Combining English auxiliaries
David Denison

The whole entirely depends, added my father, in a low voice, upon the *auxiliary verbs*, Mr *Yorick*.

Laurence Sterne, *Tristram Shandy* V.xlii

1. Introduction

The processes of grammaticalisation by which lexical verbs turned into auxiliaries in English raise a number of interesting questions, many of them already studied in depth. Grammaticalisation involves semantic and syntactic and sometimes morphological change, as well as changes of distribution, and the changes need not be simultaneous.

In this paper I wish to explore the dating and significance of grammaticalisation of certain English auxiliaries by looking at their combinatory possibilities. The sequencing and co-occurrence constraints on the present-day auxiliaries are among the most systematic areas of English syntax, if we allow ourselves to leave aside marginal and dialectal forms. Some combinations once possible have become ungrammatical, while other combinations have come into existence during the period of recorded history, not always as soon as might have been predicted from the behaviour of the individual auxiliaries. These facts allow us to infer dates for grammaticalisation certainly of the progressive and perhaps of other auxiliaries too.

The auxiliary system of Present-day English in tensed, finite clauses can be represented as follows:

(1)   (Modal) (Perfect) (Progressive) (Passive)

The four slots come in a fixed relative order. Each slot can be filled or not, independently. If none is filled, then the dummy auxiliary DO may appear as sole auxiliary; whether DO is necessary, optional, or forbidden depends on the clause type and the lexical verb.

All of this is familiar and of course oversimplified, but it will serve the purpose adequately for now. There are pros and cons in using a grammatical label like "perfect" rather than a lexical item like HAVE. The former allows us to generalise across different possible exponents of a slot, such as HAVE, BE or Old English WEORÐAN for the perfect, the

latter to generalise across different uses of a particular verb – notably BE. I shall use both (and see also §4.3 below).

With the possible exception of Passive, all of these auxiliaries form *periphrases* with a lexical verb in the sense that the combination Aux + V commutes with the simple verb V. Cross-linguistically it is probably justifiable to treat passive Aux + V as a periphrasis too, but for English – especially after the demise of the unique inflectional passive of HATAN 'be called' – the label is less than ideal. For the reason that follows, however, it will be convenient to retain passives in the definition.

These auxiliaries form probably the most orderly and systematic area of English syntax. It is a truism that each of the items which can serve as an auxiliary is a development – historically speaking – out of some full-verb use, and it is reasonable to call all of them *grammaticalised*. (I shall ignore the main-verb analyses of Present-day English auxiliaries.) There are various grounds for this: the facts that they are closed-class items, virtually without restriction as to the lexical verbs they can collocate with (though this is less true of BE than of other auxiliaries), mostly without argument structure of their own, morphologically odd, semantically general in having senses to do with tense or aspect or at least with sentence modification (epistemic meaning, etc.), and so on. But grammaticalisation is alternatively a diachronic process or a synchronic gradient, and it is a moot point how far into the process or how far along the gradient a verb has to go before it can be said to be "grammaticalised". Consider perfect HAVE in diachronic terms. The English perfect is generally regarded as a development by reanalysis of structures involving possessive HAVE. Contrast (2) and (3), for example:

(2) OE *Bede* 4 23.328.6 *ðonne hæbbe we   begen fet   gescode*
                           then   have   we   both   feet   shod(MASC ACC PL)
     suiðe   untællice
     very   blamelessly
(3) OE *Or* 132.17 *Nu   ic   hæbbe gesæd* ...   *hu*   ...
                     now   I   have   said   …   how   …

In rare examples of the older type like (2), HAVE can be a transitive lexical verb meaning 'possess', the word order may involve a sentence brace in which the NP – which is object of HAVE – precedes the participle, and the participle is an object predicative which may carry adjectival inflection. In (3), however, HAVE cannot mean 'possess', and in this particular case there is no object and no adjectival agreement on the participle. Various stages of development of the perfect are potentially relevant:

(A) when the HAVE perfect became available for any lexical verb which did not conjugate with BE (late Old English?)
(B) when it had come to be a pure tense equivalent (late Old English?)
(C) when it had developed approximately its present-day meaning (seventeenth century?) – which would have involved the *loss* of B
(D) when it became available for every non-auxiliary verb (late Modern English)

I am content to regard A as indicating the stage when perfect HAVE had become an auxiliary verb, since it suggests that HAVE was being used transparently, i.e. without an argument structure or selectional restrictions of its own. It had been reached when perfect HAVE occurred with transitive participles meaning 'distributed', 'lost', 'eaten' – meanings incompatible with possession – or with intransitive verbs, or with less than fully transitive verbs, as in (3). As discussed in Denison (1993: 346-8), word order and participial inflection are not in themselves reliable indicators of the syntactic status of possible HAVE perfects. For other auxiliaries all sorts of evidence of grammaticalisation may be used.

In this paper I shall concentrate on one seemingly simple source of evidence: the combinatory possibilities of (potential) auxiliaries. As we shall see, combinations of such verbs may provide evidence that one of them – usually the first but exceptionally the second – has been grammaticalised with auxiliary status, or conversely that the second remains ungrammaticalised. The analysis of each case is different. Exhaustive coverage is not aimed at. I begin with what from a Present-day English point of view looks like the *repetition* of a slot, then look at some other combinations.

2. Doubling of auxiliaries

2.1. Double DO

Late in the Middle English period, and especially in the works of Caxton, frequent use was made of a double DO construction:

(4)   1490 Caxton *Prol.Eneydos* 108.14   *And also my lorde   abbot of westmynster*
                                              and also my lord   Abbot of Westminster
        ded   do   shewe to me late   certayneuydences
        "did   do"   show to me recently certain   pieces-of-evidence
        wryton in   olde   englysshe
        written in   old   English
        'and also my lord, the Abbot of Westminster, had me shown recently certain pieces of evidence written in ancient English'

(In some examples – e.g. (60) below – either the first or the second verb is not DO but LET or MAKE.) I follow Ellegård (1953: 110-15) in reading *did do* examples as an attempt to mark causative meaning at a time when the periphrasis was on the increase and simple causative use of DO open to misunderstanding. If, as I believe, periphrastic DO was a development of causative DO (Denison 1985a, 1993), examples like (4) provide evidence of the grammaticalisation of the DO-periphrasis as a transparent auxiliary, since two consecutive causatives with empty argument slots would be both redundant and highly opaque. Thus the first DO is periphrastic; the second, untensed, is causative.

2.2. Double modals

Double modals are a much-tilled field and I shall not spend long on them here. Untensed forms of modals are dealt with by Visser in his (1963-1973: §§1649-1651, 1684-1687, 1722-1723, 1839, 2042, 2134),[1] with further Middle English examples in Ogura (1993, 1998) and discussion in Nagle (1993, 1995). Some examples:

(5)   c1180 *Orm.* 2958   *… Þatt I shall cunnenn   cwemenn   Godd*
                                … that I shall have-ability(INF)   please(INF)   God
        '… that I shall have the ability to please God'
(6)   c1450 *Pilgr.LM*(Cmb) 1.467 *And whan ye wole   go withoute me*
                                 and when you will   go without me [*sc.* Reason]
        ye   shul   wel   mown   avaunte yow
        you   shall   well   be-able-to   be-boastful
        'and when you wish to go without me you shall certainly be able to be boastful'
(7)   (c1463) *Paston* 66.16 *… and wythowte   I knowe   þe   serteynté*
                                … and unless   I know   the   truth
        I chal   not conne   answere   hym.
        I shall not be-able-to answer   him
        '… and without knowing the truth I shall not be able to answer him.'
(8)   c1483(?a1480) Caxton, *Dialogues* 3.37   *Who   this booke shall wylle lerne …*
                                                    he-who this book shall wish learn …
        'He who wishes to master this book …'
(9)   1532 Cranmer *Let.* in *Misc.Writ.*(Parker Soc.) II.233 *I fear that the emperor will depart thence, before my letters shall may come unto your grace's hands.*

A double modal implies that the second modal is in the infinitive, which is also the case in the non-finite clause of (10):

(10)   1533 More, *Wks.* IX 84.4 [885 C1]   *some waye y^t* [= *þat* = *that*: D.D.] *appered at y^e* [= *the*] *firste to mow stande the realme in great stede*

The modal in the infinitive is non-epistemic (only examples (6), (9) and (10) above show any possibility of an epistemic interpretation). This is consistent with Plank's observation (1984: 310, 314) that non-modal syntax and morphology in modal verbs (taking of direct objects, untensed forms) has always been associated with non-modal semantics. The double modal construction in historical texts therefore suggests that the second modal was not grammaticalised; I am unable to deduce anything about the first modal. In later English double modals are confined to dialects of northern and Scots English, plus (later still) certain south-eastern American dialects (Montgomery 1989; Montgomery and Nagle 1994 [for 1993]; de la Cruz 1995). Again the second modal is generally root rather than epistemic (Nagle 1994: 205-6), though futurity, which does occur as second modal, is not so obviously – to me at least – a root meaning. On the relationship between future meaning and (other) kinds of modality see Bybee, Pagliuca and Perkins (1991, esp. 24-5).

