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ABSTRACT
The syntax of English has changed dramatically since its first officially written accounts; although Old English seemed like a typical Germanic language with a very rich inflectional system that allowed a relatively flexible syntactic pattern from the 10th until the 12th century, it gradually lost almost all of its inflections and thus became a language with very strict and rigid word order. The present dissertation is aimed at exploring exactly how and if the influence from the other languages that English came in contact with during the 10th and the 11th century had such an impact that could have resulted in such a transformation. To this end, it examines the role of grammaticalisation as well as the theories of internal and contact-induced language change that could shed some light on how and why inflectional loss occurred in the first place. Furthermore, it investigates possible effects of the socioeconomic conditions present in the British Isles in the periods from Early to Late Modern English on language change, which might have triggered the rise of a type that would compensate for the loss of inflections, namely do-support, and if the new structure, the periphrastic do would be characteristic of some sort of social segregation. It also discusses the verb movement parameter (Emonds, 1978; Pollock, 1989, 1997, a.o.), which explains how the change in settings is responsible for the emergence of do-support in interrogative and negative sentences and the loss thereof of the ability of substantive verbs to move to the leftmost part of a question or to precede negation (not) diachronically. Apart from negation, the study looks into the placement of frequency and manner adverbs, since their position before or after the verb in the clause is a diacritic of verb movement, according to literature. It examines all the historical periods of the English language; starting from Old English, the search stretches through Middle English, Early Modern English and reaches the period of Late Modern English with the aim to locate the reasons that led to this transformation and the time range for the change. Finally, we present and discuss the results from our research into novels and original writings of the late 17th and 18th century (Late Modern English) with the aid of the AntConc text analyser in order to delve into the real speech of the period and find out whether the use of do and the preverbal position of the negative particle and adverbs was still optional or had become the only choice for grammatical sentences. The results clearly showed that the period of optionality had been long gone in English and there were but very few remnants of the Old and Middle English, when questions and negations were formed without do.
Chapter 1
Introduction

Historical linguistics is the study of language change in the course of history. There are many reasons why linguists choose to focus a life’s work on historical change, such as being fun, intellectually engaging, exciting and giving you insights into human nature, history and evolution. Moreover, it is closely related to history as the name suggests, meaning that studying the diachrony of a language involves studying first of all those events that shaped the area and the people using the language. What historical linguistics is not about is the history of linguistics, even though historical linguistics has had a huge impact on the development of linguistics, humanities and social sciences in general, being the first kind of linguistics studied in the 19th century (Campbell, 2013:2).

During the course of study and work with historical linguistics, one could not but notice that one major drawback is none other than the lack of original speakers; this is obviously not the case in other domains of linguistics, such as psycholinguistics or semantics, which rely extensively on original users of a language and the conduction of experiments; in historical linguistics we solely rely on corpora to carry out research. However, the lack of original speakers is not viewed as a problematic area any more, thanks to the various saved documents in the form of corpora that depict everyday language spoken nine or ten centuries ago; court records, theatrical plays, early scientific textbooks, fiction and even personal correspondence may offer a very clear insight into how language used to be and how it changed over the years. (Zucker, 2006).

All aspects of a language are prone to change; there is sound change, semantic change, grammatical change, change in the etymology of words that linguists have to deal with. English in particular offers the possibility to compare through small samples of texts all the different stages of its linguistic development. Campbell compares the same passage of different translation of The Bible (Matthew 26:73), starting with Late Modern English and working back to Old English (p. 6).

i. Late Modern English (The New English Bible, 1961):
   shortly afterwards the bystanders came up and said to Peter, ‘Surely you are another of them: your accents gives you away!’

ii. Early Modern English (The King James Bible, 1611):
   And after a while came unto him they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou art one of them, for thy speech bewrayeth thee.

iii. Middle English (The Wycliff Bible, 14th century)
   And a litil after, thei that stoolen camen, and seiden to Petir, teuli thou art
of hem: for thi speche makith thee knownun.

iv. Old English (The West-Saxon Gospels, c. 1050)

þa æfter lytlum fyrste genēaleton þa ðe þær stodon, cwædon to petre.
Soðlice þu eart of hym, þyn spræc þe gesweotolað.

‘Then after little approached they that there stood, said to Peter.
Truly thou art of them, thy speech thee makes clear.’

Syntactically speaking, the differences between the passages by Matthew are more than conspicuous. For example, we see that English in its Old, Middle and Early Modern form is still very much alike to the syntax of most modern Germanic languages characterized by the inversion of subject and verb when other material proceeds. Specifically, due to the placement of and after a while in the beginning of the sentence in the examples above, they came is inverted to came they. Another Germanic element in the structure is the presence of infinitives at the end of the sentence (gesweotolað, knownun, bewrayeth). Unfortunately, there are no instances of a negation or an adverb of frequency/manner in the specific passages in order to have a first glimpse at it. However, what we will first attempt to do is to check the status and position of the negation and adverbs in every part of English history before focusing mainly on the periods of our main interest, the period of (Early and Late) Modern English.

We will not try to analyse all the changes that have occurred and are more than obvious in the passage; the present dissertation focuses solely on the diachronic syntax of negation, the adverbs of frequency and manner in English sentences, as well as the passage from the rich inflectional system of Old English to the impoverished one of Modern English. This is a groundbreaking alteration, which must be examined in tandem with the rise of the auxiliary do in Middle English. We will try to analyse the reasons that triggered such a change by examining the different socioeconomic factors and conditions present from the 12th until the 16th century that marked the emergence of the new form in the language.

Another very essential feature that requires analysis when we talk about language change and diachrony of speech elements is optionality. Optionality refers to the simultaneous use of two or more different forms which carry the same semantic properties. For example, we know that William Shakespeare used interchangeably questions and negations supported with the auxiliary do and the simpler and older forms of inversion in questions or a verb followed by not in negations, as shown in the following dialogues between Othello/Iago and Oswald/Kent, found in The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (1983):
Iago: Ha! I like not that.
Othello: What dost thou say?
Iago: Nothing my lord; or if – I know not what.
Othello: Was not that Cassio parted from my wife? (Othello, Act III, Scene iii, lines 35-38)

Oswald: Why dost thou use me thus? I know thee not.
Kent: Fellow, I know thee.
Oswald: What dost thou know me for? (King Lear, Act II, Scene ii, lines 10-12)

We see that Shakespeare’s era was an era of transition and relative linguistic freedom, in which the two forms were used and were intelligible. According to Yadomi, Shakespeare in particular showed a conspicuous preference to the use of periphrastic *do* in his later plays in comparison to his earlier ones (2013: 30-39). Shakespeare is only referred to right now, as he is by far the most recognizable and one of the most proliferate writers of the period. Later on, during our analysis of the rise of *do*-support we are going to provide more information from the work of other writers of the period and will show a general tendency towards the use of *do*.

In their 1968 paper, Weinreich et al. posed a number of ‘questions’ or ‘problems’ in their effort to explain language change. The problem of transition was one of them, as well as the intermediate stages that a language goes through from form to form. One very crucial question of historical linguistics they dealt with was whether certain changes are abrupt or gradual, the latter justifying the usage of two different but synonymous patterns. Elaborating on that, we will try to investigate whether this type of change can be explained on a socioeconomic and historical basis, because as Ellegård and Nurmi point out, 1600 is a controversial and intriguing period in the history of the use of the auxiliary *do*.

Thus, it becomes clear that this dissertation is about the kind of transformation that the English syntax has undergone, mainly in the domain of the Inflection Phrase (IP). Above all, we will try to see how the parameter of *verb movement* is responsible for all these changes because everything mentioned before (rise of *do*-support, impossibility of adverb placement between thelexical verb and the object as well as preverbal negation) all boil down to that parameter.

The first chapter consists of a general overview of what historical linguistics focuses on, as well as how it has become the inspiration for this dissertation; so, the basic principles that characterized the English syntax diachronically and how they have shifted over the years resulting in the complete transformation of what has come to be present English are examined.
The second chapter focuses on the various theories that explain language change as a result of either contact between different linguistic systems or of the natural, internal processes that occur to every language and transform it. Special attention is paid to grammaticalisation, a process that sheds light on how lexical items may become parts of a language’s grammar. Furthermore, it investigates whether language change is linked to socioeconomic factors and if language novelties are rooted in the upper classes, which were the ones with the biggest access to language back in those years. Moreover, this is the chapter in which our research questions are presented, along with the methodology followed to reach or conclusions.

The third chapter is dedicated to the detailed analysis, period by period, of the linguistic phenomena in question, i.e. the placement of the negation and adverbs as well as the morphology of English so as to examine how the morphological simplification has led to the rise of do-support and to a very fixed word order. Apart from that, it focuses on the Modern English syntax and the crucial role that the auxiliary do has in it.

The dissertation continues with the analysis of texts from different periods and from different writers. Our goal is to investigate the gradual differentiation in syntactic structures and to check the extent to which optionality is lost throughout the various periods.

