The Grammar of the Verb *Persuade* in Recent Centuries

Henna Vuori
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
May 2012

_____

Tässä pro gradu -tutkielmassa tarkastellaan englannin kielen verbin *persuade* syntaktisia ja semanttisia piirteitä, erityisesti sen komplementaatiorakenteisiin liittyviä seikkoja, kirjoitetussa brittienglannissa vuodesta 1710 nykypäivään. Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on selvittää verbin käytössä tapahtuneita muutoksia kyseisten vuosien ajalta, sekä arvioida verbin tyypillisiä ominaisuuksia nykyenglannissa.

Tutkimusaineistona käytetään korpusmateriaalia kahdesta eri korpuksesta: lähteenä vuosille 1710-1920 on *The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts* (CLMET), ja nykykielen lähteenä on *The British National Corpus* (BNC). CLMET sisältää pääasiassa kaunokirjallisia tekstejä, ja se jakautuu kolmeen osaan: CLMET 1 kattaa vuodet 1710-1780, CLMET 2 vuodet 1780-1850, ja CLMET 3 vuodet 1780-1920. Korpuksesta on saatavilla laajennettu versio, *The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts Extended Version* (CLMETEV). Tätä tutkimusta varten aineisto vuosilta 1710-1780 on kerätty laajennetusta versiosta (CLMETEV 1), kun taas vuosien 1780-1920 lähteenä on käytetty alkuperäistä versiota (CLMET 2/3). Korpuksen ensimmäinen osa on huomattavasti muita suppeampi molemmissa versioissa, joten laajennettua versiota hyödyntämällä on saatu sisällytettyä enemmän aineistoa aikakauden ensimmäisiltä vuosilta. BNC sisältää materiaalia vuosilta 1960-1993. Koska BNC:n sisältö koostuu useista eri tekstilajeista, aineisto rajattiin tätä tutkimusta varten kaunokirjallisiin teksteihin (Imaginative Prose). Näin tutkimuksen nykykielinen aineisto on riittävän samankaltaista ja vertailukelpoista historiallisesta korpuksesta saadun aineiston kanssa.

Tutkielman johdanto-osassa käsitellään aluksi lyhyesti korpuslingvistiikkaa ja tutkimusmateriaalin lähteenä käytettäviä korpuksia, minkä jälkeen esitellään komplementaatiotutkimuksen perusteita. Seuraavaksi tarkastellaan verbin ominaisuuksia englannin kielen sanakirjojen, kielioppiteosten ja muiden lähteiden avulla. Lopuksi käsitellään vielä eräitä spesifimpiä komplementaatiotutkimuksen teorioita ja käsitteitä liittyen verbin *persuade* komplementaatiorakenteisiin. Tutkielman toisessa osassa analysoidaan korpusaineisto kronologisessa järjestyksessä, alkaen vanhimmasta materiaalista.

Tutkimuksessa selviää, että verbin *persuade* kolme selkeästi yleisintä komplementtia ovat olleet NP (nominilauseke) + *to*-infinitiivi, NP + *that*-lauseke ja NP koko tarkasteltavan ajanjakson ajan. Lisäksi *persuade* on aina vuodesta 1710 nykypäivään ottanut komplementikseen useita erilaisia NP:n ja preposition yhdistelmiä, esimerkiksi NP + *of* +NP ja NP + *into* + NP. Verbin komplemententaatiorakenteiden analyysiä vaikeuttaa muodon *persuaded* kaksitulkintaisuus joissakin passiivirakenteissa. Näissä *persuaded* voidaan luokitella joko verbimuodoksi tai adjektiiviksi.Yksi tutkimuksen merkittävimmistä löydöksistä on tällaisen käytön huomattava väheneminen siirryttäessä vuodesta 1710 kohti nykypäivää.

Asiasanat: verbi, persuade, komplementaatio, korpus, korpustutkimus

Table of contents

1 Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the syntactic and semantic features of the verb *persuade* in written British English from the early 18th century to the late 20th century, thus covering roughly a time frame ranging from the beginning of what is known as the Late Modern English period to the present day. The thesis is divided into two parts: the first half provides the background of the study, introducing the theoretical framework and examining the properties of *persuade* on the basis of earlier works; the second half presents a corpus analysis based on data from two corpora, the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts and the British National Corpus.

The study has a special focus on the complementation patterns of *persuade.* In general terms, the complementation of a word refers to the ways in which the word tends to combine with certain types of other words, forming recognizable patterns. The kind of patterning this study examines is demonstrated in the following quotes from the *Oxford English Dictionary*:

1) Her Consort still *persuaded* her to enjoy the diversions of the court. (1732, T. Lediard tr. J. Terrasson, *Life Sethos* II, x. 406)

2) Earnestly seeking to *persuade* him of the finality of her own religion. (1934, C. W. Hendel, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau* xx. 549)

3) Richard *persuaded* him the film needed to be re-released for the benefit of a new generation of thrill-happy speed junkies. (2003, *Jack*, May 223/3)

In the above examples *persuade* combines with different linguistic elements: in (1) it is followed by a pronoun NP (noun phrase) and a *to*-infinitive (*to* + infinitive verb form); in (2) the verb is accompanied by an NP followed by the preposition *of* and another NP; in (3) *persuade* is again followed by an NP, but after the NP there is a finite *that*-clause (with *that* omitted). Such accompanying elements can be termed as complements of *persuade*.

The choice of verb is motivated by the fact that references to both the syntactic and semantic properties of *persuade* are abundant in the literature, but a comprehensive usage-based study has not been carried out. There are plenty of issues relating to the analysis of

persuade that can be investigated in the light of data provided by modern large corpora.

Relating to complementation, it is essential to study authentic data in order to produce a reliable presentation of the complementation patterning of a verb, as the more traditional descriptions may not provide a completely realistic picture (Egan 2008, 2-7). As to why it is important to study complementation in detail in the first place, one of the reasons is that it is an essential but difficult area in the description of English, and an endless source of research questions to be investigated. From a more practical point of view, complementation is also a major source of learner errors: even very advanced learners often have difficulty producing the correct patterns (Hunston 2002, 173). This study participates in the attempt to describe the syntactic and semantic regularities involved in such patterning.

With its diachronic dimension, this study also contributes to the research into recent historical change in the English language. The CLMET provides an excellent source of data for tracking grammatical phenomena in the Late Modern English period, which apparently has not received as much attention in linguistics as the earlier periods of English (De Smet 2005, 69). My study may shed new light on the development of the recent trends in the behaviour of *persuade.*

2 On corpora

In this chapter I will present a few general notes on corpora and corpus linguistics, and

introduce the corpora used in this study.

2.1 Corpora and corpus linguistics today

Over the past five decades, since the birth of the first electronic corpus in the 1960s, the field of

corpus linguistics has expanded and developed tremendously, and electronic corpora are now

regarded as invaluable tools by linguists with many different theoretical backgrounds. Renouf

and Kehoe (2009, 1) summarize the development neatly as follows:

> Corpus Linguistics, thirty years on, is less characterizable as an innocent sortie into
> corpus territory on the basis of a hunch, and increasingly as an informed, critical
> reassessment and/or extension of existing analytical orthodoxy and descriptions, in the
> light of the potential offered by new data and tools coming on stream.

Obviously, the rapid development is still ongoing.

Recognizing the variety of theoretical leanings in the field utilizing corpora, I adopt

Lindquist's (2009, 1) view of corpus research as a methodology rather than a separate branch

of linguistics as such. The present study detects syntactic and semantic phenomena found in

corpus data with the help of a theoretical background and hypotheses formed on the basis of

relevant previous literature. This kind of study can be described as corpus-based (Lindquist

ibid., 10).

2.2 Normalisation

One of the current issues concerning the development of the field is related to the level of

statistical expertise required in carrying out corpus research: corpus linguists have sometimes

been criticised for not paying enough attention to statistical issues (Lindquist 2009, 37). Of

course, the need for different statistical techniques depends on the nature of a particular study,

as corpora can be used in numerous ways. It is beyond the scope of this study to attempt any

complicated statistical methods in the corpus analysis part. However, one standard measure,

known as normalisation, is necessary for a reliable comparison between the different corpora/sub-corpora used in this study, and between this study and others. Normalisation was introduced by Biber et al. (1998, 263), and it is generally used in corpus linguistics as a method of adjusting frequency counts from corpora of different sizes according to the same chosen basis, a certain number of words, so that the relative frequencies are comparable. It is a common practice to normalise to 1 million words, and this practice is followed in this study. With 1 million words as the basis, normalising is thus done as follows: the raw frequency of a word/pattern etc. in a corpus/sub-corpus is multiplied by 1 million; the result is divided by the total number of words in the same corpus/sub-corpus. The result is a normalised frequency (NF) of x words per million.

2.3 The corpora used in this study

The corpora used in this study are well known and widely used in linguistic studies. They are also widely available. Therefore, I find it unnecessary to discuss the compilation of the corpora in detail.

2.3.1 The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts

The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET) is the source of the Late Modern English data used in this study. It was compiled by Hendrik De Smet (see De Smet 2005 on the corpus make-up) on the basis of texts collected from the *Project Gutenberg* and the *Oxford Text Archive*. The corpus is divided into three parts covering three sub-periods of 70 years; the first part covers the years 1710 to 1780, the second 1780 to 1850, and the third 1850 to 1920. The original version of the corpus has around 9.8 million words, but there is also a larger extended version (CLMETEV) with about 14.9 million words. For this study the data from the second and third sub-period is collected from the original version, whereas the data from the first sub-period is provided by the extended version. The purpose of this choice was to be able to include more tokens from the first part of the corpus, as it is considerably smaller than the

other two in both versions. Each sub-period will be analysed separately and the results compared. The three parts will be referred to as the CLMETEV 1 (1710-1780), CLMET 2 (1780-1850) and CLMET 3 (1850-1920). According to De Smet (ibid., 78), the relatively large size of the corpus enables the investigation of "relatively infrequent syntactic patterns, or borderline phenomena between grammar and the lexicon", and it is thus an appropriate source of data for the present study. As for the disadvantages of the CLMET, it has to be remembered that, given the time-frame, the corpus is necessarily biased to "literary texts written by higher class male adults" (De Smet ibid., 72). In order to gain comparable results, the bias has to be taken into account when choosing the source of the present-day English data.

2.3.2 The British National Corpus

The present-day English data used in this study is provided by the 100-million-word British National Corpus (hereafter abbreviated to the BNC), which is comprised of texts from the years 1960 to 1993. The corpus has established itself as a useful and reliable resource for linguistic research; indeed, Lindquist (2009, 16) notes on the BNC: "Its size and the care with which this corpus was compiled and documented, as well as its general availability through various free interfaces, make it a favourite with many linguists." For this study the search was limited to the Imaginative Prose domain of the corpus (16,496,408 words) in order to consider material that is sufficiently similar to that found in the CLMET, and thus suitable for a comparison between the different time periods. On the restrictions of the BNC it could be noted that since the latest material is from 1993, the most recent development will not be revealed in this study.

3 On complementation

In this chapter I will define the concept of complementation more precisely, and introduce some essential concepts and theories relating to the study of complementation.

3.1 What is a complement?

The study of complementation is concerned with the ways in which a head word, such as a verb, noun or adjective, combines and forms patterns with other elements, regarded as its complements. Relating to the complementation of verbs specifically, Somers (1984, 508) defines complements as "those elements which may be said to be expected to accompany a given verb or to complete its meaning." There is thus a close relationship, a dependence, between a verb and its complements. The complement function can be realized by several different syntactic units: they can be phrasal, such as noun phrases (NP), adjective phrases (AdjP) and prepositional phrases (PP), or clausal, such as *to*-infinitive clauses and finite *that*-clauses (Herbst et al. 2004, xxv-xxvi). Patterns of two or more complements can be identified, as is the case in the following example from Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 217):

1)   She told <u>him</u> <u>the truth</u>.

In this example the verb *tell* occurs with a complementation pattern that can be formulated as NP + NP. Verbs determine the types of elements allowed to accompany them: it is said that verbs "license" their complements (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 219). As regards PP complements, Somers (1984, 516) points out that verbs also typically determine the specific prepositions in the PPs they allow. Verbs can be classified according to the kind of complementation they licence: this is known as "subcategorization" (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 219).

It has to be pointed out that complements may be either obligatory or optional. A complement can be regarded as obligatory if its omission leads to a completely ungrammatical sentence, or to a complete change in the meaning of the verb (e.g. Huddleston & Pullum ibid.,

221; Herbst et al. 2004, xxxi). Optional complements are still closely related to the verb. Their presence can be seen as licensed, even if not required, by a particular verb.

In some approaches (see e.g. Huddleston & and Pullum (2002) and Herbst et al. (2004)) the subject of the main verb is treated as part of its complementation pattern. As the subject can be taken for granted with any English verb, I will focus on elements inside the VP, and the complementation patterns identified will not include the subject. I will, however, discuss the nature of the subject, as well as other pre-head phenomena, if relevant.

3.2 Complements vs. adjuncts

Not all accompanying elements in a sentence can be treated as complements. The term adjunct is used in the literature to refer to essentially optional elements that are less closely related to the verb than complements. The presence of a particular kind of adjunct is not regulated by subcategorization, and different adjuncts can be attached to sentences much more freely. Adjuncts are not required to complete the meaning of the verb, but they may add information concerning the content of the sentence, answering questions such as how, when, where and why, as shown in the following examples picked from Huddleston's (1984, 223) list of adjunct types:

2) a) He drives <u>very carefully</u>.   Manner
   b) She died <u>in 1942</u>   Time
   c) He was reading <u>in the bath</u>.   Place
   d) He worked late <u>to impress the boss</u>. Purpose

Notice that the adjuncts in (1) are classified with the help of the semantic labels *manner*, *time*, *place* and *purpose* above, instead of applying the relevant phrase and clause structure labels AdvP, PP (or *in* + NP) and *to*-infinitive. As Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 215) note, "complements are more clearly differentiated by their syntactic properties, adjuncts by their primarily semantic properties."

Distinguishing between complements and adjuncts is not, of course, always a straightforward matter in practice, and linguistics are in disagreement on where the line should be drawn exactly. I will not discuss all the possible criteria at length here, but one specific test, involving the anaphoric expression *do so,* is worth introducing. The antecedent of *do so* has to cover the entire complementation pattern of the verb, which excludes its appearance before a further complement (Huddleston & Pullum ibid., 223). Adjuncts, in contrast, can be combined with *do so.* In the following examples from Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 223) the interpretation of *do so* shows that *in the garage* is a complement of the verb *keep* in (2a), whereas in (2b) it is an adjunct, not part of the complementation pattern of *wash*:

3) a) * Jill keeps her car in the garage but Pam <u>does so</u> in the road.
   b) Jill washes her car in the garage but Pam <u>does so</u> in the road.

 (2a) is unacceptable, as *does so* clearly has to be interpreted as "keeps her car in the garage", which is incompatible with the interpretation "Pam keeps her car in the road"; in (2b) it only covers *washes her car*, resulting in the perfectly consistent reading "Pam washes her car in the road", in which *in the road* is also an adjunct (Huddleston & Pullum ibid., 223). Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 223) state that the ability of an element to combine with *do so* is sufficient to confirm its adjunct status. Somers (1984, 517) also regards this as a reliable test.

3.3 Valency theory

The distinction between complements and adjuncts is one of the central issues in valency theory, a major syntactic theory dealing with complementation. The approach aims precisely at defining the essential and less essential participants in a sentence (Somers 1984, 521). A basic assumption in valency theory is the importance of the verb in a sentence: the structure of a grammatical sentence is seen as largely dependent on the complementation properties of the main verb, on its valency (Herbst et al. 2004, xxiv). In its simplest form the concept of valency refers to the number of complements a verb requires, marked in valency patterns with subjects

included; verbs are then classified as monovalent, bivalent or trivalent, according to whether they take one, two or three complements (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 219). I demonstrate this with following examples from Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 219):

4) a) <u>He</u> died.   monovalent
  b) <u>This</u> depends <u>on the price</u>. bivalent
  c) <u>He</u> blamed <u>me</u> <u>for the delay</u>. trivalent

This is not very helpful as such in practice, and further syntactic information can be given concerning features that are seen as "valency-bound", for example, the type of phrase or clause expected by the verb, or the function the complement may perform in a sentence (subject or object) (Somers 1984, 508; Herbst et al. 2004). In addition to such syntactic valency, other relevant features of the complements in a valency pattern may also be indicated; Herbst et al. (2004, xxiv) argue that "a comprehensive valency description must, however, specify not only the formal properties of the complements but also their semantic and collocational properties, i.e. the "range"."

Relating to the kinds of semantic specification that can be included in valency, Somers (1984, 508) mentions the concept of selection restrictions. This refers to the fact that a verb may require a complement with a certain semantic feature, such as the property of being human or animate. Such features can be formulated as [+ human] and [+ animate].

3.4 Argument structure, thematic structure and theta theory

Another way of describing the close relationship between a verb and its complements (and consequently excluding adjuncts) is based on logic. In this approach, too, the verb is seen as having a central role in determining the essential elements in a sentence (Haegeman 1994, 36). The number of accompanying elements a verb requires is referred to as its argument structure, and such elements, or complements, are termed as arguments of the verb. Haegeman (ibid., 36) defines arguments as "the participants minimally involved in the activity or state expressed by

the predicate." As Haegeman (ibid., 36) notes, the argument structure of a verb is thus "conceptually defined"; if we know the meaning of a verb, we can infer its argument structure by thinking about the minimum number of participants needed to realize the activity depicted by the verb. As with valency, this kind of representation of the argument structure of a verb can be complemented by specifying the syntactic categories that can realize the arguments, resulting in a representation such as the following taken from Haegeman (ibid., 41):

5) *kill*:   verb; 1   2
                     NP   NP

The action expressed by the verb *kill* thus involves two participants, two arguments, which are realized by NPs.

The above representation does not include information on the specific semantic nature of the arguments. Arguments can also be classified according to the roles they fulfil in the sentence, referred to as semantic roles, case roles, thematic roles or theta roles. In this analysis the semantic requirements a verb imposes to its arguments are referred to as its thematic structure: a verb assigns theta roles to its arguments, or "theta-marks" them (Haegeman ibid., 41). The identification of semantic roles is not always a straightforward matter, and there is no agreement in the literature on the exact number or definition of the different roles that should be distinguished. Nevertheless, the importance of such roles is generally recognized. The following four roles and example sentences from Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 228-233) serve to demonstrate some of the roles that are often identified (definitions abbreviated by me):

a) Causer (with Agent as subtype): involves direct or immediate causation of an action or event → Kim signed the letter.
b) Instrument: the entity used by an agent in performing an action → I cut the lace with the knife
c) Patient: affected by an action performed by some causer → They hit me.
d) Theme: the entity that moves or is located → He gave me the key.

In terms of thematic structure, it can be said that the verb *hit* in (c), for example, assigns the roles of Causer/Agent and Patient to its arguments. The other roles found in Huddleston & Pullum are Experiencer, Stimulus, Primary Theme, Secondary Theme, Factive Theme, Path,

Source, Goal, Location, Recipient and Beneficiary.

A theory that deals specifically with the assignment of theta roles is known as theta theory (Haegeman 1994, 41). A basic assumption in the theory is summarized in a principle known as the theta criterion (Haegeman ibid., 46):

> Each argument is assigned one and only one theta role.
> Each theta role is assigned to one and only one argument.

This is one way of predicting the structure of a grammatical sentence; all the theta roles a verb assigns must be realized in a sentence, and there cannot be arguments with no theta role given by the verb, or with more than one theta role (Haegeman ibid., 44).

4 *Persuade* in dictionaries and the other literature

I will next move on to the treatment of the verb *persuade* in secondary sources.

4.1 *Persuade* in the *Oxford English Dictionary* and other dictionaries

In this section I will examine *persuade* with the help of dictionaries, with the aim of defining the meaning(s) of *persuade,* and identifying the complementation patterns it takes. I will use the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter the *OED*) as the starting point of the discussion, but I will also consult three advanced learner's dictionaries, the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, the *Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary* and the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English,* in order to gain more information on the status and the common uses of the verb in present-day English. In addition, I will complement the picture with one different kind of dictionary, the *Valency Dictionary of English* (Herbst et al. 2004), which does not provide sense definitions, but focuses on the patterning of the headwords.

The *OED* entry for *persuade* is rather lengthy and complicated, providing as many as eight senses, all of which are divided further into sub-senses. Some of the senses or sub-senses are marked as obsolete or rare, which lead me to consider the exclusion of some possibly irrelevant senses. I decided to include all the obsolete or rare senses or sub-senses that are exemplified in the *OED* entry with quotes from after 1700, as the senses, and consequently the complements related to them, might still appear in my data. The result was that sense 8 with its two sub-senses and sub-sense 7 b were excluded from the discussion. Senses 1-7 are presented in the table below exactly as they are in the *OED*, and exemplified with some of the quotes found under the entry. The right-hand columns present the complement types that occur in the quotes; they are not intended to be complete lists of all the possible complements types related to the senses.

OED senses	Quotes	Complements
1. *trans.* **With a person as object.** **a.** To induce to believe or accept a statement, doctrine, etc; to convince *that* or *of*; to urge successfully *to* think, believe, etc. Also to talk †*from*, *into*, *out of*, †*to* (a belief). Also occas. *Intr.* Also *fig.* **b.** *refl.* To bring oneself to believe *that* something is the case; to convince oneself; to become or be sure. **c. In** *pass.* To be or become convinced, assured, or certain *that* something is the case, or *of* something.	1. He could not be persuaded that it actually was only the 24th of January. (1796, H. Hunter tr. J.H.B de Saint Pierre, *Stud Nature* 1 Pref. 31) 2. We could persuade her out of those notions. (1844, Lady G. C. Fullerton, *Ellen Middleton* xi) 3. We secretly persuade ourselves that there is no such thing as excellence. (1826, W. Hazlitt, *Plain Speaker* x, in *Wks.*) 4. I am thoroughly persuaded that the notion is a fallacy. (1852, H. Rogers, *Eclipse of Faith* 282)	1. NP + *that*-clause 2. NP + *out of* + NP 3. NP (refl) + *that*-clause 4. NP + *that*-clause
2. *trans.* **a.** To urge successfully *to* do something; to attract, induce or entice to something or in a particular direction. Also: to talk *into*, †*to*, †*unto* a course of action, position etc.; to dissuade successfully *against*, *away from*, *from*, *off*, *out of*. †**b.** In extended use: To get as if by persusion; to coax *out of* something. *Obs. nonce-use.*	1. An advertisement persuaded her to try the dietary supplement glucosamine. (2001, *Times* 24 Apr. II . 15/1) 2. Hirsch could not be spoken to, reasoned with, or persuaded into a rational line of conduct. (1904, J. Conrad, *Nostromo* viii) 3. Persuading my clients away from me. (1858, G. Eliot, *Janet's Repentance* vii, in *Scenes Clerical Life* II. 151) 4. It required earnest and intelligent industry to persuade a living out of those barren hillocks and weedy hollows. (1887, J. G. Nicolay & J. Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*)	1. NP + *to*-infinitive 2. NP + *into* + NP 3. NP + *away from* + NP 4. NP + *out of* +NP
3. **a.** *trans.* To attempt to induce or draw *to* do something; to urge, strongly advice, or plead with; to try to convince (*that*). Now *rare.* (*Eng. Regional* (chiefly *south.*)). **b.** *intr.* To use persuasion or inducement to win a person over to some opinion or course of action; to plead, make entreaties.	1. I persuaded him to see the Doctor, but he wouldn't do it. (1883, W. H. Cope, *Gloss. Hampshire Words* 66) 2. The magistrates might deliberate and persuade, the people only could resolve and execute. (1776, Gibbon, *Decline & Fall* I. ɪɪ. ix)	1. NP + *to*-infinitive 2. Ø

4. *intr.* To succeed in inducing or convincing by persuasion; to convince. Formerly with *from, to, unto*.	1.You as a woman to another may prompt, disclose, and may at last persuade. (1910, S. Phillips, *Pietro of Siena* II. ii. 25) 2. His strong, sterling face persuaded of his full knowledge. (1892, R. L. Stevenson & L. Osbourne, *Wrecker*)	1. Ø 2. *of* + NP
†**5.** *trans.* **a.** To lead a person to believe in (a fact, statement, opinion, etc.) or *that* (something is the case); to prove or demonstrate (a thing) *to, unto* a person. *Obs.* **b.** The induce the doing or practice of (an act, course of action, etc.) by argument, entreaty, reasoning , etc.; to inculcate, urge successfully *unto* someone. *Obs.*	1. A man must not use weak Arguments, or such as may make against him, when he intends to persuade the Thing he says. (1715, Pope tr. Dionysius in tr. Homer *Iliad* I. ɪɪ. Observ. 151) 2. But what need of so many arguments to persuade that which is so comfortable in to their disposition. (1753, L. M. tr. J. Du Bosc, *Accompl. Woman* II 294)	1. NP 2. NP
6. *trans.* †**a.** To advocate, advice, or commend to adoption (an act, course of action, etc.) or *that* something be done. *Obs.* **b.** To recommend the acceptance of (a statement, opinion, etc.) to urge as credible or true; to go to prove, make probable. In later use also with *upon*: to convince a person that (something) is the case. *rare* after early 18th cent.	1. He always perswades a public marriage. (1781, M. Madan, *Thelyphthora* III. 326) 2. His ministers will clearly have difficulty persuading it [*s.c.* The theory of suffering from success] upon ordinary people. (1973, *Times* 19 Nov. 15/1)	NP NP + *upon* +NP
†**With** *with.* **7.** *intr.* **a.** To use persuasion, plead, or expostulate with. Also occas.: to prevail with. *Obs.* (*rare* after 17th cent.).	Tis in vain persuading with her-she drowns all counsel in a sea of tears. (1837, F. Kemble, *Star of Seville* IV. ii. 101)	*With* + NP

Table 1: Persuade *in the OED*

I will first discuss the sense definitions in the dictionaries, and then move on to the syntactic

complementation patterns.