2.3. Double perfect

There are several ways in which a double perfect can be formed. One has been common in English for centuries, though it is unclear whether it has ever attained the level of standard usage. It depends on the notion of unrealised action or *unreality*.

2.3.1. Unreality

A correlation has developed between unrealised action and the use of the HAVE perfect in certain contexts. Some examples are unreal conditionals, where HAVE may appear in the protasis, the apodosis, or both, but the usage is not confined to conditionals:

(11)   c1230(?a1200) *Ancr.* 13b.24 *hwa   se   hefde   iseid   to eue … 'A eue*
                                anyone who   had   said   to Eve … O Eve
        went   te   awei …',   hwet hefde   ha   iondsweret?
        turn   yourself   away …   what had   she   answered
        'If anyone had said to Eve … "O Eve, turn away" … What would she have answered?'
(12)   (1448) *Paston* 128.21 *… and told here þat ȝe   had sergyd to a   fownd*
                                … and told her that you   had searched to have found
        wrytyng þer-of   and ȝe   kwd   non   fynd in non   wyse.
        writing thereof   and you   could none   find in no   way
        '… and told her you had gone searching to find written evidence of it, and you could not find any anywhere'
(13)   (1478) *Let.Cely* 34.5 *and thay spake to me, and desyryd to haue had iij*
                                and they spoke to me and desired to have had 3
        sarpelers …[2]
        bales (of wool) …
        'and they spoke to me and asked to have three bales …'
(14)   1660 Pepys, *Diary* I 102.18 (3 Apr) *This day came the Lieutenant of the Swiftsure (who was sent by my Lord to Hastings, one of the Cinque ports, to have got Mr. Edw. Mountagu to have been one of their burgesses); but could not, for they were all promised before.*
(15)   1660 Pepys, *Diary* I 216.27 (7 Aug) *Here I endeavoured to have looked out Jane that formerly lived at Dr Williams at Cambrige, whom I had long thought to live at present here; but I found myself in an errour, meeting one in the place where I expected to have found her, but she proves not she, though very like her.*
(16)   1667 Pepys, *Diary* VIII 446.5 (23 Sep)   *the glass was so clear that she thought it had been open, and so run* [PAST: D.D.] *her head through the glass and cut all her forehead.*

Many of Visser's examples of HAVE + past participle fall into the category of unrealised action; see especially his (1963-1973: §§2030-2050, 2154-2156, 2188). A few of his types

begin with isolated late Old English instances, but most of them did not appear until Middle English.

The prescriptive tradition frowns upon some of the patterns with double use of HAVE (e.g. *would have liked to have gone*), even though each pair of adjacent verbs conforms to the morphosyntax of verbal groups in standard English. However, the tendency to use HAVE may even be strong enough to produce two adjacent instances (ignoring non-verbs) of perfect HAVE, a pairing which certainly contravenes what is now a clear rule in the standard language:

(17)　a1425 *Dial. Reason & A.* 9.2　*Hadde neuere infirmite　　haue asailed　Job &*
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　had　　never infirmity　　have assailed　Job and
　　　　　Tobye: here　holinesse　hadde　not ȝit be　fully opened.
　　　　　Tobias their　holiness　had　not yet been　fully revealed
　　　　　'If infirmity had never assailed Job and Tobias, their holiness would not yet have been fully revealed.'
(18)　(1446) *Paston* 16.21　*… the valew of the heye,　yf*
　　　　　　　　　　　… the value of the hay　if
　　　　　it　　　　　　　　　　　had well a　be　dite.
　　　　　it [*sc.* a meadow not cultivated in good time]　had well have been　cultivated
　　　　　'… the value of the hay, if the meadow had been properly cultivated'
(19)　1837 Dickens, *Pickwick* xxvi.393　*"Well, I raly would* not *ha' believed it, unless I had ha' happened to ha' been here!" said Mrs. Sanders.*
(20)　1848 Dickens, *Dombey* xxxii.445　*Little Dombey was my friend at old Blimber's, and would have been now, if he'd have lived.*
(21)　1987 Wolfe, *Bonfire* xix.409　*wish we hadn'ta moved so fast with the sonofabitch.*

The syntagm seen in the last clause of (20) is variously expanded as *had have* V*ed* and *would have* V*ed*, both by syntacticians and in attested instances, though it is commonest with contracted *'d* for the first verb. See Visser (1963-1973: §2157), Wekker (1987), and also some comments in Denison (1992, 1998: 140-2).

Suppose we take the first option and treat the construction as involving double HAVE (certainly correct for (21)). One analysis would treat the first HAVE as modal, since it appears to be followed by an infinitive. Example (22) shows how modal HAVE normally behaves:

(22)　*Before an X-ray they have to have gone without food for a whole day.*

Examples like (21) would therefore be anomalous in lacking an obligation sense and in not requiring *to*. An alternative analysis of (20)-(21), which I prefer, takes both HAVEs as perfect, the first marking anteriority (central use of the perfect) and the second unreality (secondary use): each function is separately realised by a grammaticalised form of HAVE. The morphological oddity then consists in the fact that the second auxiliary is an infinitive rather than a past participle despite being in the HAVE perfect, rather as Dutch auxiliaries followed by an infinitive behave when they themselves have a perfect auxiliary (Geerts et al. 1984: 523-5):

(23) *Ik   had het   moeten   zien.*
      I   had it   must(INF for PA PTCP)   see(INF)
      'I ought to have seen it.'
(24) *Ik   ben   wezen   kijken.*
      I   am   be(INF^3 for PA PTCP)look(INF)
      'I have been to have a look.'

In the English double HAVE pattern we might expect to find forms where the second auxiliary is a past participle:

(20)' *If he'd had lived … / *If he'd'd lived*
(21)' *I wish we hadn't had moved so fast …*

The usual handbooks do not mention any, but Visser (1946-1956: §710b) has two somewhat similar examples:

(25) 1442 *Let.Bekynton* II. 213   *He might never have had escaped.*
(26) 1535 Joye, *Apol. Tindale*(Arb.) 30   *He wold …   neuer haue had so farre*
                                             he would …   never have had so far

      swaruen from his principal, as …
      swerved from his principle as …
      'He would never have strayed so far from his principle, as …'

But (25)-(26) are clearly most unusual (and (25), with its modern spelling, suspicious). Why so rare? Among the reasons may be:

(A)   phonetic awkwardness and/or avoidance of repetition
(B)   residue of historical confusion in *'d* of *had* and *would*, the latter of which would have collocated with an infinitive, not a past participle
(C)   possible association of infinitival rather than other forms of HAVE with unreality

Factor B could only be relevant for examples from around 1600 onwards, when contracted auxiliaries are first recorded. Factor C might be a consequence of the frequent use of a modal in unreal clauses, especially with the obsolescence of the non-modal type seen in (11).

It is convenient to mention here – rather than in the sections on combinations of different auxiliaries – two further pieces of evidence that suggest that infinitival *have* is undergoing further grammaticalisation. One is word order evidence that suggests that strings like *would have* or *would've* are increasingly being treated as uninterruptable "chunks". The first example below is among many gathered by Boyland (1998: 3):

(27) *What would've you done?*
(28) 1961 *Brown Corpus*, Belles Lettres G65:85 *a sentiment he would have probably denied*
(29) 1992 A. Maupin, *Maybe the Moon* xv.225   *'I should've never went on a stupid blind date. They never work out.'*

Then there is the stressed form *of* created from the unstressed enclitic *'ve*:

(30)   1819 Keats, *Letters* 149 p. 380 (5 Sep.)   *Had I known of your illness I should not*
       of written in such fiery phrase in my first Letter.
(31)   1992 D. Tartt, *Secret History* ii.57   *If I'd of been the* bar*tender at the Oak Room he*
       wouldn't have noticed.

In (30), the earliest example I have found, the *of* spelling for *have* occurs in the apodosis of a
conditional which is otherwise standard; (31) draws attention to double HAVE in a protasis
that accompanies a wholly standard apodosis. Many speakers thus apparently fail to see any
connection between a noninitial, infinitival occurrence of HAVE in a verbal group and the
normal auxiliary.