Finally, the dissertation is completed with the fifth chapter, in which a conclusion of all the results and the findings will be added; the results are going to trigger the discussion about any limitations encountered during our research, as well as any further steps or search that should be conducted in order to fully understand how the specific syntactic patterns have changed or to offer some ideas for future research.

Chapter 2
Theories of linguistic change

The present chapter focuses mainly on the theories that explain why and how language change takes place, by implementing the existing theoretical knowledge on the changes that occurred in English. To be specific, we try to analyse the contrast between a language-internal and contact-induced language change by providing specific examples, since all languages are susceptible to natural change but also on the account of the fact that English is an amalgam of the various languages spoken on the British Isles the previous centuries. In addition, we examine in depth the notion of grammaticalisation, trying to attribute specific cases of grammaticalised items, namely lexical items that became integral of the grammar. Trudgill (1983) makes a distinction between the
language-internal, or ‘natural’, or ‘proper’ changes, and those that he calls contact-induced changes ‘unnormal’ or ‘improper’. (Danchev, 1988: 39; Trudgill, 1983: 103-105; Heine & Kuteva, 2005: 257). According to this theory, language contact accelerates the changes, as the more people listen to something new, the more they tend to use it. Consequently, in a place that served as a crossroad of cultures and languages, like the English Isles, it is more likely to come across fundamental changes in a relatively short period of time. Moreover, Trudgill points out a qualitative difference as to what counts as ‘natural’ and ‘unnatural’ language change, which is a very interesting assumption. Despite the fact that sound change is the most common ‘natural’ change, morphosyntactic changes are also possible. We know that English lost its rich inflectional system and compensated for its loss with the use of prepositions and a very rigid syntax. The development is from a synthetic to an analytic structure (e.g. decrease in morphological cases and an increase in the use of prepositions, reduction in conjugations, declensions, inflected forms and a higher rate in the use of periphrastic forms). On the contrary, ‘unnatural’ linguistic changes are claimed to involve a movement from analytic to synthetic, including the development of case endings or of personal inflections on verbs out of morphologisation processes (Trudgill, 1983: 103-5; Heine & Kuteva: 2005; 257). Thus, it becomes clear that based on that theory, the vast number of morphosyntactic changes that took place in English are most likely due to its contact with other languages, thus likely to be the product of language contact.

The dissertation’s main focus will be on the syntax of Late Middle English (henceforth: LME) period. More specifically, whether the new periphrastic do forms in interrogative and negative sentences were used in tandem with the older forms or whether they had completely replaced them with very few remnants of the older forms still present. In order to achieve that, we will examine original writings from the period, and we will also compare it with examples from the previous periods so as to underline the evolution of the syntactic forms and also find out whether the rise of do was a slow and progressive alteration or an abrupt one. Moreover, we are interested in finding out whether there was an established relationship between the use of do and certain social factors, which favoured it and helped it prevail.

Finally, through the presentation of the theories of linguistic change, we will attempt to examine which one offers a better insight and explains the rise of do, and thus understand whether it was a product of internal change or a linguistic product of language contact.
2.1 Grammaticalisation

When discussing language change, one must surely analyse grammaticalisation, which involves the creation of new functional material, either through the reanalysis of existing functional material or through the reanalysis of lexical material. The direction of change is from lexical to grammatical and from grammatical to even more grammatical forms (Roberts & Roussou, 2003; Johanson, 2008; Heine & Kuteva, 2005). This process, as has been argued, involves some sort of reanalysis of lexical or functional material and usually leads to structural simplification. A very clarifying example that Roberts and Roussou provide involves the development of the future expression in *tha* + VP, in which *tha* is the future marker derived from *thélé* + subordinate clause, where *thélé* is a verb meaning want in the history of the Greek language (also see Tsangalidis 1997). Although the Post-Classical Greek construction consisted of a biclausal structure, in that *thélé* heads a VP associated with functional material, including a subordinate clause introduced by the complementiser *hina* (=to), the Modern Greek construction with *tha* is always analysed as monoclausal, since both the verb and *tha* occur in the same clause (Roberts & Roussou; Philippaki-Warburton 1992). Finally, the grammaticalisation of *thélé* to *tha* involves the following structural simplification, where CP is the clause or Complementiser Phrase:

\[
[CP[VP thélé CP]] > [CP[tha VP]]
\]

Two more examples of grammaticalisation, taken from English this time, can be used here to illustrate the point more, pointing out the unidirectionality of the process as well. What is meant with the unidirectionality hypothesis is that grammaticalisation moves towards a single direction and not vice versa; lexical items may become part of the grammar, but no grammatical structures are likely to become lexicalized. One example that certainly applies here concerns the periphrastic *go*-future in English and in other languages. English has grammaticalised a periphrastic verb form involving the lexical verb ‘*go*’ to a future tense marker, but so far, no evidence has been found for a change from future tense to a lexical verb for *go*.

Another aspect of grammaticalisation worth mentioning is that of *optionality*. As already mentioned, language change is a virtually endless process that expands over centuries. As a result, a question is very likely to pop up: Can two different structures, that carry the same meaning and serve the same linguistic need, be used simultaneously? If so, what are the parameters that favour the emergence and final
prevalence of the one over the other? Unfortunately, this is a field that remains largely unexplored. We could admit that it sounds natural if two different forms co-occur for a period. As Lehman suggests, the evolution is not linear, leading from a primitive to an advanced result, but it is rather cyclic, or even spiral (2002:4). Furthermore, he explains that grammaticalisation consists of two different processes, innovation and renovation. The former is more revolutionary, as it creates grammatical categories previously nonexistent in a language, such as the introduction of the progressive form in English, whereas the latter is more conservative and only introduces new forms for old categories (2002:19). And although the distinction between the two seems clear-cut on a theoretical level, in practice there are numerous borderline cases oscillating between the two. Due to the fact that renovation takes time, there are instances of coexistence of the old and the new construction. An example of this theory is provided by Lehmann; it is the new analytic and the old synthetic perfect (‘passé composé’ vs. ‘passé simple’) in the Romance languages. He also adds that as long as such a situation obtains, the two categories tend to be functionally diverse, so that we have two categories where we formerly only had one (2002: 19-20). If this theory stands correct, then one could argue that it could also support the simultaneous existence of do-supported negations and the simple postverbal addition of not in Middle English.

2.2 Language-internal change

In the case of language-internal changes, as we have already mentioned, certain language aspects change without the apparent influence of another linguistic system. It follows the language’s internal tendency to change and reinvent itself, where language contact can be ruled out as a contributing factor.

Language-internal change is a linguistic phenomenon that has been under scrutiny for many years by linguists, who tried to explain the underlying principles that characterise language learning. Although language learning is a very complicated and versatile phenomenon that has been thoroughly investigated and is still actually under a lot of scientific investigation, it is still worth mentioning so as to realize the discrepancy between an internal change and a contact-induced change. In what follows, we will first try to explain in brief what exactly an internal language change is.

To begin with, one could argue that the first dimension of a linguistic theory for language change is the theory of language acquisition. As every individual speaker is autonomous and unique, the grammar they acquire is also different from that of their parents’ (Yang, 2000). As these children become parents themselves, this unique
grammar is projected in the language they speak to their children. This is an oversimplified version of the distinction between E(xternal)- language (performance) and I(nternal)- language (competence), as stated by Chomsky in 1986, shown here:

Parents’ I-language → Parents’ E-language

Children’s I-language → Children’s E-language

Figure 1. The dynamics of language acquisition and language change.

The second dimension of language change has also been thoroughly discussed by generative linguists, and it involves the ways in which child language differs from adult language (Chomsky, 1975; Crain & Nakayama, 1987). Despite the differences, it has been proved that child language is highly restrictive and, given the similarities that underlie the world’s languages, has led linguists to the conclusion that human languages are limited within a very specific context of possibilities (Yang, 2000). A Universal Grammar has been hypothesized to be part of our linguistic nature, characterized by an infinite number of rules, which are nonetheless non-arbitrary. Yang finally concludes that both language acquisition and language change are constrained by this set of rules, both internal and external (Chomsky, 1981; Yang, 2000).

2.3 Contact-induced change

One could say that language contact has shaped every language into its current form and linguists know that even languages, such as the ones spoken by tribes in the Amazonian or the Pacific, which were isolated for thousands of years, started changing very soon since they came under the influence of the linguistic system they had been in contact with (Siemund, 2008; Heine, 2008; Comrie, 2008). However, linguists used to believe for a very long time that language structure is rather resistant to change in situations of language contact. What we know nowadays is that this could not be further from the truth. Every aspect of the language is prone to change and reshaping, even though this might take place over the course of decades or even centuries, but that there is at least one domain of language use and language structure where a significant constraint on linguistic transfer from one language to another can be observed, namely the domain of
grammatical meanings and structures, especially in the case of similar or corresponding structures between languages (Heine & Kuteva, 2005; 1, 5; Heine, 2008; 33).