4.1.2 Senses of persuade

Judging from the *OED* entry, what seems to be common to all the senses of *persuade* is the

presence of influence or causation: a participant causes, or tries to cause another participant (which may be explicitly or implicitly present) to realize a desired result. Moreover, the influence involved in persuading is of appealing nature, and can be described with the help of verbs such *induce, urge, attract* and *entice*. Verbal inducing and urging are obvious means, but persuading does not necessarily involve speech.

Senses 1-4 are labelled as "senses relating to persons". I interpret this as referring to the target of persuasion. The *OED* entry does not provide explicit comments on the semantic nature of the persuader, but on the basis of the quotes, it is typically human.

In sense 1 with its 3 sub-senses there is, in general, a human object that is caused to believe or think that something is the case, to accept a certain view on something. On the basis of the *OED*, *persuade* can be used in this sense as an equivalent of the verb *convince* ("to convince *that* or *of*", "to convince oneself", "to be or become convinced"). Figurative use is noted as a possibility with 1 a, which could be interpreted as referring to uses involving non-human participants. 1 b suggests that reflexive use is not infrequent with *persuade.* 1 c seems somewhat dubious, as it only occurs in a particular kind of passive which seems to have an adjectival flavour: for example, *I am persuaded that* can be interpreted as "I am certain that". This issue will be considered further in chapter 5.

In the definition of sense 2 a human object is not mentioned explicitly, but the general label "senses relating to persons" and the quotes indicate that in 2 a there is typically a human object that is caused to act, to do something, or to move (either physically or mentally) to some position or in some direction. Interestingly, in the most recent quote under 2 a there is a non-human subject, an advertisement, that persuades a person. The inclusion of 2 b as a separate, "extended" sub-sense appears somewhat curious, as it is marked as "nonce-use".

In sense 3 a the ideas of causing a person to think or do something present in senses 1 and 2 are combined under one sense, but in this sense persuasion is only attempted. I suspect that identifying this sense, and distinguishing it from senses 1 and 2 might not always be

straightforward, and the context needs to be examined carefully. On the basis of the quotes in the *OED*, the clearest, or at least one of the clearest indications of sense 3 seems to be a *but*-sentence which states explicitly that the persuasion was unsuccessful. Another one is an *-ing* form indicating ongoing action, as in the following quote from the *OED*:

1) That I should find you earnestly and vehemently persuading me to prefer Acton to Stowey. (1796, S. T. Coleridge, *Let. to T. Poole* in *Lett*)

3 b differs from 3 a in that neither the object of the attempted persuasion nor the desired mental state or action is mentioned.

Sense 4, then, is similar to 1 and 2 in that it conveys the same idea of successfully convincing a person, but, as in 3 b, the object is not mentioned. It appears that the difference between 4 and 3 b might sometimes be very subtle and difficult to discern, and a detailed examination of the context is again essential.

Senses 5 and 6 are labelled as senses "with a thing as object". The definition needs clarification: the object thing also differs from the object person of the previous senses in that it is not the object thing that is made to do or believe (figuratively) something. It seems that in senses 5 and 6, too, there is still, at least in most cases, a human target (even if it is not explicitly present) that someone influences, or tries to influence, and what is referred to as the object thing expresses the idea that is intended to be believed in or accepted. The differences between senses 5 and 6 and their sub-senses do not seem clear-cut, and, for the purposes of this study, it will probably not be necessary to treat them as separate. They are obviously more marginal than the previous senses, as they are likely to be rare or absent even in the Late Modern English period. Sub-sense 6 b is interesting, though, in that, despite being rare even after the early 18th century, it is not marked as obsolete in present-day English, and the most recent example is from as late as 1973. Therefore, it has to be recognized as a sense that might still occasionally appear even in present-day English.

In sense 7 a *persuade* is used "with *with*". In this sense there is a human target that is

explicitly present, but the preceding preposition prevents the use of the traditional object label. This obsolete sense is very marginal from the point of view of this study, and will not receive much attention.

We will now turn to the sense definitions in the three advanced learner's dictionaries. The first of these, the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, hereafter the *CALD*, summarizes the meanings of *persuade* in one single definition: "to make someone do or believe something by giving them a good reason to do it or by talking to them and making them believe it". The idea of causing a human object to believe or to do something corresponds to the essential ideas present in senses 1 and 2 in the *OED*. The entry also provides one example with a non-human object:

2) Using a bunch of bananas, the zoe-keeper persuaded the monkey back into its cage. This confirms the possibility of figurative use in this sense, though in this case not much extension is required.

In addition to sense definitions, the *CALD* provides what are called "thesaurus-panels" for words that learners of English tend to "overuse". These suggest alternative ways of conveying the same meaning with "more interesting, specified and appropriate words". *Persuade* appears to be one of these "overused" words, and the panel under the entry provides the following alternative "ways of saying persuade" (my formulations): "talk someone into doing something", " cajole or coax someone to do something", "convince someone that something is true", "talk someone round" and "dissuade someone from doing something" (instead of "persuade someone not to do something"). These can also be read as defining further the meanings of *persuade*.

The *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, hereafter the *LDCE*, provides two senses of *persuade*:

1. to make someone decide to do something, especially by giving them reasons why they should do it, or asking them many times to do it

2. to make someone believe something or feel sure about something; = convince

These also convey essentially the same ideas involving causation and a human object. There is an interesting emphasis in sense 1, though, in the word *decide* referring to the change in the mental state of the object rather than the resulting action. The equals sign in sense 2 indicates that in this sense *persuade* is synonymous with the verb *convince*; this is a notion found in the *OED*, too, as was pointed out earlier. As for the nature of the subject, in one of the examples in the *LDCE* it is a non-human subject that persuades, a thing:

3) I am not *persuaded* by these arguments.

In this case there is, of course, still a human entity that has presented the arguments in order to persuade.

The *Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary*, hereafter the *CCED*, provides three senses of *persuade*:

1. If you persuade someone to do something, you cause them to do it by giving them good reasons for doing it.

2. If something persuades someone to take a particular course of action, it causes them to take that course of action because it is a good reason for doing so

3. If you persuade someone that something is true, you say things that eventually make them believe that it is true.

In this definition, too, a human object is caused to either do or believe something. Interestingly, however, the *CCED* draws attention to the properties of the subject of the causation, dividing the first idea into two senses: in sense 1 the subject is human, and in sense 2 it is non-human, a thing. The following example is presented under sense 2:

4) The Conservative Party's victory in April's general election *persuaded* him to run for President again.

In this case there is clearly no human participant deliberately performing the act of persuasion.

Although the *Valency Dictionary of English* (Herbst et al. 2004, 585) does not provide sense definitions, the entry confirms the "normalness" of a non-human main clause subject in an additional note stating that "A person or something such as an argument or a fact can

persuade a person". In the light of the dictionary entries, it is appropriate to consider the semantic features of the subject and object NPs in the analysis of *persuade,* utilizing labels such as [- human].

None of the entries in the three advanced learner's dictionaries include uses corresponding to *OED* senses 3-7. On the basis of the five dictionaries, the main meaning of *persuade* in present-day English could thus be divided into two main ideas: 1) "someone or something causes someone (by verbal means or by other means that provide a good reason) to act or to move to a position" and 2) "someone or something causes someone (by verbal means or by other means that provide a good reason) to believe/think that something is the case".

4.1.3 Complements of *persuade*

I will next turn to syntactic considerations, with the aim of identifying the possible complementation patterns of *persuade.* The *OED* definitions and quotes provide plenty of information on the kinds of complements that *persuade* has taken during the relevant time-frame. There are as many as 20 patterns (at least) that can be identified on the basis of the *OED* (including the use without a complement):

- NP (also reflexive) + *that*-clause
- *that*-clause
- NP + *to*-infinitive
- NP
- NP + *of* + NP
- NP + *into* +NP
- NP + *out of* + NP
- NP + *from* + NP
- NP + *away from* + N
- NP + *off* +NP
- NP + *to* + NP
- NP + *unto* + NP
- NP + *upon* +NP
- NP + *against* + NP
- *with* + NP
- *of* + NP
- *from* + NP
- *to* + NP

- *unto* + NP
- Ø complement

Judging from the *OED* entry, the complementation patterning of *persuade* appears to be rather complex. Both sentential and non-sentential complements are possible. In the sentential patterns there is generally more than one complement: the first is an NP which can be labelled as a direct object of the verb in a traditional approach such as the one adopted in the *OED*; the NP is followed by a finite *that*-clause (in which *that* may be omitted), or a non-finite *to*-infinitive clause. Interestingly, the *that*-clause complement can also sometimes occur directly after the verb, without an intervening NP. The *OED* entry does not include any quotes from after 1700, but the following quote from an earlier period serves to demonstrate this kind of use:

5) Physicians *perswade* <u>that the Artery shall be cut</u> crosse asunder. (1656, J. Smith, *Compl. Pract. Physick* 44)

The non-sentential patterns also generally involve an NP object, which can stand alone as the only complement, or it can be followed by a prepositional phrase. The number of the different prepositions that may occur in the prepositional patterns is remarkably high. It has to be noted, though, that some of the prepositions marked as obsolete within the otherwise relevant senses might actually have fallen out of use by the Late Modern English period.

It does not seem surprising that the object NP complement can stand alone. In contrast, the patterns where the verb is complemented by a prepositional phrase alone, without an intervening object NP, appear much more exceptional. The quotes in the *OED* entry include examples of two such patterns from after 1700: *of* + NP (quoted in table 1 under sense 4) and *with* + NP (sense 7 a). *From* + NP, *to* + NP and *unto* + NP are identified in the definition of sense 4, and are not marked as obsolete. The remark "Also occas. *intr.*" in sense 1 a also seems to suggest the possibility of this kind of prepositional complement, but the remark is not clearly linked to any particular preposition, and there are no examples of intransitive uses of this sense.

In addition to the uses with the various complement types, *persuade* can also appear

without a complement.

As for the most common complementation patterns of *persuade* in present-day English, the three advanced learner's dictionaries provide plenty of information. The example sentences in these are taken from corpora, though often not quoted exactly, but presented in modified forms.

In the *CCED* the complementation patterns are formulated explicitly. The following patterns are listed as complements of *persuade*: 1) NP + *to*-infinitive; 2) NP; 3) NP + *into* +NP; 4) NP + *into* + *-ing*; 5) NP + *that*-clause; 6) NP + *of* + NP. The fourth pattern in the list, NP + *into* + *-ing* (*-ing* referring to the gerund, or *-ing* form of a verb), attracts attention, as the *OED* version used in this study does not present any examples of the NP + *into* + *-ing* complement under any of the senses, and it is not quite clear whether the possibility could be deduced from the sense definitions that identify the NP + *into* + NP pattern. The *CCED* does not give any examples of the pattern.

The *LDCE* also gives explicit patterns for most uses, though not formulated with phrase structure labels. The following complements can be identified: 1) NP + *to*-infinitive; 2) NP + *into* + *-ing*; 3) NP; 4) NP + *that*-clause; 5) NP + *of* + NP. The NP + *into* + *-ing* complement is thus again recognized, and the *LDCE* does also provide an example of the pattern:

6) Don't let <u>yourself</u> be *persuaded* <u>into</u> <u>buying</u> things you don't want.

Here the combination of the reflexive and the passive structure, which can be formulated as "to let oneself be persuaded + *into* + *-ing*", is also interesting.

The *LDCE* also identifies patterns that fall out of the scope of complementation, but are, nevertheless, significant from the point of view of studying types of co-occurrence of words in general. The following patterns are provided in the entry: "try/manage/fail to persuade sb" and "attempt/effort to persuade sb".

In the *CALD* the patterns are not as clearly formulated as in the previous two dictionaries, but the following complements can be discerned: 1) NP; 2) NP + *that*-clause; 3)

NP + *to*-infinitive; 4) NP + *into* + NP; 5) NP + *into* + *-ing*; 6) NP + *out of* + *-ing*. What is significant here is the inclusion of not only the NP + *into* + *-ing*, but also another sentential pattern with a preposition, the NP + *out of* + *-ing*, which is not identified in the other advanced learner's dictionaries. The following example from the *CALD* provides both patterns:

7) Her legal advisers *persuaded* <u>her</u> <u>into/out of</u> <u>mentioning</u> the names of the people involved in the robbery.

As with the NP + *into* + *-ing*, there are no obvious indications of the possibility of the NP + *out of* + *-ing* in the *OED* entry, either.

With its focus on the patterning of the headwords, Herbst et al. (2004, 585) is naturally a valuable source for identifying complements. The dictionary is based on corpus evidence, and most of the example sentences are also quotes or slight modifications of quotes from a corpus. The following are listed as the main patterns used with *persuade*: 1) NP; 2) NP + *to*-infinitive; 3) NP + *that*-clause; 4) NP + *into* + NP; 5) NP + *into* + *-ing*; 6) NP + *of* + NP; 7) NP + *out of* + NP. In addition the NP + *out of* + *-ing* pattern, is found in an additional usage guide that has "into or out of something or doing something" (ibid., 585). Herbst et al. confirm, thus, all the complementation patterns identified on the basis of the three advanced learner's dictionaries. In addition, they provide the NP + *out of* + NP included in the *OED*, too. The possibility of using *persuade* without a complement is also listed in Herbst et al..

It is noteworthy that all the three advanced learner's dictionaries and Herbst et al. provide the NP + *into* + *-ing* pattern. Therefore, I hesitate to argue that it is not regarded as a possible complement of *persuade* in the *OED*. In order to find more evidence of this particular pattern, I carried out an additional search into the entire *OED* quotation database. The database does, in fact, include at least the following example of the pattern, appearing in a quote from the Late Modern English period:

8) Damme if ever they *persuade* <u>me</u> <u>into doing</u> another 'shunt'. (1884 H. Smart *From Post to Finish* xlvi)

Perhaps the pattern is not frequent enough in the data used in the *OED* to be recognized as a

distinct, established construction. Nevertheless, judging from the attention the NP + *into* + *-ing* receives in all the other dictionaries, it should be included in the main complementation patterns of the verb in present-day English. With the NP + *out of* + *-ing* pattern the evidence is somewhat less convincing, but its presence in a dictionary focusing on patterning indicates that it should not be disregarded.

On the basis of the five dictionaries consulted in this study it could be suggested that in present-day English the most frequent complementation patterns of *persuade* are the following:

- NP + *that*-clause
- NP + *to*-infinitive
- NP + *into* + *-ing*
- NP + *out of* + *-ing*
- NP + *of* + NP
- NP
- NP + *into* + NP
- NP + *out of* + NP

It will be interesting to see whether my BNC data provides support for this suggestion.

4.1.4 Sense and complement type

I this subsection I will discuss briefly the relationship between sense and structure, and raise a few issues relating to certain specific patterns.

Some prepositional complements are obsolete in some senses, and may perhaps have been obsolete by the beginning of the time-period covered in this study. In any case, I expect them to be rare even in the Late Modern English period. Table 2 below summarizes the division of the different complementation patterns between the different senses on the basis of the dictionaries. As the definitions of the main senses are sufficiently similar in all of the dictionaries, I have attached the patterns found in the advanced learner's dictionaries to the corresponding *OED* senses 1 and 2. The sub-senses have not been separated here.

Sense	Complement types
1	NP + *that*-clause, NP + *to*-infinitive, NP, NP + *of / from/ into / out of / to* + NP, *of* + NP
2	NP + *to*-infinitive, NP, NP + *into / to / unto / against / away from / from / off / out of* +NP, NP + *into* + *-ing*
3	NP + *to*-infinitive, NP + *that*-clause, NP + *out of* +NP, Ø
4	Ø, *of* + NP, *from/to/unto* + NP
5 or 6	NP, *that*-clause, NP + *upon/unto/to* + NP
7	*with* + NP

Table 2: Sense and complement type in the dictionaries

The table shows that the "main" senses, senses 1 and 2, take the largest number of different complement types. The NP + *that*-clause and the NP + *of* + NP are not found with sense 2. As regards the NP + *to*-infinitive pattern, there is an interesting overlap between senses 1 and 2: the *to*-infinitive is typically related to sense 2, but if there is a verb such as *think* (in the sense "to be of an opinion") or *believe* in the *to*-infinitive, sense 1 is identified. In the corpus analysis I will consider whether and how often *persuade* is actually used in sense 2 with the NP + *to*-infinitive complement.

An interesting notion concerning the relationship between the NP + *into* + *-ing* and the NP + *to*-infinitive complements is found in the *CALD*: the following example with an equals sign suggests that the patterns are to be regarded as having (at least roughly) the same meaning:

Her legal advisers *persuaded* her into mentioning = to mention

The relationship between these two patterns is an issue worth considering in the corpus analysis part, if NP + *into* + *-ing* complements occur.

In Herbst et al. (2004, 585) the NP complement that occurs alone is accompanied by the note "only if clear from context". The entry provides the following example:

9) Try and *persuade* her, Laura. I believe it's very important.

Here it seems that what is to be understood in the context is something that would be realized

by a complement expressing either of the basic ideas included in the meaning of *persuade.* As

such the sense in *persuade her* in unclear, and more context would be needed to determine

whether Laura should be persuaded to believe in the truth of something or to do something. An

example of a contextual factor that helps clarify the sense is found in the *CALD* entry:

      10) If she doesn't want <u>to go</u>, nothing you can say will *persuade* <u>her</u>.

In this example it is evident that persuading relates to going. I predict that if my corpus data

includes instances of *persuade* used with the NP complement alone, determining the sense

might be somewhat problematic.

4.1.5 A notion on complementation and parentheticals

Consider the following quote from the *OED* entry for *persuade* (under sense 1 c):

      11) No one, <u>I</u> am <u>persuaded</u>, will suspect that this clause was put into St. Paul's defence.
          (1790, W. Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ* Rom. i. 10)

Here the concept of parenthetical use, as presented in Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 895-896),

seems relevant. Parentheticals are expressions that can be attached to a clause (the "anchor

clause") as additions, and that do not in this use have the sentential complementation pattern

they would have in non-parenthetical use (ibid., 895). Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 896) argue

that "in a parenthetical construction the anchor is syntactically a main clause, in non-

parenthetical it is subordinate". The following examples from Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 895)

demonstrate both uses with the verb *think*:

      12) a) I think it is quite safe. → non-parenthetical

         b) It is quite safe, I think. → parenthetical

         c) It is, I think, quite safe. → parenthetical

In (12a) the verb *think* has a *that*-clause complement, whereas in (b) and (c) it occurs without a

complement. I interpret the sequence *I am persuaded* in example (11) as having a parenthetical

flavour. In this analysis, thus, *persuade* does not have a *that*-clause complement, only the NP. It

will be of interest in the corpus analysis part to see if there are constructions that can be treated as parenthetical.

4.2 *Persuade* in the other literature

I will next examine the treatment of p*ersuade* in grammars and other sources. I found it difficult to extract all the specifically syntactic and semantic features from the grammars, and I will therefore discuss them together, not in separate sections. It has to be noted that none of the sources examined here aims at identifying all the possible complements of *persuade*.

4.2.1 *Persuade* in a grammar of Late Modern English

The first grammatical source discussed here is a grammar of Late Modern English by Poutsma (1904-1949). The grammar has a few references to the use of *persuade* in the period, providing the following 3 complementation patterns: NP + *to*-infinitive; NP + *into + -ing* and NP+ *against + -ing*.

The use of the NP + *to*-infinitive after *persuade* is first noted in a chapter on different infinitival patterns (ibid., 563), but it is also treated in relation to the other two complementation patterns. The discussion on the NP + *into + -ing* is particularly interesting, as the inclusion of the patterns is not obvious in the *OED* entry for persuade. Poutsma (ibid., 657-658) lists *persuade* among verbs that allow both NP + *to*-infinitive and NP + *into –ing* complements, presenting the following examples demonstrating both patterns:

13) See <u>what</u> your daughter has *persuaded* <u>me</u> <u>into</u> <u>reading</u>. Hyp. , CH. XIV, 71b.

14) She had *persuaded* <u>her father</u> <u>to give</u> him a place in the library. ib. , CH. X, 55.

The semantic relationship between the patterns is also commented on. When this kind of variation occurs, the difference between the patterns is, in Poutsma's (ibid., 657) view, in the strength of the idea of "a result as brought about by a dint of action", that is, the idea conveyed by *to* is "weaker". It is also noteworthy that according to Poutsma (ibid., 657), this kind of variation is found particularly with verbs expressing "persuading or compelling". On the basis

of Poutsma, it seems evident that the NP + *into* +*-ing* was an established complementation pattern of *persuade* in Late Modern English.

As for the NP + *against*+ *-ing* pattern, *persuade* is found in the following example demonstrating the use (ibid, 636):

15) To *persuade* <u>him</u> <u>against</u> <u>returning</u> into Herefordshire was scarcely the work of a moment. Pride and Prej. , CH. XXXV, 198.

This pattern is also interesting, as it is not identified in any of the dictionaries consulted above. The pattern is contrasted with the NP + *to*-infinitive: Poutsma (ibid., 635) states that with verbs that take these two patterns the *to*-infinitive expresses "what should be done", whereas the *against + -ing* expresses "what should be avoided".

