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Combinations of auxiliaries
- Auxiliaries can be chained together in sequence.
- The auxiliary *do* cannot combine with another auxiliary.
- A sequence of auxiliaries may contain only one modal.
- Any agreement and tense inflection is borne by the first verb only.
- The order is:
  MODAL - PERFECT HAVE - PROG. BE - PASSIVE BE - LEXICAL VERB

(1) I thought that the questions *might have been being asked* by a disgruntled former employee.

Affix hopping
- Auxiliaries select for the inflectional form of the next (lexical or auxiliary) verb in the sequence:
  - modal + plain form (usually)
  - perfect have + past participle
  - progressive be + present participle
  - passive be + past participle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>MODAL</th>
<th>PERF</th>
<th>PROG</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>LEXICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The question</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The question</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>being</td>
<td>asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The question</td>
<td><em>might</em></td>
<td>have</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>being</td>
<td>asked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which kind of verb?
1. He’s been asking a lot of questions.
2. You have to have a bit of patience!
3. You ought to have been asked.
4. If I’d have known, I’d have made a cake.
5. I had had enough.

- Is there anything unusual/unexpected about these examples?

Historical development of auxiliary combinations
Periods of English

- Old English (OE) 700-1100 (pre-Norman conquest)
- Middle English (ME) 1100-1500 (Chaucer born c.1343)
- Modern English (ModE) 1500 – present (Shakespeare born c.1564)
- Present day English (PDE)

(c.f. Denison 1993: 1.1 for an overview)

The combination of auxiliaries possible in PDE is richer than in older varieties.

Origins of perfect tense have

(2) ...bëonne hæbbe we begon fet gescode suiðe untællice then have we both feet shod. MASC.ACC.PL very blamelessly

[Denison 2000: 2, OE ðæt 23.328.6 ]

In older OE examples, have is a transitive verb meaning possess and the adjective is inflected to agree with the object feet.

(3) I've got these presents wrapped/ready.

(4) Nu ic hæbbe gesæd hu now I have said how ...

[Denison 2: OE Or 132.17]

In late OE (4), have is not possessive and there is no object and no agreement on the participle.

Perf. have + pass. Be (has been)

- OE and ME examples, but some evidence that it had not yet been grammaticalised, and some tendency to use is + past participle in early ModE where PDE would have been has been + past participle.

(5) Your Castle is surpriz'd: your Wife, and Babes | Sausagely slaughter'd:

(1623 [1606] Shakespeare, Macbeth IV.iii.204, Denison 2000: 13)

Prog. be + pass. be (is being)

- A late-eighteenth-century innovation (although precursors exist from the fifteenth century), prescriptively denigrated for some time after its appearance.

(6) The inhabitants of Plymouth are under arms, and everything is being done that can be. (1779 Mrs. Harris in Lett. 1st Ld. Malmesbury (1870) I.430, Denison 2000: 15)

- Formerly expressed either using passive be + past participle (7) or as passive be + present participle (8):

(7) he found that the coach had sunk greatly on one side, though it was still dragged forward by the horses; (1838-9 Dickens, Nickleby v.52, Denison 2000: 15)

(8) The house is building. (Denison 2000: 15)

Other combinations

- Other combinations with date of earliest attestation from Denison (2000):

(A) modal + perfect have + passive be + V c. 1300

(B) modal + perfect have + progressive be + V 741425

(C) perfect have + progressive be + passive be + V 1886/1929

(D) modal + progressive be + passive be + V 1915

- Denison argues that (C) and (D) are late because they involve the progressive of be, which is a late innovation anyway, even in the simple combination of progressive be + lexical be:

(9) You will be glad to hear ... how diligent I have been, and am being. (1819 Keats, Letters 137 357.4 (11 Jul), Denison 2000: 17)

A new gap

- Curiously, a new gap has appeared in the gerund paradigm:

(10) (Our) training every day has helped.

(11) (Our) having trained every day has helped.

(12) (Our) having been trained every day has helped.

(13) *Being training every day has helped.

- This existed formerly (between mid 16c until early 19c):

(14) I being now making my new door into the entry... (Pepys, 1660, Denison 2000: 8)
The emergence of modal

Modals in Old English: data

What do the following data tell us about OE modals?

(15) ic can eow
I know you

(16) ic sculde tyn pusend punda
I should ten thousand pounds

(Roberts 1985: 22, citing Visser 1963–73)

(17) ... bat I shall cunnenn owenn God
... that I shall have abilityINF pleaseINF God

"... that I shall have the ability to please God"

[Denison 2000:3, c1180 Orm. 2958]

Modals in Old English

Old English modals were main verbs which:
- took direct objects;
- had nonfinite forms (though not uniformly, cf. Warner 1990);
- were less distinct as an inflectional class (they formed part of the preterit–present class of verbs whose preterit had taken over the functions of the present tense, forcing the development of a new preterit tense, cf. Lightfoot, 1979: 101–103).

Modals in Middle English

According to Lightfoot (1979), modals were reanalysed as a distinct syntactic category in the 16c, because they:
- lost the ability to take direct objects;
- failed to adopt the (new) 'to infinitive';
- became more distinct as an inflectional class (after the loss of all the non-modal preterite–presents e.g. owe and remember);
- lost the semantic transparency between tense forms (may: might, shall: should etc.)

Transparency principle – modals were syntactically, morphologically and semantically ‘opaque’ members of the verb class.

