Bring forth *that fatall Schreechowe* to our house.

(Shakespeare *3Henry VI* II.vi [owl, fatal to . . .])

The perturb'd Court For my being absent?

(Shakespeare *Cymbeline* III.iv [Court perturbed for . . .])

- 13 Unlike other names, (*St*) *Paul's* can be used in non-prepositional contexts as early as Chaucer (Fischer *CHEL* II 2.4.1). This usage implies that the independent genitive has been institutionalised as a proper noun (Altenberg 1982: 67). In Early Modern English there is still variation:

ther wer secular chanons in *S. Peter's church* at Bath; paraventure Offa King of Merches set them ther, for I have redde that Offa did a notable act at *S. Peter's* in Bath.

([HC] Leland 143)

- 14 Fischer emphasises the partitive or 'ablative' origin of this construction: something taken out of a larger set. She suggests that in the earliest Middle English examples the genitive refers to someone's property or household. For this reason, it is no wonder that in Middle English the head of the double genitive can take the definite article.

There are, however, instances of double genitive in which the partitive reading is impossible (*that courage of his*). It is possible that the addition of the genitive ending to the *of*-complement expresses the subjective (as against the objective) relation between the genitive and its head (Altenberg 1982: 70).

- 15 This construction, which occurs in present-day written English in archaic contexts, is common in Old English but scantily attested in Middle English texts. It probably has a double origin. On the one hand, it may go back to spoken language, with a strong deictic/demonstrative force given to *this/that*; on the other, in written language, it may have been an imitation of Latin usage. See Kytö & Rissanen (1993).

- 16 In The Gospel of St John, Tyndale uses the order *eternall life* five times.

- 17 The two examples quoted by Franz (§275) from Shakespeare (the one below and *Antony and Cleopatra* V.ii) seem to be marked by emphasis or emotion and may be influenced by the demands of the metre:

it was . . . bequeathed me by will, but *poore a thousand Crownes*

(Shakespeare *As You Like It* I.i)

- 18 In Rydén and Brorström's (1987) corpus of letters and plays, the percentages of *have* with intransitive verbs vary from about twenty per cent to about forty per cent, as late as the second half of the eighteenth century.

- 19 The use of OE *weorþan* (cf. German *werden*) as a passive auxiliary disappears in Middle English.
- 20 The *OED* (s.v. *have* 18) quotes the earliest instance of *have* in these contexts from the ME *King Alisaunder*.
- 21 In the following discussion, if a more accurate specification is not needed, 'action' is used to refer to the meaning of the verb even when it would be more appropriately described as state, event, etc.
- 22 This use has been taken as an indication of 'strong assertion' (Visser §1497; Fridén 1948: 159); it is also possible that the emphasis is focussed on the cause and effect sequence expressed by the subordinate and the main clauses as much as on the assertion in itself.
- 23 Visser (§§760ff.) defines two types of narrative use of the present tense: the substitutive and the 'vividly narrative'. This distinction seems doubtful, but it is easy to accept his suggestion that the vividly reporting present is a very old feature typical of spoken language, perhaps going back all the way to Old English. If this is the case, the lack of instances in Old and Middle English narrative prose texts would be due to the shortage of speech-related texts dating from these periods.
- 24 Visser (§834) criticises the use of the term 'subjunctive' with reference to the verb forms indicating what he calls the subjunctive mood. The basis of his criticism is that no verb form is used solely for that purpose. Visser's criticism is hardly valid; the relevant point here is that the form used in a certain context marks a distinction in modality.
- 25 The distinction between the hortative subjunctive and the imperative is, in many cases, mainly terminological.
- 26 It is uncertain whether the regional 'double modals' are continuations to Early Modern English uses or modern innovations.
- 27 For a more detailed discussion of the types of subject and object favouring *do*, see Kroch, Pintzuk & Myhill (1982) and Kroch (1989).
- 28 Other more emphatic negative particles, such as *never*, did not need this kind of intensification.
- 29 Note, also, '*Do, ma'am*, let me go and see, only for a fancy, whether he is there still' (Fielding *Tom Jones* VI vi 271).
- 30 This rough classification is not intended to cover all types of uses with originally impersonal verbs. It is doubtful if, for instance, *be* in (342) can be called an 'experiencer'.
- 31 Example (361) is the earliest instance of the transitive use of *grow* quoted by the *OED*.
- 32 The figures from the Helsinki Corpus confirm Jacobsson's findings: there is a dramatic decrease in the occurrence of inversion in the second half of the seventeenth century. Even in the first half of the century, inversion is mostly restricted to the environments mentioned below, such as an auxiliary predicate or a noun subject (Kytö & Rissanen 1993).