4.2.2 *Persuade* in grammars of contemporary English

The first contemporary English grammar discussed here is Huddleston & Pullum (2002), as it provides the most references to the verb *persuade*. The following three patterns are noted as complements of *persuade*: NP + *that*-clause + NP, NP + *to*-infinitive + NP and NP + *of* + NP.

The NP + *that*-clause pattern is found in a discussion of the relationship between non-finite and finite complements, which makes extensive use of *persuade.* Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 1226) present *persuade* as one of the verbs with which the *to*-infinitive complement has a finite "alternant or near-alternant", demonstrating this with the following examples:

16) a. She *persuaded* <u>me</u> <u>to go</u>.   b. She *persuaded* <u>me</u> <u>that I should</u> go.

The other verbs mentioned are *believe*, *prefer, decide* and *demand.* With *persuade* the patterns are to be treated as near-alternants only (ibid., 1226). There is a footnote on the issue, commenting on the difference between the patterns in the following sentences (ibid., 1201):

17) 1i. Pat *persuaded* <u>Liz</u> <u>to interview</u> both candidates.

2i. Pat *persuaded* <u>Liz</u> <u>that she should</u> interview both candidates.

Relating to these examples, Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 1201) state:

There is a slight difference in meaning between the infinitival and finite constructions

with *persuade*. Whereas [1i] entails that Liz agreed or undertook to interview the candidates, [2i] is a little weaker: she accepted that there was an obligation on her to do so. But this doesn't affect the semantic status of Liz: in both cases Pat applied persuasion directly to Liz, producing a change in her psychological state.

I find it interesting that *persuade* is one of the verbs chosen to represent this kind of alternation between finite and non-finite complements. The meaning difference is greater or different from the meaning difference between the two patterns with the other verbs mentioned, a fact recognized by Huddleston & Pullum. The treatment of these patterns together raises a question concerning the most frequent meanings related to the *that*-clause complement with *persuade*. *Huddleston* & Pullum do not comment on the frequencies of the uses, but on the basis of the dictionaries, my initial hunch is that this kind of use of the *that*-clause complement, relating to action in a way only slightly different from the meaning of the *to*-infinitive construction, is not common with *persuade.* This is one of the issues I hope my corpus data will help clarify.

The NP + *to*-infinitive pattern is presented under "catenative complements" (ibid., 1177), which refers to the possibility of "concatenation", the following kind of repetition of the pattern:

18) to try to *persuade* him to help her redecorate her flat

The constructions involving this kind of complement are divided into simple and complex on the basis of whether there is an intervening NP between the matrix verb and the infinitive clause. *Persuade* is listed among verbs that can only appear in complex constructions and do not allow an alternant *–ing* form complement (ibid., 1233). On the intervening NP in these constructions Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 1181) state that it invariably functions syntactically as an object the matrix verb, and "belongs" in the matrix clause. They also note that there is correlation between syntax and semantics with *persuade*; the object NP belongs in the matrix clause semantically, too (ibid., 1201). They present the following example (ibid., 1181):

19) They *persuaded* <u>the students</u> <u>to cancel</u> the performance.

This sentence is rephrased as "persuasion was applied to the students in order that they should

agree to cancel the performance" (ibid., 1181).

Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 1202) also provide a comment on the semantic restrictions that *persuade* imposes on the NP complement in the NP + *to*-infinitive pattern: they state that the NP has to refer to "a sentient being capable of making decisions", with the exception of metaphorical language, of course.

The NP + *of* + NP complement is found in a section discussing "constructions containing prepositional verbs" (ibid, 278). Here *persuade* is simply given in a list of verbs that take an NP object complement followed by a PP complement consisting of a preposition and its object (ibid., 278-279). There is a general remark on the corresponding passive constructions: it is only the object NP of the verb, not the NP in the PP complement, that can become the subject of a passive clause (ibid., 278). It is also stated that this pattern generally allows the preposition to be fronted, extracted or repeated in coordination (ibid., 278).

Turning to Quirk et al. (1985), they provide the same three complementation patterns of *persuade* as Huddleston & Pullum: NP + *that*-clause, NP + *to*-infinitive and NP + *of* +NP. Both the NP + *that*-clause pattern and the NP + *to*-infinitive are discussed under "variants of ditransitive complementation" (ibid., 1212). The patterns are formulated as "indirect object + *that*-clause object" (ibid., 1212) and "indirect object + *to*-infinitive clause object" (ibid., 1215). In both structures the complement NP is thus treated as an indirect, not direct object, and the clausal complement is interpreted as the direct object of the verb. This differs thus from the analysis of the pattern in Huddleston & Pullum. In this study the problem of whether an object should be considered direct or indirect in traditional terms is not relevant, and will not be dealt with, as it does not affect the formulation of the complement types, but such notions are intertwined with how the semantics of the verb is presented.

Quirk et al. divide the verbs taking the NP + *that*-clause complement further into two subtypes. *Persuade* is given in a list of verbs representing the type of verbs that introduce "an indirect statement", which means that the verb in the *that*-clause is in the indicative form (ibid.,

1212). There is, however, a further remark concerning the senses of *persuade* with this pattern: the "indirect statement" interpretation applies to the "convince" sense of *persuade*, but the sense "persuade someone to do something" is also noted as a possibility, in which case the verb would represent the second type (ibid.,1213). In this second construction type, defined as "indirect directive"[1] (ibid., 1212), the verb in the *that*-clause complement can be either in the indicative or subjunctive form, commonly accompanied by a putative *should*. The "indirect directive" interpretation with *persuade* corresponds thus to the kind of "finite near-alternant" discussed and exemplified in Huddleston & Pullum. Quirk et al. (ibid., 1213) do comment on the frequency of the two corresponding patterns in general, stating that the indirect directive with a *that*-clause is "rare and formal".

As a final remark on the NP + *that*-clause, it has to be noted that the object NP is marked obligatory with *persuade*; the possibility of using the *that*-clause complement alone is thus rejected by Quirk et al. (ibid., 1213).

As for the NP + *to*-infinitive pattern, Quirk et al. (ibid., 1215) list *persuade* in a class of verbs that both take this pattern as complement and also have the property of introducing "indirect directives". *Persuade* is also found in the following examples demonstrating the use of these verbs (ibid., 1215):

> 20) I *told/advised/persuaded* <u>Mark</u> <u>to see</u> a doctor.
>   <u>Mark</u> was *told/advised/persuaded* <u>to see</u> a doctor.

The concepts of "indirect speech" and "speech act" are also mentioned in this connection; the subject NP of verbs such as *persuade* is seen as a performer of a speech act, the complement NP as the addressee, and consequently the *to*-infinitive has to be interpreted as a report of what is said (ibid., 1215).

The NP + *of* +NP is also discussed under the general label "ditransitive

---

[1] Quirk et al. (1985, 1212) provide the following illustration of this type:

She *petitioned* the king *that her father {might be/should be/be} pardoned*.

complementation" (ibid., 1208), and *persuade* is given in a list of some of the verbs taking this pattern (ibid., 1210). There are no further notions relevant to *persuade* with this complement type.

Finally, in the corpus-based grammar of Biber et al. (1999), *persuade* is related to two complementation patterns: NP + *that*-clause and NP + *to*-infinitive**.**

In a discussion of the pattern verb + NP + *that*-clause, *persuade* is mentioned as one of the verbs that this kind of patterning, and the following example is given (ibid., 661):

21) I *persuaded* <u>myself</u> <u>that something awful might happen</u>.

Biber et al. (ibid., 370) propose a semantic categorization of verbs, presenting the following main domains: activity verbs, communication verbs, mental verbs, causative verbs, occurrence verbs, existence verbs and aspectual verbs. *Persuade* is classified as a communication verb when it occurs with the NP + *that*-clause pattern. This class is defined as "a special sub-category of activity verbs that involve communication activities (speaking and writing))" (ibid., 362). Biber et al. (ibid., 664) note that within this class of verbs *persuade* is one of the less frequent ones with the NP + *that*-clause.

The pattern NP + *to*-infinitive is divided into 3 types according to the grammatical relations that the two NPs in the sentence and the *to*-infinitive clause represent (ibid., 695-696). *Persuade* is listed among the verbs that take the first pattern type, in which the complement NP is interpreted as both the object (direct or indirect) of the matrix verb, and the subject of the *to*-infinitive clause (ibid., 696). *Persuade* also appears in an example of the use of the pattern (ibid., 696):

22) He had *persuaded* <u>a woman</u> <u>to come</u> into the laundry room of the house. (FICT †)

With this complementation pattern *persuade* is classified as belonging to a different semantic group, that of verbs of "modality or causation", together with verbs such as *force, encourage, allow, help* and *require* (ibid., 696).

The treatment of *persuade* in the grammars raises a question on the semantic nature of

the verb. It has been my view, based on the dictionaries, that the presence of causation or influence is essential in the semantic "make-up" of *persuade* in all of the uses. However, in two grammars, Quirk et al. and Biber et al., the communicative aspect, conveying a message, is emphasized with the pattern with the *that*-clause complement. With the *that*-clause this seems less surprising, but Quirk et al. even apply this analysis to the pattern with the *to*-infinitive. This interpretation can also found in a more recent study by Egan (2008, 376): in his classification of verbs that take the + *to*-infinitive complement *persuade* is placed in a group of verbs appearing in "communication constructions", and it is not included in verbs appearing in "causation construction". At least in the case of the grammarians, such interpretations could be intertwined with issues such as the traditional considerations of verbs with direct and indirect objects. An additional source that is in line with my initial view is Dirven (1989, 120), who discusses verbs taking the *to*-infinitive complement, and places *persuade* in a group of "predicates denoting indirect causation or influencing other people" (together with verbs such as *advise*, *cause, force*, *lead* and *press*). In addition, Rudanko (2000, 75-76) states on verbs taking the *into + -ing* complement (*persuade* is included): "they have the basic meaning that the referent of NP1 causes the referent of NP0 to perform or to realize whatever is denoted by the lower clause."

5 *Persuade* and other word classes

As this study is concerned with the verb *persuade,* it is necessary to identify the possible cases

where one of the forms *persuade, persuaded, persuades* and *persuading* represents another

category, functioning as a de-verbal noun or adjective. In the corpus analysis part these will

ideally be kept apart from the treatment of the properties of the verb, though the possible

occurrences will be commented on to some extent. With *persuade* the relevant forms are

persuaded and *persuading*, as the noun *persuade* was, according to the *OED*, obsolete by the

beginning of the Late Modern English period. I will first list a few general syntactic criteria or

tests for distinguishing between the different functions of the *-ing* form and the past participle

form.

5.1 Verbs vs. nouns; some criteria

Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 81-82) provide some general criteria for distinguishing between

the verbal and nominal uses of the *-ing* form: 1) only nouns are used with determiners such as

the; 2) verbs take NP object complements, whereas nouns take prepositional phrases with *of*; 3)

nouns are typically modified by adjectives, whereas the corresponding verbs are typically

modified by adverbs. The following examples from Huddleston & Pullum (ibid.) demonstrate

the first two criteria:

    1) a. Kim hates writing thank- you letters. (verb)

        b. Kim had been involved in the writing of the letter. (noun)

Huddleston & Pullum (ibid., 82) point out there are also ambiguous cases, such as the

following:

    2) Kim had been talking about writing.

In such cases there are no clear indications of either a nominal or verbal function of the *–ing*

form. A possible solution is offered by Biber et al. (1999, 67), who claim that the verbal

interpretation should be regarded as a default option, as it is "the one that applies most

generally to *–ing* forms". The same applies to constructions such as the following:

3)   There is <u>no</u> denying <u>it</u>.

Biber et al. (ibid.,67) call this a "mixed" construction, as it contains both an object and a

determiner.

5.2 Verbs vs. adjectives; some criteria

A neat list of features indicating adjectival function can be found, for example, in Palmer (1987,

85-86). These apply to both the *-ing* and the *-ed* form. I present a slightly modified formulation

of these below, accompanied by example sentences also from Palmer:

a)   Attributive position (in an NP before a noun). →A complicated <u>problem</u>.

b)   Predicative position after verbs other than *be,* e.g. *seem, become.* →The problem <u>seems</u> complicated.

c)   Co-occurrence with preceding intensifiers such as *very,* and with comparative/superlative *more/most.* →The problem is <u>very</u> complicated.

d)   Coordination with a true adjective. →The problem is <u>difficult</u> <u>and</u> complicated.

To point (c) I would add *too* from Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1436). The same point can also

be complemented with *quite* and *rather* from Quirk et al. (1985, 168). An additional point

could be the possibility of adding an *un*-prefix to some adjectives to form opposites

(Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, 1437).

Huddleston & Pullum (ibid, 80) point out that a clear indication of verbal function is

again the presence of an NP object complement, demonstrating this with the following

examples:

4)   a. You're frightening <u>me</u>. (verb)

b. Such a prospect is frightening indeed. (adjective)

With the "past participle" form the presence of a *by*-phrase complement can also help confirm

the verbal interpretation, although it is not as such a sufficient criterion. Huddleston & Pullum

(ibid., 1439) note that although adjectives also allow *by*-phrase complements, they do not occur

as freely as with verbs: they are only possible if the corresponding verb has a stative meaning. They demonstrate this with the following examples:

5) a. The window was broken.

b. The window was broken <u>by vandals</u>.

In example (5a) the status of *broken* remains ambiguous, whereas in (b) adjectival reading is not possible, as *break* is dynamic (Huddleston & Pullum ibid., 1439).

5.3 The form *persuading* as a noun or adjective

Turning now to the question of how the above discussion applies to the subject verb of this study, and how likely the adjectival and nominal uses of the forms of this particular verb are in practice, I will first discuss the form *persuading*, which I do not expect to cause serious complications in the corpus analysis.

The *OED* has an entry for *persuading* as a noun. In most of the quotes some formal criteria can be applied to confirm the noun function. The examples include the following:

6) When his first scruples of conscience were overcome, he would need <u>no more</u> *persuading*. (1848, A. Brontë, *Tenant of the Wildfell Hall* II. Iii. 50)

7) By "twisting" is meant <u>the</u> *persuading* <u>of policyholders</u> in one company to transfer their insurance to another. (*Evening Post (*N.Y.*)* 20 Jan. (Financial Section) 7/1

In example (6) there are the determiners *no* and *more*. In (7) the article and the prepositional phrase are clear indicators. In one of the quotes *persuading* could be seen as ambiguous:

8) You make a distinction between *persuading* and commanding? (1877, H. James *American* xvii. 320)

Here perhaps the "default category" argument could be used. None of the other dictionaries mention the noun use, but interestingly the *LDCE* lists the pattern "little/a lot of/no persuading" under the verb entry, demonstrating the use with the following example:

9) <u>He</u> <u>took</u> <u>a lot of</u> *persuading* to come out of retirement.

This is rephrased as "it was hard to persuade him". The example resembles the *OED* example, and the nominal function of the *-ing* form seems quite obvious. Nevertheless, as this kind of

use is listed among the most common patterns in a dictionary, I will not be surprised to find it in the data. I will treat the possible occurrences as nouns.

The *OED* also has an entry for the form *persuading* as an adjective. In all of the quotes the adjectival status is confirmed by the general criteria. Here are two quotes are from the *OED*:

10) A candidate who is obviously looking at those north of the Berrimah Line as being the *persuading* voice of the Territory. (2001, *Centralian Advocate* (Nexis) 28 Aug. 8)

11) A touch fainter and more *persuading* than the touch of music or of a woman's hand. (1916, J. Joyce, *Portrait of Artist*)

In example (10) *persuading* appears as a pre-modifier of a noun. In (11) it again modifies a noun, though appearing after it, and it is also coordinated with another adjective and preceded by the comparative *more.* Though the latest quote in the *OED* is from 2001, the adjectival use is not mentioned in any of the other dictionaries, and it is thus not likely to be frequent at least in the more modern data.

5.4 The adjective *persuaded*

The *OED* provides an entry for the form *persuaded* as an adjective. It is noteworthy that in all except the oldest quote, which is from 1538, *persuaded* occurs as a straightforward pre-modifier of a noun, as exemplified in the following quotes:

12) We woke up in a gale That was reasoning with our tent And all the *persuaded* snow Streaked along. (1951, W. Stafford, *Traveling through Dark* 86

13) Politicians of their rank have in view not only a *persuaded* audience but a more thoughtful public. (1994, R. Lerner, *Revolution Revisited* iv. 59)

With such cases the criteria for distinguishing verbs and adjectives are easy to apply, and the adjectival status of *persuaded* is indisputable. None of the other dictionaries refer to this kind of adjectival use of the form *persuaded*, and I do not expect it to be frequent.

5.5 *Persuaded* and the passive gradient; verbal or adjectival passive

A more significant complication is related to the form *persuaded* and passive constructions. Before discussing the problematic cases, I will first comment on passive constructions in

general. Quirk et al. (1985, 159-160) discuss the "active-passive correspondence", presenting the following formulation (slightly modified):

> noun phrase 1 + active verb phrase + noun phrase 2←→noun phrase 2 + passive verb phrase + (*by* noun phrase 1)

The essential point is that in a "normal" passive construction the meaning relations between the participants are the same as in the corresponding active: it can be said that "John helped Mary" and the corresponding passive "Mary was helped by John" have the same truth value (Quirk et al. 1985, 160). The following quote from the *CCED* is an example of this type of "conventional" passive with *persuade*:

> 14) They were eventually *persuaded by the police to give themselves up*.

This is easily related to the corresponding active, "the police eventually persuaded them to give themselves up". With such sentences the complementation pattern can be identified on the basis of the active sentence as NP + *to*-infinitive, and this will be the practice in the corpus analysis part of this study.

Let us now turn to the less straightforward constructions. It was pointed out in the previous chapter that the passive sub-sense 1 c in the *OED* seems somewhat dubious. This is confirmed by the *CCED*. Consider the following examples:

> 15) The people in general are *persuaded of the rightness* of the German cause. (1914, T. S. Eliot, *Let.* 23 Aug. 54)

> 16) He is not *persuaded of the need* for electoral reform.

Example (15) appears in the OED under sense 1 c of the verb *persuade*, and the form *persuaded* is thus analysed as a verb. Example (16), however, appears under the label *adjective* in the *CCED*. Both examples have a subject NP, a form of the verb *be,* and the form *persuaded* followed by an *of* + NP complement. None of the several syntactic indications discussed above is present to help determine the status of *persuaded.* Judging from the treatment of the form in the two dictionaries, it is apparent that *persuaded* can be used, and also is used in practice in such a way that the sequence NP + (form of) *be* + *persuaded* can allow two alternative

grammatical interpretations. In the adjectival reading, the form of *be* is a copula, not a passive auxiliary, and there is no object NP complement. The *CCED* lists the *that*-clause and the *of* + NP as possible complementation patterns of the adjective *persuaded*. Cases with only NP + *be* + *persuaded,* including parenthetical uses, can naturally be classified as adjectival, too. From the point of view of the corpus analysis part of this study the ambiguity is unfortunate, as the possible ambiguous cases may affect the estimation of the frequency and proportion of the NP + *that*-clause, NP + *of* + NP, NP and zero complements.

The problem is, of course, related to many verbs, and commonly recognized and discussed in previous work. Writers such as Palmer (1987, 85-89), Quirk et al. (1985, 167-170) and Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1436-1440) discuss the problem of the passive gradient, the fact that there is a somewhat grey area, or continuum, between indisputable verbal passives and unambiguous adjectival cases, and different stages of verbal or adjectival force can be recognized. As regards the semantics involved in the interpretation, a commonly accepted view seems to be that all adjectival passives have a stative meaning, whereas verbal passives typically have a dynamic meaning (Quirk et al. 1985; Huddleston & Pullum 2002; Cook 1990, 25-30). On the verbal reading there is some amount of disagreement: Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1438) and Quirk et al. (1985, 168) allow some verbal passives with a stative meaning, whereas Cook (1990, 25) argues for a clear-cut semantic choice, stating that "a true passive predication describes an activity, but a stative predication describes the state of the object as a result of that activity." In order to help clarify the grey area, Cook (ibid., 27-28) provides the following additional structural principles concerning the influence of tense and aspect on the interpretation of the meaning of formally passive constructions (my modifications):

a) Simple present → generally stative

b) Past tense →ambiguous

c) Progressive aspect → always passive

d) Perfective aspect → normally passive

With cases that remain ambiguous, Cook suggests that the readers should exercise their "intuitive sense of the meaning of English sentences" (ibid., 28). Even with all the possible criteria, the conclusion is that "some passages will remain forever ambiguous" (Cook, ibid., 30).

In this study, essentially as a practical choice, I will follow the *OED* analysis when first identifying the complementation patterns and senses of *persuade* in the corpus data. Thus, if none of the distinguishing criteria mentioned in 5.1 are applicable, I will treat the structures as verbal passives and relate them to the corresponding actives. It has to be noted here that in one example under *OED* sense 1 c, *persuaded* is preceded by the adverb *fully* and in one by *thoroughly.* Such adverbs are apparently not treated in the literature as "fixed" intensifiers confirming adjectival function, and will not be included in the criteria in this study, either. I assume that the status of the *OED* serves as a sufficient justification for the approach I have chosen. However, I do find it necessary to recognize and comment on the possibility of a different interpretation, if ambiguous cases occur. One of the questions worth considering in the corpus analysis part is the frequency of such ambiguous constructions with the form *persuaded.*

6 Further issues relating to the analysis of *persuade*

In this final chapter of the theory part I will introduce some further theoretical issues relating to the analysis of the complementation patterns of *persuade*.

6.1 Control theory and NP movement

It was seen that one of the major complementation patterns of *persuade* is the NP + *to*-infinitive. Therefore, it is appropriate to introduce an important theory relating to non-finite complements, known as control theory.

First, we need to assume a special kind of "invisible", linguistically unrealized NP, known as PRO. PRO is found in the subject position of non-finite complement clauses (Carnie 2002, 260). Carnie (ibid., 269) provides the following example with *persuade*, indicating the location of PRO in the *to*-infinitive complement of the verb:

1)   Jean persuaded Robert [PRO to leave].

Semantically, example (1) is intuitively interpreted as having *Jean* as the subject of *persuade*, and *Robert* as both the object of *persuade* and the subject of *leave*. However, according to the theta criterion, we cannot allow the NP *Robert* to be an argument of *leave*: *Robert* has already been assigned a theta role by *persuade,* and an NP cannot be assigned more than one theta role. Therefore, we need PRO as a third NP argument capable of taking a theta role from *leave*. Assuming "invisible" NPs might be regarded as controversial (e.g. Egan 2008, 14; Carnie 2002, 263), but Carnie argues that "it does have a good deal of descriptive power. It can account for most of the data having to do with embedded infinitival clauses" (2002, 263). Moreover, referring to his own approach in which PRO is rejected, Egan (2008, 14) notes that it is "very much a minority one among linguists who have written on non-finite clauses."

Turning now to the concept of control, control theory is concerned with the interpretation of PRO, that is, the question of where PRO gets its reference from. In a subject control construction PRO is coreferential with the subject NP of the main clause, whereas in an

object control construction PRO is coreferential with the main clause object (e.g. Carnie 2002, 267). The verb *persuade* obviously involves object control. In fact, Carnie (ibid., 269) uses *persuade* to demonstrate object control, contrasting it with a subject control construction with *reluctant*:

2) a) Jean persuaded Robert [PRO to leave].

   b) Jean is reluctant [PRO to leave].