Lightfoot 1979 (I)

Lightfoot 1979 (II)

The parameter change equated to the establishment of a new lexical category M(odal) and a new phrasal category Aux(illary), as sister of the main verb containing T(ense) and optionally M.

The rules of negative placement and inversion were altered to refer to Aux rather than V.
Effects of reanalysis

- This reanalysis yielded the following effects:
  - Loss of nonfinite forms (infinitives and -ing forms)
  - 'One modal in a sequence' restriction
  - Modern system of negation and inversion

- The details of Lightfoot's analysis have been the subject of much controversy, with a number of authors (notably Warner 1990) pointing out that some of these developments can be traced back to Old English, and questioning the claim that the effects emerged abruptly. Nonetheless his ideas have been highly influential.

Roberts 1985:34 (ii)

- Roberts differs from Lightfoot in the triggers which he posits for the 16c change:
  1. The use of modals as functional substitutes for the moribund system of subjunctive inflections.
  2. The morphological irregularity of the modals.
  3. The phonologically motivated obsolescence of agreement inflection.

His account also partially explains the different placement of modals/auxiliaries w. r. t. floated quantifiers (all) and high adverbs.

Deontic > epistemic (Traugott 1989)

- Epistemic uses of modals are historically secondary to and develop from deontic uses.
- The time of emergence varies. Sculan 'shall, should' is used as an evidential marker in Old English.
- Must and will in strongly epistemic uses are much later.

(21) the fruit muste be delicious, the tree being so beautiful.
(1623 Middleton, Spanish Gipsie I, i.16, Traugott 1989: 42)

(22) This will be your luggage, I suppose.
(1847 Ch. Bronte, Jane Eyre XI, Traugott 1989: 43)

Problematic data

Why are the following data problematic given Lightfoot's/Roberts' analyses?

(26) I oughtn't to have done that.
(23) In evill, the best condicioun is not to wille, the second not to can
(24) a sentiment he would have probably denied
(1961 Brown Corpus, Belles Lettres G65:85, Denison 2000, 7)
(25) What would've you done? (Denison 200, 7)

Auxillaries and ellipsis

Q: Why is Fox News called Fox News?
A: Because it does.
Sandy Toksvig, The News Quiz, Friday 15th January 2009
Basic clause structure

Since the development of X-bar theory, INFL is standardly taken to be the head of a clause, not S. Like all phrases, IPs can be co-ordinated.

VP-ellipsis

- Verbs with auxiliary syntax may be stranded before a structural gap.
- We hope to arrive before dark, and I’m sure we will.

Do in ellipsis and related contexts

- Where there is no semantically contentful auxiliary, do is inserted in VP-ellipsis (that is, VP-ellipsis is licensed by an auxiliary or to):
- We hope to arrive before dark, and I’m sure we will.

Propredicate do in BrE

What is surprising about (37)?
(37) - I saw him half an hour ago at Piccadilly Circus.
- You can’t have done.

- In British English (BrE), do can appear in environments where it has no ‘last resort’ character, in a way entirely different from do-support in questions and negation.

- BrE allows do in ellipsis environments even in the presence of another auxiliary (compare: *you can’t have done seen him).

In these cases, do looks like a pro-form (a ‘pro-predicate’).

American English

- American English (AmE) generally disallows do after another auxiliary, allowing only the following (possible also in BrE):
- You can’t have.

- However, even AmE allows do after an auxiliary in a few environments, for instance, in as-clauses:

- To refuse to support the rebels in such circumstances, as the Democrats have done in the case of the “contras,” does not necessarily mean endorsement for the existing regimes.

(Kato & Butters 1987)
Two competing analyses (i) do is an auxiliary (unlike do so); (ii) do is a lexical verb. Which analysis do the following data favour?

(40) Hopefully one day they will venture up here, if they haven’t already done.

(41) Have you sued the hospital? No, but I have the doctor.
(42) Will you sue the hospital? No, but I will do the doctor.
(43) *Will you sue the hospital? No, but I will do so the doctor.
(44) He says he makes great pizza and he really does do (so).
(45) *He says he can speak Chinese and he really does can.
(46) *He says he has visited Paris and he really does have.
(47) John doesn’t know the answer.
(48) John knows the answer and Mary will do too.
(49) *John knows the answer and Mary does so too.

(50) John ate a pizza, and Mary will too.
(51) John eats pizzas, and Mary will too.
(52) John has eaten a pizza, and Mary will too.
(53) John is eating a pizza, and Mary will too.
(54) John will eat a pizza later, but Mary has already.
(55) John will eat a pizza later, but Mary is already.
(56) John will eat a pizza later, but Mary has been already.


VP-ellipsis is acceptable where the plain form is ellided and the antecedent bears (finite or nonfinite) inflection:

(50) John ate [past] a pizza, and Mary will too.
(51) John eats [present] pizzas, and Mary will too.
(52) John has eaten [past participle] a pizza, and Mary will too.
(53) John is eating [present participle] a pizza, and Mary will too.

Where the gap is perfect, acceptability remains good:

(54) John will eat a pizza later, but Mary has already.

Other differences lead to marginal acceptability:

(55) John will eat a pizza later, but Mary is already.
(56) John will eat a pizza later, but Mary has been already.

Why might we expect this to lead to ungrammaticality?

(57) John hasn’t drunk his tea yet, but Mary has.
(58) John hasn’t drunk any alcohol, but Mary has.
(59) John hasn’t drunk anything, but Mary has.

Differences in negative polarity pairs (and also deictic differences) between replacement and antecedent do not lead to ungrammaticality.
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