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This corpus-based study describes some aspects of the syntax of finite complement clauses as objects in the Early Modern English period. A well-known Renaissance text: Euphues. The Anatomy of Wit (1578), a single homogeneous corpus of c60,000 words, forms the basis of the analysis.  
Sections 2, 3 and 4 deal with the presentation and description of the various constructions found in the text: monotransitive, ditransitive and complex transitive structures. The fifth section focuses on some of the most relevant issues concerning finite complements as objects, to wit, extraposition and frequency of anticipatory elements. Extraposition is found to be possible, but very restricted and difficult to account for except in complex transitive structures, in which it is generally the norm. When extraposition does take place, the slot vacated by the clause is always filled by a heralding pronoun: this in monotransitive structures, it in complex transitive ones.

1. Introduction

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

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

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

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


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

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

Euphues. The Anatomy of Wit², a variant of the popular Reformation theme of the Prodigal Son, the story of the moral progress of a young Athenian “of more wit then wealth and yet of more wealth then wisdome”, was published in 1578 and it became an immediate - though temporary - success³. Lyly’s exquisitely elegant style, characterized by the use of structural devices such as parallelism, rhetorical questions and verbal repetition; sound patterns such as alliteration, assonance and rhyme; and ornamental devices such as allusions to classical mythology, natural history and proverbs; cannot possibly be more artificial - indeed a term of praise in Renaissance England.

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

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

2. Object Clauses in the Corpus. Monotransitive Structures
Type 1: V-OBCL (335 examples, 340 predicates) (61.8%).
Type 2: it-V-OBCL (12 examples) (2.22%).
Percentage in corpus: 64.02%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-OBCL</th>
<th>it-V-OBCL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THAT</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZERO</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 On Lyly and Euphues see Hunter (1962).
4 The presence of an anticipatory element is represented by it.
As might be expected, and fully in keeping with the results obtained in related studies, that- and zero-clauses in object function clearly predominate in the corpus.¹ Thus the percentage I have obtained for monotransitive structures (64.02%) is similar, and even higher, than the one reported by Fanego (1990, 9): (57.26%) for her EMODE corpus. Moreover, this clear predominance of object clauses is found throughout the history of English, cf. Mitchell (1985, §1967) for OE, Warner (1982, 100ff.) for ME, McDavid (1964, 108) and Elsness (1981, 282) for PE.

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

(1) ... retourninge home he was asked howe all things stode in Athlens, to whome he answered, all things are honest there... (275, 28-9).

(2) We rede in the seconde of Exodus, that when Moses desired of God to knowe what hee should name him to the children of Israel, hee answered, thou shalt saye, I am that I am.² (294, 11-2).

(3) Be not lyke the hipocrites whiche honour God with their lips, but be farre from hym with their hearts, neythner lyke y' foole which sayeth in his heart, ther is no God. (295, 33).

2.1. Type 1: V-OBCL

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

ADDE (2 examples), e.g. (312, 8-9): “Thou addest moreouer y¹ she being in great credite with the states, died in great beggerie in the streets...”; ALLEDGE NOT (192, 8-9); ALLOWE NOT = “(not) to accept as true or valid; to acknowledge, admit, grant” [OED Allow v.4]. See Conclude (not) below for the only example to be found in the corpus; ARGUE (190, 19-20); AUNSWERE (3 examples), e.g. (256, 37): “If thou saye to mee, Pishition heale thy selfe, I answere, that I am meetly well purged of that disease...”; BEHOLD = “to regard (with the mind), have regard to, attend to, consider” [OED Behold v.6a], (252, 3-10): “Here shalt thou beholde as it were in a glasse, that all the glorye of man is as the grasse, that all thinges vnder heauen are but vaine, that our lyfe is but a shadowe, a warfare, a pilgrimage, a vapor, a bubble, a blast, of such shortnessse that Dauid sayth it is but a spanne long, of such sharpnesse, that lobe noteth it re plenished with all

¹ The percentages obtained for the different constructions in the corpus offer the following breakdown: subject clauses (14.93%), object clauses (monotransitive) (64.02%), object clauses (ditransitive) (64.64%), object clauses (complex transitive) (9.92%), copular constructions (0.37%), complements to adjectives (2.96%), complements to nouns (9.23%), other constructions (9.17%).