In (2a) PRO is thus interpreted as the same entity referred to with *Robert*, whereas in (2b) it is interpreted as the entity referred to with *Jean.*

A crucial point relating to the kinds of control is that object control and subject control verbs have different thematic structures. Object control predicates assign three theta roles: Carnie (ibid., 269) refers to these as "external agent or experience, an internal theme and a proposition". Subject control predicates only assign two theta roles, lacking the "internal theme" (Carnie ibid., 269).

Sag and Pollard (1991, 65) point out that the kind of control involved is predictable on the basis of the semantic type of the verb: verbs of certain semantic type are related to subject control, whereas verbs of another semantic type are related to object control. They place *persuade* in a group of verbs of "order/permit type", which involve object control (ibid., 66). Sag and Pollard (ibid., 66) argue that the semantics of all the verbs in this group involve influence, a relationship where "a certain participant (the referent of the object) is influenced by another participant (the referent of the subject) to perform an action (characterized in terms of the soa[2] denoted by the VP complement)." This is in line with my initial view on the semantics of *persuade* with the *to*-infinitive complement, countering the "communication verb" interpretation found in some sources.

Finally, it needs to be pointed out that there are constructions that are superficially similar to the ones involving PRO and control, but are actually analyzed as having a very

---

[2] Abbreviation for "state of affairs" in Sag and Pollard's terminology.

different kind of underlying structure, involving what is known as NP movement or raising. In these, the subject of the main clause predicate is treated as having been moved to the subject position from its underlying position in the complement clause, as shown in the examples from Carnie (2002; 267, 261):

3) Jean is likely [*t* to leave] ← [____ is likely [Jean to leave]].

The thematic structure of NP movement verbs differs from that of control verbs: in the analysis of (3) *Jean* is, in fact, assigned a theta role by *leave*; *is likely* does not assign a theta role to its subject, only to the complement clause (Carnie ibid., 259). The syntactic operation in NP movement may seem very artificial, but it is also intuitively clear that what is likely in (3) is not "Jean", but "Jean to leave". A few verbs are known to occur in both control and NP movement structures. *Persuade* appears to be utilized frequently as a model case of object control, and it does not, to my knowledge, occur in NP movement structures. There is no need to discuss the differences between the structures at length here.

6.2 The Great Complement Shift

A process labelled by Rohdenburg (2006, 147) as The Great Complement Shift has had an enormous impact on the system of sentential complementation in English in recent centuries, resulting in fundamental changes (Rohdenburg, ibid.; Vosberg 2009). One of the well-known phenomena involved in the shift is, in Rohdenburg's (2006, 159) words, "the rise of the gerund (both "straight" and prepositional) at the expense of infinitives", a rivalry between infinitives and *–ing* forms that began in the Late Middle English period (Vosberg 2009, 213). This trend could show in the complementation of *persuade* in recent centuries, as the verb allows both the *to*-infinitive and a "prepositional gerund", the *into + -ing* pattern. Another widely known process is the gradual replacement of *that*-clause complements by *to*-infinitives with verbs that previously only allowed finite complement clauses (Vosberg ibid., 212). Although *persuade*

takes both patterns, the patterns are reserved for different uses with *persuade* (even with some amount of semantic overlap) and this may make the shift less relevant to my study.

6.3 Extra-semantic constraints

In this section I will discuss three concepts that can be referred to as "extra-semantic constraints" (Rohdenburg 2006, 143). These involve factors that relate to preferable complement choices in certain structural contexts. Such constraints have been shown to affect the force of The Great Complement Shift, sometimes accelerating and sometimes delaying the process.

6.3.1 Complexity Principle

One of the factors known to have an influence on complementation is a general phenomenon referred to as the Complexity Principle. The principle was introduced and formulated as follows by Rohdenburg (1996, 151):

> In the case of more or less explicit grammatical options, the more explicit one(s) will tend to be favoured in cognitively more complex environments.

This tendency could have an influence on the *that*-clause complements of *persuade*: Vosberg (2003a, 217) states that the *that*-clause with *that* omitted is "far less explicit" than the corresponding clause with *that* retained. The choice between the *to*-infinitive and the *into+ -ing* could also be affected: Vosberg (2009, 219) argues that the sentential status of infinitives is more obvious, and they are thus presumably more explicit. Rohdenburg (1996, 173) lists several factors that create a complex environment, and thus favour the more explicit option:

1) discontinuous constructions of various kinds
2) (the presence) of more or less complex surface objects preceding finite and non-finite clauses
3) heavy subject expressions (including subordinate clause)
4) complex subordinate clauses
5) passive constructions

Discontinuous constructions involve elements that are inserted between a verb and its

complement clause, referred to as insertions (Vosberg, 2003a, 210). These may be, for example, adverbial expressions. Relating to *that*-clause complements, Rohdenburg (1996, 161) states: "Any elements (whether structurally ambiguous or not) which are placed immediately after the verb (plus object) are more or less likely to trigger off an additional *that*." The complexity of the subject of the *that*-clause has also been shown to affect the presence of *that*: Rohdenburg (ibid., 163) points out, for example, that personal pronoun subject NPs are more likely to occur without a preceding *that* than full NPs. Likewise, the complexity of the main clause object has proved relevant, and it can even be said that the presence of any object is in itself a complexity factor (Rohdenburg ibid., 162). Complexity factors will be considered in the corpus analysis part.

6.3.2 Extractions

Here I will introduce a special kind of complexity factor, referred to as extractions. The term covers several kinds of "deviations from the canonical sentence structure" (Vosberg 2003a, 201) where an element has been moved from its original position in the sentence to another location. Postal (1994; 159, 162) lists nine different types of extraction, presented below with examples from the same source:

1) Question extraction → [Who] did they nominate [t] to be the director?
2) Restrictive relative extraction → [The gun] which they claimed [t] was used in the crime.
3) Pseudo clefting → [What] Ellen wants [t] is a Mercedes-Benz.
4) Negative NP extraction → [No such gorilla] did I ever see [t].
5) Comparative extraction→ Stella tickled more chimps than [what] I said that Dwight tickled [t].
6) Exclamatory extraction → [What a lovely woman] he married [t].
7) Topicalization → [Frank] I would never hire.
8) Nonrestrictive relative extraction → Frank, [who] they adored [t], is dishonest.
9) Clefting → It was Frank [who] they hired [t].

In the examples [t] refers to the "trace"*,* the slot from which the extracted element in brackets has been moved. Extractions render sentences more complex (Rohdenburg 2006, 152), and may thus have an effect on the presence/omission of *that* in the *that*-clause complements of

persuade. In addition, extractions may be relevant to the choice between the NP + *to*-infinitive and the NP + *into*+ *-ing.* This is predicted in Vosberg's (2003b, 308) Extraction Principle:

> In the case of infinitival or gerundial complement options, the infinitive will tend to be favoured in environment where a complement of the subordinate clause is extracted (by topicalization, relativization, comparativization, or interrogation etc.), from its original position and crosses clause boundaries.

Here we could consider Poutsma's example of the NP + *into* + *-ing*, presented in 4.2.1, in the light of this principle:

4) See <u>what</u> your daughter has *persuaded* <u>me</u> <u>into</u> <u>reading.</u> Hyp. , CH. XIV, 71b.

This is an example of an environment that should favour the *to*-infinitive, as the object of *reading* has been extracted from within the *into –ing* complement clause across the clause boundary.

6.3.3 The *horror aequi* principle

A factor known as *horror aequi* was defined by Rohdenburg (2003, 236) as "the widespread (and presumably universal) tendency to avoid the use of formally (near-) identical and (near-) adjacent (non-coordinate) grammatical elements or structures." Relating to the complements of *persuade*, the principle has manifested itself in English in a tendency to avoid successive *to*-infinitive constructions (Rohdenburg ibid., 236). Here we could recall the traditional treatment of catenative verbs in grammars: they allow the "chaining" of *to*-infinitives, as the invented example from Huddleston & Pullum presented in 4.2.2 demonstrates:

5) <u>to try to</u> *persuade* him <u>to help</u> her redecorate her flat

In actual language use, *horror aequi* has been shown to restrict such behaviour of verbs. With verbs that take an object NP before the *to*-infinitive, the issue is more complicated, though, because it is not clear how the intervening NP affects the scope of *horror aequi.* Rohdenburg's definition does not specify what counts as "near-adjacent". In this connection, the fact that the *LDCE* identifies the pattern "try/manage/fail to persuade sb" is interesting, as it suggests that *persuade* could be preceded by certain catenatives frequently at least in the BNC data. As for

the –*ing* form, Vosberg (2003b, 322) points out that two successive –*ing* forms are even less acceptable, stating that "the *double* –ing *constraint* is very often absolute" (ibid., 322). This could also have some relevance to my study, although with *persuade* there is the NP plus the preposition *into* between the verb and the –*ing* form.

7 Corpus analysis

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of the corpus data drawn from the CLMET/CLMETEV and the BNC. The analysis is presented in chronological order, starting with the oldest data. As the CLMET is not a tagged corpus, a separate search had to be carried out for each of the forms *persuade*, *persuades*, *persuaded* and *persuading*. With the BNC, a tagged corpus, it is possible to use the lemma search string {persuade}_V* to cover all the verbal forms of persuade. However, I decided not utilize this option in this study, as it was, in my view, necessary to aim at a uniform analysis of the possible occurrences of the sequence NP + form of *be* + *persuaded*, as far as this is possible. The search strings were thus the same as with the CLMET/CLMETEV.

In the discussion of the corpus data, I identify all the patterns and present the frequency of each pattern. I also identify the senses of *persuade* related to the patterns on the basis of the *OED.* In the illustrations of the patterns, the complements (or the relevant parts of them) are underlined, so that they are easier to spot. The sentential and non-sentential patterns are discussed in separate subsections. As more interesting phenomena have been attested with sentential patterns, and the two most prominent patterns of *persuade* are sentential, they generally receive more attention. I do not regard the zero complement as a true complement, but it is included in the non-sentential patterns.

Because of the limited scope of this thesis, not all the issues can be considered with every pattern. The division of issues is based on relevance and/or personal interest.

I consider the number of reflexive NPs and [- human] participants with all the patterns. When referring to the features of main clause subjects, I only regard clauses that have obvious subjects; this exclude, for example, clauses with an introductory *it* or *there.*

Extractions and insertions are considered in relation to the NP + *that*-clause pattern. As for other complexity factors possibly affecting the presence of *that*, I decided to investigate the occurrence of *that* omission with personal pronoun NP subjects (the forms *I, you, he, she, it, we, they*) vs. other kinds of NP subjects (including other kinds of pronoun NP), because the

pronouns are easily identified and calculated. It has to be pointed out in this connection that there are also clausal subject expressions found in the data. These are left aside in the analysis. Other complexity factors are only exemplified.

I do not discuss the influence of passive constructions as a complexity factor in this study, because the possibility of adjectival passives confuses the picture. I do, however, discuss passives in connection with the NP +*that*-clause, NP and NP + *of* + NP patterns, presenting an alternative analysis estimating the proportion of ambiguous passives. With the NP + *to*-infinitive passive constructions are ignored.

Finally, I consider *horror aequi* in connection with the NP + *to*-infinitive pattern. I examine the form of *persuade* with this pattern, and whether it is preceded by catenative verbs such as *try*, which take the *to*-infinitive complement without an intervening object NP.

7.1 *Persuade* in the CLMETEV 1

The CLMETEV 1 contains around 3 million words and is comprised of 32 texts by 23 different writers. The search in the CLMETEV 1 yielded 381 tokens of the forms of *persuade* altogether, of which the possible adjectival and nominal cases had to be identified and excluded. The –*ing* forms were unproblematic. One token was classified as adjectival:

1) Ah! Beauty Syren, fair inchanting good, sweet silent rhetoric of *persuading* <u>eyes</u>; ... (Cibber 1753, *The Lives of the Poets* more info needed!)

Here *persuading* clearly functions as a pre-modifier of the noun *eyes*. There were no tokens of *persuading* that could be classified as nouns by any criteria.

As I expected, determining the status of the form *persuaded* proved less straightforward. There were no instances of the kind of indisputably adjectival pre-modifying use presented in the *OED* entry for the adjective *persuaded*, and very few cases provided any syntactic marks of adjectival function. In contrast, instances that would fall into sub-sense 1 c of the verb *persuade* according to the *OED*, but would have to be classified as adjectival on the basis of the interpretation found in the *CCED* entry, were abundant. The following three tokens were

classified as adjectival on the basis of some of the criteria presented in chapter 5:

2) (a) My father has been extremely ill this week with his disorder-- I think the physicians are <u>more and more</u> *persuaded* <u>that it is</u> the stone in his bladder. (Walpole 1735-48, *Letters*)
(b) ..., permitted me to go alone; so that I was <u>quite</u> *persuaded* <u>of his indifference</u>; and yet, my opinion was wrong. (Smollett 1751, *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*)
(c) ..., but I am not <u>less</u> *persuaded*, <u>that</u> policy on one hand, and admiration on the other, magnified the hoard ... (Gibbon 1776, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*)

The preceding *more* and *quite* are indications of adjectival function. Though *less* is not mentioned in chapter 5, I interpret it as a comparative expression similar to *more.*

After discarding the four adjectival tokens, there were thus 377 tokens of the forms of *persuade* that I decided treat as verbal in the initial analysis. This has a normalized frequency of 125.7 words per million. The verb forms and their complementation patterns are summarized in the following table.

Complement	*persuade*	*persuaded*	*persuades*	*persuading*	Total	%	NF/million
NP + *that*-clause	38	119	1	3	161	42.7	53.7
that-clause	1	1	-	-	2	0.5	0.7
NP + *to* + *what*-clause	1	-	-	-	1	0.3	0.3
NP +*to*-infinitive	45	76	2	7	130	34.5	43.3
NP + bare infinitive	1	-	-	-	1	0.3	0.3
NP	13	22	1	2	38	10.1	12.7
NP + *of* + NP	5	11	1	-	17	4.5	5.7
NP + *to* + NP	8	-	-	-	8	2.1	2.7
NP + *into* + NP	-	1	-	-	1	0.3	0.3
NP + *off* +NP	1	-	-	-	1	0.3	0.3
Ø	15	2	-	-	17	4.5	5.7
Total	125	235	5	12	377	100	125.7

Table 3: Persuade *in the CLMETEV 1*

Ten different complementation patterns plus the zero complement appear in the CLMETEV1. It is significant that despite the rather large number of different patterns, the great majority of the tokens, 77.2 % of the total, represent one of the two major sentential patterns, the NP + *that*-clause and NP + *to*-infinitive, and four patterns only appear once. Contrary to my expectations, the NP + *into* + *–ing* pattern does not have any tokens, nor do any patterns with the *–ing* form. The pattern NP + *out of* + NP is also absent.

7.1.1 Non-sentential complements

The third most frequent complement in the CLMETEV 1, and thus the most frequent non-sentential complement, is the NP, with 38 tokens:

> 3) (a) … pride of man makes him love to domineer, and nothing mortifies him so much as to be obliged to condescend to *persuade* <u>his inferiors</u>. (Smith 1766, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*)
> (b) Or from a judge turn to pleader, to *persuade* <u>The choice</u> we make, ... (Pope 1733-4, *An Essay on Man*)
> (c) ... that if it be necessary to frighten those <u>whom</u> they want <u>art or eloquence</u> to *persuade*, ... (Johnson 1740-1, *Parliamentary Debates*)

The NP accounts for 10.1 per cent of all the tokens. Two tokens have a reflexive pronoun NP. Example (3b) provides one of the two NP complements that can be classified as [- human]. The same sentence is actually also found in the *OED* entry under sense 6 b. This is the only NP complement with which *persuade* is used in one of the senses "with a thing as object" in the CLMETEV 1. A subject NP with the feature [- human] is found in example (3c). Four of the NP complements occur with a subject that can be analysed as [- human].

In as many as 16 instances the NP complement appears in a construction that is analysed as parenthetical in this study. These include the following:

> 4) (a) These commendations will not, <u>I</u> am *persuaded*, make you vain and coxcomical, but only encourage you to go on in the right way.(Chesterfield 1746-71, *Letters to his Son*)
> (b) ... and acknowledges that he exercised a dominion nearly absolute over that house of Parliament which, he would *persuade* <u>himself</u>, laughed at him. (Walpole 1734-48, *Letters*)

Of these two, (4a) is more obviously parenthetical, interrupting the sentence structure in a way

that more readily excludes the NP + *that*-clause interpretation. This is the case in the great majority of the constructions I have treated as parenthetical. In addition, the same person and tense appear in most of these as what appears to be a fixed phrase (cf. Thompson 2002 on "epistemic/evidential/evaluative fragments"). The sequence *I am persuaded* accounts for 13 of the parenthetical constructions. Of these, seven cases are from one single text, Walpole's *Letters to his Son*, and stylistic issues could be relevant.

The NP complement appears in a passive construction in 20 occurrences, which is more than half of the NPs. Only five passives seem clearly verbal. These include the following:

5) (a) ... some measures must be taken for compelling <u>those who</u> cannot be *persuaded*, ... (Johnson 1740-41, *Parliamentary Debates*)
(b) ..., but <u>he</u> is not so <u>easily</u> *persuaded* as they think for." (Walpole 1734-48, *Letters*)

In my view, the presence of the modal auxiliary *can* confirms the dynamic verbal interpretation with *persuaded* in (5a); the reading "compelling those who cannot be in the state of having been persuaded" seems unlikely. In (5b) *easily* can only describe the process of persuading, not the nature of the resulting state entered by the object.

In the remaining 15 passive constructions the form *persuaded* can thus be regarded as ambiguous. 13 cases are, of course, accounted for by the 13 parentheticals with the sequence *I am persuaded*. Here are two more examples of such constructions:

6) (a) You are no more wanting, <u>I</u> am *persuaded*, in prudence, than in industry. (Hume 1779, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*)
(b) ..., and poor Atkinson would, <u>I</u> am *persuaded*, have mounted a breach with less concern ... (Fielding 1751, *Amelia*)

These clearly allow an adjectival reading, and could be rephrased as *I am certain/sure*. In the adjectival interpretation *persuaded* would have a zero complement. This analysis would leave only 23 NP complements of the verb. The NP would still be the most frequent non-sentential pattern, though.

As I predicted, it is often not easy to determine whether the NP object is persuaded to think that something is the case or to do something, if one aims at maintaining this division.

Perhaps this could even be left unspecified with the NP. The active parentheticals are obvious

exceptions: in them the sense is 1 a. Also, the 15 ambiguous passives represent sense 1 c, of

course. Sense 3 a, which covers both ideas, can be identified in example (3a) above. As was

noted above, one token involves sense 6 b, identified by the *OED*.

Perhaps surprisingly, the pattern NP + *of* + NP is only represented by 17 tokens:

7) (a) Knaves will no more endeavour to *persuade* <u>us</u> <u>of the baseness of mankind</u>,
than the highwayman will inform you that there are thieves on the road. (Fielding
1749, *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*)
(b) ..., the colonel was so intoxicated with his love, that it was in the power of his
mistress to have *persuaded* <u>him</u> <u>of anything</u>; ... (Fielding 1751, *Amelia*)

On the basis of the weight it is given in the secondary sources, the NP + *of* + NP complement

could be expected to be more prominent. It is, though, the second most frequent non-sentential

complement in the CLMETEV 1. The object NP in this pattern is a reflexive pronoun in only

one case. One of the higher clause subjects could be classified as [- human].

The proportion of passive constructions is high in the NP + *of* + NP group: the data

provides ten such instances. Moreover, all of the passives can be considered ambiguous. Here

are three examples:

8) (a) I know <u>they</u> were both prepossessed and fully *persuaded* <u>of it</u>- (Sterne 1759-67,
The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy)
(b) 'it is you that Theodore admires; I saw it; <u>I</u> am *persuaded* <u>of it</u>; ... (Walpole
1764, *The Castle of Otranto*)
(c) the dean, who was *persuaded* <u>of</u> <u>the importance</u> of his own dream, was very
uneasy; ... (Cibber 1753, *The Lives of the Poets*)

All these readily allow a stative reading. Notice that (8a) has the adverb *fully* preceding

persuaded. One token occurs with *strongly.* Although the presence of such adverbs is not

included in the criteria, it is evident that they strengthen the adjectival flavour. Analysed as

adjectival, the ambiguous tokens of *persuaded* would thus have the pattern *of* + NP as

complement. The adjectival interpretation would result in a radical drop in the number of the

NP + *of* +NP complements of the verb *persuade*, leaving only seven.

The sense of *persuade* with the NP + *of* + NP is 1 a in six tokens, 1 b in the reflexive

token, and 1 c in the ten ambiguous passive constructions.

There are eight occurrences of the NP + *to* + NP, which is one of the patterns marked as obsolete in the *OED*. Here are two examples:

9) (a) ... that is the maxim of a good Christian, and no man shall ever *persuade me* <u>to</u> <u>the</u> <u>contrary</u>. (Fielding 1751, *Amelia*)
(b) ... by convincing men that <u>the course of life</u> we would *persuade* <u>them</u> <u>to</u> is not contrary to their interest. (Butler 1726, *Human Nature and Other Sermons*)

Judging from the CLMETEV 1 data, NP + *to* + NP seems to have been more frequent than the NP + *into* + NP at least at the beginning of the Late Modern English period. One [- human] higher clause subject can be identified. In addition, one occurrence has coordinated [+ human] and [- human] subjects. Example (9a) is the only case where *persuade* is used in sense 1 a; in the rest the sense is 2 a.

Two non-sentential complementation patterns only appear once: here are the only examples of the NP + *into* + NP and the NP + *off* +NP:

10) (a) Squire was in love with my daughter, she was actually so with him; for they *persuaded* <u>her</u> <u>into the passion</u>. (Goldsmith 1766, *The Vicar of Wakefield*)
(b) … let it be kept from my two cousins, and only known to ourselves; if they offer to be of the party, I will *persuade* <u>them</u> <u>off it</u>. (Reeve 1777, *The Old English Baron?*)

The NP + *into* + NP is one of the patterns I expected to be more frequent even in the Late Modern English data. The sense of *persuade* is 2 a in both the above examples.

The zero complement use is as frequent as the NP + *of* + NP pattern, accounting for 17 tokens:

11) (a) If you will *persuade*, you must first please; and if you will please, you must tune your voice to harmony (Chesterfield 1746-71, *Letters to his Son*)
(b) For the first time the very best may err; art may *persuade*, and novelty spread out its charm. (Goldsmith 1766, *The Vicar of Wakefield*)
(c) ...; he *persuaded*, he flattered, he promised great things ... (Reeve 1777, *The Old English Baron*)

Example (11b) is one of the three instances of a subject analysable as [- human]. It has to be noted that the majority of the zero complements, as many as 11, are from one single source, Chesterfield's *Letter's to his Son*. (11c) is one of the four tokens related to sense 3 b in four,

whereas in the rest the sense is closest to 4.

7.1.2 Sentential complements

The NP + *that*-clause is by far the most frequently occurring complement type in the

CLMETEV 1, accounting for as many as 161 tokens, 42.7 per cent of the total:

> 12) (a) … I have observed, that it is extremely difficult to *persuade* <u>a rogue</u> <u>that you</u>
> <u>are an honest man;</u> ... (Fielding 1751, *Amelia*)
> (b) ...judging from what you are by what you ought to be, I *persuaded* <u>myself</u> <u>that</u>
> <u>you</u> <u>would not reject</u> a reasonable proposition ... (Burke 1775, *On Conciliation*
> *with America*)
> (c) "I see," said Joseph, "<u>something</u> that *persuades* <u>me</u> <u>you are</u> designed for great
> things, ... (Reeve 1777, *The Old English Baron*)

The complement NP is a reflexive pronoun in 16 instances of this pattern. In one token the

object NP is *the world*, which is technically [- human], but necessarily refers to the people of

the world. As for the features of the higher clause subject NP, eight tokens involve a subject

analysable as [- human]: example (12c) provides one of these.

