Lexical or Auxiliary:
Dare, *Need*, and *Ought* in the Paston Letters*

Kenji MATSUSE

1. Introduction

In Present-Day English (henceforth abbreviated as PDE), as Biber et al. (1999: 73) point out, *dare, need,* and *ought* are positioned "on the borderline between auxiliaries and lexical verbs, and can be regarded as *marginal*[1] auxiliaries" (emphasis added), not as ordinary modal-auxiliary verbs. As for the former two, *dare* and *need,* Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 109-110) consider them both lexical and modal-auxiliary, adding that "though the auxiliary use is rare in Am [erican]E[nglish]". Concerning the latter *ought,* however, they treat it as behaving "very largely like a modal auxiliary". And the marginality of auxiliary *ought* is often highlighted by the co-occurrence with the *to*-infinitive (= *to*-inf) in comparison with the fact that ordinary modal-auxiliary verbs usually accompany the bare/zero infinitive (= ϕ-inf).

This paper, then, discusses from a historical point of view the connection between the lexicality/(modal-) auxiliariness of the three verbs and their syntactic/semantic properties: in particular, whether they co-occur with the ϕ-inf or the *to*-inf.[2]

The structure of this paper is as follows. In the next section, first of all, the characteristics of behaviors in PDE of *dare, need,* and *ought* are clarified so that some issues to be discussed can be identified. In section 3, their historical developments in Old English

(= OE) and Middle English (= ME) are examined principally through *The Oxford English Dictionary* [2nd edition] (= *OED*²) and *The Middle English Dictionary* (= *MED*). In section 4, in order to grasp the situation in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in the latter of which, according to Lightfoot (1979),³ "radical" syntactic changes are supposed to have taken place in English, the three verbs in the Paston Letters are focused on and analyzed. One big reason for this selection is that the occurrences of *ought* in the Paston Letters were not fully examined even by Tajima (1990). In addition, since "letters" are thought to reflect a lot of colloquial forms at that time, we could also imagine how the three verbs were used in speech as well as in writing. And the last section summarizes the precedent discussions and presents a conclusion.

2. Issues to Be Discussed

Let us begin by looking through the descriptions of *dare, need,* and *ought* in PDE which were made by Konishi & Minamide (2001) (= *Taishukan's Unabridged Genius English-Japanese Dictionary*: *TUGED*), where the usages of the three verbs are being discussed in detail, and by Huddleston & Pullum (2002), a state-of-the-art grammar of the English language which succeeds Quirk et al. (1985). With *dare* we have:

> (1) a . I wonder if he'll *dare* <u>(to) propose</u> to her.
>   b . We don't *dare* <u>to speak.</u>
>   c . I *dare* not <u>tell</u> her the sad news.

TUGED (s.v. *dare*) states that *dare* is one of the verbs whose demarcation drawn between lexical transitivity and modal-auxiliariness is "vague/blurred". In affirmative contexts like (1a)

above, the occurrence of the infinitive marker *to* is optional as if behaving like an auxiliary verb (this *dare* cannot be a "genuine" auxiliary verb because of the existence of another auxiliary verb "*'ll*" [= will]), though it is common to use the *to*-inf for ordinary affirmative contexts. As regards explicitly negative contexts, however, the "lexical *dare* + *to*-inf" construction seems to be the rule in PDE as shown in (1b).[4]

On the other hand, auxiliary *dare* is, *TUGED* explains, rare itself and mainly used in British English (= BrE) rather than in AmE. It prefers *if/whether* clauses as well as negative/interrogative (i.e., non-affirmative) contexts as in (1c). Next, examples with *need* are:

> (2) a. Our house *needs* to be repaired/repairing.
>   [= We *need* to repair our house.]
>   b. *Need* you work so hard?—Yes, I *need* to/*need.
>   —No, I *need*n't.

TUGED (s.v. *need*) mentions that lexical *need* seems to appear mainly in affirmative contexts;[5] in non-affirmative ones, modal-auxiliary *need* is preferred and is typically British. Therefore, we find that instead of (2b), the following question-and-answer is also accepted in AmE: "Do you *need* to work so hard?—No, I don't *need* to".

Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 111) plausibly explain the above difference between *dare* and *need*: "with *dare* even the lexical verb occurs predominantly in non-affirmative contexts (as the modal obligatorily does), whereas lexical *need* very commonly occurs in affirmative contexts, reinforcing the contrast with the modal verb".

Semantically speaking, *need* is thought to be positioned between deontic *must* and deontic *ought*, the latter of which will be discussed next:

   (3) a. *Ought*n't we (to) ring up the police?[6]
     b. You *ought* not (to) smoke so much.