³ In the relation of predicates that follows the subsequent points should be noted; references to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) and illustrating examples are given only if there exists a significant deviance in meaning with respect to present-day usage or to specify the exact meaning of a predicate in a given context; only one example of each predicate has been found in the corpus unless otherwise stated; bracketed numbers refer to the page(s) and line(s) where the relevant complement clause (or group of coordinate clauses) is to be found in the text if there is only one instance or, if there are more than one, where one significant example - the one given - can be found; additional information is included when it serves the purpose of further clarifying aspects of the syntax of the predicates.
miseries, of suche vncerteintie, that we are no sooner borne, but wee are subjicted to death, the one foote no sooner on the grounde, but the other ready to slippe into the grawe;”;
BELEEUE (2 examples), e.g. (292, 14-5): “... thou arte not onely one of those which beleue that ther is a god...”;
CONCLUDE (NOT) (4 examples), e.g. (192, 6-7): “Doth not Cicero conclude and allowe, that if wee followe and obey Nature, we shall neuer erre?”;
CONFES(SE) (3 examples), e.g. (253, 23-5): “I must of force confesse, that it is a corrusate to the stomacke of a loyer, but a comforte to a godly lyuer, to runne through a thousande pykes, to escape ten thousande perill...”;
CONFIRME NOT (192, 8-9);
CONJECTURE (197, 31-2);
CONSIDER (3 examples), e.g. (277, 35): “We must consider that all our lyfe is deuided into remission and study;”;
DEEME = “to form the opinion, to be of opinion; to judge, consider, think, consider, hold” [OED Deem v.6] (2 examples), e.g. (218, 28-9): “… but seinghe women when one praiseth them for their deseret, deeme that hee flattereth them to obtaine his desire...”;
DENIE (294, 3); DESIRE (318, 25-6);
FORGET (NOT) (2 examples), e.g. (192, 30): “… or els you have quite for gotten yf you your selfe were young, or euer knew young dayes...”; GATHER = “to collect (knowledge) by observation and reasoning; to infer, deduce, conclude. (= Latin colligere)” [OED Gather v.10] (179, 17-8): “… whereby I gather, that in all perfect workes aswell the fault as the face is to be shouen.”;
GRAUNTE = “to admit, con fess, acknowledge. Now only in a more restricted use: To concede to an actual or hypothetical opponent (a proposition) to be used as a basis of argument.” [OED Grant v.7] (310, 26): “But thou grauntest that she shold have dyed, & yet art thou grieved yf she is dead.”;
HEAR(E) (NOT) (6 examples), e.g. (228, 28-30): “I cannot but smile to heare, that a marriage should bee solemnized, where never was any mention of assuring, and that the woed should bee a day after the weddinger.”;
HOPE (2 examples), e.g. (237, 32-3): “… but I hope that such hot longe cannot be so soone colde, neyther such sure faith, be rewarded with so sodeyne forgetfulness.”;
IMAGINE (NOT) (3 examples), e.g. (206, 33-4): “… if he perceive thee to be wonne with a Nut, he will imagine that thou wilt be lost with an Apple...”;
KNOW(E) (NOT) (23 examples), e.g. (186, 29-31): “… for hee well knewe that so rare a wyttte woulde in tyme euyther breede an intollerable trouble, or bringe an incomparabele Treasure to the common weale...”;
LAMENT (285, 23-4);
LEARN NOT (197, 17-20); MARUEL (272, 1-2); MEAN (275, 29-30);
MIND (219, 35-6);
MUSE (neede not muse, muse) = “to be affected with astonishment or surprise; to wonder, marvel. Now rare (poetic)” [OED Muse v.3b] (2 examples), e.g. (231, 18-9): “You neede not muse that I shoulde so sodeinely bee intangled, loue giues no reason of choice, neither will it suffer anye repulse.”;
NOTE probably = “to set down in writing; to put down as a memorandum; to write, indite.” [OED Note v.2-3] or, perhaps, = “to observe or mark carefully; to give heed or attention to; to notice closely.” [OED Note v.2-1] (314, 9-10): “Plato would never accept him banished yf had the Sunne, Fire, Aire, Water, & Earth, that he had before, where he felt the Winters blast and the Summers blaze, wher yf same Sunne & the same Moore shined, whereby he noted that every place was a countrey to a wise man, and all partes a pallace to a quiet minde.”;
OBSEERVE (223, 18-9); PERCEIVE (spell: perceiue, perceyue) (9 examples), e.g. (194, 35-6): “Euphues hauing thus ended his talke departed leaving this olde gentleman in a great quandarie: who perceiuing that he was more enclined to wantonnesse, then to wisedome, with a deepes sigh the teares trickling downe his cheekes, sayde...”;
PERSWADE (216, 30-2);
PRAY (2 examples), e.g. (235, 1-7): “… I will pray that thou must be measured vnto with the lyke measure that thou hast meaten vnto others: that as thou hast thought it no conscience to betray me, so others may deeme it no dishonestie to deceie thee, that as Lucilla made it a lyght matter to forswear her olde friend Philaautus, so she may make it a mooke to forsake her new pheere Euphues.”;
PROMISE (304, 1-2); PROU(E) (300, 1-2);
READ(E) (NOT) (7 examples), e.g. (197, 4-7): “I haue red (saith he) and well I beleue it, that a friend is in...
prosperitie a pleasure, a solace in adversitie, in griece a comfort, in ioy a merrye companion, at all times an other I, in all places ye expresse Image of mine owne person..."; REIOYCE (2 examples), e.g. (227, 28-9): "And surely I reioyce the more, that thou shalt be linked to him in marriage, whome thou hast loved as I heare beeinge a mayden..."; REMEMBER (NOT) (7 examples), e.g. (260-1, 29-02): "Let them both remember that the Estrich disgesteth harde yron to preserve his healthe, that the souldeiour lyeth in his harnessse to acheiue conquest, that the sick patient swalloweth bitter pilles to be eased of his grieve, that youth shoulde endure sharpe storms to finde reliefe:"; REPENT (200, 8); SAY(E) (NOT) (17 examples), e.g. (189, 15-7): "But thou wytle happily saye, that although there bee many things in Naples to bee iustlye condemned, yet there are some things of necessitie to bee commended..."; SEE (NOT) = "(not) to perceive mentally (an immaterial object, a quality, etc.); to apprehend by thought (a truth, the answer to a question), to recognize the force of (a demonstration)" [OED See v.3], (10 examples), e.g. (181, 7-8): "We common see that a black ground doth best besme se a white counterfeit.

