

'Nonstandard' Uses of the Relativizers *Who* and *Whom* in Shakespeare's Drama

Shota KIKUCHI

Abstract

本稿は、Shakespeare の戯曲における関係詞 *who* と *whom* を、後に規範文法家によって批判されることになる非標準用法（目的格における *who* の使用及び主格における *whom* の使用）に焦点を当て調査する。本研究では、まず、それらの用法の頻度を明らかにし他の作家との比較を行い、次に、その使用の背後に、後期近代英語を対象とした先行研究で指摘されているような社会的・文体的意味合いが存在しているのかどうかを探った。調査の結果、Shakespeare は同時代の他の作家と比べて格の区別に対する意識が低いことが明らかになった。また、*who* と *whom* の使用は、フォーマリティが高い使用域（韻文や上流階級の男性の言葉）においてより頻繁に観察されたが、非標準用法と社会的・文体的意味合いとの明確な関連性は認められなかった。非標準用法は、Shakespeare 自身の格の区別に対する意識の不安定性を示すものであり、特定の使用域を特徴付ける働きはないと考えられる。

Key Words: Shakespeare, relativizer, *who*, *whom*, case marking, historical sociolinguistics

1. Introduction

Written before the age of prescriptivism, Shakespeare's drama displays a number of usages of relativizers that were later to be regarded by some as nonstandard or condemned by prescriptive grammarians. Cases in point include the following:¹

- (1) Mistress and master, you have oft inquired
After the shepherd that complain'd of love,
Who you saw sitting by me on the turf,
Praising the proud disdainful shepherdess
That was his mistress. (As You Like It III. iv. 47-51)
- (2) They now are in my pow'r; And in these fits I leave them,
while I visit Young Ferdinand, *whom* they suppose is drowned,
And his and mine lov'd darling. (The Tempest III. iii. 90-93)
- (3) In the instant came The fiery Tybalt,
with his sword prepar'd, Which, as he breath'd

defiance to my ears, He swung about his head and cut the winds, *Who*, nothing hurt withal,
hiss'd him in scorn. (Romeo and Juliet I. i. 108-112)

(4) *Who* steals my purse steals trash; (Othello III. iii. 157)

(1) is an example of the subject relativizer *who* appearing in object function instead of *whom*. In (2) the object relativizer *whom* functions as subject of the verb *is* in the relative clause, with *they suppose* intervening between the two. (3) illustrates the case of *who* taking a nonhuman antecedent: the antecedent of *who* in (3) is *the winds*. The last instance shows *who* used without an antecedent, thus introducing a nominal relative clause.

It is important to note that, though the latter two usages have gone out of use and have perhaps become markers of archaism, constructions like (1) and (2) are still frequently found in Present-day English in spite of the longstanding normative attitudes against them. The *who*-for-*whom* phenomenon exemplified in (1) is attested as early as the sixteenth century but in the subsequent centuries it is avoided in writing (Rissanen 1999: 296). Despite the prescriptions against this usage,² however, *who* has gained ground to the extent that it has almost totally taken the place of *whom* in colloquial English. Likewise, the *whom*-for-*who* phenomenon in (2), whose origin can be dated back to the late fifteenth century (Araki and Ukaji 1984: 354), has been common and persistent in the language, though it has been considered to be 'incorrect' from a purely prescriptive point of view.³

Through empirical quantitative research, which has been scarce in studies focusing on the two relativizers in Shakespeare, the present paper examines such 'nonstandard' uses in Shakespeare's drama with particular attention to their frequency. Our primary focus is on the objective *who* and nominative *whom* as illustrated in (1) and (2) respectively.

Previous studies, chiefly concentrating on Late Modern English, have shown that such 'nonstandard' uses of *who* and *whom* might have stylistic and social implications. Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2009) notes that "the use of *who* for *whom* in Jane Austen's time was evidently considered to be 'vulgar', for in *Sense and Sensibility* it is associated with the non-standard language of Lucy Steele" (2009: 92). Fuami (2003), who analyzes *who* and *whom* in non-subject position as evidenced in eighteenth-century fictional prose, finds that *who* is closely associated with spoken style and *whom* with written style and also points out that the fictional characters whose speech contains non-subject *who* may be given a trace of vulgarity by the author.⁴

It is interesting, then, to find out whether the 'nonstandard' uses of these two forms in Shakespeare's drama involve such dimensions, given that grammarians had not prescribed against them during his writing career. As Shakespeare is allegedly believed to have been well aware of the social stratification of the time and reflected in his drama the contemporary colloquial

language of his time on the basis of the characters' social status (Berry 1988: ix, xv), it would not be unreasonable to expect that, assuming that they were so conspicuous or socially marked as to serve as an indicator of certain speakers, he would have most likely utilized them as a means to distinguish certain characters from others. The present paper, therefore, also aims to reveal whether stylistic and social meanings are observable in the 'nonstandard' usages in Shakespeare's drama. In doing so, our attention will be directed to the following stylistic and sociolinguistic factors: the difference between verse and prose, which involves stylistic and social implications, and the characters' social status (i.e. gender and social class). Moreover, due attention will be paid to the composition dates of the plays.