TUGED (s.v. *ought*) first of all writes this way, though it is, in a sense, a deviant definition for an modal-auxiliary verb: *ought* is an auxiliary verb, but it co-occurs with "to do". And immediately after that comment, it adds that especially in non-affirmative contexts, the infinitive marker *to* could be deleted, which is often found in the colloquial style as shown in (3). Also Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 109) point out that "[t]here is a growing tendency for it [= *ought*] to be constructed with a bare infinitive [= ϕ-inf] in non-affirmative contexts (particularly negative), ..., especially in AmE, as well as the more usual forms with *to*". Ando (2007[2003]: 185), too, recognizes this tendency and concludes that *ought* seems to have finally gained its "true" auxiliariness.

   Its deontic use represents obligation or advice, based on ethics, socially accepted ideas, health problems, etc. It is semantically weaker than deontic *must* and almost the same as deontic *should*, but is not so frequently used as *should*. With regard to the degree of obligation *ought* has, *TUGED* (s.v. *should*) gives the following scale:

   (4) WEAKER   STRONGER
     should ≦ *ought to* < had better < be to < have to < must

And its epistemic use conveys the speaker's certainty as follows:

   (5) WEAKER   STRONGER
     could < might < may < *should < ought* < would < will < must

The underlined parts of the above two scales clearly show that there is a semantically very close relationship between *should* and *ought*, as

Leech (1987²: 100) writes: "SHOULD is a more common alternative to *ought to* in both senses [= 'obligation' and 'logical necessity']".

Here, if we focus on the environments where the three verbs co-occur with the ϕ-/*to*-inf, the foregoing discussion will be summarized as follows:

(6)		*dare*	*need*	*ought*
Lexical	Afm.	△	○	—
	Non-afm.	○	○	—⁷
Auxiliary	Afm.	●	—	○
	Non-afm.	●	●	△

Afm. = Affirmative contexts, Non-afm. = Non-affirmative contexts,
— = no such use itself attested, ○= *to*-inf, ●= ϕ-inf, & △= ϕ-inf/*to*-inf

In addition to the distribution of the two kinds of infinitives co-occurring with each verb mentioned above, generally speaking, the syntagmatic positions of lexical or modal-auxiliary verbs in non-affirmative (i.e., negative or interrogative) contexts are described as follows:

(7)		Subject	*do*	*not*	<u>Verb</u>	*to*-inf ....
	Do	Subject			<u>Verb</u>	*to*-inf ...?
		Subject	<u>AuxV</u>	*not*		ϕ-inf ....
	<u>AuxV</u>	Subject				ϕ-inf ...?

(AuxV: modal-auxiliary verb)

As far as the above (7) is concerned, we have an observation that the *to*-inf occurs immediately after a verbal element, whereas the ϕ-inf does not. In other words, the occurrence of the latter needs some "intervening element" between itself and the verbal element.

Thus, the issues obtained from (6) and (7) are:

(8) a. Why can the infinitive marker *to* be optional with *dare*, but
       not with *need*, when used in affirmative contexts?
  = Why is no auxiliary *need* attested in affirmative contexts?
  = Why is auxiliary *dare* attested in affirmative contexts?
  b. Why does (auxiliary) *ought* originally accompany the *to*-inf,
       not the ϕ-inf?
  c. Why can the infinitive marker *to* be optional with *ought*,
       when used in non-affirmative contexts?

They will fully be discussed together with a historical point of view
in the following sections.

3. *Dare, Need,* and *Ought* in OE and ME

We begin with Mitchell & Robinson's (2007^7: 112) statement that
"[t]he uninflected infinitive [= ϕ-inf] is usual after the auxiliaries ...
and after *uton* 'let us', *þurfan* 'need', and **durran* 'dare'", where we
find that *thar(f)* and *dare* originally accompany the ϕ-inf. Then,
OED² (s.v. *dare*) also explains that "[i]n the original construction,
followed by the infinitive without *to* [= ϕ-inf], *dare, durst* are still in
common use (*especially in the negative* 'he dare not', 'he durst not');
and most writers prefer 'he dare go' [= auxiliary *dare*], or 'he dares
to go' [= lexical *dare*], to 'he dares go' [= lexical *dare*]" (emphasis
added). Auxiliary *dare* is what we call one of the "preterite-present"
verbs to which lots of modal-auxiliary verbs belong. Originally, it
was a lexical verb which accompanied the ϕ-inf as a "noun" object.
But when interpreted as an auxiliary verb whose peculiarity comes
from the use of the preterite form as the present form, the original
object infinitive was mutated and regarded (i.e., reanalyzed) as the
main verb of the sentence. In other words, the "verbalness" of the
infinitive came to be felt more strongly.