SET DOWNE = "to put down in writing or in print; to put on paper; to enter in a catalogue or account; to write out, compose; to put on record; to record, relate, give an account of" [OED Set v.143c], (314, 15): "How can any part of the world bee distant farre from the other, when as the Mathematicians set downe that the earth is but a pointe being compared to ye heauen.s" SHEWED = "variant of SHOW" [OED Shew], (239, 28): "... if the Princess of beautye Venus, and her heyres Helen, and Cornelia, shewde that our affection standeth on our free will..."; SHIELDE = "in deprecatory phrase God shielde, usually with a clause or sentence as direct object, rarely with addition of an indirect object; also absolutely as an exclamation: = God forbid. Obsolete" [OED Shield v.5], (221, 8-9): "But God shielde Lucilia, that thou shouldest be so careless of thine honour as to commit the state thereof to a stranger."; SUSPOSE (206, 37); SUSPECT (262, 8); SWEARE (2 examples), e.g. (312, 15-6): "... and I durst swears that for beastlines she might be the Monster of Italy." TESTIFIE (301, 19-20); THIN(C)K(E) (12 examples), e.g. (187, 11-5): "... so that I am enforced to thinke that either thou dydest want one to give thee good instructions, or that thy parentes made thee a wanton wyth to much cockeringe, either they were too foolish in vsinge no discipline, or thou too frowarde in reiecting their doctrine, eyther they willinge to haue thee idle, or thou wyllfull to bee ill employed."; VNDERSTANDE (NOT) (2 examples), e.g. (294, 25-6): "Besides this, thou shalt well vnderstande that hee is such a God as wil punishe him whoseuer he be yl blasphemeth his name..."; WEEEN: Past tense and past participle weened. "The word seems to have gone out of general use in the 17th century. It has survived as an archaism, especially in the parenthetic formula I ween. In regard to what is present or past: To think, surmise, suppose, conceive, believe, consider. In ME often with well." [OED Ween v.1], (205, 25-6): "Weenest thou that he will have no mistrust of thy faithfulness, when he hath had tryall of thy fytkenesse?"; WEEPE NOT = "(not) to shed tears over, (not) to lament with tears." [OED Weep v.6], (311, 9-10): "Thou shouldest not weep that she hath runne fast, but that thou hast gone so slowe..."; WISH(E) (318, 23-4); WOTTE = "variant of Wit v.1", due to the carrying over of the preterite-present stem wot (earlier and northern wot) into other parts of the verb. The substitution occurs first in the 2nd person singular (wot, wot for wast, wost) and the plural (for witen) of the present tense, and appears in northern texts from the end of the 13th century. In the 14th century the new forms wotest and woteth (wotis) appear. The infinitive woten occurs early in the 15th century, and wotte, wote, wot in the 16th, together with the present participle wotting. The past tense wotted is an archaism of the 19th century." [OED Wot v.1]. "To have cognizance or knowledge of; to be aware of; to know (as a fact or an existing thing)." [OED Wit v.1], (232, 27-30): "Ah well I wotte that a newe broome sweepeeth cleane, and a newe garment maketh thee leawe off the olde thoughte it be fitter, and newe wine causeth thee
to forsake the olde though it be better...”; WO(U)L(D)(E) (NOT) = “I wish” (OED Will v.1.36) (3 examples). See 2.1.2. below for examples and detailed information about the complementation of this predicate. WRITE (2 examples), e.g. (311-312, 36-01): “Thou writest that she was shamefull in hir trade and shamelesse in hir ende.”

