

**The Complementation of the Verb *Advise* from the 18th Century to the
Present**

Maija Kyytsönen
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
May 2014

Tampereen yliopisto
Englantilainen filologia
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö

KYYTSÖNEN, MAIJA: The Complementation of the Verb *Advise* from the 18th Century to the Present

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 101 sivua
Toukokuu 2014

Tämä korpuspohjainen pro gradu -tutkielma käsittelee englannin kielen verbin *advise* komplementaatiota 1700-luvulta nykypäivään. Tutkimus keskittyy kirjoitettuun brittienglantiin. Tarkoituksena on selvittää, mitä komplementtirakenteita verbin kanssa on eri aikoina esiintynyt, ja miten niiden käyttö on muuttunut tutkittuna ajanjaksona. Lisäksi tarkoituksena on tutkia, onko verbin eri merkitysten ja komplementtirakenteiden välille löydettävissä yhteyksiä.

Tutkielman teoreettisessa osassa tarkastellaan ensin verbikomplementaatiota sekä siihen vaikuttavia tekijöitä yleisellä tasolla. Huomio kiinnittyy erityisesti *advise*-verbille ominaiseen objektikontrollirakenteeseen. Tässä osassa käsitellään myös lyhyesti korpuslingvistiikkaa sekä esitellään aineiston lähteenä olevat korpuksat. Lisäksi tutkimuksen kohteena olevan verbin merkityksistä ja sille tyypillisistä komplementtirakenteista luodaan yleiskuva valikoitujen englannin kielen sanakirjojen ja kieloppien avulla.

Tutkielman empiirinen osa koostuu kahdesta eri korpuksesta saadun aineiston analyysistä. The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET) toimii lähteenä vuosien 1710–1920 aineistolle. Korpus on jaettu kolmeen 70 vuotta kattavaan osaan, joista jokaista käsitellään tutkimuksessa erikseen. Nykypäivän aineiston lähteenä sen sijaan on British National Corpus (BNC). Neljään eri korpusaineistoon perustuvan diakronisen analyysin lisäksi tutkielmassa käsitellään *advise*-verbin kanssa esiintyviä objektittomia objektikontrollirakenteita BNC:stä saadun erillisen aineiston avulla.

Tutkimuksesta ilmeni, että *to*-infinitiivi on säilynyt verbin yleisimpänä komplementtirakenteena läpi tutkitun ajanjakson, vaikka sen yleisyys onkin laskenut nykypäivän aineistossa. Erityisen huomattava oli sen ero *that*-lausekomplementtiin, joka on alkanut yleistyä vasta viimeisimmässä aineistossa. Yksi tärkeimmistä havainnoista oli verbin osoittama tendenssi ottaa epäsuora NP-objekti, joko ainoana komplementtina tai edeltäen muita komplementteja. Tämä taipumus oli erityisen vahva *to*-infinitiivin kohdalla. Lisäksi tutkimus osoitti, ettei Great Complement Shift ole vielä vaikuttanut suuresti *advise*-verbin komplementaatioon, sillä *-ing*-lause on pysynyt hyvin marginaalisena komplementtirakenteena. Se kuitenkin osoittautui syrjäyttäneen infinitiivin rakenteissa, joissa ei ole eksplisiittistä objektia.

Avainsanat: verbi, komplementaatio, objektikontrolli, korpuslingvistiikka

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 On Complementation.....	3
2.1 Complement vs. Adjunct	3
2.2 Arguments and Theta Theory	6
2.2.1 Argument Structure	7
2.2.2 Theta Theory	8
2.3 Control and NP-movement.....	9
2.3.1 Understood Subjects	10
2.3.2 Control and NP movement	11
2.3.3 <i>Advise</i> and Object Control.....	13
2.4 Other Factors Bearing on Complementation	14
2.4.1 The Complexity Principle.....	14
2.4.2 The Horror Aequi Principle.....	15
2.4.3 Extractions	15
2.4.4 <i>To</i> -infinitive versus <i>-ing</i> -clause	16
3 On Corpora	19
3.1 Corpus Linguistics.....	19
3.2 The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts	20
3.3 The British National Corpus.....	22
4 <i>Advise</i> in Previous Literature.....	23
4.1 The <i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>	23
4.2 The <i>Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary</i>	29
4.3 <i>Collins COBUILD Advanced Dictionary</i>	30
4.4 Senses	31
4.5 Grammars	31
5 <i>Advise</i> in the CLMET: 1710-1780.....	36
5.1 Sentential Complements	38
5.2 Non-sentential Complements	45
6 <i>Advise</i> in the CLMET: 1780-1850.....	49
6.1 Sentential Complements	51
6.2 Non-sentential Complements	56
7 <i>Advise</i> in the CLMET: 1850-1920.....	59
7.1 Sentential Complements	61
7.2 Non-sentential Complements	65
8.1 Complementation of <i>Advise</i> : 1985-1993	69
8.1.1 Sentential Complements	72
8.1.2 Non-sentential Complements	77
8.2 Omission of the NP Object.....	80
9 Findings	87
10 Conclusion.....	97
Works cited.....	99

1 Introduction

Consider the following authentic examples of the verb *advise*, taken from the Corpus of Late

Modern English Texts:

- (1) Mr. Goodricke brought his partner, Mr. Garth, with him to advise. (Collins, *The Woman in White*, 1859-60)
- (2) I wish, indeed, we had a guide to advise which of these roads we should take. (Fielding, *Tom Jones*, 1749)
- (3) I strongly advise you to let it take its change. (Gissing, *New Grub Street*, 1891)
- (4) I don't at all know how to advise you about mourning; (Walpole, *Letters 1735-1748*, 1735-48)

These examples illustrate simply a few of the many possible constructions that *advise* can be found in. As can be seen from the examples, the verb can occur both alone, without any complements, as it does in (1), or with a variety of different types of complement structures, as in the rest of the examples. Both (2) and (3) involve a sentential complement, but in (3) it is preceded by an object NP complement, which is not the case in (2). *Advise* can therefore even have two different complements following one another. In addition, example (4) shows that *advise* can also occur with a PP complement.

In this thesis I aim to examine the different complementation patterns of the verb *advise* from the 18th century to present-day British English. It will also be of interest to study the types of meanings that the verb has had within the last few centuries and, moreover, to investigate if there exist any connections between the different patterns and the different senses of *advise*. The aim is to provide a corpus-based study on the complementation of *advise* by analysing data drawn from two different corpora: the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET), which includes texts from 1710 to 1920, and the British National Corpus (BNC), which contains texts from 1960 to 1993. My purpose is not only to study the different patterns and meanings used but also how their use has changed over the period studied. In addition to this diachronic perspective, I will also analyse some additional data from the BNC with the specific aim of studying violations to Bach's generalization that occur with *advise* in present-day English.

Since there is so much variation as regards the number and possible types of complements that different verbs allow in English, verbal complementation may often cause problems to the learners of the language. This is one of the reasons why it is important to study this area of English both in general and with regard to specific verbs, as is the aim of this thesis. Considering the wide range of complements that *advise* can take, it should prove to be a particularly suitable topic for this purpose.

Language is not constant but rather in perpetual change. Therefore it is important to study not only the current situation but also the way it has come to be. The diachronic perspective of this thesis should therefore help in understanding verbal complementation as a continuing process, which in turn explains some of the wide variation found in this area of language. This perspective will also allow us to contribute to the research on Late Modern English as a whole. This is important, since De Smet (2005, 69) has noted that this period has been greatly overlooked in earlier research, despite it being among the more documented periods of English.

The thesis is composed of two parts. The first half will begin in Chapter 2 from a general discussion on verbal complementation and on certain theoretical aspects that will be helpful when studying this topic. Chapter 3 will provide a brief introduction to the use of corpora in linguistic research and present the corpora used in the thesis. The first part will conclude in Chapter 4 with an overview of the treatment of *advise* in several selected dictionaries and grammars of English. The second half of the thesis will focus on the analysis of the corpus data. The diachronic analysis consists of four sets of data, which will all be discussed in separate chapters. Chapters 5-7 involve data from the CLMET and Chapter 8 from the BNC. Chapter 8 will also include an analysis of some additional data from the BNC, separate from the diachronic perspective. Finally Chapter 9 will provide the main findings of the thesis on the basis of the preceding chapters.

2 On Complementation

As the main focus of this thesis is on verbal complementation, it is important to start with a discussion on what exactly is meant by the term complementation. In the first section of this chapter I will try to explain the distinction between two possible post-verbal elements, namely complements and adjuncts. Understanding the difference between them is essential for the analysis of the data, where only the complements are to be considered. The later sections will focus on some important theoretical aspects that have a bearing on the study of complementation and will prove to be helpful when we turn to analysing the verb *advise*.

2.1 Complement vs. Adjunct

The meaning of complementation is neither straightforward nor undisputed, and different grammarians see the matter differently. Huddleston and Pullum (2002), for instance, include the subject of a clause among the complements of the verb, along with the post-verbal structures. However, in this thesis I adopt the view used by Huang (1997), among others, and only treat the elements that follow the verb as its complements.¹

According to Huang (1997, 68-70), one way to classify lexical items is what he calls C-selection (Category-selection) or strict subcategorization. This refers to the types of complements that the lexical items select. Although the term C-selection can also be used in the analysis of word classes other than verbs, the discussion here is restricted to verbal complementation, as the complementation of other word classes falls outside of the scope of the thesis. To illustrate the meaning of C-selection, Huang provides the following examples (ibid., 68):

- (1) a. Anteaters resided in Southern California.
- b. *Anteaters resided Southern California.
- c. Anteaters inhabited Southern California.

¹ It is worth mentioning that this statement refers to unmarked constructions. In marked constructions, such as those involving extractions, the post-verbal elements may in fact precede the verb. However, these constructions are still analysed similarly to their unmarked counterparts in this thesis.

d. *Anteaters inhabited in Southern California.

Here we see that although the two verbs are similar in meaning, *reside* needs to be followed by a PP rather than an NP, whereas with *inhabit* the opposite is true. These examples show that only certain types of constructions can occur after specific verbs, or in other words, that different verbs C-select (or subcategorize for) different complements. In addition to NPs and PPs, the complements can also be sentential constructions, such as *that*-clauses or *to*-infinitives.

The post-verbal elements in the sentences in (1) are complements of the verb, but there are also other elements that can follow a verb, but which are not considered its complements, such as the bolded expressions in the following examples (from Huang 1997, 74-75):

- (2) John died **in Paris**.
- (3) John died **last year**.
- (4) John put a book on the table **with a loud noise**.
- (5) John knows that I like him **because it is obvious**.

These are all adjuncts, which are defined as “optional phrasal constituents” by Haegeman (1991, 32). They can be expressions of place (2), time (3), manner (4) or reason (5), for example. In order to differentiate between the two types of post-verbal elements, i.e. complements and adjuncts, it is useful to mention some more criteria.

Huang points out that only complements are used to subcategorize verbs (1997, 75). This means that only certain types of complements can occur with a particular verb, whereas adjuncts can usually be used with all types of verbs, in addition to their complements. Huddleston and Pullum use the term “licensing” for this distinction. They consider the most important feature that differentiates complements from adjuncts to be that complements “require the presence of an appropriate verb that licenses them” (2002, 219).

Huddleston and Pullum discuss licensing further with reference to the choice of preposition in a post-verbal PP. With complement PPs, it is not possible to change the preposition to another one without the sentence becoming ungrammatical or without causing “an unsystematic change in the meaning” (ibid., 220). For example in sentence *It depends on the cost* replacing the preposition *on*

with another one would make the sentence ungrammatical, and the meaning of the PP cannot be directly derived from the meaning of *on* itself.

Huang also notes another basic difference between the two elements, namely that complements “help complete the meaning of a sentence as required by a verb”, whereas adjuncts do not (1997, 75). This could be illustrated by the following pair of examples, modified from Huang, which also shows that the same structure can actually be both a complement and an adjunct in different situations:

- (6) John resides in Boston.
- (7) John saw Bill in Boston.

In (6) *in Boston* is a complement, because without it the sentence would be incomplete. In (7) however, the sentence would be complete even without the phrase *in Boston*, which here acts as an adjunct.

The same distinction is covered by Huddleston and Pullum in their discussion on obligatoriness (2002, 221), where they note that complements are sometimes obligatory, but adjuncts never are. Therefore, if a structure is obligatory, it is a complement. A larger problem arises with optional elements, which can be either complements or adjuncts. Consider the following examples (*ibid.*):

- (8) She perused the report.
- (9) She read the report.
- (10) She left because she was ill.

In (8) the NP *the report* is obligatory, but in both (9) and (10) the post-verbal elements are optional, since both *She read* and *She left* are grammatical alone. Yet, *the report* in (9) is a complement, whereas *because she was ill* in (10) is an adjunct. To explain the difference, Huddleston and Pullum take the view that if an element is an obligatory complement with some verbs, it is also a complement rather than an adjunct when it is optional, unless there is some other evidence to the contrary (*ibid.*). And as they see (8) and (9) as otherwise the same construction, except for the difference in obligatoriness, it is suitable to consider *the report* as a complement in both cases.

The final way of distinguishing between complements and adjuncts that I will introduce here, is the so called *do so*-test, which originates from a discussion by Lakoff and Ross (1966) on verb phrase constituency. *Do so* is an anaphoric expression which derives its meaning from an antecedent that it replaces. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 223) provide the following examples:

- (11) *Jill **keeps her car in the garage** but Pam does so in the road.
 (12) Jill **washes her car** in the garage but Pam does so in the road.

The antecedent of *does so* is bolded in each case. As seen here, the antecedent includes the verb and all its complements, but not the adjuncts that follow it. As Huddleston and Pullum point out, because *in the garage* is a complement of *keep* in (11), the interpretation of *does so* is *keeps her car in the garage*, and therefore it cannot combine with another similar complement, like *in the road*. In (12) *in the garage* is an adjunct, so it is not included in the antecedent of *does so*. The *do so*-test is not fool proof, however, because not all adjuncts can combine with *do so* either. But Huddleston and Pullum do note that if a dependent structure can combine with it, it is an adjunct (ibid.).

As the discussion in this section shows, it is not always easy to distinguish between complements and adjuncts. Some cases can admittedly be interpreted in different ways depending on the viewpoint, and in the analytical part of my thesis I will discuss any less clear instances that might be found in the data.

2.2 Arguments and Theta Theory

This section will provide a brief discussion on the argument structure and thematic structure of verbs. These notions will be important in understanding the concepts of control and NP movement, which will be introduced later.

2.2.1 Argument Structure

The notion of subcategorization was already mentioned above, and in this section the idea is discussed further in more general terms by briefly presenting the concept of argument structure. As Haegeman states it, arguments are “the participants minimally involved in the activity or state expressed by the predicate” (1991, 36). Therefore, the argument structure of a verb tells us the number of arguments that it needs to have. If we consider, for instance, the act of sneezing, it is clear that only one participant, the person who sneezes, is needed. In the act of imitating, on the other hand, two participants are needed: the one who imitates and the one who is the object of imitation.

The notion of complement is closely related to the notion of argument but there is an important difference. The subject of a verb is also considered to be one of its arguments but, in the view taken in this thesis, the subject is not included in the complements of the verb. It is important to point out that words other than verbs also have argument structures but, as was the case with complements above, we only need to discuss the argument structure of verbs for the scope of this thesis.

The argument structure of a verb has to be a part of the lexical information we have on the verb in our mental lexicon. When we know a word, we also know how many arguments it takes (Huang 1997, 64). As was discussed in Section 2.1, verbs can be categorized on the basis of the types of complements they take. Similarly, verbs can also be categorized based on the number of arguments they take. Of the examples used above, *sneeze* requires one argument and is therefore a one-place predicate, whereas *imitate*, which requires two arguments, is a two-place predicate.

Sometimes it is difficult to determine how many arguments a verb actually takes, as can be seen from the following pair of examples (Haegeman 1991, 38):

- (13) Hercule bought Jane a detective story.
- (14) Hercule bought a detective story.

The first sentence seems to show that the verb *buy* requires three arguments: the person who buys, the object being bought and the recipient of the object that is bought. In the second sentence, on the

other hand, the verb only has the first two arguments. However, the action described in (14) still undeniably involves a recipient as well, even though it is not explicitly stated. In this case, it can be interpreted that the recipient is Hercule himself. Therefore, we can assume that, in any case, the verb *buy* requires three arguments, but the third one can simply be omitted. In other words, it can have an implicit argument.

2.2.2 Theta Theory

Let us now turn our attention more clearly to the semantic relations between arguments and their predicates. In addition to having argument structures, predicates also have a thematic structure. This means that predicates assign thematic roles or theta roles to their arguments (Haegeman 1991, 41).

Even though the existence of theta roles and the importance of theta theory in general are widely accepted among linguists, there are many differing opinions on the number and type of theta roles distinguished (ibid.). For the purposes of this thesis it is not necessary to introduce all possible labels for these roles, but only a brief discussion on the most important and generally accepted labels should suffice. Consider the following:

(15) John gave Mary the present.

(16) Susan knew the answer

Following Haegeman's distinctions (1991, 41-42) the theta roles in (15) would be Agent (*John*), Benefactive or Beneficiary (*Mary*) and Theme (*the present*). In (16) *Susan* would be the Experiencer and *the answer* the Theme. In addition to these roles, a number of other theta roles, for instance Goal, Source, Location and Instrument, have been distinguished in literature.² These labels seem mostly straightforward, even though the boundaries between different roles are not always very clear. Especially the Theme role is not always agreed on. Some linguists use the terms Patient

² According to Carnie (2002, 169-170) labels such as Agent or Theme actually refer to thematic relations that bundle together to form a theta role, not to the theta role itself. Therefore, *John* in (15), for instance, has two thematic relations, Agent and Source, but it still has only one theta role. However, the common practice is to refer to the theta role by its most prominent thematic relation, a view which is also adopted here.

or Undergoer for the same role, and some even divide the role further and use both labels Theme and Patient for different roles. Similarly, the label Recipient is also sometimes used for the role of Benefactive, especially when the action involves a change in possession.

However, the exact way the roles are labelled is not important in regards to their use. What is important is that a predicate is associated with a certain number of theta roles, which are again a part of our lexical information on the predicate, and in order to have a grammatical sentence these roles must be assigned to the structurally realized arguments of the predicate (ibid., 44). If we take example (15) above, the predicate *give* requires three theta roles (Agent, Benefactive and Theme), each assigned to an argument. Were we to omit the NP *Mary*, the sentence would become ungrammatical, because the role of Benefactive would not be assigned. The sentence would also become ungrammatical if we were to add the NP *the book*, for instance: **John gave Mary the present the book*. This is because the role Theme cannot be assigned to more than one argument. The requirements seen from these examples can be summed up in the theta criterion below, as formulated by Haegeman (1991, 46):

- a. Each argument is assigned one and only one theta role.
- b. Each theta role is assigned to one and only one argument.

This criterion should prove to be helpful in the discussion on understood subjects in the following sections.

2.3 Control and NP-movement

In this section I will discuss the concepts of control and NP movement and their relation to the verb *advise*. I will firstly introduce the idea of understood subjects, which is closely related to these concepts, before discussing further what is meant by the notions of control and NP movement and considering the position of *advise* in relation to these two types of constructions.

2.3.1 Understood Subjects

As has been discussed above, the complements of a verb can be either sentential or non-sentential. Sentential complements can be divided further into finite and non-finite clauses. With regard to non-finite clause complements, i.e. infinitival clauses and *-ing* clauses, it is important to understand the notion of understood subjects. Compare the following examples:

(17) John promised that he would do the job.

(18) John promised to do the job.

In (17), which involves a finite complement clause, there is an explicit subject NP *he* which acts as the subject of the lower clause. The lower clause in (18), on the other hand, does not have an explicit subject, but we can still understand the subject of the matrix clause, namely *John*, to be the one who does the job. Therefore, we can assume that there is an implicit understood subject in the lower clause which is linked to the subject of the matrix clause.

Some evidence to support the claim that understood subjects exist is provided by the theta criterion introduced in the previous section. Consider the following:

(19) John wants to read the book.

Here the predicate *want* has two arguments which it assigns theta roles to: *John* has the role of Experiencer and the infinitival clause *to read the book* has the role of Theme. The other predicate, *read*, also requires two arguments. One of the arguments is the NP *the book*, to which it assigns the role Theme. *Read* also needs another argument to which to assign the role of Agent. Since the NP *John* was already assigned the theta role Experiencer by *want*, it cannot be an argument of *read*, as the theta criterion states that each argument can be assigned only one theta role. Therefore, an understood subject is needed to act as the first argument of the lower predicate.

2.3.2 Control and NP movement

As we now assume the existence of understood subjects, we can turn the discussion onto the two types of constructions that involve understood subjects in English. These types are illustrated in the following examples from Davies and Dubinsky (2004, 3):

- (20) Barnett seemed to understand the formula.
 (21) Barnett tried to understand the formula.

At first it would seem that the two sentences involve the same construction, the only difference being the matrix verb. However, the different matrix verbs also have a different relation to the subject NP *Barnett*. As Davies and Dubinsky (ibid.) point out, in (20) *Barnett* is semantically linked only to the embedded verb but not to the matrix verb, whereas in (21) it is linked to both. The difference is that sentence (20) involves NP-movement, more specifically Subject to Subject-Raising, and sentence (21) involves Subject Control.

Whether a construction involves control or NP Movement depends on the matrix verb, as seen in (20) and (21) above. In other words, both control and NP movement are lexically governed, meaning that the rules applied in both constructions only apply when a certain matrix verb is involved (ibid., 4). Therefore, we can classify verbs as being either control or NP movement verbs.