OED² further points out that "[t]he original 3rd singular present *he
dare*, and past tense *durst*, remained undisturbed to the modern

period, in which the transitive senses [= 'to dare to undertake or do', etc.] were developed; but early in the 16th century the new forms *dares, dared* appeared in the south, and are always used in the transitive senses, and now also in the intransitive sense [= 'to have boldness or courage'] when followed by *to*",[8] which means that, as Mustanoja (1960: 530) also points out, there was no such case with the *to*-inf in ME. Examples are:

> (9) a . Hwæðer he wið Romanum <u>winnan</u> *dorste*
>   (c893, King ÆLFRED, *Orosius*, IV, xi)
>   b . The counsell neither *durst* <u>to abridge or diminish</u> any of
>   them.
>   (c1555, Nicholas HARPSFIELD, *Divorce Hen.* VIII[9] [1878], 269)

From above we see that the earliest OE example has the ϕ-inf, but the *to*-inf is not found until the sixteenth century.[10]

Concerning *thar(f)* derived from OE *þurfan*, as Mitchell & Robinson (2007[7]) suggest, *OED*[2] (s.v. *thar(f)*) states that this verb is "[o]bsolete except Scottish *dialect*. The ME. β-forms [= *thar*, etc.] had lost the *f* or *v*, apparently first in the 2nd singular present *þearft, þearft-tu, þer-tu*, leaving a stem *þar-, þer-, þor-, þur-* which was afterwards often confused with the *dar-, dor-, dur-* of DARE v^{1}", and gives the earliest example with the ϕ-inf in OE:

> (10) gif he gewitnesse hæbbe, ne *þearf* he þæt <u>geldan</u>
>   (c890-901, King ÆLFRED, *Legal Code of Ælfred the Great*,
>   Introduction, c. 28)

In addition, *MED* (s.v. *durren*) also writes that as to *durren*, "[i]n both meaning and form, there is much confusion with **thurven** [= *thar(f)*]" and presents its semantic development as follows:

(11)a. To have the courage (to do something), *dare*:   ?a1160∼

   b. To be under necessity or obligation; (one) *must* (do something),
      ought needs, should:
      —with negative, (one) need not (fear, blame, seek, say, etc.):
                                                                ?1200∼

   c. To be able (to do something):   c1350∼

As regards *need* which has inherited the semantic content of the
extinct *thar*(*f*), *OED²* (s.v. *need*) explains that the "*need* + *ϕ*-/*to*-inf"
construction signifies "[t]o be under a necessity or obligation to do
something", and the predominancy of co-occurring with the *to*-inf in
this construction is shown by the comment that "[i]n modern usage
the *to* is expressed except when the clause has the forms *it* (*he, I,*
etc.) *need not, (why) need (it,* etc.)?, or virtually equivalent to one of
these". The earliest examples for each infinitival form are as follows:

(12)a. More þan he *nediþ* <u>for to have</u>.
              (c1380, John WYCLIF, *Select English Works*, III, 348)

   b. The woman .. Cawkit ilk ʒett, that thai *neid* **nocht** <u>gang</u> by.
              (c1470, HENRY the Minstrel, *Wallace*,[11] VII, 414)

In (12a) we see a variant of the *to*-inf, that is, the *for to*-inf, which
was being frequently used in ME[12] and disappeared thoroughly in
Modern English (= ModE) except for some dialectal expressions. For
(12b), notice that the *ϕ*-inf occurs in a non-affirmative context in
the fifteenth century, which is to be crucial later.

   Finally, let us take a look at *ought*. Traugott & Dasher (2002: 11)
aptly explain the semantic change of *ought*; they write: "[i]n ME
ought (*to*) was the past tense form of both 'have/owe' and of the
obligation modal. Both the 'have/owe' and the modal senses were
derived from Late OE *ahte* 'have', but the original meaning of
possession was lost". We find, therefore, that *ought* is also one of the

preterite-present verbs. And Ono (1969: 203) claims that in the present-tense use, *ought* has the meaning "[a]m (is, are) bound or under obligation", and points out the following information obtained from the first edition of *OED*:

(13)a. *ought* + simple inf [= ϕ-inf]: a1220-1868
　　 b. *ought* + *to*-inf:　　　　c1175-1886

This clearly shows that the meaning the auxiliarily-functioned *ought* has, from the very beginning, starts with the *to*-inf. Ono (1969: 226) goes on to say that Chaucer in the fourteenth century rather intensively used the construction like (13a), and it is also not rare in Thomas More's writings in the fifteenth century, but in Shakespeare, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there is only one example with the ϕ-inf. At any rate, we find that the (13b) type had already firmly prevailed in later ME and early ModE periods.

　 With regard to the origin of the co-occurrence with the ϕ-inf, Tajima (1990: 236) speculates that there must have been an analogy with the behavior of *shall/should* which is semantically similar to *ought*, but concludes that the *to*-inf (including the *for to*-inf) is overwhelmingly more common than the ϕ-inf in late ME. And Fischer (1992: 405, fn. 33) ascribes the reason why the ϕ-inf co-occurred with *ought* (as well as *need* above) in ME to the usage of *ought* (*need*) as an "impersonal" verb, because, she writes, "impersonal verbs regularly took the bare infinitive (= ϕ-inf)".