2. Data and Methodology

2.1 Data

As to the scope of this study, I have limited myself to 37 dramas:⁵ *The First Part of Henry the Sixth* (1589-90) (henceforth *1H6*), *The Second Part of Henry the Sixth* (1590-91) (henceforth *2H6*), *The Third Part of Henry the Sixth* (1590-91) (henceforth *3H6*), *Richard the Third* (1592-93) (henceforth *R3*), *The Comedy of Errors* (1592-94) (henceforth *ERR*), *The Taming of the Shrew* (1593-94) (henceforth *SHR*), *Titus Andronicus* (1593-94) (henceforth *TIT*), *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1594) (henceforth *TGV*), *Love's Labor's Lost* (1594-95) (henceforth *LLL*), *King John* (1594-96) (henceforth *JN*), *Richard the Second* (1595) (henceforth *R2*), *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595-96) (henceforth *MND*), *Romeo and Juliet* (1595-96) (henceforth *ROM*), *The First Part of Henry the Fourth* (1596-97) (henceforth *1H4*), *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1597) (henceforth *WIV*), *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth* (1598) (henceforth *2H4*), *Much Ado about Nothing* (1598-99) (henceforth *ADO*), *As You Like It* (1599) (henceforth *AYL*), *Henry the Fifth* (1599) (henceforth *H5*), *Julius Caesar* (1599) (henceforth *JC*), *Hamlet* (1600-1) (henceforth *HAM*), *Twelfth Night* (1601-2) (henceforth *TN*), *Troilus and Cressida* (1601-2) (henceforth *TRO*), *All's Well That Ends Well* (1602-3) (henceforth *AWW*), *Measure for Measure* (1604) (henceforth *MM*), *Othello* (1604) (henceforth *OTH*), *King Lear* (1605) (henceforth *LR*), *Macbeth* (1606) (henceforth *MAC*), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606-7) (henceforth *ANT*), *Coriolanus* (1607-8) (henceforth *COR*), *Pericles* (1607-8) (henceforth *PER*), *Timon of Athens* (1607-8) (henceforth *TIM*), *Cymbeline* (1609-10) (henceforth *CYM*), *The Winter's Tale* (1610-11) (henceforth *WT*), *The Tempest* (1611) (henceforth *TMP*) and *King Henry the Eighth* (1612-13) (henceforth *H8*).⁶ The numbers in brackets indicate the composition dates.⁷

The Riverside Shakespeare is used as a textual basis,⁸ because this is the edition used by the majority of scholars and it provides sources for the concordances compiled by Marvin Spevack (1968-80), from which I have greatly benefited in collecting instances. The instances were

surveyed according to a number of factors that were thought to be of possible influence: medium and the character's social status. The type of relative clause (i.e. restrictive vs. non-restrictive) and the type of antecedent (i.e. personal vs. non-personal) are not taken into account, as their relevancy to the *who/whom* usage has been revealed to be doubtful in some previous work (Dekeyser 1984; Schneider 1992). The following sections introduce the variables I have taken into consideration in this paper.

2.2 Medium

Shakespeare employs both blank verse and prose in his drama. This dichotomy is said to have stylistic and social nuances: verse is normally used to convey the speech of noble or dignified characters and the high style (Berry 1988: xvi; Hussey 1982: 147), whereas prose is usually an indicator of social inferiority or some deviations from a norm (Busse 2002: 65).

This verse/prose distinction has often been adopted in analyzing relativizers in Shakespeare. Araki (1980: 147-148), for instance, finds that the relative frequency of *wh*-relativizers is higher in verse than in prose. The present study seeks to find out whether the social division of the two dramatic media has an influence on the choice of *who* and *whom*.⁹

2.3 Gender

Inspired by the recent development of historical sociolinguistics, we shall attempt to shed new light on the *who/whom* usage from a gender and class perspective. In this enterprise, the characters have been classified into 'men' and 'women' on the basis of their gender. Characters who disguise themselves as the opposite gender have been categorized according to their original biological gender on the assumption that such rare cases do not significantly distort the overall picture. Supernatural beings (e.g. Puck in *MND*), narrators (e.g. Rumor in *2H4*) and the chorus have been excluded from the classification.