Extractions are not frequent with the NP + *that*-clause pattern. Five tokens appear in an

extraction environment:

> 13) (a) It will only instance in <u>modesty, which</u> all old <u>Englishmen</u> are *persuaded*
> <u>cannot</u> <u>exist</u> within the atmosphere of Middlesex. (Walpole 1734-48, *Letters*)
> (b) How we disposed of our eggs and figs, I defy you, or the Devil himself, had he
> not <u>been there</u> (which <u>I</u> am *persuaded* he was), to form the least probable
> conjecture ... (Sterne 1759-67, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*)

In the first example the subject of the *that*-clause has been extracted. In (13b) the extracted

element is a complement of the verb *be* in the *that*-clause. Insertions are more frequent with the

NP + *that*-clause pattern than extractions: nine instances of insertion context can be identified:

> 14) (a) ... <u>he</u> was fully *persuaded* in his mind <u>that there was</u> a mutual affection
> between them; ... (Haywood 1744, *The Fortunate Foundlings*)
> (b) <u>Manfred</u>, though *persuaded*, like his wife, <u>that the vision had not been</u> the
> work of fancy, ... (Walpole 1764, *The Castle of Oranto*)
> (c) I am indeed *persuaded*, said PHILO, <u>that the best</u>, and indeed the only
> method ... (Hume 1779, *Dialogue Concerning Natural Religion*)

 In three cases the inserted element is a reporting clause with the verb *say*, as in (14c).

In the majority of the *that*-clauses the complementiser *that* is explicitly present: there are 107 tokens with *that* retained and 54 with *that* omitted. The percentages are 66.5 and 33.5. It has to be noted here that one token involves a special kind of patterning with *but*:

> 15) <u>I</u> cannot be *persuaded* <u>but that marriage is</u> one of the means of happiness.
> (Johnson 1759, *Rasselas*)

Here *but* is not treated as an insertion, but rather as part of a formula that includes the negative auxiliary preceding *persuade.* In this use it is impossible to omit *that.* In the extraction cases *that* is omitted, which seems to be related to the type of extraction. In six of the nine insertion environments, on the other hand, *that* is present. The extraction and insertion cases, as well as (15), have been left aside in the consideration of further complexity factors.

Turning to the structure of the *that*-clause subject, the data shows a contrast between personal pronoun subject NPs and other kinds of NP: of the 64 *that*-clauses with a personal pronoun subject, 42.2 % occur without *that*; of the 64 tokens with another kind of NP, only 14.1 % are without *that.* The issue is obviously complicated by other complexity factors relating to the NPs involved. These are only exemplified here:

> 16) (a) ..., endeavoured to *persuade* <u>their patrons and their countrymen,</u> <u>that they lost</u>
> the victory ... (Johnson 1740-41, *Parliamentary Debates*)
> (b) I *persuade* <u>myself,</u> <u>that</u> were I capable of giving you a description of what
> passed there, <u>you</u> <u>would agree</u> ... (Doddridge 1750, *The Life of Colonel James*)

Example (16a) contains a long object, and in (16b) there is an adjunct between *that* and the subject of the clause. These are far from unique examples in the data, and *that* omission would seem unlikely in such sentences.

Passives are frequent with the NP + *that*-clause complement: as many as 104 instances of the pattern appear in passive constructions. This is 64.6 % of all the tokens of the pattern. Moreover, I would analyse most of the passives as ambiguous, though drawing the distinguishing line proved challenging. Perhaps eight tokens demonstrate relatively clear verbal behaviour. Here are three of them:

> 17) (a) ... who <u>have been</u> taught, almost from their infancy, that cowardice and flight

are the greatest crimes, and *persuaded*, <u>by</u> national prejudices, and principles studiously instilled, <u>that no foreign forces could withstand</u> them, ... (Johnson 1740-41, *Parliamentary Debates* Vol. 1)
(b) ... those are best qualified to deceive others, who <u>can</u> be *persuaded* <u>that they are</u> contending for the right. (Johnson 1740-1, *Parliamentary Debates*)
(c) ... hesitated, and doubted, and lingered, expecting that other counsels would take place; and <u>were slow to be</u> *persuaded* <u>that all which had been done by Cabal was</u> the effect, not of humour, but of system. (Burke 1770, *Thoughts on the Present Discontents*)

Example (17a), the only passive sentence containing a *by*-phrase, is the clearest verbal case in the data: the perfective construction, the coordination with *taught* and the *by*-phrase confirm the verbal interpretation. In (17b) the modal auxiliary *can* seems to tilt the scale in favour of the verbal reading again. In (17c) it is the dynamic process of persuading the object that is depicted as slow.

Around 96 ambiguous passives thus remain. It is significant that the combination of the first person and the present tense is again very frequent in the ambiguous passive constructions: it is found in as many as 52 tokens:

18) (a) ... and, if you put a little Oil upon the Liquor, <u>I</u> am *persuaded* <u>they will keep</u> several Months. (Bradley 1732, *The Country Housewife and Lady's Director*)
(b) ... and <u>I</u> am *persuaded* <u>they all echoed back praise</u> to the Most High. (Doddridge 1750, *The Life of Col. James*)
(c) ... yet <u>I</u> am firmly <u>persuaded</u> there are none whose office is so sacred, ... (Doddridge 1750, *The Life of Colonel James Gardiner*)

The great majority of such sentences have the exact sequence *I am/I'm persuaded.* These clearly allow a stative adjectival reading, and could be replaced by *I am certain/sure.* Note that in (18c) persuaded is preceded by *firmly.* Of all the ambiguous tokens of *persuaded*, 13 have this kind of preceding "intensifying" adverb, which again seems to favour the adjectival reading. The specific adverbs occurring in the data are *fully* (six tokens), *firmly* (five tokens), *thoroughly* and *verily.* The other ambiguous passives are of various kinds, including the following:

19) (a) ... an hour hence <u>he</u> will be *persuaded* <u>there is both an external and internal world</u>; ... (Hume 1739-40, *Treatise of Human Nature*)
(b) Adieu! and <u>be</u> *persuaded* that I shall love you extremely, ... (Chesterfield 1746-71, *Letters to his Son*)

(c) While the haughty <u>Dogmatist</u>, *persuaded* <u>that he can</u> erect a complete system of Theology by the mere help of philosophy, ... (Hume 1779, *Dialogues Concerning NaturalReligion*)
(d) <u>They</u> were *persuaded* <u>that</u>, by some ridiculous arts of divination, <u>they could</u> discover the will of the superior beings, ... (Gibbon 1776, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*)

The above serve to demonstrate the challenges of the passive gradient. It is not possible to aim at a comprehensive treatment of the passive constructions in the present study, and suffice it to say that all the issues raised in chapter 5, such as the influence of tense and aspect, are definitely relevant on the basis of the data. It should also be pointed out that one particular source, Chesterfield's *Letters to his Son*, is again a major contributor, providing 18 of the ambiguous passive cases. The adjectival interpretation of the ambiguous passives would have fundamental consequences to the analysis of the complementation patterns of *persuade* in the CLMETEV 1. There would be only 65 NP + *that*-clause complements of the verb, and the adjective *persuaded* would take 96 *that*-clause complements. In this analysis the NP + *to*-infinitive would be considerably more frequent with *persuade*. Moreover, even if more verbal passives were identified in possibly less convincingly adjectival cases, the instances with *I am persuaded* would alone change the order of the two major sentential patterns.

As for the meanings of *persuade*, the NP + *that*-clause is related to sense 1 a in 49 tokens, and to 1 b in the 16 cases with a reflexive NP object. It is not always quite obvious, though, that sense 3 a can be excluded, but there are no clear cases of 3 a. The 96 ambiguous passives represent sense 1 c, of course. As for the notion of the "near-alternant" NP + *that*-clause and NP + *to*-infinitive patterns, there is only one token that can be analysed as conveying a meaning close to that of *persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive:

20) ... panegyrists, who may, perhaps, endeavour to *persuade* <u>us,</u> <u>that we ought to</u> resign all our understanding ... (Johnson 1740-41, *Parliamentary Debates*)

Applying the "near-alternant" interpretation, the *that*-clause in (20) could almost be replaced by *to resign.*

The NP + *to*- infinitive is the second most frequent complement in the CLMETEV 1:

with 130 tokens, the pattern accounts for 34.5% of the total:

> 21) (a) And I hope, for her own sake and mine, she will *persuade* <u>the Captain</u> <u>to redeem</u> her, ... (Gay 1728, *The Beggar's Opera*)
> (b) I have been for some time *persuading* <u>my aunt</u> <u>to wear</u> them. (Goldsmith 1773, *She Stoops to Conquer*)
> (c) Whenever <u>Parliament</u> is *persuaded* <u>to assume</u> the offices of executive Government, ... (Burke 1770, *Thoughts on the Present Discontents*)
> (d) ... many who could not *persuade* <u>themselves</u> <u>to imitate</u> his example ... (Doddridge 1750, *The Life of Colonel James*)

Interestingly, the NP complement is a reflexive pronoun in three instances of the pattern. It was seen that the *OED* relates the reflexive use to the NP + *that*-clause complement in the separate sub-sense 1 b, and none of the secondary sources include examples with a reflexive pronoun NP in the NP + *to*-infinitive. Moreover, while the *to*-infinitive verb is *believe* in one token and *suspect* in one, in example (21d) it refers to action. There is one token with a [- human] object. The same token also has one of the eleven higher clause subjects analysable as [- human]:

> 22) ..., and her affability easily *persuaded* <u>the hearts that were swelling with sorrow</u> <u>to discharge</u> their secrets in her ear, ... (Johnson 1759, *Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia*)

Of course, the hearts stand for their human owners here.

The form of *persuade* is the *to*-infinitive in 22 tokens of the NP + *to*-infinitive pattern. The proportion of *to persuade* is thus 16.9 %. There are three cases where *persuade* is preceded by a catenative without an object NP: the verbs are *try*, *attempt,* and *endeavour*. *Try* and *attempt* appear in the *to*-infinitive form:

> 23) (a) He ordered Oswald to acquaint with his son, and <u>to try to</u> *persuade* <u>the young man</u> <u>to meet</u> ... (Reeve 1777, *The Old English Baron*)
> (b) ... it was in vain <u>to attempt to</u> *persuade* <u>her</u> <u>to betray</u> ... (Richardson 1740, *Pamela*)

These are obvious violations of *horror aequi.*

As can be expected, the *to*-infinitive pattern is generally related to sense 2 a of *persuade*. Three tokens involve sense 1 a or b: the *to*-infinitive verbs in these are *think*, *believe* and *suspect*. In two cases the sense is obviously 3 a. Example (21b) above provides one of these: the continuous aspect clearly indicates that the act of persuading is not depicted as successfully

completed. As with the previous pattern, there are also cases where it is not quite clear whether the persuasion could be only attempted, and the sense would thus be 3 a rather than 2 a.

In two tokens *persuade* is used with a *that*-clause complement alone, without an intervening NP complement:

24) Lord Bath spoke too, and would fain have *persuaded* <u>that this measure was not</u> Solely Of one minister, but that himself and all the council were especially concern ... (Walpole 1735-48, *Letters* Vol. 1)

This pattern was identified in the *OED*. It was obviously still possible at least at the beginning of the Late Modern English Period. The *that*-clause is a special kind of [- human] object. In both tokens *persuade* has sense 5 or 6.

The data provides one occurrence of a quite unexpected sentential pattern that can be formulated as NP + bare infinitive:

25) That erst us held in love of ling'ring life; Then hopeless, heartless, 'gan the cunning thief *Persuade* <u>us</u> <u>die</u>, to stint all further strife: To me he lent this rope, to him a rusty knife. (Cibber 1753, *The Lives of the Poets*)

This is an intriguing example, as the possibility of a bare infinitive is not found in any of the sources, not even in the oldest quotes in the *OED* entry. Perhaps it is a feature of poetic language only, or the language of this particular poem or author. Nevertheless, sense 2 a can be identified.

Interestingly, there is also one instance of a sentential pattern that can be formulated as NP + *to* + *what*-clause:

26) --And I must *persuade* <u>you</u> <u>to what I know will do you good</u>. (Gay 1728, *The Beggar's Opera*)

None of the sources provide this kind of complement with *persuade.* It is not quite unexpected, though, as the possibility can be predicted on the basis of the NP + *to* + NP pattern. The sense of *persuade* is 2 a here.

7.2 *Persuade* in the CLMET 2

The CLMET 2 has around 3.7 million words from 40 different texts by 30 different authors.

The search yielded 357 hits altogether. One token was classified as a noun:

> 27) ... and when his first scruples of conscience were overcome, he would need <u>no
> more</u> *persuading, ...* (Brontë 1848, *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*)

All the other *-ing* forms were clearly verbal. The form *persuaded* was again problematic: no

cases of pre-modifying adjectival function were found, and ambiguous passive constructions

with no clear syntactic clues were frequent. The criteria were only applicable with the

following four tokens:

> 28) (a) ..., and who, I <u>feel</u> *persuaded*, must be one of the remnants of the demon
> hunter's band. (Ainsworth 1843, *Windsor Castle*)
> (b) ..., I could not but <u>feel</u> *persuaded* <u>they were</u> just. (Galt 1821, *The Ayrshire
> Legetees*)
> (c) Elisabeth was exceedingly pleased with this proposal, and <u>felt</u> *persuaded* <u>of her
> sister's ready</u> <u>acquiescence</u>. (Austen 1813, *Pride and Prejudice*)
> (d) ... and Elisabeth <u>felt</u> *persuaded* <u>that no real confidence could</u> ever subsist
> between them. (Austen 1813, *Pride and Prejudice*)

In all of these *persuaded* is preceded by the verb *feel*, which confirms the adjectival

interpretation. After discarding the above five tokens, 352 verbal forms remained, which has a

normalized frequency of 95.1 words per million. The verb *persuade* is thus less frequent than

in the CLMETEV 1. The table below presents all the verb forms and their complements.

Complement	*persuade*	*persuaded*	*persuades*	*persuading*	Total	%	NF/million
NP + *that-clause*	53	79	1	2	135	38.4	36.5
NP + *to-infinitive*	66	88	1	14	169	48.0	45.7
NP + *against* + *-ing*	-	-	-	1	1	0.3	0.3
NP + *from* + *-ing*	1	-	-	-	1	0.3	0.3
NP	7	19	-	-	26	7.4	7.0
NP + *of* +NP	2	5	-	-	7	2.0	1.9
NP + *to* +NP	1	3	-	-	4	1.1	1.1

NP + *into* +NP	1	1	-	-	2	0.6	0.5
NP + *out of* + NP	1	-	-	-	1	0.3	0.3
NP + Adv	1	2	-	-	3	0.9	0.8
Ø	2	-	-	1	3	0.9	0.8
Total	134	202	2	18	352	100	95.1

Table 4: Persuade *in the CLMET 2*

Ten different complementation patterns plus the zero complement can be identified. The proportion of the two major sentential patterns, NP + *that*-clause and NP + *to*-infinitive, is even higher in this sub-corpus: together they comprise 86.4% of the total number of tokens. Also, the *to*-infinitive is now clearly the dominant pattern. There are still no instances of the NP + *into* + *-ing* pattern to be compared with the *to*-infinitive. On the other hand, two other patterns with *-ing* appear. The NP + *out of* + NP now emerges, as does a completely new kind of pattern, NP + Adv.

7.2.1 Non-sentential complements

The NP retains its position as the third most frequent pattern, with 26 tokens:

> 29) (a) You never will *persuade* her if you fear and doubt. (Gaskell 1848, *Mary Barton*)
> (b) "Nothing *persuaded* her but her own sense of duty." (Brontë 1848, *The Tenant of Wilfell Hall*)

The proportion of this pattern has dropped slightly, though, being now 7.4 per cent of the total. Only one token has a reflexive pronoun NP. Example (29b) above is one of the two instances of a higher clause subject that can be classified as [- human].

Parentheticals are again frequent, accounting for 14 of the NP complements. Moreover, in all except one occurrence, the parenthetical construction involves a combination of the first person pronoun and the present tense:

> 30) (a) The little respect which the male world pay to chastity is, I am *persuaded*, the grand source of many of the physical and moral evils that torment mankind, ... (Wollstonecraft 1792, *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*)

(b) It has, <u>I</u> am <u>persuaded</u>, made them equal to double their numbers." (Southey 1813, *Life of Horatio Lord Nelson*)
(c) In the winter, <u>I</u> am *persuaded*, I could not exist in rooms thus closed up, ... (Wollstonecraft 1796, *Letters from Sweden*)

The first two examples are more obvious and typical parenthetical cases. Again, the majority of the constructions I have analysed as parenthetical are of this kind. Eight parentheticals are from texts by the same writer, Wollstonecraft: five tokens are from *Letters*, and three from *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. It was seen that most of the parentheticals in the CLMETEV 1 were from letters providing advice to the recipient, and stylistic issues could be relevant here, too.

As many as 16 NP complements appear in passive constructions. The following three passives are the only ones I would analyse as rather clearly verbal:

31) (a) ... and as they can never be convinced by those who speak sense, <u>they</u> are always *persuaded* <u>by those</u> who talk nonsense. (Edgeworth 1796-1801, *The Parent's Assistance*)
(b) ... and with heart for fighting <u>could</u> <u>their poor heads</u> be got *persuaded*. (Carlyle 1837, *The French Revolution*
(c) Leonato, <u>thus</u> <u>persuaded</u>, yielded; ... (Lamb 1807, *Tales from Shakespeare*)

The *by*-phrase in (31a) and the modal *could* in (31b) help confirm the verbal reading in. Interestingly, (31b) also has what seems to be a mixture of two passive auxiliaries, *be* and *got*. In (31c) *thus* refers to the manner in which the object was persuaded.

There are thus 13 passives I have treated as ambiguous. Naturally, the parentheticals with *I am persuaded* account for 12 of them. With these the possibility of an adjectival interpretation is obvious. Classified as adjectives, the ambiguous tokens of *persuaded* would thus take half of the NP complements, leaving only 13 NP complements of the verb. The NP would still be the third most frequent complement.

As with the earlier data, determining the sense of *persuade* with the NP complement proved challenging in many cases. With 12 instances the choice between senses 1 a are 2 a would have to be made with the help of a tedious examination of the context, and I will not attempt it here. In the only active parenthetical the sense is 1 a. The 13 ambiguous passive

forms have sense 1 c.

With just seven tokens, the NP + *of* +NP is even less frequent than in the CLMETEV 1:

32) I am afraid I should make but a very poor hand at it, if I tried to *persuade* <u>him</u> <u>of</u> <u>it</u>. (Dickens 1848, *Dombey and Son*)

Again, the majority of the NP + *of* + NP complements appear in passive constructions. In my view, all of the five passives can be analysed as ambiguous. Here are three examples:

33) (a) ... but I look on the man who is firmly *persuaded* <u>of</u> <u>infinite Wisdom and Goodness</u> superintending and directing every circumstance that can happen in his lot- ... (Burns 1780-96, *Letters*)
(b) "It is what I have suspected all along, and <u>what</u> I am sure my late <u>master</u> was <u>persuaded</u> of, and the horror of such an idea cut short his days. (Hogg 1824, *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*)
(c) <u>He</u> affected to be *persuaded* <u>of</u> <u>the wisdom</u> of the measure; ... (Edgeworth 1796-1801, *The parent's Assistance*)

In all the above sentences *persuaded* can be interpreted as referring to a mental state. In (33a) we have the adverb *firmly* preceding the form *persuaded*. *Firmly* appears with two NP + *of* + NP complements, enhancing the adjectival force of *persuaded.* The adjectival interpretation of the ambiguous passives would have significant consequences, as only two NP + *of* + NP complements of the verb would remain.

The sense of *persuade* with the NP + *of* + NP is clearly 1 a in the two active cases, and 1 c in the five passives.

The NP + *to* +NP complement is still found. The pattern accounts for four tokens:

34) (a) And did he ever attempt to *persuade* <u>you</u> *to* <u>any other step</u>? (Hazlitt 1823, *Liber Amoris*)
(b) <u>Regiment du Roi</u> was *persuaded* <u>to its barracks</u>; stands there palpitating. (Carlyle 1837, *The French Revolution*)

The NP + *to* + NP still has more tokens than the NP + *into* + NP. The sense of *persuade* is 2 a in all of the tokens.

The CLMET 2 provides three tokens of a completely new pattern type, which can be formulated as NP + Adv:

35) The Mayor, "a man infinitely respectable," with his Municipals and tricolor sashes, finally gains entrance; remonstrates, perorates, promises; gets <u>Salm</u> *persuaded*

home back to its Barracks. (Carlyle 1837, *The French Revolution*)

This pattern is not recognized in any of the secondary sources. However, I do not find it surprising that, instead of a PP, an adverb can also indicate the direction or end position resulting from persuasion, functioning necessarily as a complement. The other adverbs occurring in this pattern are *up* and *there*. The sense of *persuade* is obviously 2 a with this pattern.

The NP + *into* +NP is represented by just two tokens:

36) However, Catherine would not be *persuaded* into tranquillity. (Brontë 1847, *Wuthering Heights*)

In both tokens the sense of *persuade* is 2 a. Another prepositional pattern, the NP + *out of* + NP, now emerges, but there is only one token:

37) ... and her sister Luciana, who lived with her, tried in vain to *persuade* her out of her groundless suspicions. (Lamb 1807, *Tales from Shakespeare*)

In the CLMET 2, the NP + *out of* + NP is thus still far from being a major complementation pattern of *persuade.* Here the sense of *persuade* is closest to 1 a.

The zero complement use is now considerably less frequent than in the CLMETEV 1, accounting for just three tokens:

38) (a) ... for wishing rather to *persuade* by the force of my arguments, than dazzle by the elegance of my language, ... (Wollstonecraft 1792, *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*)
(b) So what signifies mouthing about *persuading* and convincing? (Edgeworth 1796-1801, *The Parent's Assistance*)

In (38b) *persuading* is ambiguous between verbal and nominal reading. With this example the default category argument is applicable, and *persuading* is thus treated as a verb. The sense of *persuade* is closest to 4 in (38a), whereas in the other tokens it could also be 3 b.

7.2.2 Sentential complements

The CLMET 2 reveals a change in the order of the two major sentential patterns: the NP + *to*-infinitive is now by far the most frequently occurring pattern, with 169 tokens:

39) (a) ... and then we must *persuade* <u>your father</u> <u>to give</u> you a decent fortune, ... (Brontë 1848, *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*)
(b) ..., I fell into the hand of a Basque woman, who *persuaded* <u>me</u> <u>to live</u> with her, ... (Borrow 1842, *The Bible in Spain*)
(c) ... no old gentleman "with a snow-white beard" will have any chance of *persuading* <u>me</u> <u>to surrender</u> ... (De Quincy 1822, *Confession of an English Opium Eater*)
(d) ..., I could not *persuade* <u>myself</u> <u>to proceed</u>. (Brontë 1847, *Wuthering Heights*)

The proportion of NP + *to*-infinitive complements is 48 per cent, almost half of the total number of tokens. Reflexive pronoun NP complements are again found: example (39d) provides one of the six tokens. In two of these the *to*-infinitive verb is *think*, and in one *believe*, whereas in three it is related to acting, as in (39d). The NP complement has the feature [-human] in two cases, and seven tokens have a higher clause subject that can be classified as [-human]. Here are examples of both:

40) (a)..., if <u>criticism</u> could be *persuaded* <u>to think</u> so. (Hazlitt1821-22, *Table Talk*)
(b) If your love for me do not *persuade* <u>you</u> <u>to come</u>, ... (Lamb 1807, *Tales from Shakespeare*)

Admittedly, *criticism* only represents the human source of criticism.