　 From the above discussion in this section, we can find out some possible explanation at least for Question (8b) presented in section 2: "Why does (auxiliary) *ought* originally accompany the *to*-inf, not the ϕ-inf?"; the following fact seems to be crucial:

(14) Enne seðe *ahte* to geldanne [= had to pay]
                                (c950, *Lindisfarne Gospels*, Matthew, xviii, 24)

(14) is the earliest example of *owed* "was under obligation to pay" cited in *OED²*, where it also co-occurs with the *to*-inf, though *OED²* says that "for the following two centuries and a half, examples are wanting to show the passing of this into the simple *ahte* [= auxiliary *ought*]". As a matter of fact, the year of the earliest example of auxiliary *ought* cited in *OED²* is c1175 as shown in (13b). And also Traugott (1992: 242) points out that "[t]he inflected infinitive [= *to*-inf] was of relatively limited occurrence in verse and indeed is quite rare in the earlier OE prose. Nevertheless, a few verbs seem to have required the inflected infinitive from early times, e.g. *agan* 'to possess and have as a duty', *habban* 'to have'". It seems to be rather natural that we have these facts, because the action "to have (an obligation)" tends to have a directionality, which is best fitly shown by the preposition "to" plus an object. So it is not uncommon that when the direction of the obligation is an action, the inflected *to*-inf was used instead of the ϕ-inf, as seen in the quasi-modal auxiliary verb "have to" shows.

From these, we understand that in the two hundred years or so the formal/syntactic status of *ought* had changed from a lexical verb to an auxiliary one (i.e., a category change), but its semantic content was well preserved in it, which still required accompanying the former type of infinitive closely related to its semantic content. This, so to speak, "semantic attraction of syntactic forms" might be one of the explanations for the formal irregularity and marginality of the modal-auxiliary verb *ought*.

4. *Dare, Need,* and *Ought* in the Paston Letters

We conducted a statistical survey of the *"dare/need/ought +* infinitive" construction found in the Paston Letters (= PL), utilizing the concordance compiled by Uchioke (2004), which is based on 930 letters and documents written in CE 1425-1510 and edited by Norman Davis (2004[1971/76]).[13] Here we also expect to find colloquial speech styles as well as those typical of letters in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

4.1. *Dare*

The morphological variants of *dare* in the PL are: *dar, dare/ darenot* [found in the one-word form], *darre, durst,* and *durste,* which are all auxiliary forms. Lexical forms like *dareth, dares,* or *dared,* however, have never been met with. We, therefore, safely conclude that *dare,* in the PL, has not yet shifted to a lexical verb as *OED[2]* points out, but still remains an auxiliary one.

We will show the result of investigation in the following table, where "Afm." means affirmative contexts; "Neg.", negative contexts;[14] and "Infs", forms of the infinitive co-occurring with *dare* in the PL:

(15) Variants	Afm.	Neg.	Infs
dar	15	18	only ϕ-inf
dare	11	14	only ϕ-inf
darenot	—	2	only ϕ-inf
darre	3	0	only ϕ-inf
durst	7	22	ϕ-inf & *for to*-inf
durste	4	2	only ϕ-inf
TOTAL	40 [40.8%]	58 [59.2%]	

The above table reveals that in late ME, auxiliary *dare* was still frequently and vigorously used in affirmative contexts as well as in negative ones, which might tell something about Question (8a): "Why

is auxiliary *dare* attested in affirmative contexts?" The fact is that the PDE situation in which auxiliary *dare* functions in both affirmative and non-affirmative contexts can also be seen in late ME, though lexical *dare* had not yet emerged at all at that time. This means that auxiliary *dare*'s co-existence with lexical *dare* did not influence very much the occurrence of the former in affirmative contexts.

With the "*dare* + infinitive" construction, the earliest and the latest examples found in the PL corpus are:

> (16)a . þe seyd parlement at Leycestre *durst* **not, ne** yet **ne** *dar* **not,**
>   <u>rydyn</u> **ne** <u>go</u> abowte...   (c1426, 5, 148-49, WP1/MA)[15]
>   b . he *durste* **not** <u>meue</u> hym wyth it. (1489, 413, 14, WP3/JP3)

Though in (16a) the negative particle "ne" is still being used side by side with "not", this usage just seems to be characteristic of the letter #5 in c1426, in which we also have found (17) below, while in other letters and documents there is no such usage of "ne" with *dare* at all:

> (17) seruantz **ne** *durst* **not** at here fredom **nothyr** <u>goo</u> **ne** <u>ryde</u>
>   (c1426, 5, 35-36, WP1/MA)

In the PL, as understood from the table (15) above, it appears to be the rule for *dare* to function as a modal-auxiliary verb with the ϕ-inf; we have just one exception for it, though:

> (18) they seyd they *durst* **not** <u>for to take</u> vppon hem for to be
>   bonden,   (1465, 182, 12-13, MP/JP1)

Despite the fact that we find the ϕ-inf with quite a length of

intervening elements between *dare* and the infinitive in (17), and there is even a united verbal-negative complex, *darenot*, which accompanies the ϕ-inf in other examples; the hypothesis that the "not" can be an intervening element to adopt the ϕ-inf will not account for this irregularity in (18). This could be, therefore, one of the earliest lexicalized examples of auxiliary *dare*. It is, however, also true that even in the latest example (16b), we still see the ϕ-inf instead of prepositional infinitives. So it may be natural that in *The Canterbury Tales* which is supposed to have been composed in c1375-a1400, no prepositional infinitives with *dare* were attested, as was pointed out in Matsuse (1987: 43).