2.3.2. Perfect HAVE + perfect BE

There is actually an occasional HAVE perfect of the BE perfect (Visser 1963-1973: §2162)!
Rydén & Brorström (1987: 25) find it obvious that "this variant emerged to satisfy a need for
stressing the resultative aspect more emphatically than the *be* + P[ast]P[article]
construction was capable of at the time":

(32)   a1400(a1325) *Cursor* 7074   *Bot als*   *þe*   *tan*   *als*
                                     but as-if   the   one [sc. half] as
       be   *þat*   *toþer |*   *Of al*   *þis*   *werld had risen bene*
       against the   other   of all   this   world had risen been
       'but as if one half of this world "had been risen" against the other'
(33)   (modern) *She's been gone a long time.*

Visser (1946-1956: §682) suggests that the BE-perfect "gradually got the character of" copula
BE + adjective, "especially when the collocation was not accompanied by verbal adjuncts".
This would then have allowed the normal conjugation of (copula) BE to operate. Visser's
suggested reanalysis would be the exact converse of grammaticalisation, and it is simpler to
assume that the BE-perfect never was fully grammaticalised.

2.4. Double progressive?

Actually I have no examples of the double progressive, that is, doubling of progressive BE,
but perhaps it is relevant to mention the doubling of *-ing*, even though the first *-ing* should
not be regarded as progressive, since verbs like KNOW, OWN which resist the progressive
have *-ing* forms in non-finite clauses. The syntagm *being* + V*ing* should occur when a finite
progressive is turned into a gerundial or present participial construction, as in:

(34)   1660 Pepys, *Diary* I 302.21 (26 Nov)*… I being now making my new door into the entry, …*

The *being* + V*ing* pattern had some currency at least from the mid-sixteenth century to the early nineteenth (Denison 1985b; 1993: 394-5, 411 n.8). Modern grammars claim it to be impossible in Present-day English. The gap is an odd one. Consider the following pairs, where a finite clause in the (a) sentence is turned into a non-finite clause in (b) by altering the first verb to an *-ing*:

(35)   a.   *Jim teaches/taught five new courses.*
        b.   *Teaching five new courses makes it easier.*
(36)   a.   *Jim has/had taught these courses before.*
        b.   *Having taught these courses before makes it easier.*
(37)   a.   *Jim has/had been teaching these courses for some time.*
        b.   *Having been teaching these courses for some time makes it easier.*
(38)   a.   *Jim is/was teaching five new courses.*
        b.   **Being teaching five new courses makes it easier.*

There is now a systemic gap at (38)b, a gap, furthermore, which has actually opened up where previously the paradigm was complete.[4]
        There are some glorious examples which combine *being* + V*ing* with *passival* usage (see §3.3.2 below):

(39)   1676 Prideaux, *Letters* 50.4   *a great deal of mony beeing now expendeing on St. Mary's …*
(40)   1774 Woodforde, *Diary* I 125.12 (13 Mar)   *I talked with him pretty home* ['directly'] *about matters being so long doing —.*

See Denison (1993: 394-5, 440-3) for more detail, where an attempt is made to link the loss of the *being* + V*ing* pattern to a reanalysis and grammaticalisation of progressive BE.

2.5. Double passive?

The following examples appear to combine passive BE and passive GET in a single syntagm:

(41)   1736 Butler *Anal.* i. iii*These hopes and fears … cannot be got rid of by great part of the world.*
(42)   1810 Syd. Smith *Wks.* (1850) 183   *Nor is this conceit very easily and speedily gotten rid of.*

Indeed the construction of (41)-(42) is still wholly grammatical.
        I assume that these apparent double passives were formed in the following steps:

(43)   *A neat solution rids us of the problem.*
(44)   a.   *We are rid of the problem.*

b.   *We get rid of the problem.*
(45)   *The problem is got rid of.*

That is, (44)a,b were possible passives of (43), but either could be interpreted as containing a statal AP *rid of the problem*, with BE/GET taken as ergative and the whole clause as active. (It is impossible to assign historical priority between active and passive readings.) Then (44)b – which would also have had an overall dynamic meaning in the active reading and even perhaps an agentive role for *we* – was open to reanalysis as containing a group-verb GET *rid of*. This is lexicalisation but not grammaticalisation. Only then could a new prepositional passive be formed from it, in the same way as from TAKE *care of* or PUT *paid to*. In this way, and because the semantic role of *the problem* is Patient, we can explain how (45) is possible but the double passives (46)-(48) are not:

(46)   **The problem is been rid of.*   ($\Leftarrow$ (44)a)
(47)   **A ride is got taken for.*   ($\Leftarrow$ *He gets taken for a ride.*)
(48)   **Free tickets were got given us.*   ($\Leftarrow$ *We got given free tickets.*)

If this account is correct it suggests that the apparent GET-passive (44)b was *not* (exclusively) perceived as the passive turn of (43).[5] Compare the dual reading of *has been gone*, with BE as auxiliary or as copula (§2.3.2 above).

3. Other combinations of auxiliaries
3.1. Auxiliary + DO

In most accounts of standard Present-day English, the dummy auxiliary DO is presented as incompatible with any other auxiliary verb, though there may be mention of its occurrence with marginal auxiliaries, as for instance in *didn't used to* V. We now look at some constructions, older and newer, where DO appears to collocate with a central auxiliary. First we look at instances where DO precedes BE. Then we investigate cases where DO follows another verb, where it will necessarily be untensed.

3.1.1. Tensed DO + BE

The dummy auxiliary DO does not co-occur with BE except in imperatives, and imperative *do* and *don't* are anyway arguably different from the usual dummy auxiliary. Sporadically, however, one does find the passive auxiliary BE – in the infinitive, *be* – after tensed DO, usually interrupted by other material:

(49)   1713 J. Swift, L-19, Vol. II, Letter LXI, p. 634   *Parvisol has sent me a Bill of*
        50ll. as I orderd him; wch I hope will serve me & bring me over, pray Gd [....][6] does
        not be delayd for it; but I have had very little from him this long time.

(50)   1998 letter, *Oldham Evening Chronicle* p. 4 (23 Nov.)   *Did littering the streets not once be considered breaking the law?*

(51)   1998 *Oldham Evening Chronicle* p. 4 (16 Dec.)   *Does everyone get cards from others and be obliged to say, "No idea who they are"?*

(52)   1995 att. D.D., Gerald Hammond   *We agree that particular students do be flogged.*

One might include here examples like:

(53)   1865 Arnold, *L*-33 pp. 258-9 *I do not feel quite certain that little Tom will not be more reconciled to school by the end of the week. If he does not, however, I suppose you cannot come to Italy.*

involving substitute DO rather than periphrastic auxiliary DO. Mistakes or anacolutha such examples may be, but they seem to suggest the beginnings of an invariant passive auxiliary closely tied to its participle. Related to this is a combination of DO with lexical BE:

(54)   *If you don't be careful, you'll …*

(55)   1888 A. T. Ritchie, L-67, letter, p. 207   *I read your letter to-day and I could have cried to think you sometimes feel so far away, but one thing you need never feel, that you don't live and talk and be here just as much as if you were.*

(56)   1995 letter, *Oldham Evening Chronicle* 26/6 (24 Jan.)   *If the taxi driver …was having a dig at me … why didn't he stop and be a witness?*

which may not yet be generally acceptable but which occurs in speech with reasonable frequency. The quasi-imperative *Why don't you be … ?* construction is now fully accepted in standard:

(57)   1920 Wharton, *Age of Innocence* xiv.118   *"Who's 'they'? Why don't you all get together and be 'they' yourselves?"*

The typical syntactic contexts for tensed DO + BE are non-assertive, frequently both negative and either interrogative, quasi-imperative, or conditional. If BE is lexical, it usually forms a nonstative group-verb with its complement.

3.1.2. Other auxiliaries + untensed DO

Periphrastic DO in Present-day English has no untensed forms, but in the period when the periphrasis was being grammaticalised there were occasional exceptions. Here are some reasonably likely examples of infinitive and past participle periphrastic DO prior to 1500:

(58)   (c1300) *Havelok* 1747 *He … bad him …*   *Hauelok wel   yemen   and*
                        he … bade him …   Havelok well look-after   and
         his   wif, /   And wel   do   wayten   al   the nith
         his   wife   and well   "do"   watch-over   all   the night
         'He … asked him … to look after Havelok and his wife well and to guard them well all night.'

(59) a1400(a1325) *Cursor* 2818 *Þe angls   badd loth   do   him flee.*
                                   the angels   bade Lot   "do"   him flee
(60) (c1395) Chaucer *CT.Sq.* V.45 *He leet the feeste   of his nativitee | Doon*
                                     he had the feast   of his nativity   "do"
      cryen   thurghout   Sarray his citee.
      cry   throughout   Tzarev his city
      'He had the feast of his birthday announced throughout his city of Tzarev.'
(61) ?c1425(?c1400) *Loll.Serm.* 2.592   *... þat resenable men ...   schul þanne do*
                                           ... that rational men …   shall then "do"
      make hem   redy   aȝen   þe   comynge of þe   Lord.
      make themselves   ready for   the   coming of the   Lord
(62) (?1456) *Paston* 558.12   *The parson wyth yow shall do   well*
                                 the person with you shall do(INF)   well
      sort my maister   evidenses
      sort my master's   pieces-of-evidence
      'The person with you will certainly sort my master's evidence for him'
(63) ?a1475 *Ludus C.* 283.339   *and þis ȝe   knowe now All and haue don*
                                   and this you   know   now all and have "done"
      here | þat   it stant   in þe   lond of galelye.
      hear   that   it stands   in the land of Galilee
(64) a1500 *Partenay* 2367 *behold | ho shall doo   gouerne And rule this contre*
                             behold who shall "do"   govern and rule this country

See further Visser (1963-1973: §§1414a, 2022, 2133). (Examples (58)-(60) involve infinitival DO as complement to a causative or other non-auxiliary verb.) This material provides some weak evidence for differentiating phases of grammaticalisation of DO (Denison 1985a: §4.6), as examples like (59) and (64) seem to show uses of DO + infinitive which are contextually like the periphrasis in excluding an intermediary (subject of DO = subject of lexical verb), and yet which precede the restriction to tensed forms which periphrastic DO and the modals later underwent in standard English.