2.4 Social Class

There are diverse opinions as to how many social divisions were perceived at the time. Assuming that the major dividing line runs between the gentry and the non-gentry (Nevalainen 1999: 508), I have adopted a twofold division and classified characters into 'gentry' and 'non-gentry' for the following reasons; firstly, because Shakespeare's plays are set in various places (e.g. in Italy in *TN* and in Denmark in *HAM*) and in different times (e.g. in the fourteenth century in *ROM* and in the fifteenth century in *IH4*), simple classification often works better; secondly, detailed classification can make the classification more cumbersome because it has proved difficult to draw the line between the gentry and the professions. The judgment to adopt

this twofold classification was further encouraged by Berry’s comment on the relationship between Shakespeare’s drama and social structure in Early Modern England: the language of ‘noble’ people is linguistically differentiated from that of ‘ignoble’ people in terms of blank verse and prose (Berry 1988: xii).

The categorization of the characters is based upon the social structure in Tudor and Stuart England as schematized in Table 1. Female characters with no information on their status are tagged according to their father’s or husband’s status, following the contemporary practice. As with the gender parameter, characters in disguise pretending to be higher or lower in rank have been categorized according to their original social status.

Table 1. Rank and status in Tudor and Stuart England

Estate		Grade	Title
GENTRY	Nobility	Royalty	
		Duke	Lord, Lady
		Archbishop	
		Marquess	
		Earl	
	Gentry proper	Viscount	
		Baron	
		Bishop	
		Baronet 1611-	Sir, Dame
		Knight	
Professions	Esquire	Mr, Mrs	
	Gentleman		
	Army Officer (Captain, etc.), Government Official (Secretary of States, etc.), Lawyer, Medical Doctor (Doctor), Merchant, Clergyman, Teacher, etc.		
NON-GENTRY	Yeoman	Goodman, Goodwife	
	Merchant		
	Husbandman		
	Craftsman	(Name of Craft:	
	Tradesman	Carpenter, etc.)	
	Artificer		
	Labourer		
	Cottager		
	Pauper		

(Adapted from Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003: 36))

3. *Who* and *Whom* in Shakespeare's Drama

3.1 General Overview

For the purpose of taking an overview of the distribution of *who* and *whom*, let us take a look at the following table which shows the number of instances found in our corpus.

Table 2. *Who* and *whom* in Shakespeare's drama with reference to medium and the characters' gender and social class

	<i>who</i>	<i>whom</i>	Total
MEDIUM	625 (62%)	380 (38%)	1005 (100%)
Verse	535 (61%)	345 (39%)	880 (100%)
Prose	90 (72%)	35 (28%)	125 (100%)
GENDER	619 (62%)	376 (38%)	995 (100%)
Men	550 (61%)	346 (39%)	896 (100%)
Women	69 (70%)	30 (30%)	99 (100%)
SOCIAL CLASS	600 (63%)	359 (37%)	959 (100%)
Gentry	533 (61%)	335 (39%)	868 (100%)
Non-gentry	67 (74%)	24 (26%)	91 (100%)
Total	625 (62%)	380 (38%)	1005 (100%)

There are 625 instances of *who* and 380 of *whom* in our material as shown in the table. From this table, several general tendencies emerge.

Verse, representing a more formal type of discourse than prose, exhibits a stronger inclination to employ *whom* (39 percent as against 28 percent in prose), which is in line with the tendency still continuing that *whom* is more frequently met with in formal registers (Aarts and Aarts: 2002; Quirk et al. 1985: 367). The difference is statistically significant with an error probability of less than 5 percent (chi-square=5.84, df=1, p=.016). Note also that the absolute frequency of the two relativizers is quite biased: about 88 percent of the total are found in verse (880 out of 1005 instances). My previous study, investigating thirteen plays of Shakespeare,¹⁰ demonstrates that they form a larger share of the four types of relativizers (i.e. *that*, *zero*, *which* and *who(m)*) in verse (11 percent) than in prose (5 percent) (Kikuchi 2012: 22-23).