2.1.2. WITH UNINTRODUCED CLAUSES (176 EXAMPLES)

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

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

And I would ye gentlemen here present wer as ready to credit my profe, as ye gentlewomen are willing to heare their own prays, or I as able to overcome as Mistres Lucilla would be cõtē to be ouerthrown.

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

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

this latter case being an example of what Jespersen (1909-49, 3: 11.861) calls prosiopesis, i.e., the loss of one or two syllables at the beginning of an utterance when the speaker produces no audible sound as he begins to articulate what he is going to say. The subsequent loss is not confusing to the hearer, as the elided elements are always pieces of well-known information, as the subject pronoun in the above example. Moreover, it is not uncommon for these reduced constructions to become set phrases, as thank you or pray.
In all the examples found in the corpus, (I) *wo(u)ld(e) (not)* is used as an expression of longing, equivalent to “I wish”, “O that” [OED Will v. 36], in structures with or without the presence of the complementizer, although it should be noted that examples with the complementizer are far less common and are always correlated with the presence of the subject, as can be seen in Table 2 below:

**Table 2. Complementation of *wo(u)ld(e) (not)*.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOULD</th>
<th>S-WOULD</th>
<th>WOULD TO GOD</th>
<th>S-WOULD TO GOD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THAT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZERO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

... I woulde to God that eyther I had never borne, or thou never bredde. (243, 18-9).

But I would to God Euphues woulde reparer thither, that the sight of him might mitigate some part of my martindale. (207, 31-3).

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

(4) This News I picked up at Bet’s door. Would to God we had peace! (1777, Miss M. Townshend, in: Jesse Selwyn & Contemp. (1844) III, 260).

