

yet this follie doth many times assault the brauest minds:
Affirmative Declarative *do* in 17th-Century English

BJØRG BÆKKEN

1. Introduction

The origin and early use of periphrastic *do* has intrigued scholars for a considerable period of time, and it has been described as one of the great riddles of English linguistics. Numerous studies have been devoted to the topic; two early ones are Engblom 1938 and Ellegård 1953. In recent years there has been renewed interest in the use of *do* in earlier periods of English, and quite a few studies have approached the problem from the point of view of text linguistics and discourse analysis.

The present paper will not be concerned with the origin of periphrastic *do*, but will address the use of the form in affirmative declarative clauses in 17th-century English, ie the central part of the Early Modern English period. It seems to be generally accepted that Early Modern English was an important period in the development of *do* as periphrastic auxiliary, and in his 1953 study Ellegård found a peak in the use of *do* in affirmative declarative clauses in the second half of the 16th century, more specifically between 1550 and 1575. However, some recent studies have suggested that this peak may have occurred somewhat later: Ilse Wischer (2000), who has studied the use of *do* in affirmative declarative clauses in the Early Modern English part of the Helsinki Corpus, found the use of *do* in such clauses to culminate around 1600, which corresponds to Rissanen's findings from 1991. Simi-

lar tendencies were discovered by Bækken (1999). The latter study suggests that *do* periphrasis in inverted structures with transitive verbs may have survived at least till the end of the 17th century, perhaps even well into the 18th. This obviously means that a closer investigation of the 17th century might yield some interesting results.

For the purpose of the present investigation the 17th century has been divided into three periods of approximately 35 years; thus period I covers the years 1600 to 1635, period II 1635 to 1670, and period III 1670 to 1705. The material consists of approximately 10,600 examples of declarative main clauses with one or more initial elements other than the subject. This gives the two main patterns XSV and XVS, in which X covers one or more initial elements of different structural types, S is the subject and V the finite verb. The XSV structure is thus non-inverted, while XVS is inverted. However, it should be stressed that only main clauses with an initial non-subject element are examined, consequently this cannot claim to be an exhaustive investigation of *do* periphrasis in the period in question.

The analysis of the material supports the view that there are specific conditions that seem to favour the use of *do*. These may be of a morphological, syntactic, semantic or pragmatic nature. The paper addresses a number of features of this type, most of which have traditionally been regarded as important when trying to account for the use of affirmative declarative *do* in the Early Modern English period. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives an overview of the rate of affirmative declarative *do* in XSV and XVS clauses in 17th-century English. Section 3 discusses the type of verb used in such structures, and a distinction is drawn between transitive and intransitive verbs and between present and past tense forms. In section 4 it is shown that structures containing different types of intensity adverbials or emotional adverbials have high rates of *do*. Finally, section 5 considers the use of *do* in different text types, and this is followed by a brief conclusion in section 6.

2. Periphrastic *do* in affirmative declarative clauses

Table 1: Proportion of *do* periphrasis in affirmative declarative clauses: XSV and XVS

	1600–1635		1635–1670		1670–1705	
	<i>do</i> /total	%	<i>do</i> /total	%	<i>do</i> /total	%
XSV	63/2573	2.4	57/1705	3.3	21/1685	1.2
XVS	45/400	11.3	21/163	12.9	12/255	4.7
XSV+XVS	108/2973	3.6	78/1868	4.2	33/1940	1.7

Table 1 sets out the rate of *do* periphrasis in XSV and XVS structures. The calculation follows Ellegård (1953) in that the frequency of *do* is calculated from all simple verb phrases and periphrastic *do* combined.¹ If the two word orders are considered together, the table shows a slight peak in the use of *do* in the middle of the 17th century, but the difference between periods I and II is not statistically significant. By contrast, the decrease from II to III is highly significant, and also the decrease from I to III, ie from the beginning to the end of the century, is significant.² The picture is the same when the two word orders are considered separately: neither order shows

¹ Ellegård (1953:152) gives the following formula for the relative frequency of *do*

$$\text{relative frequency} = p = \frac{00 \times d}{+ s} \%$$

where *d* = number of *do* forms, and *s* = number of simple finite full verb forms.