       The past participle construction gained some vogue in sixteenth-century Scottish poetry, and we find examples like:

(65) 1568(1500-20) Dunbar *Poems* 55.13 *Thow that   hes   lang done*
                                          you   that   have   long "done"
      Venus   lawis teiche ...
      Venus's   laws   teach …

as well as examples of the present participle and infinitive of periphrastic DO. Some Scots dialects even now allow untensed forms of modal verbs like CAN (§2.2 above), and it seems likely that the untensed use of DO must be tied in with this. If some Scots dialects have been able to use periphrastic DO with fewer restrictions than other varieties of English, it seems almost paradoxical that "… the Scotch language used periphrastic *do* much more sparingly than the dialects South of the Humber even in the 16th and 17th centuries" (Ellegård 1953: 46, and cf. 164, 200n., 207n.). But perhaps there is no paradox: if these are the same dialects which allow untensed modals, then they rely less on the operator~non-operator distinction

which goes hand-in-glove with periphrastic DO. Arguably they show a less advanced stage of grammaticalisation than that reached by DO in standard Modern English.

3.2. Perfect HAVE + passive BE

Visser claims that perfect + passive BE can be traced back to Old English (1963-1973: §2161), citing the following examples:

(66)   *Lk(WSCp)* 12.5-0   *Ic   hæbbe on   fulluhte   beon   gefullod.*
                                 I   have   in   baptism   been/(to) be   baptised
        Lat. baptisma autem habeo baptizari
(67)   a1225(?a1200) *Trin.Hom.* 59.14   *feren   it is þat   we and ure heldrene*
                                               afar   it is that   we and our ancestors
        habbæð   ben   turnd   fro   him.
        have   been   turned from   him
        'It is long since that we and our ancestors have been turned away from him.'

But Mitchell (1985: §753 n.188) rejects (66) as containing infinitival, not participial, *beon*, and (67) as being Middle English. And indeed Visser has a respectable collection of examples from early Middle English onwards:

(68)   c1180 *Orm.* 18232   *&   forr ðatt   Crist   ær   haffde ben*
                                  and   because   Christ earlier had   been
        Fullhtnedd   att   teȝȝre maȝȝstre
        baptised   by   their   master
(69)   c1230(?a1200) *Ancr.* 86b.28   *… ȝef   ich hefde ibeon akeast   wið strengðe.*
                                        … if   I   had   been overthrown   by force

The perfect auxiliary is always HAVE, which is interesting.[7] Three reasons suggest themselves:

(A)   passive BE was not yet grammaticalised
(B)   the BE-perfect was already recessive
(C)   some restriction on double BE

Of these, A seems most cogent for early Middle English, giving a *terminus a quo* for the grammaticalisation of the passive. There is no independent evidence that passive BE was grammaticalised at that time. Suppose to the contrary that it already had been. A syntagm consisting of grammaticalised passive BE + past participle would arguably have been a mutative intransitive, precisely the sort of syntagm liable to form its perfect with BE. Since that did not happen, the likelihood is that passive BE was still an ungrammaticalised main verb. By the time it *did* become grammaticalised, the productive way to form a perfect was with HAVE, perfect BE being by then recessive – factor B. Further evidence that passive BE was indistinguishable from main verb BE in early English is that main verb BE has likewise

never formed a perfect with auxiliary BE, but rather – since very late Old English – always with HAVE.

Instead of HAVE + *been* + past participle or indeed the non-occurring *BE + *been* + past participle, one often finds just BE + past participle:

(70) (a1387) Trev.*Higd.* I 1.xxiv.235.20 *And whan þe ymage was made,*
   and when the image was made
   hem semede þat þe legges were to feble …
   them(OBL) seemed that the legs were too weak …
(71) 1623(1606) Shakespeare, *Mac* IV.iii.204 *Your Castle is surpriz'd; your Wife, and Babes | Sauagely slaughter'd:*
(72) 1853 Dickens, *Bleak House* lv.814 *That the visitors … have been here this morning to make money of it. And that the money is made, or making.*

For discussion, references and further examples see Visser (1963-1973: §1909), Denison (1998: 183-4). It is possible that the increased tendency in recent years to use HAVE + *been* + past participle (*had been made, has been surprised*) for the notion of current relevance in such sentences may follow from the loss of the HAVE perfect as a simple tense equivalent (= stage C in the grammaticalisation of the perfect in §1 above). The last clause of example (72) actually contrasts two forms which would both now be inappropriate here, the non-perfect passive and the passival (§3.3.2 below); in Present-day English it might read *And that the money has been, or is being, made*. And in example (73) it is unclear whether *were … made* should be modernised as Present-day English *had been made* or *were being made*:

(73) 1848 Cottle, *Reminiscences of … Coleridge and … Southey* p. 434 *Independently of which, an idea had become prevalent amongst the crowd of afflicted, that they were merely made the subjects of experiment, which thinned the ranks of the old applicants, and intimidated new.*

I have noticed one example of perfect + passive WURTHE, (74) – Visser has some Old English examples too in his §2166 – and here the perfect auxiliary is indeed BE, as it is with all main-verb uses of WURTHE too, e.g. (75)-(76):

(74) c1180 *Orm.* 19559 *ȝæn himm, þatt wass att Sannt Johan Bapptisste*
   against him that was at Saint John Baptist
   wurrþenn fullhtnedd
   become(PA PTCP) baptised
   'against him that had been baptised by John the Baptist'
(75) c1180 *Orm.* 3914 *Annd Godess enngless wærenn þa Well swiþe glade*
   and God's angels were then well very glad
   wurrþenn | Off þatt, tatt Godd wass wurrþenn mann
   become(PA PTCP) concerning that that God was become man
   'and the angels of God had then become very glad of the fact that God had become man'
(76) c1180 *Orm.* 2272 *Forr þatt nass næfrær wurrþenn,*
   for that not-was never-before happened

'For it had never happened before that …'

There is one context in Present-day English, the "strange existential" of (77) mentioned by Lakoff (1987: 562-5), where the auxiliary before a passive seems to hover between HAVE and BE:

(77) *There's a man been shot.*
(78) *A man has been shot.*
(79) a. *There's a man in the garden.*
      b. *There's some men in the garden.*
      c. *There's been an accident.*

In Lakoff's analysis, *'s* in (77) is a contraction of perfect *has* (cf. (78)), not *is*, but cannot be used in uncontracted form – a "rational property" which depends on phonological identity with its "ancestor" element, the *'s* = copula *is* of normal existentials like (79)a. The invariant form *there's* appears to have been grammaticalised, a claim corroborated by its well-known colloquial use with plural NPs, as in (79)b. However, the strange existential also provides evidence for the status of the second auxiliary. In normal existentials, all uses of BE behave alike, auxiliary and non-auxiliary, and *has been* would be treated as a form of BE around which the true subject could be moved under *there*-insertion, as in (79)c. Pattern (77) rather suggests that the BE of *been shot* has been grammaticalised as an auxiliary of SHOOT.

3.3. Progressive + BE

In this section I consider combinations of the progressive, BE + V*ing*, with a second use of BE, the most important of which is the combination of progressive BE and passive BE (§3.3.1). In order to put its appearance in context we need to mention alternatives (§3.3.2), precursors (§3.3.3), and analogues (§3.3.4), before considering an analysis (§3.3.5).

3.3.1. Progressive BE + passive BE

According to Mossé (1938: §§263-264) and Visser (1963-1973: §2158), finite progressive passive constructions only began to be used in the late eighteenth century. Mossé and Visser show that progressive passives were at first stigmatised in print and heavily condemned. To Visser's 28 examples prior to 1872, we can add quite a few more, all of them three-verb syntagms of the type, tensed form of BE (+ …) + *being* + past participle, for example:[8]

(80) 1772 J. Harris, in *Lett. 1st Ld. Malmesbury* (1870) I.264   *I have received the speech and address of the House of Lords; probably, that of the House of Commons was being debated when the post went out.*
(81) 1779 Mrs. Harris in *ibid.* I.430   *The inhabitants of Plymouth are under arms, and everything is being done that can be.*

(82)   1801 tr. *Gabrielli's Myst. Husb.* I.125   '*It* [sc. *a bill*] *is being made out, I am informed, Sir.*'
(83)   1829 Landor *Imag. Conv., Odysseus*, etc.,   *While the goats are being milked, and such other refreshments are preparing for us as the place affords.*

Since then the construction has become generally acceptable. For an account of its spread via a social network see now Pratt and Denison (in press).