This might be called a kind of "counter-" grammaticalization: i.e., from auxiliary to lexical. But, why could this possibly take place? The development of the *to*-inf itself may be one of the reasons, as Los (2005) discusses it in detail. For example, in the group of causative verbs, native-origined ones such as *make* or *let*, from the very beginning, co-occur with the ϕ-inf, while one like *cause*, newly-joined in ME, takes the *to*-inf, which suggests that the functional regions of the ϕ-inf had already been to a large extent confined by the ME period principally because of the blurring of inflectional system in English. In connection with this, it is also likely that people felt that the semantic content of *dare* was rather special/marginal in comparison with those of authentic modal-auxiliary verbs like *must* or *can*. Thus there emerged an environment in which auxiliary *dare* could be (re)interpreted rather as lexical, not as auxiliary: hence the co-occurrence with the *to*-inf.

4.2. *Need* [& *Thar(f)*]

Before discussing *need*, here we should also briefly refer to *thar(f)/thurven* in the PL; we have just two examples of it:

(19)a . He *thare* <u>have</u> non excuse for defavte of leyser

$\qquad$ (1463, 172, 9-10, MP/JP1)

$\qquad$ b . ye *ther* <u>feere</u> as fore the sy3t of hem,

$\qquad$ (1465, 180, 113-4, MP/JP1)

From (19a) in particular, where the third-person-singular ending *-eth* is lack, we understand that *thar(f)* is functioned as an auxiliary verb in the PL. Accordingly, for it, we have found only the ϕ-inf, but not the *to*-inf.

The result of investigation is presented in the following table (20), where "Infs" means forms of the infinitive co-occurring with *need* in the PL; "Aux.", explicit auxiliary uses; "Lex.", explicit lexical uses; and "Amb.", ambiguous uses:

(20) Variants	Afm.	Neg.	Infs	Aux.	Lex.	Amb.
ned	0	2	only *to*-inf	0	0	2
nede	3	9	only *to*-inf	0	7	2
neede	0	2	only *to*-inf	0	1	1
nedid	0	1	only *to*-inf	—	1	—
nedis	0	1	only *to*-inf	—	1	—
nedith	0	2	only *to*-inf	—	2	—
nedyd	1	2	only *to*-inf	—	3	—
nedyth	1	4	*to*-inf & *for to*-inf	—	5	—
TOTAL	5 [17.9%]	23 [82.1%]		0	20	5

(21) a. ye shulde **not** *nede* <u>to drede</u> yow,

$\qquad$ (c1444, 432, 52, JGr/WP1)

$\qquad$ b. they *nede* **not** <u>to fere</u> them of ther payment

$\qquad$ (c1503, 845, 28, RC/JP3)

Explicitly lexical forms of *need* are easy to find, because they are either inflected like *nedith/nedis* or *dedid*, or used together with an auxiliary verb as seen in (21a). But we can not easily judge that *nede* in (21b) is "definitely" an auxiliary form, only in terms of the word

order "*nede* + not" which is specific to auxiliary verbs in PDE, because what we call "*do*-support" or "*do*-insertion" had not fully been established until the sixteenth century: hence we have the following:

(22) he **ne** *nedid* **not** <u>to haue</u> sent no spyes.

<div align="right">(c1452, 45, 48. JP1/RS)</div>

The past-tensed *nedid* is immediately followed by the negative particle "not" as "shulde" in (21a), not preceded by "did not" and also not changed to its root form "nede". The case in (21b) with no explicit inflection, therefore, is ambiguous between a lexical reading and an auxiliary one in connection with the negative particle "not".

Thus it may be safe to say that there was no "explicit" example of *need* with the ϕ-inf in the PL. And this fact at least tells us that its shift to an auxiliary verb might not have been well recognized in the Pastons yet, though the ϕ-inf was already able to be used with *need* in the fifteenth century, as shown in (12b) above.

The reason why the construction in which its ancestral *thar*(*f*) co-occurs with the ϕ-inf was not directly handed down to the "*need* + infinitive" construction may partly be explained also by the development of the *to*-inf in ME. By the time when *need* inherited the semantic content of *thar*(*f*) as a lexical verb, newly in ME, the *to*-inf had begun being predominantly and intensively used, unlike the time in which *thar*(*f*) was used.