To be more specific, contact-induced language change is a very complex process that is characterized by a lot of different stages and whose outcomes may not always be clear-cut. What we mean is that although language contact maybe the immediate explanation for various changes, it may as well provide the trigger for other changes to happen, in other words, changes that are independent of language contact. And, as Heine and Kuteva (ibid.) support, a wide range of different phenomena (such as borrowing from one language to another, or convergence, during which two languages in contact become more and more alike as a result of the use of similar structures) should be viewed as contact-induced language change, in case of any kind of contact-induced transfer of linguistic material. Of course, this kind of linguistic change cannot be examined outside its very own sociolinguistic context, since it has been proved that social factors such as status, dominance or prestige are crucial in language change (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Winford, 2003). A very clarifying example of this is the English language and the way it was influenced by French after the Norman Conquest. At that time, French became the language used in courts and by the Royalty; it had a much higher status compared to English, which was limited to the countryside and to everyday, colloquial speech. Consequently, the influence French had was tremendous, especially on a lexical level, which touches upon all aspects and topics of English. Even though the lexicon and the semantics of the language were greatly influenced during those times, we are only going to investigate how English was syntactically modified and influenced over the previous millennia. Moreover, the varieties whose speakers had frequent contact with speakers of other varieties were more susceptible to alteration than varieties whose speakers had rare external contact.

2.4 The sociolinguistic factor

Finally, one aspect that should not be neglected is that of social structure and how this is depicted in people’s way of speaking. We cannot view language independently from its social network, since the structure and dynamics of the social network determine to what extent a linguistic element holds through and eventually becomes integral part of a broader linguistic system (Culicover, 2008). The changes in the basic syntactic structure of English should, thus, be treated as the result of some concrete historical and social context. In the case of do-support, Culicover suggests that there was a ‘noise’ in the social network that triggered the rise of this periphrasis; in particular, he claims at the
specific time and at the specific place, the social conditions and linguistic needs required the emergence of such a construction, because it did not appear in any other language, even an adjacent one (2008: 47). Drawing on this, we will try to examine the possible role of social factors regarding whether the rise of do was also a result of social implications.

It has been generally argued that the morphological simplified version of Middle English that emerged was a kind of Anglo-Danish communication system that helped trade. It emerged mainly in the eastern areas of the country and was heavily influenced by Scandinavian languages; apart from the full loss of inflections, there was also absence of grammatical gender and some reflexification, which is characteristic of both Danish and Norman French (Milroy & Milroy, 1985). On the other hand, the western areas, i.e. West Midlands, were far away from the Scandinavians’ zone of colonisation and thus maintained its prior form with gender and case inflections. Moreover, according to Milroy & Milroy, with the Norman Conquest, the French imposed a very strict and well-organised administration, with a very centralised authority and division of classes, reinforced by the existence of feudal aristocracy (p. 378). As a result, there was very limited interaction between the people of different classes. Unfortunately, the researchers do not mention any differentiation as to whether different social classes showed a preference to the older structure or the periphrastic do. It remains a shadowy part of the linguistic history of English. Of course, we cannot overlook the fact that people of lower classes such as peasants, blacksmiths or workers (not to mention women) had limited access to reading and writing (if they actually had any), and in the case they did, we do not expect to find pieces of writing among the people who had to struggle with the challenges of the troubled everyday life of the Middle Ages.

Still, although the topic does not seem to be fully examined, Dieter Stein’s 1990 research on the topic showed that there was a rather high discrepancy in the ratio of do-support use in what she calls ‘courtly speech’ while the situation with ‘low texts’ is quite different. First of all, she points out that do frequently occurs in 16th century classical quotations attributed to authorities like God, the Bible or Cicero, who are either always true or were the highest point of an argument (1990: 60). Furthermore, also during the 16th century, the increase in the use of periphrasis in this type of texts resulted in the acquisition of a ‘stylistic connotation’ or in becoming a marker of ‘high style’ literature (1990: 108). To support her point of view, she provides examples from Lord Berner’s translation of Froissart (1525-1535), which she concludes is a text in which the occurrences of do are restricted in direct speech only; she notices that the ratio of do is much higher in direct speech than it is in the instances of narration; she
concludes that this could be a very clear case of the mannerisms and the sophistication that the courtly speech of the 16th century intended to reflect (116). To further support her argument, she provides excerpts from Harman’s *Caveat* (1567), considered to be a kind of ‘low literature’ that describes contemporary criminal practices, in which the ratio of *do* is very limited, just a couple of cases every three or four pages (117). Moreover, 16th century country language saw the emergence of structures like not *only…but* and *though…yet* which are typical cases requiring the presence of ‘do’.

She further adds that in various texts of the era (Tyndale’s *Four Gospels*, *The Authorized Version of 1611*, Bishop Cranmer’s *Book of the Common Prayer*) the writers seem to try to balance between being faithful to colloquial language trying to elevate somehow above it. To achieve the former, they avoid *do* as much as possible, as it was considered a marker of courtly speech and an unrealistic representation of everyday people’s speech. To achieve the latter, they used they archaic form of -*th* ending in the third person singular (*singeth, doth, hath*), which would successfully embellish their work (1990:121).

**Chapter 3**

**Negation, adverbs, auxiliary do: historical overview**

This chapter is concerned with the investigation of how the loss of verb movement has influenced the syntax of English on a more general level. It has been one of the most important syntactic changes and actually the rise of periphrastic *do* and the fixed placement of negation and adverbs in English are just projections of this phenomenon. In what follows, we will first analyse what really verb movement is and how it is involved in the variations that occurred in the language. Next, we will make a historical overview of the syntactic patterns that are the immediate results of the loss of verb movement; specifically, we will discuss negation patterns, the position of adverbs of frequency and manner on a syntactic and a historical basis. The patterns are seen throughout the various periods of the English language history. Moreover, the rise of periphrastic *do* will be discussed in a separate subchapter. Since it was not a property of the language in the first period English, we can only discuss its gradual rise and how this was formed from the 16th and 17th century onwards. In short, we will see the syntactic form that Modern English (henceforth: ModE) has, and then do a historical overview in order to compare it with its previous forms so as to reach some safe conclusions about the causes that triggered the changes.
3.1 Verb movement

As we have already mentioned, the total loss of inflections in both verbs and nouns was a fact that had a tremendous impact on the syntax of English. We are going to concentrate solely on verbs here. To compensate for loss of inflections, new forms had to emerge in order to mark the verb in terms of tense, aspect and person. This led to a very rigid and fixed clausal syntax, in which every word had its special role and verb movement was only allowed in certain conditions and following specific rules. On the contrary, Old English syntax, being fully inflectional, allowed a much more flexible movement of the clausal elements; first of all, Old English was an OV language, where the agent of the verb would appear later on in the sentence, but the inflected forms would easily refer to it.

The principle that can account for the inflexibility of Modern English is the Verb Movement parameter, formulated by Emonds (1978) and developed by Pollock in his influential 1989 article. In it, Emonds attributes the placement of negators, adverbs, auxiliaries as well as quantifiers to the same parameter, proposing the ‘opacity’ or ‘transparency of Agr(eement)’, according to which languages differ in terms of the ability of the verb to move from its base position to I(nflection) P(hrase) to check subject agreement or not, depending on the morphological properties of each language. This results in crosslinguistic differences, since lower sentence adverbs (frequency or manner, for example) appear the verb and its object in languages in which the verb raises out of its original position such as in French, and those in which they surface preverbally, as in English (Pollock, 1991: 366; Kaltenbacher: 2000: 94).

\[
[CP[IPNP I (NegP not)] [VP (Adv) V\ldots]]
\]

In other words, Agr(eement) determines if verbs in a language can raise. Kaltenbacher suggests that in traditional syntactic terms [+strong] Agr signifies that the verbs of a language are highly inflected, meaning that they are transparent and thus, they may move to the head of Agr. Additionally, the presence of verbal inflections is responsible for the licensing of null subjects, turning the language into a pro-drop one. One the contrary, in case Agr is [-strong], it is then opaque, and any kind of verb movement is blocked (2000: 95). We can understand this better if we take a look at the following examples, all taken from Pollock (1989); if English allowed verb raising to Infl, then all the following sentences would be considered correct:
(1) *John likes not Mary.
(2) a. *John kisses often Mary.
    b. John often kisses Mary.
(3) a. *My friends love all Mary.
    b. My friends all love Mary.

On the other hand, we see that there is a very limited category of verbs that can undergo movement under certain circumstances; the lexical have and be and the auxiliaries have, be and do. This becomes evident in the next examples, in which the verbs raise:

(4) a. John seldom has enough money.
    b. John has seldom enough money.
(5) a. John is never happy.
    b. John never is happy.
(6) My friends have all loved Mary.
(7) John is often kissing Mary.
(8) John does not like Mary.

According to Pollo

ck, the theory that underlies these examples is relevant to θ-theory; be and have do not have any θ-roles to assign, so they are not blocked and can be raised, since [-strong] Agr does not allow the transmission of a verb’s θ-roles, in the way that [+strong] Agr would.