Not everybody agrees with Ellegård's use of simple forms only, eg Frank (1985:12, 14) argues that all verb phrases should be taken into account, complex as well as simple, his hypothesis being that complex verb phrases exercise a pressure towards the use of *do*.

² The following *p* values were found:

period I–II: *p* = .1726

period II–III: *p* = .0001

period I–III: *p* = .0001

any significant difference between the first two periods, while the use of *do* declines significantly towards the end of the century.³ However, the table shows that throughout the century *do* is considerably more frequent in the XVS than in the XSV order. This is confirmed by the qui-square test, which shows the difference between the two word orders to be highly significant in all three periods ($p = .0001$ for all three).⁴ In this respect the present data confirms the results reported in Bækken 1999, which also showed *do* to be more frequent in the XVS than in the XSV order.

An important function of inversion (ie XVS order) in declarative clauses is to change the thematic organisation of the message, thereby shifting the focus to one particular element, often the subject of the sentence, but also other elements may be focused through the use of inversion. This means that the shift of focus provided by the XVS order may have an intensifying or emphatic effect. As shown by Bækken 1998, inversion was still quite frequent around 1600. This is most likely a reflex of the fact that English in earlier periods had some sort of V2 constraint, which means that there was a tendency for the finite verb to occur in second position in declarative main clauses, regardless of the type and complexity of the initial element. It is significant that the majority of the inverted structures with affirmative declarative *do* are instances of Auxiliary (ie partial) inversion as exemplified in [1]–[6]. There are very few instances of complete Verb phrase inversion, a few examples being provided in [7]–[10]. In structures with Auxiliary inversion the use of *do* may be seen as a method of resolving the conflict between the traditional verb-second constraint and the new subject-verb (SV) order: the

³ The following p values were found:

XSV

period I–II: $p = .0935$

period II–III: $p = .0001$

XVS

period I–II: $p = .5866$

period II–III: $p = .0044$

⁴ It should be noted that in period III the expected frequency in the XVS order is 4.

verb-second requirement is satisfied by placing *do* in front of the subject, SV (verb-medial) order by placing the subject in front of the lexical verb. Thus *do* has an important pragmatic function in retaining verb-second order at the same time as it may serve to shift the focus of the structure. Additionally, in structures with transitive verbs, Auxiliary inversion prevents splitting the lexical verb and its object, as attested by examples [2]–[6]. It is a well-known fact that verb–object bonding (VOB)⁵ is strong in present-day English, and this constraint appears to have been developing in the course of the Late Middle English and Early Modern English periods (cf Killie 1993:115, note 6).

[1] In this manner did I continue many moneths, (MM 46, 17) (I)⁶

[2] And in the same did Moyses wriyte his fyue books. (RDI 7, 17) (I)

[3] By the same number doth nature divide the circle of the Sea-Starre, (GCY 84, 3) (II)

[4] From Adam did this Tyrant begin his dangerous Reign. (KSM 243, 39) (II)

[5] Then did he repent his inconsiderate Choice, in preferring the momentary Vision of her Face, to a certain Intelligence of her Person, (WCIN 34, 28) (III)

[6] Yet did he in short time wisely appease these Stirs, (LJW 9, 6) (III)

[7] and in the neat and fine keeping of the kiln doth consist much of the housewife's art, (EHW 189, 19) (I)

[8] In such a grove doe walke the little creepers about the head of the burre. (GCY 75, 7) (II)

⁵ The VOB principle is described by Tomlin (1986:73) as follows: 'In general the object of a transitive clause is syntactically and semantically more tightly "bound" to the verb than is the subject of a transitive clause. ... Various independent syntactic, semantic, and even phonological processes appear to conspire to prevent the separation of the object from the verb; and these same processes often permit separation of the subject from the verb in order to maintain the bond between the verb and object'.

⁶ The text codes are presented in a separate list at the end of the article. The Roman numerals following the text codes refer to the three periods as described in section 1.