3.3.2. Passival BE + V*ing* (= "with passive sense")

Until the progressive passive

(84)   *The house is being built.*

entered the language, it was necessary either to do without explicit progressive marking, as in (85) and the last clause of (86):

(85)   1662 Pepys, *Diary* III 51.25 (24 Mar)   *I went to see if any play was acted*[9]
(86)   1838-9 Dickens, *Nickleby* v.52   *he found that the coach had sunk greatly on one side, though it was still dragged forward by the horses;*

or to do without explicit passive marking, as in the curious construction of (87):

(87)   *The house is building.*

This is not formally a passive (there is no BE + past participle), but its subject NP is the argument which would be subject in a true passive and object in a normal active, which is why Strang (1982: 441) calls (87) a "covert passive" and Visser (1963-1973: §§1872-1881) calls it "passival". Passival (87) seems to have fulfilled the function of the missing (84); see Denison (1993: 389-91) for details of its early history. Note also (39)-(40) above. The alternatives remained in use even after the progressive passive began to be possible.

        Visser (1963-73: §§1879-81) suggests that the retreat of the passival in the face of the advancing progressive passive did not begin until the twentieth century – though Nakamura's (1991: 126-9) statistics on usage in diaries and letters show a steep decline from mid-nineteenth century. I shall suggest that the replacing construction, progressive + passive, is evidence of the grammaticalisation of the progressive.

3.3.3. Precursors of progressive BE + passive BE

A precursor of the progressive + passive construction involved the participial or gerundial phrase *being* + past participle used absolutely[10] or separated from a tensed BE. The gerundial pattern appeared in the fifteenth century; for discussion see Denison (1993: 431-3):

(88)   (1456) *Paston* 562.4   *… we being enformed þat the   matiere is*
                              … we being informed that the   affair is
        pitevous   praie you   hertly   þat   ye   wul …
        lamentable   pray you   earnestly   that   you   will …

(89)   1769 Mrs. Harris in *Lett. 1st Ld. Malmesbury* (1870) I.180   *There is a good opera of Pugniani's now being acted*

(90)   1779 J. Harris in *ibid.* (1870) I.410   *Sir Guy Carlton was four hours being examined.*

(91)   1798 Woodforde, *Diary* V 137.19 (14 Sep)   *… that the French … had been defeated, and that the Irish were in a fair Way, of being made quiet.*

Sentences like (89) cannot be confidently separated from the progressive passive, given that (89) looks like a normal *there*-transform of

(89)'   *A good opera of Pugniani's is now being acted.*

with only a light adverb interrupting the verbal syntagm.

        These non-finite constructions probably do not contain a combination of auxiliaries. While Visser regards none of them as true progressive passives, Nehls (1974: 158 n.149) singles out (90) as the first certain example of the construction; see also my comment on (89). I have found a seventeenth-century example which looks exactly like the progressive passive:

(92)   1667 Pepys, *Diary* VIII 249.28 (3 Jun) *… thinking to see some cockfighting, but it was just being done; and therefore back again …*

I believe, however, that (92) probably belongs with the (88) type as another kind of *precursor* of the progressive passive, because *being done* seems to mean 'just finished' or 'becoming finished' for Pepys, like the non-finite (93):

(93)   1667 Pepys, *Diary* VIII 250.30 (4 Jun) *and that being done, …*

For clear evidence that *being* could mean 'becoming' in *Pepys* see Denison (1993: 433).
        I find one of Mossé's (1938: §262) alleged near-progressives, not as it happens repeated by Visser, particularly interesting:

(94)   1766 Goldsmith, *Vicar* xxv.141   *I … immediately complied with the demand, though the little money I had was very near being all exhausted.*

The *all* confirms that semantically, (94) is no progressive. The analysis must be something like:

(95)   [VP *was* [AP [DEG *very near*] [AP *being all exhausted*]]]

Compare my discussion of *is being wicked* in §3.3.4 below, where I recognise a non-progressive structure like (95) for some early examples.

There are also prepositional patterns which seem to resemble the progressive passive in the same way that BE + P + V*ing* resembles the ordinary progressive:

(96)   1669 Pepys, *Diary* IX 475.1 (8 Mar) *He tells me that Mr. Sheply is upon being turned away from my Lord's family, and another sent down*

3.3.4. Progressive of BE

The construction BE + lexical *being* is interesting for the light it throws on the relation between the progressive and stative verbs – here the archetypal stative verb, BE itself. It may also be relevant to the history of the progressive passive, which begins with an identical sequence of verb forms. For possible early examples see Denison (1993: 395-6). For Mossé (1938: §266) and Visser (1963-73: §§1834-5) the first late Modern English example is:

(97)   1761 Johnston, *Chrysal* II 1.x.65 *but this is being wicked, for wickedness sake.*

They ignore the fact that (97) and examples from Fanny Burney and Jane Austen over the next sixty years[11] do not appear to contain a progressive verbal group *is being* at all: rather the verb is just equative *is*, which links an inanimate pronoun subject (*it, this, there*) to a gerundial phrase *being* AP. The surface subject is not an argument of the AP. The pattern may have helped prepare the ground for the introduction of a progressive of BE, but it is difficult to think of a sentence like (97) which could actually have been reanalysed as a true progressive, since the function of the subject NP would have to change so radically. The first modern-looking example in Visser's collection is Jespersen's first (1909-1949: IV 225):

(98)   1819 Keats, *Letters* 137 357.4 (11 Jul)   *You will be glad to hear … how diligent I have been, and am being.*

Here *I* is underlyingly an argument of *being diligent*. Visser explicitly (1963-1973: 2426 n.1) – but, I would say, wrongly – accuses Jespersen of getting the date of introduction too late.
    For examples with NP rather than AP as complement, the one late-seventeenth-century example, (99), is better analysed as a *non*-progressive, just like (97). For good examples we must wait until the nineteenth, (100):

(99)   1697 Vanbrugh, *Provok'd Wife* III.i.198   *That's being a spunger, sir, which is scarce honest:*
(100)   1834 R. H. Froude *Rem.* (1838) I. 378   *I really think this illness is being a good thing for me.*

    Mossé and Visser do not distinguish two possible structures – non-progressive (99) and progressive (100) – for BE + *being* + AP/NP. Nor do they do so for BE + *being* + PA PTCP. Mossé (1938: §266) merely observes that they are analogous constructions which appeared at about the same time, but that the former remained rare until the end of the nineteenth century. Visser (1963-1973: §§1834-1835, 2158), however, who claims a much

earlier date, suggests that BE + *being* + AP may have been another subsidiary cause of the use of the progressive passive.

Note also this apparent example with PP as adjunct or complement:

(101)   c1515 Rastell, *Interlude* 376 *Yet the eclyps generally is alwaye | In the hole worlde as* [sc. *at*] *one tyme beynge;*

3.3.5. Reanalysis of progressive BE

I take it that progressive BE, like other auxiliaries, is developed out of a lexical verb by reanalysis. However, of all the auxiliaries, progressive BE is the one where the semantic difference between a full-verb use and auxiliary use is least perceptible, giving us wide latitude in dating a reanalysis. I hypothesise that it occurred comparatively late. Incidentally, in my conception of syntax there is no need to assume unique, black-and-white analyses everywhere. A recently-dominant but now less salient analysis can still play a part in the behaviour of a construction, and not only in non-productive relics. Compare the concept of **persistence** in grammaticalization theory (Hopper 1991).

If there has been a reanalysis of the progressive, what are the consequences of locating (the most rapid phase of) the changeover in the late Modern English period? I have sketched out a scenario in previous publications (e.g. Denison 1993: 441-3; 1998: 155-7) and will be briefer here. The crucial points are that before the reanalysis a putative progressive passive:

(102)   **The house was being built.*

would have had to be analysed as containing the progressive of BE, but it could not have been supported by pattern (103), progressive BE + predicative adjective, since that was not in use before the nineteenth century:

(103)   *Jim was being stupid.*

Here I follow Jespersen (1909-1949: IV 225) and Strang (1970: 99) against Visser (1963-1973: §2158); see §3.3.4 above. And the semantics of syntagms like *being built* would not generally have been durative: see the discussion of (92)-(93) above. Hence the semantic and syntactic oddity of the progressive passive would explain its non-appearance until near the end of the eighteenth century and the fierceness of some people's reactions to it when it did finally begin to appear in print in the nineteenth century.