One may moreover notice that difference in the characters' gender and social status results in different distribution of each relativizer: men and gentry make more frequent use of *whom* than women and non-gentry in terms of proportion and absolute numbers. While the chi-square test indicates that the gender difference is statistically insignificant (chi-square=2.62, df=1, p=.106), social stratification proves to be of statistical significance (chi-square=5.25, df=1, p=.022). Once we pay heed to the combined effects of gender and class factors, a clearer picture emerges as

shown in the following table:

Table 3. *Who* and *whom* in Shakespeare with reference to gender and social class of the characters

		<i>who</i>	<i>whom</i>	Total
Men	Gentry	473 (60%)	309 (40%)	782 (100%)
	Non-gentry	59 (74%)	21 (26%)	80 (100%)
Women	Gentry	60 (73%)	26 (27%)	86 (100%)
	Non-gentry	8 (72%)	3 (28%)	11 (100%)

Male gentry differentiate themselves from the other groups with respect to the absolute frequency and the ratio of each relativizer: the proportion of *whom* amounts to 40 percent in their speech, whereas it falls below 30 percent in the speech of the other characters. The difference between gentry men and the others is highly significant with a p-value below 0.01 (chi-square=7.82, df=1, p=.005). Though it seems necessary to allow for the possible discrepancy of the total number of words among the four groups, it is intriguing to notice that as many as 86 percent of *whom* (309 out of 359 instances) and 79 percent of *who* (473 out of 600 instances) belong to the speech of male gentry. In fact, the proportion that these relativizers account for in the four types of relativizing strategies (i.e. *that*, zero, *which* and *who(m)*) is the highest in their speech (10 percent as against 4 percent in male non-gentry speech, 5 percent in female gentry speech and 2 percent in female non-gentry speech) (Kikuchi 2012: 26). It follows then that male gentry may be distinguished from the characters from other walks of life in terms of the use of these two relativizers.

Let us take a more detailed look at the two relativizers by focusing our attention on their syntactic functions. They can generally be divided into two types, i.e., simple relative pronouns and free relatives. The following table differentiates the two types and categorizes them further according to the function they have in the relative clause. As our primary concern is with the use of the two relativizers deployed as simple relative pronouns in subject and object functions, free relatives, though listed in the table, are beyond the scope of our investigation.

Table 4. *Who* and *whom* in Shakespeare with reference to grammatical function

	<i>who</i>	<i>whom</i>	Total
Simple relative pronoun	548 (60%)	360 (40%)	908 (100%)
subject	511 (98%)	13 (2%)	524 (100%)
object	27 (12%)	206 (88%)	233 (100%)
prepositional complement ¹¹	0 (0%)	136 (100%)	136 (100%)
pied piping	0 (0%)	126 (100%)	126 (100%)
stranded preposition	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)
nominative absolute	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)
objective absolute	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
complement	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
others ¹²	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
Free relative¹³	77 (79%)	20 (21%)	97 (100%)
subject ¹⁴	72 (100%)	0 (0%)	72 (100%)
object	3 (15%)	17 (85%)	20 (100%)
prepositional complement	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
complement	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Total	625 (62%)	380 (38%)	1005 (100%)

Table 4 shows that only 2 percent of the subject relativizers are constituted by *whom* (13 instances).¹⁵ The results will be illuminated by comparison with other Early Modern writers. However, such statistical information as will provide a yardstick against which to assess our data has been very limited. Sugden (1936) provides valuable information on Spenser's language. He finds no single instance of *whom* for *who* in *The Faerie Queene* (1936: sect. 144). It can be assumed then that Shakespeare is less conservative than Spenser in terms of the use of *who* instead of *whom*. Though Curme (1931: 232) states that "this incorrect usage was common in Shakespeare's time", our results suggest that writers' idiosyncrasies have to be allowed for.

On the other hand, around 10 percent of the object relativizers are realized in terms of *who* with 27 instances.¹⁶ Partridge's study on the morphology of Ben Jonson's plays, masques and entertainments collects only three instances of *who* for *whom*, containing no relative uses (1953: 91). Partridge ascribes the rarity of *who* in this function to his being a cautious grammarian (1953: 288). According to Schneider (1992: 445-446), no attestations of *who* are found in any other than the subject function in Sidney, Herbert and the poetry of Jonson and Milton. In light of these facts, Blake (2002) is no doubt right in saying that "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" (2002: 44). It should be noted, however, that *who* employed as a relativizer does not function as prepositional complement, whether it is preceded by a preposition or not (cf. Franz 1939: sect. 333).¹⁷ Because

this is equally the case with the contemporary writers mentioned above, Blake's observation, referring to "oblique cases", seems too broad to be fully credible.

The discussion thus far has evinced that Shakespeare is less strict about the case marking than other contemporary writers. In what follows, we shall examine in detail the rivalry between the two forms, firstly, in object function and, secondly, in subject function.