[9] Anno 1607. Aprill the nineteenth, at Saint Ethelburge in Bish-ops Gate street, did communicate with the rest of the Parishioners these persons Seamen, purposing to goe to sear foure dayes after, for to discouer a Passage by the North Pole to Japan and China. (HHV 567, 21) (I)

[10] And after this manner doth lay the foundation of the circular branches of the Oak, (GCY 84, 10) (II)

3. The verb in affirmative declarative clauses with do periphrasis

3.1 Type of verb

In Ellegård's (1953) material periphrastic *do* was more common with transitive than with intransitive verbs. Ellegård's (1953: 190f) explanation for this state of affairs runs as follows:

... when the verb was intransitive, inversion was quite a normal construction. There was thus generally no reason to use *do* in the function we are studying, and in fact it does not seem to have been so used to any great extent. But when the verb was transitive, inversion was uncommon and getting more so. It was more acceptable when the verb was an auxiliary. Hence the *do*-construction could fulfil a definite function: when inversion was for some reason resorted to, it was more and more often achieved by means of the *do*-form.

As shown by table 2, the present material clearly corroborates Ellegård in that there is a higher rate of *do* in structures with transitive than in structures with intransitive verbs. However, in the present material the difference in the proportion of *do* with the two types of verb is statistically significant only in the first part of the century, ie in period I ($p = .0063$), while there is no difference between the two types of verb in the last two periods (II: $p = .6394$; III $p = .1541$).

Table 2: Proportion of *do* periphrasis in affirmative declarative clauses in structures with transitive (trans) and intransitive (intrans) verbs.

	1600–1635		1635–1670		1670–1705	
	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>
trans	77/1501	5.1	51/902	5.7	24/934	2.6
intrans	31/1070	2.9	27/548	4.9	9/621	1.4
trans+intrans	108/2571	4.2	78/1450	5.4	33/1555	2.1

Tables 3–4 show the proportion of *do* in the two word orders in structures with transitive and intransitive verbs, respectively. As shown by table 3, *do* in structures with transitive verbs occurs most typically in the XVS order, which shows a significant increase of *do* from period I to II ($p = .0384$), while there is no significant difference between periods II and III ($p = .1775$). This means that in structures with transitive verbs there is still a high rate of *do* in period III, ie at the very end of the 17th century. Interestingly, Bækken 1999 reports the rate of *do* at the end of the 17th century to be 26.3%, ie practically the same as the present rate.

In structures with intransitive verbs as presented in table 4, *do* is also more frequent in the XVS order than in XSV, but the increase from period I to II is not significant, whereas the overall decrease from I to III is significant ($p = .0216$).⁷

A comparison between transitive and intransitive verbs shows inverted structures with *do* periphrasis to be considerably more frequent with transitive than with intransitive verbs in all three periods. Unfortunately, a statistical test is applicable only in period I, in which case the difference is highly significant ($p = .0001$), while there are too few examples in the other two periods. However, if the century is treated as a whole, the difference between the two types of verb in the use of *do* in XVS structures is significant ($p = .0001$).

⁷ The increase from I to II shows a p value of .3691, while the decrease from II to III is significant ($p = .0027$), but the E value is 4.

Table 3: Proportion of periphrastic *do* in affirmative declarative clauses with transitive verbs: XSV and XVS

	1600–1635		1635–1670		1670–1705	
	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>
xsv	47/1380	3.4	39/879	4.4	16/904	1.8
xvs	30/121	24.8	12/23	52.2	8/30	26.7
total	77/1501	5.1	51/902	5.7	24/934	2.6

Table 4: Proportion of periphrastic *do* in affirmative declarative clauses with intransitive verbs: XSV and XVS

	1600–1635		1635–1670		1670–1705	
	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>
xsv	16/864	1.9	18/459	3.9	5/451	1.1
xvs	15/206	7.3	9/89	10.1	4/170	2.4
total	31/1070	2.9	27/548	4.9	9/621	1.4