The problem is why lexical *need* "had to" be grammaticalized into auxiliary *need*, especially in non-affirmative contexts (in BrE) (= Question (8a)); it may be regarded as a kind of "return" to the root shared with *thar*(*f*), both semantically and syntactically. One of the reasons for this is likely to be lexical *need*'s semantic similarity to

modal-auxiliary verbs like *must* or *should* which had firmly prevailed in ME. Then, why only in non-affirmative contexts? The latent lexicality of *need* might have required an intervening element between *need* and the infinitive following it (see (7) above), in order to realize the same situation where lexical *need* co-occurs with the *to*-inf (the "to" could be perceived enough as an intervening element in affirmative contexts). Thus, semantically speaking, chasing the ordinary and common modal-auxiliary verbs like *must* or *should, need* has obviously become modal-auxiliary, but syntactically speaking, this shift was not perfect: the co-occurrence with the ϕ-inf was severely limited to non-affirmative contexts that permit and (virtually) realize the elemental order for the "lexical *need* + infinitive" construction. And we understand, too, that it may be natural that this shift to a modal-auxiliary verb was encouraged only in BrE, probably because of the fact that the development of modal-auxiliary verbs took place more positively in BrE which had lost the traditional inflectional device for the present tense in the subjunctive mood than in AmE which still keeps it intact (Koma 1996: 64).[16]

4.3. *Ought*

While Tajima (1990) just took a look at some selected letters and documents in the Pastons, in this paper, utilizing Davis (2004[1971/76]), we investigated all 930 letters and documents. The result of investigation is shown in the following table, where "Infs" means forms of the infinitive co-occurring with *ought* in the PL:

(23)

Variants	Afm.	Neg.	Infs
aghte	1	0	only *to*-inf
oght	1	1	*to : for to* = 1 : 1
ought	20	3	ϕ : *to* = 8 : 15
oughtnot	—	1	only *to*-inf
owght	2	1	ϕ : *to* = 1: 2
owghte	2	0	only *to*-inf
TOTAL	26 [81.3%]	6 [18.7%]	

The examples for each infinitive are:

(24) a. ye wolde, and weell *aghte* <u>to, take</u> ther-in greet comffort
           (1474, 287, 5-6, JP2/JP3)
     b. they *oght* <u>for to pay</u> you,   (1465, 182, 8, MP/JP1)
     c. whate *ought* <u>be</u> doon there-ynne,   (1455, 523, 7, SJF/JP1)

(24c) is considered to be a definite example of *ought* accompanying the ϕ-inf, while the occurrence of the ϕ-inf in (25) below could probably be ascribed to the juxtaposition with "sholde" which requires the ϕ-inf, though the same kind of juxtaposition in (24a) allows *ought* to have the infinitive marker:

(25) þe goode rewle and mesure þat ȝe *owght* and **sholde** <u>haue</u> yn
     þe despociscion   (1464, 694, 31-32, UN/JP1)

In any case, we have found only nine examples which co-occur with the ϕ-inf, out of 32 "*ought* + infinitive" constructions in total; they account for 28.1 percent:[17]

(26)

Infs	Afm.	Neg.	TOTAL
ϕ-inf	8	1	9 [28.1%]
to-inf (*for to*-inf)	18	5	23 [71.9%]
TOTAL	26	6	32 [100%]

That the ratio of the ϕ-inf to the (*for*) *to*-inf is approximately three to seven seems to show that the use of the latter is predominant. And it is also evident from (26) that in the PL, the environment in which the ϕ-inf is favored is considered to be affirmative contexts rather than non-affirmative ones, unlike the tendency for *ought* found in PDE. The "intervening element" hypothesis applied to the "*dare* + infinitive" construction, however, this time, does not seem to account for the appearance of the ϕ-inf in this construction, because just two out of eight examples have some intervening elements between *ought* and the ϕ-inf as in (27):

> (27) who *ought* **more** <u>halde</u> wyth me yn reson
> (1460, 888, 22, WWr/JB)

Thus these facts tell us that in the fifteenth century, at least in the PL, it was basically the rule for the "*ought* + infinitive" construction to favor the *to*-inf, but the ϕ-inf used for it was also not rare, whether it is in non-affirmative or affirmative contexts. The overall picture is, therefore, that as shown in the above (13), with this construction, the two kinds of infinitives co-existed from the thirteenth century onward until now.

The problem is, then, why the co-existence of these infinitives was possible for *ought* as a modal-auxiliary verb. Concerning the reason why *ought* failed to join the "core" modal-auxiliary verbs like *must* or *can*, Nordlinger & Traugott (1997: 307, fn. 13) mention the following two points: (1) "its [= *ought's*] semantics which was tied to *advisability* rather than prototypical deonticity" (cf. (4) above) and (2) "the lack of epistemic meaning *until the nineteenth century*" (emphases added). It is conceivable enough that its semantic peculiarity and its mono-barreled semantic structure that lasted long

may have hindered *ought* becoming truly modal-auxiliary in the course of its development. So we may be able to say that this "imperfect auxiliariness" of *ought* caused it to have the indeterminacy of the infinitive for it, though it has always predominantly co-occurred with prepositional infinitives closely related to and semantically attracted by its former lexicality.

