

# Grammatical features of Shakespeare's language

---

**Blagus, Gorana**

**Master's thesis / Diplomski rad**

**2016**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:142:242689>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2025-02-27**



**FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET**  
SVEUČILIŠTE JOSIPA JURJA STROSSMAYERA U OSIJEKU

*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer i mađarskog  
jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer

Gorana Blagus

## **Gramatička obilježja Shakespeareovog jezika**

Diplomski rad

Mentor: izv. prof. dr. sc. Tanja Gradečak – Erdeljić

Osijek, 2016.

Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za engleski jezik i književnost

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer i mađarskog  
jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer

Gorana Blagus

## **Gramatička obilježja Shakespeareovog jezika**

Diplomski rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti

Znanstveno polje: filologija

Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentor: izv. prof. dr. sc. Tanja Gradečak – Erdeljić

Osijek, 2016.

J.J. Strossmayer University in Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Teaching English as a Foreign Language, MA Programme and

Teaching German as a Foreign Language, MA Programme

Gorana Blagus

**Grammatical features of Shakespeare's language**

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić, Associate Professor

Osijek, 2016

J.J. Strossmayer University in Osijek  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Department of English Language and Literature  
Teaching English as a Foreign Language, MA Programme and  
Teaching German as a Foreign Language, MA Programme

Gorana Blagus

**Grammatical features of Shakespeare's language**

Master's Thesis

Scientific discipline: Humanities

Scientific field: Philology

Scientific branch: English Studies

Supervisor: Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić, Associate Professor

Osijek, 2016

# Osijek, 2016

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	6
2. The Challenge of Periodization of English Language.....	7
3. Origin of English Language.....	7
3. 1. Germanic Group of Languages.....	8
4. Historical Background of English Language .....	9
4.1. Old English.....	10
4. 1. 1. Foreign Influences on Old English.....	13
4. 1. 2. The NormanConquest.....	14
4. 2. Middle English.....	15
4. 3. Modern English.....	17
5. The English Renaissance – Elizabethan Era.....	22
6. Life of William Shakespeare.....	22
7. Shakespeare's Language.....	24
8. Grammatical Features of Shakespearean Language.....	26
8.1. The Most Prominent Features of Shakespearean Language.....	26
8.1.1. Nouns.....	26
8.1.2. Genitive Case.....	27
8.1.3. Pronouns.....	28
8.1.4. Relative Pronoun.....	33
8.1.5. Indefinite Pronouns.....	35
8.1.6. Adjectives.....	36

8.1.7. Comparative.....	37
8.1.8. The Possessive Adjectives.....	37
8.1.9. Just, Mere, Proper and Very.....	38
8.1.10. Articles a/an.....	38
8.1.11. Conjunctions.....	38
8.1.12. Prepositions.....	38
8.1.13. Inflections.....	40
8.1.14. Plural.....	40
8.1.15.3rd Person Singular.....	40
8.1.16. Preterite-Present.....	42
8.1.17. Passive Voice.....	42
8.2. Shakespeare’s Grammatical Innovations.....	43
8.2.1. Adjectives Used as Adverbs.....	43
8.2.2. Adjective Compounds.....	43
8.2.3. Adverbs Used as Nouns.....	45
8.2.4. Adverbs Used as Adjectives.....	46
8.3. Irregularities in Shakespearean Language.....	46
9. Conclusion.....	50
10. Works Cited.....	52

## **Grammatical Features of Shakesperean Language**

The objective of this paper is to depict the main grammatical features of Shakesperean language concerning the changes that happened during time and social circumstances of that time. The paper brings a short overview of the history of English language, starting with the origin of English, continuing through influences that affected its development, and leading to the features of the Modern English variety. After that, William Shakespeare, his life and work are introduced, as well as the historical environment and its cultural components that affected Shakespeare in his writing.

In the main part of the paper, one can find Shakesperean language explained and grammatical features organised into three chapters: The most prominent grammatical features in comparison to Present-day English, Grammatical irregularities in Shakesperean language and Shakespeare's grammatical innovations.

**Keywords:** Shakespeare, grammar, language, features, characteristics



## **Gramatička obilježja Shakespeareovog jezika**

Cilj je ovog rada prikazati glavna gramatička obilježja Shakespeareovog jezika, uvjetovana promjenama koje su se dogodile kroz vrijeme, ali i društvenim okolnostima toga doba. Rad donosi kratak pregled povijesti engleskog jezika, počevši s podrijetlom engleskom jezika, nastavljajući s utjecajima koji su djelovali na njegov razvoj pa sve do karakteristika moderne inačice engleskog jezika. Nakon toga, predstavljan je William Shakespeare, njegov rad i život, kao i povijesno okruženje i njegove kulturne sastavnice koje su utjecale na Shakespearea pri njegovom pisanju.

U glavnom dijelu rada može se pronaći objašnjenje Shakespeareova jezika te gramatička obilježja organizirana u tri poglavlja: najistaknutija gramatička obilježja u usporedbi s engleskim jezikom danas, gramatičke nepravilnosti u Shakespeareovom jeziku te Shakespeareove gramatičke novitete.

Ključne riječi: Shakespeare, gramatika, jezik, obilježja, karakteristike

## 1. Introduction

William Shakespeare is remembered as one of the greatest English playwrights, but also one of the greatest influencers when it comes to English language. English was a dynamic language throughout the whole of its history, and Middle and Elizabethan English witnessed some major changes that resulted in the emergence of Modern English.

English language was more suited to changes at that time, so the age of Shakespeare was very prolific when it comes to linguistic changes of any kind. Shakespeare introduced around 1,500 new English words among 20,000 used in his corpus – more than any poet ever. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:39). His linguistic innovations reflected, not only in, what some authors call ‘explosion of vocabulary’, but also in the way he used - English grammar.

After an extensive research on William Shakespeare, his life and biography, as well as his works and career as a playwright and actor, this paper focuses on the mark Shakespeare left in the English language – more specifically in the most prominent grammatical features that Shakespeare used in his writings. The paper is divided into three chapters: the most prominent grammatical features of Shakespearean language in comparison to Present-day English (hereinafter referred to as PdE), grammatical irregularities in Shakespearean language (hereinafter referred to as ShE) and Shakespeare’s grammatical innovations.

The first chapter puts emphasis on Shakespeare language in comparison to Present-day English, explains the differences between Shakespeare’s grammar and features that can be found in today’s English grammar. Furthermore, the second chapter entitled ‘Grammatical irregularities in Shakespearean language’ shows Shakespeare’s discrepancy in using different grammatical forms and features, characteristic for his time. Lastly, ‘Shakespeare’s grammatical innovations’ displays his linguistic creativity that manifested in playing with grammatical and linguistic features such as using adverbs as adjectives or pronouns, etc.

## 2. The Challenge of the Periodization of the English Language

According to Blake, to most people today 'English' language means the variety of the language characterized by the written form which is highly regulated, - known as Standard English. (Blake, 1996:1). He considers that one cannot decide correctly when 'English' began because the concept 'English' is to a large extent a political and educational one. (Blake, 1996: 1-2) Nevertheless, histories have divided English language into three major periods: Old English (sometimes referred to as Anglo-Saxon), Middle English and Modern English, which can be branched into two categories Early Modern English and Late Modern English. Baugh and Cable in *A History of the English Language* describe the development of the English language through three time periods: Old English (450 – 1150), Middle English (1150 – 1500), and Modern English (since 1500) (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 46).

## 3. The origin of the English language

The English language, as the most European languages, traces its original roots back to the family of the Indo-European languages. There is no written evidence of an original Indo-European language, so the general knowledge about it is based on the hypothesis and reconstruction. Between 3500 BC and 2500 BC, the Indo-Europeans began to spread out across Europe and Asia, so their languages developed and diverged in isolation. The original Indo-European language was split, until around 1000 BC, into a dozen or more major language groups or families. The main groups are: Hellenic, Italic, Indo-Iranian, Celtic, Germanic, Armenian, Balto-Slavic, and Albanian. Several more groups (including Anatolian, Tocharian, Phrygian, Thracian, Illyrian, etc.) have died out completely, while other may have existed and didn't leave a trace ("Before English", Mastin, 2011: par.1). The existence of cognates (words of similar meaning and form in different languages) proves and confirms the common ancestry of these languages. The recognition of this common ancestry of Indo-European languages belongs to the amateur linguist Sir William Jones in 1786.

Some of the examples of cognates include: *father* in English, *Vater* in German, *pater* in Latin and Greek, *fadir* in Old Norse and *pitr* in ancient Vedic Sanskrit; *Brother* in English, *broeder* in Dutch, *Bruder* in German, *braithair* in Gaelic, *bróðr* in Old Norse and *bhratar* in Sanskrit; *Three* in English, *tres* in Latin, *tris* in Greek, *drei* in German, *twee* in Dutch, *trí* in Sanskrit; *Is* in English,

*est* in Latin, *esti* in Greek, *ist* in Gothic, *asti* in Sanskrit. (“Before English“, Mastin, 2011: par.6-7)

### 3.1. Germanic Group of Languages

The Germanic language speaking group can be placed in the region between the Elbe river in modern Germany and southern Sweden around 3,000 years ago. (“Before English“ Mastin, 2011: par.8) Similarly the history of the Indo-European language, the early history of Germanic is also largely based on reconstruction because there are no written data about it. The earliest record of a Germanic language is written in Gothic, which were the translations of the New Testament and the Gospels. (Baugh, Cable, 2005:28).

Scholars made a division of the Germanic languages into three groups: West Germanic, including English, German, and Netherlandic (Dutch); North Germanic, including Danish, Swedish, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Faroese; and East Germanic, now extinct, comprising only Gothic and the languages of the Vandals, Burgundians, and a few other tribes. (Buccini, Moulton, 2016:“Germanic Languages: par.1)

West Germanic is divided into two branches, High and Low German by the operation of the Second Sound-Shift. Low German includes Old Saxon, Old Low Franconian, Old Frisian, and Old English, while High German is divided into Old High German, Middle High German, and Modern High German. (Baugh, Cable, 2005:29)

Two other groups include East and North Germanic, where the principal language of the East Germanic is Gothic, while North Germanic languages are known as one which were spoken in Scandinavia, Denmark, Iceland, and the Faroe Islands. The earlier form of the Scandinavian language is known as Old Norse. (Baugh, Cable, 2005:29)

Over time, certain consonants in the Germanic family of languages have shifted somewhat from the Indo-European base, as stated by Jacob Grimm. Therefore, Germanic words like the English ‘foot’, West Frisian foet, Danish fod, Swedish fot, etc, are related to the Latin ped, Lithuanian peda, Sanskrit pada, etc, due to the shifting of the “p” to “f” and the ‘d’, to ‘t’. Several other consonants have also shifted (‘d’, to ‘t’, ‘k’, to ‘h’, ‘t’, to ‘th’, etc), hiding to some extent the common ancestry of many of the daughter languages of Indo-European. This process explains many apparent root differences in English words of Germanic and Latinate origin (e.g. father and paternal, ten and decimal, horn and cornucopia, three and triple, etc). (“Before English“,Mastin, 2011: par.8)

English was first brought to the North Sea coasts of England in the 5th and 6th centuries A.D. by the immigrants who spoke a cluster of related dialects falling within the Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family. Their language began to develop its own distinctive features in isolation from the continental Germanic languages, and by 600 A.D. developed into what we call today Old English or Anglo-Saxon, covering the territory of most of modern England. (Kemmer, 2005: par.1)

#### 4. Historical background of the English Language

Before the Anglo-Saxons arrived, the first inhabitants on the British Isles were Celts and Picts. The first people in England whose language is known to have existed are the Celts and Celtic was probably the first Indo-European language spoken in England. Thus, the majority of the population of Britain spoke Celtic languages, which were divided into two branches: Gaelic or Goidelic and Brythonic. Latin was introduced when Britain became a province of the Roman Empire and it was spoken for a period of about four centuries before the coming of English. The Romans never penetrated far into the mountains of Wales and Scotland, but they protected the northern boundary by a stone wall stretching across England at approximately the limits of Agricola's permanent conquest and the district south of this line was under Roman rule for more than 300 years. It was inevitable that the Roman conquest of Britain will be followed by the Romanization - where the Romans lived and ruled, there Roman ways were found. Among all the evidence of Romanization, the most relevant for this paper is the use of Latin language - a great number of inscriptions have been found, all of them being in Latin. Latin was used as the language of government and the military in Roman Britain, especially in urban areas and among the upper echelons of society.

Latin never replaced the Celtic language in Britain as it did in Gaul and its borrowings found in Old English are explained as being borrowed either on continent or during or after the conversion to Christianity. In contrast to that, a very few words were borrowed into English from Celtic, while it is uncertain whether Celtic influenced some areas of grammar and pronunciation.