(5) Ah my sweete home Hierusalem Would god I were in thee. (c1600, Hymn Hierusalem my happie homen xi).

2.2 Type 2: It-V-OBCL

ADDE (*must adde*) (320, 6); AGREE (246, 2-5); LET (2 examples), e.g. (221, 35-6): “... neither let this comfort thee, that at his departure he deputed thee in Philaunus place.”; NOTE = “to observe or mark carefully; to give heed or attention to; to notice closely.” [OED Note v. 1], (196, 24-8): “But this I note, that for the most part they stande so on their pantuffles, that they be secure of perilis, obstinate in their owne opinions, impatient of labour, apace to conceiue wrong, credulous to beleue the worst, ready to shake off their olde acquaintance without cause, and to condemn them without colour,”; OBJECT (218, 32-6); REMEMBER (233, 30-1); SAY(E) (2 examples), e.g. (317, 26-30): “… for this say they all (which is the chiefest note of a gentleman) that thou shouldst as well desire honestie in thy lyfe as honour by thy lynage, that thy nature should not swerre from thy name, that as thou by dutie woldest be regarded for thy progeny, so thou wouldst endeavour by deserts to be reverenced for thy piecie.”; THIN(C)K(E) (2 examples), e.g. (250, 6-10): “Thinke this with thy selfe, that the sweete songs of Calipso, were subtill snares to entice Vlysses, that the Crabbe then catcheth the Oyster, when the Sunne shineth,
that Hiena, when she speakeyth lyke a man deuiseth most mischiefe, y^1 women when they be most pleasaut, pretend most trecherie.”; VOW (225, 28-9).

3. OBJECT CLAUSES IN THE CORPUS. DITRANSITIVE STRUCTURES

Type 3: V-O_1-OBCL (36 examples, 37 predicates).

Percentage in corpus: 6.64%.

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

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

ADMONISHE + NP + OBCL = “to put (a person) in mind of duties; to counsel against wrong practices; to give authoritative or warning advice; to exhort, to warn.” [OED Admonish v.1], (267, 5-6): “Plato that deuine Philosophers admonished all nurses and weareers of youth, that they should not be to busie to tell them fonde fables of filthie tales…”; ASSURE + NP + OBCL (5 examples), e.g. (198, 23-5): “Which if I may obteine, assure your selfe y^1 Damon to his Pythias, Pylades to his Orestes, Titus to his Gysippus, Theseus to his Pyrrothus, Scipio to his Leulius, was never fowre more faithfull then Euphues will be to his Philaetus.”; BESEECHEN + NP + OBCL (229, 15-6); COMMAUND + NP + OBCL: See Desire below for the only example to be found in the corpus; COUNSELL + NP + OBCL (203, 21-3); DESIRE + NP + OBCL (4 examples), e.g. (318-319, 36-05): “In the meane season I desire thee, yea, & in Gods name command thee that if neither the care of thy parents whom thou shouldest comfort, nor the cousailie of thy friends which thou shouldest credit, nor the rigor of the lawe which thou oughtest to feare, nor the authority of the Magistrate which thou shouldest reverence, can allure thee to grace; yet the lawe of thy Saviour who hath redeemed thee, and the punishment of the almightie who continually threateneth thee, draw thee to amendment…”

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

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

EXHORT + NP + OBCL (284, 5-8); FEARE + NP + OBCL (213, 35-7); PERSWADE + NP + OBCL (4 examples), e.g. (198, 34-5): “… since you your self haue vsed so little curiositie, perswading my selfe, that my short answere wil worke as great an effect in you, as your few words did in me.”; PROTEST + TO-NP + OBCL (212, 4-5); TEACH + NP + OBCL (2 examples), e.g. (202, 10-3): “Dooth not experience teach vs that in the most curious Sepulchre are enclosed rotten bones? That the Cypresse tree beareth a fayre leafe but no fruites? That the Estridge carruyth fayre fethers, but rancke flesh?”; TELL + NP + OBCL (250, 16-7); WARNE + NP + OBCL (238, 31-2); WITNESSE + TO-NP + OBCL (300, 18).
3.2. WITH UNINTRODUCED CLAUSES (12 EXAMPLES)

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

4. OBJECT CLAUSES IN THE CORPUS. COMPLEX TRANSITIVE STRUCTURES

Type 4: V-C_o-OBCL¹ (1 example) (0.18%).
Type 5: V-it-C_o-O的地-OBCL (1 example) (0.18%).
Type 6: V-it-A-OBCL (3 examples) (0.56%).
Percentage in corpus: 0.92%.