Let us first briefly consider the concept of NP movement, illustrated in (20). The verb *understand* requires two arguments, to which it assigns the roles of Experiencer and Theme. *Seem*, on the other hand, only requires one argument, Theme. As mentioned, in (20) the NP *Barnett* is semantically linked only to the lower verb. This is the case, because *Barnett* is actually an argument of *understand*, not of *seem*. In fact, in NP movement the higher subject, in this case the NP *Barnett*, originates from the lower clause, where it gets a theta role from the lower verb. The original frame, before NP movement, would in this case be:

- (20') [_{NP}]_{NP} seemed [_{S2} [Barnett to understand the formula]_{S2}]_{S1}

The first element here is an empty NP which is not assigned a theta role, and is not therefore an argument of either verb. The first and only argument of *seem* is the clause *Barnett to understand the formula*, and the two arguments required by *understand* are the NPs *Barnett* and *the formula*.

Contrary to the NP movement verb *seem*, the matrix verb *try* in (21), which involves control, requires two arguments. The role of Theme is assigned to *to understand the formula*, but *try* also assigns the role of Agent to the NP *Barnett*. This means that the lower verb *understand* needs an understood subject argument to which to assign the role of Experiencer, since *Barnett* has already been assigned a theta role. In control constructions this subject is commonly referred to as PRO. The reason why the NP *Barnett* in (21) is semantically connected to both the matrix and the lower verb is that it controls the reference of PRO. The frame for sentence (21) would therefore be:

(21') [Barnett_i tried [PRO_i to understand the formula]_{S2}]_{S1}

As mentioned above, sentence (21) is an example of Subject Control, but there is also another type of control construction, namely Object Control. Consider the following example (Davies and Dubinsky 2004, 3):

(22) Barnett persuaded the doctor to examine Tilman.

Here the matrix verb *persuade* assigns a theta role to the NP *Barnett*, similarly to (21), and it also assigns additional roles to the NP *the doctor* and to the infinitival clause *to examine Tilman*. Again, the lower verb *examine* requires an understood subject argument. The difference here is that the understood subject of the lower clause, PRO, is not controlled by the subject of the matrix clause *Barnett*, like it was in (21), but rather by the object of the matrix clause, *the doctor*. The frame for sentence (22) would therefore be:

(22') [Barnett persuaded [the doctor]_i [PRO_i to examine Tilman]_{S2}]_{S1}

2.3.3 *Advise* and Object Control

Let us now consider the position of *advise* in relation to NP movement and control:

(23) John advised Peter to leave.

Example (23) seems to be structurally similar to example (22), which leads us to conclude that *advise* is an object control verb. The object of the matrix clause, *Peter*, controls the understood subject PRO in the lower clause. Because of its status as an object control verb, we would not therefore expect *advise* to occur without the NP object in cases like (23), since then the understood subject of the lower clause would not have a controller. This expectation is known as Bach's generalization, which Rizzi (1986, 503) states as follows: "In object control structures the object NP must be structurally represented."

However, this does not always hold for *advise*, and violations of Bach's generalization are found. Rohdenburg (2006, 145-6) notes a change in the complements of manipulative verbs, like *advise*, as regards their control potential. He shows that *to*-infinitive, *-ing*-clause and *that*-clause complements can all occur with an unspecified object with *advise*:

- (24) a. She advised to do it in advance.
 b. She advised doing it in advance.
 c. She advised that it (should) be done in advance.

However, Rohdenburg argues that, in recent centuries, there has been a considerable change towards the preference for the *-ing*-clause complement, as in (24b), in cases like these, where there is no explicit object (*ibid.*). The *to*-infinitive clause, on the other hand, has become rare, and with many other similar verbs it has fallen out of use completely. The *that*-clause complement seen in (24c) continues to also be acceptable, which is not that surprising, however, considering that it does not involve object control, and cannot therefore violate Bach's generalization.

In the empirical part of the thesis I will examine whether Rohdenburg's claim holds true in my data. I will also study the violations of Bach's generalization more closely with authentic data from the British National Corpus, with the emphasis on the type of the omitted object.

2.4 Other Factors Bearing on Complementation

In this section I will introduce some further theories and principles that are important to the study of complementation. The factors presented here will be discussed in relation to *advise* in the analytical part of the thesis.

2.4.1 The Complexity Principle

The complexity principle, introduced by Rohdenburg (1996, 149), is meant to account for the distribution of different types of competing constructions, which differ in terms of their explicitness. Rohdenburg (*ibid.*, 151) formulates the principle as follows: “In case of more or less explicit grammatical options the more explicit one(s) will tend to be favoured in cognitively more complex environments”.

The application of the principle requires that we know, firstly, how to distinguish between more or less explicit constructions, and secondly, what is meant by a complex environment. As regards the first question, Rohdenburg notes that it is usually the bulkier construction that is the more explicit variant (*ibid.*, 152). So, for instance, a finite *that*-clause would be more explicit than a *to*-infinitive, and a *to*-infinitive would in turn be more explicit than a bare infinitive without the infinitival particle.

A complex environment can manifest itself in many ways, for example as passives, long object NPs or intervening adverbials. Another complexity factor that Rohdenburg (2006, 149) notes specifically in reference to verbs like *advise* is the involvement of *not*-negated complements.

Consider the following examples that he gives (negated from (24)):

- (25) a. She advised not to do it in advance.
 b. She advised not doing it in advance.
 c. She advised that it (should) not be done in advance.

As pointed out in Section 2.3.3, the *-ing*-clause complement has become the norm in cases where there is no explicit NP object. However, Rohdenberg argues that, even in these cases, *not*-negation as a complexity factor causes the most explicit variant, the finite complement of (25c), to be preferred over the other two constructions. Therefore, the rise in the use of the *-ing*-clause complement is delayed in cases like (25a-c), because it is the least explicit of the constructions.

2.4.2 The Horror Aequi Principle

The horror aequi principle refers to a universal or near-universal tendency to avoid using identical or similar grammatical structures adjacently (Rohdenberg 2003, 236). This means that, for instance, the *to*-infinitive structure tends to be avoided if the superordinate expression itself includes a *to*-infinitive. Rohdenberg notes two avoidance strategies that are preferred. Either the introduction of the second *to*-infinitive can be delayed, for instance by adverbial insertions, or another construction, such as an *-ing*-clause, can be chosen instead (*ibid.*).

2.4.3 Extractions

Extractions refer to “certain non-canonical sentence structures” (Vosberg 2003, 305) where a complement is extracted from its original position. The way extractions affect the choice of complement clauses is stated in the Extraction principle (*ibid.*, 308):

In the case of infinitival or gerundial complement options, the infinitive will tend to be favoured in environments where a complement of the subordinate clause is extracted... from its original position and crosses clause boundaries.

To put the matter in another way, it can be said that extractions are more likely to occur out of infinitival clauses than of gerundial clauses.

There are several types of extractions, such as relativization, topicalization or interrogation, each of which are illustrated below (modified from Huang 1997, 126-132):

(26) This is the story which I told you that you should hear ____.

(27) This book, I thought you told me that you don't like ____.

(28) Who do you suppose I should talk to ____?

In each of the examples there is a noticeable gap in the lower clause, marked here by underscores, resulting from the complement being extracted. It has been argued that these filler-gap dependencies cause these kinds of constructions to be more difficult to process (Vosberg 2003, 307). Therefore, extractions can also be seen as one factor to consider when investigating the effects of the complexity principle.

2.4.4 *To*-infinitive versus *-ing*-clause

The term Great Complement Shift has been introduced in the literature to refer to a variety of changes that have been happening in English complementation in recent centuries. Perhaps the most important of these changes is the emergence of the *-ing*-clause as a second type of non-finite complement alongside the infinitive. The *-ing*-clause complement has increasingly started to replace the *to*-infinitive in the complement position (Vosberg 2009, 212-3). This shift has affected many predicates which previously have only been used with the infinitival complement, so that they now occur either more frequently or even predominantly with *-ing*-clause complements. Therefore, it is of interest to investigate whether the rise of the *-ing*-clause can also be attested to in the complementation of *advise*.

It is important to note that while the *to*-infinitive and the *-ing*-clause are often interchangeable as complements, the choice between the two constructions is not simply a matter of the current stage of the predicate as regards the Great Complement Shift. Rather, it has been suggested that the two non-finite complement structures have obtained some semantic specialization which affects the choice of one over the other in any specific instance. This would indeed to be expected in light of the so-called Bolinger's principle, which states that "a difference in syntactic form always spells a difference in meaning" (Bolinger 1968, 127). Therefore, two constructions can never be perfectly interchangeable.

The possible semantic differences between the *-ing*-clause and the *to*-infinitive have received much attention in the literature, and it is perhaps not necessary to discuss them here exhaustively. However, a few of the more prominent distinctions might deserve to be mentioned. As Allerton points out, the semantic distinction between the two constructions relates to the fact that the *-ing*-clause is more nominal in nature than the more verbal *to*-infinitive (1988, 11). Therefore, the former has a closer connection to the simple NP complement and would then be expected to be more frequent with predicates allowing the NP as a complement. Another often suggested difference concerns the distinction between factuality and potentiality. Compare (Bolinger 1968, 123):

- (29) a. Can you remember to do that?
b. Can you remember doing that?

In (29a) the reference in the lower clause is to something potentially happening in the future, whereas in (b) the reference is to something actually done. In the case of *advise*, this would suggest that the *-ing*-clause complement might be preferred in cases where the advice was actually followed, but with the *to*-infinitive this implication would not be clear. Whether this type of a semantic difference does exist with *advise* will be studied in the second half of the thesis.

Also, considering the etymological roots of the *to* particle as a directional preposition, it has been suggested that the *to*-infinitive evokes the idea of movement, whether actualized or not, from the event of the main verb to that of the infinitive, as in the following (from Duffley 2000, 233):

- (30) I wanted to talk to Mary about it.
(31) I managed to talk to Mary about it.

Therefore, an implication of sequence and of futurity in relation to the main verb seems to be inherent in the *to*-infinitive. With the *-ing*-clause, on the other hand, there is no automatic temporal relation to the main verb, since the event of the lower clause can be before, after or simultaneous with the event of the main clause (ibid., 223). This would suggest that the *-ing*-clause could then have a more immediate temporal connection to the matrix clause than would be possible for a *to*-infinitive.

While the general rise of the *-ing*-clause complement and the various semantic factors have an impact on the choice between the two constructions, the effect of the syntactic factors discussed in the previous subsections has to be kept in mind as well. As shown already in Section 2.4.1 with reference to negation, the rise of the *-ing*-clause is delayed in environments where these other factors, such as the complexity principle, provide an additional influence. Therefore, the choice between the *-ing*-clause and the *to*-infinitive depends on a variety of both semantic and syntactic factors that affect the choice differently in each particular instance.

3 On Corpora

In this chapter I will briefly discuss the use of corpora in linguistic research and introduce the two corpora used in the thesis, namely the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts and the British National Corpus.

3.1 Corpus Linguistics

In recent decades the use of corpora has emerged from having a rather marginal role to becoming an essential part of linguistic research. Corpus linguistics has evolved into an active and respectable field of its own, and the use of corpora has also been widely adopted as an additional tool by researchers outside of corpus linguistics (Lindquist 2009, 10). Early on Leech recognized corpora as one of three main sources of data in linguistic research, alongside introspection and elicitation (1968, 88). As Svartvik points out, all these methods should be considered complementary to each other, since linguistic phenomena are far too complex to be described by only one of these means (1992, 8).

Among the advantages of corpora is that the data collected is more objective and verifiable than that obtained by introspective observation. Their large size and the variety of corpora available also make it possible to analyse language variation and frequencies of linguistic items in ways not available by the more traditional methods (*ibid.*, 8-9). Therefore, corpora provide an excellent resource for the current study, which focuses on changes in the language. Grammatical change, such as that involving complementation, does not happen instantly but rather through gradual shifts in the frequencies and statistical distributions of different variants. The best way to document these kinds of changes is by using a set of matching corpora for analysis (Mair 2002, 108-109).

Two major research approaches have been recognised for corpus linguistics. Studies in this field are usually considered either “corpus-based” or “corpus-driven”. The difference between these approaches is that corpus-based research aims to study the variation and use of linguistic features

already defined in linguistic theory, whereas corpus-driven studies make “minimal a priori assumptions” about the linguistic features and categories used in the analysis (Biber 2010, 162). In this thesis we assume the existence of linguistic concepts like “phrase” and “clause” and use them in our analysis, instead of deriving the categories from the corpus analysis itself. Therefore, this thesis is corpus-based, rather than corpus-driven, in its approach to corpus research.

When using data from more than one corpus or sub-corpus, it is important to remember that frequency counts from different corpora are not directly comparable, since the size of the corpus must always be taken into consideration. An item that occurs 50 times in two different corpora, one consisting of a million words and the other of ten million words, does not have the same frequency in both corpora. Therefore, frequencies must be normalized for the results to be comparable. The usual method for normalizing (see e.g. Biber et al. 1998) is to divide the raw frequency count by the number of words in the corpus or sub-corpus used, and then to multiply the resulting figure by the number chosen as the basis for normalizing, e.g. a million, as used in this thesis.

3.2 The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts

The corpus that I will be using for the first three periods studied in this thesis is the extended version of the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (henceforth referred to as the CLMET). The corpus is compiled by Hendrik De Smet and the extended version consists of nearly 15 million words. The texts in the CLMET have been drawn from the *Project Gutenberg* and the *Oxford Text Archive* and range from 1710 to 1920 (De Smet 2005, 69-70). The corpus is further divided into three parts, each consisting of a sub-period of 70 years (ibid., 70). The size of each part is shown in Table 3.1³ below. For this thesis I have included data from the whole corpus and analysed the data from each part separately.

³ Modified from <https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/clmetev.htm>

Table 3.1. The make-up of the extended version of the CLMET.

Sub-period	Number of words
1710–1780	3,037,607
1780–1850	5,723,988
1850–1920	6,251,564
Total	14,970,622

De Smet has based his collection of texts on four principles (*ibid.*, 70-72). Firstly, all the authors in each sub-period are born within the same time-span in order to increase the homogeneity of each section, and to decrease the homogeneity between different sub-sections. Secondly, the corpus only includes texts from British native speakers of English, so that dialectal variation can be reduced. Thirdly, a large variety of authors is used, and a limit of 200,000 words has been set for each author. This should help avoid the “thwarting of the data by the idiosyncrasies of individual authors” (*ibid.*, 71). The fourth principle results from the fact that the two sources for the corpus mainly include literary, formal texts, written by high-class male authors. In order to avoid this bias in the corpus, De Smet has deliberately favoured non-literary texts from lower registers and by lower-class authors when collecting the data, and he has also tried to choose as many women writers as possible. Despite these efforts, De Smet notes that “the corpus continues to be biased to literary texts written by higher class male adults” (*ibid.*, 72).

Because of the aforementioned sociolinguistic bias, the CLMET is not ideal for sociolinguistic research. In addition, the exact bibliographical information of the texts is often unclear, meaning that one cannot be sure which editions or versions of the texts are used, or whether some editorial changes have been made to the original texts, which is why the corpus is not suitable for studying phenomena such as spelling or punctuation (*ibid.*, 79). De Smet also notes that the corpus might be too small for lexicographic studies, but considers it to be useful for studying “relatively infrequent syntactic patterns, or borderline phenomena between grammar and the lexicon” (*ibid.*, 78). De Smet even mentions that the CLMET has actually been used in the study of verbal complementation in

English (ibid., 80), which is also the aim of this thesis. Therefore, the CLMET should prove to be a useful resource for this study.

3.3 The British National Corpus

The second corpus used in the empirical part of the thesis is the British National Corpus (henceforth the BNC). It will provide the data for the study of present-day English to complete the diachronic analysis of *advise*. In addition, a separate analysis focusing on the omission of the NP object will be performed using data from the BNC.

The BNC is a British English corpus consisting of just under 100 million words and including both spoken and written texts. The texts in the corpus range from 1960 to 1993. Due to its large size and wide range of text types and genres the BNC is an extremely useful resource for corpus linguistics. One of the advantages of the corpus is that queries can be restricted with several different factors, such as publication date, genre, or age or gender of the author. Therefore, it is possible to obtain a set of data that best suits the requirements of one's own project. The data for the diachronic part of this thesis is drawn from the written part of the corpus, which consists of about 88 million words. More specifically, the search was limited to the text domain of "imaginative prose", in order to make the data as similar to the CLMET as possible, for ease of comparison. In addition, the diachronic data was restricted to the years 1985-1993. However, the data for the separate analysis of the NP object is drawn from the whole written part of the BNC.

4 *Advise* in Previous Literature

This chapter will centre on the treatment of the verb *advise* in some selected dictionaries and grammars of English. Unless noted otherwise, I will be using the labels used by the dictionary or grammar under discussion in each section.

4.1 The *Oxford English Dictionary*

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (henceforth referred to as the *OED*), the English verb *advise* originates from the Anglo-Norman and Old French word *avisier*, which in the 11th and 12th centuries had the meaning ‘to recognize, look at, examine’ (*OED* s.v. *advise*, v.). Later, in the 13th century, the verb started to be used with the meanings ‘to inform’, ‘to consider’ and ‘to give counsel’. The *OED* also notes the post-classical Latin form *advisare*, with the meaning ‘to inform, recommend’.

The *OED* (*ibid.*) lists 7 different senses for *advise*, most of which have additional subsenses. However, not all of the senses listed are relevant for our discussion, since this thesis only deals with English from the 18th century onwards. The earliest texts included in the corpora studied are from 1710, and therefore it is not necessary to take into account those senses of *advise* that were no longer in use at that time. The first of these relates to vision, similarly to the early meanings of *avisier* mentioned above, and the latest examples of this sense are from the 17th century. Similarly, senses 4, ‘to find, discover’, and 6, ‘to contrive, to plan’, are labelled as obsolete and have no examples after the 17th century. In addition, some of the subsenses for other meanings have no longer been in use within the last few centuries. The remaining four senses have been included in the following table (Table 4.1), with examples of all the patterns that are included within the quotations provided for each sense or subsense. The labelling of the patterns is my own.

Table 4.1. *Advise* in the *OED*.

Sense (<i>OED</i>)	Example (<i>OED</i>)	Complementation pattern
<p>2a. (a) <i>trans. (refl.)</i>. To deliberate, reflect, consider, take thought. Freq. with subordinate clause; also with <i>of, on, upon</i>, or infinitive. Now <i>rare (arch. in later use)</i></p> <p>(c) <i>intr.</i> in same sense. Also (in later use only) <i>to advise with oneself</i>. Now <i>rare</i>.</p>	<p>1819 Scott <i>Ivanhoe</i>: ‘Advise thee well, Isaac,’ said Locksley, ‘what thou wilt do in this matter.’</p> <p>1906 E. G. Hardy <i>Stud. Rom. Hist.</i>: I will give thee one day's respite that thou mayest consider thine interest and advise thyself concerning thy life.</p> <p>1826 <i>German Novelists</i>: He began to advise with himself, what was best to be done.</p> <p>1891 <i>Belgravia</i>: Once there, he would have time to advise with himself, to review the whole burning question.</p>	<p>[__ NP_{REF} <i>wh</i>-clause]</p> <p>[__ NP_{REF} <i>concerning</i> NP]</p> <p>[__ <i>with</i> NP_{REF} <i>wh</i>-clause]</p> <p>[__ <i>with</i> NP_{REF}]</p>
<p>c. <i>trans. Sc. Law</i>. To give judicial consideration to (a case, petition, etc.); (later <i>esp.</i>) to reserve for further consideration; to review, reconsider, revise.</p>	<p>1863 <i>Scotsman</i>: Some time ago the case was again heard before both Divisions, and to-day it was advised.</p>	<p>[__ NP]</p>
<p>3. <i>intr.</i> To deliberate in company <i>with</i> another person regarding a particular matter; to take counsel or confer <i>with</i>. Also: (of a group of people) to take counsel or confer together, to make joint deliberation (now only in <i>to advise among themselves</i>).</p>	<p>1722 <i>Minutes Provinc. Council Pennsylvania</i>: He had called them together at this time Chiefly to advice with them on that Head.</p> <p>1870 C. M. Yonge <i>Cameos</i>: Edward..merely told them that he must advise with his Council.</p> <p>1949 F. E. Manuel <i>Realities Amer.-Palestine Relations</i>: The Zionists in America in the meantime had advised among themselves and the result of their deliberations was [etc.].</p>	<p>[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>on</i> NP]</p> <p>[__ <i>with</i> NP]</p> <p>[__ <i>among</i> NP_{REF}]</p>
<p>5. a. <i>trans.</i> To give guidance or suggestions, or state one's opinion, to (a person, etc.) as to the best course of action; to counsel, make recommendations to; (also more generally) to give one's assessment of something to (a person), usually as a basis for making a decision.</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p>1993 M. Atwood <i>Robber Bride</i>: She..reads the items [on the menu], and asks Mitch to advise her, as if she can't make up her own mind what to put into her mouth.</p> <p>2008 <i>Metro</i>: Nurses are to visit fat</p>	<p>[__ NP]</p>

<p>(a) Simply. Sometimes used parenthetically to introduce or accompany the recommendation being made.</p> <p>(b) With infinitive or <i>that</i>-clause indicating the recommended action.</p> <p>(c) With <i>against</i> (formerly <i>from</i>), followed by a deprecated course of action. Similarly (now less commonly) with <i>to</i> followed by a recommended course of action.</p> <p>(d) With interrogative clause.</p>	<p>children in their homes to advise them on losing weight.</p> <p>(b) 1860 J. Tyndall <i>Glaciers of Alps</i>: My host advised me to avail myself of the promising weather.</p> <p>1770 J. Cook <i>Voy. & Trav. Russ. Empire</i>: He advised them that they should disclose their apprehensions to none.</p> <p>(c) 1817 J. Austen <i>Persuasion</i>: She...ran up the steps to be jumped down again. He advised her against it.</p> <p>2009 <i>Church Times</i>: The parish was advised against attempting to repair the bell-frame</p> <p>1811 <i>Cobbett's Weekly Polit. Reg.:</i> He applied to Counsel, on the subject of bringing an action against Lord Castlereagh, who advised him from the measure.</p> <p>1781 Johnson <i>Pope</i>: Walsh advised him to correctness.</p> <p>(d) 1909 G. Stein <i>Three Lives</i>: She listened and decided, and advised all of her relations how to do things better.</p>	<p>[__ NP <i>on -ing</i>-clause]</p> <p>[__ NP <i>to</i>-infinitive]</p> <p>[__NP <i>that</i>-clause]</p> <p>[__ NP <i>against</i> NP]</p> <p>[__ NP <i>against -ing</i>-clause]</p> <p>[__ NP <i>from</i> NP]</p> <p>[__ NP <i>to</i> NP]</p> <p>[__ NP <i>wh</i>-clause]</p>
<p>b. <i>trans.</i> To state or propose (something) as being in one's own opinion the best course of action, mode of conduct, etc.; to recommend, advocate.</p> <p>(a) With infinitive or (in later use more commonly) <i>that</i>-clause as object.</p> <p>(b) With interrogative clause as object.</p>	<p>(a) 1866 <i>Rural. Amer.:</i> The very best winter squash grown, and the only one we would advise to cultivate.</p> <p>1901 <i>Boston Med. & Surg. Jrnl.:</i> We advised that he have an x-ray.</p> <p>(b) 1855 <i>Mining Mag.:</i> For the due and useful performance of this duty, so as to do and advise what is right and</p>	<p>[__ <i>to</i>-infinitive]</p> <p>[__ <i>that</i>-clause]</p> <p>[__ <i>wh</i>-clause]</p>