Next, the recently remarkable tendency of *ought*'s co-occurring with the ϕ-inf (or deleting the infinitive marker *to* from the *to*-inf), especially in non-affirmative contexts (and in AmE) (= Question (8c)) as in (28), should be discussed here:

(28) (= (3)) a. *Ought*n't we (to) ring up the police?
b. You *ought* not (to) smoke so much.

The "intervening element" hypothesis could account for this case, too. The inverted subject and the negative particle "not" can be an intervening element to make an environment in which the ϕ-inf is likely to occur. Another reason could have something to do with the pronunciation:

(29) a. He *ought/oughtn't* to go.
b. He *oughta/oughtn'ta* go.

That is, the phonological reduction of "*ought*(n't) to /ɔːt(nt) tuː/" to /ɔːtə/ or /ɔːtn(t)ə/ which can visually be shown in (29b). The infinitive marker *to* tends to be phonologically absorbed into and amalgamated with *ought* when it is pronounced in ordinary speeches, because it has no primary stress and begins with the same sound as the last sound of *ought* it follows. At first sight, in non-affirmative contexts, this reduction seems to function to help the use of the *to*-inf rather than the ϕ-inf, because it could lower the status of "not" as

an intervening element. But here the fact is that in spite of the reduction of "not", the infinitive marker of the *to*-inf would be reduced so that it can be integrated into the auxiliary verb. So even if the power of "not" could be weaker as an intervening element, it is hard to presume that the marker in its full form, i.e., /tu:/, instead, would newly get the status of an intervening element; but rather it would behave invariably as the weak form seen in affirmative contexts, namely /tə/ in /ɔ:tə/. We conclude, therefore, that we can say that the φ-inf (or the *to*-inf without *to*) does appear not only in non-affirmative contexts where we can well perceive the overt existence of an intervening element, but in fact in affirmative contexts as well; in the latter contexts, the infinitive marker *to* is integrated into *ought* and felt as if they were one word, which native speakers of English just do not notice, because it is a very natural and ordinary practice to pronounce that way. And the pronunciation characteristic of AmE like /ɔ:ʃə/ may contribute to the way in which Americans subconsciously take the *to*-inf for the φ-inf in affirmative contexts, and probably this phonological treatment also creates the use of the φ-inf in non-affirmative contexts, amplified with the help of the intervening elements in them.

5. Summary and Conclusion

We have seen the lexical and auxiliary behaviors of *dare, need,* and *ought* in the history of English, especially focusing on the situation of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in terms of the Paston Letters as an example.

The findings from the present survey of the Paston Letters are:

> (30)a. Auxiliary *dare* seems to be the rule in the Paston Letters,
> but one example of lexical *dare* has been met with, though

> *OED*² cites the earliest example of the latter only from the sixteenth-century data.
>
> b. Only lexical *need* was found in the Paston Letters; it seems that the Pastons had not yet recognized auxiliary *need* even in non-affirmative contexts, despite in other late ME corpora auxiliary *need* was already not rare.
>
> c. Tajima (1990) did not report the ϕ-inf in his corpus of the Paston Letters, but we this time did find nine examples of it, though the predominant use of the *to*-inf was also confirmed.

With regard to Questions (8a)-(8c) presented in section 2, the keywords to solve them seem to be: (1) intervening elements between modal-auxiliary verbs and the infinitive, (2) functional extension of the *to*-inf, (3) semantic attraction of specific syntactic forms, (4) imperfect auxiliariness, and (5) phonological reduction and its washback· effect.

The fact that the ordinary direction of grammaticalization "from lexical to auxiliary" is found with *need* and *ought*, but not with *dare* (we do have a slight tendency as seen in (1a), though) should be further discussed. And *ought* also may have, in a sense, some remnants of lexicality, when it is used in a negative context like "**shouldn't** *ought* to", even though it is not acknowledged as the standard use (see foot note 7).

Are they lexical or auxiliary? Verbs like *dare, need,* and *ought* have all the more important issues for the study of grammaticalization because of their marginality.

Notes

*   In commemoration of Professor Morio Nishikawa's retirement from Kumamoto University, who had been the president of *The English Literary Society of Kumamoto* in the academic years 2005-2008

1 . Traugott & Dasher (2002: 107) use the term "quasi-auxiliaries" instead of "marginal" for *ought,* but Griffiths (2006: 111) classifies it under the category of "main/core" auxiliaries.

2 . Since the optionality of the infinitive marker *to* is one of the major issues in historical linguistics, discussions about it can be found elsewhere. For example, Iyeiri (2007: 94) refers to the verb *help*:

(i) to *help* him (to) deal with his concerns

She claims that this phenomenon is caused by the difference between the use in AmE and that in BrE rather than by some semantic "indirectness" of *to* which *TUGED* (s.v. *help*) suggests, but Declerck (1991: 488) also points out the semantic constraint that "*to* is not normally omitted if *help* does not have its most literal meaning" (cf. Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1244) and gives the following examples:

(ii) a. Jill *helped* me (to) lay the table.