3.2 *Who* and *Whom* in Object Function

Moderate attention has been paid to the variation between *who* and *whom* in oblique cases in Shakespeare's English. Schneider (1992) presents a fairly comprehensive analysis of the variation between *who* and *whom* in non-subject functions with particular attention to text type (prose or verse), clause type (relative or interrogative) and syntactic function (direct object or prepositional complement). He concludes that "[w]ho for *whom* came in as an informal variant, through interrogative clauses and predominantly as a prepositional complement if the preposition was stranded, but also as a direct object" (Schneider 1992: 446). He considers *who* in oblique cases to be a case of "change from below", by which he means "an innovation introduced at the lower end of the socio-stylistic range of internal variation." It is of great importance to bear in mind that though he distinguishes between interrogative and relative usages, he fails to do so in analyzing other factors such as text type and syntactic function. In this regard, the present study can play a complementary role as it is intended to direct a spotlight on their relative uses, thus allowing us to see the genuine correlation between the use of the relativizers and other factors. What differentiates our study from Schneider (1992), moreover, is the decision to limit the scope of the investigation to object function, which is justified by the zero occurrence of *who* as prepositional complement noted earlier. The following results were obtained concerning the distribution of *who* and *whom* in object function:

Table 5. *Who* and *whom* in object function in Shakespeare with reference to medium and the characters' gender and social class

	<i>who</i>	<i>whom</i>	Total
MEDIUM	27 (12%)	206 (88%)	233 (100%)
Verse	24 (11%)	190 (89%)	214 (100%)
Prose	3 (16%)	16 (84%)	19 (100%)
GENDER	26 (12%)	204 (88%)	230 (100%)
Men	23 (11%)	192 (89%)	215 (100%)
Women	3 (20%)	12 (80%)	15 (100%)
SOCIAL CLASS	25 (11%)	198 (89%)	223 (100%)
Gentry	20 (11%)	159 (89%)	179 (100%)
Non-gentry	5 (11%)	39 (89%)	44 (100%)
Total	27 (12%)	206 (88%)	233 (100%)

As I argued in Kikuchi (2012: 67), the text type (verse or prose), which Schneider claims to be of relevance in the selection of *who* and *whom* in non-subject position, appears to be of minor importance, as the differential is only 5 percent, surprisingly lower than that Schneider reported (25 percent). This observation is supported by the chi-square analysis (chi-square=0.36, df=1, p=.55). Demonstrating that the relativizers are less subject to textual factors, our results, at the same time, support his claim that clause type (relative or interrogative) is more relevant a factor than text type (Schneider 1992: 442).

Turning our attention to the characters' social status, we can observe that the ratio of objective *who* does not remarkably vary in relation to gender and social class. The result of the chi-square test indicates that these two factors are statistically insignificant (chi-square=1.21, df=1, p=.27 for gender, chi-square=0.00, df=1, p=.97 for social class). It is, however, worth pointing out that although the number of instances is rather limited, the majority of the instances (18 out of 27 instances) come from the speech of male gentry, which would represent a rather formal register in Shakespeare's drama. This, accompanied by the insignificant influence of medium on the variation noted above, would cast doubt on the likelihood that the use of *who* for *whom* in Shakespeare's drama may have vulgar connotations. The plausible explanation would be that both *who* and *whom*, belonging to the subset of *wh*-relativizers, are chiefly associated with formal registers and therefore this 'nonstandard' use does not serve as a marker of colloquialism or vulgarity.

Then, what would it be that triggered his use of *who* instead of *whom*? Our results strongly suggest that it should only be attributed to his accidental insensibility to the case marking. The ratio at which it occurs may be nothing but an indicator of the degree of the writer's lack of

awareness in distinguishing between *who* and *whom*.

3.3 *Who* and *Whom* in Subject Function

This section deals with the two forms employed as subject relativizers, paying special attention to the *whom-for-who* phenomenon. Unlike the variation in object function, there has been no adequate treatment available of this variation. The table below lists their distributions according to medium and the characters' social status:

Table 6. *Who* and *whom* in subject function in Shakespeare's drama with reference to medium and the characters' gender and social class

	<i>who</i>	<i>whom</i>	Total
MEDIUM	511 (98%)	13 (2%)	524 (100%)
Verse	433 (98%)	11 (2%)	444 (100%)
Prose	78 (98%)	2 (2%)	80 (100%)
GENDER	505 (98%)	13 (2%)	518 (100%)
Men	447 (97%)	12 (3%)	459 (100%)
Women	58 (98%)	1 (2%)	59 (100%)
SOCIAL CLASS	491 (98%)	12 (2%)	503 (100%)
Gentry	437 (97%)	12 (3%)	449 (100%)
Non-gentry	54 (100%)	0 (0%)	54 (100%)
Total	511 (98%)	13 (2%)	524 (100%)