<p>(c) With simple object, denoting a course of action; later also with other simple objects, the action being understood (such as the carrying out of a specified plan, the administration of a specified drug or treatment, etc.).</p>	<p>avoid doing or advising what is wrong, technical knowledge is indispensable.</p> <p>(c) 1864 J. C. Jeaffreson <i>Life R. Stephenson</i>: [He] advised a route along the south of the Commercial Road.</p>	<p>[__ NP]</p>
<p>c. <i>intr.</i> To give advice or counsel.</p>	<p>1853 Dickens <i>Bleak House</i>: You know me. It's my old girl that advises. She has the head.</p> <p>1767 <i>Gentleman's Mag.</i>: Gentlemen, who thought themselves equal to advise about the government of the nation.</p> <p>2007 P. J. Corfield <i>Time & Shape of Hist.</i>: He has encouraged, doubted and advised upon appropriate changes to the text.</p>	<p>[__Ø]</p> <p>[__ <i>about</i> NP]</p> <p>[__ <i>upon</i> NP]</p>
<p>7. <i>trans.</i> a. To intimate or give notice to (a person); to inform, notify, apprise, tell. Freq. with <i>of</i>, or subordinate clause (often preceded by <i>that</i>).</p>	<p>1855 W. H. Prescott <i>Hist. Reign Philip II</i>: He advised the constable of this at once.</p> <p>1879 <i>Globe</i>: [He] advised the inspector that Gaydon had committed a murder.</p>	<p>[__ NP <i>of</i> NP]</p> <p>[__NP <i>that</i>-clause]</p>
<p>b. To give news, notification, or notice of (an event, commercial transaction, etc.); to inform of; to announce.</p>	<p>1880 <i>Echo</i>: The manager..advises the landing of the first Palestine party.</p>	<p>[__ NP]</p>
<p>c. With clause (esp. <i>that</i>-clause) as object: to report, state, note.</p>	<p>2005 J. W. White <i>Bestest</i>: Laura..sent him a typed letter, advising that her classes were going well.</p> <p>1902 <i>Philistine</i>: He did not advise when he would come or how.</p>	<p>[__ <i>that</i>-clause]</p> <p>[__ <i>wh</i>-clause]</p>
<p>d. With direct speech as object: to inform, tell, instruct.</p>	<p>1881 J. H. Riddel <i>Senior Partner</i>: 'Pay the levy and get rid of the man,' advised Mr. Alty cheerfully.</p> <p>1953 K. Tennant <i>Joyful Condemned</i>: 'Siddown,' he advised Jake Fletcher, who took the straight-backed chair.</p>	<p>[__ quote]</p> <p>[__ NP quote]</p>

As can be seen from the table, the definitions for most of the senses include some possible complementation patterns that are used with that particular sense or subsense. Sense 2a is said to usually include a reflexive noun phrase as a part of the complement, which can be a subordinate clause, infinitive or a prepositional phrase headed by *of*, *on* or *upon*. I would also consider their example with *concerning* as a PP, as the word is used here as a preposition, even though it is not listed in the actual definition. Sense 2a can also occur intransitively with a PP headed by *with*. No patterns are listed in the definition for sense 2c, but the verb is said to be transitive in this case, and, in fact, all the examples involve a direct object NP as the complement. For sense 3 the PP headed by *with* is mentioned as the only possible complement, although an example with *among* was also included.

With sense 5 *advise* can be used either intransitively or transitively with the infinitive, *that*-clause and interrogative clause listed as possible sentential complements. *Ing*-clauses are not mentioned in the definition but they do occur in the quotations provided. In addition, a simple (NP) object and a PP headed by *against*, *from* or *to* are also listed for sense 5. It is worth pointing out that with subsense 5b the *that*-clause is said to be the more common alternative in comparison to the infinitive, but no such claims pertaining to the frequencies of these patterns are made with subsense 5a. The main difference between 5a and 5b seems to be that 5a includes someone who the suggestion or recommendation is given to, which is not the case with 5b, as can be seen from the examples accompanying the senses: examples for 5a involve an indirect object NP but those for 5b do not. This suggests, therefore, that we might expect to find the *that*-clause complement more frequently without the indirect object complement than the *to*-infinitive in the data, which would be in concordance with Bach's generalization. Finally, sense 7 is mentioned as being frequent with a PP headed by *of*, or having a clause, especially a *that*-clause, as an object. *Advise* can also be used with a direct speech complement in this sense.

Some of the labels used in the *OED* are quite general, as they do not include the types of complements for the prepositional phrase complements, for instance. Therefore, to illustrate the full range of possible complement structures of *advise* that are found in the *OED*, I have compiled the following list of patterns in (1). It includes both the patterns found in the quotations provided and those which seem to be considered possible even though they are not illustrated. Again, the labels are my own. The parentheses indicate that the pattern is possible both with and without the NP element⁴.

- (1) (a) [__ Ø] (b) [__ NP] (c) [__ (NP) *to*-infinitive]
 (d) [__ (NP) *that*-clause] (e) [__ (NP) *wh*-clause] (f) [__ (NP) quote]
 (g) [__ *with* NP *on* NP] (h) [__ *with* NP] (i) [__ *with* NP *wh*-clause]
 (j) [__ *about* NP] (k) [__ NP *against* NP] (l) [__ NP *against* -*ing*-clause]
 (m) [__ (NP) *on/upon* NP] (n) [__ NP *on* -*ing*-clause] (o) [__ NP *concerning* NP]
 (p) [__ *among* NP] (q) [__ NP *to* NP] (r) [__ NP *of* NP]
 (s) [__ NP *from* NP]

Along with the seven senses, the *OED* entry for *advise* also includes two specific phrases where the verb can frequently be found. The first phrase listed is *be advised*, in the imperative mood, with the meaning ‘heed this advice’, ‘be warned’ or ‘be aware’, as exemplified in the following:

- (2) Be advised that your sly references to my sneaky serves and odious gamesmanship haven't escaped me. (1951, S.J. Perelman, *Don't tread on Me*)

Here the verb is passivised, and even though there is no explicit subject for *be advised*, I would still consider the complementation pattern in this case to be [__ NP *that*-clause]. This use is not labelled as being restricted in any way and it will be interesting to see whether it occurs in the data studied in the second part of the thesis. The second phrase *to advise and consent*, meaning ‘(of a legislative body) to give advice and consent to a law, decision, etc.’, is labelled “chiefly U.S.” and its use seems to be restricted mainly to the field of legislation. Therefore, it is not very likely to occur in the data studied in this thesis.

⁴ The label NP_{REF} used in Table 4.1 is here included into the label NP.

4.2 The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*

The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (*OALD*) recognises the following three senses for *advise* (*OALD* s.v.). In Table 4.2 I have included an example of each sense along with all the patterns that are listed for the sense. The labelling of the patterns used in the *OALD* has been changed to conform to the rest of the thesis.

Table 4.2. *Advise* in the *OALD*.

Sense	Patterns
[1] 'to tell sb what you think they should do in a particular situation': I would strongly advise against going out on your own.	[__Ø], [__ NP], [__ NP <i>to</i> -infinitive], [__ (NP) <i>that</i> -clause], [__ <i>-ing</i> -clause], [__ (NP) quote], [__ (NP) <i>against</i> NP/ <i>-ing</i> -clause]
[2] 'to give sb help and information on a subject that you know a lot about': She advises the government on environmental issues.	[__Ø], [__ NP], [__ (NP) <i>wh</i> -clause], [__ (NP) <i>on</i> NP], [__ (NP) <i>about</i> NP/ <i>-ing</i> -clause]
[3] '(formal) to officially tell sb sth': Please advise us of any changes in your personal details.	[__ NP], [__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause], [__ NP <i>that</i> -clause], [__ NP <i>of</i> NP]

The parentheses indicate that the NP in question is optional in their view. It is interesting to note that even though the initial object NP is listed as optional for most of patterns with senses [1] and [2], it seems to be required with sense [3].

Sense [3] corresponds fairly well with sense 7 in the *OED*, "To intimate or give notice to (a person); to inform, notify, apprise, tell". Both senses [1] and [2] seem to be included in the *OED*'s sense 5. The difference between [1] and [2] seems to be that [2] includes the idea of the adviser being some kind of an expert on the subject, but this is not required in sense [1]. However, the *OED* does not have a similar distinction within sense 5. The *OALD* does not seem to have corresponding senses for the *OED*'s senses 2a, 'to deliberate, reflect, consider, take thought', 2c, 'to review, reconsider, revise', or 3, 'to take counsel or confer *with*'.

Most of the patterns in the *OALD* were also found in the *OED*. The two dictionaries differ in whether they consider the object NP to be needed or even possible preceding *about* or *against*.

More importantly, the *OALD* includes the [__ -ing-clause] complement as a possible pattern for *advise*. This pattern was not found alone in the *OED*, where it only occurred together with prepositions. In addition, the two dictionaries differ in regard to their treatment of the direct speech complement. In the *OED* this pattern was only listed for the ‘inform’ sense (sense 7), but not for the ‘recommend’ sense (sense 5). In the *OALD*, however, the situation is the opposite.

4.3 Collins *COBUILD Advanced Dictionary*

COBUILD lists three different senses for *advise* (*COBUILD* s.v.), which are included in Table 4.3 below, along with the possible patterns provided for each sense. The labelling of the patterns is again modified for conformity with the rest of the thesis.

Table 4.3. *Advise* in *COBUILD*.

Sense	Patterns
[1] ‘If you advise someone to do something, you tell them what you think they should do.’: The minister advised him to leave as soon as possible.	[__ NP <i>to</i> -infinitive], [__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause], [__ <i>against</i> *], [__ <i>that</i> -clause], [__ quote]
[2] ‘If an expert advises people on a particular subject, he or she gives them help and information on that subject’: A family doctor will be able to advise on suitable birth control.	[__ (NP) <i>on</i> *]
[3] ‘If you advise someone of a fact or a situation, you tell them the fact or explain what the situation is.’ <i>formal</i> : I think it best that I advise you of my decision to retire.	[__ NP <i>of</i> *]

The asterisks indicate that the dictionary did not specify the element following the prepositions in their labelling, but only NP complements can be found in the examples provided. As seen from the table, the three senses are basically identical with the three senses in the *OALD*. The third sense is even labelled “formal” in both dictionaries. As did the *OALD*, *COBUILD* also makes the distinction of sense 2 involving an expert as the adviser. The complementation patterns that the two dictionaries mention are not entirely the same, however. In general, *COBUILD* lists considerably

fewer possible patterns for the verb, and all the patterns found in *COBUILD* are mentioned in the *OALD* as well.

4.4 Senses

To summarize, the *OED* mentions four relevant senses for *advise*, and both the *OALD* and *COBUILD* list three senses, which are basically the same in both dictionaries. The *OED*'s sense 7, 'to inform', corresponds to the third sense of each of the other two dictionaries, and the *OED*'s sense 5, 'to give guidance or suggestions; to recommend', corresponds to both first and second senses of the *OALD* and *COBUILD*. The *OED*'s senses 2 and 3 were not found in the other dictionaries. For the purposes of this thesis it might be best to combine these two senses together to form the sense 'to deliberate or reflect', since the only difference between them seems to be whether the deliberating is done in a group or by yourself. Sense 2 is also mentioned as being rare and includes the fairly restricted judicial subsense of 'to review or reconsider', which is why it might not need to be considered separately.

With all the dictionary entries in mind, I decided to use the following three simplified senses in my own analysis of *advise*. The first two senses correspond to the *OED*'s senses 5 and 7 respectively, and the third one is the combined sense mentioned above.

1. 'to recommend or give guidance'
2. 'to inform or notify'
3. 'to deliberate or confer (with)'

4.5 Grammars

Biber et al. argue that speech act verbs make one semantic category of verbs that take a *that*-clause as a complement (1999, 661). They include *advise* in this category and note that it can occur either with only a *that*-clause or with an NP *that*-clause pattern (ibid., 664). These patterns were also found in the dictionaries. Biber et al. also point out that some of the simple verbs that can take a

that-clause complement can also be used as prepositional verbs and take noun-headed phrases as complements. With *advise* this would mean the pattern NP *of/about* NP (ibid., 662). The first option with *of* was listed in all the dictionaries, but the pattern with a PP headed by *about* with a preceding NP was only found in the *OALD*.

In addition to *that*-clauses, Biber et al. note that speech act verbs like *advise* can also take *to*-clauses⁵ as complements (ibid., 693). In particular, the pattern NP *to*-clause is mentioned as occurring with *advise*, as is the corresponding passive *be advised to*-clause, where the object NP becomes the subject of the main clause (ibid., 700). In my analysis, however, I will consider the passives as having the same pattern as the corresponding active, since it is often argued that corresponding active and passive sentences are both derived from the same underlying structure (see e.g. Perlmutter and Soames 1979). The pattern NP *to*-clause is actually the only possible complement pattern involving infinitive clauses for *advise*, according to Biber et al. (1999, 700). The verb is not listed as taking the pattern with only the *to*-clause, without a preceding object NP, which is a possible pattern in the *OED*. In addition, patterns involving a bare infinitive clause do not occur with *advise* in their view.

Biber et al. also introduce three different types for the complementation pattern NP *to*-clause, which differ in their semantic and structural relations (ibid., 695-697). These types can be seen in the following examples (3)-(5), also from Biber et al.:

- (3) I told grandma to make me and Tim some more.
- (4) Rechem believes the results to be unscientific.
- (5) Ollie has promised Billy to take him fishing next Sunday.

Example (3) involves object control, as the understood subject of the *to*-infinitive clause is controlled by the object of the matrix clause, *grandma*. Example (4), on the other hand, involves NP movement, since the NP *the results* is simply raised to the object position in the higher clause, but it is not actually an object of *believe*, only the subject of the lower predicate. In (5) it is the subject of

⁵ Biber et al. use the term *to*-clause for what is elsewhere in this thesis referred to as the *to*-infinitive.

the main clause, *Ollie*, that controls the understood subject of the *to*-infinitive, and the NP *Billy* functions only as the object of *promise*, meaning that the example involves subject control. *Advise* is not directly mentioned as being used with any particular type, but Biber et al. note that speech act verbs, like *advise*, often occur with the first type (ibid., 696). This is in concordance with the discussion on Section 2.3.3, where it was concluded that *advise* is an object control verb.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 303) consider *advise* to be basically a transitive verb, but note that it can sometimes appear in an intransitive construction as well. They argue that when used intransitively, *advise* can often still be interpreted as having an unexpressed human object. They provide a pair of examples:

- (6) I'd advise you against buying it.
- (7) I advise against buying it.

In (6) there is an expressed human object *you*, referring to the person being advised. In (7) there is no expressed object, but we can still interpret that the verb has *you* as an unexpressed object. Notice that cases like (7) violate Bach's generalization (see Section 2.3.3 above), since the controller of PRO is omitted. It is also worth noting that the example involves an *-ing*-clause complement, which Rohdenburg (2006) mentions as the likeliest construction to occur with an unexpressed object, as stated in Section 2.3.3. This issue is discussed further in the empirical part of the thesis where violations to Bach's generalization are studied on the basis of corpus data.

Huddleston and Pullum also list *advise* among verbs that are used to report direct speech (2002, 1027). This is consistent with the pattern [___ (NP) quote] found in the dictionaries. In addition, they mention that reporting verbs like *advise* can also take content clauses as complements to report indirect speech (ibid., 1028). This leads to a question of whether sentential complements like *to*-infinitives and *that*-clauses are always used specifically to paraphrase quotations when complementing *advise*, or are they used with some other functions as well. I will try to answer this question in my analysis of the corpus data.

Quirk et al. (1985, 1212-5) note *that*-clauses, *to*-infinitives and *wh*-clauses all as possible complements for *advise*, but they point out that each clause type is used to introduce different things. The *that*-clause complement is said to have two possible types with ditransitive verbs, depending on whether the verb introduces an indirect statement (8) or an indirect directive (9) (ibid., 1212):

- (8) May I inform you that your order is ready for collection?
- (9) She petitioned the king that her father might be/should be/be pardoned.

The difference is that with the first type the lower verb is in the indicative, but with the second type the lower verb can also be in the subjunctive. The second type can also contain a putative *should* or other modal in the lower clause. *Advise* is listed as only taking the first type of *that*-clause complement, which contains an indirect statement. With indirect directives a *to*-infinitive is used instead (ibid., 1215):

- (10) I advised Mark to see a doctor.

Interestingly, Rohdenburg does not seem to agree with this view, since one of his illustrations with *advise*, example (24c) in Section 2.3.3, involves a *that*-clause with an indirect directive. Therefore it is interesting to see if any examples of the directive type are found with the *that*-clause in my data or if this type really is restricted only to the *to*-infinitive pattern in actual use.

The third possible type of complement clause, the *wh*-clause, is then used to introduce indirect questions, according to Quirk et al. (ibid., 1214-5). In their view *wh*-clause complements occur mostly with an infinitive with *advise*, as in (11) below, although a finite *wh*-clause is also possible, especially in non-assertive contexts.

- (11) They advised him what to wear in the tropics.

In addition, Quirk et al. mention that the complex preposition *as to* can be used for introducing *wh*-clause complements, and they provide examples of this with *advise*, both with a finite and an infinitival *wh*-clause complement (ibid., 1215):

- (12) They advised us as to where the documents might be found.

(13) Helen advised us as to how to maintain the machine.

In his old but still very useful grammar of Late Modern English, Poutsma (1904, 614-5) distinguishes another pattern for *advise*, namely the *-ing*-clause. He considers the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern to be the normal construction for the verb, but according to him, the gerund seems to be the only possibility when the personal object is understood, and not explicit:

(14) When Tremaine comes, his brother will advise postponing his marriage till he is in better health.

This remark is very interesting in that it shows that the change observed by Rohdenburg (see Section 2.3.3), namely that the *-ing*-clause has become the preferred option when the NP object is unexpressed, was already noticeable in the early 20th century.

Poutsma also notes the Poss *-ing*-clause pattern for *advise* (ibid., 711):

(15) I should advise your giving Sybil her head in this matter

In his view, the difference between this pattern and the *to*-infinitive pattern is that with the Poss *-ing* pattern “the person indicated by the genitive or possessive pronoun, is not represented as the recipient of any advice” (ibid., 712), as is the case with the NP object preceding the infinitive. However, it seems questionable whether this is always the case, since even in the quoted example (15) above, the likeliest interpretation would seem to be that the recipient of the advice is the same *you* as the one indicated by the possessive.

5 *Advise* in the CLMET: 1710-1780

In the following three chapters I will be analysing data obtained from the extended version of the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts. The present chapter focuses on data from the first subsection of the corpus, which covers texts from 1710 to 1780. A search was performed for all four verb forms of *advise*. Altogether, the search yielded 227 tokens: 127 occurrences of *advise*, 73 of *advised*, 21 of *advising* and 6 of *advises*. All tokens proved to be relevant verbal uses of the word, so no tokens needed to be omitted from the analysis.

In Table 5.1 below, I have included all the complementation patterns found in the data, along with their distribution and normalized frequencies (per million words). I will first present an overview of the findings and then discuss some of the individual patterns found in more detail, focusing first on the sentential complements and then on the non-sentential complements. In the analysis I will also discuss the patterns in relation to the different senses of *advise*, listed in Section 4.4.

Table 5.1 Complementation patterns of *advise* in the first part of the CLMET.

Pattern	Number of tokens					% of all tokens	Normalized frequencies (NF)
	<i>advise</i>	<i>advised</i>	<i>advising</i>	<i>advises</i>	Total		
[__ NP <i>to</i> -infinitive]	77	53	12	4	146	64.3	48.1
[__ NP]	22	9	4	2	37	16.3	12.2
[__ Ø]	8	0	2	0	10	4.4	3.3
[__ <i>with</i> NP]	5	2	0	0	7	3.1	2.3
[__ NP <i>to</i> NP]	3	1	1	0	5	2.2	1.6
[__ <i>that</i> -clause]	2	3	0	0	5	2.2	1.6
[__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	1	0	1	0	2	0.9	0.7
[__ NP quote]	1	1	0	0	2	0.9	0.7
[__ <i>wh</i> -clause]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ NP <i>against</i> NP]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ NP <i>against -ing</i> -clause]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ <i>to</i> NP]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ quote]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ NP bare infinitive]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ NP <i>that</i> -clause]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3

[__ NP <i>about</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ <i>on</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ NP <i>on</i> NP]	0	0	1	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>on</i> NP]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>on</i> - <i>ing</i> - clause]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.3
Total	127	73	21	6	227	100	74.7

As many as 21 different patterns were found in the data, but only two of them, [__ NP *to*-infinitive] and [__ NP] had more than 10 occurrences. These two forms account for over 80 per cent of all tokens, and especially the *to*-infinitive is extremely frequent, occurring nearly 65 per cent of the time with *advise*.