After the reanalysis, the progressive passive (102) became possible for those speakers with the new grammar, since it was the progressive not of passive BE but of the lexical verb. Warner (1986: 164-5) has also proposed a reanalysis of constructions involving tensed forms of BE, giving 1700 and 1850 as extreme limits. All uses of BE belong together in Warner's account. In subsequent publications (1993, 1995, 1997) he has constructed an explanation of how auxiliary verbs came to differ from full verbs by having a series of forms with

independent syntactic properties, rather than belonging to a paradigm with a single subcategorisation. In this explanation the loss of the *being* + V*ing* pattern, (34), is another symptom of the same change.

3.4. Combinations involving passive GET

We take up a recent addition to the roster of possible English auxiliaries, one that is not fully grammaticalised even now: GET. For a valuable recent study see Gronemeyer (1999).

3.4.1. First appearance of passive GET

Most authorities follow *OED* in giving the mid-seventeenth-century (104) as the first recorded passive with GET:

(104)   1652 Gaule *Magastrom.* 361 *A certain Spanish pretending Alchymist … got acquainted with foure rich Spanish merchants.*

Strang cautiously – and rightly – describes *acquainted* as a "predicative which could be taken as a participle" (1970: 150-151). A better example is:

(105)   1693 Powell, *A very good wife* II.i p. 10 [ARCHER] *I am resolv'd to get introduced to Mrs. Annabella;*

There is then something of a gap. In Jespersen's collection (1909-1949: IV 108-9) the next examples chronologically are:

(106)   1731 Fielding, *Letter Writers* II.ix.20 *so you may not only save your life, but get rewarded for your roguery*
(107)   1759 Sterne, *Tristram Shandy* III.ii.126   *he should by no means have suffered his right hand to have got engaged*
(108)   1766 Goldsmith, *Vicar* xvii.90   *where they give good advice to young nymphs and swains to get married as fast as they can.*

For some reason Visser's collection (1963-1973: §1893) misses (106)-(108) and continues with *OED*'s next examples, dated around 1800:

(109)   1793 Smeaton, *Edystone L.* §266   *We had got (as we thought) compleatly moored upon the 13th of May.*
(110)   1814 D. H. O'Brien, *Captiv. & Escape* 113 *I got supplied with bread, cheese and a pint of wine.*

Strang, too, seems to be unaware of (106) (and indeed (105)) when she writes that "unmistakably passive structures are not found till late in the 18c" (1970: 151).

3.4.2. Modal and/or HAVE/BE + passive GET

Soon after passive GET entered the language it began to occur with preceding auxiliary verbs, including modals and DO, as in (106) and:

(111)   1816 'Quiz' *Grand Master* viii.213   *Or else they wou'd Get most confoundedly bamboo'd.*
(112)   1819 Southey *Lett.* (1856) III.150 *I shall get plentifully bespattered with abuse.*
(113)   1901 Shaw, *Cæsar and Cleopatra* II 272b   *CÆSAR. No man goes to battle to be killed. – CLEOPATRA. But they do get killed.*
(114)   1989 Gurganus, *Confederate Widow* III.i.2 328 *If I do get killed, I'll only be dead.*

When preceded by HAVE it seems reasonable to speak of perfect HAVE + passive GET, as in (107), (109) and:

(115)   1950- *Survey of English Usage* N2 *If they don't offer it this time, I won't drag it away once somebody mentioned it but it hasn't got mentioned very much.*
(116)   1989 Gurganus, *Confederate Widow* II.i.2 164 *… he settled near his company's bonfire. It'd got built one mile from the meadow where …*

When preceded by BE there is room for doubt, as we shall see, as to the status of BE (perfect or passive auxiliary?) and/or GET (passive auxiliary or causative?):

(117)   1837 Carlyle *Fr. Rev.* I VII.x.281   *the first sky-lambent blaze of Insurrection is got damped down;*
(118)   1837 Carlyle *Fr. Rev.* I III.ii.69   *An expedient … has been propounded; and … has been got adopted*
(119)   1870 Alford in *Life* (1873) 457 *I only hope the Master's work may be got done by bedtime.*
(120)   1662 J. Davies, *Olearius' Voy. Ambass.* 220 *They were both gotten sufficiently Drunk.*
(121)   1701 W. Wotton, *Hist. Rome, Alexander*, iii. 510 *Maximus was got as far as Ravenna.*
(122)   1888 *Berksh. Gloss.* s.v. *Veatish I be got rid o' the doctor, an' be a-veelin' quite veatish* ['fairly well in health'] *like now.*

Examples (117)-(118), (120)-(121) come from Haegeman (1985: 55-6, 71). In my opinion it is highly doubtful whether any of (117)-(122) contain GET as passive auxiliary. If Carlyle is not to be charged with using a double perfect, BE in (118) should mark passive, not perfect, but in fact from a Present-day English point of view (117)-(119) look like passives of the pattern GET + NP + PA PTCP, and Jespersen (1909-1949: V 16, 36) seems to agree; he asserts that they correspond to the mainly American type (I give a later example):

(123)   1945 *Coast to Coast* 1944 103   *Well, he's got me beat.*

In that case the GET of (117)-(119) and (123) is no passive auxiliary. Nor is the GET of (120)-(121) either, since there is no lexical past participle.

For the sake of completeness we may note that the sequence Modal + HAVE + GET + PA PTCP is attested too, though my example is recent:

(124)   1950- *Survey of English Usage* T1 *If you, in fact, cleared that cupboard out to put offprints in it, it might have got cleared out then.*

3.4.3. Progressive BE + passive GET

This is a predictable combination, though Visser (1963-1973: §2160), perhaps surprisingly, has no examples before the very end of the nineteenth century:[12]

(125)   1819 Scott *Let.* in Lockhart (1837) IV.viii.253 *My stomach is now getting confirmed, and I have great hopes the bout is over.*
(126)   1837 Carlyle *Fr. Rev.* I VII.viii.268   *One learns also that the royal Carriages are getting yoked*
(127)   1837 Dickens, *Pickwick* xxxii.479   *Extraordinary place that city. We know a most astonishing number of men who always are getting disappointed there.*

The gerundial use of passive GET is earlier still:

(128)   1776 G. Semple *Building in Water* 46 *Our Coffer-dam ... which we began to despair of ever getting made even tolerably stanch* ['water-tight'].

However, at present I have no examples of progressive BE + passive GET preceded by another auxiliary, whether modal or perfect HAVE, though they are clearly grammatical in Present-day English. Examples like

(129)   1931 – *Big Money* xiii.309 *… even if he had been getting steadily plastered* ['drunk'] *all afternoon.*

are not convincingly passive.

4. Multiple auxiliary combinations

We are now in a position to look for generalisations about how certain combinations of auxiliaries came about, and when.

4.1. Two auxiliaries

A modal can be followed by an auxiliary of the perfect, the progressive or the passive, and this has been the case since Old English for all such pairs except perhaps modal + perfect BE, which is said to date from the fourteenth century but has a couple of possible Old English examples.

Perfect HAVE can be followed by an auxiliary of the progressive (from a1325) or the passive (c1180), and perfect BE is followed by passive WURTHE (Old English). For perfect HAVE + passive GET I have examples from 1832 (§2.4.2).

Progressive BE can be followed by an auxiliary of the passive. Tensed progressive BE + passive BE is found from 1772 (§3.3.1), tensed progressive BE + passive GET is found from 1819 (§3.4.3) – both rather earlier when the first verb is untensed BE.

4.2. Three or four auxiliaries

If we treat BE as the only significant auxiliary of the progressive, the following four-verb combinations should be possible, with dates of their earliest occurrence where known:

(A)   modal + perfect HAVE + progressive BE + V: ?a1425
(B)   modal + perfect HAVE + passive BE + V: c1300
(C)   perfect HAVE + progressive BE + passive BE + V: 1886/1929
(D)   modal + progressive BE + passive BE + V: 1915

Patterns A to C require a past participle of BE. Patterns C and D combine progressive BE and passive BE in a single syntagm.

Including passive GET brings the following additional possibilities, all grammatical now, though data on first occurrences are not readily available:[13]

(E)   modal + perfect HAVE + passive GET + V: 1950- (§3.4.2)
(F)   modal + progressive BE + passive GET + V: Present-day English
(G)   perfect HAVE + progressive BE + passive GET + V: Present-day English

The following table arranges the information given above so that dates of first occurrence of three-auxiliary (four-verb) patterns can be compared with the dates of first occurrence of each adjacent pair of auxiliaries they contain.[14] To clarify what is being tabulated, the first line claims that pattern A (modal + perfect + progressive *might have been singing*) is found from ?a1425, whereas the adjacent pairings that make it up (modal + perfect *might have sung* and perfect + progressive *has been singing*) are found from Old English and a1325, respectively.