From a pragmatic point of view *do* will serve to give more weight to the verb regardless of the order of subject and verb and regardless of whether the verb is transitive or intransitive. The wish to increase the weight of the verb may have been particularly urgent in a period when most of the verbal endings were disappearing. Rissanen (1985:164), in discussing the use of affirmative *do* in Early American English, comments on the fact that the addition of *do* lengthens the verb phrase and increases its weight, '[i]t would seem natural that the need to increase the weight of the predicate became acute in late Middle English and Early Modern English when the reduction of verbal endings – notably the loss of the unstressed vowel – produced a large number of monosyllabic verb forms'. In structures with intransitive verbs the verb may appear in absolute clause-final position; in such cases *do* may function as some sort of 'pragmatic tool' inserted to add weight to the final verb as exemplified in [11]–[13]. With transitive verbs *do* may have exactly the same weight-adding effect, but it will not normally serve to achieve end weight due to the presence of a direct object, which most typically occurs post-verbally. Still the pragmatic effect of *do*-insertion may be equally conspicuous in

transitive structures as illustrated by [14]–[17]. Moreover, examples [18]–[19] show that also transitive verbs may occur in final position if the object is fronted, and *do* will then have the same effect as in intransitive structures like [11]–[13].

[11] There Rhetia, and Helvetia doe confine. (CCRB 92, 13) (I)

[12] At the same time, and an age after or more, the inhabitants of the great Atlantis did flourish. (FBNA 204, 2, 37) (I)

[13] And as the Sun returns again to the Northward, so the Southerly Winds do increase (WDVX 5, 32) (III)

[14] Therefore amongst his other fundamental laws of this kingdom he did ordain the interdicts and prohibitions which we have touching entrance of strangers; (FBNA 206, 1, 14) (I)

[15] and for as much as they know of you, you doe deserve a very good Esteem, (LTDO 27, 8) (II)

[16] but then the most Accurate, do make a Circumflex, or this mark ^ over the o, thus; ... (TTE 18, 27) (III)

[17] And which is yet more; divers of their most learned men do confess, that . . . they are gross Idolaters (TIPR 468, 31) (III)

[18] Us He did take; (LASR 3, 22) (I)

[19] His counsel the multitude did easely approue and follow, (RDI 4, 14) (I)

3.2. The form of the verb

A number of studies have suggested that *do* serves as an inflection-replacer, above all in past tense contexts (eg Dahl 1956, Wischer 2000). The proportion of present and past tense forms in the present material is presented in table 5, which shows that present tense forms dominate in periods I and III, while there is a majority of past tense forms in period II. As there can be little doubt that the tense-indicator function of *do* is particularly important in past time contexts, it may well be significant that period II, which has the highest frequency of *do*, also has the

highest proportion of past tense forms. This may be an indication that at this time *do* was felt as a convenient tense carrier. However, in this particular period one text, *A True Journall of the Sally Fleet*, is responsible for 66% of the past tense forms; thus the present result should be treated with some caution. Some further comments on the *Sally Fleet* text are provided in section 5 below.

Table 5: Present and past tense forms: XSV + XVS

	1600–1635		1635–1670		1670–1705	
	no	%	no	%	no	%
present	66	61.1	28	35.9	27	81.8
past	42	38.9	50	64.1	6	18.1
	108		78		33	

The verbs that combine with *did* are most typically either irregular or they end in *t/d*, ie structures in which the tense-indicator function of *do* is particularly important. Examples are provided in [20]–[21]. Such forms account for 57.1% of the verbs in period I and 86% in period II. Among the remaining verbs, there is a predominance of verbs of Romance origin, most of them polysyllabic, as *compare*, *consider*, *continue*, *distinguish*, *flourish*, *improve* etc. Some examples are provided in [22]–[24]. In period III, there are only six past tense forms altogether, and it is difficult to discern any clear tendencies; still two of the verbs end in *t/d*, as illustrated by [25]–[26]. Thus it seems clear that the form of the verb may have been of importance for the use/non-use of *do*, in particular in the first two thirds of the 17th century, which is when the use of *do* appears to have reached a peak.

In the present tense, as illustrated by [27]–[28], it is noticeable that quite a few of the forms are marked for the third person, and some also for the second person.⁸

⁸ The proportions of second and third person present tense forms are as follows: period I 29/65 = 44.6%; period II 9/28 = 32.1%; period III 9/27 = 33.3%. Most of these are third person singular forms with *doth* dominating in period I, while *does* is the major form in period III.