Another interesting point to note is the fact that only 29 of the tokens, i.e. 12.8 per cent, did not have an object NP as a part of the complementation structure. Furthermore, there are some pairs of patterns which are otherwise the same, but one includes the initial object NP, and with most of these, the pattern with the object NP was more frequent. For instance, the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive] occurred 146 times, but the pattern [__ *to*-infinitive] without the object NP was not found in the data at all. A notable exception to this tendency is the *that*-clause, which occurred five times without the initial NP and only once with it.

The data included seven cases like the following, where *advise* occurred in coordination with other verbs and was therefore not adjacent to its complements:

- (1) ...they both sat up with him all night, advising, persuading, and exhorting him to do justice. (Reeve, *The Old English Baron*, 1777)

In cases like these *advise* was generally analysed as having the complements that come after the coordinated verbs. In (1), for instance, *advising* was analysed as having the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive], with *him to do justice* being the complements. In one instance, however, this view had to be adjusted:

- (2) ...the blame or praise of all the measures must be transferred from him to the council, and

every man that has advised or concurred in them, will deserve the same censure or the same applause; (Johnson, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1740-1)

None of the dictionaries consulted in Chapter 4 included [__ *in* NP] as a possible complement for *advise*, but all of them do include it for *concur*. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider that the preposition is licensed specifically by *concur*, making the pattern of *advise* simply [__ NP], as in *advised them* (referring to *the measures*).

As for the senses, sense 1, ‘to recommend or give guidance’, was by far the most frequent, as it was involved in 215 of the 227 tokens. All of the remaining 12 instances occurred with sense 3, ‘to deliberate or confer (with)’. Therefore, sense 2, ‘to inform or notify’ did not occur in the data at all.

Some of the cases were difficult to judge, and alternative interpretations for the complementation patterns or senses are undoubtedly possible for some of them. I will look into these unclear examples in more detail in the following sections and try to explain the basis for my decision in each case.

5.1 Sentential Complements

The most frequent sentential complement, and the most frequent complement of all kind, was the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive], illustrated in (3) and (4) below, which occurred in nearly two thirds of all the cases.

(3) I would advise you to read it, at leisure hours. (Chesterfield, *Letters to His Son on the Art*, 1746-71)

(4) You might as well advise me to give up my fortune as my argument. (Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, 1766)

There was one instance where the analysis was not quite as straightforward:

(5) ...he was grown foolhardy, and would go on, though I advised him not — if ever I open a door that is shut again—“ “Trifle not,” said Manfred, shuddering,... (Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, 1764)

Because of the complex nature of the passage, the token was difficult to analyse. It seems that the negation is not applied to *advised*, but rather to a VP that is ellipted because the speaker is

interrupted. The interruption also explains why the *to* particle is not retained, as is usually required for infinitival ellipsis of this kind (cf. example (5) in Section 7.1 below). While this token was analysed as having the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive] here, it would certainly be possible to leave the unclear clausal complement out, and only analyse the pattern as a simple NP object.

As noted above, the tendency for *advise* to have the NP complement preceding other possible complements is especially clear with the *to*-infinitive, which does not occur without it at all in the data. This supports the view of Biber et al. in Section 4.5, as they did not list *advise* as taking the complement [__ *to*-infinitive], which was found in the *OED* for its sense 5b. The NP object is also expected to occur in light of Bach's generalization (see Section 2.3.3). Biber et al. do not include the bare infinitive as a possible complement for *advise* either (1999, 700), but there was one example of that pattern found in the data:

(6) Let me advise you therefore, dear child, never suffer this fellow to be particular with you again. (Fielding, *Tom Jones*, 1749)

The reason for the use of the bare infinitive might be that the infinitive clause here could actually be considered more like an order than a recommendation. Then, the use of the bare infinitive could be explained as being the marker of the imperative mood.

On the basis of the data, the NP object in the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern, and in fact in all the sentential complements, always has a human referent. The NP can be a personal pronoun, as in examples (3) and (4), or a phrase such as *his father*, *the solicitor*, *the reader of Pope* or *several volunteers of quality*, all of which clearly refer to a human or a group of humans.

Only two of the 146 examples with [__ NP *to*-infinitive] did not involve an explicitly human referent:

(7) ...who advised all Ships not to go through this Strait... (Cook, *Captain Cook's Journal*, 1768-71)

(8) ...greatness has been more than once advised to submit to certain condescensions towards individuals, which have been denied the entreaties of a nation. (Burke, *Thoughts on the Present Discontents*, 1770)

However, even in (7) and (8) a reference to humans can still be observed. In (7) *all Ships* can be understood as referring to the crews of the ships. Similarly, *greatness* in (8) refers to great individuals.

In Section 4.5 I listed three types of [__ NP *to*-infinitive] constructions from Biber et al. (1999). The hypothesis mentioned there suggested that *advise* would occur with the first type, involving object control, where the post-verbal NP functions as both the object of *advise* and the subject of the following *to*-infinitive. This indeed seems to be true on the basis of the corpus data. For example in (3) above, *you* is both the object of *advise* and the subject of *read*.

With reference to the theta roles introduced in Section 2.2.2, the NP object always has the role of Recipient when preceding a sentential complement. That is not the case with the understood subjects that it controls, however. With the exception of seven tokens with the pattern [__NP *to*-infinitive], in all sentential complements with object control the understood subject of the lower clause clearly had the role of Agent, as in examples (3) and (4) above. In those seven cases the understood subject had the role of Experiencer, as in the following:

(9) [T]he judge beginning to be angry, our facetious author desired the felon to return his purse, and advised the old man never to be so bitter against innocent men's negligence, when he himself could not keep his purse safe in that open assembly. (Cibber, *The Lives of the Poets*, 1753)

However, even in these cases, which involve some kind of an emotional state rather than an action, there was a certain element of agentivity present in the events of the lower clause. For instance, the implication in (9) is that the old man should at least somewhat actively try to affect his emotions.

Adverbial insertions refer to adverbial elements occurring in between the verb and its complements, or between different complement elements. They seem to be fairly common with the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern for *advise*. Of the 146 tokens found 25 involved an adverbial insertion. The adverbial can consist of only one adverb, as in (10), or it can be a longer phrase, as in (11):

(10) ...I would advise you, **however**, to rise exactly at your usual time... (Chesterfield, *Letters to His Son on the Art*, 1746-71)

(11) ...he advised me, **if I was determined to leave him**, to make the best of my way to England and sue for a divorce. (Smollett, *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, 1751)

Interestingly, as is the case in the examples above, the adverbial can actually only occur between the NP object and the *to*-infinitive, as none of the insertions involved an adverbial preceding the NP object.

In 19 tokens with the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern an element was extracted from the lower clause. In two of them the extracted element was an adverbial, as in (12) below, and these were therefore not relevant in the light of the extraction principle (see Section 2.4.3), which only concerns complement extractions. However, they do increase the overall complexity of the structure and are therefore still worth considering. In the other 17 cases a complement of the lower clause was extracted, as in (13) and (14) below. There is a noticeable gap in these sentences after *get* and *do*, respectively.

(12) ...I was, by my excess of grief, plunged into a languishing distemper, for which my physicians advised me to drink the Bath waters. (Smollett, *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, 1751)

(13) But there is a short history, of all military orders whatsoever, which I would advise you to get,... (Chesterfield, *Letters to His Son on the Art*, 1746-71)

(14) This is what I was advised to do when very young, by a very wise man; (Chesterfield, *Letters to His Son on the Art*, 1746-71)

Sentence (14) is also an example of a passive construction. With the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern *advise* occurred seven times in the passive, where the object NP is moved to the subject position in the matrix clause, as in (14) or (15) below:

(15) ...my grandmamma was advised to send me to school; (Fielding, *The Governess*, 1749)

In both (14) and (15) the pattern is still [__ NP *to*-infinitive], with *I* and *my grandmamma*, respectively, being the object NPs.

Biber et al. mentioned both *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitives as possible complements for *advise* (see Section 4.5), and it is quite surprising to note how great the difference in their frequencies is. The pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive] was found 146 times, but the *that*-clause complement occurred

only six times, once with an NP object and five times without one. Therefore, we can note that, in the data, the *to*-infinitive complement always occurs with the NP object, whereas the *that*-clause nearly never does. In the lone example of [__ NP *that*-clause] *advise* is actually coordinated with *beseech*, similarly to example (1), which might explain the presence of the NP object:

(16) ...That an humble address be presented to his majesty, most humbly to advise and beseech his majesty, that he will be most graciously pleased to remove the right honourable sir Robert Walpole [...] from his Majesty's Presence and Councils... (Johnson, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1740-1)

While the complexity principle might affect the choice of complement in (16), it does not seem to be a very important factor in the choice between *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitives overall. If it was, *that*-clauses would be expected to be more common in complex environments, but the data does not support this. If we count coordination, insertions, extractions, passives and NPs longer than three words as complex environments, the *to*-infinitive complement occurred in such environments in 55 of the 146 tokens, whereas only one of the six tokens with a *that*-clause complement did, the aforementioned example of coordination.

The horror aequi principle cannot be considered to have much effect either. Seven of the 77 tokens of [__ NP *to*-infinitive] with the form *advise* involve a *to*-infinitive in the matrix clause as well. In the lone instance of [__ NP *that*-clause], example (16) above, *advise* does occur in a *to*-infinitive construction. However, that does not help support the idea of the horror aequi principle affecting the choice between a *to*-infinitive and a *that*-clause, because we can note that in the eight tokens with a *to*-infinitive in the matrix clause, where the two constructions have been in competition, the *to*-infinitive has been chosen seven times, and the *that*-clause only once. In fact, it seems that instead of preferring another construction after an infinitive, the other avoidance strategy mentioned by Rohdenburg (see Section 2.4.2), namely to delay the introduction of the infinitive in the complement, is more commonly used with *advise*. Three of the cases involved an adverbial intrusion between the verb and the complements, and in the other four cases the object NP between the two *to*-infinitives might function in the same way.

Since all tokens with either a *to*-infinitive or a *that*-clause complement involved sense 1, ‘to recommend or give guidance’, the sense of the verb does not have an effect on the choice between the two either. It seems, then, that the presence or absence of the object NP might be the main factor that differentiates between the use of a *that*-clause complement and a *to*-infinitive complement with *advise*. This is also supported by the distinction made in the *OED*, discussed in Section 4.1, where it was suggested that the *that*-clause complement would be more likely to occur without the object NP. Consider the following example:

- (17) ...I would advise that Britain alone should pour her armies into the continent...
(Johnson, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1740-1)

The corresponding *to*-infinitive complement would have been *advise Britain to pour her armies....* As was noted above, the object NP occurring with the *to*-infinitive always has human reference, which is not the case here. An interpretation similar to examples (7) and (8), where *Britain* was seen as referring to the people or leaders of Britain, would of course be possible, but this difference might still cause the *that*-clause complement to be preferred.

Other sentential complement patterns that were found in the corpus data were [__ NP *wh*-clause] and [__ NP quote], both occurring two times, and [__ *wh*-clause], [__ quote], [__ NP *against -ing*-clause], [__ *with* NP *on -ing*-clause] and [__ *with* NP *wh*-clause], each occurring once. Contrary to the *to*-infinitive, the *wh*-clause complement is possible even without the NP object, but as the following example shows, even then a human object might be implied:

- (18) I wish, indeed, we had a guide to advise which of these roads we should take.
(Fielding, *Tom Jones*, 1749)

Here there is no explicit NP object, but, with reference to Huddleston and Pullum in Section 4.5, it could be argued that it still involves an unexpressed object NP *us*. Because there is no NP object, it is not surprising that this token involves a finite *wh*-clause, instead of an infinitival *wh*-clause, which Quirk et al. claim to be the usual type with *advise* (1985, 1215). The finite clause does not

require the object, since no controller is needed for the lower clause. As to be expected, both tokens with the [__ NP *wh*-clause] pattern, however, did occur with an infinitive (see example (20) below).

The patterns [__ NP quote] and [__ quote] refer to cases where *advise* is used to report speech, as noted by Huddleston and Pullum (see Section 4.5). Here is one of the three cases in the data:

(19) Yet sooth the ladies, I advise... (Cibber, *The Lives of the Poets*, 1753)

In (19) the sentential complement is fronted, and the sentence without this extraction would be *I advise: sooth the ladies*. Again, there is an unexpressed object NP *you*. Example (19) is certainly not a prototypical example of this pattern (cf. the last two examples in Table 4.1), as it occurs without quotation marks, and it does not actually report a past speech event. However, the sentential complement cannot be interpreted as either a *that*-clause or a *to*-infinitive, so the pattern [__ quote] seems to be the best interpretation. This is a rather special case, however, and could probably be explained by the poetic nature of the text. In Section 4.5 I also raised the question of whether all sentential complements of *advise* can in fact be thought of as paraphrases of quotations. This view would require quite a broad interpretation of reported speech, as it would also have to include hypothetical and unreal speech events, as we can see from example (18), for instance. Therefore, I do not see this view to be very convincing.

Only three of the 162 tokens with sentential complements involved sense 3, ‘to deliberate or confer (with)’, instead of the usual sense 1. Two of these had the initial *with* NP complement, which was also always used in sense 3 when occurring without sentential complements, as will be discussed in the following section. The third example had the pattern [__ NP *wh*-clause]:

(20) As, after they were under confinement, they had no opportunity of advising each other what to do... (Haywood, *The Fortunate Foundlings*, 1744)

Even here the distinction is not clear, and one could very well interpret that *advise* actually has sense 1 here as well. However, the interpretation adopted in my analysis is that the people involved had no opportunity of discussing together what they should do, not of each telling the other their

opinion of what they should do. Therefore, the NP *each other* is used similarly to the reflexive NP in the *OED*'s sense 2a, which is here included within the simplified sense 3.

5.2 Non-sentential Complements

Non-sentential complement patterns were less frequent than sentential ones, as they only occurred in 65 of the tokens. In addition, most of them only occurred once in the corpus data. The most frequent non-sentential complements were [__ NP] with 37 tokens, and [__Ø] with 10 tokens. The remaining 18 tokens involved a prepositional phrase of some kind, either with or without a preceding object NP. As mentioned in the previous section, there were in addition three sentential complements that were a part of a prepositional phrase.

With the sentential complements the object NP always had human reference. This was often the case with the [__ NP] pattern as well:

(21) To advise his majesty, my lords, is not only our right but our duty; (Johnson, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1740-1)

However, with this pattern, another type of NP was also possible. Compare (21) to (22) below:

(22) ...an eminent physician of an amiable character, who advises the highland air... (Smollett, *The Expedition of Humphrey Clinker*, 1771)

Here the object NP, *the highland air*, does not have the theta role of Recipient, as was the case with sentential complements and with (21). Rather the NP in (22) is assigned the role of Theme.

Therefore, when occurring without a sentential complement, the object NP can be either a direct object (22), referring to what is advised, or an indirect object (21), referring to the people who are advised. 21 of the 37 tokens with the [__ NP] pattern involved a direct object, and 16 involved an indirect object.

The data included one token where the NP object was followed by a *to*-infinitive, making it look structurally similar to the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern discussed in the previous section. However, the infinitival clause was not actually a separate complement of *advise* in this case:

(23) When I speak of the habitual imitation and continued study of masters, it is not to be understood that I advise any endeavour to copy the exact peculiar colour and complexion of another man's mind;... (Reynolds, *Seven Discourses On Art*, 1769-76)

Here the *to*-infinitive is in fact a complement of the noun *endeavour*, not of *advise*. Therefore, the infinitival is a part of the NP object, making the complement pattern of this token [__ NP]. The basis for this analysis is even clearer if we take theta roles into consideration. As already mentioned, with the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern the NP always has the role of Recipient, and its referent is always human. Here there is no human referent, and the theta role of the object is clearly Theme, making this a case of direct object NP.

In six of the 21 tokens the direct object NP was extracted, as illustrated in (24):

(24) ...as the first time ever what I had advised had any weight with you. (Richardson, *Pamela*, 1740)

In cases like this *what* was considered to be the direct object NP, which has been relativized and extracted from the post-verbal position. With indirect objects extractions did not occur. In addition to the extractions, there were also two tokens which involved a passive construction, as in (25):

(25) ...that this step was advised by those who were prompted to consider its importance by motives more prevalent than that of publick [sic] spirit... (Johnson, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1740-1)

All but one token with the [__ NP] pattern appeared with sense 1 of the verb. The remaining token, with a direct object NP, involved sense 3:

(26) It must surely be confessed, that it is not necessary to advise what is already determined. (Johnson, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1740-1)

In the case of (26) the context makes it clear that the sense used is that of deliberating or conferring together, rather than that of recommending a certain measure. It is not surprising that sense 3 was not found with an indirect object NP, because the act of deliberating does not seem to be semantically compatible with having an argument with the theta role of Recipient. However, as example (20) in the previous section shows, sense 3 does not seem completely impossible with an indirect object NP, at least if the NP in question is a reflexive or used similarly to one.

The [__Ø] pattern occurred 10 times in the data, and always with sense 1. In one token the form *advising* could also be considered a noun, but since the verbal interpretation was still possible, it was included in the analysis:

(27) ...who is not only able to advise, but who knows the manner of advising. (Fielding, *Amelia*, 1751)

As was sometimes the case with sentential complements without the indirect object NP, the zero complement pattern could also have an implied object, as can be seen from (28) below:

(28) ...who, in his answer, observed, that it was too late to advise, when I was actually determined. (Smollett, *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, 1751)

Advise could here be seen as having the unexpressed object *me*. This was not the case in all the tokens with [__Ø], however, since in five of the 10 tokens this kind of an interpretation was not possible. They were tokens like (29) below, which referred to advising in general:

(29) It is easy for men in your situation to advise,... (Reeve, *The Old English Baron*, 1777)

All in all, 21 tokens with a prepositional phrase complement were found in the corpus data, and, as mentioned above, three of them involved sentential complements. Nine of the patterns only occurred once. The patterns involving *with* were the most common, as the pattern [__ *with* NP] occurred seven times alone and three times together with another complement.

(30) ...the sovereign advised with his ministers, instead of consulting the great council of the nation. (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 1776)

In four tokens the NP following *with* was extracted:

(31) 'Tis sad to have nobody to advise with! (Richardson, *Pamela*, 1740)

Here the original structure is *to advise with nobody*.

The patterns with the PP headed by *with*, were extremely interesting in that they were the only ones that always involved sense 3 of *advise*. In fact, there were only two tokens in the data which occurred in sense 3 and which did not have [__ *with* NP] as a part of the complement. These have been illustrated above in examples (20) and (26). Therefore, there does seem to be a connection between the patterns and the senses of *advise*, so that sense 3 is nearly exclusively used with the [__

with NP] pattern, and sense 1 with all other possible complements. It will be interesting to see whether the situation is different in the later periods studied, especially if sense 2 will occur in them as well.

Other PP complements that occurred more than once in the data were PPs with *to* (six times), *on* (four times) and *against* (two times):

(32) I would not advise you to a pharisaical pomp of virtue. (Chesterfield, *Letters to His Son on the Art*, 1746-71)

(33) ...there I will advise on the proper measures for a divorce; (Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto*, 1764)

(34) As the earl constantly and zealously advised him against several imprudent measures, which were taken by the court... (Cibber, *The Lives of the Poets*, 1753)

In two tokens there were actually two PP complements successively, the first headed by *with* and the second by *on*, as in (35):

(35) I have advised with the most notable antiquarians of this city on the meaning of Thurgut Luetis. (Walpole, *Letters 1735-1748*, 1735-48)

The other token, however, had a sentential *-ing*-clause complement in the latter PP.

6 Advise in the CLMET: 1780-1850

This section will focus on the analysis of data from the second sub-section of the CLMET, which includes texts from 1780 to 1850. Again, a search was performed for all four verb forms of *advise*, and it yielded 289 tokens altogether. However, four of the tokens were omitted from the analysis because the word was used either as a noun or an adjective, as in the following:

- (1) Take my advising, and write a bit of a letter to your friends,... (Hogg, *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, 1824)
- (2) This in me was an advised thought; (Galt, *Annals of the Parish*, 1821)
- (3) So soon! Art thou well advised of this? (Bulwer-Lytton, *The Last Days of Pompeii*, 1834)

This also included one case of *well advised* (3), which was analysed as an adjective even without a hyphen. The distribution and frequencies of the complement patterns of the remaining tokens are presented in Table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1. Complementation patterns of *advise* in the second part of the CLMET.

Pattern	Number of tokens					% of all tokens	Normalized frequencies (NF)
	<i>advise</i>	<i>advised</i>	<i>advising</i>	<i>advises</i>	Total		
[__ NP <i>to</i> -infinitive]	69	93	12	10	184	64.6	32.1
[__ NP]	27	13	3	3	46	16.1	8.0
[__ Ø]	11	4	2	1	18	6.3	3.1
[__ <i>that</i> -clause]	1	6	1	1	9	3.2	1.6
[__ NP <i>against</i> NP]	2	3	0	0	5	1.8	0.9
[__ NP <i>that</i> -clause]	3	1	0	0	4	1.4	0.7
[__ NP <i>of</i> NP]	0	2	1	0	3	1.1	0.5
[__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	2	1	0	0	3	1.1	0.5
[__ <i>with</i> NP]	3	0	0	0	3	1.1	0.5
[__ NP quote]	2	0	0	0	2	0.7	0.3
[__ <i>against</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.2
[__ NP <i>against</i> - <i>ing</i> -clause]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.2
[__ NP _{POS} - <i>ing</i> -clause]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.2
[__ NP <i>about</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.2
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>on</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	0.2
[__ NP <i>to</i> NP]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.2

[__ NP <i>upon</i> NP]	0	0	1	0	1	0.4	0.2
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>to</i> -infinitive]	0	1	0	0	1	0.4	0.2
Total	123	127	20	15	285	100.0	49.8

As seen from the table, as many as 18 different patterns were found for *advise*, but only three of them, [__ NP *to*-infinitive], [__ NP] and [__Ø], had more than 10 occurrences. Interestingly, these three patterns were the most common ones in the first part of the CLMET as well, and their frequencies in terms of percentages of all tokens were extremely similar in both parts. However, their normalized frequencies have decreased, together with the overall frequency of the verb, which has gone from 74.7 to 49.8. Eight patterns that were found in the first part of the corpus did not occur in the second part, and instead five new patterns were found.