Table 1: Earliest combinations of auxiliaries

pattern	first pair	second pair	three auxiliaries
A	Old English	a1325	?a1425
B	Old English	c1180	c1300
C	a1325	1772	1886/1929
D	Old English	1772	1915
E	Old English	1832	1950-
F	Old English	1819	Present-day English
G	a1325	1819	Present-day English

I have not discussed or tabulated the maximal, four-auxiliary (five-verb) sequences, on the assumption that nothing of great significance will be lost by the omission.

4.3. The process of combining

Interestingly, Table 1 shows that it is always the first pairing which occurs earliest, then the second pairing, and finally the three-auxiliary pattern. The table would appear to support the conclusion that auxiliaries are added on at the left, at the tensed end of the verbal group, in a development like (130):

(130)   *has been being sung*   ←   *is(was) being sung*

In this hypothesised development, there is an easily motivated substitution of perfect *has been* for simple tensed *is/was*, and after only a modest time-lag. That is a much more satisfactory hypothesis than an imaginable (131):

(131)   *has been being sung*   ←   *has been sung*

with the rather opaque and very long-delayed substitution of progressive participle *been being* for simple past participle *been*. However, the evidence for some of the dates is too skimpy to justify any weighty conclusions. One might compare also

(132)   (=(77))*There's a man been shot.*

There too we seem to have a grammaticalised item, *'s* or rather *there's*, added on at the left of a pre-existing *been shot* syntagm, though the process is a rather more complex one involving blending.

Kossuth (1982: 291) presents a theory "that the order of appearance in co-occurrences parallels that of the original auxiliarization, but with a lag of a good century". That last figure seems about right, to judge from my Table 1. However, I assume that passive BE was grammaticalised before progressive BE (see below), which is not her assumption. In Kossuth's view, finite clauses in English have always been subject to what she calls a Once-per-Clause Constraint (Kossuth 1982: 290). This states that each optional auxiliary can appear at most once, but the basis of the rule has undergone a significant change in the last

two hundred years. Formerly it had to be stated in terms of lexical items like BE, latterly in terms of grammatical categories like Progressive. I have given a detailed critique in Denison (1993: 454-5).

The crucial dating problem is the progressive passive, as in the Present-day English example:

(133) *Max was being serenaded.*

From a present-day perspective its introduction in the late eighteenth century is completely unmysterious, representing as it does the syntactic combination of two long-established periphrases in a semantically compositional way. The question then arises, why it took so long to appear, and why its early use met with such a torrent of abuse. In the light of the discussion of how auxiliaries combine, we can say that the combination of progressive and passive had to await the full grammaticalisation of the progressive. In §3.3.5 above I suggested that the reanalysis which produced the fully grammaticalised progressive did not take place until around the late eighteenth century.[15]

5. Conclusion

We have returned to the question of grammaticalisation of individual auxiliaries. The process of grammaticalisation of an originally lexical verb – which is a matter of both semantics and syntax – can be long-drawn-out and hard to assign dates to. In semantics grammaticalisation probably involves generalisation and perhaps bleaching of meaning (but cf. Brinton 1988), while in syntax the (pre-)auxiliary changes from being head of its phrase to a modifier of the lexical head. (The latter characterisation will not apply to abstract formal analyses which stack Present-day English auxiliaries, like catenatives, in a nest of left-headed phrases, so that apart from the first, tensed verb, each verb is part of the complement of the one preceding.) In the course of this paper on combinations of auxiliaries I have given specific pieces of evidence for certain datings. Summing up, I suppose that the auxiliaries were grammaticalised in the following order:[16]

Table 2: Dates of grammaticalisation

auxiliary verb	grammaticalisation
modals and ONGINNAN	already in Old English
perfect HAVE	already in Old English
periphrastic DO	fourteenth-fifteenth centuries
passive BE	fourteenth-eighteenth centuries?
progressive BE	late eighteenth century?
passive GET	twentieth century and continuing

I have concentrated on the central auxiliaries (plus some brief observations on GET), but the many verbs which are, or have been, marginal to the auxiliary system would also repay investigation from this point of view, as with syntagms like *gonna go*, imperative *don't*

let's V/*let's don't* V, and so on. I discuss a number of marginal auxiliaries in Denison (1998).
The history of all verbal periphrases in English is a much larger topic than can be dealt with
in a single paper. The pathways of development of each periphrasis and the relationships
between periphrasis and simple form are intricate matters, some of which are gone into in
Denison (1993). Even where these matters are well understood it can be difficult to decide
where on the scale from full verb to auxiliary a particular example falls – in other words, to
pin down the degree of grammaticalisation involved. All I have attempted here is to gather
one particular sort of evidence, in the belief that it may shed light on the processes of
grammaticalisation.

David Denison
~~Dept of English and American Studies~~ Linguistics and English Language
University of Manchester
Manchester M13 9PL
England.
e-mail: ~~d.denison@man.ac.uk~~ david.denison@manchester.ac.uk

Notes

[1]Visser observes that with three-verb clusters of modal + modal + V, the first modal is almost always SHALL
(1963-73: §2134). The only exceptions Visser gives for the Middle English and early Modern English
periods are the following:

a.	a1400 *Lanfranc* 17.2	*Also he muste*	*kunne*	*evacuener*	*him þat is*
		also he must	know-how-to	free	him that is
	ful	*of yuel humouris.*			
	full	of evil humours			
b.	(c1443) Pecock *Rule* 375.2		*infantis mowe receive ...*	*þi*	*sacrament of*
			infants may receive ...	your	sacrament of
	baptym eer	*þei*	*mowe*	*kunne*	*worschipe*	*þee.*
	baptism before	they	may	know-how-to	worship	you
c.	c1454 Pecock *Fol.* 129.5	*if y se*	*my neiȝbour*	*goyng ... forto*	*drenche*
		if I see	my neighbour	going ... to	drown
	him silf, y oughte ... forto	*wille*	*defende*	*him fro*	*drenching...*
	him self I ought ... to	wish	prevent	him from	drowning ...

References are given to *may can V*, etc., in current American English dialects. Elsewhere, however
(1963-73: §1357), he notes infinitival modal DARE, as seen for instance in:

d.   1871 Macduff *Mem. Patmos* xi. 153 *We cannot dare read the times and seasons of prophecy.*

Ogura (1998: 232-3) cites *wolde mot* in one MS of *Cursor Mundi*, though *mot* seems to me an obvious
error for *not*, the negative particle used in that MS., and (1434) Misyn *ML may will* with root *will*.

[2]The context of (13) makes clear that a definite order for the wool had not yet been placed.

[3]*Wezen* is a special infinitive form – differing from the normal infinitive *zijn* – used colloquially to replace the
past participle *geweest* in this construction (Geerts et al. 1984: 578).

[4]The judgements remain the same if the subject NP *Jim* is retained in the non-finite versions.
A similar exercise with passive examples reveals the possibly unexpected absence of *being + being +
Ving*:

a.   *The courses are/were being taught by the same tutor.*
b.   **Being being taught by the same tutor makes it easier.*

This is of less interest, however, since here the (a) pattern is relatively new.

[5]It is perhaps not surprising that *OED* should be inconsistent in its analysis of what are surely parallel
constructions, the idioms GET *quit of* and GET *rid of*, which provide many of the possible early
examples of passive GET (to judge from a computer search of *OED* citations). It defines the former s.v.
quit, quite a., therefore not as a GET-passive, but the latter s.v. transitive *rid* v. 3d.

[6] The editor marks [....] as "quite undecipherable" but notes that previous editors of the journal had read "MD"
[= Swift's monogram for Stella, and sometimes Stella and Dingley]. I am grateful to Dr Fujio
Nakamura (p.c.) for examples (49), (53) and (55) and the information on (49).

[7]Here English is like, say, French and unlike, say, Italian or Dutch.

[8]Further examples up to c1830 in *OED*[2] (found by means of an early test release of the CD-ROM version) are
dated 1826 s.v. *new* a. A.5b, a1834 s.v. preconception, 1828 s.v. ring v.[2] B.6a.

[9]The sense of (85) is '... if any play was being acted (later that evening)/was to be acted', so that it would not be a substitute for the central sense of the progressive.

[10]Non-finite *being* + passive participle should not be called "progressive", since verbs like KNOW, OWN which resist the progressive have non-finite *-ing* forms.

[11]It is worth pointing out that the two examples from Jane Austen – Mossé cites *Pride & Prejudice* II.iii[xxvi].144 and Visser *Emma* II.xiv[xxxii].280 – are dialogue by Eliza Bennet and Mr Woodhouse, respectively. It is highly unlikely that Austen, even with her general predilection for the progressive, would have put such a novel construction into the mouths of "careful" speakers, especially the fussy, old, prim Mr Woodhouse.

Phillipps (1970: 117) cites an example outside dialogue:

a.   1816 Austen, *Emma* III.xv[li].444   *She was so happy herself, that there was no being severe.*

By such gerundial usage, he suggests, "Jane Austen does approach the modern construction". And *OED*[2] has an example from 1679 s.v. *idiotical* a. 1.