Furthermore, Lightfoot and Hornstein offer their own analysis on what exactly verb movement is and how it relates to English. They argue that in case a verb moves to a clause-initial position, this happens in an at least two-step fashion, via a position in which it is associated with inflectional elements (1994:3). As a result, the English verb be is likely to move to a clause-initial position (9a), but not across another element that carries some kind of an inflection (9b). Finally, they explain that the route to initial position goes through the inflection position, occupied by at most one item each time, is in (9a) and can in (9b).

(9) a. is: Ray e: smart?
    b. *be: Ray can e: smart?

It becomes evident that this kind of verb movement tends to be more localized (that is from head to head) than movement of phrasal categories, which are allowed to move more freely across other phrasal categories.

Finally, Lightfoot and Hornstein (1994) support that languages with a rich inflectional system have V-to-I operations in their system and this inflectional system could be what triggers the raising operation. In Standard English, only the verb be is highly inflected and this element raises to I, can occur left of not and may consequently move on to C (as in Is Michael a doctor now?). Furthermore, in some forms of English,
such as black English Vernacular or some form of children’s speech, we find no inflected forms of be, regardless of the number or person of the subject NP. On the contrary, we find negatives and interrogatives such as in (10c, d) but not (10e); the latter is what would be expected if the uninflected be raised to I.

(10) a. Michael is a doctor now
    b. Michael be a doctor now
    c. Michael don’t be a doctor now
       do Michael be a doctor now?
       what do Michael be?
    d. did it be funny?
       do clown be boys or girls?
       I don’t be angry
    e. *Michael ben’t a doctor now
       * be Michael a doctor now?
       * what be Michael?

According to Lighfoot and Holstein, the contrast between these forms of the language strongly suggests that the inflected be raises to I, whereas the uninflected form does not (1994: 9). Thus, as we see, rich inflection and V-to-I raising are linked in some way.

**3.2 (Late) Modern English**

Late Modern English or Modern English is the language that expands more or less from 1800 until now, the 21st century. It is the type of language still used by speakers and learners today. This is a period of great expansion of the language, both geographically and in terms of the purposes that a language serves. With the establishment of the British naval supremacy, the British Empire expands throughout every corner of the Earth, from the archipelagos of the Pacific to New Zealand. More recently, the American prominence in world affairs has further strengthened the status of English as the lingua franca of our times. Furthermore, the number of speakers has undergone a population explosion, as in the vast number of native speakers we must add the billions of people who use English as their second language. Finally, as Algeo and Pyles support in their book, the uses to which English is put have ramifications with the growth of science, technology and commerce (2005: 201)

On the whole, as van Gelderen (2014) points out, there have been much fewer internal changes in the language compared to the previous periods, even though the similarity of the language might be misleading (207). Charles Jones has called the 18th and 19th centuries the ‘Cinderella period of English historical linguistics’, as it raised
from a relatively dark period of having limited use in the British Isles, to a language that became more and more important globally in terms of trade, literature and science (cited in van Gelderen, 2014: 279). There are many external alterations resulting from colonialism, which produce branches such as the American, Asian, African and Australian English, as well as a lot of varieties in each of these broad categories, like Pakistani English or Georgian English. Last but not least, this is the first time in history that we can investigate the details of language use and its correlation to gender, age, region or socio-economic background of the speakers, thus making a real-life sociolinguistic investigation.

Moreover, syntactically speaking, it is very well known that English is characterized by a very high degree of rigidity, not allowing but a little movement to its elements, due to the scarcity of inflections. This lack of inflections on the verb (apart from the third person singular ‘-s’ of agreement in the Present Tense) requires the existence of a certain sentential element to denote the agent, that is the subject. This has been considered to be the main reason why English, along with other European languages like French, German or Dutch, which do not have a full morphological paradigm as is the case with Italian, Spanish or Greek, are non-pro drop languages. Consequently, English has become an SVO language, keeping this form very strictly, licensing verb movement under very specific conditions. The loss of inflections had certain ramifications concerning the position of the verb in a clause and whether it can move to the left of the clause (see. Section 3.1 for a detailed analysis of the Verb Movement parameter).

3.2.1 Negation

As pointed out, the problem with negation is that it is not typologically coherent; neither does it behave under one single ‘rule’ (Klima, 1964: 246; Mazzon, 2004: 93). What the previously mentioned authors mean by that is that negation in a present-day English sentence could just be expressed with a single element like not, nobody, never, with two elements like not ever, not long or through Neg-Incorporation or even implied negation, like in the case of forbid (Mazzon, ibid.). Still, they realize that the main negative elements are not and never, so we shall focus solely on them. The default, unmarked placement of not is close to an Auxiliary/Tense element and the introduction of do-support has resulted in a similar surface position of both negation and frequency/manner adverbs, (Jacobson 1964: 182-3; Jacobson 1975: 86).
Mazzon also discusses the importance of semantics in negation, adding that more often than not, negative sentences are ‘derived’ from positive ones, which mirrors some sort of intuition as well. To enlighten the readers, she adds some very well-known examples to reinforce the notion that we need to take into account semantic and pragmatic factors to fully comprehend negation.

(11) I will force you to marry no one.
(12) Not many of the arrows hit the target.

What she means to underline here is the need to abandon older misconceptions about the existence of a single negative particle and examine the difference between sentence negation and constituent negation (Mazzon, 2004: 95).

Finally, we should not ignore the work on negation by Haegeman (1995), who suggests that negation is always high in deep structure, that there are two types of negation as mentioned before and that we should always search the semantic factors underlying the negation, i. e. with regard to triggering or not inversion (1995: 72-9). Her examples clearly show that the differentiation between constituent and sentential negation is always evident, as seen in (13) and (14):

(13) Not often does John attend parties.
(14) Not surprisingly, they left.

However, according to Mazzon, Haegeman does not offer an explanation for cases like (15) and (16), which are clearly negative but do not have a NegP clearly described as operator; they are much more general or ‘peripheral’ but still, they pass all tests on negativity (Mazzon, 2004: 95).

(15) On no account will I go there.
(16) John said nothing.

3.2.2 Adverbs

Our search will not focus on the position of adverbs/ adverbial modifiers in general, but rather on the position of adverbs of frequency and of manner, even though bibliography is for the most part dedicated to adverbs of time and place; analysis of adverbs of frequency and manner still receives relatively little attention in the linguistic literature (Potsdam 2000:1). We might say that even though adverbs of manner, time and place behave more or less in the same way, adverbs of frequency follow a very specific
pattern of their own. First of all, as far as adverbs of manner are concerned, we need to distinguish adverbials from one-word adverbs, such as *carefully* and with *a lot of care*, even though not all adverbs have a periphrastic equivalent.

(17) She hugged the baby **carefully**. / She hugged the baby with **care**.
(18) The boy smiled **happily**. / *The boy smiled with **happiness**.

Secondly, we observe that from the five clause elements (subject, verb, object, complement, adverb), adverbs are usually considered peripheral and optional and are frequently found at the end of a sentence. Moreover, they are relatively mobile and their number in a sentence might be unlimited (Virtanen, 1992: 8-10). Unfortunately, Virtanen’s study focuses on adverbials of time and place and much of the very enlightening information cannot be used here.

Jackendoff developed a very popular theory concerning the classification of adverbs in English. It recognizes two syntactic classes of adverbs corresponding to the traditional distinction between predicate modifiers and propositional modifiers, the former attached at the VP level (VP-adverbs) and the latter modifying S (S-adverbs) (1972: 50-7). Examples (19)-(20) include VP-adverbs.

(19) Tom **completely/easily/handily/quickly** finished his lunch.
(20) Jonathan **evidently/probably/certainly/apparently** lost his wallet.

S-adverbs can appear clause-initially (1972: 37), immediately after the subject (20), or to the immediate right of a modal or finite auxiliary verb (21). On the other hand, VP-adverbs may appear clause-finally (22), or to the left of the main verb (23).

(21) **Probably/ Often** Sam has been called.
(22) Sam **probably/ often** has been called.
(23) Sam has **probably/ often** been called.

### 3.2.3 The auxiliary *do*

In ModE, the use of the auxiliary *do* is limited in interrogatives (except for *wh*- subject questions) and negative declaratives for lexical verbs, but not allowed in the case of *be*. It is prohibited in affirmative clauses, apart from the emphatic ones (as in *I do like fish and chips*). As mentioned before (in 3. 1), the bibliography largely agrees that the cause of this is the fact that *be*, and auxiliary verbs can move to T⁰ in the clausal structures,
but lexical verbs cannot (Han & Kroch, 2000). This means that be and auxiliaries may undergo verb movement, in contrast to lexical verbs, which always stay in-situ. Negation allows category movement, resulting in auxiliaries not requiring do-support. Finally, affirmative clauses do not require do-support, because no element blocks category movement (apart from do-insertion in emphatic statements).