[20] but out of the hardness of men's hearts did this Invention spring. (KSM 237, 39) (II)

[21] Good Sir Julius Caesar, if you bee remembered, I did send you a note signed with my owne hand (LTEB 33, 6) (I)

[22] The nine and twentieth, in the morning calme, being halfe a league from the shoare, the Sea being smooth, the Needle did encline 84. degrees, (HHV 578, 1) (I)

[23] In this manner did I continue many moneths, (MM 46, 17) (I)

[24] Thus did the Romans distinguish their Two Emperours, Augustus and Tiberius, (KSM 246, 20) (II)

[25] So perfectly did Melora confide in Olimpia, that she made no scruple to rely upon her Conduct, (IHC 16, 11) (III)

[26] Then did he repent his inconsiderate Choice, in preferring the momentary Vision of her Face, to a certain Intelligence of her Person, (WCIN 34, 28) (III)

[27] Heere doth that earnest appetite of the Vnderstanding content it selfe, (CG 74, 27) (I)

[28] Now dost thou rend thine hair, blaspheme thy Creator, (TDWY 1084, 13) (I)

4. *Do combined with adverbs*

As mentioned in section 2 above, the shift of focus in inverted structures may have an intensifying effect. Similarly, the fact that the addition of *do* has a lengthening effect (cf section 3.1), thus giving more weight to the verb phrase, easily leads to intensity or emphasis. No doubt this is closely connected with, perhaps the origin of, the emphatic use of *do* that we know today. Stein (1991) suggests that it was the 17th century which saw the appearance of the so-called 'emphatic' use of *do*, developing parallel with the decline of unstressed *do*. Stein (1991:358) defines three semantic types of *do*, one of which is intensity, which is closely connected with, in his words 'coterminous with', the occurrence of *do* with adverbs and inversion, since adverbs and inversion as well as intensity serve to express emotional attitudes, in Stein's

words 'if intensity is the expression of an emotional attitude, this is also what adverbs (and inversion) achieve' (Stein 1991:359).

The present material contains a number of examples of *do* combined with some sort of intensifying and/or emotional adverbial; examples are provided in [29]–[39]. Of those, [29]–[38] contain intensifying/emotional adverbials inter-verbally; [37]–[38] contain such adverbials initially as well as inter-verbally, while [39] has an initial intensifying/emotional adverbial. Interestingly, the occurrence of intensifying/emotional adverbials in structures with affirmative declarative *do* is a very conspicuous feature of the present material, and this feature seems to deserve to be pursued further.

[29] Out of my weeping pen does the ink mournfully and more bitterly than gall drop on the pale-faced paper, (TDWY 1082, 20) (I)

[30] and thearfore being fullie perswaded of your affection towards mee in such sort that you will never suffer my name to come in question for anie debt contracted by me, I do earnestlie intreate you to cause see these billes payed and discharged as sone ad may bee for my respect, (LTEB 33, 20) (I)

[31] But yf hereafter occation shall happen in this kynde (which I trust God of his goodness will prevent) I doe then assuredlie hope to geve you sutch certayne Notice thereof (WWP 40, 30) (I)

[32] On this lovely creature did a young man so steadfastly fix his eye that her looks kindled in his bosom a desire, (TDWY 1086, 30) (I)

[33] This Bull Bellarmine doth extreamly magnify, (JTSM 18, 4) (II)

[34] But seeing the effects thereof have been so far contrary to my intentions, I doe with all humility beg your Majesty's pardon for the same. (OLSB 292, 6) (II)

[35] Thus hoping your Worshipp will not bee unmindfull of mee I doe humbly take my leave (OLTS 230, 16) (II)

[36] Yet contrary to this Rule, we do commonly write these words following of a sharp sound, with ow; (TTE 4, 17) (III)

[37] and surely it doth well become them all: (WCDD 277, 32) (I)

[38] Doubtless the good Dean did well know that common dreams are but a senseless paraphrase on our waking thoughts, (LHW 91, 20) (II)

[39] O pain, in vain doest thou attempt me; (JTGG 86, 3) (II)

5.0 *Do in different types of text*

Table 6 shows the frequency of *do* in the four text types distinguished in the corpus, ie 'descriptive prose', 'religious prose', 'letters' and 'history', the latter category including also some geographical descriptions.