The tendency for *advise* to occur with the initial NP object, either alone or as a part of the complement, was again observed in the second part, as only 33 tokens, 11.6%, did not involve it. This also includes the new pattern [__ NP_{POS} *-ing*-clause], where the initial NP is not an object, as will be discussed later.

As was the case in the previous chapter, in tokens where *advise* occurred together with another verb it was generally considered as having the complements following the last verb. In few cases, however, this view had to be adjusted:

(4) ...so much as in the necessary duties of advising and finding fault. (Ellis, *The Women of England*, 1839)

Here it is in fact the VPs *advising* and *finding fault* that are coordinated, not the verbs themselves, so *advising* was here analysed as having the zero complement.

The predominance of sense 1, ‘to recommend or give guidance’, was again noticeable, since only 11 tokens did not involve it. However, five of these involved sense 2, ‘to inform or notify’, which was not found at all in the first part of the corpus. Therefore, the use of sense 3 decreased from 5.3% in the first part to 2.1% in the second.

I will now look into the patterns found in the data in more detail, first discussing the sentential complements and then the non-sentential complements of the verb.

6.1 Sentential Complements

Again, by far the most frequent sentential complement, and the most frequent complement of any kind, was the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive], illustrated in (5) below, which occurred 184 times. This pattern always involved the verb in sense 1.

(5) I would advise you to write with invisible ink. (Godwin, *Four Early Pamphlets*, 1783-4)

While the normalized frequency of this pattern decreased from the first part of the corpus, its frequency in relation to other patterns remained almost exactly the same, since it still accounted for nearly two thirds of the tokens.

In the first part of the CLMET it was noted that the tendency for the NP object to be included in the complement pattern is especially clear with the infinitival construction. The analysis of the second part seems to confirm this, since no examples of the *to*-infinitive without the initial NP were found. Unlike in the first part of the corpus, there were no occurrences of the bare infinitive complement either. This supports the view of Biber et al. in Section 4.5, as they considered the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern to be the only possible infinitival complement for *advise*.

However, one example of the unusual pattern [__ *with* NP *to*-infinitive] was found in the data:

(6) I therefore advised with those whose friends were taken from them, not to make that amplitude of preparation which used to be the fashion... (Galt, *Annals of the Parish*, 1821)

Here the PP headed by *with* is used instead of the NP object. It seems that this is simply a one-off anomaly of the general pattern, since the PP is used semantically in the same way as the NP object in the other cases. Normally the [__ *with* NP] pattern involves the ‘deliberate or confer (with)’ meaning of the verb, but the meaning used here is sense 1, ‘to recommend’, as is usual for the infinitival cases.

When preceding any sentential complements the NP object always has a human referent. This can be simply a pronoun, as in (5), or a phrase such as *your lordship*, *any such person* or *my sex*, all of which refer to a human or a group of humans. The prediction by Biber et al. (see Section 4.5), namely that *advise* should always occur in the first type of [__ NP *to*-infinitive] construction, holds true on the basis of the data. In the following, for instance, the NP *her*, which is the object of *advise*, controls the understood subject of *dress* in the lower clause. This is clear from the fact that the reflexive pronoun is co-referential with the object rather than the subject of the higher clause.

(7) ...he advised her to dress herself in boy's clothing for more security in traveling; (Lamb, *Tales from Shakespeare*, 1807)

In 180 of 184 tokens with the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive], the understood lower subject had the theta role of Agent. In two tokens PRO had the role of Experiencer, as in (8), and in another two, the role of Theme, as in (9):

(8) ...it seemed to me that pipes and arms were cheaper here than at Constantinople, and I should advise you therefore if you go to both places to prefer the market of Cairo. (Kinglake, *Eothen*, 1844)

(9) ...the admiral...sent him a note, advising him to be guided by the wishes of the president of the council. (Southey, *Life of Horatio Lord Nelson*, 1813)

Even in (8) the role does involve some agentivity, making it closer to the role of Agent. In both cases where PRO had the role of Theme, it resulted from the lower clause being in the passive. *Advise* being an object control verb, the lower subject needs to be coreferential with the object of the higher clause, which makes the passive construction necessary in cases like (9). With the active version the object NP would have to be *the wishes of the president of the council*, which would conflict with the requirement of the higher object having a human referent.

Adverbial insertions were as common with the *to*-infinitive in the second part as they were in the first part. Of the 184 tokens 33 involved an adverbial insertion, such as *therefore if you go to both places* in (8) above. One of these instances was quite surprising, however, because the adverbial

occurred between the verb and the NP object, instead of following the NP, as was the case in all the other tokens in both parts of the corpus:

(10) ...advising, **at the same time**, his friend Brown, **by all means**, to lay in a good stock of old hops,... (Hunt, *Memoirs of Henry Hunt 1*, 1820-2)

Even here there is another adverbial occurring between the NP and the infinitival clause.

Considering that Biber et al. listed both the *to*-infinitive and the *that*-clause as possible complements for *advise*, the difference in their frequencies is quite surprising. The former occurred 184 times, whereas the latter only occurred 13 times, including tokens both with and without the NP object. However, the *that*-clause complement was more common without the initial object NP (nine tokens) than with it (four tokens), contrary to the infinitival complement. In fact, according to the *OED* the *that*-clause was expected to be the more common alternative instead of the infinitive when occurring without the personal object, especially in later usage (see Section 4.1). Therefore, the conclusion made in the previous chapter, namely that the presence or absence of the NP object is the main factor governing the choice between the two constructions, seems to be confirmed here.

Consider the following:

(11) He shook his head, and advised that Heathcliff should be left alone... (Brontë, *Wuthering Heights*, 1847)

Here it is not clear who is being advised since there is no indirect object NP. And as it seems, on the basis of the data, that the [__ *to*-infinitive] pattern tends to be avoided, the [__ *that*-clause] pattern seems to be the preferred option in cases where the recipient of the advice is not explicitly mentioned.

Another possible explanation for the higher frequency of the [__ *that*-clause] pattern in relation to the [__ NP *that*-clause] pattern is that it is usually the former rather than the latter that corresponds to the [__ NP *to*-infinitive]:

(12) I would therefore advise that you challenge your brother to single combat. (Hogg, *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, 1824)

Here the corresponding infinitive would be *I would therefore advise you to challenge you brother*.

Moreover, in the cases where there was an NP object preceding the *that*-clause complement, the choice of the complement could usually be explained by some other factors:

(13) This comes to advise you that fifteen barrels of herring were, by the blessing of God, shipped safe on board the Lovely Janet... (Burns, *Letters 1780-1796*, 1780-96)

(14) I would strongly advise any of my countrymen who may chance to read these lines, that, if their fate lead them into Spain or Portugal, they avoid hiring as domestics, or being connected with, individuals of the lower classes... (Borrow, *Bible in Spain*, 1842)

(15) I had no sooner begun to advise your poor Papa that he really ought to seek some distraction and restoration in a temporary change... (Dickens, *Dombey and Son*, 1848)

Example (13) actually involves the ‘to inform’ sense of the verb, which was listed as requiring the NP object in the *OALD*. The [__ *that*-clause] pattern, on the other hand, always involved the ‘to recommend’ sense in their view. Moreover, none of the dictionaries consulted considered the *to*-infinitive complement possible for the ‘inform’ sense. In (14) the choice of the *that*-clause complement might be explained by the complexity principle. The sentence involves a long and complex NP object and an adverbial insertion, which may be the reason for the choice of the more explicit *that*-clause instead of the *to*-infinitive. In (15) the horror aequi principle might account for the choice of the complement. The *that*-clause might have been chosen because the matrix clause itself involves a *to*-infinitive. Then, in (14) and (15), the presence of the NP before the *that*-clause might result from the *that*-clause being in competition with the *to*-infinitive. The NP would then be used because it would be required for the infinitival as well. This explanation would, however, be somewhat contradictory to the explanation illustrated in (12).

According to Quirk et al. (see Section 4.5) the distinction between the use of *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitives is that the former is used for indirect statements, and the latter for indirect directives (1985, 1212). Examples (14) and (15) seem to contradict this statement, as they both involve an indirect directive in the lower clause. In fact, example (13) is the only one of the 13 tokens with a *that*-clause complement where *advise* introduces an indirect statement.

In addition to the patterns already discussed, other sentential complements found were [__ NP *wh*-clause] (16), [__ NP quote] (17), [__ NP *against -ing*-clause] (18) and [__ NP_{POS} *-ing*-clause] (19). All of these were quite rare, as none of them occurred more than three times in the data.

(16) My friends of the embassy, however, had advised me how to act in such a case. (Borrow, *Bible in Spain*, 1842)

(17) Don't waste your fine speeches, Wheeler, I advise you this election time. (Edgeworth, *The Parent's Assistant*, 1796-1801)

(18) ...all the members of it were cautioned and advised against acting as executors or administrators to estates... (Clarkson, *The History of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade*, 1839)

(19) ...one of them going to the window and finding a shower of rain coming on, seriously advised their stopping till the next morning... (Hazlitt, *Table Talk*, 1821-2)

Two of the three tokens with the [__ NP *wh*-clause] pattern, including (16), occurred with an infinitive, which was in the theoretical part of the thesis noted to be more common than a finite *wh*-clause with *advise*. However, the third token involved a finite clause, showing that it is possible as well. In (17) there are no quotation marks and the example does not actually involve reporting a past speech event. However, the complement clause cannot be analysed as either an infinitive or a *that*-clause, so the pattern [__ NP quote] seems to be the best interpretation. Examples (18) and (19) were the only tokens with an *-ing*-clause found in the data, and the normalized frequency of this complement type actually decreased from the previous period. This shows that the rise of the *-ing*-clause, discussed in Section 2.4.4, does not yet seem to have affected *advise* by the mid-19th century. However, the pattern [__ NP_{POS} *-ing*-clause] illustrated in (19) was a new construction not yet found in the earlier period. Since this pattern was already discussed by Poutsma (see Section 4.5), we might expect it to occur more frequently in the third part of the CLMET, which covers the beginning of the 20th century.

6.2 Non-sentential Complements

Non-sentential complements were again less frequent than sentential ones, as they occurred in 80 of the 285 tokens. Moreover, five of the 10 non-sentential patterns only occurred once in the corpus data. The most frequent non-sentential complements were the same patterns as in the earlier period, namely [__ NP] with 46 tokens and [__Ø] with 18 tokens. Their frequency in relation to all pattern stayed nearly the same, but the normalized frequencies decreased slightly together with the overall frequency of the verb. *Advise* was also found with quite a few different prepositional complements, some with and some without the initial NP object complement.

With the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern, and in fact with all sentential complements, the initial object NP always had a human referent. This was not always the case, however, when the object NP occurred alone. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, with the [__ NP] pattern the object could be of two types:

(20) It was their duty to advise the king, and not to ask his advice. (Clarkson, *The History of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade*, 1839)

(21) This reasoning does not appear to have escaped the penetration of those who advised the abolition of the late Board of Longitude. (Babbage, *Reflections on the Decline of Science in England*, 1830)

In (20) the NP *the king* is of the same type than with the sentential complements, having a human referent, but that is not the case with the NP *the abolition of the late Board of Longitude* in (21).

When occurring alone, the NP can be either an indirect object (20), referring to the people who are advised, or a direct object (21), referring to that which is advised. In other words, the NP object can have either the role of Recipient or of Theme with *advise*. In the first part of the corpus the direct object was more frequent, occurring in 21 of the 37 tokens, but in the second part the situation was the opposite. 26 of 46 tokens, i.e. 57 per cent, involved an indirect object. However, since these differences are not very substantial, it is impossible to say whether the indirect use has actually become more frequent or whether this is simply an idiosyncrasy of the data.

Three of the cases with an indirect object were interesting in that they involved the phrase *be advised*, which was listed separately in the *OED*.

(22) ...now pray be advised, and you shall be none the worse for it. (Borrow, *Bible in Spain*, 1842)

Even though this use is a somewhat special case because of its idiomatic nature, these tokens were still analysed as if they were in the active, as was the case with all other passive constructions.

Another interesting case with the pattern [__ NP] was the following token, where the NP *thou* was used reflexively:

(23) But concerning the mice, advise thou, lest there be famine in the land. (Cottle, *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey*, 1847)

This use seems to be similar to the *OED*'s sense 2a, and this was in fact the only token with this pattern that involved the simplified sense 3, 'to deliberate or confer (with)'.

As the direct object the NP could be extracted, as in (24) below:

(24) Now as to carriage, I know scarcely what to advise; (Cottle, *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey*, 1847)

Here the object NP *what* is considered to have been relativized and extracted from the post-verbal position. Seven of the 20 cases with direct object complements involved an extraction, but with indirect objects extractions did not occur.

The only other relatively frequent non-sentential complement was [__Ø], which occurred 18 times. Even with the zero complement, the verb could still sometimes have an implied object (as in example (7) in Section 4.5), as seen from (25):

(25) ...in short, we'll dismiss the matter, as you advise. (Brontë, *Wuthering Heights*, 1847)

Here we can interpret that the verb has the unexpressed object *us*. This kind of an interpretation is not always possible with the zero complement, however, as in cases like the following, which refers to advising in general:

(26) I never pretend to advise, being an implicit believer in the old proverb. (Byron, *Letters* 1810-1813)

Finally, as many as eight different non-sentential prepositional patterns were found, totaling to 16 tokens, or 5.6%. Six of the patterns were already found in the first period studied, if we consider *on* and *upon* as one. The pattern [__ *against* NP] was new, but it had occurred in the earlier data with a preceding NP object. The other new pattern, [__ NP *of* NP], was more interesting in that it included a completely new preposition *of*.

(27) On the second night of your visit a messenger arrived with a despatch [sic], advising Beckendorff of the intended arrival of his Royal Highness on the next morning. (Disraeli, *Vivian Grey*, 1826)

Moreover, this pattern was the only one that always occurred with the ‘inform’ sense of the verb, as in (27). This is consistent with the analysis of the dictionaries in Chapter 4, since all the dictionaries consulted considered this pattern exclusive to the ‘inform’ sense.

As was the general tendency in the data, most of the prepositional patterns also had the initial NP object, as in (27) above. The only instances where this was not the case were the lone example of [__ *against* NP] and the four tokens with a PP headed by *with* (one of which was followed by a separate PP headed by *on*), illustrated below. Here the NP has actually been extracted from its original position after *with*.

(28) ...that is, if he had a friend, you know, and some one [sic] to advise with. (Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge*, 1841)

The absence of the object NP in the patterns involving *with* can be explained by the fact that these patterns always involved sense 3 of the verb, ‘to deliberate or confer (with)’. On the basis of its definition, this sense would seem to be unlikely with an indirect object, because it does not involve actually giving advice to someone, but rather discussing some matter together.

7 *Advise* in the CLMET: 1850-1920

In this chapter I will be analysing data obtained from the third sub-section of the CLMET, which includes texts from 1850 to 1920. Again, a search was performed for all four verb forms of *advise*, and it yielded 201 tokens altogether. However, three tokens were not included in the data studied. In one token with *advising* the word was used as a noun, and the other two cases involved the form *better advised*, which was analysed as an adjective:

- (1) ...we Squares are better advised, and are as well aware... (Abbott, *Flatland*, 1884)

There was also one token which was misspelled, with “it” in the place of “if”:

- (2) The Chaplain at Pentonville advised him it he really meant reformation to seek the Salvation Army on his release” (Booth, *In Darkest England and the Way Out*, 1890).

As the misspelling was so obvious I decided to include the corrected token in my data. The breakdown of the 198 tokens that were included in the data was as follows: 105 occurrences of *advise*, 77 of *advised*, 14 of *advising* and 2 of *advises*.

In Table 7.1 below, I have included all the complementation patterns found in the data, along with their frequencies. Similarly to the previous chapters, I will first present an overview of the findings and then discuss some of the individual patterns found in more detail, focusing first on the sentential complements and then on the non-sentential complements.

Table 7.1. Complementation patterns of *advise* in the third part of the CLMET

Pattern	Number of tokens					% of all tokens	Normalized frequencies (NF)
	<i>advise</i>	<i>advised</i>	<i>advising</i>	<i>advises</i>	Total		
[__ NP <i>to</i> -infinitive]	52	48	7	1	108	54.5	17.3
[__ NP]	30	12	4	1	47	23.7	7.5
[__ Ø]	12	3	0	0	15	7.6	2.4
[__ <i>that</i> -clause]	2	3	1	0	6	3.0	1.0
[__ quote]	0	6	0	0	6	3.0	1.0
[__ NP _{POS} <i>-ing</i> -clause]	3	1	0	0	4	2.0	0.6
[__ NP <i>of</i> NP]	0	1	1	0	2	1.0	0.3
[__ <i>to</i> -infinitive]	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ NP <i>to</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.2

[__ <i>concerning</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ <i>wh</i> -clause]	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ NP quote]	0	1	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ NP <i>that</i> -clause]	0	1	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ NP <i>about</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ NP <i>on</i> NP]	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
[__ NP <i>in</i> NP]	0	1	0	0	1	0.5	0.2
Total	105	77	14	2	198	100.0	31.7

17 different patterns were found in the data. The three most frequent patterns were again the same as in the first two parts of the corpus, namely [__ NP *to*-infinitive], [__ NP] and [__ \emptyset], and they were also the only patterns that had more than ten instances. [__ NP *to*-infinitive] was still by far the most common pattern occurring in over a half of the tokens, but its frequency has in fact decreased ten percentage points when compared to the second part of the corpus. Most of this loss seems to have been caused by the [__ NP] pattern, which in turn has increased by 7.6 percentage points. However, the overall frequency of the verb has continued to decline dramatically, since its normalized frequency in this part was less than half of the figure in the first part of the corpus.

The tendency for *advise* to take the initial NP object is again confirmed, with only 34 tokens, 17.1%, occurring without it. The *that*-clause and direct speech complements provide interesting exceptions to this tendency, as they both occurred six times without the NP object, and only once with it. On the other hand, the tendency was again especially strong for the *to*-infinitive, which had only one occurrence without the NP object, but 108 occurrences with it.

Advise was nearly always used in sense 1 in the data, as was the case in the previous parts. There were only six instances of sense 2, and three instances of sense 3. The third sense, ‘to deliberate or confer (with)’, has therefore been in a slow decline, and it is interesting to see whether it has gone completely out of use in present-day English studied in the next chapter.

7.1 Sentential Complements

The most frequent sentential complement, and the most frequent complement of all kind, was the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive], illustrated with (3) and (4) below:

(3) But I would advise you to confine yourself to domestic scenes. (Hardy, *A Pair of Blue Eyes*, 1873)

(4) I gravely advise people, if they possibly can, to write of the wealthy middle class; (Gissing, *New Grub Street*, 1891)

Two of the tokens involved an ellipsis in the complement clause, so that only the *to* particle was retained:

(5) “Did you ever read any of Ouida’s novels?” “No, I never did.” “I advise you to before you think of taking your wife over there.” (Gissing, *The Odd Woman*, 1893)

In (5) it is clear from the preceding discourse that the infinitival complement would be *to read Ouida’s novels*. In cases like this it is possible for the clause to be ellipted, to avoid repetition (see e.g. Biber et al. 1999, 751). The *to* particle can then be used as a pro-form for the infinitival clause, since the ellipted clause is recoverable from the context (Declerck 1991, 472). Therefore, these kinds of cases were still analysed as having the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive] in this thesis.

As has already been discussed, the *to*-infinitive complement seems to require the preceding NP object. However, one example of the pattern [__ *to*-infinitive] was found in the third part of the CLMET:

(6) I advise some attention to be paid to the fire. (Baker, *Eight Years’ Wandering in Ceylon*, 1855)

Even though there is an NP after the verb here, it is not the object of *advise*, but of the verb *pay* in the lower clause, which has been passivised. This is clear if we consider its theta role. When preceding a *to*-infinitive the NP always has the role of Recipient, but here the NP *some attention* has the role of Theme, which it gets from *pay*. Therefore, the NP is not an independent complement of *advise*, but rather a part of the *to*-infinitive complement.

The reason for the rareness of the [___ *to*-infinitive] pattern is clearer if we consider the active version of (6):

(6') I advise to pay some attention to the fire.

We can see that the understood subject PRO of the lower clause lacks a controller since there is no object NP, and this violates Bach's generalization. Although the sentence is not ungrammatical, the lack of object NP might still have made it sound odd to some speakers causing the pattern to be avoided. Therefore it is not very surprising that this lone example of the [___ *to*-infinitive] pattern was in the passive. Passivisation gives an explicit subject to the lower clause and, since it is possible to omit the *by*-phrase in a passive construction, the fact that PRO does not have a controller is not as much of an issue as with the active sentence.

As has already been noted in the earlier chapters, the initial NP object always has human reference in the pattern [___ NP *to*-infinitive]. It can be a proper noun, a personal pronoun, as in example (3), or a phrase such as *the gentlemen* or *people* in example (4), which clearly refer to a person or a group of people. In two tokens of the data in this part the NP object did not involve an explicitly human referent:

(7) My opinion is, that you should advise the House to vote that which would tend most to public order,... (Bagehot, *The English Constitution*, 1867)

(8) ...we advised the Bank to take the whole affair into their own hands at once,... (Bagehot, *Lombard Street*, 1873)

However, in both (7) and (8) the object NPs can still be interpreted as referring to groups of people, similarly to examples (7) and (8) in Section 5.1. *The House* in (7) refers to the members of the House, and *the Bank* in (8) refers to the people in charge of the bank. Even example (6) above, which does not have an explicit NP object, can be interpreted as having an unexpressed human object, similar to Huddleston and Pullum's example (7) mentioned in Section 4.5. There is some human or group of humans who the speaker advises, even if they are not expressed.

As was the case in the earlier parts, the understood subject PRO nearly always has the role of Agent with *advise*. In only three of the 108 tokens with the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern Experiencer was seen as the more accurate interpretation, considering the lower verb. Here is one of these:

(9) I should have advised him, in sober seriousness, to live for two years at the rate of a thousand a year. (Gissing, *New Grub Street*, 1891)

However, even here the action of living seems to be something actively performed rather than simply passively experienced. A similar situation was also noted in the previous chapters in cases where PRO seemed to have the role of Experiencer on the basis of the lower verb. Therefore, it seems that the use of *advise* itself implies some level of agentivity in the lower clause, even if the lower verb did not.

The *to*-infinitive continues to be considerably more frequent than the *that*-clause in the third part of the corpus, even though they were both widely discussed in the literature. The *to*-infinitive occurred 109 times, but the *that*-clause only occurred seven times. Furthermore, the *to*-infinitive was nearly always used with the initial NP object, whereas the *that*-clause occurred only once with it. The following is one example of the [__ *that*-clause] pattern:

(10) ...she had advised that he should remain at the Abbey for a little while. (Brebner, *The Brown Mask*, 1910)

Here the *that*-clause involves an indirect directive, which again seems to refute the claim by Quirk et al. (see Section 4.5) that this type of a *that*-clause would not appear with *advise*.

The reason for the [__ *that*-clause] pattern being more common than the [__ NP *that*-clause] pattern might be that it is actually the former rather than the latter that is the equivalent of the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] construction. The corresponding *to*-infinitive for (10), for instance, would be *she had advised him to remain at the Abbey*. The subject of the *that*-clause becomes the object of the matrix clause. Similarly, the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern can be changed into the [__ *that*-clause] pattern by making the NP object the subject of the *that*-clause.

However, it is important to note that the [__ *that*-clause] complement is not necessarily semantically equivalent to the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] complement. Even in (10) it might not be the subject of the *that*-clause, *he*, that is the recipient of the advice, as would be the case with the corresponding *to*-infinitive. The adviser could have advised a third person to make sure that the aforementioned *he* remains at the abbey. This difference suggests that in cases where the actual recipient of the advice is not specified the *that*-clause complement would be the preferred choice, since the [__ *to*-infinitive] pattern without an initial NP was noted above to be rare.

The [__ NP *that*-clause] pattern might then be expected to be used instead of the *to*-infinitive in cases where the recipient of the advice is expressed, but it is different from the subject of the *that*-clause. Quite surprisingly, however, there were no instances of such use in the data studied, since in the only example of the [__ NP *that*-clause] pattern, illustrated in (12), *advise* was used in the ‘inform’ sense. The example actually contains a passive construction, where the NP object is moved to the subject position of the matrix clause, but the pattern is still [__ NP *that*-clause].

(11) ...but would like a little “Unsweetened,” as he was advised it was the most healthy spirit.
(Grossmith, *The Diary of a Nobody*, 1894)

The original object NP *he* and the lower subject *it* are indeed different in (11), but since this sense does not allow the *to*-infinitive complement, the two patterns were not in competition.

The [__ NP_{POS} *-ing*-clause] pattern, illustrated in (12) below, was found four times in the data.

(12) ...and I ventured to advise his having a drop of brandy-and-water, by way of night-cap.
(Collins, *The Moonstone*, 1868)

In this pattern the person indicated by the possessive pronoun is not necessarily also the recipient of the advice, as noted by Poutsma (see Section 4.5), although in all the cases in the data this interpretation was possible.

Other sentential complements found in the data were [__ quote] (13), [__ NP quote] (14), [__ *wh*-clause] (15) and [__ NP *wh*-clause] (16). The first pattern occurred six times, and the other three patterns only occurred once each.

(13) “Don’t ever discuss political economy with Henry,” advised her sister. (Forster, *Howard’s End*, 1910)

(14) [“]Don’t be absurd,” I advised him. (Jerome, *They and I*, 1909)

(15) ...putting all the various writers into their relationships one to another, advising what books should be first taken by the beginner in the field,... (Wells, *Mankind in the Making*, 1902-3)

(16) In the intervals of business he would pull out Philip’s life, turn it inside out, remodel it, and advise him how to use it for the best. (Forster, *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, 1905)

Interestingly, the first two patterns, where *advise* was used as a reporting verb, always occurred with sense 1 of the verb, despite the fact that these patterns were only listed for the ‘inform’ sense in the *OED*. However, both the *OALD* and *COBUILD* did include their use for the ‘recommend’ sense. In example (15) the *wh*-clause occurs as a finite clause but in (16) it involves an infinitive. The reason for this difference is probably that (15) lacks an object NP which could act as the controller of the lower clause, and with a finite clause this does not cause a problem. Example (16) does have an object, so the infinitival *wh*-clause, noted in Section 4.5 to be the more common alternative with *advise*, is possible.

7.2 Non-sentential Complements

The most common non-sentential complement was the NP object, which occurred 47 times in the data. Even though the normalized frequency of this pattern decreased slightly from the previous period, its frequency in relation to the other patterns increased by 7.6 percentage points. With sentential complements, the object NP always has human reference, but when occurring alone, this is not always the case, as established in the earlier chapters. As the only complement the NP can be either an indirect object (17), as with the sentential complements, or a direct object (18), both cases being illustrated below:

(17) ...you should be beside the King to advise him. (Brebner, *The Brown Mask*, 1910)

(18) I advise a plain gored skirt—not pleated; (Chambers, *Lawn Tennis for Ladies*, 1910)

The proportion of the indirect object uses of this pattern had been on the rise in the second part, where they accounted for 57 per cent of the cases, and this trend seems to continue in the third part.

The data of this part included 29 tokens with an indirect object and 18 tokens with a direct object, making the proportion of the former 62 per cent.

As a direct object, the NP could be extracted, as in the following example:

(19) ...or at least barricade the fence was what he ought to have advised. (Blackwood, *The Extra Day*, 1915)

Here *what* is considered to be the direct object of *advise*, and it has simply been relativized and extracted from the post-verbal position. Extractions of some kind occurred in six of the 18 tokens where the NP was a direct object, but with indirect objects, extractions did not occur.

Three of the tokens with the [__ NP] pattern included the idiomatic phrase *be advised*, illustrated in (20), which was listed separately in the entry for *advise* in the *OED* (see Section 4.1).

(20) But if ever ye come to your country, be advised, and venture no more into lands that ye know not... (Haggard, *She*, 1887)

This is certainly a special case of the usual pattern because of its idiomatic nature, but it was still analysed as having the NP object, as was done in the previous chapter as well.

The [__ NP] pattern was nearly always used with sense 1 of the verb, as in examples (17)-(20), but there were also three instances of the other two senses for this pattern, two for sense 2 and one for sense 3, both illustrated below:

(21) The poison travels: Father advised it. (Meredith, *The Amazing Marriage*, 1895)

(22) ...[if he] is not in a position to defend himself, then we should feel free to advise such a case, hoping thereby to save such person and his family and friends from much misery... (Booth, *In Darkest England and the Way Out*, 1890)

Interestingly, [__ NP] is in fact the only pattern that was found with all three senses of the verb in the CLMET, even when taking the whole corpus into consideration.

The second most common non-sentential pattern was [__ Ø], exemplified below, which occurred 15 times:

(23) ‘Am I never to advise?’ asked her husband,... (Gissing, *The Odd Woman*, 1893)

The zero complement was quite frequently used with the verb *advise* in coordination with another verb, as in (24):

(24) I really must decline to advise, or interfere in any way. (Gissing, *New Grub Street*, 1891)

Four of the 15 cases involved this kind of use. In addition, in four other cases with the zero complement the verb was used in some other kind of coordinated construction, as in the following example:

(25) Henry VII. attained a kingdom in which there was a Parliament to advise, but scarcely a Parliament to control. (Bagehot, *The English Constitution*, 1867)

As many as six different patterns involving a prepositional phrase were found in the data, but none of them occurred more than two times. The prepositional phrases nearly always were preceded by an indirect object, similarly to the sentential complements:

(26) I think Miss Barfoot could advise us about it. (Gissing, *The Odd Woman*, 1893)

The only exception was the pattern [__ *concerning* NP]:

(27) ...when it is held by men thought fit to administer the affairs of a nation or advise concerning its defence. (Bridge, *Sea-Power and Other Studies*, 1899-1902)

This PP was not found in either of the other parts, but it was listed as a possible complement type in the *OED* (see Table 4.1), although only with an initial NP. Another new prepositional pattern found in the third part was the pattern [__ NP *in* NP]:

(28) ...the king and those who advised him in the matter, ..., were not inclined to give ear to his ambassador's prayer. (Hope, *Rupert of Hentzau*, 1898)

This pattern does not seem to have much of a semantic difference with the prepositional patterns with *on*, *upon* or *about*. Since all three were found in the CLMET, but none with much frequency, it would appear that none of these had yet become the required preposition to be used with *advise*, but that there was still certain amount of variation in their use.

In regards to the prepositional patterns, the most striking difference to the earlier parts of the corpus is the fact that no tokens of the [__ *with* NP] pattern were found, either alone or together with other complements. This had been the most frequent prepositional complement in the first two

parts of the corpus, occurring 10 times in the first part and five times in the second part. The loss of this pattern seems to explain the decrease in the frequency of sense 3, since it is the only possible sense for the [__ *with* NP] pattern.

8 *Advise* in the BNC

In this chapter I will be analysing two sets of data from the British National Corpus (henceforth the BNC). Firstly, I will continue with the diachronic analysis by studying the complementation of *advise* in present-day English in order to compare the findings to those made in the previous chapters. The second section will provide a separate analysis which focuses on the omission of the NP object of *advise* before sentential complements. When examples from the BNC are used, reference codes are provided alongside each quotation in both sections.

8.1 Complementation of *Advise*: 1985-1993

This section will conclude the diachronic analysis of *advise*. The data for this section is taken from the written section of the BNC, and more specifically from the “imaginative prose” section of the corpus, since this text domain is closest to the texts included in the CLMET. The query was also restricted to texts published between the years 1985 and 1993. Therefore, the subsection of the corpus used consisted of 14,093,934 words. A lemma search was performed for the verb *advise*⁶, and it yielded 444 hits. This was then thinned by random selection to 300 tokens, amounting to approximately two thirds of the cases. Because of this, the word count also had to be adjusted before counting the normalized frequencies of the patterns. The resulting figure used in the calculations amounted to a little over 9.5 million words.

Of the 300 tokens in the sample as many as 10 were irrelevant for our analysis. All of these involved one of the adjectival phrases *well advised* or *ill advised*, illustrated below:

- (1) I believe you would be well advised to accept it. (HTT 573)
- (2) Pascoe would be ill advised to rely on it. (C8T 2485)

Both of these are listed as adjectives in the *OED* (s.v. *well(-)advised*, adj. and s.v. *ill-advised*, adj.), and they were therefore omitted from the analysis.

⁶ Search string: {advise}

This leaves us with 290 relevant tokens to be analysed. The distribution and frequencies of all the complementation patterns found are shown in Table 8.1 below. Again, I will first present an overview of the findings before turning to discussing the individual patterns in more detail.

Table 8.1. Complementation patterns of *advise* in the BNC.

Pattern	Number of tokens					% of all tokens	Normalized frequencies (NF)
	<i>advise</i>	<i>advised</i>	<i>advising</i>	<i>advises</i>	Total		
[__ quote]	0	73	0	2	75	25.9	7.9
[__ NP <i>to</i> -infinitive]	32	35	8	0	75	25.9	7.9
[__ NP]	33	19	4	0	56	19.3	5.9
[__ NP quote]	0	23	1	0	24	8.3	2.5
[__ NP <i>that</i> -clause]	4	7	2	1	14	4.8	1.5
[__ Ø]	4	5	0	0	9	3.1	0.9
[__ <i>that</i> -clause]	3	4	0	0	7	2.4	0.7
[__ NP <i>on</i> NP]	1	3	3	0	7	2.4	0.7
[__ NP <i>of</i> NP]	1	3	1	0	5	1.7	0.5
[__ <i>-ing</i> -clause]	3	1	0	0	4	1.4	0.4
[__ <i>on</i> NP]	2	0	1	0	3	1.0	0.3
[__ <i>against</i> NP]	1	2	0	0	3	1.0	0.3
[__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	0	0	3	0	3	1.0	0.3
[__ NP NP]	2	0	0	0	2	0.7	0.2
[__ NP <i>about</i> NP]	2	0	0	0	2	0.7	0.2
[__ NP <i>against -ing</i> -clause]	0	1	0	0	1	0.3	0.1
Total	88	176	23	3	290	100.0	30.5

As seen from the table, 16 different patterns were found for *advise* in the data. Five of these occurred more than ten times. There is a striking difference in the most frequent patterns when compared to the patterns found in the CLMET. The three most frequent patterns in all three parts of that corpus were [__ NP *to*-infinitive], [__ NP] and [__ Ø], with most other patterns being quite rare. The *to*-infinitive is still the most frequent pattern, but this time alongside the pattern [__ quote]. In fact, the latter has gone through a dramatic increase from the previous periods studied, since it only occurred six times in the third part of the CLMET. Its normalized frequency has therefore increased from 1.0 to 7.9, which is even greater a change when we consider the overall decrease in the frequency of the verb itself. The frequency of the *to*-infinitive, on the other hand,

has decreased just as dramatically. In the previous chapter, where the pattern was already noted as being in decline, it still accounted for 55 per cent of all tokens, but here it occurred only in a little over 25 per cent of the tokens found.

Another significant change that can be noted is the frequency of the [__ NP *that*-clause] pattern. It was found only six times in all of the CLMET, and in each of the three parts it was less frequent than the pattern without the NP object. The *that*-clause had been an exception to the tendency for *advise* to have the initial NP as a part of the complement in the other parts, but this situation seems to have changed in current English. However, the [__ quote] pattern does go against this tendency, since it occurred three times as frequently without the NP object as with it.

As with the other chapters, there were a few cases where *advise* occurred in coordination with other verbs, and in these cases it was again analysed as having the same complementation pattern as the coordinated verb. In (3) below, for instance, the pattern is [__ NP]:

(3) He saw — Dorothy advising and supporting him — that this was a chance that might not recur. (EV1 2240)

There was also one instance that involved two complement patterns, [__ NP *of* NP] and [__ *that*-clause], in coordination:

(4) ...but with a telegram already despatched to Mrs Appleby, advising her of his visit and that he would be bringing a young lady, he told himself that it was too late to change the arrangement. (FS1 1604)

The view taken here is that the two patterns belong to two separate VPs that are coordinated, but the second instance of *advising* has simply been ellipted to avoid redundancy. Therefore, it is the first pattern, i.e. [__ NP *of* NP], that is analysed as the complement in this instance.

Sense 1, ‘to recommend or give guidance’, was still by far the most frequent, as it was in all the earlier periods. However, sense 2, ‘to inform or notify’, seems to be significantly more frequent in present-day English than it was earlier, as it only accounted for 3% of the tokens in the third part of the CLMET, but in the BNC data it was used in 34 tokens, accounting for 11.7% of the tokens.

Interestingly, sense 3, ‘to deliberate or confer (with)’, which had been decreasing in frequency through all three previous periods studied, was not found in the BNC data at all.

8.1.1 Sentential Complements

The [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern, illustrated in (5) below, was still the most frequent sentential complement together with the pattern [__ quote], but, as mentioned above, its frequency decreased dramatically from the earlier periods to only 25.9 per cent of the tokens.

(5) Nigel advised her to tell that to the Russians. (ACE 787)

There was again one token which involved an ellipsis in the complement clause, so that only the *to* particle was retained (cf. example (5) in Section 7.1):

(6) I strongly advise you not to; you'll only get yourself into serious trouble. (B1X 3016)

The preceding context makes it clear that the structure of the full VP would be *advise you not to get the truth out of him*. This case was analysed as having the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive] despite the ellipsis.

The [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern was the only infinitival complement found in the data confirming the view of Biber et al. (1999, 700) (see Section 4.5). The NP following *advise* had in each case a human referent with the theta role of Recipient, as was expected. In nearly all the tokens the understood lower subject PRO had the theta role of Agent, as was the case in the previous periods studied as well. However, in one token PRO had the role of Experiencer (7), as indicated by the lower verb *enjoy*. In another token the lower clause was in the passive (8).

(7) I would advise you to enjoy her while you can. (JXS)

(8) Dr Allott advised me to be entered for Wadham, Oxford's ‘medical’ college, and I arrived there when I was eighteen. (CHG 113)

As discussed in reference to a similar example in Section 7.1, (7) still seems to imply a somewhat more active involvement than simply passively enjoying, making the theta role closer to that of Agent. In (8), on the other hand, the passive construction causes PRO to have the role of Theme.

The passivisation results from the requirement for the higher object and the lower subject to be coreferential in an object control structure. Since both of these types of instances were rare in all the sets of data studied, it seems that *advise* in itself implies at least a certain level of agentivity in the lower clause, so that uses where PRO does not have the role of Agent tend to be avoided.

Ten of the tokens with the infinitival pattern involved an adverbial or a reporting clause between the NP object and the infinitive:

(9) I'd advise you, however, to think things over tonight. (C8D 2510)

There were also ten instances where *advise* was in the passive. These included three tokens with the *get*-passive, as in (10), and one token (11) with the phrase *be advised*, where the verb is analysed as having the NP object in the view of this thesis.

(10) Perhaps Sir George will get advised to see Blackadder. (APR 2338)

(11) Cadet: be advised to beware which obscenities you scream during punishment, lest you rate further chastisement. (CJJ 593)

The greatest change involving the sentential complements happened with the pattern [__ quote].

When counting together both cases with and without the initial NP object, this complement occurred in one third of the tokens in the BNC data (NF=10.4). The increase from earlier periods is quite remarkable, since the pattern only occurred 12 times in the whole of the CLMET (NF=0.8).

Both patterns [__ quote] and [__ NP quote] are illustrated below:

(12) 'Keep your head down, Laz,' he advised. (HTU 372)

(13) 'Get some mousetraps then,' Nellie advised her. (EA5 538)

Most of the tokens were typical cases of this kind, where *advise* appeared as a reporting verb together with a direct quotation. There was, however, one instance which occurred without quotation marks:

(14) Better take a cheap all-day ticket, the bus conductor advised, if Nenna really wanted to get from Chelsea to Stoke Newington. (H0R 1575)

The sentence still reports a past speech event similarly to a direct quote. There were also two tokens where the object NP was a reflexive pronoun, as illustrated below:

(15) Change your mind right now, she advised herself. (H8F 2894)

These cases do not report a past speech event, but rather the thoughts of the subject of the reporting clause. They were still considered as having the pattern [__ NP quote] in the analysis.

All the examples (12)-(15) involve sense 1, ‘to recommend or give guidance’. However, with the quotation pattern sense 2, ‘to inform or notify’, was possible as well, as seen from (16):

(16) ‘Bob is Head of SO13 Anti-Terrorist Branch,’ Bliss advised. (CEC 3076)

Four tokens with the [__ quote] pattern and three tokens with the [__ NP quote] pattern involved this sense of the verb. Therefore, the significant increase in the frequency of these patterns also explains some of the increase of sense 2 in the data.

Another part of the explanation is the *that*-clause complement, which can also occur with the ‘inform’ sense. The frequency of the [__ *that*-clause] pattern has not changed much from the previous period, but the frequency of the [__ NP *that*-clause] pattern has. The latter only appeared once in the third part of the CLMET (NF = 0.2), but 14 times in the BNC (NF = 1.5). 13 of the 14 tokens involved sense 2, as illustrated below:

(17) She was asked to hold and, after much background mumbling, the clerk advised her that the form she had submitted had regrettably been overlooked. (JY9 1670)

Of the seven tokens with the [__ *that*-clause] pattern three involved sense 2. Therefore, only five tokens with either *that*-clause pattern appeared with sense 1, which shows that the normalized frequency of this usage has in fact slightly decreased from the earlier periods, despite the *that*-clause complement itself having become more frequent. Then, it is the rise of sense 2 that seems to have caused the increase of the *that*-clause complement, and its use with the NP object in particular.

Since there were only five tokens with a *that*-clause complement occurring with sense 1 of the verb, the *to*-infinitive still clearly seems to be the preferred option with this sense, which allows both patterns. The tendency for the *that*-clause, unlike the infinitive, to appear without the object NP can again be noted, as only one of the five tokens had the pattern [__ NP *that*-clause]:

(18) I shall advise her that the lessons should cease. (CEY 496)

The choice of the *that*-clause complement over the *to*-infinitive is clear here, because the recipient of the advice is different from the lower subject. In fact, the lower clause does not even involve a human subject, which could act as the recipient, making an object control structure impossible. Similarly, in example (19) below the lower clause focuses more on the action rather than the agent, as seen from the use of the passive, which might be the reason for the use of the *that*-clause:

(19) He advised that this should be done soon, because the wall was badly soaked, and they were asking for dry rot. (EV1 1766)

It was already noted in the earlier chapters that, with sense 1, the *that*-clause is preferred instead of the infinitive in cases where the recipient of the advice is not clear or it is different from the lower subject. There was only one token with a *that*-clause in the data where the choice of complement could not be explained by either of these reasons:

(20) ‘Another message to Rome,’ Talbot said. ‘Again Code B. To Vice-Admiral Hawkins. Message received. Strongly advise that you come soonest. Tonight. (CKC 1137-1141)

Here it would seem clear that the recipient of the advice would be the same *you* as the lower subject. Therefore the infinitival pattern *advise you to come soonest* should also be possible. Then the reason for the complement in this instance might be that the sentence is a part of a military radio message and a *that*-clause might be considered less direct and therefore more appropriate in a message to a superior officer.

In addition to the patterns already discussed, three other sentential complement constructions were found in the data: [__ *-ing*-clause] (21), [__ NP *wh*-clause] (22) and [__ NP *against -ing*-clause] (23).

(21) ‘You can stay in your own apartment, but I do advise keeping as still and quiet as possible.’ (JYA 4663)

(22) But you can help me by advising me what to do for Sir Henry Baskerville. (H7V 286)

(23) Indeed, my legal representative has strongly advised me against making it. (BMR 1450)

All three tokens with the [__ NP *wh*-clause] pattern involved an infinitive, as in example (22). No finite *wh*-clauses were found, which is not very surprising considering that the infinitive was noted

to be the normal choice for *advise* in Section 4.5, and that there were no cases of the [__ *wh*-clause] pattern, which might have preferred the finite clause due to Bach's generalization.

The *-ing*-clause had been a fairly marginal complement in the earlier sets of data, and its normalized frequency has not increased significantly in the BNC either. Therefore, it seems that the Great Complement shift had not yet radically affected *advise* by the early 1990s. However, the pattern [__ *-ing*-clause], without preceding NP objects or prepositions, only appeared in the BNC data for the first time, having four occurrences, suggesting that it is becoming more common. On the other hand, the pattern [__ NP_{POS} *-ing*-clause], which was the only *-ing*-clause pattern found in the previous period studied, did not occur at all in the BNC data.

It was discussed in Chapter 2 that there is an increasing tendency to prefer the *-ing*-clause complement, instead of *to*-infinitives or *that*-clauses, in situations where there is no explicit object NP. It has already been noted that the infinitival complement does not occur without the NP object. However, there were four tokens of this kind occurring with the [__ *that*-clause] pattern in the BNC⁷ (as in example (19) above), the same number as with the [__ *-ing*-clause] pattern. None of these tokens involved any complexity factors which could explain the choice of the more explicit construction, so it seems that the *-ing*-clause has not yet become the preferred option in these cases, but that the two patterns are still both used frequently. However, since there was only one token where the *-ing*-clause complement occurred with an initial NP object (with the pattern [__ NP *against -ing*-clause]), it does seem that its use without an explicit object is the environment where its frequency has started to increase the most.

Some possible semantic differences between the *-ing*-clause and the *to*-infinitive were discussed in Section 2.4.4. It was suggested that the former might be more connected to factuality, as it is with some other verbs, so that it would imply that the advice was actually followed. This does not seem

⁷ The preference of the *-ing*-clause only concerns sense 1 of *advise*, because sense 2 cannot take either the infinitival or the *-ing*-clause as a complement. The three other tokens of the [__ *that*-clause] pattern involved sense 2 of the verb and were therefore irrelevant in this discussion.

to be the case with *advise*, because in none of the tokens with an *-ing*-clause complement this kind of an implication was present. However, none of the tokens involved the main verb in the past tense, which is the environment where it would be easiest to discover this kind of a difference. In any case, the figure of the *-ing*-clause complement is so small in the data that it is impossible to draw any definite conclusions about possible semantic differences between these constructions on this basis.

8.1.2 Non-sentential Complements

Non-sentential complement patterns were again less frequent than the sentential ones, as they appeared in 88 of the 290 tokens. As with all the other periods, the pattern [__ NP] was the most frequent of the patterns, occurring 57 times. Both its normalized frequency and the percentage it takes of all tokens have decreased slightly from the CLMET. Below are two examples of the pattern:

(24) He wanted to set up a new-enterprise in New York, a law firm advising immigrants.

(GUX 772)

(25) ‘A colleague advised a couple of weeks in the sun, away from it all.’ (JYC 134)

As these examples illustrate, the NP object can be of two different types. In (24) the NP *immigrants* is an indirect object with the theta role of Recipient, as it always is when preceding sentential complements as well. In (25), however, the NP is a direct object with the theta role of Theme. In the BNC data 36 of the 56 tokens with this pattern involved an indirect object. This type has therefore become more and more frequent in relation to the direct object, since its proportion of all cases of this pattern has risen in each set of data.

In eight of the 20 cases of a direct object, the NP was extracted, as in (26):

(26) She wondered what Grandmama would have advised in all the circumstances. (H8A 3170)

Interestingly, there were no cases of the indirect object being extracted in either the BNC or the CLMET. The fact that the direct object could be extracted also explains the occurrence of the pattern [__ NP NP], which was not mentioned in any of the dictionaries consulted. This pattern was not found in the CLMET but it appeared twice in the BNC:

(27) Can you tell me what you are going to advise your client now? (AB9 2064)

In example (27) *advise* has two NP objects: the indirect object *your client* and the direct object *what*, which has been extracted. The expectation is then that this pattern would not be possible if one of the object NPs was not extracted, since no examples of this kind were found. However, the pattern was too rare to make any definite claims of this kind.

While extractions only happened with direct objects, both object types could be passivised, as seen from (28) and (29) below.

(28) ‘Full cooperation is advised,’ Ace said tersely, and fired a blast from her weapon into the wall beside the Doctor’s head to illustrate her point. (G1M 3475)

(29) Really, it’s all so complicated, but it seems I was being rather badly advised. (C8S 1491)

In (28) it is the direct object, and in (29) the indirect object that has been passivised. Two tokens with the phrase *be advised* were also considered as being examples of the [__ NP] pattern, which has been the view taken in the previous chapters as well.

In most of the tokens with the NP object, *advise* had sense 1, ‘to recommend or give guidance’, but there were also three tokens which involved the ‘inform or notify’ sense of the verb, as in (30):

(30) Simply advise me when you have finalized everything. (CKE 3522)

The use of *advise* without any complements has decreased from the earlier periods. Only nine tokens appeared with the zero complement in the BNC data, one of which is shown below:

(31) Yet she badly needed an ally, a friend who would listen and advise. (GON 1644)

It has already been discussed in the earlier chapters that the zero complement pattern can still involve an implied object argument with the theta role of Recipient, and this indeed was the case in eight of the nine tokens found in the data. In (31), for instance, *advise* can be considered as having

the implied object *her*. The argument with the role of Theme can also be implied, as seen from example (32) below. This was also the only token without an implied indirect object NP, since the Recipient is no one in particular.

(32) The triple-D code phrase, sometimes vulgarized as Death-Destruction-Doom, would itself suffice to launch exterminatus. Thus the Inquisition mission stationed on the orbital fortress would advise. (CM4 2168)

Here the preceding context and the use of the adverb *thus* make it clear what the content of the information advised is. As many as five of the nine tokens with the [__ Ø] pattern involved an implied content clause of this kind. When occurring without a complement *advise* could be in both sense 1 or 2, as seen from examples (31) and (32) respectively.

All in all, the data contained 20 tokens with a non-sentential prepositional complement, in addition to the lone token with the sentential pattern [__ NP *against* -ing-clause] illustrated in the previous section. The two most frequent of these patterns were [__ NP *on* NP], with seven tokens, and [__ NP *of* NP], with five tokens, both illustrated below:

(33) There had been a dozen East European ‘experts’ around the breakfast table, advising Maggie on her Polish trip. (AE0 1759)

(34) Surely Proctor Firenze would have advised Jaq of the presence of another Malleus man? (CM4 1366)

The pattern [__ NP *of* NP] was interesting in that it was the only pattern which was only used with the ‘inform’ sense of *advise*. Even the *that*-clause, which was the other complement predominantly used with this sense, still appeared with the ‘recommend’ sense of the verb as well. All other prepositional complements involved sense 1 of *advise*, except for one of the tokens with the [__ NP *on* NP] pattern.

The overall tendency for *advise* to have the NP object preceding any other complements can also be noted for the prepositional patterns. The only patterns without the object were [__ *on* NP] and [__ *against* NP], both occurring three times in the data.

(35) One of my staff is also aboard the Clarion Call, advising on maritime protection. (CEC 698)

(36) If you have any messages like that you can pass them on yourself — but I'd advise against it. (HHC 991)

Even with these patterns the object can still be implied, as seen from (36). Here it is clear that the unexpressed object of *advise* is *you*.

All in all, no new prepositional patterns were found in the BNC data, but some of the patterns that did appear in the CLMET did not occur here. The prepositional phrase complements headed by *in*, *concerning* and *to*, all of which appeared once in the third part of the CLMET, were all missing from the BNC data. However, the normalized frequencies of the PPs headed by *of* and *on* have slightly increased, which seems to show that *advise* has increasingly started to select these two prepositions instead of allowing the larger variation in the choice of preposition that could be seen in the earlier periods.

8.2 Omission of the NP Object

As was noted in Section 2.3.3 *advise* is an object control verb, meaning that the object NP of the main clause controls the interpretation of the understood subject in the lower clause. According to Bach's generalization it should not be possible to omit the object NP in object control structures, since PRO would then lack a controller (Rizzi 1986, 503). The strong tendency for *advise* to take an NP object both with sentential and non-sentential complements was seen clearly in the data studied in the earlier chapters. However, violations to Bach's generalization do still occur with *advise*.

Consider the following example, from the *OED* (*OED* s.v. *advise*, v.):

(37) Seal will grow in Georgia, especially in the hilly or mountainous section. We would not advise to plant it in low lands. (*Special Crops*, 1917)

Here the NP object has been omitted, violating Bach's generalization. Cases like (37) also seem to go against the Projection Principle, according to which all lexical information must be syntactically represented (Haegeman 1991, 47), since the object argument seems to be absent. Rizzi provides a possible explanation for this in arguing that the argument role can be "saturated" lexically before

the application of the Projection Principle (1986, 508-9). In other words, the object role can be seen as a part of the lexical meaning of the predicate, so that the object argument is already filled inertly and the Projection Principle would still hold true. This analysis would also explain why the NP object can be omitted with only some predicates and not with others.

Rizzi claims that in these kinds of cases the object role is assigned “arbitrary interpretation” (ibid., 509), meaning that the implicit object should have generic, not specific reference. This prediction is perhaps quite surprising considering that omissions in language usually occur to avoid redundancy. Therefore, the omitted elements normally refer to things already known, so that the reference is then specific. However, following Rizzi’s claim, the situation seems to be the opposite in this case. The object is omitted specifically because its reference is not known. Interestingly, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 303) do not seem to agree with Rizzi, because they argue that the unexpressed human object can be either general or specific in its reference.

In this section I will study if Rizzi’s claim is supported by data drawn from the written part of the BNC. The aim is to find instances of *advise* with sentential complements involving object control but without an NP object. Since adverbial insertions and other factors make it difficult to search for all possible instances reliably, the focus will be on qualitative, not quantitative analysis.

According to Rohdenburg (2006, 145), as discussed in Section 2.3.3, *to*-infinitives, *that*-clauses and *-ing*-clauses are all possible complements of *advise* in cases where it is used with an unspecified object. He also argues that in current English the *-ing*-clause complement would be the preferred construction in these kinds of cases, whereas the *to*-infinitive is falling out of use completely (ibid.). Therefore, it is of interest to examine whether these claims are true on the basis of the BNC data studied here.

That-clause complements often occur with a \emptyset -*that*, making relevant instances difficult to search for. Also, as the invented example (38) below shows, with *that*-clauses the object NP can

sometimes be interpreted to be the same as the lower subject, which often explains the omission of the object NP:

(38) John advised (Peter) that Peter should leave.

More importantly, *that*-clause complements do not involve object control, since there are no understood subjects in the lower clause. Therefore, they do not violate Bach's generalization even when the object of *advise* is omitted. For these reasons *that*-clause complements are ignored in this study.

Despite the fact that the *OED* includes an example of a *to*-infinitive with the object omitted (see example (37)), this pattern does not seem possible on the basis of the corpus data, which is in concordance with the rareness of the [__ *to*-infinitive] pattern noted in earlier chapters. A search for the forms *advise*, *advises* and *advising* followed by the infinitive marker *to*⁸ yielded three tokens, but none of them were relevant. In two of them the passive form *advised* was misspelled and in one the object NP was extracted:

(39) Everyone was welcome, including prostitutes whom Libion would advise to become models... (ANF 224)

With the form *advised* possible instances are difficult to find since it is used with passives, and in fact, in a random sample of a 100 tokens⁹, all tokens involved a passive construction. Therefore, we can conclude that the *to*-infinitive complement is not used without the NP object in current English.

Even though it was not discussed by Rohdenburg, the *OED* also recognises the *wh*-clause complement without the object as a possible pattern for *advise*. Two tokens with this pattern were found in the diachronic data analysed in the previous chapters, but both of these occurred with a finite *wh*-clause which does not involve object control.

⁸ Search string: [advise,advises,advising] _TO0

⁹ Search string: advised _TO0

In the BNC a search for these yielded 10 tokens¹⁰, two of which were irrelevant. One involved a passive construction and in the other the verb was followed by the adjunct *wherever we can*. One of the remaining relevant examples involved a situation similar to that illustrated in (38) above:

(40) No more than a dozen people were involved in advising how Charles and Diana could reach a civilised arrangement. (CBF 8480)

Here the likeliest interpretation is that Charles and Diana are the ones who receive the advice, meaning that the implicit object NP is the same as the lower subject, and that the object might be omitted to avoid redundancy, since it is not the controller of the lower predicate. Six of the other seven cases did involve object control and in all but one of them the implicit object had generic reference. Below are two examples:

(41) In Britain a lifetime administrative career can still be crowned after retirement by a company directorship or a job advising how best to influence one's erstwhile colleagues. (CS3 494)

(42) He may need to advise how to obtain legal help or financial guidance. (B30 213)

In (41) the generic reference is seen from the use of the indefinite pronoun *one*, which is co-referential with the omitted object. In (42) the context makes it clear that the object is *a patient* in the general sense of any patient, which shows that the reference can be to a specific group, in this case the group of patients, but it is still general in the sense that it can refer to any member of that group. The only example where the implicit object had specific reference is seen below:

(43) 'I am meeting in one hour with a senior Air Force expert,' said Stannard. 'He will advise how best to get the package there.' (CAM 809-810)

Here *advise* can be interpreted as having the unexpressed object *me*.

The *OED* did not list any examples of the *-ing*-clause complement without the NP object, but this pattern was listed in the *OALD*, and several instances of it were found in the BNC. A lemma search for *advise* followed by an *-ing*-clause yielded 54 tokens¹¹, and a lemma search for *advise*

¹⁰ Search string: {advise}_V*_AVQ

¹¹ Search string: {advise}_V*_V*G

followed by a preposition and then an *-ing*-clause yielded 35 tokens¹². The data included 15 irrelevant tokens, five in the former and ten in the latter set of tokens. In four of them *advise* was used in the passive, in one of them the noun form *advice* was misspelled, and the rest were cases like the following:

- (44) Asimov advised aspiring writers to take their models from history and the classics (AJ0 251)
- (45) No doubt Picasso had advised Kisling of Modigliani's talent. (ANF 826)
- (46) When this study was mounted participants were advised in writing that all findings would be reported to their medical practitioner... (FT0 1473)

The *-ing*-form was either a modifier within the object NP (44), a proper noun (45) or a part of an adverbial (46). Example (46) would of course be irrelevant because of the passive as well. In addition to these irrelevant cases, the data included two tokens like (47) below, where it was unclear whether the *-ing*-form was used as a noun or a verb:

- (47) Some doctors advise against riding and diving. (G2T 1140)

Since the verbal interpretation is possible, these cases were included in the analysis.

Therefore, the remaining data included 49 tokens of [___ *-ing*-clause] pattern, and 25 tokens of [___ Prep *-ing*-clause] pattern. In the latter case the preposition was *against* in 17 of the tokens and *on* in eight of the tokens. This result seems to confirm Rohdenburg's claim, because the *-ing*-clause complement is indeed used instead of the *to*-infinitive when there is no object NP, although this does not yet prove anything about its frequency in relation to the *that*-clause.

All three patterns involving the *-ing*-clause are illustrated below:

- (48) I advise reading this book one entry at a time, and, where possible, following up the footnotes. (CKX 1013)
- (49) Detectives say a number of forged tickets are in circulation and advise against buying tickets from touts. (K1H 1109)
- (50) Experts from the AA, Halfords and local Road Safety officers will be on hand to advise on buying and fitting child seats. (K52 6302)

¹² Search string: {advise}_V*_PR*_V*G

In all of these examples the understood object NP has generic reference. The advice is directed to people in general, not to anyone in particular. This was indeed the case in most of the examples found in the data. However, even if the reference was generic, it did not always refer to completely everyone, but to a specific group of people, as in (47) above. There it was clear from the context that the advice was intended specifically to pregnant women. Still, the understood object referred to that whole group generically, not to any specific pregnant woman. This is the same situation as with the *wh*-clause complement in example (42) above.

In some instances the object of *advise* was unknown and could in a way be understood as referring to ‘the people in charge’, so the reference was not exactly generic, but the object was not specified either.

(51) ...for the continued dominance of the Axis in the European war advised maintaining a pro-Axis stance in external affairs. (HPV 801)

Here the understood object does not refer to all people in general, but to those in charge of the external affairs. However, the reference is still generic within that group.

All in all, of the 74 tokens with an *-ing*-clause complement, 55 involved an understood object with the kind of generic reference discussed above. In addition, there were five cases like the following where the implicit object could be found elsewhere in the sentence:

(52) Second, the Health Advisory Service visits hospitals and health services to advise on improving the current quality of service and to examine and advise on development plans for mental health. (FYW 990)

Here the implicit object of *advise* could be interpreted as being the NP *hospitals and health services*, so that the example might alternatively be phrased *to advise them on improving*. With this interpretation the reference would be more specific than in examples (48)-(51). However, in these cases the NP referred to some group or collective unit of people, like *hospitals and health services* in (52), which might make the reference more generic.

In the rest of the tokens the implicit object could be interpreted as a specific person, as in the following:

(53) I don't advise coming down to the mortuary, Pat. (HTJ 296).

(54) Certainly Leicestershire's team manager Jack Birkenshaw has no doubt about the credentials of the 27-year-old quickie, whose career took off when umpire Allan Jones, a former fast bowler himself, advised coming in off a straight rather than a curved run. (EB3 581)

In (53) the understood object would be *you*, referring to Pat. In (54) the object seems to be *the 27-year-old quickie*. In both these cases the advice seems to concern a specific situation, but in many of the instances with a specific understood object the advice was still generically applicable:

(55) I would strongly advise against buying a Moorish Idol. (FBN 2112)

This sentence was in reply to a question, and therefore the object could be interpreted as *you*.

However, as the example was from a periodical, the advice was probably intended to other readers as well, not just to the person who had sent in the question. This might in fact be one reason for the choice of omitting the object, since the form without the object seems more generic and might then be preferred in a text catered to all readers.

Since the data analysed here was rather limited in size, more research would be necessary to make any definitive claims. However, some interesting conclusions can still be made on the basis of the data. Rizzi's claim that the implicit object should have generic reference cannot be confirmed completely, because in 25% of the tokens the reference was clearly specific. It was also possible to recognise different levels of generality, so that the reference was not always completely arbitrary even in the generic instances, but rather generic within a certain group. All in all, there were no noticeable differences between the uses with and without the preposition or between the uses with *against* and *on*, as regards the reference of the omitted object NP. With all types, the proportions of generic and specific objects were quite similar.

9 Findings

The previous four chapters have focused on the analysis of data from four different periods, from the early 18th century to present day. In this chapter I will summarise the most important findings of these preceding chapters by discussing the major changes in the complementation of *advise* in the course of the last three centuries. I will also comment on the usage of some specific patterns and discuss some of the factors that affect the choice of complement with this verb.

As could be expected on the basis of the theoretical part of the thesis, *advise* allows a wide range of different complement structures. As many as 33 distinct complement patterns were found in all the data studied, including the patterns [__ *against* -ing-clause] and [__ *on* -ing-clause], which only occurred in the separate BNC data studied in Section 8.2. However, 11 of these patterns only appeared once, and several others only a handful of times. There were many patterns that either disappeared in the course of the period studied or only appeared for the first time in the later sets of data. These quantitative changes are shown in Table 9.1 below, which includes the normalized frequencies and the percentages of all those complement patterns that occurred at least five times in all of the diachronic data. The two -ing-clause patterns mentioned above are therefore not included in the table. Since the normalized frequency of the verb *advise* as a whole was noted to have declined dramatically over the course of the data, the percentage figures might be more useful in comparing the frequencies of the patterns in relation to each other.

Table 9.1. Changes in the frequencies of the most common complementation patterns.

Pattern	CLMET1		CLMET2		CLMET3		BNC	
	NF	%	NF	%	NF	%	NF	%
[__ NP <i>to</i> -infinitive]	48.1	64.3	32.1	64.6	17.3	54.5	7.9	25.9
[__ NP]	12.2	16.3	8.0	16.1	7.5	23.7	5.9	19.3
[__ Ø]	3.3	4.4	3.1	6.3	2.4	7.6	0.9	3.1
[__ quote]	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	7.9	25.9
[__ NP quote]	0.7	0.9	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.5	2.5	8.3
[__ <i>that</i> -clause]	1.6	2.2	1.6	3.2	1.0	3.0	0.7	2.4
[__ NP <i>that</i> -clause]	0.3	0.4	0.7	1.4	0.2	0.5	1.5	4.8
[__ NP <i>of</i> NP]	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.1	0.3	1.0	0.5	1.7

[__ NP <i>about</i> NP]	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.7
[__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	0.7	0.9	0.5	1.1	0.2	0.5	0.3	1.0
[__ NP <i>against</i> NP]	0.3	0.4	0.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
[__ NP <i>to</i> NP]	1.6	2.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.0
[__ <i>with</i> NP]	2.3	3.1	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
[__ NP <i>on</i> NP]	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.7	2.4
[__ NP _{POS} <i>-ing</i> -clause]	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.6	2.0	0.0	0.0

The table clearly shows that while there were a high number of patterns found overall, only a few of them occurred frequently. We can also note that the frequencies of the most common patterns did not change much within the first three periods studied. In fact, the first three patterns listed were the three most frequent in each part of the CLMET. However, there is still a noticeable decline in the frequency of the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern and a simultaneous increase in the frequency of the [__ NP] pattern in the course of the corpus. However, the greatest changes seem to take place between CLMET3 and the BNC, which is perhaps not that surprising considering the time span of 65 years between the data in these corpora. The dramatic decline of the *to*-infinitive is accompanied by a corresponding increase in the frequency of the quote pattern and, to a lesser degree, of the *that*-clause, when considering the percentage figures.

Because of its reporting function, we might expect the quote pattern to be quite strongly connected to certain text types over others, at least more so than the other patterns. Therefore, possible differences in the make-up of the corpora used might have some bearing on the frequency of this pattern. The “imaginative prose” section of the BNC does have more literary fiction than the CLMET, which also includes some less literary texts, such as personal letters and parliamentary debates. Nevertheless, the change is still so great that it cannot be explained by the slight difference in the corpus make-up alone, so it does seem that the use of *advise* as a reporting verb has increased significantly over the last few centuries.

While there was a wide range of complements found with *advise*, there was not as much variety in the senses it occurred in. In Section 4.4 I listed the three simplified senses of *advise*, formed on the basis of the consulted dictionaries, which acted as the basis for the analysis in the second part of

the thesis. Table 9.2 below shows the distributions of these three senses among the tokens analysed in each period studied.

Table 9.2. Senses of *advise* in the data.

Senses	CLMET1	CLMET2	CLMET3	BNC
1. 'to recommend or give guidance'	94.7%	96.1%	95.5%	88.3%
2. 'to inform or notify'	0.0%	1.8%	3.0%	11.7%
3. 'to deliberate or confer (with)'	5.3%	2.1%	1.5%	0.0%

An overwhelming majority of the tokens involved sense 1 in all four sets of data. However, the frequency of sense 2, 'to inform', has increased steadily throughout the data since its first appearance in CLMET2. Correspondingly, the frequencies of the other two senses have decreased, with sense 3 having disappeared completely in the BNC data. Whether this trend will continue and whether the 'inform' sense of the verb will eventually become as commonly used as the 'recommend' sense will be left for future research.

Because of this strong dominance of one single sense, it is not expected that the sense of the verb would be a major factor contributing to the choice of the complement. However, some connections between senses and complement patterns were found in the analysis. In Table 9.3 below I have compiled all those patterns that occurred at least once with either of the two less frequent senses, i.e. senses 2 or 3. The figures represent the number of tokens found in all of the diachronic data put together.

Table 9.3. Patterns occurring in sense 2 or 3.

	Sense 1	Sense 2	Sense 3
[__ <i>with</i> NP]	-	-	10
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>on</i> NP]	-	-	2
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>on -ing</i>]	-	-	1
[__ <i>with</i> NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	-	-	1
[__ NP <i>wh</i> -clause]	8	-	1
[__ NP]	177	6	3
[__ Ø]	47	2	3
[__ NP <i>that</i> -clause]	5	15	-
[__ <i>that</i> -clause]	23	4	-

[__ NP <i>of</i> NP]	-	10	-
[__ NP <i>on</i> NP]	8	1	-
[__ quote]	78	4	-
[__ NP quote]	26	3	-

Firstly, it is clear that the [__ *with* NP] complement, either alone or with other complements, only seems to be possible for the ‘to deliberate or confer (with)’ sense of the verb.¹³ Moreover, all the other patterns that appeared with sense 3 were still far more common with sense 1. Therefore there definitely exists a connection between sense 3 and the [__ *with* NP] complement. This pattern seems to have gone out of use in present-day English, however, since no tokens were found after the CLMET2 data. This might also explain why sense 3 as a whole seems to have gone out of use in present-day English, since this pattern was the only one used with the sense with some frequency.

A similar connection can be observed with sense 2 and the [__ NP *of* NP] pattern, which was not found with either of the other senses. As regards the *that*-clause complement, we can note that there is a connection between the sense of the verb and the use of the NP object. With the ‘recommend’ sense *advise* tends to occur without it, but with the ‘inform’ sense the verb tends to take the object. With all the other patterns appearing with more than one sense, sense 1 is still the prevalent sense. The patterns [__ NP] and [__ Ø] are interesting in that they are the only ones that were found in all three senses of *advise*.

One of the major findings of the analysis in the previous chapters was that *advise* tends to take the indirect NP object before any other complements. This tendency was especially strong with the *to*-infinitive, with which the NP seems to be mandatory. Therefore, Bach’s generalization seems to be confirmed with *advise*, as regards the infinitival complement of the verb. The object NP is required for the lower subject PRO to have a controller. Only one example of the [__ *to*-infinitive] pattern was found in all of the data, and in that the lower clause was in the passive so that the lower

¹³ One token with the pattern [__ *with* NP *to*-infinitive] was found with sense 1, as discussed in connection with example (6) in Section 6.1. However, this was deemed to be a single anomaly to the pattern [__ NP *to*-infinitive] and should not greatly affect the conclusion made here.

verb did not have an understood subject. Since there also was only one token with a bare infinitive complement found, the view of Biber et al. (see Section 4.5), namely that the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern is the only possible infinitival complement for *advise*, seems to be confirmed.

The analysis showed that with the *to*-infinitive, and in fact with all sentential complements, the initial NP object always had the theta role of Recipient. It also always had a human referent. The understood lower subject, on the other hand, nearly always had the theta role of Agent. In a few cases PRO had the role of Theme, which was a consequence of the lower clause being in the passive. In addition, there were a few tokens where the lower subject seemed to have the role of Experiencer, considering the lower predicate. However, even in these cases some level of agentivity seemed to be involved in the event described. The conclusion drawn was that the verb *advise* itself implies a certain level of agentivity in the lower clause, which might cause the uses where the lower subject does not have the role of Agent to be avoided.¹⁴

In the theoretical part of the thesis it was suggested that the *that*-clause complement would be more likely to occur without the NP object than the *to*-infinitive, since it does not involve object control. This was indeed the case in the first three sets of data, where the [__ *that*-clause] complement was more frequent than the [__ NP *that*-clause] complement. In the BNC data, however, the frequency of the latter pattern increased quite significantly. This change can mostly be attributed to the rise of the ‘inform’ sense of *advise*, since all but one of the tokens of this pattern involved this sense in the BNC. With the predominant ‘recommend’ sense, the tendency for the *that*-clause to not have the NP object was still strong in the BNC as well. This tendency can be explained by the fact that it is actually the pattern [__ *that*-clause], not [__ NP *that*-clause], that was found to be equivalent to the competing [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern.

The reporting function of *advise* was another case where the NP object was frequently not used. The quote complement was rare in general in the CLMET data, and in the BNC it appeared three

¹⁴ This conclusion is consistent with the findings by Rudanko (1989, 116-7), who notes that in object control structures roles other than Agent are less compatible and more strained, as regards the lower subject.

times as frequently without the NP than it did with it. The reason why the object NP is not necessary is that this complement does not involve object control that would require the presence of the NP. The matrix clause with *advise* only acts as a frame for the reported clause.

The tendency for *advise* to take the initial NP complement is summarized in Table 9.4 below. The table shows the proportions of all those tokens which included an indirect NP object either alone or preceding the other complements. Therefore, cases where the lone NP complement was a direct object are not taken into consideration here.

Table 9.4. Initial NP object with *advise*.

	CLMET1		CLMET2		CLMET3		BNC	
Indirect NP	177	78 %	231	81 %	146	74 %	176	61 %
No indirect NP	50	22 %	54	19 %	52	26 %	114	39 %

As seen from the table, the use without the NP has become more frequent in the last set of data.

This can mostly be explained by the increase of the reporting verb function of *advise* noted in this period, since this use tended to appear more often without the NP than with it, as discussed above.

Outside of this function the tendency is as strong as before. It is also worth noting that even in cases where there was no explicit NP object representing the Recipient argument this object could still be implied (see e.g. example (31) in Section 8.1.2).

Advise being an object control verb, this tendency to have the NP object is of course not overly surprising. Therefore, the cases where the verb is used without an object, but in an object control construction, are that much more interesting. In Section 8.2 it was seen that these kinds of violations of Bach's generalization do occasionally occur with *advise*. No cases were found with *to*-infinitive complements in current English, but with *wh*-clauses, and especially with *-ing*-clauses, some examples were found. Rizzi's (1986, 509) claim that the omitted object role would have generic reference seemed to hold true in most cases. In 60 of the 80 tokens with either an *-ing*-clause or an infinitival *wh*-clause the omitted object had generic reference. Even when the object had specific reference, the advice in question could still sometimes be considered generically applicable.

However, contrary to Rizzi's view, the interpretation was not always completely arbitrary in the generic cases, since the object could sometimes refer generically to the members of a certain group, and not necessarily to all people in general. In any case, the fact that tokens involving specific objects were quite frequent as well shows that Rizzi's claim could not be confirmed completely.

Both the *to*-infinitive and the *that*-clause were widely discussed in the literature as possible complements for *advise*, and on that basis it was surprising to see how great the difference in their frequencies was throughout the data. As seen from Table 9.1, the *to*-infinitive is continually the most frequent of all complements while the *that*-clause only accounts for a few percent of the tokens in each part. The frequency of the *that*-clause does rise slightly in the BNC data, but this is due to the increased use of the 'inform' sense of the verb, which often occurs with the [__ NP *that*-clause] pattern, and which does not allow the infinitival complement. With sense 1 its frequency declined. Table 9.5 shows the frequency figures of these two complements with the 'recommend' sense of *advise*, i.e. the sense with which both complements can occur. Both cases with and without the initial NP complement are included here.

Table 9.5. *To*-infinitive and *that*-clause with sense 1.

	CLMET1		CLMET2		CLMET3		BNC	
	NF	% (of all tokens)	NF	% (of all tokens)	NF	% (of all tokens)	NF	% (of all tokens)
<i>to</i> -infinitive	48.1	64.3	32.3	64.9	17.4	55.1	7.9	25.9
<i>that</i> -clause	2.0	2.6	2.1	4.2	0.8	2.5	0.5	1.7

According to Quirk et al. (1985, 1212) these two complements are used for different purposes. The *to*-infinitive would be used when introducing indirect directives and the *that*-clause when introducing indirect statements. According to the data, however, the *that*-clause can be used in both instances, and the difference is in fact in the senses of the verb, rather than in the complements themselves. In a way sense 1, 'to recommend', implies a directive in itself, just like sense 2, 'to inform', implies a statement. Whether the lower clause involves an indirect directive or a statement, depends then on the sense of *advise* in the main clause. Since the *that*-clause can be used with both

senses, it can also be used in both functions. The fact that the infinitive is still the more common complement with sense 1, and that only the *that*-clause is used with sense 2, might explain the basis for the claim by Quirk et al.

On the basis of the data the main factor affecting the choice between the *to*-infinitive and the *that*-clause with sense 1 of the verb is the initial NP object. As was noted before, the NP seems to be mandatory with the infinitive, but the *that*-clause nearly always occurs without it in this sense. Therefore, the *that*-clause is preferred in cases where the recipient of the advice, indicated by the NP object, is not explicitly mentioned, since the [__ *to*-infinitive] pattern would violate Bach's generalization. In addition, the *that*-clause is needed when the recipient is known, but it is different from the lower subject. When the recipient is the same as the lower subject, the infinitive is preferred, as seen from its greater overall frequency. The analysis also showed that the complexity principle and the horror aequi principle could affect the choice between the *to*-infinitive and the *that*-clause somewhat in individual cases, but overall they were not found to be major factors. In general, it seems that the *that*-clause is only used if there is a specific reason for it and that the infinitive is still the unmarked alternative.

A similar pattern could also be observed with the two types of *wh*-clause complement. As expected on the basis of the literature, the infinitival *wh*-clause was more frequently used with *advise* than the finite *wh*-clause. However, the finite clause was the only one that could occur without the NP object, so it was needed when the Recipient argument was not explicit. Otherwise the infinitival *wh*-clause was the norm. Therefore, the choice between the two parallels the one between the *to*-infinitive and the *that*-clause complements.

One of the major consequences of the Great Complement Shift, as discussed in Section 2.4.4, is the emergence of the *-ing*-clause complement as a competing construction for the *to*-infinitive. It was noted that the *-ing*-clause has increasingly started to replace the infinitive complement with many predicates. However, on the basis of our data it seems that the Great Complement Shift has

not yet noticeably affected the complementation of *advise*. The *-ing*-clause was found to be an extremely marginal complement in all four sets of data in the diachronic analysis. However, Rohdenburg's claim that the *-ing*-clause would be the preferred complement in situations where there is no explicit NP object seems to be confirmed by our analysis. The separate BNC data analysed in Section 8.2 showed that exceptions to Bach's generalization are relatively frequent with the *-ing*-clause, whereas with the *to*-infinitive they do not occur in current English. Therefore, it seems that this environment without an explicit NP object is the one where the *-ing*-clause has started to gain ground the most.

In the theoretical part of the thesis it was also suggested that there might be some semantic differences between the *to*-infinitive and the *-ing*-clause, which might affect the choice of complement. Although our analysis did not indicate any such differences with *advise*, the number of tokens involving the *-ing*-clause was so small that it is impossible to make any definitive claims pertaining to possible meaning differences between the constructions. Nevertheless, this finding raises the question of whether this seeming lack of semantic differentiation similar to verbs like *remember* (see Section 2.4.4) has been one reason why the rise of the *-ing*-clause complement has not yet strongly affected *advise*.

Even though sentential complements were involved in the majority of the tokens, the [__ NP] patten actually continued to be among the most frequent complements throughout the period studied. When preceding other complements, the NP was always an indirect object, meaning that it had human reference and filled the role of Recipient in the thematic structure of *advise*. As the lone complement, however, the NP could be either an indirect object or a direct object, representing the role of Theme. The proportions of these two types of objects are seen in Table 9.6 below.

Table 9.6. The type of the lone NP object.

	CLMET1		CLMET2		CLMET3		BNC	
Indirect object	16	43 %	26	57 %	29	62 %	36	64 %
Direct object	21	57 %	20	43 %	18	38 %	20	36 %

On the basis of the data the indirect object has become more and more frequent in relation to the direct object.

One interesting finding as regards the NP object is that only the direct object could be extracted on the basis of the data. There were no tokens where the indirect NP object was extracted with any of the patterns, sentential or non-sentential. This is an interesting result since there does not seem to be any reason why the indirect object could not be extracted. In fact, one of the tokens that were disregarded in the separate BNC analysis in Section 8.2 (see example (39) in that section) did involve an extracted indirect object. While this token was irrelevant for the analysis in Section 8.2, it still proves that the extraction of indirect objects is possible with *advise*. Nevertheless, it seems that extractions do occur much more frequently with direct objects. The possibility for the NP objects to be extracted also explains the occurrence of the rare pattern [__ NP NP]. This was only found with the direct object being extracted.

The dictionaries consulted in Chapter 4 listed quite a few different prepositional phrases as possible complements for *advise*. In this light it was not surprising that a fairly large number of prepositional complement patterns were also found in the data analysed. As many as nine different prepositions occurred as a part of the PP complements found, although three of them only appeared once. In fact, despite the high number of different patterns, PP complements were rare in general, as they only accounted for a few percent of each set of tokens. With reference to Huddleston and Pullum (2002), discussed in Section 2.1, it seems that *advise* does not license one single prepositional complement quite as strongly as some other predicates do. In most cases the meaning of the prepositional phrase is still directly derived from the meaning of the preposition itself. However, the latest set of data studied showed that the PPs headed by *on* and *of* have become more frequent in relation to other patterns, suggesting that *advise* has started to select these patterns more strongly in recent decades. This is especially true for the pattern [__ NP *of* NP], since it seems to have become the expected prepositional complement for sense 2 of *advise*, as seen from Table 9.3.

10 Conclusion

This thesis has aimed to provide a corpus-based study on the complementation of *advise* from the early 18th century to present-day English. The purpose has been to investigate both the changes that have occurred in the recent centuries and the situation as it stands now.

Advise was found to have taken a large variety of different complement patterns over the course of the period studied, but only a few of them occurred with some frequency. The most common patterns remained consistent throughout the data. The most frequent of these was the [__ NP *to*-infinitive] pattern, which did, however, suffer a dramatic decrease in the present-day data, due to the rise of the quote pattern.

The analysis revealed much less variety in the senses of the verb than it did with the complement patterns, since sense 1, ‘to recommend’, was the dominant sense throughout the data. The use of sense 3, ‘to deliberate’, declined in each set of data studied and the sense fell off use completely by the present-day data. On the other hand, sense 2, ‘to inform’, only first appeared in CLMET2, and its use has increased ever since. One of the research questions raised in the introduction was whether there exist any connections between the patterns and senses of *advise*. Because of the strong prevalence of one single sense, the sense of the verb did not play a major role in the choice of patterns, but some connections were found. The [__ *with* NP] pattern was restricted to sense 3, and the [__ NP *of* NP] pattern to sense 2. The *that*-clause complement, on the other hand, usually occurred with an NP object in sense 2 but without one in sense 1. All other patterns were predominantly used with sense 1.

Among the main results of the analysis was the tendency for *advise* to take an indirect NP object, either alone or preceding another complement. The tendency was particularly strong for the *to*-infinitive complement, which does not seem to occur without the object in current English. This result is in concordance with Bach’s generalization. However, exceptions to Bach’s generalization were found to be possible with the *-ing*-clause complement. Rizzi’s (1986) claim that the omitted

objects would tend to have generic reference was not completely confirmed, since instances with specific reference were found with some frequency as well.

The competition between the *to*-infinitive and the *that*-clause complements was one important focal point in the analysis. The sense of the verb proved to have some influence in the choice, since only the latter structure could occur with the ‘inform’ sense of the verb. With the predominant ‘recommend’ sense, however, the *to*-infinitive was the dominant variant, and the *that*-clause was mainly only used when there was no NP object, as the infinitive would have caused a violation of Bach’s generalization in these instances.

Interestingly, the Great Complement Shift was found not yet to have strongly affected *advise*, as regards the rise of the *-ing*-clause complement. This pattern remained a marginal complement variant compared to the infinitive even in the latest set of data. However, the *-ing*-clause, not the infinitive, was found to be used in cases that violate Bach’s generalization, which confirms Rohdenburg’s (2006) claim that this variant has started to become the preferred option in cases without an explicit object. This suggests that the effects of the Great Complement Shift are starting to be seen with *advise* as well, at least in this particular environment.

As is the case with any study, there are still many aspects of this topic that we could not fully address here, and which are therefore left for future research. Because of its diachronic focus, this thesis is limited to written British English, instead of covering all varieties of the language. Therefore, there still remains much room for studying the complementation of *advise* in other types of English, be it spoken language, regional varieties or specific text types. In addition, the semantic factors affecting the choice of complement is another area which could prove to be fruitful for further research. Our current analysis did not allow us to make any definite claims on this subject, but the rise of the *-ing*-clause and the ‘inform’ sense of the verb might provide a change worth studying more in the future.

Works cited

Corpora

Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (extended version). Available from
<https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/clmetev.htm>

The British National Corpus. BNC XML Edition. 2007. Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. Available from
<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk>.

Dictionaries

Hands, Penny, ed. 2009. *Collins COBUILD Advanced Dictionary*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. December 2012. Oxford University Press. Available from
<http://www.oed.com>.

Turnbull, Joanna et al., eds. 2010. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Other works cited

Allerton, David J. "‘Infinitivitis’ in English." In *Essays on the English Language and Applied Linguistics on the Occasion of Gerhard Nickel's 60th Birthday*, ed. Josef Klegraf and Dietrich Nehls, 11-23. Heidelberg: Groos.

Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad and Randi Reppen. 1998. *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Biber, Douglas. 2010. "Corpus-based and Corpus-driven Analyses of Language Variation and Use." In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, ed. Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog, 159-191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1968. "Entailment and the Meaning of Structures." *Glossa* 2: 119-127.

Carnie, Andrew. 2002. *Syntax: A Generative Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Davies, William D. and Stanley Dubinsky. 2004. *The Grammar of Raising and Control: A Course in Syntactic Argumentation*. Malden: Blackwell.
- De Smet, Hendrik. 2005. "A corpus of Late Modern English texts." *ICAME Journal* 29: 69-82.
- Declerck, Renaat. 1991. *A Comprehensive Descriptive Grammar of English*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Duffley, Patrick J. 2000. "Gerund versus Infinitive as Complement of Transitive Verbs in English: The Problems of 'Tense' and 'Control'." *Journal of English Linguistics* 28, 3: 221-248.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1991. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1997. "Introduction to Syntax." *LSA Linguistic Institute*.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George and John Robert Ross. 1966. "Criterion for verb phrase constituency." *Harvard Computation Laboratory Report to the National Science Foundation on Mathematical linguistics and automatic translation*. NSF-17.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1968. "Some assumptions in the metatheory of linguistics". *Linguistics* 39: 87-102.
- Lindquist, Hans. 2009. *Corpus Linguistics and the Description of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mair, Christian. 2002. "Three changing patterns of verb complementation in Late Modern English: a real-time study based on matching text corpora." *English Language and Linguistics* 6, 1: 105-31.
- Poutsma, Hendrik. 1904. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*. Groningen: Noordhoff.
- Perlmutter, David M. and Scott Soames. 1979. *Syntactic Argumentation and the Structure of English*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. "Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of pro." *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 3: 551-557.
- Rohdenburg, Günther. 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 *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*, ed. Günther Rohdenburg and Britta Mondorf, 205-250. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rohdenburg, Günther. 2006. "The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System." In *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms: English from 1500-2000*, ed. Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Dieter Kastovsky, Nikolaus Ritt, and Herbert Schendl, 143-166. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 1989. *Complementation and Case Grammar: A Syntactic and Semantic Study of Selected Patterns of Complementation in Present-Day English*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Svartvik, Jan. 1992. "Corpus linguistics comes of age." In *Directions in Corpus Linguistics*, ed. Jan Svartvik, 7-13. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vosberg, Uwe. 2003. "The role of extractions and *horror aequi* in the evolution of *-ing* complements in Modern English." In *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*, ed. Günther Rohdenburg and Britta Mondorf, 305-328. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vosberg, Uwe. 2009. "Non-finite complements." In *One Language, Two Grammars?*, ed. Günther Rohdenburg and Julia Schlüter, 212-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.