Moreover, in the case of a rigid, non-inflectional language like English, the rise of an auxiliary like do was necessary to indicate subject agreement, or the D features on Tense, if you will. This has been referred to as ‘a last resort mechanism’:

In the last-resort account, the required adjacency between tense/agreement and the main verb has been disrupted in all of the SP contexts (except emphasis), preventing the tense/agreement affix from combining with the verb. This triggers the insertion of do into the syntactic position occupied by tense/agreement. (Bruening, 2010: 44)

### 3.3 Old English

The Old English (henceforth, OE) period lasts approximately from 450 AD to 1100. This is the first time that the recorded history of the language begins in the British Isles and it is this period in which the language starts becoming distinct from its Germanic cousins (Algeo & Pyles, 2005: 86). A very common misconception concerning this period is that the language was crude or dull. The truth is that, especially after the conversion of England to Christianity, England became the centre of scholarly activity. Various monasteries (Canterbury, Glastonbury, York, Wearmouth) offered studies, which helped the language thrive and expand. Moreover, literature in the OE period was rich in poetry. The most famous piece of art is of course the epic poem *Beowulf*, probably written in the early eighth century, which is a sophisticated blending of pagan and Christian themes. A crucial remark that we can make here is that OE can be described as more synthetic, with a free word order and absence of certain pronouns and auxiliaries, whereas Present English (PE) is more analytic (van Gelderen, 2014: 71). Finally, there were four principal dialects were spoken in Anglo-Saxon England: Kentish, West Saxon, Mercian and Northumbrian (Algeo & Pyles, 2005: 94; v. Gelderen, 2014: 51).

### 3.3.1 Negation

It is widely accepted that OE syntax is recognizable English, even for the unskilled reader (Algeo & Pyles, 2005: 116; Fischer et al., 2000: Mitchell & Robinson, 2001: 65).
It is also known that OE syntax was a lot freer than PE syntax due to the richer morphology of nouns and pronouns. Manuscripts of the period show that the OE negative adverb *ne* was usually before the verb it modified.

(24) *Ic ne dyde* ‘I did not’  
(Mitchell & Robinson, 101)

Moreover, it contracted with the following verbs: *nis* (*ne is* ‘is not’), *nille* (*ne wille* ‘will not’), *naeße* (*ne haefþe* ‘have not’). That clearly shows a link to PE, where *isn’t*, *won’t* and *haven’t* are among the most frequent forms.

Additionally, *nā* and *nē* are used to negate words that are not finite verbs, as shown in (25).

(25) *He waes Godes bydel ond nā God* ‘He was God’s messenger and not God’

We also know that *ne*, not before a finite verb, is a conjunction as in (26).

(26) *ne leornian ne tæcan* ‘neither to learn nor to teach’.  
(Mitchell & Robinson, 102)

Finally, Fischer et al. (2000) show that there is a very small proportion of cases in which sentential negation is expressed with two different negative elements, *na* or *no* being the second element, although *noht* and *nawiht* are also attested, as in (2000: 27):

(27) *Ne bið na se leorningeniht forðor honne his lareow*  
not is not the apprentice further than his master  
‘The apprentice is not ahead of his master’  
(ÆHom 14.134)

Another noteworthy remark that (28) and (29) clearly show is that the auxiliary *do* has not yet started being used in questions and negations, as van Gelderen suggests (2014: 72).

(28) *gehyrest þu eadwacer*  
hear you Eadwacer  
‘Do you hear, Eadwacer?’  
(from Wulf and Eadwacer)

(29) *hwæt gehyryst þu*  
what hear you  
‘What do you hear?’  
(made up example)

### 3.3.2 Adverbs

The great majority of OE adverbs is formed from adjectives by adding the suffix –*e*, like in *wrāþ* ‘angry’, *wrāþe* ‘angrily’ or *hraþ* ‘quick’, *hraþe* ‘quickly’ (Algeo & Pyles, 2005: 108; Mitchell & Robinson, 2001: 53). Additionally, other characteristic endings include –*lice*, as in *hraedlīce* ‘quickly’, or –*unga*, as in *eallunga* ‘entirely’. Finally, the

Something that should be mentioned here is that nouns and adjectives in dative and genitive can be used adverbially during this period, as in (Mitchell & Robinson, 2001: 30),

(30) He hwearf dæges and nihtes
He wandered of a day and of a night
‘He wandered day and night’,
where dæges and nihtes are genitive singulars. PE words like homewards (OE hāmweardes), towards (tōweardes), also derive from the genitive singular ending –es, as Algeo and Pyles mention (2005: 108). This very ending is only written differently in PE common words such as once, twice, thrice, hence and since.

As far as their position in OE sentences is concerned, Fischer et al., (2000) note that they usually appear to the left of any non-fronted verb, suggesting that they are limited to the preverbal position as shown in (31):

(31) Hwa wolde me æfre gelyfan?
‘Who would me ever believe?’
‘Who would ever believe me?’ (ÆCHom II, 6.53.37)

On the other hand, (32) is an exceptional case in which the adverb follows the infinitive, according to Fischer et al., (2000):

(32) Ac we sceolon biddan soðlice þa halgan...
but we must pray truly the saints
‘But we must truly pray to the saints’ (ÆLS(Swithun) 284)

### 3.4 Middle English

The chronological period of Middle English (henceforth, ME) is roughly extended between 1100 and 1500, although those limits are more arbitrary than OE. By 1100 the dramatic changes had long been established and the Norman conquest in 1066 had already started affecting English drastically. The term middle very successfully encapsulates the role of ME in the history of the language in general; that it is a transition from the old to the new, and the link between the English of the Middle Ages (OE) and that of the first printed books that despite the differences is very similar to English that is spoken today, according to Algeo and Pyles (2005: 123).

To be more specific, three drastic changes can be traced in the language, affecting its sounds, the use of words, as well as in the words themselves, according to Burrow and Turville-Petre (2005: 4). First of all, a much simpler system of inflections is introduced especially when it comes to nouns and adjectives. A plausible explanation
for that simplification was the need for distinction between stressed and unstressed syllables in the words. As a result, most unstressed syllables are reduced to a /a/ and since most inflectional endings are unstressed, they become gradually obsolete, as in *stānes* (genitive masculine of the noun *stān* ‘stone’). An associated change is also the loss of all grammatical gender in ME, since the differentiation between masculine, feminine and neuter was based upon the existence of inflectional endings.

Moreover, ME becomes less free and more rigid, depending more and more on prepositions to designate the relationships of words within a sentence, as shown in (33), an example taken from Burrow and Turville-Petre (ibid.):

```
(33) be worst piler on to biholde
    the worst pillar on to look
    ‘the worst pillar to look at’
    (Sir Orfeo, 367, 1330-40)
```

It is, of course, widely accepted that this was another parameter of the simplification of the inflectional system. It is now word order that distinguishes between the subject and the object of a verb, something that was evident from the distinction of nominative (subject) and accusative (object) in OE.

Finally, the word stock of the language dramatically changes as well. The Norman Conquest leads to the inundation of English (a Germanic language) with numerous French loans, which even replace the OE words. Even though OE had few instances of foreign words, ME is characterized by not only significant borrowings from French and Latin, but also from the languages of the Scandinavian settlers, who had populated large areas of England by the 12th century. In this respect we see an influence of these languages in other linguistic levels as well.

### 3.4.1 Negation

We have already mentioned that in earlier periods, negation was expressed with *ne* used preverbally. According to Burrow and Turville – Petre (ibid), this is a practice that continues throughout this period, too and they provide numerous examples to prove that (52).

```
(34) I ne can    ne    I ne mai
    I not can neither I am not able to
    ‘I do not know neither am I able to’
    (The Peterborough Chronicle 33, 1137)

(35) ne    wonde    / pís aventure for to frayn
    not hesitate / this adventure to frayn
```
‘Don’t hesitate to attempt this’ (Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, 488-9)

From that period, *ne* could also be used with another negative word in a sentence. Most often this word would be *nouȝt*, which originally meant ‘*nothing*’ or ‘*nought*’, which later on developed to the negation adverb ‘*not*’. (36) to (39) are all examples taken from Burrow and Turville-Petre and point out the gradual evolution of the negation during the period.

(36) *he no schuld  nouȝt from hem go*

he no would  not  from them go
‘he would not  go from them’

In other cases, the subject would follow the verb, paving maybe the way to a first-time-ever postverbal negation:

(37) *ne reche  ic  nouȝt*

no  care  I  not
‘I don’t care’

Finally, *nouȝt* could be used to modify another adverb:

(38) *wel: his nest nouȝt wel he ne bihedde*

his nest  not well  he  not hide
‘He did not guard his nest well’

From the 14th century, it becomes common to use *not* as the only negative element of a sentence and it is placed postverbally, as in (39):

(39) *I know not  þe*

I know  not  you
‘I don’t know you’ (Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, 400)

(40) *Arthure  wolte  not  ete*

Arthure  wanted  not  eat
‘Arthur didn’t want to eat’ (Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, 85)

### 3.4.2 Adverbs

In OE the typical adverb ending was –*e* or –*lice*. In ME, on the other hand, -*e* is lost and –*lic* reduces to –*ly*, as van Gelderen informs us (129).