Table 6: *Do* in different text types

	1600–1635		1635–1670		1670–1705	
	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>	<i>do</i> /total	% <i>do</i>
'descr prose'*	34/474	7.2	12/394	3.0	10/533	1.9
'rel prose'**	24/683	3.5	14/409	3.4	12/372	3.2
'letters'	16/407	3.9	12/509	2.4	4/362	1.1
'history'	34/1409	2.4	40/556	7.2	7/673	1.0
total	108/2973	3.6	78/1868	4.2	33/1940	1.7

*descr prose = descriptive prose

**rel prose = religious prose

In each of the three periods the table shows considerable differences between some of the text types. A very noticeable feature which emerges from the table is the continuing high frequency of *do* in religious texts as illustrated in [40]–[45]. Religious prose is generally known to be conservative, and it is possible that the use of *do* in affirmative declarative clauses was gradually felt to be an archaic feature in the 17th century, and this may be one reason why it was

retained in this type of text. Moreover, sermons are examples of texts that are prepared with a view to oral delivery, and it has been claimed by eg Rissanen (1985 and 1991) that *do* is a feature of spoken language in Early Modern English. It is thus possible that style may go some way towards explaining the continuing use of *do* in this type of text. A third possibility is that religious language may be more likely to use emphatic structures, and at least some of the examples of *do* in this type of text may well be (early?) instances of emphatic *do*.

A comparison of the present results with the data in Bækken 1999 shows that already in the earliest period in the latter corpus, covering the years 1480-1530, religious prose shows a high rate of *do*, and it is difficult to account for *do* in such an early period as a conservative feature.

A noticeable feature, which does not appear in the table, is the great variation not only between text types but also between individual texts. In period I the highest rate of *do* is found in 'descriptive prose', but the high rate in this category is due above all to two texts, viz Richard Rowland's *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* and William Drummond's *A Cypress Grove*. In period II 'history' is the category with the highest rate of *do*, and again it is due to the extensive use in one particular text, viz *A True Journall of the Sally Fleet*, in which 35.1% of all recorded structures contain affirmative declarative *do*. In period III 'religious prose' is responsible for the highest rate of *do*, and in this case two texts by Tillotson feature higher rates than the others.

[40] And after much travel and much pains, when we open our lips to speak of the wonderful works of God, our tongues do falter within our mouths, (RHSR 661, 38) (I)

[41] Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, (GOSJ 156, 10, 17) (I)

[42] O pain, in vain doest thou attempt me; (JTGG 86, 3) (II)

[43] From hence do we derive this Monster, This Enemy to Nature and Opposite to God: (KSM 243, 33) (II)

[44] When a stone is placed to be cast away, just in the middle of the sling, then doth the slinger cast it furthest of all. (JBGS 173, 2, 44) (III)

[45] (His Disciples passing through the Corn on the Sabbath Day, and being hungry, pluckt the Ears and did eat;) this our Saviour does justifie to be no Breach of the Law (TIGP 497, 30) (III)

The *Sally Fleet* text, which dates from 1637, is interesting. The text, exemplified in [46]–[51], has a much higher rate of *do* than the other texts in the corpus, and all the examples are in the past tense. The latter fact may not be very surprising since the whole text is recorded in the past. What is more noticeable is that all the verbs that occur with *do* are irregular. There are examples of *come, go, make, see, send, shoot, take*, etc (cf examples). However, the same verbs occur frequently also in structures without *do*, and there is great variation between structures with and without *do*. It is difficult to discern particular factors that may help to explain the use of *do*, but it is possible that there are discourse features that are of importance here.