A brief look at the ratio of *whom* from top to bottom in the table gives us the impression that all the factors are of little relevance: the difference in its ratio is within only 3 percent in each category. The most remarkable factor, though excluded from the table, seems to be chronology. It is of great interest to observe that all but one instance of *whom* in subject position appear in the plays composed after 1600. As abundant evidence exists that the language of Shakespeare had undergone some grammatical changes in the course of his career as a dramatist,¹⁸ this might be yet another case symptomatic of his changing grammar. In this view, the increase of the phenomenon under discussion would denote the dramatist's growing uncertainty about the case marking. In this connection, it is worthy of remark that though the earliest instance of subjective *whom* is attested in what is called push-down relative clauses (Quirk et al. 1985: 1298-1299), which would often cause uncertainty in grammatical structure and indeed have yielded 8 instances of this phenomenon in our corpus including (5) below, the late plays allow it to appear even in environments which we would not expect to produce much confusion as the following instances (6) and (7) show:

- (5) Besides, I met Lord Bigot and Lord Salisbury, With eyes as red as new-enkindled fire, And others more, going to seek the grave Of Arthur, *Whom* they say is kill'd to-night On your suggestion. (JN IV. ii. 162-166)
- (6) If thou beest Prospero, Give us particulars of thy preservation, How thou hast met us here, *whom* three hours since Were wrack'd upon this shore; (TMP V. i. 134-137)
- (7) And thou, fresh piece Of excellent witchcraft, *whom* of force must know The royal fool thou cop'st with— (WT IV. iv. 422-424)

The intervening elements between the relativizer and the verb in the relative clause are adverbial phrases *three hours since* in (6) and *of force* in (7), which would not directly attract subject relativizers. Concerning these instances, Franz (1939: sect. 333), however, speculates that the preceding objective case may have triggered the use of *whom*. From these observations, a case can be made that the use of *whom* in subject function is most strongly conditioned by syntactic environments. Whether it carries vulgar or colloquial implications is highly doubtful, as all the instances of it except one occur in the speech of male gentry, who, as we have seen, exhibit a marked number of instances of 'nonstandard' *who*.

4. Conclusion

The present paper has carried out a quantitative study on the variable use of relativizers *who* and *whom* in Shakespeare's drama and shed fresh light on it from stylistic and sociolinguistic perspectives. Much emphasis has been placed on the usages censured by grammarians in post-Shakespearean times, i.e. the use of *who* in object function and the use of *whom* in subject function.

The general observation we can make from the overall distribution of these relativizers is that they are chiefly associated with formal registers (i.e. verse and the speech of male gentry). It was interesting to discover that the ratio and the absolute frequencies of the inflected form *whom* are higher in these registers, which is in harmony with the tendency that has lasted to Present-day English.

Our investigation of the rivalry between the two relativizers in object function proved that Shakespeare is ahead of his contemporaries (e.g. Jonson and Sidney) in utilizing *who* in this specific syntactic environment and showed that his use of it may not be considerably affected by types of text (verse or prose). It was also demonstrated that the use of *who* for *whom* is unlikely to be related to the degree of colloquialism and vulgarity.

The occurrences of *whom* in subject function could be most reasonably attributed to the

author's growing uncertainty about the case marking, caused by syntactic environments that trigger the use of the objective relativizers, e.g. push-down relative clauses. It turned out that this 'nonstandard' usage does not serve as an indicator of an informal type of discourse.

In the present study, we have concluded that Shakespeare was less meticulous about the case marking of the relativizers than his contemporaries and that the 'nonstandard' uses of the relativizers in his drama may most plausibly have resulted from his occasional lack of awareness of the case system rather than from his design to bring about socio-stylistic effects. In other words, the attestations of 'nonstandard' usages would solely be a reflection of the variability of his grammar. Our results might be unsurprising in view of the assumption that such connotations as 'vulgar' would not have existed if the normative attitudes had not prevailed. Nevertheless, the present study, I hope, has added new contributions to the literature by providing valuable statistical information and a novel viewpoint from which to investigate relativizers in Shakespeare's language.

Notes

I am very grateful to Dr. Jun Terasawa for his helpful comments and suggestions. Special thanks also go to anonymous referees who gave me invaluable comments and Dr. Brendan Wilson, who checked my English. All remaining errors are my own responsibility.

¹ Hereafter italics in the quotations in this paper are all mine.

² The use of subject form *who* for *whom* is, for instance, proscribed by Murray (1806: Rule VI), Cobbett (1819: Letter XVII) and Fowler (2009: 723).

³ Normative attitudes against *whom* in subject function are expressed by Lowth (1769: 67), Murray (1806: Rule VI), Cobbett (1819: Letter XVII) and Fowler (2009: 724), to name but a few.

⁴ Note that Fuami (2003) does not distinguish between interrogatives and relatives.

⁵ The present study leaves *Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Edward III* out of the investigation, though they are included in *The Riverside Shakespeare*.

⁶ Abbreviations of the plays are based upon Spevack (1968-80).

⁷ The composition dates follow those listed in *The Riverside Shakespeare*.

⁸ As Blake (2002: 44) notes, there may be variation in the use of *who* and *whom* between quartos and the First Folio. The interference of editors too cannot be neglected as Traugott (1972) writes: "Pope emended *who* to *whom* wherever it occurred in Shakespeare in non-subject and nonpredicate nominal function, whether it was the relative or interrogative" (1972: 183). The present paper, however, is not concerned with such variation and examines the usage of *who* and *whom* as attested in *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Nevertheless, every time the instances of 'non-standard' uses are collected, quartos (the facsimiles in Allen and Muir (1981)) and the First Folio (1623) will be consulted to confirm any

influence from the editor's emendation (see notes 15 and 16).

- ⁹ As is the case with the majority of the studies on *who* and *whom*, metrical factors are left out of account.
- ¹⁰ The thirteen plays are *JN, MND, ROM, 1H4, WIV, 2H4, AYL, H5, HAM, TN, OTH, LR* and *MAC*.
- ¹¹ We include in this category the cases where preposition is repeated as in the following:
- (i) For she is sweeter than the perfume itself To whom they go to. (SHR I. ii. 152-153)
- ¹² This category contains three instances that are unclassifiable according to our criteria. They are provided below:
- (i) Give scandal to the blood o'th' Prince my son (*Who* I do think is mine, and love as mine), (WT I. ii. 330-331)
- (ii) I met a courier, one mine ancient friend, *Whom*, though in general part we were opposed, Yet our old love made a particular force, And made us speak like friends. (TIM V. ii. 6-9)
- (iii) O, and I, forsooth, in love! I, that have been love's whip, A very beadle to a humorous sigh, A critic nay, a night-watch constable, A domineering pedant o'er the boy, Than *whom* no mortal so magnificent! (LLL III. i. 174-178)
- Who* is the object of one and the subject of another verb at the same time in (i) and *whom* is syntactically redundant in (ii). (iii) provides the only instance of *than whom* in our material.
- ¹³ The ambiguous cases in which it is difficult to draw the line between free relatives and indirect interrogatives have been left out of count. Consider the following:
- (i) Look who kneels here ! (PER V. iii. 46)
- ¹⁴ The statistics include 11 instances of *who* found in the idiomatic expression *as who should say* as illustrated below:
- (i) Look how the black slave smiles upon the father, *As who should say*, "Old lad, I am thine own." (TIT IV. ii. 120-121)
- ¹⁵ There is no variation between the edition I used and the First Folio in the use of *whom* in subject function. However, one instance was collected from *LR* in which the quarto edition differs from the First Folio:
- (i) This is most strange, That she, *whom* even but now was your best object, The argument of your praise, balm of your age, The best, the dearest, should in this trice of time Commit a thing so monstrous, to dismantle So many folds of favor. (LR I. i. 213-218)
- In the first quarto, *that* is employed in place of *whom*.
- ¹⁶ Of the 27 instances in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, three instances provide cases in which the First Folio displays *whom* instead of *who*:
- (i) Here comes my servant Travers, *who* I sent On Tuesday last to listen after news. (2H4 I. i. 28-29)
- (ii) I have a wife *who* I protest I love; (MV IV. i. 290)
- (iii) And in the imitation of these twain—*Who*, as Ulysses says, opinion crowns With an imperial voice —many are infect. (TRO I. iii. 185-187)

This divergence is explained by the fact that the basic texts for *2H4*, *MV* and *TRO* in the present edition are from quartos where *who* is selected in the corresponding parts. On the other hand, in the following two instances from *R3*, *whom* appears at the expense of *who* in the quarto version:

(iv) Clarence, *who* I indeed have cast in darkness, I do beweepe to many simple gulls—

(*R3* I. iii. 326-327)

(v) Dighton and Forrest, *who* I did suborn To do this piece of ruthless butchery, Albeit they were flesh'd villains, bloody dogs, Melted with tenderness and kind compassion, Wept like two children in their deaths' sad story.

(*ibid.* IV. iii. 4-8)

¹⁷ Note, however, the following instance, in which a preposition precedes *who* employed as an object free relative:

(i) This is a creature, Would she begin a sect, might quench the zeal Of all professors else, make proselytes Of *who* she but bid follow.

(*WT* V. i. 106-109)

As Abbott (1870: sect. 274) claims, *who* in this sentence is not a prepositional complement.

¹⁸ Busse (2002), for example, notes a shift from around 1598 in the paradigm of the second person pronoun *thou* and *you*. As for relativizers, Hope (1994, 2010) detects a shift from *that* and zero to *who* and *which* over the course of Shakespeare's career.

Texts used

Allen, Michael J. B., and Kenneth Muir, eds. 1981. *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto: A Facsimile Edition of Copies Primarily from the Henry E. Huntington Library*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Evans, G. Blakemore, ed. 1997. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Shakespeare, William. 1623. *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies, A Facsimile of the First Folio, 1623*. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.

Works cited

Aarts, Flor, and Bas Aarts. 2002. "Relative *Whom*: "a Mischief-maker." In Andreas Fischer, Gunnell Tottie, and Hans-Martin Lehmann, eds. *Text Types and Corpora*. Tübingen: Narr. 123-130.

Abbott, Edwin A. 1870. *A Shakespearian Grammar: An Attempt to Illustrate Some of the Differences between Elizabethan and Modern English*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan.

Araki, Kazuo. 1980. *Shakespeare no Hatsuo to Bumpo. [Shakespeare's Pronunciation and Grammar]* Tokyo: Aratake Shuppan.

Araki, Kazuo, and Masatomo Ukaji. 1984. *Eigo Shi IIIA. [History of English IIIA]* Eigogaku Taikei 10 [Outline of English Linguistics 10]. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Berry, Ralph. 1988. *Shakespeare and Social Class*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International.

- Blake, Norman F. 2002. *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Busse, Ulrich. 2002. *Linguistic Variation in the Shakespeare Corpus: Morpho-syntactic Variability of Second Person Pronouns*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Curme, George O. 1931. *Syntax*. Boston: D.C. Heath.
- Cobbett, William. 1819. *A Grammar of the English Language in a Series of Letters; with Explanatory Remarks by Michio Masui*. Tokyo: Nan'un-do, 1970.
- Dekeyser, Xavier. 1984. "Relativizers in Early Modern English: A Dynamic Quantitative Study." In Jacek Fisiak, ed. *Historical Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 61-89.
- Fowler, Henry W. 2009. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage: The Classic First Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franz, Wilhelm. 1939. *Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Fuami, Kayoko. 2003. "The Subjective/Objective Case Distinction, with Special Reference to Eighteenth-century Fictional Prose." *Konan Women's University Researches of Literature and Culture Volume 39*: 23-32.
- Hope, Jonathan. 1994. *The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays: A Socio-linguistic Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hope, Jonathan. 2010. *Shakespeare and Language: Reason, Eloquence and Artifice in the Renaissance*. London: Methuen Drama.
- Hussey, Stanley S. 1982. *The Literary Language of Shakespeare*. London: Longman.
- Kikuchi, Shota. 2012. "Relativizers in Shakespeare's Drama: From a Historical Sociolinguistic Perspective." Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Tokyo.
- Lowth, Robert. 1769. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar; with Explanatory Remarks by Toshio Gunshi*. Tokyo: Nan'un-do, 1968.
- Murray, Lindley. 1806. *English Grammar; Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners; with Explanatory Remarks by Masatomo Ukaji*. Tokyo: Nan'un-do, 1968.
- Nevalainen, Terttu. 1999. "Making the Best Use of 'Bad' Data." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 100 (4): 499-533.
- Nevalainen, Terttu, and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2003. *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Longman.
- Partridge, Astley C. 1953. *The Accidence of Ben Jonson's Plays, Masques and Entertainments*. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rissanen, Matti. 1999. "Syntax." In Roger Lass, ed. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol. III, 1476-1776. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 187-331.

- Schneider, Edgar W. 1992. "Who(m)? Constraints on the Loss of Case Marking of *Wh*-pronouns in the English of Shakespeare and Other Poets of the Early Modern English Period." In Matti Rissanen, Ossi Ihalainen, Terttu Nevalainen, and Irma Taavitsainen, eds. *History of English: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 437-452.
- Spevack, Marvin. 1968-80. *A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare*. 9 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Sugden, Herbert W. 1936. "The Grammar of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*" *Language* 12 (4): 9-228.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2009. *An Introduction to Late Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1972. *A History of English Syntax: A Transformational Approach to the History of English Sentence Structure*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