(41) *He made the peple  pitously to synge*

‘He made the people sing compationately’ (Chaucer’s, The Friar’s Tale, 1316)
According to Fischer et al., the order of elements in clauses underwent major changes throughout the years, and their effects are quite evident in the ME period (2000: 81). One major change of the period was the positioning of the verb and its object, since now English is slowly starting to lose its SOV structure and at the same time is developing into its SVO one, which is still the case in ModE.

Another way to examine adverb placement is with respect to the verb itself. In ME finite clauses, adverbs like *ever* and *often* usually follow the tensed verb, as shown in (42). But, according to Han and Kroch (2000), if these adverbs are VP-adjoined, then the fact that the tensed verbs precede the adverbs suggests that the verb moves over the adverb (2000: 8). In ME infinitival clauses, adverbs can follow the infinitive too, as we see in (43). This is indicative of the fact that ME infinitive verbs may also undergo movement, according to Han and Kroch (2000):

(42) *Here men vndurstonden ofte by this nyght the nyght of synne*

here men understood often by this night the night of sin

(Wycliffe Sermons, 1,477.605)

(43) a. *Monye men han a maner to eate ofte for to drylke*

many men have a manner to eat often in-order to drink

(Wycliffe Sermons, 1,478.631)

b. *the othur was that God wold geue hur that grace, to hur that was the modur of God to do euer plesaund seruyse to God.*

the other was that God would give her that grace, to her that was the Mother of God to do always pleasing service to God.

(Sermons from the MS Royal 256.260)

### 3.5 Early Modern English

Early Modern English (henceforth, EME) was the kind of language spoken roughly between 1500 and 1800. This is considered as a major transformative period, due to the fact that the 15th century is thought of as a fallow period for the English language and culture, after which historical facts and developments culminated in what is known as England’s Golden Age, beginning with the Elisabethan period, according to Algeo & Pyles (2005: 153).

One very basic differentiation of this period is that *carpe diem* ‘seize the day’ replaces *memento mori* ‘remember that you will die’; with the birth of the Renaissance comes freedom of ideas and linguistically, this is translated in a freedom to borrow and create new words (van Gelderen, 2014: 159). English becomes even more analytic and the completion of the Great Vowel Shift means that the spelling becomes standardised and uniform. The vast influx of Latin and Greek words continues, more in the written language and less in the oral one, as they are either used as scientific terms or used by the Church. Moreover, this period is closely associated to the discovery of the New
World as well as to the beginning of colonisation. Other languages, such as Spanish and Portuguese, will also influence English. Finally, we must also mention that from early on in their history, the American colonies begin to influence the general vocabulary with loanwords from both Amerindian languages, as well as languages spoken by other European settlers in the New World. Further changes in the form and meaning introduced in America were more often than not under protest back in England.

This is a period of great importance for our study, due to the fact that the use of *do* as an auxiliary in the formation of interrogative and negative clauses projects for the first time. As mentioned in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 in further detail, the rise of *do* was primarily a linguistic need as English was undergoing a lot of alterations that changed dramatically the fully inflected, Germanic language that Old English was to the rigid language it is today.

### 3.5.1 Negation

The fact that EME is a transitional phase of the language has already been mentioned. This is further reflected in the use of negation in the writings of the period. The use of *do* in questions and negative sentences is not yet obligatory, and we can see that Shakespeare uses both structures, as seen in the following examples, taken from *The complete works of William Shakespeare*:

(44) *Do you not heare him?*  
(45) *A heauie heart beares not a humble tongue*  

Another remark worth making is that, even though in OE and ME negation can be expressed by one or two negatives, this changes in the EME period. Van Gelderen informs us that although we see that *not* or *nothing* usually appear alone in a clause, there are a few instances in which single negation is expressed using multiple negative words (2014: 176):

(46) *Nor go neither: ... and yet say nothing neither*

### 3.5.2 Adverbs

Algeo and Pyles inform us that many adverbs ending in *-ly* in Modern English (henceforth, ModE) did not obligatorily require the suffix in EME (2005: 181-2). The works of Shakespeare provide us with various such examples, like *grievous sick*,
wondrous strange and indifferent cold. Furthermore, the writers underline the use of sure, saying that it would be listed as ‘bad English’ in today’s English school system:

(47) If she come in, shee’ll sure speake to my wife (Othello, 5.2.96)

(48) And sure deare friends my thankes are too dear a halfepeny (Hamlet, 2.2.282)

(49) Sure the Gods doe this yeere connive at us (Winter’s Tale 4.4.692)

Moreover, the emergence of do-support could also be understood as the result of the new placement of adverbs of indefinite time and modality (i.e. adverbs of frequency like always, never, often etc.), which had been placed postverbally before the 15th century and now surface preverbally (Kroch, 1989: 142).

3.5.3 The rise of periphrastic do

From the 15th century onwards, a new form of auxiliary do developed as a morphological marker of person and tense in negative, interrogative as well as imperative sentences where no other auxiliary tensed verb was present. During this period, its use was variable, inconsistent and it gradually increased (Varela- Pérez, 1997: 35; Han & Kroch, 2000:1). That means that throughout the EME period there was a choice between negating with do followed by the particle not preceding the main verb (as in modern English I do not go) and negating with the adverbial form not following the verb (as in I go not). Finally, a third hybrid form with not preceding the base form of the verb and without the existence of periphrastic do emerged as a form of transition between the two stages (Jespersen, 1940: 428; Ukaji, 1992: 454). To put it simple, one could support that the path of the historical evolution of the negation in English looks more or less like that:

IC NE SEGGE> I NE SEYE (NOT)> I SAY NOT> (I NOT SAY)> I DO NOT SAY> I DON’T SAY

Additionally, the loss of inflections and the emergence of the subclass of modal verbs are associated with the rise of do, as Culicover (2008) points out, as well as a number of other changes, listed below:

i. growth of periphrastic do+V

ii. loss of full V2 reanalysis of V2 as “residual” V2 in questions and other “affective” environments;

iii. formation of a distinct subclass of modal verbs;

iv. loss of case and establishment of “positional licensing” of subjects
A very classic and pioneering paper concerning the development of *do* was written by Ellegård in 1953. He conducted a thorough study from OE until the 18\textsuperscript{th} century in which he showed how the auxiliary *do* was used in each construction (Yadomi, 2013; Ellegård, 1953), (see Table 1). We can thus conclude that there was a significant and sudden increase in the use of *do* in affirmative questions and negative questions and an also significant but a little slower increase in negative declarative and negative imperative sentences. Last but not least, the use of *do* in affirmative declarative sentences lasted until about 1620, before becoming obsolete.

There are many reasons why *do* emerged and became such an integral part of the English syntax, and one should view it in the context of a wide range of changes that occurred during that period. As Varela-Pérez (1997) argues, a modification in the condition of one structure in the system might trigger a number of other changes in the rest of the components, something which is the case with any properties associated with a specific parameter. What happened with English is that, the basic word order changed from SOV to SVO and this actually resulted in the use of the *do* support in negative, declarative and interrogative sentences. Moreover, the loss of inflections demanded the existence of a point of reference as far as person and tense is concerned and this new
auxiliary could become this point of reference. (1997: 36). Old English, which was very much alike modern German or modern French, which fully allow V-to-I, changed to the language it is today in which only auxiliary and modal verbs are allowed to be adjoined to I\(^0\). Finally, do-support is used for tense marking early on in a clause, since there are no more inflections to point it out (Culicover, 2008).

**Chapter 4**

*Do-support in 17\(^{th}\), 18\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) century literature*

Our search is limited mainly to the 17\(^{th}\) century, which is roughly divided in two periods; early 17\(^{th}\) century (1603-1660) and the Restoration (1660-1714), as well as the 18\(^{th}\) century and the beginnings of the 19\(^{th}\) (circa 1820). During those decades Jane Austen, whose novels will serve as a basis for our analysis, produced some of her finest pieces of art. As mentioned in Chapter 3, they are periods in which the language had already undergone its major changes and had moved from a Germanic in form and morphology OE, to a language that is closer to the present form of English. This can also be proved by the literature itself, as most literature written those years can be read without any translation. Our main focus is always the rise of periphrastic *do*, which, despite its first appearance several centuries ago, still has not solidified its presence as a sine qua non element in the formation of questions and negative sentences. We are, thus, going to examine whether periphrastic *do* was used simultaneously and interchangeably with the older and simpler forms of inversion in questions and with the single negator *not* in negatives. We know already that during the 16\(^{th}\) century and the Shakespearean period, there was optionality, meaning that both forms were used and were intelligible. Our research focuses on whether remnants of the old forms were still used in 17\(^{th}\), 18\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) century or if they had become totally swept by the new forms and thus obsolete. Furthermore, we are going to focus our attention on some adverbs of frequency and manner as well, because the position of adverbs is also linked to the verbal position.