[46] The 27th of March at three of the clock in the afternoone there did come in a Sally man of warre from Argier with passengers, (SF 5, 7) (II)

[47] and so sayling alongst the Coasts untill the 21 of March in the morning at day-light wee did see the South Cape of Spaine, (SF 3, 12) (II)

[48] and going close aboard the North shore as neere as shee could steere for running ashore, wee and the Antilop did shoot above 100 peeces of Ordnance at that ship, (SF 5, 10) (II)

[49] The 24. day, our boats did take a great boat of theirs. (SF 12, 21) (II)

[50] The next day being the twenty-one of Aprill the Moores in the old towne did hang out a white Flagge (SF 8, 1) (II)

[51] and while the Trench was making, our men did sinke many of their Shippes, (SF 9, 9) (II)

6. *Conclusion*

It is difficult to draw any very definite conclusions on the basis of the present results. Still, I hope to have shown that there was some sort of peak in the use of affirmative declarative *do* in the first decades of the 17th century; still, in specific syntactic structures the use of *do* was retained, at least by some writers, throughout the century and perhaps into the next. However, the material has revealed great variation between individual writers in their use of *do* periphrasis in affirmative declarative structures. As to the features that may have favoured *do*, it is difficult to point to one particular conditioning factor, rather it seems that a number of elements may have been involved, all of them favouring the periphrasis. In some cases the same example may contain several features that would all of them favour *do*. Nevertheless, it seems fairly clear that affirmative declarative *do* was more common in the XVS order than in XSV, and more common with transitive than with intransitive verbs, and above all in structures containing intensifying and/or emotional adverbials. The latter feature in particular appears to warrant further study.

University of Bergen

Text codes

The texts listed here are only those from which the examples have been taken. A full list of the 17th-century texts studied will be found in Bækken (forthcoming).

- CCRB (1611) *Coryat's Crudities*. vol II. 1905. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons.
- CG (1623) Drummond, William. *Flowres of Sion to which is adjoyned his Cypresse Grove*. (The English Experience, 590.) 1973: 45-68. Amsterdam: Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm, Ltd.
- EHW (1631) Markham, Gervase. *The English Housewife*. Edited by Michael R. Best. 1986. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University press.
- FBNA (1614-17) Bacon, Francis. New Atlantis. In *Great Books of the Western World, 30: Francis Bacon*. Edited by R. M. Hutchins. 1952. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.
- GCY (1658) Browne, Sir Thomas. *Urne Buriall and The Garden of Cyrus*. Edited by John Carter. 1958. Cambridge: CUP.
- GOSJ (1611) The Gospel according to St John. Chapters 1-16. No date. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode Limited.
- HHV (1625) Henry Hudson's Voyages. From *Purchas His Pilgrimes in Five Bookes*. The Third Part. 1966. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc.
- IHC (1696) Pix, Mary. *The Inhumane Cardinal*. A Facsimile Reproduction with an Introduction by Constance Clark. 1984: 1-40. Delmar, New York: Sholars' Facsimiles & Reprints.

Affirmative Declarative do in 17th-Century English

- JBGS (1683) Bunyan, John. *The Greatness of the Soul*. In *The Complete Works of John Bunyan*. Vol. III. Edited by Henry Stebbing. 1970. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation.
- JTGG (1650s) Taylor, Jeremy. *The Golden Grove*. Edited by Logan Pearsall Smith. MCMXXX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- JTSM (1638) Taylor, Jeremy. *A Sermon Preached in Saint Maries Church in Oxford. Vpon the Anniversary of the Gunpowder-Treason*. 1971:1-34. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd & New York: Da Capo Press.
- KSM (1640, 1661-62) King, Henry. *The Sermons of Henry King (1592-1669), Bishop of Chichester*. Edited by Mary Hobbs. 1992. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- LASR (1605) Andrewes, Lancelot. *Sermons*. Edited by G. M. Story. 1967. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LHW (1651) Walton, Izaak. *The Life of Sir Henry Wotton*. In *Izaak Walton's Lives*. No date. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.
- LJW (1699) Paule, George. *The Life of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury In the Times of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I*. MDCXCIX, pp 1-42. London: Ri. Chiswell.
- LTDO (1650s) *The Letters of Dorothy Osborne to William Temple*. Edited by G.C. Moore Smith. 1947. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LTEB (1612ff) *The Letters of Elizabeth Queen of Bohemia*. Compiled by L.M. Baker. 1953. London: The Bodley Head.
- MM (1629) Godwin, Francis. *The Man in the Moone*. Edited by Grant McColley. 1937. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College. *Studies in Modern Languages*.

