

Auxiliary or periphrastic do

the grammatical (auxiliary) verb used with lexical verbs to form negations, questions, and emphatic forms. The auxiliary *do* carries inflection for person, i.e. **present-tense** {-s} or zero or for **tense** {did} in the past. Examples: *Does she like history or doesn't she? Yes, she really does!* See also **auxiliary verbs** and **NICE**. In some varieties periphrastic *do* is used to mark **habitual aspect**, and in EModE it was also used in non-emphatic affirmative statements.

As the OE system of aspectual prefixes grew obsolescent, there was a need for new ways of marking aspect. One of these would have been causative *do* + infinitive to mark perfect aspect. This means that this construction would only appear with telic (goal-directed) and punctual verbs, not with state and activity verbs. This, then, would explain why *do* did not for a long time co-occur with *be* and *have* and still does not co-occur with the auxiliaries, “i.e. precisely those verbs that do not show *do*-support once *do* has become grammaticalized,” and has lost its causative-perfective coloring (Fischer 1992: 267–275).

Fischer, O. (1992) “Syntax,” in: N. Blake (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol. 2, 1066–1476. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 207–408.

Change from above, below

refers to language change that comes about consciously (above the level of awareness) or unconsciously (below the level of consciousness). In addition, change from above is more likely to affect formal rather than colloquial, vernacular speech. Change from above therefore often begins with socially higher standing speakers, after which it may spread “downward” to the lower classes. Although there is a certain correlation between the upper classes and a higher degree of consciousness, the two should not be confused with each other.

Corpora

A (linguistic) corpus is a collection of texts which has been put together in order to examine language empirically. Today, corpora are digitally based, which makes access to the data in them rapid and thorough. The size of a corpus may vary from thousands to millions of words, and they consist of both written and

(more recently) spoken language. Among those drawn upon directly or indirectly in *HoE* are the following (incomplete list):

ACE: the Australian Corpus of English (1986)

ARCHER: A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers, historical corpora (1650–1990)

Brown: the Brown Corpus of American English (1961) and thirty years later Frown (1992): the Freiburg-Brown Corpus

BNC: the British National Corpus (1980s–1993)

COCA: the Corpus of Contemporary American English (1990–2011)

Corpus of Early English Correspondence (1418–1680)

Helsinki Corpus of English Text, historical part (750–1700)

ICE: the International Corpus of English, appearing in numerous national varieties, such as ICD-India or ICE-Great Britain

IDEA: International Dialects of English Archive (1997ff)

LOB in the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus (LOB, 1961 and thirty years (1991) later in the FLOB or Freiburg-LOB corpus

ONZE: Origins of New Zealand English Project, spoken New Zealand English (nineteenth to twentieth centuries)

SEU: the Survey of English Usage, digitalized as LLC or the London-Lund Corpus (1959ff)

TELSUR: Telephone Survey of American English (1992–1999)

VOICE: the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English for contemporary use of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in Europe (2001ff)

WCNZE: the Wellington Corpus of New Zealand English (1986–1990)

Evidential modality

has to do with the sources of information about what is asserted, which can be direct or indirect observation, the former by means of the senses (chiefly vision: “Seeing is believing”), the latter by inference (*it must be*), belief (*I guess*), or hearsay (*it is said to be*) among other things (Plungian 2001: 351–2; Chafe 1986: 261–262). Hearsay includes what we know by report. The forms involved include *supposta*, *be said to* (etc.), and *seem*, *appear*. It is hearsay that has been grammaticalized with the semi-modal *supposta* (derived from the *someone is supposed to be*-construction, which is a passive derived from its active counterpart *to suppose someone or something to be...*). In present-day usage, however, *supposta* has become independent of its origin, the cognitive verb *suppose*. *Supposta* never has a *by*-agent prepositional phrase and is no longer reversible into an active construction. And, of course, there is *to*-amalgamation. Other expressions of hearsay are less completely grammaticalized. *Be said to* (*The modal auxiliaries are said to be complex*), in contrast to *supposta*, has no *to*-amalgamation. Yet, *be said to* is passive in form, but never has a *by*-agent prepositional phrase; it has no corresponding active phrase, i.e. there is no **somebody said the modals to be complex*. Indeed, several verbs of speech have the same restriction, for example, *rumor* or *repute*. Both because of their meaning and their formal restrictions these three may be considered to be examples of semi-modals of hearsay. *Seem* and *appear* are examples of hearsay in the visual area. They show fewer signs of grammaticalization, which consists chiefly of their voice neutrality. That is, the whole verb phrase, *seem* + infinitive, functions as a unit, e. g. *The modals seem to offer a problem*, which may be passivized without a difference in meaning as *A problem*