The *to*-infinitive form of *persuade* before the NP + *to*-infinitive complement is slightly more frequent than in the previous data: there are 32 such tokens, which is 18.9 % of all the instances of the pattern. Now *persuade* is preceded by a catenative without an object NP in 15 instances: *endeavour* appears in seven and *try* in five cases; *attempt*, *mean* and *wish* all appear once. In one case the verb *try* is also in the *to*-infinitive form:

41) ... and had come again to supper <u>to try to</u> *persuade* <u>him</u> <u>to spend</u> less, ... (Lamb 1807, *Tales from Shakespeare*)

Try and *persuade* are again involved in a violation of *horror aequi*.

The NP + *to*-infinitive is clearly related to sense 2 a in the majority of the tokens, but there are also several instances of sense 1: in four of these the *to*-infinitive verb is *think*, in two *believe,* in one *consider,* and one has the phrase *to be of the same mind.* The three reflexive uses with *think* and *believe* would have sub-sense 1 b. Two tokens obviously represent sense 3 a, and more cases could be possible, as not all of the tokens are quite clear.

The NP + *that*-clause has fallen behind the *to*-infinitive. It is still by far the second most frequent pattern, with 135 tokens and 38.4 per cent of the total:

> 42) (a) You will not easily *persuade* <u>me</u> <u>that you have</u> not a grammatical knowledge of the English language. (Burns 1780-96, *Letters*)
> (b) "how great was the difficulty to *persuade* <u>my father</u> <u>that all necessary knowledge was not</u> comprised in the noble art ... (Shelly 1818, *Frankenstein*)
> (c) I easily *persuade* <u>myself</u> <u>that I behold</u> the very personage ... (Beckford 1783, *Dreams, Waking Thoughts and Incidence*)

Reflexive pronoun NPs are very frequent in this pattern in the CLMET 2: they appear in as many as 38 instances of the NP + *that*-clause pattern. Three tokens have a [- human] NP complement. As for the higher clause subjects, six can be analysed as [- human]. Both kinds of [- human] NP are demonstrated in the following examples:

> 43) (a) I straightened myself in my stirrups, and strived to *persuade* <u>my understanding</u> <u>that this</u> <u>was</u> real Egypt, ... (Kinglake 1844, *Eothen*)
> (b) ... nothing would *persuade* <u>him</u> <u>that two Englishmen really wished</u> to go... (Darwin 1839, *The Voyage of the Beagle*)

Understanding is part of a human, though, and the meaning is rather close to the reflexive use. Four of the [- human] subjects are realised by pronouns: *nothing* occurs twice; the other pronouns are *something* and *anything*.

Not many NP + *that*-clause complements occur in extraction environments. Here are two of the five cases involving extraction:

> 44) (a) – <u>a return</u> which <u>I</u> am *persuaded* <u>will not be</u> unacceptable – (Burns 1780-96, *Letters*)
> (b) ... a degree of éclat, which <u>I</u> am *persuaded* <u>the performance would never have excited</u> ... (Galt 1821, *The Ayrshire Legatees*)

In example (44a) the extracted element is the subject of the *that*-clause, whereas in (44b) it is a complement of the verb within the *that*-clause. Insertions are again more frequent. There are ten instances of insertion environment, three of which are presented below:

> 45) (a) ..., for she meant to *persuade* <u>Imogen</u>, when her husband was gone, <u>that her marriage was not</u> lawful, ... (Lamb 1807, *Tales from Shakespeare*)
> (b) I *persuaded* <u>myself</u> then <u>that it was</u> from reluctance to ask... (De Quincy 1822, *Confessions of an English Opium Eater*)
> (c) And it would have been difficult, I promise you, to *persuade* or convince <u>me</u> either <u>that I should</u> give up ... (Edgeworth 1796-1801, *The Parent's Assistance*)

With (45c) the analysis is complicated by the fact that *persuaded* is coordinated with *convince*. I have still treated the adverb *either* as an insertion between the object of *persuade* and the *that*-clause.

In the great majority of the NP + *that*-clause complements, in 103 (76.3 %), the complementiser *that* is explicitly present. This leaves 32 tokens without *that*, with a proportion of 23.7 %, which is around 10 % lower than in the CLMETEV 1. In the extraction cases *that* is omitted, which seems to be related to the type of extraction again. In eight of the ten insertion cases, on the other hand, *that* is present. There are now four instances of the pattern with *but* and a negative element before *persuade*:

> 46) They can hardly *persuade* <u>themselves</u> <u>but that there is</u> something unbecoming. (Dickens 1848, *Dombey and Son*)

These cases have been ignored when considering the influence of complexity factors on the presence of *that*. After excluding the extraction and insertion cases, there are 60 *that*-clauses with a personal pronoun subject NP, and 47 with another kind of NP. There is again a contrast between the two kinds of NP, although the proportion of *that* omissions has fallen in both groups: with a personal pronoun subject NP *that* is omitted in 28.3 % of the cases, whereas with another kind of NP the percentage of *that* omission is 10.6%. Again, the issue is not that straightforward, as other factors should be considered. The following exemplify such factors:

> 47) (a) ... or try to *persuade* <u>the man of strong natural powers</u> <u>that he can supply</u> their deficiency... (Hazlitt 1821-22, *Table Talk*)
> (b) ... it will be in her power to *persuade* <u>him</u> <u>that</u>, instead of being in love with you, <u>he is</u> very much in love with her friend." (Austen 1813, *Pride and Prejudice*)

There are again tokens with a long object phrase, as in (47a), and *that*-clauses with an adjunct directly after *that*, as in (47b). Such sentences seem hostile to *that* omission.

Passives are again frequent with the NP + *that*-clause pattern: as many as 58 tokens appear in passive constructions. The proportion of passives has fallen considerably from the previous 64.4 %, though, being now 43 %. As with the earlier data, I would regard the vast majority of the passives as ambiguous. Seven are rather clearly verbal, including the following:

48) (a) <u>I</u> am *persuaded* by your open, honest countenance, <u>that you are speaking</u> the truth. (Edgeworth 1796-1801, *The Parent's Assistance*)
(b) Will he confess?- can <u>he</u> not be *persuaded* <u>that in his delirium he struck</u> the blow? (Bulwer-Lytton 1834, *The Last Days of Pompeii*)
(c) ... the unreflecting <u>multitude</u> were not to be *persuaded* <u>that an invasion could</u> only be effected by numerous and powerful fleets. (Southey 1813, *Life of Horatio Lord Nelson*)

Example (48a) provides the only passive constructions with a *by*-phrase. Again, the presence of

the *by*-phrase seems to render the dynamic interpretation of *persuaded* more appropriate. In

(48b) and (48c) the modals have the same effect.

The remaining 51 passives have thus been analysed as ambiguous. It is not surprising

that a little more than half of these involve the first person and the present tense. Here are two

of the 28 tokens of this kind:

49) (a) "<u>I</u> am *persuaded* <u>we shall see</u> the mysterious huntsman again. (Ainsworth 1843, *Windsor Castle*)
(b) <u>I</u> am fully *persuaded*, <u>that we should hear</u> of none of these infantine airs, ... (Wollstonecraft 1792, *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*)

The possibility of an adjectival reading of *persuaded* is obvious in sentences such as the above.

Example (49b) also has the adverb *fully* preceding *persuaded.* Six of the ambiguous passives

are accompanied by "intensifying" adverbs, four by *fully* and two by *firmly.* Three more

ambiguous passives are provided below:

50) (a) Many <u>travellers</u> who have been conversant with savages have been fully *persuaded* <u>that their jugglers actually</u> <u>possessed</u> some means of communication with the invisible world, ... (Southey 1829, *Sir Thomas Moore*)
(b) *Persuaded* <u>that he heard</u> some sound in the chamber, <u>Fenwolf</u> nodded to Tristram ... (Ainsworth 1843, *Windsor Castle*)
(c) ..., <u>he</u> refused to accept the existing state of things, was *persuaded* <u>that it might</u> <u>be</u> safely improved, saw the practical steps required ... (Byron 1810-13, *Letters*)

Example (50a) shows that the perfective aspect does not necessarily resolve the ambiguity of

persuaded in all contexts: a stative reading seems quite acceptable here. This case serves as a

good example of a perfective construction that defies the general tendency ("normally passive")

suggested by Cook (see 5.5). As with the CLMETEV 1 tokens, a comprehensive treatment of

all the passive constructions would have to involve a detailed examination of all the possible

contextual clues, and it cannot be attempted in this study. Suffice it to say that at least the 28 tokens with *I am* could safely be excluded as representing the adjectival use of *persuaded*.

The adjectival interpretation of the ambiguous passives would result in a radical drop in the frequency of the NP + *that*-clause pattern, as only 84 complements of the verb *persuade* would remain. Nevertheless, the NP + *that*-clause would still be considerably more frequent than the third most frequent complement, the NP.

The sense of *persuade* with the NP + *that*-clause is generally one of the sub-senses of 1. In 46 cases 1 a is the most likely sense, though in some instances sense 3 a could perhaps be identified. In the 38 cases with a reflexive NP sense 1 b is obvious. The 51 ambiguous passive constructions represent sense 1 c. Only three tokens can be analysed as close to *persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive in meaning:

> 51) ... "but I hope *to persuade*, or rather to convince <u>you</u>, <u>that you ought to</u> join me."
>   (Edgeworth 1796-1801, *The Parent's Assistance*)

In two of these *persuade* is preceded by *ought to*, and in one by *should*.

The NP + *against* + *-ing* pattern emerges, as does a new kind of sentential pattern with the – *ing* form, NP + *from* + *-ing.* Both have only one token:

> 52) (a) If my mother had not been always *persuading* <u>me</u> <u>against</u> <u>going</u> to sea, ...
>   (Marryat 1841, *Masterman Ready*)
>   (b) In pity to this young man, I would wish to *persuade* <u>him</u> <u>from</u> <u>wrestling</u>.
>   (Lamb 1807, *Tales from Shakespeare.*

In (52a) the aspect confirms that persuading had only been attempted, and the sense of *persuade* would have to be 3 a. As for (52b), reading more context reveals that here *wrestling* refers to a particular occasion, which is enough to exclude the otherwise possible nominal reading. The sense of *persuade* is 2 a in this example.

7.3 *Persuade* in the CLMET 3

The CLMET 3 contains around 4 million words from 51 different texts by 29 different authors. The search for the forms of *persuade* provided 279 hits altogether. One token was analysed as a

noun:

> 53) To think that a man should <u>need</u> *persuading* to win back such a wife. (Gissing 1891, *New Grub Street*)

The other tokens of the *-ing* form were unambiguously verbal. As for the form *persuaded*, it is not surprising that it did not appear once as a pre-modifying adjective. As with the previous sub-corpora, few obvious syntactic indications of adjectival function were available. There were two instances where *persuaded* was preceded by the verb *become*, which was seen occur with adjectives:

> 54) (a) She spoke with such conviction that he <u>became</u> *persuaded* <u>that all was</u> not delusion, ... (Yonge 1865, *The Clever Woman of the Family*)
> (b) In the course of time he and his wife <u>became</u> persuaded even to unconsciousness <u>that no one could</u> ever dwell under their roof without deep cause for thankfulness... (Butler 1903, *The Way of All Flesh*)

However, despite the shortage of formal signs of adjectival function, the problem of ambiguous passive constructions was far less serious than with the earlier data. This is mainly because passive constructions were, in fact, considerably less frequent with the NP and NP + *that-* clause complements.

After discarding the above three tokens, 276 tokens of the verb *persuade* remained, which has a normalized frequency of 69 words per million. Thus, the frequency of *persuade* continues to decrease. Here are all the verb forms and the related complements.

Complement	*persuade*	*persuaded*	*persuades*	*persuading*	Total	%	NF/million
NP + *that-* clause	33	40	-	12	85	30.8	21.3
NP + *about* + NP + *that-* clause	-	1	-	-	1	0.4	0.3
NP + *of* + *what*-clause	1	-	-	-	1	0.4	0.3
NP + *to-* infinitive	42	78	1	8	129	46.7	32.3
NP + *against* + *-ing*	1	-	-	-	1	0.4	0.3
NP	23	20	-	-	43	15.6	10.75

NP + *of* +NP	-	6	-	-	6	2.2	1.5
NP + *to* + NP	-	1	-	-	1	0.4	0.3
NP + *into* + NP	1	2	-	-	3	1.1	0.8
NP + *against* + NP	-	1	-	-	1	0.4	0.3
NP + *towards* + NP	-	1	-	-	1	0.4	0.3
NP + Adv	-	2	-	-	2	0.7	0.5
Ø	-	1	-	1	2	0.7	0.5
Total	101	155	1	21	276	100	69

Table 5: Persuade *in the CLMET 3*

The CLMET 3 provides as many as 12 different complementation patterns plus the zero complement. The NP + *to*-infinitive and the NP + *that*-clause are still both considerably more frequent than the other patterns, covering together 77.5 % of the total, but the NP + *that*-clause has suffered a rather dramatic fall from its position in the earlier data. Of the non-sentential patterns, the NP has gained ground. There are two new prepositions, *about* and *towards*. Unfortunately, there are still no instances of the NP + *into* + *-ing* pattern.

7.3.1 Non-sentential complements

Not surprisingly, the NP is the most frequent non-sentential complement, accounting for 43 tokens:

> 55) (a) Spiridione is wrong; I must *persuade* <u>him</u>. (Forster 1905, *Where Angels Fear to Tread*)
> (b) He *persuaded* <u>his own subjects</u>; he certainly did not constrain them. (Freeman 1888, *William the Conqueror*)

With 15.6 per cent of the total, the NP has reinforced its position as the third most frequent complementation pattern. The NP is a reflexive pronoun in one token.

A radical change is seen in the frequency of parenthetical constructions: the number of such constructions with the NP complement has dropped to only two:

56) (a) For such, I tried to *persuade* <u>myself</u>, was the nature of Ruth's regard for me; ... (Blackmore 1869, *Lorna Doone*)
(b) ... for no other purpose, <u>I</u> am firmly *persuaded*, than to annoy her. (Collins 1868, *The Moonstone*)

The decline of the parenthetical construction is obviously reflected in another change, a reduced frequency of passives: only 12 of the NP complements occur in passive constructions. Moreover, almost all of the passives are easily classified as verbal:

57) (a) And was he anxious to steal the gunpowder, or did <u>he</u> <u>have to</u> be *persuaded*? (Jerome 1909, *They and I*)
(b) Is she a Catholic?" "No." "That is a pity. <u>She</u> <u>must</u> be *persuaded*. (Forster 1905, *Where Angels Fear to Tread*)
(c) And, *persuaded* <u>by the physician</u>, <u>they</u> had allowed Madame de Mauban to visit the King ... (Hope 1894, *The Prisoner of Zenda*)

The modals in the first two examples, the *by*-phrase in (57c), and the overall context in all three confirm the dynamic verbal reading. The parenthetical in (56b) above is the only instance of a clearly ambiguous passive construction.

Despite being a welcome change in general, the lower frequency of ambiguous passives in the NP group leaves more tokens with an unclear sense. Again, I have considered it best not to specify the sense according to the division of the two main ideas, and 42 tokens remain ambiguous between 1 a and 2 a so far. In the active parenthetical construction, which also contains a reflexive NP, the sense is clearly 1 b, and in the only ambiguous passive 1 c.

The NP + *of* + NP pattern shows no signs of becoming more frequent, providing only six tokens:

58) ..., and nobody could have *persuaded* <u>her</u> <u>of the truth</u> of Mr. Cardew's doctrine ... (Rutherford 1893, *Catherine Furze*)

Example (58) provides the only active sentence structure with the NP + *of* +NP. Of the five passive constructions, I would analyse only one as clearly verbal:

59) I believe that if <u>once</u> *persuaded* <u>of the injustice</u> of his suspicions <u>he</u> would <u>in the reaction</u> become a fervent supporter of Mr. Mauleverer ... (Yonge 1865, *The Clever Woman*)

In this example it appears that the word *once* and the PP *in the reaction* together support the

dynamic interpretation. The four ambiguous passives include the following:

> 60) (a) I am not only *persuaded* of Herncastle's guilt; I am even fanciful enough to believe ... (Collins 1868, *The Moonstone*)
> (b) It was not for me to dispute the point (though I was not yet *persuaded* of it), ... (Blackmore 1869, *Lorna Doone*)

It is clearly possible to interpret *persuaded* as referring to a state in these examples. Classified as adjectival, such tokens would take two thirds of the NP + *of* + NP complements. With the remaining two tokens, the NP + *of* + NP would even be fall behind the following pattern.

As for the sense of *persuade* with the NP + *of* +NP, it is, of course, 1 a in the active construction and the verbal passive case, 1 b in the reflexive use, and 1 c in the ambiguous passive constructions.

The NP + *into* + NP has not gained ground: there are just three tokens of the pattern:

> 61) But there he made friend with the real Earl of Warwick, and *persuaded* him into a plan for escape. (Yonge 1873, *Young Folk's History of England*)

One token has a reflexive pronoun as the first NP complement. As for the meanings of *persuade*, sense 2 seems to be the most appropriate one in all three tokens.

The NP + Adv pattern occurs again: the CLMET 3 provides two tokens with two different adverbs:

> 62) (a) Even if Lord North had wished to make peace, and *persuaded* Parliament accordingly, ... (Bagehott 1867, *The English Constitution*)
> (b) ... he actually set out to conquer France, and then let himself be *persuaded* over and paid off by the cunning King of France, ... (Yonge 1873, *Young Folk's History of England*)

Example (62a) has the adverb *accordingly*, which might not be a typical kind of adverb in complement function. Nevertheless, it does seem to complete the meaning of *persuaded*, as it has to be interpreted as defining the favourable mental state into which the object should enter. (62b) is curious, as it seems as if *persuade* forms a phrasal verb with *over*. In both tokens the sense of *persuade* could be 1 a.

The patterns NP + *to* +NP and NP + *against* + NP have one token each:

> 63) (a) The clock in M. Niepce's room, which the grocer had persuaded to exact time-

keeping, ... (Bennet 1908, *The Old Wives' Tale*)
(b) She would not be *persuaded* against visitations to pestiferous hovels.
(Meredith 1895, *The Amazing Marriage*)

The NP + *to* + NP has thus not disappeared completely yet. The preposition *against* first

appeared in the CLMET 2, but it was there patterned with an *-ing* form, not an NP. Example

(63a) has a [- human] object NP. The sense of *persuade* is clearly 2 a in both the above tokens.

A completely new preposition also appears in the CLMET 3: there is one occurrence of

a pattern termed as NP + *towards* + NP:

64) Her hands *persuaded* Sophia towards the corridor. (Bennet 1908, *The Old Wives'
Tale*)

Though the higher clause subject in (64) is technically [- human], the limitations of such labels

are again revealed, as the NP *her hands* just represents the human whole using the hands. The

sense of *persuade* is clearly 2 a.

The zero complement continues to decline, appearing only twice:

65) Fitz gave up his attempts at persuasion; from *persuading*, he fell to being
persuaded,...(Hope 1894, *The Prisoner of Zenda*)

In this example *persuading* could be treated as ambiguous between verbal and nominal reading,

but the context seems to favour the verbal interpretation. In any case, the default category

argument can be applied. The sense of *persuade* is 3 b in both tokens.

7.3.2 Sentential complements

The NP + *to*-infinitive is again the most frequent complementation pattern, with 129 tokens:

66) (a) Oh, if I could *persuade* her to return to her husband! (Gissing 1893, *The Odd
Woman*)
(b) "Here have I been *persuading* Herr Liesecke to stop ... (Forster 1910, *Howards
End*)
(c) ... if my Father could have *persuaded* himself to let me alone, ... (Gosse 1907,
Father and Son)
(d) Sheer weariness, seasoned with some hope that the broth would give me
strength to mount on my legs and walk, *persuaded* me to drink it. (Meredith 1870,
The Adventures of Harry Richmond)

The proportion of the NP + *to*-infinitive complements is 46.7 per cent of the total number of

tokens, only slightly lower than in the CLMET 2. A reflexive pronoun object NP, exemplified in (66c), is found in five tokens. In one of these the infinitive verb is *believe,* and in four it refers to action. The NP object is [- human] in only one case. The higher clause subject is analysable as [- human] in six tokens, one of which is found in (66d).

The proportion of *to*-infinitive forms of *persuade* with the NP + *to*-infinitive pattern is now 15.5 %, which is lower than in the previous two sub-corpora. Of the 20 cases, *persuade* is preceded by *try* in seven, and by *endeavour* in two. In none of the cases is the preceding verb in the *to*-infinitive form.

The NP + *to*-infinitive is obviously related to sense 2 a in most tokens. The reflexive use with *believe* represents sense 1 b. There is another token with *believe,* representing sense 1 a. Example (66b) above provides a clear case of 3 a, the continuous aspect confirming the interpretation. It is again not quite obvious whether other cases of 3 a could be identified.

The NP + *that*-clause pattern has become less frequent, but it is still by far the second most common complement. It has 85 tokens, which is 30.8 per cent of the total:

> 67) (a) It is most difficult to *persuade* people that by fighting they may strengthen the enemy, ... (Bagehott 1867, *The English Constitution*)
> (b) By the time she had done she had *persuaded* Dick that life in the backwoods of Canada had been his dream from infancy. (Jerome 1909, *They and I*)
> (c) ... and she could not *persuade* herself that the gentlemen fenced only for pastime. (Hope 1898, *Rupert of Henzau*)
> (d) Gudge has succeeded in *persuading* himself that slums and stinks are really very nice things; ... (Chesterton 1912, *What's Wrong with the World*)

Reflexive pronoun NP complements are now remarkably frequent in this pattern: as many as 36 tokens, 42.4 per cent of all the NP + *that*-clause complements, have a reflexive pronoun NP. The higher clause subject has the feature [- human] in just two tokens.

Extractions are again infrequent with the NP + *that*-clause, occurring only twice. Insertions are not frequent either: only four tokens appear in an insertion context. The extraction cases and one of the insertions are presented below:

> 68) (a) Most men do what is right, or what they *persuade* themselves is right; (Churchill 1899, *The River War*)

(b) ... <u>Margaret</u> did not trust them, and was hard to *persuade* <u>that Warwick could mean</u> well ... (Yonge 1873, *Young Folk's History of England*)
(c) I don't doubt that he *persuaded* <u>himself</u>, for the moment, <u>that he had behaved admirably,</u> ... (Forster 1905, *Where Angels Fear to Thread*)

In (68a) the subject of the *that*-clause has been extracted, whereas in (68b) it is the object of *persuade*.