- OLSB (1635–46) *Original Letters illustrative of English History*. Edited by Henry Ellis. Second series II, vol. III, pp 282-286, 292-303, 306-313, 316-327. MDCCCXXVII. London: Harding and Lepard
- OLTS (1637–45) *Original Letters illustrative of English History*. Edited by Henry Ellis. Third series, vol. IV. MDCCCXLVI. London: Richard Bentley
- RDI (1605) Rowlands, Richard. *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*. (The English Experience, 95.) 1979. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd.
- RHSR (1612–13) *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker*. Ed by John Keble. Vol. III. MDCCCXLV, pp 469-481, 643-653, 659-664. Oxford: OUP.
- SF (1637) Dvnton, John. *A True Iovrnall of the Sally Fleet*. (The English Experience, 242.) 1970. Amsterdam: Da Capo Press, Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm Ltd.
- TDWY (1603) Dekker, Thomas. The Wonderfull yeare, 1603. In J. W. Hebel *et al* (eds) *Tudor Poetry and Prose*. 1953. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- TIGP (1688) Tillotson, John. Instituted Religion not Intended to Undermine Natural. 1976: 495-513. In *Three Restoration Divines: Barrow, South, Tillotson. Selected Sermons*. Vol. II:ii. Edited by Irène Simon. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- TIPR (1680) Tillotson, John. The Protestant Religion Vindicated. 1976: 455-471. In *Three Restoration Divines: Barrow, South, Tillotson. Selected*

- Sermons*. Vol. II:ii. Edited by Irène Simon. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- TTE (1687) Care, Henry. *The Tutor to True English*. 1971. Menston: Scolar Press.
- WCDD (1622) Gouge, William. *Of Domesticall Duties*. (The English Experience, 803.) 1976. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd.
- WCIN (1691) Congreve, William. *Incognita*. Edited by H. F. B. Brett-Smith. 1922: 9-61. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- WDVX (1688?) Dampier, William. *Voyages and Descriptions*. Vol. II. MDCXCIX. London: James Knapton part III: 1-11, 12-14, 76-88.
- WWP (1597-1628) Wentworth, William & Thomas. *Wentworth Papers 1597-1628*. Edited for the Royal Historical Society by J.P. Cooper. (Camden Fourth Series, volume 12.) 1973: 9-24, 25-35, 38-46. London: The Royal Historical Society.

References

- Bækken, Bjørg. 1998. *Word order patterns in Early Modern English with special reference to the position of the subject and the finite verb*. Studia Anglistica Norvegica 9. Oslo: Novus Press
- Bækken Bjørg. 1999. 'Periphrastic do in Early Modern English'. *Folia Linguistica Historica* XX/I-2, pp 107-128
- Bækken Bjørg. Forthcoming. *Word order patterns in 17th-century English: XSV versus XVS*
- Dahl, Torsten. 1956. 'Linguistic studies in some Elizabethan writings II: the auxiliary do'. *Acta Jutlandica* 28:3-104
- Ellegård, Alvar. 1953. *The auxiliary do*. Gothenburg Studies in English II. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell
- Engblom, Victor. 1938. *On the origin and early development of the auxiliary do*. Lund Studies in English VI. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup

- Kastovsky, Dieter (ed). 1991. *Historical English syntax*. Topics in English Linguistics 2. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Killie, Kristin. 1993. *Early Modern English subject modifiers*. Tromsø Studies in Linguistics 13. Oslo: Novus Press
- Rissanen, Matti. 1985. 'Periphrastic *do* in affirmative statements in early American English'. *Journal of English Linguistics* 18.2:163–183
- Rissanen, Matti. 1991. 'Spoken language and the history of *do*-periphrasis'. In Dieter Kastovsky (ed) 1991:321–342
- Stein, Dieter. 1991. 'Semantic aspects of syntactic change'. In Dieter Kastovsky (ed) 1991:355–366
- Tomlin, Russell S. 1986. *Basic word order: functional principles*. London: Croom Helm
- Wischer, Ilse. 2000. 'What makes a syntactic change stop? On the decline of periphrastic DO in EModE affirmative declarative sentences'. Paper presented at the 11th ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela