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

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

4.1. TYPE 4: V-C_o-OBCL

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

… I thought good that this my faythe shoule be set downe to finde fauour with the one, and confute the causls of the other.

4.2. TYPE 5: V-it-C_o-O的地-OBCL

MAKE COMMON (251, 13-6):

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

4.3 TYPE 6: V-it-A-OBCL

According to Fanego (1990, 13), the most characteristic adjuncts to be found in this type “denote place, goal, source, and other related notions …”; and she adds that “since complement clauses can only refer to abstractions, their occurrence in such patterns is restricted to metaphorical contexts where verb and adjunct constitute an idiomatic unit devoid of its literal meaning”. My scarce findings confirm this point:

CAST IN ONE’S HEAD (219, 33-5):

… yet wisely did she cast this in hir head, that if she should yeele at the first assault he woulde thinke hir a lyght huswife, if she should reiect hir scornfully a very haggard...

¹ The following terminological conventions should be noted: (i) A denotes an obligatory adverbial; (ii) C_o stands for object complement.
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TAKE BY THE WAY (224, 16-8). Cf. OED Take v.41b = “to accept as true or correct; to believe (something told to one)” and cf. also OED Way sb 1.31c for By the way = “figuratively with reference to the tenor of discourse: incidentally, in passing, as a side-topic”:

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

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

Thou takest it heavylye that thou shouldst bee accused without colour, and exiled wythout cause...

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

2 Examples (7a-c) have been taken from McCawley (1988, I: 97).
(8a) Harry predicted that the Yankees would win the pennant.
(8b) %Harry predicted it that the Yankees would win the pennant.\footnote{McCawley uses the symbol % to indicate acceptability which varies dialectically.}

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

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

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

(9) *He never gave that Bolsheis are human beings a thought.\footnote{Example (9) has been taken from McCawley (1988, I: 97), where it appears as (9d) and has been renumbered here for convenience.}

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

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

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

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

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

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

(12) Ic wat þæt þis ludeisce folc micelum blissigan wile mines deapes. (ÆChom i.86.31).

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

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

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

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

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

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

(15) Pan he by-gan repentye sare þat he hþ greued his Eem (c1380 Sir Ferumbr. 261).

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

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

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

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

(17) Pis therdæ Coel þat icumen was Custance. (Layamon 10950).

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

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

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

(19) ... for this thince courtiers, that to be honest is a certeine kinde of countrye modestie, but to bee amiable the courtly curtesie. (320, 8–9).

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

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

(21) Thinke this with thy selfe, that the sweete songes of Calipso, were subtill snares to entice Velysse, that the Crabbe then catcheth the Oyster, when the Sunne shineth, that Hiena, when she speaketh lyke a man deuisest most mischiefe, y women when they be most pleasante, pretend most trecherie. (250, 6–10).
As for complex-transitive structures, I have only found 2 examples with the pattern SVO, one with the heralding pronoun this and another in which this preparatory element is absent and hence does not follow PE usage:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3. ANTICIPATORY ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOTRANSITIVE STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLEX TRANSITIVE STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLEX TRANSITIVE STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. CONCLUSIONS

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

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

1 Examples (22)-(23) and (24)-(26) below may be found in preceding sections and are repeated here for convenience.
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Extraposition of object complement clauses, though possible, is very restricted and difficult to account for in EMODE. Moreover, it has never been the norm in English; instead, structures of the type V-OBCL have always been the unmarked option.

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

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