In the overwhelming majority of the *that*-clauses *that* is explicitly present. It is retained in 76 tokens (89.4 %), and omitted in 9 tokens. The proportion of omissions is thus only 10.6 %. Of the two extraction cases one involves *that*-omission, whereas in all the four insertion cases *that* is present. The tokens involving extraction or insertion have again been left aside in the consideration of the *that*-clause subjects. Of the 37 *that*-clauses with a personal pronoun subject, seven are without *that*; of the 35 *that*-clauses with another kind of subject NP, two have *that* omission. The percentages have fallen further compared to the previous two sub-corpora, being now18.9 and 5.7 respectively. Nevertheless, there is a noticeable difference between the two groups of NP. Not surprisingly, several tokens involve other factors complicating the interpretation of the results:

69) (a) ... those who would *persuade* <u>the heedless general reader</u> <u>that every social failure is</u> ... (Wells 1902-03, *Mankind in the Making*)
(b) I *persuaded* <u>myself</u> <u>that,</u> if I could only discover the proper words to say or the proper passes to make, <u>I could</u> induce ... (Gosse 1907, *Father and Son*)

In (69a) both the object of *persuade* and the subject of the *that*-clause are rather long. In (69b) an adjunct again intervenes between *that* and the subject.

Passive constructions continue to become less frequent with the NP + *that*-clause pattern. There are now 20 passives, and the proportion is 23.5%, when the percentages were 64.4 and 43 in the CLMETEV 1 and CLMET 2. Most of the passives can still be classified as ambiguous. Here are the only two passives I would treat as clearly verbal:

70) (a) As they reached the city, <u>she</u> grew more composed, being *persuaded* <u>by Bernstein</u> <u>that nothing in her bearing must rouse suspicion</u>. (Hope 1898, *Rupert of Hentzau*)
(b) ..., <u>the Duke of Strelsau</u>, although too well informed to believe the account of the origin of my sickness, was yet <u>persuaded</u> <u>by the reports</u> and by my seeming

inactivity <u>that I was</u> in truth incapable of action, ... (Hope 1894, *The Prisoner of Zenda*)

Both examples contain a *by*-phrase, which helps clarify the function. The remaining 18 passives have thus been analysed as ambiguous. These include the following:

71) (a) But though <u>I</u> am fully *persuaded* <u>that I shall see</u> him no more, I am far from thinking of marriage with another. (Hardy 1874, *Far from the Madding Crowd*
(b) "For the most part of that night <u>I</u> was *persuaded* <u>it was</u> a nightmare. I bit myself and screamed in a passionate desire to awake. (Wells 1888, *The Time Machine*)
(c) <u>Anton</u> went off, *persuaded* <u>that he had</u> scored a point against me. (Hope 1898, *Rupert of Hentzau*)

The combination of the first person and the present tense is still found in six ambiguous tokens. The proportion is lower than in the earlier data: *I am persuaded* accounts for 33.3 % of the ambiguous passives. "Intensifying" adverbs are also found: *firmly* appears in four cases, *fully* in one, and *completely* likewise in one. The adjectival interpretation of the ambiguous passives would leave 67 NP + *that*-clause complements of the verb *persuade.* The drop would be significant, but not as drastic as in the two previous sub-corpora. The position of this pattern would not be threatened. Nevertheless, remembering that the NP complement would only lose one token, the distance between the two patterns would be shortened.

The majority of the NP + *that*-clause complements are naturally related to one of the sub-senses of sense 1. Perhaps 30 are related to sense 1 a. The sense is 1 b in the 36 instances of reflexive use, and 1 c in the 18 ambiguous passive constructions. There is one rather clear case of sense 3 a. There are now no instances where the NP + *that*-clause pattern could be analysed as a near-alternant of the *to*-infinitive.

The NP + *against* + *-ing* pattern occurs once, as does the NP + *of* + *what*-clause:

72) (a) They even took money from the French King to *persuade* <u>Charles</u> <u>against</u> <u>helping</u> the Dutch in their war against the French.(Younge 1873, *Young Folk's History of England*)
(b) ... he spoke kindly to her at first and tried to *persuade* <u>her</u> <u>of</u> <u>what he really</u> <u>believed</u> himself ... (Yonge 1873, *Young Folk's History of English*)

In (72a) the sense of *persuade* is clearly 2 a, whereas in (72b) it is 1 a.

The CLMET 3 includes one instance of a curious pattern that would have to be formulated as NP + *about* + NP + *that*-clause:

> 73) ... and did not gain in the opinion of <u>those boys</u> <u>about</u> whom <u>he</u> was *persuaded* <u>that they</u> <u>could assuredly never know</u> what it was to have a secret ... (Butler 1903, *The Way of All Flesh*)

This seems to be a mixture of two patterns. Here the form *persuaded* is also ambiguous, and could be adjectival. The sense of *persuade* is either 1 a or 1c.

7.4 *Persuade* in the BNC

The Imaginative Prose section of the BNC contains 16,496,408 words from 476 different texts. The search returned a total of 909 tokens. As the number was too high for the purposes of this study, it was reduced to a random 50% with the thinning tool of the corpus. The remaining total was thus 454 tokens. Of these 8 were discarded as nouns. In all except one of the instances classified as nominal the form *persuading* appeared in the pattern found in the *LDCE*, and could be rephrased as "it was/was not hard or difficult to persuade someone".

> 74) (a) She <u>needed</u> <u>a lot of</u> *persuading*, but Sean was persuasive. (ATE 3168)
>   (b) Bishop didn't <u>take</u> <u>much</u> *persuading*. (GIM 2182)

One token was different in that the preceding verb was *do*:

> 75) "Well, I promised your Uncle Nick I wouldn't <u>do</u> <u>any</u> <u>persuading</u>. (F99 26449)

My data suggests that the nominal use of *persuading* is advancing. The remaining *-ing* forms were verbal.

As for the adjectival use of the form *persuaded*, the BNC data revealed a radical drop in its frequency. There were no formal indications of adjectival function in any of the examples. The most significant change, however, was a drastic decline in the number of ambiguous passives. Passive constructions were even less frequent with the relevant complementation patterns, especially the NP + *that*-clause. The NP + *that*-clause and NP +*of* + NP complements had also become less frequent in general.

After discarding the noun forms, there were thus 446 verbal forms left. This has a

normalized frequency of 54.1 words per million (within the Imaginative Prose domain), which

is lower than in any part of the CLMETEV/CLMET. The verb forms and their complement are

presented in table 6 below.

Complement	*persuade*	*persuaded*	*persuades*	*persuading*	Total	%	NF/million
NP + *that*-clause	34	22	1	7	64	14.3	7.8
that-clause	1	-	-	-	1	0.2	0.1
NP + *about* +*what*-clause	1	-	-	-	1	0.2	0.1
NP + *how*-clause	-	-	-	1	1	0.2	0.1
NP + *to*-infinitive	156	117	1	22	296	66.4	35.9
NP + *into* + -*ing*	1	1	-	-	2	0.4	0.2
NP	32	20	-	3	55	12.3	6.7
NP + *of* + NP	4	1	-	-	5	1.1	0.6
NP + *out of* +NP	1	-	-	1	2	0.4	0.2
NP + *to* + NP	-	1	-	-	1	0.2	0.1
NP + *into* +NP	1	2	-	-	3	0.7	0.4
NP + *on to* +NP	1	-	-	-	1	0.2	0.1
NP + *about* + NP	-	1	-	-	1	0.2	0.1
NP +*in* + NP	1	-	-	-	1	0.2	0.1
NP + Adv	3	4	-	1	8	1.8	1.0
for + NP	1	-	-	-	1	0.2	0.1
Ø	-	3	-	-	3	0.7	0.4
Total	235	174	2	35	446	100	54.1

Table 6: Persuade *in the BNC*

The BNC data provides the largest number of different complementation patterns, 16. In

addition, the zero complement is still found. However, most of the patterns are infrequent, and

half only occur once. The dominance of the NP +*to*-infinitive pattern is overwhelming, 66.4 %

of all the tokens being of this type. The NP + *that*-clause is still the second most frequent

pattern, but the NP is not very far behind. The NP + *into*+-*ing* finally emerges, but no other

patterns with *–ing* occur. There is also a completely new type of sentential pattern, termed as

NP + *how*-clause. Two new prepositions appear, *on to* and *in*.

7.4.1 Non-sentential complements

The NP is still the most frequently occurring non-sentential complement, with 55 tokens:

> 76) (a) 'So, I have to try to *persuade* <u>him</u>.(C8S 2325)
> (b) 'Well, Luis must have *persuaded* <u>her</u>. (F9C 2160)
> (c) The smell is *persuading* <u>me</u>. (JYA 1100)

The NP is also approaching the NP + *that*-clause pattern, though its proportion of the total

number of tokens is, in fact, slightly lower than in the CLMET 3. The higher clause subject can

be classified as [- human] in two tokens, one of which is provided in (76c) above.

The parenthetical construction, already rare in the CLMET 3, has now disappeared

completely. The absence of parentheticals is obviously reflected in the fact that the proportion

of passive constructions is again lower than in the CLMETEV 1 and CLMET 2. Nine NP

complements appear in passive constructions, most of which I would analyse as rather clear

verbal passives:

> 77) (a) A divorce from Zoe – if <u>she</u> <u>could</u> be *persuaded*. (K8R 1524)
> (b) "I did not ask for it. <u>I</u> was <u>persuaded.</u> (HGK 395)

The presence of a modal seems again helpful in confirming a verbal reading in (77a). In (77b)

the sentence with *persuaded* would, of course, be ambiguous without context, but in this

example the context indicates that the dynamic reading is more appropriate. The following is

the only passive I would regard as ambiguous:

> 78) He is certain. And <u>I</u> am *persuaded*. (G0M 438)

As has been noted earlier*,* it is quite evident that in cases such as the above *I am persuaded*

could be rephrased as *I am certain.*

As for the meanings of *persuade*, the problem of assigning sense with the NP complement concerns the majority of the tokens. Contextual clues could again be used to help divide the tokens according to whether they relate to acting or thinking, but as with the previous data, I am inclined to leave this unspecified in this study, and say that the sense is either 1 or 2. The clearest cases are perhaps the ambiguous passive, which represents sense 1 c, and example (76c) above, which has the continuous aspect indicating sense 3 a.

The NP + Adv pattern has advanced, accounting for eight tokens. Here are three examples with different adverbs:

79) (a) She had laid siege to the typist's room for some minutes before Marshall had *persuaded* <u>her</u> <u>downstairs</u>. (GWG 2381)
(b) It could have been the assurance of that privacy, and, perhaps, the promise of food which had *persuaded* <u>him</u> <u>in</u> from the cold. (CJF 1373)
(c) ...'you and I might be able to *persuade* <u>Miss Milligan</u> <u>otherwise</u>'(EEW 2025)

Note that in (79b) there is thus no "two word" preposition *in from*, but an adverb complement *in*, followed by an omissible PP functioning as an adjunct. Interestingly, the adverb *otherwise* occurs in three examples from three different texts. The other adverbs found in this pattern are *back* and *onwards*. One NP complement has the feature [- human]. Example (79b) above provides one of the two instances of a higher clause subject that can be analysed as [- human]. The sense of *persuade* is 2 a in all the eight tokens.

The NP + *of* + NP complement continues to be rather infrequent: the pattern is represented by six tokens:

80) ..., but there is no way that we shall ever *persuade* <u>the airheads in Congress</u> <u>of</u> <u>that most obvious piece of wisdom</u>. (CCW 1472)

The proportion of the NP + *of* + NP pattern has, in fact, dropped by half from the 2.2 per cent in the CLMET 3. One token has a higher clause subject that is analysable as [- human]. One of the NP + *of* +NP complements appears in a passive construction:

81) "... Do you really think I am a man to do such things?" She could not choose an answer. At that moment it was easier to be *persuaded* <u>of his innocence</u>, his scathing rejection of violence. But she knew other things about him. (GV2 615)

This passive can be considered ambiguous, and the adjectival interpretation would leave five

NP + *of* + NP complements of the verb.

The sense of *persuade* with the NP + *of* + NP is 1 a in all except the ambiguous passive

token, which represents sense 1 c.

The NP + *into* + NP pattern has three tokens, and the NP + *out of* + NP has two:

82) (a) Ballater, too keen a businessman to throw his money around, proceeded to try
to *persuade* <u>Marshall</u> <u>into</u> <u>a satisfactory deal</u>.
(b) ... did you think you stood any chance of *persuading* <u>him</u> <u>out of</u> <u>two important</u>
<u>objectives</u> without offering anything in return? (GW3 2053)

These two patterns are still not as frequent as I would have expected. The proportion of the NP

+ *into* + NP is even lower than in the CLMET 3. In one of the NP + *into* + NP complements

the first NP is a reflexive pronoun. *Persuade* is used in sense 2 a with both patterns.

Surprisingly, the BNC provides one occurrence of the allegedly obsolete NP + *to* + NP:

83) I'd like to know how the fox *persuaded* <u>them</u> <u>to</u> <u>that</u>. (GWF 1827)

The pattern is thus not completely impossible in present-day English. The higher clause subject

in the only token is [- human] but [+ animate]. The sense of *persuade* is 2 a in this example.

Two new prepositional patterns, termed as NP + *in* + NP and NP + *on to* +NP, occur

once in the BNC, as does the pattern NP + *about* + NP:

84) (a) First of all he persuaded her to work in Bonanza's joints, and it wasn't long
before he *persuaded* <u>her</u> <u>in</u> <u>other directions</u>. (FAP 2004)
(b) It is hard to describe the feeling I had as I *persuaded* <u>her scaly old feet</u> <u>on to</u>
<u>my finger</u> ... (G02 1868)
(c) His mum must have *persuaded* <u>him</u> <u>about</u> <u>the parrot</u>. (ABX 909)

The NP + *about* + NP is not completely new, as the CLMET 3 included one instance of this

pattern combined with a *that*-clause. Example (84b) has a [- human] first NP complement (the

NP refers to a pigeon's feet). With the NP + *about* + NP, the sense of *persuade* is 1 a, whereas

with the other two patterns it is clearly 2 a.

An unexpected new pattern, formulated as *for* + NP, has one token:

85) Can I argue and *persuade* <u>for moderation</u>. (HGG 1097)

The possibility of this kind of complement cannot be predicted on the basis of the secondary sources. In (85) the occurrence of the pattern could be explained by the influence of the verb *argue,* which is known to take the *for* +NP complement. Sense 5 or 6 could be identified here.

The zero complement is again rare, accounting for only three tokens. There is also an interesting change in the use of the zero complement, as is apparent in the examples:

> 86) (a) 'Go on mum, *persuaded* Jack. (BPD 788)
> (b) Go on,' he *persuaded*, 'off you go. (HGY 980)
> (c) 'Drink your wine,' he *persuaded* softly. (H9V 761)

Notice that the tokens are from different sources. The zero complement cases clearly differ from those found in the earlier corpus data: *persuade* is used in reporting a direct quote, in the same way as verbs such as *say.* This use is not mentioned in any of the secondary sources, but it could be fitted under sense 3 b. It would also be possible to analyse this kind of structure differently, identifying a complement clause. However, Huddleston & Pullum (2002, 1024) treat it as a parenthetical construction with zero complement, and their analysis is followed in this study.

7.4.2 Sentential complements

The overwhelming majority of the complements in the BNC are of the type NP + *to*-infinitive. This pattern has as many as 296 tokens, which is 66.4% of the total:

> 87) (a) And I didn't *persuade* <u>her</u> <u>to do</u> anything against her will. (G0N 3200)
> (b) 'I dare say <u>he</u> could be *persuaded* <u>to convey</u> letters from Ludlow to a certain damsel of my acquaintance' (CCD 670)
> (c) He was simply *persuading* <u>her</u> <u>to stay</u>, and she knew it. (HKG 3868)

The reflexive NP complement has almost disappeared from this pattern: there is only one case. Interestingly, there are nine tokens with a [- human] complement NP. As for the higher clause subjects, as many as 11 can be classified as [- human]. Here are examples of both:

> 88) (a) Finally the engine gave up the ghost completely, and nothing could *persuade* <u>it</u> <u>to start</u> again. (AC6 577)
> (b) You don't fight sea by getting angry with it, or *persuade* <u>it to be</u> kinder by loving it. (HRC 545)
> (c) It was only <u>the threat</u> of banishment from the game that *persuaded* <u>him</u> <u>to wear</u>

the sponsor's bibs at the tournaments. (CS4 1999)
(d) ... perhaps something in her face *persuaded him* <u>not to protest</u>. (JY5 3602)

The [- human] subject is realized by the pronoun *nothing* in three tokens, and by *something* in two.

The *to*-infinitive form of *persuade* with the NP + *to*-infinitive pattern is now more frequent than ever, occurring in 112 instances of the pattern, with a proportion of 37.8 %. It is significant that the verb *try* is now very frequent before *persuade*: there are as many as 38 cases of *try* preceding *persuade.* In six cases the preceding *try* is in the *to*-infinitive form. Interestingly, in three of these there is *and* between *to try* and the form *persuade*, instead of the infinitive marker *to*. Such patterns were not found in the CLMET/CLMETEV. Here are examples of *to try to persuade* and *to try and persuade*:

89) (a) He sent his young daughter over <u>to try to</u> *persuade* <u>us</u> <u>to stay</u>. (AC6 2062)
(b) Leaving Howard <u>to try and</u> *persuade* <u>Colonel Mortimer</u> <u>to take</u> his men to the cemetery ... (FSR 1709)

Violations of *horror aequi* involving the verbs *try* and *persuade* emerge again. However, a consideration of *horror aequi* could perhaps be seen in the introduction of *and* replacing the infinitive marker *to* between the verbs. In addition to the co-occurrences with *try*, there are also several tokens of others catenatives appearing before *persuade*: *manage* appears in seven, *want* in four, and *attempt* in two cases. These not occur in the *to*-infinitive form.

In the overwhelming majority of the tokens the NP + *to*-infinitive is quite clearly related to sense 2 a. There are two clear instances of 1 a with the verb *believe*. Two cases with *agree* could also be placed under 1 a. Example (87 c) above provides one of the two most obvious cases of sense 3 a. In both cases the continuous aspect confirms the sense. There are still some tokens that could be ambiguous between 2 a and 3 a.

The NP + *that*-clause is still the second most frequent pattern, but it continues to lose ground. The NP + *that*-clause has 64 tokens, which is 14.3 % of the total:

90) (a) He would *persuade* <u>her</u> <u>that he loved</u> her, ... (HGE 2603)
(b) ... I had *persuaded* <u>myself</u> <u>that sending men to prison wasn't</u> something I cared

to do for the rest of my life. (CJF 2067)
(c) "The Devil's greatest success has been in *persuading* <u>people</u> <u>he doesn't exist</u>," (F9C 395)
(d) My <u>glass</u> shall not *persuade me* <u>I'm</u> senescent, ... (GII 868)

Reflexive NP complements are rather frequent in this pattern, occurring in 14 tokens. Example (90 d) provides one of the five tokens with a higher clause subject that can be classified as [-human].

None of the NP + *that*-clause complements in the BNC appears in an extraction environment. Insertions are also almost absent; here is the only insertion case:

91) His friends and his colleagues were trying to *persuade* <u>him</u> at the time <u>that this would</u> not be wise - ... (BNS 240)

As can be expected in an insertion context, the complemetizer *that* is retained in example (91). The great majority of the *that*-clauses in the BNC, 50 tokens, have an explicit *that*. The remaining 14 tokens thus involve *that* omission. The percentages are 78.1 and 21.9 respectively. The data shows again a difference between the two groups of NP (the insertion case has been excluded here): of the 27 *that*-clauses with a personal pronoun subject NP, 37% occur without *that*; of the 21 clauses with another kind of subject NP, 14 % are without *that*. Interestingly, the proportion of *that* omission has now risen over that found in the CLMET 2 and 3 in both NP groups. As can be expected, the picture is complicated by other related factors. For example, there are a few considerably long objects:

92) (a) ... he managed to *persuade* <u>whoever it was in charge of building anti-invasion pillboxes</u> <u>that Fisher's Farm was</u> worth defending. (HWL 2651)
(b) ... and *persuaded* <u>the uniformed ape on security hall</u> <u>that I was not</u> a terrorist. (CCW 210)

With this kind of object phrase *that* omission seems highly unlikely. There is now only one case of an adjunct between *that* and the subject, compared to the several cases in the earlier data.

Only nine instances of the NP + *that*-clause pattern occur in passives constructions in the BNC. They account for 14.1 % of the tokens, which is 9.4 % less than in the CLMET 3.

Moreover, I would treat most of the passives as rather clearly verbal. Three of the six passives analysed as verbal are provided below:

93) (a) <u>She</u> toyed with the idea of Yorkshire or even further south but was <u>persuaded</u> by Louise <u>that that it would be</u> a mistake ... (CEY 965)
(b) Perhaps <u>you</u> might be *persuaded* <u>that Mr Henderson of Branbury Castle also falls</u> into this rare category. (AR3 360)
(c) <u>I</u> wasn't fired - nothing as ungentlemanly as that. Merely <u>persuaded</u> <u>that resignation was</u> in my best interests. (HTG 2817)

Example (93a) contains the only passive accompanied by a *by*-phrase. (93b) demonstrates the influence of modals. In (93c) the preceding context excludes a stative reading: the only possible interpretation is "someone persuaded me". The following are the three passives classified as ambiguous:

94) (a) She knew, or she was *persuaded* <u>that she knew</u>, where he was bound. (H8L 966).
(b) <u>Midge</u> was *persuaded* <u>that there was</u> no point in going to the airport ... (HTJ 351)
(c) Long before his ordination <u>Frere</u> had been *persuaded* <u>that the human heart was</u> held in common ... (H82 2507)

It is noteworthy that there are no instances of *I am persuaded* in the BNC. Also, all of the ambiguous passives involve the past tense. The adjectival interpretation of these three tokens would not have serious consequences to the analysis of the verb *persuade*, as 95.3 % of the NP + *that*-clause complements would remain.

Naturally, the NP + *that*-clause is, in most cases related to sense 1 a or b, depending on whether the object NP is reflexive or not. The three ambiguous passives, then, represent sense 1c. There are at least 2 instances of sense 3 a, and more cases could perhaps be identified, as there are still some less obvious tokens. Only one NP + *that*-clause complement is almost replaceable by the *to*-infinitive:

95) ... it would be difficult to *persuade* <u>Jimbo</u> <u>that he had to work</u> at the exercises: yet if the treatment were to succeed, it had to be him ... (CHG 2439)

The meaning is not very far from the meaning of *to persuade Jimbo to work.*

The NP + *into* + *-ing* pattern finally emerges, but with just two tokens:

96) (a) 'She allowed a man to *persuade* <u>her</u> <u>into</u> <u>taking</u> the drug, so she can only blame herself of her predicament'(CCW 2011)
(b) ... he was bullied rather than <u>persuaded</u> <u>into</u> <u>going</u> down with them into the great burrow. (EWC 2388)

It is surprising and unfortunate that the pattern is not more frequent. The sense of *persuade* in the two tokens is 2 a. With two tokens a proper comparison with the NP + *to*-infinitive complements is not possible, but we could still consider Poutsma's comment on the semantics of the two patterns (see 4.2.1). The notion that the idea conveyed by *to* is "weaker" is rather vague, of course, but a more specific form of it could perhaps be utilized in the analysis of *persuade*: for example, it would seem possible that in the above examples the *into + -ing* excludes the "attempted persuasion" use of *persuade*, even without further context, and in this sense the NP + *into +-ing* could be described as "stronger". In the present study, this remains only a tentative suggestion.

Interestingly, the *that*-clause complement without a preceding NP returns:

97) Nonetheless, he continued to try and *persuade* <u>that he was</u> telling the truth. (GV8 725)

This is the only token, but is shows that it is not impossible to find this pattern with *persuade* even in present-day English. The *that*-clause object is [- human]. The sense of *persuade* would be 5 or 6.

There are two new sentential patterns, termed as NP + *about* + *what*-clause and NP + *how*-clause. Both occur once:

98) (a) But you can't *persuade* <u>them</u> <u>about what's going on</u>. (GIX 1154)
(b) Ariel had kept he cabin sheltered, *persuading* <u>the strangers' headman</u> <u>how</u> <u>Sycorax and</u> <u>she needed the shade</u> of the jungle canopy overhead. (G0S 301)

The possibility of the first pattern is predictable on the basis of the NP + *about* + NP. The *how*-clause is interesting in that it occurs without a preposition. The sense of *persuade* is 1 a in both.

8 Review of the corpus findings and concluding remarks

In this concluding chapter I will bring the results of the corpus analysis together, presenting the main findings.

The corpus analysis reveals that the frequency of the verb *persuade* has decreased continually during the years 1710-1993. The normalized frequency per million words is 125.7 in the CLMETEV 1, 95.1 in the CLMET 2, 69 in the CLMET 3, and 54.1 in the BNC.

The corpora provide together as many as 25 different patterns. Ten of the patterns identified on the basis of the secondary sources are not found at any point: NP + *out of* + *-ing*, NP + *from* + NP, NP + *away from* + NP, NP + *unto* + NP, NP + *upon* + NP, *with* + NP, *of* + NP, *from* + NP, *to* + NP and *unto* + NP. On the other hand, the data includes 13 patterns that were not identified in the sources: NP + *from* + *-ing*, NP + *how*-clause, NP + *to* + *what*-clause, NP + *of* + *what*-clause, NP + *about* + *what*-clause, NP + *about* + NP + *that*-clause, bare infinitive, NP + *about* + NP, NP + *in* + NP, NP + *on to* + NP, NP + *towards* + NP, NP + Adv and *for* + NP. The number of different patterns is highest in the BNC, 17. The CLMETEV 1 provides 11, the CLMET 2 likewise 11, and the CLMET 3 13 different patterns. Despite the fact that the number of different non-sentential patterns is higher in all the corpora/sub-corpora, it is seen that the sentential patterns take the overwhelming majority of all the tokens. Table 7 below provides a summary of the sentential patterns found in the corpora.

Sentential patterns	CLMETEV 1 (1710-1780)		CLMET 2 (1780-1850)		CLMET 3 (1850-1920)		BNC (1960-1993)	
Number of patterns: Sentential tokens: % of total:	5 patterns 296 tokens 78.2 % / 377		4 patterns 306 tokens 86.6 % / 352		5 patterns 217 tokens 78.6 % / 276		6 patterns 365 tokens 81.8 % / 446	
NP + *that*-clause	161	42.7 %	135	38.4 %	85	30.8 %	64	14.3 %
that-clause	2	0.5 %	-	-	-	-	1	0.2 %
NP + *how*-clause	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2 %
NP + *to* + *what*-clause	1	0.3 %	-	-	-	-	-	-
NP + *of* + *what*-clause	-	-	-	-	1	0.3 %	-	-

NP + *about* + *what*-clause	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2 %
NP + *about* + NP + *that*-clause	-	-	-	-	1	0.3 %	-	-
NP + *to*-infinitive	130	34.5 %	169	48 %	129	46.7 %	296	66.4%
NP + bare infinitive	1	0.3 %	-	-	-	-	-	-
NP + *into* + *-ing*	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.4 %
NP + *against* + *ing*	-	-	1	0.3 %	1	0.4 %	-	-
NP + *from* + *-ing*	-	-	1	0.3 %	-	-	-	-

Table 7; Sentential patterns in the corpora

Two sentential patterns, the NP + *to*-infinitive and the NP + *that*-clause, have been above all the other patterns in the years 1710-1993, and accounted together for the great majority of the tokens. However, the NP + *that*-clause has suffered a dramatic fall from being the leading complement in the CLMETEV 1, with a proportion of 42.7 %, to being only 2 % higher than the NP in the BNC. Today, the dominance of the NP + *to*-infinitive is overwhelming. One of the biggest surprises in this study is the fact that the NP + *into –ing* complement is absent in the CLMETEV/CLMET, and only occurs twice in the BNC. It can be said that the spread of the "prepositional gerund", one of the processes involved in the Great Complement Shift, had not had a significant impact on the complements of *persuade* by 1993, at least not in imaginative prose. Another surprise is that the NP + *out of* + *-ing* is not found at all in any of the data. The source of data could be relevant here; including other genres and data from the past ten years might provide more evidence of the NP + *into* + *-ing* and NP + *out of* + *-ing.*

Table 8 presents the division of the non-sentential patterns across the four time-periods.

Non-sentential patterns (Ø included)	CLMETEV 1 (1710-1780)		CLMET 2 (1780-1850)		CLMET 3 (1850-1920)		BNC (1960-1993)	
Number of patterns: Non-sentential tokens: % of the total:	6 patterns 82 tokens 21.8 % / 377		7 patterns 46 tokens 13.4 % / 352		8 patterns 59 tokens 21.4 % / 276		11 patterns 81 tokens 18.2 % / 446	
NP	38	10 %	26	7.4 %	43	15.6 %	55	12.3 %
NP + *of* +NP	17	4.5 %	7	2.0 %	6	2.2 %	5	1.1 %

NP + *about* + NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2 %
NP + *to* + NP	8	2.1 %	4	1.1 %	1	0.4 %	1	0.2 %
NP + *into* + NP	1	0.3 %	2	0.6 %	3	1.1 %	3	0.7 %
NP + *in* + NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2 %
NP + *on to* + NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2 %
NP + *out of* + NP	-	-	1	0.3 %	-	-	2	0.4 %
NP + *off* + NP	1	0.3 %	-	-	-	-	-	-
NP + *against* + NP	-	-	-	-	1	0.4 %	-	-
NP + *towards* + NP	-	-	-	-	1	0.4 %		
for + NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2 %
NP + Adv	-	-	3	0.9 %	2	0.4 %	8	1.8 %
Ø complement	17	4.5 %	3	0.9 %	2	0.7 %	3	0.7 %

Table 8; Non-sentential patterns in the corpora

Of the non-sentential patterns, the NP is by far the most frequent one in all the four time-periods, and in the present day it even approaches the NP + *that*-clause. One of the most surprising findings relates to the NP + *of* + NP: the pattern is considerably less frequent than I expected in all of the corpora/sub-corpora. So are the NP + *into* + NP and NP + *out of* + NP. A significant, though not surprising finding, is the possibility of the NP + Adv pattern. The NP + Adv first appears in the CLMET 2, and it seems to advance, being more frequent than the NP + *of* +NP in the BNC. The higher frequency of the zero complement in the CLMETEV 1 is partly explained by the fact that most of the tokens, 11, are from *Letters to his Son*.

Most of the patterns listed in the above tables have less than five tokens. Table 9 below provides the patterns that have at least five tokens, listed in the order of frequency.

Corpus	Complementation patterns with at least five tokens
CLMETEV 1	NP + *that*-clause, NP + *to*-infinitive, NP, Ø, NP + *of* + NP, NP + *to* + NP
CLMET 2	NP + *to*-infinitive, NP + *that*-clause, NP, NP + *of* + NP

| CLMET 3 | NP + *to*-infinitive, NP + *that*-clause, NP, NP + *of* + NP |
| BNC | NP + *to*-infinitive, NP + *that*-clause, NP, NP + Adv, NP + *of* + NP |

Table 9; The main complementation patterns of persuade

These could be called the main complementation patterns of *persuade* within the relevant genre. The changes over the relevant time-frame are the exclusion of the zero complement and the NP + *to* + NP after the year 1780, and the introduction of the NP + Adv before the NP + *of* + NP in the present-day listing.

Of the excluded tokens, the ones involving the kind of nominal pattern provided in the *LDCE* are worth mentioning. The pattern is, indeed, relatively frequent in the BNC, and could become even more frequent in the future.

Turning to the complexity factors examined in this study, the vast majority of the NP + *that*-clause complements retain the complementiser *that* throughout the corpus data. This is predictable on the basis of the notion that the presence of an object is a complexity factor as such. Extractions are infrequent in all the fall time-periods, the highest number of tokens being 5 (in the CLMETEV 1 and the CLMET 2), and their frequency has dropped continuously. In the CLMETEV 1 and CLMET 2 the 5 extraction cases involve *that*-omission, which could be explained by the type of extraction. In the BNC there are no extractions. Insertions have generally been slightly more frequent than extractions, though they have also suffered a continuous fall. The insertions show a preference for *that* retention. The pattern with *but that* has one token in the CLMETEV 1 and five in the CLMET 2, but disappears after that. Table 10 summarizes the division of the presence/omission of *that* in general, and the proportion of *that*-omission in *that*-clauses with a personal pronoun NP subject vs. other kind of NP subject. The extraction and insertion cases are excluded below, as are the tokens with *but that*.

NP + *that*-clause pattern	CLMETEV 1	CLMET 2	CLMET 3	BNC
All *that*-clauses with *that* present	66.5 %	76.3 %	89.4 %	78.1 %

All *that*-clauses with *that* omitted	33.5 %	23.7 %	10.6 %	21.9 %
Personal pronoun NP + *that* omission	42.2 % of 64	28.3 % of 60	18.9 % of 37	37% of 27
Other NP + *that*-omission	14.1 % of 64	10.6 % of 47	5.7 % of 35	14 % of 21

Table 10; Presence/omission of that *in the NP +* that-*clause complements*

It is seen that in all the four time-periods *that*-clauses with a personal pronoun subject NP are more likely to occur without an explicit *that* than other kinds of subject NP. Interestingly, in both NP groups the percentages of *that* omission fall towards the end of the Late Modern English period, but rise again considerably in present-day English. As has been noted earlier, the results do not give the full picture, as the issue is complicated by other factors relating to the overall complexity of the subject and object expressions, and the presence of adjuncts. Also, the possible distinction between active and passive constructions has not been taken into account in this study. In addition, more pronoun groups should perhaps be distinguished, although there are just a few cases of other pronoun NPs as subject in my data.

The possible influence of *horror aequi* was investigated in the analysis of the NP + *to*-infinitive, considering the frequency of the *to*-infinitive form of *persuade* with this pattern, and the presence of certain catenative verbs. Table 11 summarizes the findings.

___ *to persuade* + NP + *to*-infinitive	CLMETEV 1	CLMET 2	CLMET 3	BNC
Try	1 *to try*	5 (*to try* 1)	7	38 (*to try* 3)
Attempt	1 *to attempt*	1	-	2
Endeavour	1	7	2	-
Manage	-	-	-	7
Want	-	-	-	4
Mean	-	-	-	-
Wish	-	-	-	-
Other element	19	35	11	58
All	22 → 16. 9 % of 130	32 → 18.9 % of 169	20 → 15.5 % of 129	109 → 36.8 % of 296

Table 11: To-infinitive form of persuade + *NP +* to-*infinitive*

The figures seem to indicate that there has not been a very strong tendency to avoid the *to*-infinitive form of *persuade* with this pattern. In present-day English it is even more frequent than ever, with a significant percentage. Cases of co-occurrence with catenatives such as *try* have occurred before, but they are vey frequent in the BNC. The verb *try* is particularly frequent. This could suggest that with *persuade* the force *horror aequi* is, indeed, weakened by the presence of the object NP, but it could also be overridden by semantic factors: it is only natural that persuading involves effort and uncertainty of the end result. With *try* one also avoids having to use *persuade* in the sense "to attempt to persuade", which is potentially confusing. A recognition of *horror aequi* could be seen in the three out of six cases with *to try* where the particle between the verbs is *and.* Such cases do not appear before the BNC (not with any pattern).

The next table presents the frequency of the constructions analysed as parenthetical.

NP complement	CLMETEV 1	CLMET 2	CLMET 3	BNC
Non-parenthetical	22 → 57.9 %	12 → 46.2 %	41 → 95.3 %	55 →100 %
Parenthetical	16 → 42.1 %	14 → 53.8 %	2 → 4.67 %	0
All NP complements	38	26	43	55

Table 12; Parenthetical constructions in the corpora

Parenthetical constructions are frequent with the NP complement in the years 1710-1850. It has to be remembered that in the first two sub-corpora the majority of the tokens are from texts by the same writer, and stylistic issues could be relevant. After 1850 the frequency of parentheticals drops radically, and in the present-day data *persuade* is not found in such constructions. The fixed phrase found in the majority of the parenthetical constructions, *I am/I'm persuaded*, has thus fallen out of use. However, the BNC reveals a new kind construction that can be interpreted as parenthetical, where *persuaded* is used to introduce a quote in a pattern treated as zero complement in this study. Admittedly, the parenthetical

constructions could also be analysed differently, and a few tokens are less obviously parenthetical, the choice being perhaps too much based on the influence of punctuation. Nevertheless, I believe that distinguishing between the parenthetical construction and that NP + *that*-clause has proved a useful tool for detecting and describing change in the behavior of *persuade*, and thus a justified choice.

I will next review the results of the most challenging part of the study, the analysis of the passive constructions related to the patterns NP + *that*-clause, NP and NP + *of* + NP. This study has shown that the passive gradient is one of the central issues to be considered in the analysis of the properties of *persude* in recent centuries, and that there are no simple and straightforward solutions to the ambiguities it produces. The best that one can do is to aim at following the same lines in the interpretation of passive constructions throughout the data. I believe that my practical solutions for the starting point of the analysis have been justified, as they have helped me cover the corpus data according to a sufficiently consistent set of principles. At the same time, it has also been necessary to discuss the problem areas, and emphasize the possibility of an alternative treatment of the passives, as the choice has consequences to the analysis of the complements of *persuade*. During the analysis process, I have also been forced to assess the applicability of different formal and semantic criteria in determining the verbal or adjectival force of the form *persuaded*. I have identified, for example, the presence of a *by*-phrase, the presence of modal auxiliaries, the perfective aspect and the vague concept of "general context" as factors that help extract the verbal forms of *persuade*. The presence of "intensifying adverbs" is among the factors favouring the adjectival reading.

Turning to the ambiguous passive constructions found in the data, table 13 below summarizes the estimation of the proportion of ambiguous passives in the relevant pattern groups.

Patterns with ambiguous *persuaded*	CLMETEV 1		CLMET 2		CLMET 3		BNC	
NP + *that*-clause	96	59.6 %	51	37.8 %	18	21.2 %	3	4.9 %
NP	15	39.5 %	13	50 %	1	3.8 %	1	1.8 %
NP + *of* + NP	10	58.8 %	5	71.4 %	4	66.7 %	1	20 %
All ambiguous tokens:	121 → 32.1 % of 377		69 → 19.6 % of 352		23 → 8.3 % of 276		5 → 1.1% of 446	

Table 13; Ambiguous persuaded *in the corpora*

The table shows clearly that the proportion of ambiguous *persuaded* is high at the beginning of the Late Modern Period, but the use declines radically towards the present day, and is now very close to becoming obsolete. If the ambiguous passive forms are classified as adjectives, the main consequences are the following: the NP + *to*-infinitive has been the dominant complementation pattern of the verb *persuade*, and far above all the other patterns, throughout the entire time-frame investigated in this study; the adjectival use of the form *persuaded* was frequent at the beginning of the Late Modern English period, but has almost vanished from present-day English. Besides being the most challenging part of this study, the analysis of the passive constructions has also proved to be one of the most rewarding and important parts of the study, as it has produced novel and significant findings relating to the major complements of *persuade*.

The next table provides the results of what could be called the feature analysis relating to the object complement participants and the main clause subject participants.

Type of phrase	CLMETEV 1	CLMET 2	CLMET 3	BNC
Reflexive pronoun NP object	22 (5.8 %)	45 (12.8 %)	43 (15.6 %)	16 (3.6 %)
[- human] object complement	6 (1.0 %)	5 (1.4 %)	1 (0.4 %)	11 (2.5 %)
[- human] main clause subject	28 (7.4 %)	16 (4.5 %)	8 (2.9 %)	19 (4.3 %)

Table 14; Participant features in the corpora

The reflexive use is less frequent in present-day English than in the earlier period. It has to be noted here that the reflexive pronoun NP peaks in the NP + *that*-clause complements in the CLMET 2 and CLMET 3, but is considerably less frequent in the BNC. The data also reveals that the NP + *to*-infinitive complement can also have a reflexive pronoun NP, but this use is now very rare. Not surprisingly, the feature label [- human] proved problematic and even potentially misleading in some cases, but it can still be useful in covering several uses involving "a good reason" that persuades vs. a human being using verbal persuasion. Both [- human] object complements and [- human] main clause subjects occur in all the corpora/sub-corpora, but [- human] objects are considerably less frequent. This is not unexpected, remembering the notion that the object of *persuade* has to be "a sentient capable of making decisions" (see 4.2.2). The proportion of [- human] subjects is, in my view, significant enough to justify a reference to such use in a dictionary entry. The majority of the [- human] objects clearly represent figurative uses of the senses related to the patterns, whereas the three cases of a *that*-clause object found in the data naturally represent a very different sense.

Turning to the senses of persuade, the major senses are the ones related to the two main complements in all of the time-periods, and there are no surprises as regards my initial view of the meanings of *persuade*. The division of the NP + *that*-clause and the NP + *to*-infinitive complements generally follows the division of the two main ideas included in the sub-senses of sense 1 and 2 respectively, and in the definitions found in the other dictionaries, but there are, indeed, a few cases of the NP + *to*-infinitive relating to the idea of thinking/believing that something is the case in all the corpora/sub-corpora. There is also a somewhat grey area between the senses, if the *to*-infinitive verb is other than *believe* or *think*. As for the NP + *that*-clause as a "near-alternant" of the NP + *to*-infinitive, this kind of use is, indeed, very rare throughout the corpora.

Not surprisingly, the NP + *of* + NP can only be related to sense 1, and the same naturally appeals to the close patterns with *about*. The other prepositional patterns are generally

more flexible and can involve both senses, but the majority of the tokens appear to involve sense 2. The NP + Adv also appears to allow sense 1 in some rare cases, but they are exceptional, and the sense is typically 2 a.

As I predicted, the NP pattern proved problematic in many cases; determining the senses of *persuade* with all the NP complements would require an examination of a large amount of contextual information. Therefore, I decided not to attempt a division of the NP complements according to the two main ideas in this study. Perhaps the behavior of the NP follows the behavior of the NP + *to*-infinitive and NP + *that*-clause, in which case the great majority of the NP complements in present-day English would be related to action, but this is an issue to be investigated in further studies.

All the other senses have a minor role in any of the corpora. Admittedly, as has been noted, the line between the uses involving successful persuasion and the ones where it is only attempted is not always obvious in the corpus data. Nevertheless, the first ones are the default options. Some instances of a clear sense 3 a can be identified even in the BNC; such cases typically involve the continuous aspect. The zero complements represent either 3 b or 4, of course, but the choice between the two is not always obvious. The only instances of senses 5 or 6 are three tokens in the CLMETEV 1 and one token in the BNC. There are no instances of the sense with *with*.

Reviewing all the senses relating to the complements of *persuade* in recent centuries, I would continue to adopt my initial view of the semantics of *persuade*, and argue that the semantic relationships between *persuade* and its complements, have the same basis in common in most uses, irrespective of the more specific syntactic or semantic features of the complements, and that this has been the case during the entire period between the years 1710-1993. This relationship is perhaps best described by evoking the concepts of thematic structure and theta roles: the subject argument can be described as the influence; the second argument is the one influenced by the influence, perhaps the theme or patient; the third argument, when

present, depicts the desired state into which the patient enters, or the action it realizes, as a result of the influence. The nature of the influence can then be defined further, according to whether it involves, for example, deliberate verbal communication or other means. I leave the more subtle specification for further studies.

In this thesis I have presented a rather comprehensive overview of the syntactic and semantic features of the verb *persuade* in recent centuries, identifying some of the major changes in the behavior of the verb over the years 1710-1993, and providing a revised picture of its use in present-day English. I believe my study has revealed important points relating to the hypotheses formed on the basis of the previous sources, and produced new information relating to some of the recent issues in the study of complementation. At the same time, the study also leaves a number of questions to be investigated in the future. One of the main issues to be clarified further is the interpretation of the form *persuaded* in formally passive constructions, as it has fundamental consequences to the analysis of the status of the verb *persuade* and its complements in the Late Modern English period. Different complexity factors can also be examined further, as this study has only been able to scratch the issue. As a more general point, years have gone by since the endpoint of the BNC data, and it would be essential to include more recent material in order to detect the latest trends, especially when it comes to the spread of the NP + *into + -ing* pattern.

References

Primary sources:

The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, original and extended version

The British National Corpus

Secondary sources:

Biber, Douglas et al. 1998. *Corpus Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D. et al. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.

Carnie, Andrew. 2002. *Syntax.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Cook,Walter. 1990. "Passive Semantics: Ambiguity of the Short Passive" *Language and Linguistics.* Vol. 1, no. 1. 25-30. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press

Dirven, René. 1989. "A Cognitive Perspective on Complemetation," in D. Jaspers et al. eds., *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon.* Dordrecht: Foris, 519-550.

Egan, Thomas. 2008. *Non-finite Complementation.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1994. *Introducing Government and Binding Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell

Herbst, Thomas et al. 2004. *A Valency Dictionary of English*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

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

Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, Susan. 2002. *Corpora in Applied Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindquist, Hans. 2009, *Corpus Linguistics and the Description of English*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

The Oxford English Dictionary. 3rd ed. 2005. OED online. Oxford University Press. Available from http//:www.oed.com. [Accessed August 2011]

Palmer, F. R. 1987. *The English Verb*. 2nd ed. Harlow: Longman

Poutsma, H. 1904-1929. *A Grammar of Late Modern English.* Groningen: Noordhoof

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svarvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Renouf, Antoinette and Andrew Kehoe, eds. 2009, *Corpus Linguistics: Refinements and Reassessments*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Rohdenburg, Günter. 1996. "Cognitive Complexity and Increased Grammatical Explicitness in English". *Cognitive Linguistics* 7-2, 149-182.

Rohdenburg, Günther. 2003. "Cognitive Complexity and *horror aequi* as factors determining the use of interrogative clause linkers in English," in G. Rohdenburg and Britta Mondorf, *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 205-250

Rohdenburg, Günter. 2006. "The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System," in Christiane Dalton-Puffer et al. eds., *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms.* Bern: Peter Lang, 143-166

Rudanko, Juhani. 2000. *Corpora and Complementation.* Lanham: University Press of America

Sag, Ivan and Carl Pollard. 1991. "An Intergrated Theory of Complement Control," *Language* 67, 63-113.

Sinclair, John. 2006. *Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary*. 5th ed. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Smet, Hendrick de. 2005. "A Corpus of Late Modern English Texts." *ICAME Journal* 29, 69-82.

Summers, Della. 2005. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English.* 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited

Somers, Harold. 1984. "On the validity of the Complement-Adjunct Distinction in Valency Grammar," *Linguistics* 22, 507-530.

Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. ""Object complements" and conversation: Towards a realistic account," *Studies in Language.* 26.1, 125-64.

Vosberg, Uwe. 2003a. "Cognitive Complexity and the Establishment of –ing Constructions with Retrospective Verbs in Modern English," in M. Dossena and C. Jones, eds., *Insights into Late Modern English.* Bern: Peter Lang, 197-220.

Vosberg, Uwe 2003b. "The Role of Extractions and *Horror Aequi* in the Evolution of *–ing* complements in Modern English," in G. Rohdenburg and Britta Mondorf, *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 305-328.

Vosberg, Uwe. 2009. "Non-finite complements," in G.Rohdenburg and Julia Schülter, *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 212-227.

Walter, Elizabeth, ed. 2008. *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.