In order to have a clearer image of every century, it was decided to investigate each period separately and then compare the results, to find out whether there had been even the slightest change in a relatively short period of time.
4.1 Material

When we first began working on this thesis, the main idea was to concentrate on texts that would be characteristic of LME and of the 18th century and would reflect the language of the era to a great extent. We decided to focus our research on the writings by Jane Austen, as she is a very well-known and prolific writer; moreover, her books and style of writing are considered to be typical of the era, reflecting everyday English, as her books include both a lot of narration and an abundance of dialogues, which are usually expected to offer great insight into spoken language. On the course of the research, it was decided to include literary work by other writers of the period and the previous centuries as well, in order to observe the gradual process of the differentiation in syntax. As has been mentioned earlier, LME had already stabilised its form, the rise of do was definitive and had already been in use for almost three centuries, so it was decided to look into the literature of the previous period as well, in order to be able to check the progressive increase of the periphrastic type, as well as the duration of optionality between the two patterns. To achieve this, writers from the earlier LME period were also included. More specifically, the second half of the 17th century was examined through Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* and *The Tale of a Tub*; John Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera*; Samuel Johnson’s *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* (henceforth: Scotland) as well as *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia*, Daniel Defoe’s *The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* and finally John Locke’s *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (henceforth: Human Understanding).

As for the 18th century, this was examined through the writings of Jane Austen’s *Emma, Love and Freindship, Mansfield Park, Northager Abbey, Persuasion*, the *Letters* (of the 1796-1817 period), *Pride and Prejudice* as well as *Sense and Sensibility* are used. In addition to these literary works, Henry Fielding’s *Shamela, Tom Jones* and *Joseph Andrews* have been analysed, Edward Gibbon’s *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Volume I*, and finally Adam Smith’s’ 1776 *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (henceforth: The Wealth of Nations) are included in the research in order to discover any discrepancies between the writers. The decision to include that many texts by various writers from this period was made for the sake of variety of texts as well as to ensure that the idiolect of a writer would not influence our conclusions, nor would it hinder our objectivity.
4.2 Tools and procedure

Our search became possible thanks to the existence of the University of the Oxford Text Archive (OTA), a repository of digital literary and linguistic resources for research and teaching. It includes a vast amount of works, divided by century, which makes the search a lot easier since it is also very inclusive, providing what most writers have produced. The literary works examined in our search were downloaded in text (.txt) form and then analysed with the AntConc text analyser (AntConc version 3.5.7 for Macintosh OS X), which has the ability to track and count specific lexical items in a context, isolating each sentence including the items in search.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 Late 17th century

As Table 2 shows, the results here seem to agree with the theories and historical data that by the time LME set in, the use of periphrastic do had been already obligatory, at least in the case of lexical verbs. Be and have had been already used as auxiliaries, being allowed to move to the head of the clause and thus, not being in need of do to form their interrogative and negative structures. In the 5110 instances that not appears in the books we are examining, 1595 (almost 31%) were cases of the two auxiliaries in negative form. What is more, Table 3 shows the instances of modal verbs that can also be negated without do. There are 1134 cases (22.2% of the verbs of the period we are examining). Finally, we analysed the cases in which the auxiliary do is used indeed in order to form negatives. We see that these cases account for about 10.4% of all the negatives clauses found in the books. These three numbers give rise to another point. If do-negations, auxiliaries be, have and the modal verbs add up to approximately 65% of negative clauses, how is the rest 35% of the instances of not used? Our search showed that although do-support is more or less the rule in LME, there are still many cases in which the writers opt for the older negative form and attach not to lexical verbs; know, appear, dare, say, come are some verbs that often negated with a simple not, proving, therefore, that there was still optionality to some extent, even though it was not the rule:

(50) which **appears not** at first, (John Locke, Human Understanding)
(51) of which I **know not** the philosophical name (Samuel Johnson, Scotland)
(52) How long he might live afterwards, I **know not** (Defoe, Robinson Crusoe)
(53) I grant Men **come not** to the Knowledge of these (John Locke, Human Understanding)
Table 2: *be* and *have* forms followed by *not*, without any periphrastic *do*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be not</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am not</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>6,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is not</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was not</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>4,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were not</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have not</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had not</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hath not</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1595</strong></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: modal verbs followed by *not*, without any periphrastic *do*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will not</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would not</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could not</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may not</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might not</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must not</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ought not</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall not</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should not</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need(s) not</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1134</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: periphrastic *do* used in negation, preceding lexical verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do form</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do not</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did not</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doth not</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dost not</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>528</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides negative sentences, interrogative sentences were also checked, although we did not expect similar results. Interrogatives are usually found in novels and generally in writings that include dialogues and in general instances of vivid images and interaction among people. Jonathan Swift’s books do have dialogues, but unfortunately this is not
the case with other books, like *Human Understanding*, which touches upon socioeconomic issues. As a result, our results were naturally confined to a smaller number of cases. Thus, as we can see in Table 5, the majority of questions are formed with the use of periphrastic *do* (or *did*). The auxiliaries *be* and *have* form questions by simple inversion and so do modal verbs, something which clearly is parallel to what happens in ModE, too. What is unusual, though, is the total lack of any inverted forms of lexical verbs. It seems that in LME forming questions by simple investing the verb and the subject was already considered ungrammatical, as it is nowhere to be found in these books. Even though there were those archaic forms in negatives, it seems that in the 18th century *do* had definitely been an indispensible part of grammar.

Table 5: Cases of interrogative sentences with the use of periphrastic *do*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do I</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dost thou</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does he</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doth he</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does she</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doth she</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doth it</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the adverbs used in the writings are also more or less placed as adverbs in ModE are. Adverbs of manner are usually placed clause-initially (54) or clause-finally (55), before a verb (56), after modals and auxiliaries (57), or to modify adjectives inside an A(djective) P(hrase) (58):

(54) But **surely**, said Rasselas, the wise men...  (Samuel Johnson, Rasselas)
(55) So far the Mind cannot perceive **clearly**  (John Locke, *Human Understanding*)
(56) and I **quickly** learn’d him to know his own  (Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe*)
(57) and then could **clearly** distinguish it  (Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*)
(58) with justice pronounce myself an author **perfectly** blameless  (Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*)
This is the case for the adverbs of frequency more or less as well. No spectacular
differences compared with today’s language, and moreover, there are no clues from the
texts that syntactical patterns were any different whatsoever, by allowing for example
the adverb to be placed between a verb and its direct object.

4.3.2 18th century
As mentioned before, the 18th century was a period when the language had more or less
acquired its present form; do was an internal part of the syntax and the option of using
do or just using not seems to have also been lost except for some very specific cases, as
the results point out. To be specific, from the 18th century literary works mentioned in
4.1, there were 13710 cases where the negator not is used. From this number of cases, in
3922 cases (almost 28,6%) not is used after the two main auxiliary verbs be and have
(Table 1). Considering how frequently these verbs are encountered in everyday speech,
we realize that the percentage is quite a high one, proving the theory that has been
supported so far that be and have may undergo verb movement and thus do not need the
existence of another auxiliary in negation. Furthermore, 4921 instances (almost 35,9%)
of not are used after modal verbs, showing that modal verbs developed their own
strategies and behave more or less like auxiliaries (Table 2). This is a proof that modal
verbs function in a similar way as auxiliaries and this is why they form questions by
inversion and negative sentences followed by not. In addition, do appears in 2708 cases
(almost 19,8%), and is always followed by lexical verbs like acknowledge, act, speak,
think (Table 3). Finally, in 2159 (15,7%) cases not is used as a verbal negator, but rather
as an adverb or a pronoun negator, as seen in the following examples:

(59) I am certain you will blame Fortune and not me. (Fielding, Shamela)
(60) Papa hath told me so with a Politesse not often seen on this side Paris. (Fielding, Joseph
Andrews)
(61) any person living twenty miles of London, and not free of the city. (Smith, The Wealth
of Nations)

One very interesting point that should be underlined here is that, in the case of have, the
periphrastic do is not used even when have is a lexical verb, meaning possess. We can
notice in the following examples (62)-(67) that these are cases in which the negation
today would have been formed with do, whereas back in 18th and 19th century, the
negation of have is only formed with the addition of not.
(62) I declare I have not a comfort or an indulgence (Austen, Persuasion)
(63) I have not time for more (Fielding, Joseph Andrews)
(64) those criminals who have not themselves any estate (Smith, The Wealth of Nations)
(65) but poor Edward has not even that. (Austen, Sense and Sensibiltity)
(66) because Wickham has not sixpence of his own. (Austen, Pride and Prejudice)
(67) different branches of trade of which Great Britain has not the monopoly (Smith, The Wealth
of Nations)

Another important finding is that not is only used as a negator (i.e. without the presence
of do) with a handful of verbs; there are only 4 cases of ‘say not’, 3 cases of ‘seem not’,
3 cases of ‘let not’ and 20 cases of ‘dare not’. A number of everyday, common English
verbs like come, bring, go were checked, but returned no results whatsoever.

Table 6: be and have forms followed by not, without any periphrastic do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be not</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am not</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is not</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was not</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were not</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have not</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had not</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3922</td>
<td>28,6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: modal verbs followed by not, without any periphrastic do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will not</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would not</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>5,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>7,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could not</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>10,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may not</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might not</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must not</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ought not</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall not</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should not</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2,32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need not</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4921</td>
<td>35,9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When it comes to questions, the conclusions that could be reached from the books examined are more or less similar to the ones concerning 17th century. In general, questions are formed with the aid of *do* and at the same time, there are almost no cases of interrogatives without it.