[12]Note that his earliest examples of progressives of GET and BECOME + AP (GET *old*, BECOME *impolite*, etc.) are also from the turn of the twentieth century, though he has much older citations with the verbs GROW and WAX (Visser 1963-1973: §1840). Earlier instances of progressive GET + AP include (a), (b) and (c) below and (129) above, while participial GET + AP is much older still, (d) below:

a.   1802 Woodforde, *Diary* V 403.19 (29 Aug)   *My Throat is daily getting better he says.*
b.   1834 T. Medwin *Angler in Wales* I.21   *The race of our bull-dogs is getting fast extinct, ...*
c.   1839 Dickens, *Ol. Twist* (1850) 60/1   *'You're getting too proud to own me afore company, are you?'*
d.   1624 Saunderson *12 Serm.* (1637) 172   *The Morter getting wet dissolveth ...*

[13]If we included passive WEORÐAN it would bring the additional possibility of modal + perfect HAVE/BE + passive WEORÐAN + V, but according to Mitchell (1985: §§753, 1095) this did not occur in Old English, and I have not located any examples in Middle English. The theoretical combinations involving progressive BE + passive WEORÐAN did not apparently occur.

[14]I tabulate the order as idealised to the Present-day English norm. Compare now Warner (1997: 182-4); I have modified one date – c1300 rather than a1325 for pattern B – in the light of Warner's useful discussion.

[15] The likelihood of differential dates of adoption of the new grammar by different groups of speakers is discussed in Pratt and Denison (in press), and for other evidence on the dating of grammaticalisation of the progressive see Denison (1998: 143-6).

[16]I cannot justify all the various datings in Table 2, and I have not mentioned ONGINNAN 'begin' at all: see Denison (1985a, 1993) for some discussion. There are, incidentally, significant differences from the dates given in Kossuth's Table 2 (1982: 294). Quite a bit of the data in her interesting sketch can in fact be antedated (as she herself foresaw). In the light of the argument developed here I have modified some datings from the table originally given in Denison (1993: 440).

Bibliography

Boyland, Joyce Tang
    1998   A corpus study of *would* + *have* + past-participle. In: Richard M. Hogg and Linda van Bergen (eds.), *Historical linguistics 1995: selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995*, vol. 2, *Germanic*, 1-17. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 162.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Brinton, Laurel J.
    1988   *The development of English aspectual systems: aspectualizers and post-verbal particles*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 49.) Cambridge etc: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca and Revere D. Perkins
    1991   Back to the future. In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 2, *Focus on types of grammatical markers*, 17-58. (Typological Studies in Language 19.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

de la Cruz, Juan
    1995   The geography and history of double modals in English: a new proposal. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 16: 75-96.

Denison, David
    1985a The origins of periphrastic DO: Ellegård and Visser reconsidered. In: Roger Eaton, Olga Fischer, Willem Koopman and Frederike van der Leek (eds.), *Papers from the 4th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics: Amsterdam, 10-13 April 1985*, 45-60. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 41.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Denison, David
    1985b Some observations on *being teaching*. *Studia Neophilologica* 57: 157-159.

Denison, David
    1992   Counterfactual *may have*. In: Marinel Gerritsen and Dieter Stein (eds.), *Internal and external factors in syntactic change*, 229-256. (Trends in Linguistics / Studies and Monographs 61.) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Denison, David
    1993   *English* historical *syntax: verbal constructions*. (Longman Linguistics Library.) London and New York: Longman.

Denison, David
    1998   Syntax. In: Suzanne Romaine (ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language*, vol. 4, *1776-1997*, 92-329. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellegård, Alvar
    1953   *The auxiliary 'do': the establishment and regulation of its growth in English*. (Gothenburg Studies in English 2.) Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Geerts, Guido, Walter Haeseryn, J. de Rooij and M. C. van den Toorn
    1984   *Algemene nederlandse spraakkunst*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Gronemeyer, Claire
    1999   On deriving complex polysemy: the grammaticalization of *get*. *English Language and Linguistics* 3: 1-39.

Haegeman, Liliane
    1985   The *get*-passive and Burzio's generalization. *Lingua* 66: 53-77.

Hopper, Paul J.
    1991   On some principles of grammaticization. In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 1, *Focus on theoretical and methodological issues*, 17-35. (Typological Studies in Language 19.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins.

Jespersen, Otto
    1909-49   *A Modern English grammar on historical principles*, 7 vols. Heidelberg: Carl
            Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
Kossuth, Karen C.
    1982   Historical implications of the co-occurrence constraints on auxiliaries. *Lingua* 56:
            283-295.
Lakoff, George
    1987   *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind.*
            Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
Mitchell, Bruce
    1985   *Old English* syntax, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Montgomery, Michael B.
    1989   Exploring the roots of Appalachian English. *English World-Wide* 10: 227-278.
Montgomery, Michael B. and Stephen J. Nagle
    1994 (for 1993)   Double modals in Scotland and the southern United States: trans-
            Atlantic inheritance or independent development? *Folia Linguistica Historica* 14:
            91-107.
Mossé, Fernand
    1938   *Histoire de la forme périphrastique 'être + participe présent' en germanique*, vol.
            2, *Moyen-anglais et anglais moderne*. (Collection Linguistique, La Société
            Linguistique de Paris 43.) Paris: C. Klincksieck.
Murray, James A. H., Henry Bradley, William A. Craigie and Charles T. Onions (eds.)
    1933 (and CD-ROM version 1988)   *The Oxford English dictionary*, 13 vols. Oxford:
            Clarendon Press.
Nagle, Stephen J.
    1993   Double modals in early English. In: Henk Aertsen and Robert J. Jeffers (eds.),
            *Historical linguistics 1989: papers from the 9th International Conference on
            Historical Linguistics, Rutgers University, 14-18 August 1989*, 363-370. (Current
            Issues in Linguistic Theory 106.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia PA: John
            Benjamins.
Nagle, Stephen J.
    1994   The English double modal conspiracy. *Diachronica* 11: 199-212.
Nagle, Stephen J.
    1995   The English double modals: internal or external change? In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.),
            Linguistic change under contact conditions, 207-215. (Trends in Linguistics /
            Studies and Monographs 81.) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Nakamura, Fujio
    1991   On the historical development of the activo-passive progressive: 'the house is
            building'. In: Shuichi Chiba (ed.), *Aspects of English philology and linguistics
            (Festschrift offered to Dr Masatomo Ukaji on his sixtieth birthday)*, 121-143.
            Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
Nehls, Dietrich
    1974   *Synchron-diachrone Untersuchungen zur Expanded Form im Englischen: eine
            struktural-funktionale Analyse*. (Linguistische Reihe 19.) Munich: Max Hueber
            Verlag.
OED
    see Murray et al. (1933, 1988) and Simpson and Weiner (1992 [1991])
Ogura, Michiko
    1993   *Schal (not) mowe*, or double auxiliary constructions in Middle English. *The
            Review of English Studies* 44: 539-548.
Ogura, Michiko
    1998   On double auxiliary constructions in medieval English. In: Jacek Fisiak and Akio
            Oizumi (eds.), *English historical linguistics and philology in Japan*, 229-236.
            Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Phillipps, Kenneth Charles
    1970   *Jane Austen's English*. (The Language Library.) London: André Deutsch.

Plank, Frans
    1984   The modals story retold. Studies *in Language* 8: 305-364.
Pratt, Lynda and David Denison
    in press   The language of the Southey-Coleridge circle. *Language Sciences*.
Rydén, Mats and Sverker Brorström
    1987   *The 'be/have' variation with* intransitives *in English: with special reference to the Late Modern period.* (Stockholm Studies in English 70.) Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
Simpson, John A. and Edmund S. C. Weiner
    1992 (beta test version 1991)   *The Oxford English* dictionary*: CD-ROM version* (2nd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Strang, Barbara M. H.
    1970   *A history of English*. London: Methuen.
Visser, Frederik Theodoor
    1946-56   *A syntax of the English* language *of St. Thomas More*, 3 vols. (Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama n.s 19, 24, 26.) Louvain: Librairie Universitaire.
Visser, Frederik Theodoor
    1963-73   *An historical syntax of* the *English language*, 4 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
Warner, Anthony R.
    1986   Ellipsis conditions and the status of the English copula. *York Papers in Linguistics* 12: 153-172.
Warner, Anthony R.
    1993   *English auxiliaries: structure and history*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 66.) Cambridge, etc: Cambridge University Press.
Warner, Anthony R.
    1995   Predicting the progressive passive: parametric change within a lexicalist framework. *Language* 71: 533-557.
Warner, Anthony R.
    1997   Extending the paradigm: an interpretation of the historical development of auxiliary sequences in English. *English Studies* 78: 162-189.
Wekker, Herman Chr.
    1987   Points of Modern English syntax LXIX. *English Studies* 68: 456-463.