- 33 This order is also possible in present-day Northern British English.
- 34 According to Jespersen (*MEG* II 7.741) *whether* is used with three referents by Spenser and Jonson. He gives only one example from Jonson's writings:
a question it were now, *whether of vs three . . .* In pleasing him, claime the
precedencie can?
(Jonson *Volpone* III.iii)
- 35 According to Visser (§25) the S+V imperative (the type 'you go home'), common in Old and early Middle English, drops into disuse in Early Modern English, to appear again at the end of the seventeenth century. The only example quoted by Visser from the seventeenth century (Congreve *Love for Love* I.i.7: *you go to breakfast*) seems faulty: the passage reads *go you* in the editions I have checked. The other Modern English instances in Visser are from the end of the eighteenth century or later.
- 36 The opinions of the grammarians vary concerning the coordinate or subordinate status of *for*-clauses; see e.g. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 2.60, 13.18). See also Jucker 1991.
- 37 For a possible subordinating *and* in Old English, see Mitchell (1985: §§3668–70).
- 38 In 'ordinary' *aci*, as in *I see him come*, *him* is as much object of the matrix verb as it is the subject of the infinitive: *I see him – he comes* (Fischer 1990: 226–7). Example (554) cannot be analysed *I wish them – they renounce*, but, rather, *I wish – they renounce*.
- 39 Rydén (1966: 204) quotes the following example:
which wisdome and warenes will not serue neither a traueler, except
Pallas be alwayes at his elbow, *that* is Gods speciall grace from heauen, to
kepe him in Gods feare . . .
(Ascham *Taxophilus* 225)
But *that* may here be a demonstrative pronoun.
- 40 The grammarians' opinions are not categorical on this point before the eighteenth century (Bately 1965: 246–8).
- 41 The combination *even if* is recorded from the eighteenth century on, but it seems to be rare until the nineteenth:
leaving themselves at liberty, *even if* these concessions should be made, to
break the treaty by ulterior demands.
([HC] Bolingbroke I 15)

FURTHER READING

There is no exhaustive treatise on Early Modern English syntax comparable to Mitchell's *Old English Syntax* and Mustanoja's *Middle English Syntax*, vol. I. Four main types of sources can be referred to in the discussion and study of Early Modern English syntax: (1) general surveys of Early Modern English with chapters on syntactic features; (2) studies of the language or, more specifically, the syntax of individual authors or texts; (3) histories of English containing discussion of syntactic developments; (4) histories of English syntax.

There are a few fairly recent general descriptions of Early Modern English.

Barber (1976) and Görlach (1991; original German version 1978) contain good chapters on syntax, appropriately projected against the socio-cultural background of the period, with due attention paid to textual variation. Their discussions can be supplemented by Knorrek's (1938) and Partridge's (1969) stylistically oriented observations. Biber & Finegan (1992) introduces an interesting 'dimension-based' approach to the analysis of textual variation in Early Modern English, with reference to a number of linguistic variables, some of which are syntactic.

Studies of the language of individual authors or texts differ vastly in depth and width. By far the most important is still Franz (1939), which contains a wealth of material from the entire Early Modern English period. Compared with Franz, Abbott (1870) necessarily appears dated although not useless. Of the numerous other works on Shakespeare's language, Blake (1983) is the most useful from the syntactician's point of view. Brook (1976) is uneven in its discussion of syntactic phenomena. Of the syntactic discussions of the other Early Modern English authors and texts, many are old but still useful as collections of material: Widholm (1877) on Bunyan, Kellner (1887) on Marlowe, Bøgholm (1906) on Shakespeare and Bacon (in Danish), Grainger (1907) on the King James Version, Uhrström (1907) on Richardson, Björling (1926) on the Bible versions, Sugden (1936) on Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and Weijl (1937) on Bishop Fisher. More recent studies, giving a full or partial coverage of the syntax of the works they concentrate on, are Dahl (1951) on Deloney, Partridge (1953) on Ben Jonson, Emma (1964) on Milton, Brook (1965) on *The Book of Common Prayer* and Davis (1971) on Tyndale (see also the studies on more specific syntactic topics in 4.2–4.6 below).

Amongst the histories of English, Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar* is a classic. Brunner (1960–2) is systematic, and Strang (1970) is useful for its cultural and socio-historical considerations, despite its 'reversed chronology'. Lass (1987) gives a good general background for the most important developments and contains a fair amount of lucid linguistic discussion. Visser's monumental *Historical Syntax* offers a solid basis for all studies of the development of the English verb syntax, although his argumentation is open to dispute at some points and the accuracy of the spellings of his examples is worth checking. Kisbye (1971–2) contains extensive material but is mainly descriptive. Traugott (1972) gives a theoretically oriented survey of the most important syntactic developments, with particular emphasis on the shaping of modern English. Lightfoot (1979) deals with a number of important developments ranging from Old to Early Modern English; his studies have created a lively discussion of the theoretical issues of syntactic change but also called forth considerable criticism. The most recent overall survey of English historical syntax is Denison (1993).

Many older historical grammars, such as Mätzner (1880–5), Sweet (1892–8), Poutsma (1904–26), or surveys of historical syntax (Kellner 1892, Einenkel 1916, Deutschbein 1917) contain interesting examples and some brilliant analyses of individual syntactic phenomena, although their overall approach is, understandably, dated.

The influence of Latin syntax on Early Modern English is discussed by Sørensen (1957) and, in relation to style, by Partridge (1969). The studies of Workman (1940), Orr (1948), and Prins (1952) on the influence of translations on English concentrate mainly on late Middle English and do not discuss syntactic constructions extensively. An excellent recent discussion of the importance of translation on the development of English is Blake (1992).

As to the Old and Middle English background, this chapter owes a lot to Traugott and Fischer in the two first volumes of the *Cambridge History of the English Language*. Mitchell (1985) for Old English and Mustanoja (1960) for Middle English have also been indispensable.

In the following survey of earlier research dealing with the various details of Early Modern English syntax, references to the general works mentioned above are not repeated. I have also, both in my notes and bibliography, avoided references to works discussing various syntactic phenomena from a purely theoretical or present-day point of view.

4.2 The only exhaustive study of the structure of the Early Modern English noun phrase is Raumolin-Brunberg (1991), which concentrates on Thomas More's usage. It also contains an excellent survey of the linguistic description of the noun phrase in more general terms.

4.2.1 Christophersen's (1939) account of the historical development of the English article system is still well worth reading. Reinicke (1915) discusses the use of the definite article in sixteenth-century texts, and Schröter (1915) usage with river names.

4.2.2–4.2.4 Poussa (1992) contains interesting observations on the development of the uses of *this* and *that* from Early Modern English on. The history of the indefinite pronouns and the propword has been a topic of considerable interest. Einkenkel's (1903–4, 1912, 1914) survey is exhaustive but dated. The rise and development of the pronominal and propword *one* has been discussed by Einkenkel (1912, 1914), Luick (1906, 1913, 1916), Langenfelt (1946) and Rissanen (1967, 1997). On the development of the pronominal uses of *one*, see also Bald (1984). Meier (1953) and Jud-Schmid (1956) discuss the expression of the indefinite subject in Middle English and Early Modern English. The compound pronouns formed with *-body* and *-one* are discussed by Raumolin-Brunberg (1994a) and Raumolin-Brunberg & Kahlas-Tarkka (1997).

4.2.5 The only comprehensive treatment of the genitive in Early Modern English is Altenberg (1982). Of the older studies, van der Gaaf (1926, 1932), Stahl (1927), and den Breejen (1937) are worth mentioning. Nunnally (1992) contains observations on the types of the genitive in Bible translations.

4.2.6 The order and compatibility of the elements of the noun phrase have not been studied extensively in the past. Sørensen (1983) discusses the history of cataphoric reference of the personal pronouns. Mustanoja (1958) is a thorough survey of the rise and development of the syntactic type *one the best man*. The

question of the gradual transfer from post- to premodification is discussed by Sørensen (1980) and Raumolin-Brunberg (1991). Kytö & Rissanen (1992) traces the development of the combinations of a demonstrative and a possessive pronoun (the type *this my book*).

4.3 In comparison to the noun phrase, the syntax of the Early Modern English verb has been much more extensively studied. Trnka (1930) discusses the syntax of the verb from the end of the fifteenth century (Caxton) to c. 1770 (Dryden). There are also a few monographs which deal with the verb syntax of individual authors: Visser (1946, 1952) on More, Söderlind (1951, 1958) on Dryden, Amman (1961) on Elyot, Ando (1976) on Marlowe.

4.3.1–4.3.2 The development of the tense forms in late Middle and Early Modern English (from Chaucer to Shakespeare) is described by Fridén (1948). Adamson (1995) discusses the historical present in Early Modern English and Elsness (1991) the expression of past time. Of the special studies concentrating on the distribution of *shall* and *will* in Early Modern English, Fries (1925), Hulbert (1947), Weida (1975) and the last two chapters in Kytö (1991) deserve special mention. The *be/have* variation has been studied by Zimmerman (1973); Kytö (1994, 1997); Rainer (1989), based on a corpus of letters; Kakietek (1976), on Shakespeare; and Rydén & Brorström (1987), on eighteenth-century usage. The passives with *have* (the type *he had a book given to him*) are discussed by Moessner (1994).

The standard work on the diachrony of the forms with aspectual significance is Brinton (1988). Mossé (1938) discusses the rise of the *ing*-periphrasis from a wider Germanic perspective. Nehls (1974) concentrates on the history and present-day usage of *be + ing* in English. Scheffer (1975) contains a convenient summary of the main outlines of the development of this construction. Åkerlund's early works (1911, 1913/14), are also worth noting. Of recent articles sharpening our picture of the character and development of this construction, Strang (1982), Nagucka (1984), Denison (1985c), Wright (1994b) and Danchev & Kytö (1994), on *be going to + inf.*, are some of the most important. Van Draat discusses the early variation between the preterite tense and perfect in three early articles (1903, 1910, 1912a).

4.3.3–4.3.4 A theory of the development of the category of modal auxiliaries is presented in Lightfoot (1979). This has been criticised, and ideas on the establishment of this category have been presented, by Fischer and van der Leek (1981), Warner (1983, 1990), Plank (1984), Goossens (1984) and van Kemenade (1989), etc. Kytö (1991) is now the standard work on the early variation between the modals, particularly *can* and *may*. Kakietek (1972) is a thorough discussion of the modals in Shakespeare.

4.3.5 The most important early study on the origin and development of *do*-periphrasis is Ellegård (1953). Langenfelt's (1933), Engblom's (1938) and Dahl's (1956) surveys and Visser's theory on the origin of this construction, presented in his *Historical Syntax* (Vol III, 1963–73: 1969 III), are also worth noting. In recent years, there has been a steady flow of studies on *do*-periphrasis. Tieken

(1987) and Stein (1990) are book-length studies; the articles by e.g. Ihalainen (1983), Frank (1985), Tieken (1985, 1986, 1989, 1990), Stein (1985a, 1986), Denison (1985b), Nevalainen (1987), Wright (1989a, b), Kroch (1989), Rissanen (1985, 1991a) and Raumolin-Brunberg & Nurmi (1997) illustrate various features in the rise and early development of this periphrasis.

4.4.1–4.4.4 The development of the case system has been studied, at a theoretical level, by van Kemenade (1987). Spies (1897) contains some interesting observations on the forms and non-expression of the subject and object pronouns. Insightful general discussions of the impersonals, with Old English as their starting point, are Elmer (1981), Fischer and van der Leek (1983, 1987), Allen (1986) and Denison (1990). Mair (1988) discusses the impersonal and personal uses of *like* in late Middle and Early Modern English, and Kopytko (1988) the impersonal use of verbs in Shakespeare. Palander-Collin (1997) discusses the development of *methinks* and related constructions, and Peitsara (1997) the development and variation of reflexive strategies. Van der Gaaf (1929, 1930a) and Brose (1939) have studied the conversion of indirect and prepositional objects into the subject of the passive clause. More recent and theoretically oriented studies of these topics are Bennett (1980), van der Wurff (1990: 35–42) and Moessner (1994). The prepositions of the agent of the passive have been discussed by Peitsara (1992).

4.5.1 The literature relevant to the theoretical approaches and typological implications of the development of English word order have been competently summarised by Fischer in *CHEL* II. Salmon (1965) is an excellent survey of the structure of the simple sentence in Shakespeare's language. The occurrence of the inversion in statements with an initial adverb is discussed in Fries (1940), Jacobsson (1951) and Kytö & Rissanen (1993). Kohonen (1978) describes the early grammarians' statements on word order. Jacobson (1981), Swan (1988) and Nevalainen (1991) discuss the variation in adverbial placement in Early Modern English.

4.5.2 The standard description of English negation is given by Jespersen (1917). Klima (1964) and Horn (1989) are more modern, theoretically oriented studies. Ukaji (1992) discusses the placement of the negative particle *not* before the verb (*he not goes*) and Tottie (1994) the variation between *no(ne)* and *not any*. Austin (1984) describes the use of double negation in late eighteenth-century letters, and Tieken (1982) surveys the attitudes of eighteenth-century grammarians to it. Baghdikian's two articles (1979, 1982) contain a few interesting observations on the development of the negative structures in Early Modern English. Rissanen (1994) discusses the order of the subject and the negative particle in negative questions.

4.5.3–4.5.4 Wikberg's (1975) monograph is the most extensive treatment of the formation of questions in Early Modern English. (See also the works mentioned under 4.3.5 above.) Millward (1966) and Ukaji (1973) discuss the imperatives in Shakespeare.

- 4.6.2.1 The links introducing nominal clauses, particularly zero and *that*, in Early Modern English have been discussed by Erdmann (1980), Fanego (1990) and Rissanen (1991b). Fischer's articles, conveniently collected in her doctoral dissertation (1990), form an excellent package of research on the use and development of non-finite nominal clauses. Another important monograph-length study is Fanego (1992). The development of the 'gerund' has been discussed by Wik (1973) and Jack (1988).
- 4.6.2.2 Of the abundant literature on relative clauses and links in Early Modern English, Rydén (1966, 1970) are the most exhaustive although they only cover a relatively short period of time. Romaine (1982) is an excellent introduction to the theoretical description of relative clauses from the historical point of view. Relativisation as a more general question of theoretical linguistics has been competently discussed in Keenan and Comrie (1977) and Romaine (1984). The implications of Keenan and Comrie's 'accessibility hierarchy' to the diachronic development of the relative links have been pointed out, among others, by Romaine (1980) and Dekeyser (1984). The choice of the relative link in Modern English has also been recently dealt with e.g. by Kemp (1979), Kytö & Rissanen (1983), Rissanen (1984), Austin (1985), Dekeyser (1988), Schneider (1992) and Wright (1994a); earlier works on the same topic are Krüger (1929), Steinki (1932), Winkler (1933), Mitsui (1958), Scheurweghs (1964) and Bately (1964, 1965). Reuter (1936) discusses continuous relative clauses, and van der Wurff (1989, 1990) and Moessner (1992) the embedding of adverbial clauses into relative clauses.
- 4.6.2.3 The development of causal clauses has been discussed by Wiegand (1982), Altenberg (1984), Rissanen (1989), and that of concessive clauses by König (1985). The comparative phrase *as who say(s)* has been discussed by Nevanlinna (1974). Ross (1893) is a thorough text-based survey of absolute constructions. Of later works on non-finite adverbial clauses, Wik (1973) is worth mentioning.