The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity was an event of huge cultural significance. It began in the late sixth century and was mostly complete by the late seventh century. One of its main impacts was the introduction of writing extensive texts in the Roman alphabet on parchment, in contrast to inscribing very short inscriptions on wood, bone, or stone in runic characters. Almost all of the surviving documentary evidence concerning Old English is mediated

through the Church. The course of history was affected in 449 when Germanic tribes, the founders of the English nation began the invasion of Britain. Bede in *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* stated that the Germanic tribes that conquered England were the Jutes, Saxons, and Angles.

The Celts called their Germanic conquerors Saxons, as well as early Latin writers, who, following Celtic usage, generally call the Germanic inhabitants of England Saxons and the land Saxonia. Soon, beside Saxons, the terms Angle and Anglia appear and refer to the West Germanic tribes in general. In 601 Æthelbert, king of Kent, is styled *rex Anglorum* by Pope Gregory and a century later Bede called his history the *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*. As time passed, Angli and Anglia become the usual terms in Latin texts. However, writers in the vernacular never call their language anything but Englisc (English). Although the word derived from the name of the Angles (OE Engle), it is used without distinction for the language of all the invading tribes. England (land of the Angles) begins to take its place from about the year 1000, which means that the name English is older than the name England. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 39- 45)

#### 4.1. Old English

It is very difficult to determine when Old English began, because it cannot be traced beyond the date of the earliest records for either Old English or any of its closest relatives. ‘Old English’ is the agreed name for the language of the earliest extensive sources found in contemporary copies: Latin-English glossaries from around the year 700, although some other material was certainly composed before 700, but survives only in later copies. By that time, Old English was already very different from its Germanic sister languages as a result of many sound changes and other linguistic developments. The most important changes had already happened before and some of them were very probably in progress or even complete before the time of the settlement in England. („Old English“: par.15) Some scholars distinguish the undocumented period before the earliest texts as ‘pre-Old English’. Old English belongs to the West Germanic branch of the Germanic languages, along with Old Frisian, Old Saxon, Old High German, and the various dialects which later gave rise to Old Dutch. (Durkin: par.18)

Old English was not a uniform language and within it one can distinguish four dialects: Northumbrian, Mercian, West Saxon, and Kentish. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 47)

Language of Old English has undergone many profound changes over time. Firstly, the pronunciation of Old English words commonly differs from that of their modern equivalents, particularly the long vowels which have undergone considerable modification. (Baugh, Cable,

2002: 48-49) Therefore, the Old English word *stān* is the same word as Modern English *stone*, but the vowel is different. A similar change happens in *hālig—holy*, *gān—go*, *bān—bone*, *rāp—rope*, *hlāf—oaf*, *bāt—boat*. Other vowels have undergone changes, too - *fōt* (foot), *cēne* (keen), *metan* (mete), *riht* (right), *hū* (how), and *hlūd* (loud), but their identity is still familiar to modern speaker and can be connected to their modern descendants. Words like *hēafod* (head), *fæger* (fair), or *sāwol* (soul) display forms that were contracted in later English. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 49)

Furthermore, some of the most obvious differences in Old English, that the modern reader can notice, are differences in spelling. Old English used two characters to represent the sound of *th*: þ and ð, *thorn* and *eth*, as in the word *wiþ* (with) or *ðā* (then), which does not exist today. It also expressed the sound of *a* in hat by a digraph *æ* (ash). Also, Old English represented the sound of *sh* by *sc*, as in *scēap* (sheep) or *scēotan* (shoot), and the sound of *k* by *c*, as in *cynn* (kin) or *nacod* (naked). *C* was also used for the affricate now spelled *ch*, as in *speech*. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 49)

Further, an important feature of Old English is the rarity of the words derived from Latin and the absence of those from French, which today form a large part of the present English vocabulary and make up more than half of the words that are now in common use. The vocabulary of Old English was almost purely Germanic and a large part of it disappeared from today's language. Those that survive are basic elements of English vocabulary and, by the frequency with which they occur, make up a large part of any English sentence. Except pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs, and the like, they express fundamental concepts like *mann* (man), *wīf* (wife, woman), *cild* (child), *hūs* (house), *weall* (wall), *mete* (meat, food), *gærs* (grass), *lēaf* (leaf), *fugol* (fowl, bird), *gōd* (good), *hēah* (high), *strang* (strong), *etan* (eat), *drincan* (drink), (sleep), *libban* (live), *feohtan* (fight). (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 49)

The most fundamental feature that distinguishes Old English from the language of today is its grammar, which resembles more to modern German. While Modern English is an analytic, Old English a synthetic language, what means that it indicates the relation of words in a sentence largely by means of inflections. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 50)

The Old English nouns had four cases. While the endings of these cases vary with different nouns, they fall into certain broad categories or declensions. One can differentiate a vowel declension and a consonant declension, also known as the strong and weak declensions, according to whether the stem ended in Germanic in a vowel or a consonant. Within each of these types there

are certain subdivisions. The gender of Old English nouns does not depend on considerations of sex. Although nouns determining males are often masculine and those indicating females feminine, nouns indicating neuter objects are not necessarily neuter: *Stān* (stone) is masculine, *mōna* (moon) is masculine, but *sunne* (sun) is feminine, as in German. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 50-51)

An important characteristic of the Germanic languages affects adjectives as well - it is the development of a twofold declension of the adjective: one, the strong declension, used with nouns when not accompanied by a definite article or similar word (such as a demonstrative or possessive pronoun), the other, the weak declension, used when the noun is preceded by such a word. Therefore, in Old English one can find *gōd mann* (good man) but *sē gōda mann* (the good man), which are forms of the nominative singular masculine in the strong and weak. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 51-52)

Verbs in Old English can be distinguished only by two simple tenses by inflection: a present and a past. It had no inflectional forms for the passive as it was the case in Latin or Greek. Also, it recognized the indicative, subjunctive, and imperative moods and had the usual two numbers and three persons. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 53)

In addition, a peculiar characteristic of the Germanic languages meant the division of the verb into two great classes - the weak and the strong, today known as regular and irregular verbs. These terms, commonly used in modern grammars, are not convenient because they suggest an irregularity in the strong verbs that is more apparent than real. The strong verbs, like *sing*, *sang*, *sung*, which represent the basic Indo-European type, are so named because they have the power of indicating change of tense by a modification of their root vowel, while in the weak verbs, such as *walk*, *walked*, *walked*, the change is effected by the addition of a “dental,” sometimes of an extra syllable. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 54)

A part of the flexibility of the Old English vocabulary comes from the generous use made of prefixes and suffixes to form new words from old words and to modify or extend the root idea, where it also resembles modern German. Some suffixes used for forming words were: *-ig*, *-full*, *-lēas*, *-lice*, *-nes*, and *-ung*. Others frequently used include the adjective suffixes *-sum* (wynsum) and *-wīs* (rihtwīs), the noun suffixes *-dōm* (cyningdōm, eorldōm), *-end*, and *-ere* denoting the agent, *-hād* (cildhād), *-ing* in patronymics, *-ung* (dagung dawn), *-scipe* (frēondscipe), etc. The use of prefixes was a fertile resource in word building, too and it is particularly characteristic in the formation of verbs. There are about a dozen prefixes that occur with great frequency, for example: *ā-*, *be-*, *for-*, *fore-*, *ge-*, *mis-*, *of-*, *ofer-*, *on-*, *tō-*, *un-*, *under-*, and *wiþ*. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 60)



Lastly, Old English was different when it comes to syntax, too. One of the most obvious characteristics of syntactic style in any language is the degree to which grammatical and semantic relationships are expressed by subordinate clauses. A high proportion of long sentences with subordination is known as hypotactic style, whereas shorter sentences and a higher proportion of principal clauses is paratactic. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 61)

#### 4.1.1. Foreign influences on Old English

Old English language was under the great influence of other languages, which mostly includes Celtic language, Roman and Scandinavian languages. Celtic language mainly influenced the names of the places (*Kent, Devonshire, London, Winchester, Salisbury, Exeter, Gloucester, Worcester, Lichfield, Thames, Avon, Dover*, etc.) and did not have any other important influence on Old English (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 67)

On the other hand, Latin had a major impact on Old English when it comes to language as well as culture and religion. A new vocabulary was introduced due to new philosophical and spiritual concepts that stem from Christianity. Some of the Latin borrowings in this period include: *abbot, alms, altar, angel, anthem, Arian, ark, candle, canon, chalice, cleric, cowl, deacon, disciple, epistle, hymn, litany, manna, martyr, mass, minster, noon, nun, offer, organ, pall, palm, pope, priest, provost, psalm, psalter, relic, rule, shrift, shrine, shrive, stole, subdeacon, synod, temple, tunic* and *tunic*.

Church strongly influenced domestic life of people. Its influence on words belongs in the group of the earlier borrowings and it is the most evident in the adoption of many words concerning names of the clothing items and household use (*cap, sock, silk, purple, chest, mat, sack*), words denoting foods (*pear, radish, doe, oyster, beet*), names of trees, plants, and herbs (*box, pine, aloes, balsam, fennel, hyssop, lily, mallow, marshmallow, myrrh, rue, savory*). Another aspect of its influence was obvious through the language that is related to learning and education (*school, master, Latin, grammic(al), verse, meter, gloss, notary*). (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 78)

Old English went through Scandinavian influence, which as well changed the language in new ways. It was strongest in the north and lasted for a full 600 years. (Kemmer, 2001-2005: par.2) Since it can be felt on all linguistic levels, including those of vocabulary, morphology and syntax, it can be stated that Scandinavian influence had the strongest impact on language. Moreover, a certain number of inflectional elements typical for the Northumbrian dialect have been attributed to Scandinavian influence, among which are the *-s* of the third person singular, present indicative,

of verbs and the participial ending *-and* (bindand), corresponding to *-end* and *-ind* in the Midlands and South, and now replaced by *-ing*. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:93)

#### 4.1.2. The Norman Conquest

The English language, in the way it is today, would not have been the same if it was not for the events that happened in 1066, when the Duke of Normandy, William, sailed across the British Channel and challenged King Harold of England in the struggle for the English throne. After winning the battle of Hastings, William became a crowned king of England and the Norman Kingdom was established, while Norman-French became the language of the English court. At the beginning French was spoken only by the Normans, but soon, due to intermarriage, English men learned French. Around 10,000 French words were taken into English language during the Middle English period, of what 75% of them are still in use. (Influence of the Norman Conquest on English language“: par.1)

The most prominent changes that occurred after the Norman conquest was one concerning the language. Anglo-Norman became the language of the court, the administration, and culture, while English was demoted to more common and unprestigious usages. Anglo-Norman was established as the language of the ruling classes, and remained on that position three centuries later. French was used by the upper class, but also by travelling merchants, so those who wanted to belong to these groups, or have a relationship with them, had to learn the language. The influence of the Normans can be depicted by two words, *beef* and *cow*. *Beef*, commonly eaten by the aristocracy, stems from the Anglo-Norman, while the Anglo-Saxon commoners, who tended the cattle, retained the Germanic *cow*. The largest number of words was borrowed by the government, spiritual and ecclesiastical (religious) services, which include: *state*, *royal* (roial), *exile* (exil), *rebel*, *noble*, *peer*, *prince*, *princess*, *justice*, *army* (armee), *navy* (navie), *enemy* (enemi), *battle*, *soldier*, *spy* (verb), *combat* (verb) and more. Also, many legal terms, such as *indict*, *jury*, and *verdict* have Anglo-Norman roots, since the Normans ran the courts. French words also affected English art, culture, and fashion like: *music*, *poet* (poete), *prose*, *romance*, *pen*, *paper*, *grammar*, *noun*, *gender*, *pain*, *blue*, *diamond*, *dance* (verb), *melody*, *image*, *beauty*, *remedy*, *poison*, *joy*, *poor*, *nice*, etc.