seems to be offered by the modals. Furthermore, they have no progressive (**He was seeming to go*) and seldom a perfect form ([?]*He has seemed to be very busy the last few weeks*).

Chafe, W. (1986) “Evidentiality in English Conversation and Academic Writing,” In: W. Chafe and J. Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood: Ablex, 261–272.

Plungian, V. A. (2001) “The Place of Evidentiality within the Universal Grammatical Space,” In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 349–357.

Other examples of grammaticalization in the area of modality

Got. NSGenE – though not StE – is in the process of adding a new preterite-present verb: *got*. Example: *But I don't got it in me no more to fight* (R. Skloot *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*. (2010) p. 11), where *got* is used as an infinitive and the third person singular present tense is the question as to whether the speaker got it in her or not, obviously without a first person singular {s}. Furthermore, non-standard GenE *got*, esp. in the form *gotta*, is often modal, cf. *He gotta leave, don't he?*

Lets and Lemme. The trajectory of *let* runs from “allow” to the semi-modal imperative-hortatory *lets*. It follows only part of the path sketched out in the following steps, which partially conform to the progression given by Hopper and Traugott (2003: 7):

context item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| (1) <i>Let us go</i> literal: “Allow us to go” | lexical word |
| (2) <i>Let's go</i> (contraction; imperative-hortatory modality) | grammatical word |
| (3a) <i>Lets us go</i> (amalgamation; first person plural) | clitic |

The final step, emergence of an inflectional affix, does not occur. Indeed, new inflectional affixes are unknown in ModE. But further paradigmatic expansion occurs to include:

- (3b) *Lets each person go* (the third person);
- (3c) *Lemme go* (amalgamation; the first person singular);
- (3d) *Lets you and me ask her to come* > *Lets you ask her to come* (the second person) (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 829f).

Hopper, P.J. and E.C. Traugott (2003) *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.

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

Silverstein Hierarchy

Silverstein's **Lexical Content Hierarchy**: first person > second person > third person pronoun > lexical noun/nominal phrase (NP): human > animate > inanimate. Paraphrased in Dixon words: “The further to the left on the hierarchy an NP is, the more likely it is to be definite ... and the farther to the right it is the more likely it is to be indefinite” (1993: 91).

- Dixon, R.M.W. (1993) *Ergativity*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Silverstein, M. (1976) "Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity," In: R.M.W. Dixon (ed.) *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies; N.J. Humanities Press, 112–171.

Survey of English Dialects (SED)

was a dialect survey undertaken in England and Wales between 1950 and 1961. Its purpose was to collect samples of older local speech before their differences disappeared as StE intruded via urbanization, social mobility, and the mass media. It made use of a questionnaire that included some 1300 questions and a sometimes questionable methodology. Its results have been published starting with Orton, Harold et al. (1962–71) *Survey of English Dialects: Basic Materials*. Introduction and 4 vols.. Leeds: E. J. Arnold & Son. Also: Orton, Harold and Nathalia Wright (1974) *A Word Geography of England*. New York: Seminar Press; and Upton, Clive and J. D. A. Widdowson (2006) *An Atlas of English Dialects*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.