### Table 9: Cases of interrogative sentences with the use of periphrastic *do*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Did I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Did you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does he</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Did he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does she</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Did she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Did it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Did we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Did they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>386</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, a third element that should be included here is the position of adverbs, since their position and use are in parallel with that of *not*; as we have seen in 3.2.2 adverbs many appear clause-initially, clause-finally, on the right of an auxiliary or a modal or on the left of a finite verb, always depending on the case. Based on our research and the results we have at hand, the same applies to adverbs of frequency and of manner during LME as well. More specifically, we analysed four different and very common English adverbs: the adverbs of frequency *usually* and *often* and the adverbs of manner *happily* and *totally*. We found that the adverbs of frequency behave in LME the same as in ModE. The majority is placed after a modal verb or an auxiliary. From the 70 cases of *usually* in the texts, 37 are used after a modal or auxiliary and 22 before a verb. *Often*, on the other hand, is a lot more common and is used in 551 different instances. 384 were after an auxiliary verb or a modal, 135 were placed preverbally and in only 32 was *often* placed postverbally. *Happily* is encountered 62 different times, out of which 35 are placed after an auxiliary or after a modal verb, 25 are placed preverbally and the postverbal placement occurs in only 2 cases. Finally, totally is used 79 times. This is a
special case of an adverb, as it is mainly used to modify an adjective, thus, the vast majority is used that way.

There is one last finding worth mentioning. The only writer who seems to either have a different idiolect or prefers a more archaic type of writing is Henry Fielding. He deliberately chooses the older forms *hath* for the third person singular in 233 cases and *hast* for the second person singular in 12 cases; what is more, the third person singular *doth* as the archaic form of *do* in 71 cases and finally *dost* which was the older form of the second person singular of *do* in 24 cases. What is even more fascinating is the fact that he uses the *doth* and *dost* to form negative and interrogative sentence as well as seen in the following examples:

(58) *Hath* he offered any Rudeness to you? *(Fielding, Joseph Andrews)*

(69) but I find she *hath* not *(Shamela)*

(70) which penalty the prosecution of offendrers *hath* not been so effectually put in execution *(Smith, The Wealth of Nations)*

(71) O Villain! Who *hast* attacked my Chastity *(Joseph Andrews)*

(72) How *dost* thou deceive them? *(Fielding, Joseph Andrews)*

(73) but that *doth* not weigh much *(Fielding, Joseph Andrews)*

(74) Why *dost* thou not suspect my innocence? *(Austen, Love and Friendship)*

(75) The Malster *doth* not always keep in his granaries a stock *(Smith, The Wealth of Nations)*

As can be noticed, the examples show that other writers of the era use the archaic forms of *do* and *have*; these cases are just limited to one or two per book and it could be supported that they exist there just for stylistic reasons, for example to give to the speaker an air of authority or sophistication. Moreover, Henry Fielding lived and wrote about 40 years prior to the rest of the writers. This could be an indication of a process in action in his generation. But the truth is that even Fielding himself used the modern types as well, but certainly to a much less extent. More specifically, in his books there are 68 instances of *doth* and 7 of *does*, while for the 232 cases of *hath* there are only 13 of *has*. On the other hand, he uses the archaic form *thou hast* only 8 times, whereas the modern form *you have* (second person singular and plural) is used 96 times. One thing that could support this simultaneous use is a case of optionality where two different, but synonymous forms compete, before one form finally becomes fully standardized and mainstream. The latter case of optionality is similar with the process we already observed concerning *do* and inverted questions in the 16th century Shakespearean writings.
Chapter 5
Discussion and conclusion

5.1 Discussion
The results clearly showed that any principle that underlined the syntax of the language in its older forms had totally vanished by the 16th century. By then, English had already acquired the form and shape it has even today on the basis of morphology and syntax; the average speaker of ModE can easily understand the writings of 17th and 18th century. More specifically, in 17th century writings, although the periphrastic do is very prevalent and overwhelmingly present, there is still a percentage of verbs that continues to form negative and interrogative sentences using a postverbal not and a simple inversion. Verbs like dare, say and let fall into this category and a reason for that could be the maintenance of a slim proportion of remnants that sound more formal and archaic. We also saw in 4.3.1 that auxiliary like do, have and be and modal verbs, which unlike lexical verbs can be raised in a sentence, follow a pattern of their own and continue to form their interrogatives and negative forms in the older fashion. This is due to the fact that due to the fact that lexical verbs cannot raise and the presence of an auxiliary that can be placed as head of sentence is essential. Adverbs of frequency and manner, on the other hand, present no important differences compared to today’s adverb placement; they are used clause initially and finally, preverbally, after an auxiliary or to modify an adjective within the limits of the Adjective Phrase. Furthermore, the results also showed that during the 18th century, the situation concerning verbs is even more clear-cut. Any remnants of the older syntactic forms seem even more unusual in the 18th century. The same verbs (say, dare, let) were examined but found to use the periphrasis do in an even larger percentage; very few cases used the postverbal not to form negation. The case of the lexical have is a somehow outstanding one, as it is a verb that is regularly presented to follow the archaic form and negate with not. Additionally, the case of a single writer that still used the older forms cannot be representative of the era, owing to the fact that the specific writer could have used a more formal and archaic idiolect of just show preference to a purer, less modern form of the language. Finally, the position of adverbs is also more or less the same as it is today and as it was in the 17th century as well. They are usually placed after an auxiliary or modal verb in a sentence or before the main verb of a clause.

5.2 Conclusion
We have made an attempt to answer to two major questions of the field of English Historical Linguistics; first, we tried to present how English has changed over the
course of its history and also why it has changed, by providing some basic theories that explain language change. Although there are no clear boundaries concerning where language-internal changes end and contact-induced language changes begin, the alterations that English has undergone could have been the result of a combination of the two factors; since the fundamental shifts started taking place about one thousand years ago, it could be assumed that the changes are somehow the outcome of the extended interaction of the old-English speaking world with the influx of the newcomers who settled on the islands from the 10th until the 12th century. Thus, we saw English change from a language with many inflectional suffixes to one with fewer ones, from synthetic to analytic (v. Gelderen, 286), with the simultaneous increase in the use of auxiliaries like have as well as prepositions. Moreover, the rise of periphrastic do construction compensated for the loss of inflectional marking, since it made it possible to mark a verb for person and tense. This is a groundbreaking change that was observed in English and no other language of that family, which might be a red flag for the existence of certain internal parameters that allowed it.

Since the verb is the milestone of a clause, it becomes clear that the verb is also the point of reference when talking about syntax and syntactic change. In our dissertation, we did not delve into the syntax of the verb, but rather on two elements that are closely related to it and their syntactic patterns reflects the syntactic behaviour of verb. We have thus tried to analyse the position of the negation and the adverbs (of frequency and manner) on a historical basis; how they were formed and used in through different phases of the English linguistic history, because that brought us to the question were aimed at answering in the first place, i.e. the position of the negation and the adverb in Late Middle English, an whether we find in it any remnants of the older structures without do or if the language had completely modernised by then.

Of course, one must not ignore some of the limitations that might be encountered during the course of a study like the present. First of all, working with Historical Linguistics can be very challenging from the very beginning; there is no choice of conducting a real-time experiment, as there are no native speakers of OE or ME for example. Thankfully, the amazing job that linguists and researchers have done in creating the various corpora has ameliorated the situation and made the in-depth analysis of older texts a possibility. Not only do they offer researchers the opportunity to find virtually anything that they want but it is also conducted easily and without any further cost. Moreover, one drawback that we had to face during our research has to do exactly with the period of our main focus. We can now admit that when the idea of the topic was first conceived, it was somehow expected to find more clear-cut cases of the
older syntactic patterns. Our expectation was proved wrong and the English of the 17th and 18th centuries is much more similar to today’s language than to the language of Shakespearean times.

Furthermore, it is also worth mentioning that this kind of research is a great stepping-stone for whoever loves Historical Linguistics and is interested in delving into the diachrony and the evolution of languages; historical corpora like for example the Helsinki Corpus, the PennParsed Corpora of Historical English, the one used here, the University of Oxford Text Archive or the Historical and Diachronic Corpora can provide texts that are parsed or offer great assistance to any ongoing or future research. And of course, we should not overlook the fact that historical corpora are currently being created in other languages too, apart from English, which means that such detailed research may take place using texts from other languages, too.

Finally, we need to note that although this MA dissertation has endeavoured to analyse the diachronic use and syntactic position of the English negation and adverbs to a great extent, there is still a lot to be examined, such as different linguistic phenomena and constructions on a purely syntactic basis, or on a sociolinguistic level in order to discover how and if social differentiation affected language use and how this language use during the LME period is depicted in the language today. This would be an undeniably successful choice of a PhD thesis for anyone interested in understanding more deeply how and especially why the English language acquired its present characteristics.
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