Vocabulary was not the only thing that changed in the English language - while Old English had been an extremely inflected language, it had lost most of its inflections. When it comes to grammar, it was influenced by in the word order. While Old English (and Present day English in most of the occasions) had an Adj + N order, some expressions like *secretary general*, changed

into the French word order, that is, N + Adj. Moreover, English pronunciation changed, as well. French influence helped to distinguish voiced counterparts [v], [z], [ʒ] (the) of the fricative sounds [f], [s], [θ] (as in thin), and [ʃ] (shin), and [ʒ] (mirage), but also contributed the diphthong [oi] (boy). (“Influence of the Norman Conquest on English language“: par.2-7)

#### 4.2. Middle English

The Middle English period (1150–1500) was marked by significant changes affecting English language, that were the most extensive and fundamental in the whole history. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:146) On the eve of the Norman Conquest, written and spoken English, which was Old English at that time, was widely used throughout the Anglo-Saxon kingdom, but the Conquest changed this situation. (Horobin, 1988: 26) Although changes mainly happened as the result of the Norman Conquest, others were extension of tendencies that had begun to manifest themselves in Old English and would have happened even without the Conquest. The changes of this period affected English grammar and vocabulary and were so extensive in each department that it is difficult to say which group is the more significant. Changes in the grammar reduced English from a highly inflected language to an extremely analytic one. At the beginning of the period English was synthetic language, while at the end of the period it changed to analytical. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 146)

The changes in English grammar can be described as a general reduction of inflections. Endings of the noun and adjective that marked distinctions of number and case, and often of gender, were so altered in pronunciation that they lost their distinctive form and, along with that, their usefulness. When it comes to verbs, to some extent the same thing happened.

In the early Middle English two methods of indicating the plural remained: the -s or -es from the strong masculine declension and the -en (as in oxen) from the weak. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 146-148)

When it comes to the adjective the leveling of forms had even greater consequences - in the weak declension there was no longer any distinction between the singular and the plural: both ended in -e (blinda> blinde and blindan>blinde), and that also happened to those adjectives under the strong declension whose singular ended in -e, too. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 148)

Concerning the pronouns system, the loss was greatest in the demonstratives. Of the numerous forms of *sē*, *sēo*, *þæ*, only *the* and *that* survived through Middle English and continued to be in use until today, while a plural *tho* (those) survived to Elizabethan times. All the other

forms indicative of different gender, number, and case disappeared in most dialects early in the Middle English period and the same is true for the demonstrative *þēs, þēos, þis* (this). Except in the South, the neuter form *þis* started to be used in Middle English for all genders and cases of the singular, while the forms of the nominative plural were similarly extended to all cases of the plural, appearing in Modern English as *those* and *these*. In the personal pronoun the losses were not so great and most of the distinctions that existed in Old English were retained. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:149). Also, one general simplification is noted during Middle English and that is the loss of the dual number. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:150)

The principal changes in verbs during that period were the serious losses suffered by the strong conjugation. Almost a third of the strong verbs in Old English seem to have died out early in the Middle English period, while about ninety of them have left no traces in written records after 1150. The loss has continued- some thirty more became obsolete in the course of Middle English, and an equal number, died out, except in the dialects, often after they had passed over to the weak conjugation or had developed weak forms alongside the strong. Nowadays, more than half of the Old English strong verbs have disappeared completely from the standard language. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 150-151)

For some reason the past participle of strong verbs seems to have been more powerful in comparison to the past tense. In a number of verbs, weak participles are later in appearing and the strong form often continued in use after the verb had definitely become weak. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:152)

Middle English has different variety in the different parts of England. The language differed almost from county to county, while noticeable variations could be noticed between different parts of the same county. One can distinguish four principal dialects of Middle English: Northern, East Midland, West Midland, and Southern. The Northern dialect extends as far south as the Humber; East Midland and West Midland together cover the area between the Humber and the Thames; and Southern occupies the district south of the Thames, together with Gloucestershire and parts of the counties of Worcester and Hereford, thus taking in the West Saxon and Kentish districts of Old English. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:175-176)

The characteristics that distinguish these dialects are partly matters of pronunciation, partly of vocabulary, partly of inflection. The most easily recognized feature is the ending of the plural, present indicative, of verbs. Dialectal differences are recorded between Northern and Southern, while the Midland dialect often occupies an intermediate position. Thus the characteristic forms

of the pronoun *they* in the south were *hi, here (hire, hure)*, *hem*, while in the north forms with *th-* (modern *they, their, them*) early became predominant. When it comes to pronunciation the Northern and Southern dialects sometimes presented notable differences. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:177)

Standard English stems from the English Midland dialect which occupied a middle position between the extreme divergences of the north and south and it was less conservative than the Southern dialect, while less radical than the Northern. In its sounds and inflections it shared some of the characteristics of both its neighbors, while it also the largest and most populous of the major dialect areas and its influence was likely to be felt. Moreover, the presence of the universities, Oxford and Cambridge, in this region made intellectual centers and played important role when it comes to language. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 179-180) The most influential factor in the rise of Standard English was the importance of London as the capital of England. In the latter part of 14<sup>th</sup> century, the London standard was accepted, at least in writing, in most parts of the country. By the middle of the century a fairly consistent variety of written English was developed in spelling and grammar, and as the language of official use it was likely to have influence in similar situations elsewhere. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:181-182)

#### 4.3. Modern English

The beginning of the Modern English period is placed at 1500 and certain new conditions that previously either did not exist at all or were present in only a limited way occurred, and they cause English to develop along somewhat different lines from those that had characterized its history in the Middle Ages. The new factors include the printing press, the rapid spread of popular education, the increased communication and means of communication, the growth of specialized knowledge, and the emergence of various forms of self-consciousness about language. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 187)

The printing press was introduced into England about 1476 by William Caxton and it made a rapid progress. At once, it was possible to reproduce a book in a thousand copies or a hundred thousand, every one exactly like the other. It became a powerful tool for promoting a standard, uniform language, and the means were now available for spreading that language throughout the area in which it was understood. Other factor of great importance to language in modern times is the way in which the different parts of the world have been brought together through commerce, transportation, because the rapid means of communication developed. Moreover, Latin became

less and less standard form of language for learned discourse. Finally, a self-consciousness about language appeared which had two aspects, one individual, one public. At the individual level people lift themselves into a different economic or intellectual or social level and were likely to make an effort to adopt the standards of grammar and pronunciation of the people with whom they have identified, just as they try to conform to fashions and tastes in dress and amusements. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:187-188)

In the sixteenth century the modern languages faced three great problems: recognition in the fields where Latin for centuries was dominant, the establishment of a more uniform orthography, and the enrichment of the vocabulary so that it could meet the demands of the wider use.

When it comes to Latin, scholars felt that they cannot express their thoughts and abstract ideas in Latin, while defenders of the classical tradition defended it. There was a fear that the study of the classical languages would suffer if the use of the vernaculars were carried too far. The demand was soon met and translations, along with original works generated by the same intellectual ferment, virtually poured from the press in the course of the sixteenth century. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:189-193)

In the sixteenth century the question of orthography or “right writing,” was a matter of real importance and the subject of much discussion. The confusion was increased when certain spellings gradually became conventional while the renaissance slowly changed. The trouble was not that English spelling was bad, but that there was no generally accepted system that everyone could conform to - it was neither phonetic nor fixed and there were limits to its variety and inconsistency. It varied more from writer to writer, according to education and temperament, than within the practice of the individual. That problem is apparent from the attempts made to draw up rules and to devise new systems. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:193-195)

Enlarging the vocabulary was also one of the challenges confronting the modern languages and many writers wanted to improve the English language. The scholarly monopoly of Latin throughout the Middle Ages had left the vernaculars undeveloped along certain lines. English was undoubtedly inadequate, in comparison to the classical languages, to express the thought that those languages embodied and that in England was now becoming part of a rapidly expanding civilization. The translations that appeared in such numbers convinced people of the truth of this fact - translation brought the limitations of translators' medium and tempted them to borrow from other languages the terms whose lack in their own. For writers who knew Latin was almost as the

second mother tongue the temptation to transfer and naturalize in English was particularly great. This was the case with French and Italian, too and in this way many foreign words were introduced into English. Although, the greater number of these new words was borrowed from Latin, they were not exclusively drawn from that source, some were taken from Greek, a great many from French, and not a few from Italian and Spanish. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:199-201)

The words that were introduced at this time were often basic words—nouns, adjectives, verbs. Among nouns one may find *allurement*, *illusion* as examples. Among adjectives one finds *abject* (in our sense of “down in spirit”), *agile*, *appropriate*, *conspicuous*, *dexterous*, *expensive*, *external*, *habitual*, *hereditary*, *impersonal*, *insane*, *jocular*, *malignant*. Among the verbs, one can find the most important acquisitions, like *adapt*, *alienate*, *assassinate*, *benefit*. Sometimes the same word has been borrowed more than once in the course of time and changed meanings. Some words, in entering the language, retained their original form, while others underwent change. Words like *climax*, *appendix*, *epitome*, *exterior*, *delirium*, and *axis* still have their Latin form. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:208-210)

It is not always possible to say whether a word borrowed was taken over directly from Latin or indirectly through French, and often both influences merged or came even from other languages. The Italian and Spanish words borrowed at this time reflected the general commerce of ideas. Borrowing of foreign words was not the only method of enriching the vocabulary, during this period old English words were revived and poets also invented new words. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:201-216)

It is a well-known fact that, except for a man like the Elizabethan translator Philemon Holland, Shakespeare had the largest vocabulary of any English writer. Among Shakespearian words the following words are found *agile*, *allurement*, *antipathy*, *catastrophe*, *consonancy*, *critical*, *demonstrate*, *dire*, *discountenance*, *emphasis*, *emulate*, *expostulation*, *extract*, *hereditary*, *horrid*, *impertinency*, *meditate*, *modest*, *pathetical*, *prodigious*, *vast*, the Romance words *ambuscado*, *armada*, *barricade*, *bastinado*, *cavalier*, *mutiny*, *palisado*, *pell-mell*, *renegado*—all new to English in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Some of the words Shakespeare uses must have been very new indeed, because the earliest instance in which we find them at all is only a year or two before he uses them (i.e. *exist*, *initiate*, *jovial*), and in a number of cases his is the earliest occurrence of the word in English (*accommodation*, *apostrophe*, *assassination*, *dexterously*, *dislocate*, *frugal*, *indistinguishable*, *misanthrope*, *obscene*, *pedant*, *premeditated*, *reliance*, *submerged*, etc.), which proves he was among the liberals in his attitude toward foreign

borrowing. Shakespeare's use of the new words illustrates an important point in connection with them - they were often used in a sense different from ours, closer to their etymological meaning in Latin (Baugh, Cable, 2002:217).

Shakespeare's pronunciation was much more like today's. He pronounced [e] for [i] in some words. Middle English ē was sometimes open, sometimes close [ɛ: e:] and the two sounds were still distinct in Shakespeare's day, [e:] and [i:] respectively. Consequently sea [se:] does not rhyme with see. It is obvious that in Shakespeare's day there was much fluctuation in the pronunciation of words containing this Middle English vowel, both in the different parts of the country and in the usage of different individuals. It is only in recent times that the pronunciation of words has been standardized, and even today there is some vacillation between a long and short vowel. In addition to such differences when it comes to the quality of vowels there were some differences of accent. Shakespeare said *persev'er, demon'strate, and generally aspect', de'testable, while he has charact'er, com'mendable, envy', se'cure, welcome'*, etc., in contrast to the accentuation that is customary in these words today. However, we should probably have little more difficulties in understanding Shakespeare's pronunciation than we experience in listening to a broad Irish brogue. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:218-219)

The subject of sound-changes was as significant in the history of languages as the changes in grammar and vocabulary. Some sounds in English have been less subject to change than others and would offer little difficulty. The short *e* under certain conditions remained unchanged since Old English times: Old English *bēdd* is still *bed* today. But the *ā* in Old English *stān* (stone) became around 1100 similar to the sound in *law*, while Shakespeare's pronunciation was similar to its pronunciation at the present day (stone). (Baugh, Cable, 2002:219-220)

All Middle English long vowels underwent extensive alteration in passing into Modern English, but the short vowels, in accented syllables, remained comparatively stable. The Great Vowel Shift is responsible for the unorthodox use of the vowel symbols in English spelling. The spelling of English became fixed in a general way before the shift did not change when the quality of the long vowels changed. Today's vowel symbols are no longer correspond to the sounds they once represented in English. The spelling, too, does not accurately represent the pronunciation today. This is because in all periods of the language the vowels of unstressed syllables had a tendency to weaken and then often to disappear. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:224)



The noted intellectual tendencies can be understood as the eighteenth-century efforts to standardize, refine, and fix the English language. For the first time attention was turned to the grammar, and it was discovered that English had no grammar. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:241)

This is the period when many grammarians appeared while tried to form a proper English grammar. Some of them were Robert Lowth, James Buchanan, Noah Webster, etc. Grammarians' goal was to codify the principles of the language and reduce it to rule; to settle disputed points and decide cases of divided usage; and to point out common mistakes or what were supposed to be mistakes, in order to correct and improve the language. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 258 – 261)

The Modern English period is a period in which the use of the English language has been vastly extended. Since the English language was used in British colonies which include North America, India, Australia, the most obvious results of English expansion can be seen in the vocabulary. New territories mean new experiences, new activities, new products, and they reflected in the language. When it comes to grammar, the most important change was the wide extension of the use of progressive forms of the verbs. The extension of such forms to passive was an even later development. (Baugh, Cable, 2002: 273 – 275).

In the nineteenth and twentieth century the English language was, one more time, enriched in its vocabulary. The events of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that affected the English-speaking countries have not been so revolutionary when it comes to language, although they had political and social impact. More influential in that sense are the great developments in science and the rapid progress that has been made in every field of intellectual activity in the last 200 years. The great developments in industry, the increased public interest in sports and amusements, and the many improvements in the mode of living, have all contributed to the vocabulary. World War II was less productive of memorable words, but it made its contribution to the language in the form of certain new words, new meanings, or an increased currency for expressions that had been used before. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:279-283)

Later on, English language continued to develop through borrowings, suffixes and prefixes, coinages, etc. (Baugh, Cable, 2002:284-286) A turning point, dividing Middle English from Modern English and separating these two eras, is considered to be the Great Vowel Shift. (“Early Modern English“: par.1)

##### 5. The English Renaissance – Elizabethan Era

The English Renaissance roughly covers the 16th and early 17th Century (unlike the European Renaissance which begun in Italy in the 14th Century), and is often referred to as the

“Elizabethan Era” or the “Age of Shakespeare” after the most important monarch and most famous writer of the period. The additions to English vocabulary during this period were deliberate borrowings, as explained before, and not the result of any invasion or influx of new nationalities or any top-down decrees. (“Early Modern English“, Mastin, 2011: par.8)

Latin (and to a lesser extent Greek and French) was still very much considered the language of education and scholarship at this time, and the great enthusiasm for the classical languages during the English Renaissance brought thousands of new words into the language, mostly around 1600. A huge number of classical works were being translated into English during the 16th Century, and many new terms were introduced where a satisfactory English equivalent did not exist. (“Early Modern English“, Mastin, 2011: par.9)

## 6. Life of William Shakespeare

Although he wrote a lot, not a lot was written about Shakespeare, which is why biographers need to let many things to imagination, just as Shakespeare invented his characters. All the proven facts about Shakespeare’s earlier years came from the church documents. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:9)

Parish records point out (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:9) that William Shakespeare was baptized on 26 April 1564 in the great church of Holy Trinity, Stratford-upon-Avon, which suggests that he was born no more than two or three days before. His birthday is traditionally celebrated on 23 April - the date officially taken as the date of his birth. (Wells, 1978: 7) He was the oldest son of John Shakespeare and Mary (Arden). (Sisson, 1971:3).

Although there is no list of pupils, it is considered that he attended a ‘petty school’ to acquire rudiments of an education which would be furthered at the King’s New School. His father’s position of being among wealthier men in town would have qualified him to attend the school. Moreover, the education offered was such as lies behind the plays and poems. (Wells, 1978: 8). At the age of eight, Shakespeare began going to classes where he could have learned Latin, grammar, as well as the works of classical literature. (Wells, 1978: 8).

Shakespeare and his family lived in a beautiful and fertile part of the country where he could play with his younger sisters and brothers. (Wells, 1978: 8). In 1582, in the age of 18 he married the eight year older Anne Hathaway of Shottery. It is known that he had three children: Susanna, born in 1583 and twins Hamnet and Judith, born in 1585, but the seven years after are blank in history’s knowledge. Shakespeare may have followed one or more of the other avocations,

such as soldier, sailor, lawyer, etc. Although the undocumented period of Shakespeare's life, which is from 1585 to 1592, is known as the 'lost years', it is also unknown what he was doing even before then, in his late teens. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:10) All that is known is that he left Stratford at some point, joined a theatrical company, went to London and began to write – it is not known in what order these events happened. (Wells, 1978: 9-10)

The first reference to Shakespeare can be found in 1592 when Robert Greene wrote scornfully of an 'upstart crow' referring to his play *Henry VI*. While parodying Shakespeare, Greene helped in determining a date by which Shakespeare's play was written. What is known next is that he lived in London, while his family stayed in Stratford. There is no evidence of how often he visited them, but it is known that he had no more children. (Wells, 1978:10-11)

Shakespeare was just another among the playwrights who was trying to satisfy the needs of the new permanent theatres that had been recently built in London. But unlike others, he was obviously quickly noticed, as his early plays were presented at the Rose – London's most popular theater in early 1590's. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:12) In the coming years his growing success can be found in both Stratford and London records. (Wells, 1978:11) In October 1594 the Lord Chamberlain's Men was founded. For the rest of his career he will belong to this company as an actor and playwright. The company was soon considered to be London's best and after James I succeeded Elizabeth in 1603, it became known as King's Men. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:12) In 1599 a key turning point occurred – the Globe has opened and it was soon recognized as London's best playhouse. During the next decade almost all of Shakespeare's new plays were presented there. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:13) Although Lord Chamberlain's Men were successful during Elizabeth's time, their popularity rose even more with James. During Elizabeth's last nine years of reign, the Lord Chamberlain's Men performed at court 32 times, while between 1603 and Shakespeare's death in 1616, as the King's Men, they appeared before James on 177 occasions. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:13) After Shakespeare's monumental *Hamlet* in 1600-01, he began turning his energy toward tragedies. His outburst of creativity between 1604-1607 brought *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *MacBeth* which are considered to be genius. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:13). It is considered that *The Tempest*, the play first performed before King James in November 1611, is the last play he wrote on his own, while *Henry VIII* is remembered as the play that set fire and destroyed Globe on June 29, 1613. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:14).

Around 1610, his increasing involvement with Stratford suggests that he was withdrawing from his London responsibilities and started retiring. At that time he was only 46 years old and probably had a physical breakdown. In March 1613 he bought a house in Blackfriars, but also in the same year the last of his three brothers died. In February 1616 his second daughter Judith married Thomas Quiney – by that time he surely knew that he was mortally ill. The only records of his illness link it to the festivities at the wedding – it is suggested by Dr. Hall, his son-in-law, that Shakespeare drank too much at the wedding and caught a chill. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:15). According to the monument, he died on 23 April 1616. (Wells, 1978:12-13)

He was buried beneath the stone floor of Holy Trinity Church, the same church where he had been baptized 25 years earlier. (Dunton-Downer; Riding, 2004:14).

## 7. Shakespeare's Language

William Shakespeare was the one man that single-handedly changed the English language to a significant extent in the late 16th and early 17th Century. Shakespeare took advantage of the relative freedom and flexibility, as well as the protean nature of English at the time, and played free and easy with the already liberal grammatical rules, for example in his use of nouns as verbs, adverbs, adjectives and substantives - an early instance of the “verbification” of nouns which modern language purists often decry. He possessed a vast vocabulary and he personally coined an estimated 2,000 neologisms (new words) in his many works, including: *bare-faced, critical, leapfrog, monumental, castigate, majestic, obscene, frugal, aerial, gnarled, homicide, brittle, radiance, dwindle, puking, countless, submerged, vast, lack-lustre, bump, cranny, fitful, premeditated, assassination, courtship, eyeballs, ill-tuned, hot-blooded, laughable, dislocate, accommodation, eventful, pell-mell, aggravate, excellent, fretful, fragrant, gust, hint, hurry, lonely, summit, pedant, gloomy*, and hundreds of other terms still commonly used today.

Some calculations state that almost one in ten of the words used by Shakespeare were his own invention. However, not all of these were necessarily personally invented by Shakespeare himself: they merely appear for the first time in his published works, and he was more than happy to make use of other people's neologisms and local dialect words, and to mine the latest fashions and fads for new ideas. (“Early Modern English“, Mastin, 2011: par.2)

He also introduced countless phrases in common use today, like *one fell swoop, vanish into thin air, brave new world, in my mind's eye, laughing stock, love is blind, star-crossed lovers, as luck would have it, fast and loose, once more into the breach, sea change, there's the rub, to the*

*manner born, a foregone conclusion, beggars all description, it's Greek to me, a tower of strength, make a virtue of necessity, brevity is the soul of wit, with bated breath, more in sorrow than in anger, truth will out, cold comfort, cruel only to be kind, fool's paradise and flesh and blood, and many others.* (“Early Modern English“: par.3)

In Shakespeare's time word order became more fixed in a subject-verb-object pattern, and English developed a complex auxiliary verb system, although *to be* was still commonly used as the auxiliary rather than the more modern *to have* (e.g. *I am come* rather than *I have come*). *Do* was sometimes used as an auxiliary verb and sometimes not (e.g. *say you so?* or *do you say so?*). Past tenses were likewise still in a state of flux, and it was still acceptable to use *clomb* as well as *climbed*, *clew* as well as *clawed*, *shove* as well as *shaved*, *digged* as well as *dug*, etc. Plural noun endings had shrunk from the six of Old English to just two, “-s” and “-en”, and again Shakespeare sometimes used one and sometimes the other. The old verb ending “-en” had in general been gradually replaced by “-eth” (e.g. *loveth, doth, hath, etc.*), although this was itself in the process of being replaced by the northern English verb ending “-es”, and Shakespeare used both (e.g. *loves and loveth*, but not the old *loven*). Even over the period of Shakespeare's output there was a noticeable change, with “-eth” endings outnumbering “-es” by over 3 to 1 during the early period from 1591-1599, and “-es” outnumbering “-eth” by over 6 to 1 during 1600-1613. (“Early Modern English“: par.4)

Other than the spellings of words such as *weild, libertie, valewed and honor*, the most obvious differences from modern-day spellings are the continued transposition of “u” and “v” in *loue* and *vnable*, and the trailing silent “e” in *lesse, Childe* and *poore*, both hold-overs from Middle English and both in the process of transition at this time. However, it should be remembered that, just as with Chaucer, the Shakespeare folios we have today were compiled by followers such as John Hemming, Henry Condell and Richard Field, all of whom were not above making the odd change or “improvement” to the text, and so we can never be sure exactly what Shakespeare himself actually wrote. (“Early Modern English“, Mastin, 2011: par.50)

## 8. Grammatical features of Shakesperean Language

### 8.1. The Most Prominent Characteristics of Shakespearean Language in Comparison to Present-day English

Abbott noted that when it comes to Shakespearean grammar, one can meet every variety of apparent grammatical inaccuracy: *he* for *him*, *him* for *he*; *spoke* and *took*, for *spoken* and *taken*; plural nominatives with singular verbs; relatives omitted where they are now considered necessary; unnecessary antecedents inserted; shall for will, should for would, would for wish; *to* omitted after „I ought“, double negatives; double comparatives and superlatives, *such* followed by *which*, *that* by *as*, *as* used for *as if*; *that* for *so that*; and lastly, some verbs apparently with two nominatives, and others without any nominative at all. Many words, and particularly prepositions and the infinitives of verbs, are used in a different sense from the modern. (Abbot, 1883:6)

#### 8.1.1. Nouns

By Shakespeare's time, nouns have reduced their inflectional system to a position not so different from Present-day English. Most nouns show a distinction in their ending between singular and plural, but in terms of case it is only the possessive or genitive singular which regularly retains a distinctive ending, though nouns with irregular plurals could also have distinctive genitive plural forms. There was no distinction between subject and oblique forms and there was no inflection in a noun after a preposition. The difference with Present-day English lies more in the particular forms of inflection found in some words than in the basic structure itself. (Blake, 2002: 35)

In ShE, the standard plural of the noun is formed by adding *-(e)s* to the base form: Leagues (MA 1.1.4), Letter - letters (MA 1.1.1 and 20). Other parts of speech functioning as nouns may take the plural inflection: Seueralls (WT 1.2.226) and group plurals occur, too: twenty Sir Iohn Falstoffs, (MW 1.1.2–3), three Doctor Faustasses, (MW 4.5.65). (Blake, 2002: 38)

Similar to PdE, there are a number of exceptions to the rule of adding *-(e)s* to form the plural, though in ShE more words fall into this category as the language has gradually reduced the number of exceptions to the standard pattern: Unlike PdE, words ending in *-es*, *-s*, *-se* are often written without the ending *-(e)s*, possibly because in speech this ending was not pronounced and so it was not written: Their wiues haue sense like them: (Oth.4.3.93, where *sense* is plural ‘emotions, feelings’), a thousand of his people butchered: Vpon whose dead corpes , (1H4.1.42–3

where the sense is plural, but at 2H4 1.1.191 the sense is singular), Your Mightinesse on both parts (H55.2.28, where the sense is plural) and Are there ballance heere to weigh the flesh? (MV 4.1.252). In some of these cases the plural sense is obvious, while in others like a collective noun might be implied. (Blake, 2002: 38)

When the singular of a word ends in -f(e), the plural may have /v/ written ue, cf. PdE wife-wives, though the number of words included in this category is greater in ShE, for example beef – Beeues (2H4 3.2.318). Instability exists in these plurals with variation between Q and F so that in this example beefes is found in Q and Beeues in F. (Blake, 2002:36)

Some words appear both with and without -(e)s and, when that happens, there may be a difference in meaning between the two forms, although this is not a general rule. For example, both *brain* and *brains* mean ‘brain, intelligence’ and both can take a singular verb: his Braines still beating, puts him thus (Ham 3.1.177). Other words which take a singular determiner include *means* (though also in singular mean), *news*, *thanks*, *tidings* and *ways*. Words and phrases which occur like this include: out of door(s), out of gate(s), breech(es), buttock(s) and war(s). Some words have a plural form with a singular sense; in many cases this is the result of the anglicisation or modernisation of a French or earlier English word ending in -esse; French *richesse* and ME *almesse* gave *riches* and *alms* respectively: that ritches (Son 87.6), a present almes, (TS 4.3.5). (Blake, 2002: 37) The same is true today concerning PdE and some phrases remain in English language until this day.

In compounds the second element usually has the plural form as Son in Lawes, (KL 4.5.182). (Blake, 2002: 38)

Non-countable nouns with collective sense also occur in the plural without ending, therefore *horse* in the sense of *cavalry* was uninflected. Other words in this category include *cannon*, *folk*, *ordinance*, *poll ‘head’*, *sail*, but also words for animals and fishes, like *sheep* and *mackerel*. (Blake, 2002: 37)

### 8.1.2. Genitive case in Shakespearean language

The genitive singular of nouns is formed by adding -(e)s, the same as in PdE, while the apostrophe is not usually part of the inflection, though it may be found with proper nouns: some to Caska's; (JC 3.3.37, Casca's house), and sometimes with other words: Life's Feast (Mac 2.2.38). Apostrophe became common in this usage after Shakespeare's time and remained in usage until today.

As with the plural, when a word ends in *-f(e)*, for example, *life* the *-f* appears in the possessive as *-u*: *his sweete liues losse*. (KJ 4.3.106). There are many cases where the inflectional ending *-e(s)* is not found. (Blake, 2002:38)

Similar to the ending *-s* denoting plural, in many cases the inflectional ending *-e(s)* is not found for the same reasons. When a noun ends in *-s*, *-se*, *-ce*, it is probable that the inflectional ending in polysyllabic proper names, like Pythagoras, was not sounded and therefore not added in writing. (Blake, 2002: 38)

In PdE there is still absence of the ending *-s* in case when word ends in *-s* or when we express possession of noun that is plural, but it is denoted by adding apostrophe at the end of the word ending in *-s*, i.e. *chairs'*.

Two possessives could appear before the head: *Cæsars deaths houre*; (JC 3.1.155), 'the hour of Caesar's death', *your Husbands Brothers wife*, (Ham 3.4.15). (Blake, 2002: 41) That form was typical for Germanic languages and more attributed to the old English period. In Present-day English it cannot be found anymore.

### 8.1.3. Pronouns

In Shakespearean language, the personal pronoun has three persons: masculine, feminine and neuter, distinguished in singular and plural. Most had three cases: the subject or nominative case, the oblique case, which combined the former object and post-preposition cases, and the genitive case, which is nowadays the possessive pronoun. The subject and oblique forms are largely same as today, except that the second person had singular *thou* (subject) and *thee* (oblique) and plural *ye* (subject) and *you* (oblique). These forms were merging under „you“, which could be used for all four forms. (Blake, 2002: 42)

Accordingly, while Present-day English uses only four pronouns for addressing a person or persons: *you*, *your*, *yourself*, and *yours*, in Shakespeare's time ten pronouns were used: *thou*, *thee*, *thy*, *thysself*, *thine*, *ye*, *you*, *your*, *yourself*, and *yours*. The rules governing the use of these ten pronouns were both grammatical and cultural and their application depended also on the social status of the person or persons addressed. Cummings:2003

*Thou* was used to address a person of inferior status, like a child or servant; friend; or to impart a poetic ring when expressing profound thoughts or reciting a prayer. It was in Nominative



case: *Thou art my friend*. and agreed with verb endings: *-t, -st, -est*. Examples: Thou art, thou hast, thou wast, thou hadst.

*Thee* was used for the same purpose as *thou*, but in case when it was object of the sentence. I love thee. I give thee all my love. When it comes to verb endings, it was not affected.

*Thy*, as the previous, it was used in the same situations, but denoted a possessive form of *you*: Here is thy sword. It was not affected concerning verb endings, as well.

*Thine* was used to show possession without a following noun or with a following noun beginning with a vowel or a silent *h* followed by a vowel. Accordingly, it denoted a possessive form and was not affected concerning verb endings: This sword is thine. Where is thine enemy? Thyself

*Thyself* was also used to address a person of inferior status, such as a child or servant; a friend; or to impart a poetic ring when expressing profound thoughts or reciting a prayer. It denoted reflexive or intensive form. Examples: Wash thyself. Thou thyself art a fool.

It agreed with the following verb Endings: *-t, -st, -est*. Examples: Thou thyself art, thou thyself hadst.

*Ye* in early use served to address several persons of exalted social position(s) and was in nominative Case. Example. Ye are mighty lords. It was not affected by verb endings.

*Ye* in later use served to address one or several persons of any social status and denoted nominative or objective case, while it was not affected by verb endings. Examples: Ye are a fool. Ye are all fools. I'll strike ye down.

*Ye* also denoted as a definite article in the early use. It was pronounced the same as today's *the*. Examples: Ye olde tavern (pronounced as the old tavern); Ye gods (pronounced as the gods). It was used to modify a noun in the same way as the definite article *the*. *Y* was a printer's character representing *th*.,but Shakespeare generally did not use "ye" in this sense. It was not affected by verb endings. (Cummings: 2003)

The subject first person singular and the oblique third person plural kept traces of older forms, *ich* and *hem*, written - *'em*. While the first was dialectal, the second, representing loss of initial */h/*, was common.

The subject third person masculine *he* often appears as *a* (modernised as - *'a* editions). Although colloquial, people of all ranks use it: Who ere a was, a shew'd a mounting minde: (LL 4.1.4, spoken by the Princess of France). (Blake, 2002: 42)

Before <h> the mine/thine forms are found frequently before host (e.g. TG 4.2.28).

Thy/thine were being replaced by your. The third person singular has two separate forms - masculine and neuter *his*, and feminine *her*. The use of *his* for the neuter makes it impossible to decide whether something abstract or non-human is being anthropomorphised: Where hatefull death put on his vgliest Maske (2H4 1.1.66), what a Face I haue, Since it is Bankrupt of his Maiestie. (R2 4.1.256–7). (Blake, 2002: 45)

However, there were signs of a change in usage, for *his* is sometimes replaced by *it* or less often *its*: (The innocent milke in it most innocent mouth) (WT 3.2.99), that it's had it head bit off by it young, (KL 1.4.199), and Heauen grant vs its peace, (MM 1.2.4).

The plural forms were *our*, *your* and *their*. There are possible examples of the older *her* for *their* in Shakespearean English, though in modern editions of the plays they may be modernised to *their*:

These watergalls in her dim Element, Foretell new stormes to those alreadie spent. (RL 1588–9). (Blake, 2002:46)

The *her* in: For why, my bowels cannot hide her woes, (TA 3.1.229) may be the possessive plural referring to bowels (or possibly singular if bowels is a collective noun). (Blake, 2002: 46)

Where compound nouns consisting of several elements, such as titles with a prepositional phrase, occur in the possessive, the inflection is usually on the final, or what was considered the most important, element: the Duke of Glousters purse. (R3 1.4.125).

In cases where the elements are split before and after the head, then naturally the inflectional ending is attached to that part before the head: The Arch-bishops Grace of Yorke, (1H4 3.2.119). Certain words implying either type like kind or manner or space like side may occur with or without a following of: On this side Tyber, (JC 3.2.242, ‘on this bank of the Tiber’). (Blake, 2002:40)

The oblique form *him* is used of animals, though whether that is a form of anthropomorphism or a trace of the older inflection is uncertain: that he can shoo him [i.e. his horse] himselfe: (MV 1.2.41). (Blake, 2002: 42) The same applies to the possessive adjective. Today, *it* is commonly used for animals, while it is acceptable to use *him* and *her* to denote animal only if one wants to emphasize sex of the animal or his personal relationship with it.

According to Abbot, it is perhaps impossible to trace a concept of the irregularities concerning the inflection of personal pronouns and sometimes euphony and emphasis may successfully contended against grammar. Because of euphony, *thou* is often ungrammatically replaced by *thee* or by *you*, the same as *I* is used for *me*. (Abbott, 1883: 139)

When it comes to the reflexive pronouns, *self* was still used in its old adjectival meaning ‘*same*’, especially in one *self*, i.e. ‘one and the same’, and ‘*hat self*’. (Abbott, 1883: 28)

The early English did not always use ‘*self*’, except for emphasis. (Abbott, 1883: 29) Their use was to large extent the same as PdE modern poetic use.

The reflexive pronoun was traditionally represented by the oblique case of the personal pronoun and this system retained in Shakespearean English, though forms with the possessive pronoun and *-self* are not rare. Thus Ile withdraw me, (1H6 4.2.8), thou bear'st thee like a King: (1H4 5.4.35), and I will discase me, and my selfe present As I was sometime Millaine: (Tem 5.1.85–6). (Blake, 2002: 43)

Some examples of the personal pronoun for the reflexive are unusual: A Traitor to his God, his King, and him, (R2 1.3.108, ‘*himself*’).

But, *it* was not used as a reflexive; only *itself* is found: Whilst it hath thought it selfe (Son 119.6); *himself* may be used instead of *itself*, though metaphorical anthropomorphism cannot always be excluded: knauery cannot sure hide himselfe in such reuerence. (MA 2.3.118– 19), this streame, through muddy passages Hath had his current, and defil'd himselfe. (R2 5.3.61–2). (Blake, 2002: 43)

There are many irregularities found in use of personal pronouns in Shakespearean grammar, some of them include following examples.

He is often used for him and vice versa.

‘And yet no man like *he* doth grieve my heart.’ R. and J. iii. 5. 84. (Abbott, 1883: 140)

Him is also used for he:

*Him* is often put for ‘he’, by attraction to ‘whom’ understood, for ‘he whom’.

‘Your party in converse, *him* (whom) you wold sound.

He closes with you,’ &c. – Hamlet, ii. I. 42.

Sometimes the relative is expressed:

‘His brother and yours abide distracted – but chiefly *him that* you term’d Gonzalo’ – *Temp.* 6. 1. 14. (Abbott, 1883: 140)

‘Tween you and I’ seems to have been a regular idiom in Elizabethan time, and the sound of *d* and *t* was avoided before *me*. *Thou* is often ungrammatically replaced by *thee*, or rarely by *you*. This was mostly the case in questions and requests and Shakespeare’s *thou* is often omitted after a questioning verb. (Abbott, 1883: 139)

*I* is used for me (sometimes in cases of euphony):

‘Here's none but thee and I.’ – 2 Hen. V. i. 2. 69.

‘Unless you would devise some virtuous lie  
And hang some praise upon deceased I.’

The rhyme is an obvious reason in the last explanation. In both examples, *I* is preceded by dental.  
(Abbott, 1883: 141)

*Me* is used for *I*:

‘No mightier than myself or me’ – J. C. i. 3. 76. (Abbott, 1883: 141)

*She* for *her*:

‘She was more often used for ‘woman’ than ‘he’ for a man.’ (Abbott, 1883: 140)

‘Yes, you have seen Casio and she together.’ – O. iv. 2. 3. (Abbott, 1883: 141)

*Them* for *they*:

‘Your safety, for the which myself and them

Bend their best studies.’ – K. J. iv. 2. 50. (Abbott, 1883: 142)

*Thee* is used for *thou*:

Although, verbs followed by *thee* instead of *thou* have been called reflexive, there are some phrases with verbs of motion like ‘haste thee’, which can be explained by euphonic reasons. The, used in this way, follows imperatives which, being emphatic, require an unemphatic pronoun.

‘Now, fellow, fare thee well.’ – Lear, iv. 6. 41. (Abbott, 1883: 142)

*Thee* is likely the dative in:

‘Thinks thee?’ – *Hamlet*, 5. 2. 68.

*Thee* for *thou* is found also after the verb to be:

‘I would not be *thee*, uncle.’ – Lear, i. 4. 204.

‘It is *thee* I fear.’ – 2 Hen. 6. 4. 1. 117.

In the latter example *thee* was influenced by the verb and represents a person about whom something is predicated. There is the assumption that *thou* was changed to *thee* according to the analogy of the sound of *he* and *she*, which are used for ‘man’ and ‘woman’. (Abbott, 1883: 142)

Among native speakers, in spoken communication one can still find that some use *me* and *I* interchangeably, which is not the proper use. *I* denotes subject of the verb, while *me* is the object. The same is true for *he* and *him* and *they* and *them*. *Thou* and *thee* have completely disappeared from Present-day English and *you* replaced its meaning.

There is also the use of *us* for *we* in ‘*shall's*’:

Initially, *shall* meant necessity and obligation, and did not denote an action on the part of the subject. In South of England it was used as an impersonal verb.

Shakespeare used it in:

‘Shall’s have attend you there?’ – W. T. 1. 2. 178. (Abbott, 1883: 142-143)

In Present-day English, this use is not found.

Me, thee, him are often used, in virtue of their representing the old dative, where we today use *for me, by me, etc.*

‘I am appointed (by) him to murder you.’ – W.T. i. 2. 412. (Abbot, 1883: 146)

Our is used vocatively, like ‘my’:

‘*Our* very loving sister, well be-met.’ – *Lear*, 5. 1. 20. (Abbott, 1883: 148)

Also, *him, her, me, them* were used for *himself, herself, etc.*

‘How she opposes *her* (sets *herself*) against my will.’ T. G. of V. 3. 2. 26. (Abbott, 1883: 149)

In addition to the personal pronoun forms, the plural of reflexive pronouns includes forms with both *-selues* and *-self*. The distinction between *ourself* and *ourselves* is that the former is marked for singular and is frequently employed when a king or queen uses the royal we: We will keepe our selfe till Supper time alone: (Mac 3.1.44–5) and Leave vs to our selues, and make your self some comfort (Cym 1.1.156). (Blake, 2002: 43)

The third person form is always *themselves* rather than *theirselves*: where they view themselves, (MM 2.4.125). According to Blake (2002: 43) the form *oneself* is not found.

#### 8.1. 4. Relative pronoun

*That* was used as a relative after a noun preceded by the article, and after nouns used vocatively, in order to complete the description of the antecedent by adding *some essential characteristic of it*. (Abbott, 1883: 176)

‘It is an heretic *that* makes the fire,

Not she which burns in it.’ W. T. 2. 3. 115. (Abbott, 1883: 177)

‘Hast thou conspired with thy brother, too,

*That* for thine own gain shouldst defend mine honour?’ K. J. 1. 1. 242. (Abbott, 1883: 175)

The relative pronoun is often omitted, especially in cases when antecedent clause is emphatic and evidently incomplete. The omission of the relative may be related to the

demonstrative *that* and the relative *that* ('We speak *that* (dem.) *that* (rel.) we do know' can be contracted into 'We speak *that* we do know.')

Thus, one can find in Shakespeare:

'Now follows that (*that*) you know, young Fortinbras,' *Hamlet*, 1. 2. 17. (Abbott, 1883: 164)

The relative takes a singular verb, although the antecedent is plural and the verb after the relative is often in the third person, although the antecedent is in the second or first: "Such commendations as becomes a maid.' – *Hamlet* 6. 5. 3. 177. (Abbott, 1883: 170)

Interrogative and relative pronouns are closely linked historically since the forms *who*, *whom*, *whose* and *what*, *which* were originally interrogative pronouns were subsequently deployed as relative pronouns as well. (Blake, 2002: 43)

*That* which had always functioned as a relative pronoun continued to do so.

Interrogative and relative pronouns regularly come at the beginning of a clause, *who* could replace the oblique *whom*, as is true today: Timon hath made his euerlasting Mansion Vpon the Beached Verge of the salt Flood, Who once a day with his embossed Froth The turbulent Surge shall couer; (Tim 5.2.100–3). (Blake, 2002: 43-44)

Shakespeare was in advance of other writers of his time in the use of *who* instead of *whom* in oblique cases of the relative pronoun, though he uses *whom* more often as a relative than as an interrogative pronoun. (Blake, 2002: 43)

ambiguity surrounding the use of *who/whom* led to the occasional mixed usage. (Blake, 2002: 44)

*Whom* and *whose* are used for both singular and plural: friends that are both his, and mine, Whose loues I may not drop, (Mac 3.1.122–3). (Blake, 2002: 44)

When it comes to Shakespearian use of *who* and *what*, *who* denoted the masculine or feminine, *what* denoted neutral interrogative (or it was used as the indefinite relative *who-so*, *what-so*), and *that* denoted both the demonstrative and relative, except in the oblique cases. (Abbott, 1883: 171)

*Who*, *which* and *that* are used indiscriminately as relative pronouns for animate or non-animate referents. (Blake, 2002: 44)

'*Who* steals my purse (he) steals trash,' – *Othello*, 3. 3. 157. (Abbott, 1883: 171)

*Who* was used as the relative to introduce a *fact* about the antecedent. It was often replaced by 'and he', 'for he', 'though he'. (Abbott, 1883: 171)

'Caius Ligarius doth bear Caesar hard

*Who* (since he) rated him for speaking well of Pompey.' J. C. 2. 1. 216. (Abbott, 1883: 179)

*Who* personified non-human antecedents, meaning it was used of animals, particularly in similes where they are compared to men.

‘I am the cygnet to this pale faint swan,

*Who* chants a doleful hymn to his own death.’ – K. J. 5. 7. 22. (Abbott, 1883: 179)

*Who* was also used for any one.

‘The cloudy messenger turns his back

And hums *as who should say*, ‘You’ll rue the time

That clogs me with this answer. – *Macbeth*, 3. 6. 42. (Abbott, 1883: 175)

Shakespearian use of *which* understood cases where *which* was used interchangeably with *who* and *that*.

*Which* interchanged with *who*:

‘Then Warwick disannuls great John of Gaunt,

*Which* by his power conquered all France.’ 3 *Hen.* 6. 3. 3. 87. (Abbott, 1883: 181)

Used for *that*:

‘The mistress *which* I serve.’ – *Temp.* 3. 1. 6.

#### 8.1.5. Indefinite pronouns

Moreover, *every one*, *other*, *neither* are used as plural pronouns:

‘Smooth every passion

That in the nature of their lord *rebel*.’ – *Lear*, 2.2.82.

‘If every of your wishes had a womb.’ A. and C. 1.2.38.; A.Y.L. 5.4. 178.

‘Theresites’ body is as good as Ajax’

When *neither* are alive.’ – *Cymb.* 4.2.252.

‘*Other* have authoritie.’ – ASCH. 46. (Abbott, 1883: 24)

The use of *all(e)* and *other(e)* as plural pronouns is consistent with ancients usage. It was as correct as ‘omnes’ and ‘alii’ in latin, as ‘alle’ and ‘andere’ in German. (Abbott, 1883:25)

### 8.1.6. Adjectives

When it comes to adjectives in Shakespearean language, they were mostly affected concerning inflection in the comparison of adjectives.

The comparative inflection *-er* was sometimes used even when the positive ended in *-ing*, *-ed*, *-id*, *-ain*, *-st*, *-ect*. ‘Horrider,’ *Cymb* 4.2.331; ‘curster’, *T. of Sh* 3.2.156. (Abbot, 1883.21)

These endings in Present-day English generally take ‘more’ and belong to the ‘longer’ comparison of adjectives which is one that adjectives of three or more syllables take.

The superlative ending *-est*, like the Latin superlative, is sometimes used to signify ‘very’, with little or no idea of excess.

‘A little ere the mightiest Julius fell.’ – *Hamlet*, 1.1.114. (Abbot, 1883.21)

The Superlative inflection *est* is found after *-ent*, *-ing*, *-ed*, *-ect*. Thus, ‘violentest’ (*Coriol.* iv. 6. 73); ‘cursedst’ (*M. of V.* ii. I. 46); ‘yingest’ (*T. of Sh.* i. 2. 25); ‘perfectest’, (*Macb.* i. 5. 2).

Superlatives may be used of just two, my yongest daughter, Before I haue a husband for the elder: (TS 1.1.50–1) and Our eldest, Malcolme, (Mac 1.4.38, said by Duncan who has only two sons), as well as with words which are semantically superlative your chiefest thoughts (MV 2.8.43) and th'extremest verge (AY 2.1.42). (Blake, 2002: 47)

The inflections *-er* and *-est*, which represent the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives, though retained, yet lost some of their force, and sometimes received the addition of *more*, *most*, for the purpose of greater emphasis.

‘*More nearer.*’- *Hamlet*, ii. I. 11. (Abbott, 1883: p.22)

In Present-day English, comparison of adjectives depends on whether adjective counts more or less than three syllables.

Examples of double comparatives and superlatives are not infrequent: more better (Tem 1.2.19) More worthier (Cor 3.1.123), more sounder (AY 3.2.59), the most vnkindest cut (JC 3.2.181). The ending <-(e)r> can be added to comparatives which are irregular: Our worser Genius (Tem 4.1.27) and With lesser waight (CE 1.1.108). (Blake, 2002: 47)

Although traditional inflections for the comparative and the superlative were respectively <-er> and <-est>, *more* for the comparative and *most* for the superlative started to appear. The modern tendency restricting the inflections to monosyllables and *more* and *most* to polysyllables was hardly felt at this time; it was also possible to use *less* and *least*. (Blake, 2002: 46)

Double comparatives and superlatives, that is with both more/most and the inflection, are not uncommon, for grammarians had not yet purged them from the language. (Blake, 2002: 46)



*More* and *most* were the comparative and superlative of *much*, and they retain their adjectival sense in addition to acting as intensifiers in comparative and superlative formations.

#### 8.1.7. Comparative

The inflection *er* instead of *more* is found before ‘than.’

‘Sir, your company is fairer than honest.’ – *M. for M.* iv. 3. 185. (Abbott: p. 21)

The comparative inflection *-er* was sometimes used even when the positive ended in *-ing*, *-ed*, *-ain*, *-st*, *-ect*. These terminations (perhaps because they assimilate the adjective to a participle by their sound) generally now take „more“.

‘Horrider,!’ *Cymb.* Iv. 2. 331 ; ‘curster,’ *T. Of Sh.* iii. 2. 156; ‘perfecter,’ *Coriol.* ii. I. 91 ; ‘certainer’, *M. Ado.* v. 3. 62. (Abbott, 1883: p 21.)

In its function as part of the comparative *more* was an adverb, but it was also used as an adjective in the sense ‘greater’: Her best is betterd with a more delight. (VA 78). (Blake, 2002: 47)

Uses no longer common in PdE include *more* with monosyllables: more graue aspect. (TN 1.4.28), more smooth, (TN 1.4.32), more speed (CE 1.1.109) and the inflections <-er/-est> with polysyllables: Nothing certainer. (MA 5.4.62), a properer man (AY 3.5.52; cf. More proper AY 3.5.56), rascaldest sweet yong Prince. (1H4 1.2.80–1), and the perfect’st report, (Mac 1.5.2); and lesse happier Lands, (R2 2.1.49) can be included here. (Blake, 2002: 47)

*More* and *most* are frequently used as the comparative and superlative of the adjective ‘great’:

‘At our more leisure.’ –*M. for M.* 1.3.49.

‘With most gladness.’ –*A. and C.* 2.2.169. (Abbott, 1883.27)

*One* is used for ‘above all’ or ‘alone’: ‘On the wisest prince.’ –*Hen.* VII. 2.4.49.

#### 8.1.8. The Possessive Adjectives

The possessive adjectives, when unemphatic, are sometimes transposed, being really combined with nouns: ‘Dear *my lord* – *J. C.* ii. I. 255. ; ‘Good *my brother.*’ – *Hamlet*, i. 3. 46. (Abbot, 1883: 25) The possessive adjective was formed from the possessive pronoun. The singular forms consists of *my/mine* (first person) and *thy/thine* (second person). Previously *my* and *thy* were used before words beginning with consonants and *mine* and *thine* before words beginning with vowels or <h->: the Ladie is dead vpon mine and my masters false accusation: (MA 5.1.233–5).

This distinction was not observed regularly and F and Q may vary in this feature. (Blake, 2002: 44-45)

#### 8.1.9. Just, Mere, Proper, Very

Adjectives *just*, *mere*, *proper*, and *very* were sometimes used as in Latin.

Just as exact : ‘A just seven-night.’ – M. Ado, 2.1. 375. (Abbott, 1883:26)

Mere as ‘unmixed with anything else’; hence by interference, ‘intact’, ‘complete’:

‘The mere perdition of the Turkish fleet.’ –O. 2.3. (Abbott, 1883:26)

Proper as ‘peculiar’, ‘own’: ‘Their proper sevles.’ –Temp. 3.3.60. (Abbott, 1883:27)

‘With my proper hand.’ –Cymb. 4.2.97; T.N. 5.1.327. (Abbott, 1883:27)

Very as true: ‘My very friends.’ –M. of V. 3.2.226. (Abbott, 1883:27)

*Some*, being frequently used with numeral adjectives qualifying nouns of time, as ‘some sixteen months’ (T.G. of V. 4.1.21.), is also found, by association, with singular noun of time meaning ‘a certain’.

‘I would detain you here some month or two.’ –M. of V. 3.2.9. (Abbot, 1883.30)

#### 8.1.10. Articles a/an

Today, English indefinite article is distinguished from Numeral ‘one’, but in Early English there was no such distinction. According to that, in E.E. *a* was more emphatic, which explains its omission where one today would insert it or its insertion where one should use some more emphatic word, i.e. ‘some’, ‘any’, ‘one’, etc. (Abbott, 1883: 56)

In E.E. *a* can be found before consonants as well as vowels, but when it comes to Shakespeare there is no such instance, but it occurs before ‘w’:

‘Have *an* wish but for’t.’ – P. of T. 4. 4. 2. (Abbot, 1883: 57)

#### 8.1.11. Conjunctions

*And* was often used in the emphatic sense, but also within a question, expressing emphatic interrogation. (Abbott, 1883: 72)

#### 8.1.12. Prepositions

Meaning of the prepositions are more restricted today than in E.E. because of a few reasons: some of the prepositions have been pressed into the ranks of conjunctions, also, as a result of the

development of the language, new prepositional ideas have sprung up and required new prepositional words to express them resulting in the increase of the number of prepositions, while the scope of each has decreased. Many meanings of certain prepositions have been divided, such as meaning of 'by' which was divided into: 'near'; 'in accordance with'; etc. (Abbot, 1883: 94)

*Against* was used metaphorically to express time

Today this is restricted to colloquial language, but it is often found in Shakespearean grammar:

'Against (the time that) my love shall be as I am now.' – Sonn. 63.

'Gainst that season comes.' – Hamlet, 1. 1. 158. (Abbot, 1883: 94)

Since prefix *a*, which still exists in *alive*, *afoot*, *asleep* etc. where it is contraction of the preposition 'on' or the less common form *an*, was becoming vulgar in Shakespeare's time, he uses *at* instead:

'The wind at help.' - Hamlet, 4.3.46. (Abbott, 1883: 95)

*For to* joined with infinitive, which is now never used except by vulgarity, was very common in E.E. It possibly originated from the gradually weakened meaning of 'to' as it started to be considered only as the sign of the infinitive. Therefore, *for* was added to give the notion of motion or purpose.

'Let your highness

Lay a more noble thought upon mine honour

Than *for to* think that I would sink it here.' – A. W. 3. 3. 181. (Abbott, 1883: 102)

*Forth* was used as a preposition denoting *from*:

'Steal *forth* thy father's house.' – M. N. D. 1. 1. 164. (Abbott, 1883: 104)

*From* and *out* were joined to signify outward motion. Today, one uses *out of* instead:

'*From out* the fiery portal of the East.' – Rich. 2. 3. 3. 64. (Abbott, 1883: 105)

Although there are some exceptions, today, *in* has almost lost its metaphorical meaning applied to time, but Shakespeare, in his works, frequently uses it for 'at' or 'during':

'How ! the duke in council

In this time of the night.' – Othello, 1. 2. 93. (Abbott, 1883: 107)

*Off* applied to time meaning 'from'.

### 8.1.13. Inflections

As far as English inflections are concerned the Elizabethan period was destructive rather than constructive. Some inflections were discarded that PDE has restored, others retained that PDE has discarded. Sometimes, where inflections were retained the sense of their meaning and power had been lost, and at other times the memory of inflections that were no longer visibly expressed in writing still influenced the manner of expression. (Abbot, 1883. 7)

### 8.1.14. Plural

Ben Jonson writes: - ‘The person plural keep the termination of the first person singular. In former times, till about the reign of King Henry VIII. they were wont to be formed by adding *thus*: - loven, sayen, complainen. But now (whatsoever is the cause) it is quite grown out of use, and that other so generally prevailed that I dare not presume to swet this on foot again.’ (Abbott, 1883. 8)

The standard plural is without an ending like the base form: Clouds, Dewes, and Dangers come; (JC5.3.63).

A few examples of older <-en> survive as an archaism or a non-standard form: perishen (Per c. 5.35, spoken by Gower as prologue), and waxen (MN 2.1.56, spoken by Puck). The plural could also end in <-(e)s> or <(e)th>, and examples are not infrequent: Which very manners vrges. (KL 5.3.209), My old bones akes: (Tem 3.3.2), Vntimely stormes, makes men expect a Dearth: (R3 2.3.35), Looke how thy wounds doth bleede at many vents: (TC 5.3.85), All his successors (gone before him) hath don't: (MW 1.1.12). (Blake, 2002: 90)

These forms are often considered erroneous so that <-(e)s> or <-(e)th> are emended unnecessarily to the zero form in modern editions. (Blake, 2002: 90)

### 8.1.15. 3<sup>rd</sup> Person Singular

The standard ending of the third singular changed during Shakespeare's lifetime. The <-eth> ending was the regular ending of this person in southern texts, but its replacement by northern <-(e)s> was widely accepted in the decade 1590–1600 except in the non-modals hath and doth where <-th> survived in writing among some writers till well into the eighteenth century.

The change to <-(e)s> occurs soonest after verbs with a final stem consonant, especially a

non-sibilant. Rhythm had a part in the process, for the <-eth> ending could add an extra syllable in that situation.

A three-stage process is discernible: (a) <-eth> is the dominant form; (b) a transitional stage where both <-eth> and <-(e)s> are found, though <-(e)s> is the main form in verbs with a non-sibilant final root consonant, and (c) <-(e)s> is the regular form in all environments except for *hath* and *doth*. The early plays show a preference for <-eth>, but in the period covered by *Love's Labour's Lost* to *The Merchant of Venice* there is a transition stage where both are found; in the later plays <-(e)s> is the norm except in *hath* and *doth*. Even with these two forms, there is a marked increase in *has* and *does* forms in ShE after the turn of the century. (Blake, 2002: 89-90)

The change from the <-eth> to the <-(e)s> ending is also marked by the increasing use of the *do*-periphrasis, since the introduction of *do* could compensate rhythmically for the loss of a syllable at the end of the verb. That prose is not a significant feature is suggested because, although *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is largely in prose and *Othello* largely in verse, neither contains a significant number of <-eth> endings because of their date of composition. However, there are certain stock phrases like *it pleaseth mee* (AY 3.2.17), in which the <-eth> ending occurs even in prose.

The effect is not so much one of metre, though that may be important, as one of rhythm, for the variation between short and long syllables could be disrupted after a monosyllabic verb ending in a consonant if *-eth* gave way to *-(e)s*.

Modern editors often choose the form which seems most appropriate to them, regardless of their base text. The *-eth* form remained the written form which did not reflect everyday pronunciation.

Two nouns in the singular linked by *and* often have the present plural in <-(e)s>: *faith* and *troth*, ... *Bids thee* (TC 4.7.52–4), *Hanging and wiuing goes by destinie*. (MV 2.9.82), *Where death and danger dogges the heeles of worth*. (AW 3.4.15). It could be argued that the compositor or even the author was influenced by two nouns in the singular to make the verb singular so that it should be emended in modern editions; but the examples are numerous enough to suggest this is not the case. When the verb precedes a plural subject, the verb may take the <-(e)s> ending: *Then what intends these Forces* (2H6 5.1.60), *There comes none [i.e. swaggerers] heere*. (2H4 2.4.92), *depends and rests The liues of many*, (Ham 3.3.14–15). (Blake, 2002: 91)

The verb to be has two paradigms in the present indicative: (a) singular am (first), art (second) and is (third) and plural are; and (b) singular be (first), be'st (second), be (third), and plural be. The be forms are less common in the singular than the plural. The singular forms other than be'st may be subjunctive (since they occur after verbs like think or in conditional clauses. The plural forms be and are interchange, though it is uncertain whether there is an implication of register in the choice of one or the other:

Sl. ... be there Beares ith' Towne?

An. I thinke there are, Sir,

(MW 1.1.268–9) (Blake, 2002: 91)

The form *is* may be used with plural subjects: the meere Lees Is left this Vault, (Mac 2.3.94–5), more lynes, then is in the new Mapped, (TN 3.2.74–5). (Blake, 2002: 92)

#### 8.1.16. Preterite-present

The original preterite-present verb *wot* (meaning ‘*I know*’) exists in the present indicative with forms singular: wot, wot'st, wots, plural wot: I wot (92) well where he is: (RJ 3.2.139), for wot'st thou whom thou moou'st, (AC 1.5.22), in grosse braine little wots, What watch the King keeps, (H5 4.1.279–80), you wot well (Cor 4.1.28). (Blake, 2002: 93)

The present and the preterite tenses have expanded forms, but as these had not yet been grammaticalised they are treated with expanded verb forms. (Blake, 2002: 93)

#### 8.1.17. Passive Voice

In ShE it is sometimes difficult to determine what is in the passive and some examples are not unambiguously passive.

A passive infinitive occurs in both the present and perfect: I tooke him to be kil'd with a thunder-strok; (Tem 2.2.106–7), they be not to be talkt on, (RJ 2.4.42), I am easier to bee plaid on, (Ham 3.2.357–8), To confesse, and be hang'd (Oth 4.1.36–7); Thou had'st bin better haue bin borne a Dog (Oth 3.3.367). The passive infinitive to be sold is used where we might use for sale in PdE: Assuredly the thing is to be sold: (AY 2.4.95).

The present indicative passive uses the present tense forms of the verb to be: Still am I cal'd? (Ham 1.4.61), the Fire Is spied (Oth 1.1.76–7), She is abus'd, stolne from me, and corrupted By Spels, and Medicines, (Oth 1.3.60–1), I am found by you: (Oth 1.2.47), He weepes for what is

done. (Ham 4.1.26). The preterite of the verb to be can express the passive of both the active preterite and perfect tenses: So was I bid report here (Oth 1.3.15), they were parted With fowle and violent Tempest. (Oth 2.1.34–5).

## 8.2. Shakespeare's grammatical innovations

In Elizabethan English almost any part of speech could be used as any other part of speech. An adverb could be used as a verb 'They askance their eyes' (R. of L.); as a noun, "the backward and abysm of time' (Sonn.); or as an adjective, 'a seldom pleasure' (Sonn.). Any noun, adjective, or neuter verb can be used as an active verb. You can 'happy' your friend, 'malice' or 'foot' your enemy, or 'fall' an axe on his neck. An adjective can be used as an adverb; and you can speak and act 'easy', 'free', 'excellent', or as a noun, and you can talk of 'fair' instead of beauty and 'a pale' instead of 'paleness'. Even the pronouns are not exempt from these metamorphoses. A 'he' is used for a man, and lady is described by a gentleman as 'the fairest *she* he has yet behald.' (Abbott, 1883:5)

### 8.2.1. Adjectives Freely Used as Adverbs

In Early English many adverbs were formed from adjectives by adding *e* (dative) to the positive degree: as *bright*, adj.; *brighte*, adv. In time the *e* was dropped, but the adverbial use was kept. Hence, from a false analogy, many adjectives (such as *excellent*) which could never form adverbs in *e*, were used as adverbs. We still say colloquially, 'come *quick*', 'the moon shines *bright*', etc. But Shakespeare could say:

'Which the false man does *easy*.' – *Macb.* ii. 3. 143.

'Which else should *free* have wrought.' – *Macb.* ii. I. 19. (Abbott, 1883: p. 17)

### 8.2.2. Adjective compounds

Two adjectives were freely combined together, the first being a kind of adverb qualifying the second.

'I am to *sudden-bold*.' – *L. L. L.* ii. I. 107.

'More *active-valiant* or more *valiant-young*.' I *Hen. IV.* v. I. 90. (Abbott: p. 18)

Adjectives, especially those ending in *ful*, *less*, *ble* and *ive*, have both an active and a passive meaning; just as we still say, ‘a *fearful* (pass.) coward,’ and ‘a *fearful* (act.) danger.’

‘Such *helpless* harmes yt's better hidden keep.’ – SPEN. *F. Q.* i. 5. 42.

‘Even as poor birds deceived with painted grapes,

.....

Like those poor birds that *helpless* berries saw.’ *V. And A.* 604 ; *Rich. III.* i. 2. 13. (Abbott, 1883: p: 19)

‘*Probable*’, ‘*contemptible*’, and ‘*artificial*’, are active in – ‘The least of all these signs were *probable*.’ – *2 Hen. VI.* iii. 2. 178.

‘Tis very probable that the man will scorn it, for he hath

A very *contemptible* spirit. ’ – *M. Ado*, ii. 3. 188.

‘We, Hermia, like two *artificial* gods

Have with our needles created both one flower. ’ *M. N. D.* 2. 204. (Abbott, 1883: p.19)

Adjectives are frequently used for Nouns, even denoting the singular.

‘A sudden *pale* usurps her cheek.’ – *V. and A.*

‘Every Roman's *private* (privacy or private interest.)’ *B. J. Sejan.* iii. 1. (Abbott, 1883: p.20)

When an adjective is used as a noun it may be preceded by *a-*:

‘One heaved *a-high* to be hurled down below.’ *Rich.* 3. 4. 4. 86. (Abbott, 1883. 34)

Nouns used as adverbs

The following example suggests that Shakespeare used *chance* as an adverb:

‘How chance thou art returned so soon?’ – *C. of E.* 1.2.42.

Still, the order of the words ‘thou art’ indicates that it is possible that Shakespeare used *chance* as a verb. (Abbott, 1883. 40)

When it comes to the noun *home*, today one still say ‘to come home’ using the word adverbially with verb of motion, but not as in the following examples in which Shakespeare wrote:



'(Your son) lack'd the sense to know her estimation *home*.' A.W. 5.3.4. (Abbott, 1883.43)

### 8.2.3. Adverbs used as nouns

The adverbs *backward* and *inward* are used as nouns in the following:

'In the dark *backward* and abyss of time.' – Temp. 1.2.50.

'I was an *inward* of his.' – M. for M. 3.2.138.

The adjectives all, each, both, every, other are sometimes interchanged and used as Pronouns in a manner different from modern usage. (Abbot, 1883.22)

*All for any*: 'Without all bail.' – Sonn. 74.

*All for every*: 'And all thing unbecoming.' – Macb. 3.1.12. (Abbot, 1183.23)

*Each for both*: 'Each in her sleep *themselves* so beautify.' – R. of L. 404. (Abbot, 1183.23)

*Both seems put for 'each' or either used for 'each other'*: 'They are both *in either's* powers.' – Temp. 1.2.450. (Abbot, 1183.23)

The licence of converting one part of speech into another may be illustrated by the following words used as adjectives:

'The fine point of *seldom* (rare) pleasure.' –Sonn. 7.

'Each *under* (inferior) eye.' –Sonn. 7.

'This *beneath* (lower) world.' –T. of A. 1.1.44.

'The orb below

As *hush* (silent) as death.' –Hamlet, 2.2.508.

'Most *felt* (palpable) and open this.' –B. J. Sejan. 1.2.

'Most *laid* (plotted) impudence.' –B. J. Fox.

Also, any noun could be prefixed to another with the force of an adjective: 'water-drops', 'water-thieves', 'water-fly'. (Abbot, 1883.31)

This licence, however, was sometimes used where one should prefer the genitive or an adjective. Thus, 'the region kites' (Hamlet, 2.2.607.) for 'the kites of the region;' and 'the region of cloud', Sonn. 33. (Abbott, 1883:31)

A word like 'music' is not commonly used by us as a prefix unless the suffix is habitually *connected with* 'music': thus 'music-book', 'music-master', etc., but not 'music' for 'musical' as in

'The honey og his *music* vows.' –Hamlet, 3.1.164. (Abbott, 1883.31)

This licence is very frequent with proper names.

'Here is *Philippi* fields.' –J. C. 5.5.19.

'Draw them to *Tiber* banks.' –J. C. 1.1.63.

'There is no world without *Verona* walls.' –R. and J. 3.3.17. (Abbott, 1883:31)

#### 8.2.4. Adverbs Used as Adjectives

Much and more are often used as an ordinary adjective, after a pronominal adjective:

'Thy *much* goodness.' – M. for M. 5.1.534. (Abbott, 1883. 44

#### 8.3. Irregularities in Shakespearean Language

Double negatives are common irregularities in Shakespearean English. Non-assertive forms were not used and double or triple negation was common. It formed a situation which makes the use of non-assertive forms as found in PdE unnecessary. Where in PdE one might have either 'I have nothing' or 'I don't have anything', in ShE a clause like 'I don't have nothing' is perfectly acceptable as the equivalent to either of the two PdE expressions.

Thus we find statements like: 'And to be King, Stands not within the prospect of beleefe, No more then to be Cawdor'. (Mac 1.3.71–3, where PdE would have *Any more* rather than *No more*). Nevertheless, certain expressions in PdE are associated only with negatives, and by the same token some in ShE are largely confined to negative clauses. (Blake,2002:215)

Lack of concord means that sentence may take a singular verb and the inflection both a third singular and a possible plural ending of the present indicative, though a zero plural is the norm.

This failure in concord arises because the two nouns are virtually synonymous: Sorrow, and grieffe of heart Makes him speake fondly (R2 3.3.183–4); because, though quite different in

their meaning, the two nouns are close enough in relationship to share a common purpose: Our Master and Mistresse seekes you : (AY 5.1.59), Thou know'st, that Banquo and his Fleans liues. (Mac 3.2.38); because the two nouns form a hendiadys: The Blood and Courage that renowned them, Runs in your Veines: (H5 1.2.118–19, 'the courageous blood') your honor, and your goodnesse is so euident, (WT 2.2.46); or because the two nouns, though opposites, together are thought to cause the action of the verb: Despaire, and hope, makes thee ridiculous.

A co-ordinate subject may take a plural verb when a co-ordinate pair nearby has a singular verb and a singular verb may depend on a subject with more than two nouns: all disquiet, horror, and perturbation followes her. (MA 2.1.243–4). (Blake, 2002:201-202)

The infinitive can appear as the bare infinitive, the to -infinitive or even as the for to -infinitive. This last appears only infrequently in ShE. Bare infinitives are found after modal auxiliaries and after do and let.

Non-finite infinitive clauses can function as the subject or object of a verb as well as the complement of a noun or adjective. A calculation of the occurrence of the bare and the to -infinitive in various syntactic structures reveals that the to -infinitive is the dominant form in all environments (subject, predicative and object clauses and with noun and adjective complements), and the bare infinitive occurs extensively only in object clauses, but even there the to -infinitive is in a three to two majority (Fanego 1994: 193). Subject to-infinitive clauses may take a dummy subject like it or that and, if so, come either before or after the main. (Blake, 2002: 24)

Elizabethan language was known for its unsettled nature in which adjectives were freely used as adverbs without termination *ly*, while on the other hand *ly* was sometimes added to words which PdE has rejected it, such as "fastly" and "youngly". (Abbott, 1883. 32)

Adverbs with prefix a- usually occurred before nouns. In it the a- represents some preposition, as 'in', 'of', 'on', etc. contracted by rapidity of pronunciation.

Occasionally "of" and "a" are interchanged, but most frequently "a" represents modern "on" or "in". (Abbott, 1883. 33) A- is used where one should now use 'at', as well. (Abbott, 1883. 32)

In the line: '3<sup>rd</sup> Fisherman. Master, I marvel how the fishes live *in the sea*.

1<sup>st</sup> Fisherman. Why, as men do *a-land*.' –P. of T. 2.1.31.

a- represents 'in'. (Abbot, 1883.32)

In the line: ‘Sets him new *a-work*.’ – Hamlet, 2. 1.58. (Abbott, 1883. 32) *aa* represents *at*.  
In the following line *a-* is used before verbal noun and *a’* represents ‘on’ or ‘in the act of killing’:

‘I would have him nine years *a killing*.’ – O. 4. 1. 188.  
(Abbott, 1883. 34)

The *a* in adverbial words sometimes took form *an*:

‘And each particular hair to stand *an end*.’ – Ham. 1. 4.19. (Abbott, 1883. 33)

Also, *a-* can stand as a prefix of participles and adjectives. (Abbott, 1883.34).

Contrary to the modern usage, the adverb *here* is used very freely in compounds:

‘they here approach’ Macb. 4.3.133.; ‘here-remain’ ib. 148. (Abbott, 1883. 43)

*Hitherto* is now used as adverb of time, but Shakespeare used it as an adverb of space:

‘England from Trent and Severn *hitherto*.’ Hen. 4. 3. 1. 74. (Abbott, 1883: 43)

Howsoe’er was used denoting ‘in any case’

‘Howsoe’er, my brother hath done well.’ – Cymb. 4.2.146. (Abbott, 1883. 44.)

*Never* is used where in PdE use *ever* is used:

‘And creep time ne’er so slow,

Yet it shall come for me to do thee good.’ – K. J. 3.3.31. (Abbott, 1883.45)

*None* seems to be emphatic form of ‘no’, just as ‘mine is of ‘my’ in the modern idiom:

‘Satisfaction (there) can be *none* but by pangs of death.’ T.N.3.4.261. (Abbott, 1883.45)

*Round* is used adverbially, meaning ‘straightforwardly’. From its connection with ‘regular’, ‘symmetrical’, and ‘complete’, round was used to denote ‘plain and honest’.

Therefore, one finds:

‘I went *round* to work.’ – Hamlet. 2. 2. 139. (Abbott, 1883.48)

*Severally* was used for ‘separately’:

‘When *severally* we hear them rendered. – J. C. 3. 2. 10. (Abbott, 1883. 48)

*Sometimes* and *sometime* were used for 'formerly' by Shakespeare:

'Thy *sometimes* brother's wife.' – Rich. 2. 1. 2. 54. (Abott, 1883. 51)

*Than* is used for *then*:

'And their ranks began

To break upon the galled shore and *than*

Retire again.' – R. of L. 456. (Abbott, 1883.52)

Today *than* and *then* differ in meaning, where *than* is being used concerning a comparision, while *then* when one is relating to time.

*Then* is also used for *when*:

'And more more strong, *then* lesser is my fear,

I shall endue you with; meantime but ask.' K. J. 4. 2. 4253)

*To-fore* was very common in E.E., just as 'be-fore' and 'a-fore':

'O would thou wert as thou *to-fore* hast been.' T. A. 3. 2. 294. (Abbot, 1883. 53)

## 9. Conclusion

English language experienced many changes during its development towards the Modern English variety. The establishment of grammatical rules as one knows them today, started during the Middle English period. In Shakespeare's time, English language was subjected to changes and novelties the most, which Shakespeare used in a way that will leave a trace even centuries after. In addition to Shakespeare's contribution to vocabulary, scholars and grammarians give him honor for his innovation in grammar. Since the time in which he lived can be described as a transitional period, in which writers could make impact on language, Shakespeare's play with rules remained remembered as a unique grammatical expression. Although it does not have so many similarities with the Present-Day English, it enriched the English language, and contributed to forming English as one knows it today.

## Works Cited

1. Abbott, E.A. *Shakespearian Grammar*. Macmillan and CO., 1883.
2. Baugh, Albert C., Cable, Thomas. *A History of the English Language*. Routledge, 1993.
3. „Before English.“ *History of English Language*. Mastin, Luke. 2011. link Date of Access: 22.09.2016.  
< [http://www.thehistoryofenglish.com/history\\_before.html](http://www.thehistoryofenglish.com/history_before.html) >
4. Blake, N.F. *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language*. Palgrave, 2002.
5. Blake, N.F. *History of English Language*, Palgrave, 1996.
6. Buccini, Anthony F., Moulton, William G.“Germanic Languages.”*Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2016.  
< <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Germanic-languages> >
7. Dunton-Downer, Leslie. Riding, Alan. *Essential Shakespeare Handbook*. DK, 2004.
8. „Early Modern English.“*History of English Language*. Mastin, Luke. 2011. Date of Access 22.09.2016.  
< [http://www.thehistoryofenglish.com/history\\_early\\_modern.html](http://www.thehistoryofenglish.com/history_early_modern.html) >
9. Harrison, G.B. *Introducing Shakespeare a new and revised edition*. Penguin Books, 1966.
10. Horobin, Simon; Smith, Jeremy. *An Introduction to Middle English*. Edinburgh University Press, 1993.
11. Kemmer, Suzanne. “A Brief History of English, with Chronology.” *Words in English*. WebWizDesign, 2001-2005. Date of Access: 22.09.2016.

< <http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~kemmer/Words04/history/> >

12. “The Elizabethan Age.” *Shakespeare in American Communities*. Date of Access: 25.09.2016.

< <http://www.shakespeareinamericancommunities.org/education/elizabethan-age>>

13. Wells, Stanley. *Shakespeare The Writer and his Work*. W&J Mackay Ltd, 1978.

14. “Influence of the Norman Conquest on English language”. *Literary Articles*. Date of Access: 23.09.2016.

< <http://www.literary-articles.com/2012/12/influence-of-norman-conquest-on-english.html> >