   [= Jill was one of the persons performing the action.]

   b. The BBC commentary *helped* us to see the gravity of the situation.

   [= The commentary is not one of those that see the gravity of the situation.]

Concerning *help*, not only in the above, what we call, "accusative with infinitive" construction, but in the "*help* + infinitiv(al object)" construction as well, we often witness the ϕ-inf instead of the *to*-inf, which we may say is characteristic of the "modal-auxiliary verb + ϕ-inf" construction, as in:

(iii) ..., which eventually **should** *help* revive the ailing economy,

                              (*The Daily Yomiuri*, Nov. 20, 2008)

The crucial point here is that the auxiliarily-functioned *help*, which is shown by the co-occurrence with the ϕ-inf, appears side by side with a genuine auxiliary verb *should* (see also (1a) above with *dare*). We may say that this *help* lies between a lexical verb and an auxiliary verb.

3 . D. W. Lightfoot, *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. Cited by Fischer (2007).

4 . Both Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 110) and *TUGED* (s.v. *dare*) point out the optionality of the infinitive marker *to* in implicitly negative contexts, too:

(iv) a. Few of them *dare/dared* (to) stand up to him.

   b. I hardly *dare* (to) breathe for fear of making an error.

5 . With lexical *dare* and *need*, *TUGED* (s.v. *dare & need*) says, their progressive forms cannot usually be allowed.

6 . The examples in (3) are taken from T. Konishi, (ed.), *Genius English-Japanese Dictionary*, 4th edition, (Tokyo: Taishu-kan, 2006).

7 . But *TUGED* (s.v. *ought*) also refers to such uses of "lexical *ought*" in non-affirmative contexts as "didn't/hadn't/shouldn't *ought* to" or "Did/Didn't you *ought* to...?", among which only "hadn't/shouldn't *ought* to" is regarded as "non-standard"; the others are just colloquial. And the expression "shouldn't *ought* to" seems to be commonly used in AmE (in personal communication with Professor Judy Yoneoka of Kumamoto Gakuen University who comes from California).

Terasawa (2008: 195) also notes that it is possible to use the following type of tag question (vb) in place of (va):

(v) a. We *ought* to go there, *oughtn't* we?
   b. We *ought* to go there, **shouldn't** we?

8 . The northern situation is explained as follows: "[t]he northern dialects retain 'he dare, he durst', and writers of northern extraction favour their retention in literary English when followed by the simple infinitive without *to* [= ϕ -inf]".

In the descriptions cited from *OED²*, various kinds of abbreviations are almost all recovered in this paper.

9 . *A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon.*

10. As for the construction with the *to*-inf, *OED²* adds that "the 3rd singular is now *dares* and the past tense *dared*; but *durst to* was formerly used. 'None dared to speak', is *more emphatic* than 'none durst speak'" (emphasis added).

11. *The Actis and Dedis of the Illustere and Vailʒeand Campioun Schir William Wallace.*

12. As regards Chaucer's use of the *for to*-inf, Horobin (2007: 117) writes that "this variation [= the *to*-inf or the *for to*-inf] may also be manipulated for *metrical effect*" (emphasis added).

13. Beadle & Richmond (2005) have edited other documents related to the Pastons (document numbers 931-1051), but the present survey do not include them.

14. As the present PL corpus does not have any examples of the three verbs in interrogative contexts, we use the term "Neg." instead of "Non-Afm." for the ensuing tables.

15. Information as to each letter in the PL is shown in the round brackets in the following order: (1) the year it was written, (2) the number given for edited letters and documents, (3) line(s) in the edition, and (4) from whom [the left side of the slash] to whom [the right side of the slash] it was sent. And the abbreviations for senders and receivers are as follows:

WP1: William Paston I, **MA**: memorandum to Arbitrators, **WP3**: William Paston III, **JP3**: John Paston III, **MP**: Margaret Paston, **JP1**: John Paston I, **JGr**: James Gresham, **RC**: Richard Calle, **RS**: Richard Southwell, **JP2**: John Paston II, **SJF**: Sir John Fastolf, **UN**: unidentified, **WWr**: William Worcester, & **JB**: John Berney.

16. Los (2005: 300) claims that in OE, the functional shrinking of the subjunctive clauses was brought about by the competition with the *to*-inf, saying: "the *to* -infinitive was at first analysed as equivalent to the optative subjunctive, and started to occur with discourse subjunctive (reported speech) only at a later stage". This suggests that not only modal-auxiliary verbs, but also the functional field of the *to*-inf was enlarged at the cost of that of the subjunctive clauses in the course of time.

17. Tajima (1990: 235) has found 12 examples of *ought* in his corpus of the selected PL, among which 11 have prepositional infinitives (= the *to*-inf & the *for to*-inf), and no example with the φ-inf is attested.

   Matsuse (1987: 43-44) reported that in *The Canterbury Tales*, 39 examples with the φ-inf were met with, out of 50 "*ought* + infinitive" constructions, which occupy 78 percent. Also Matsuse (1996: 70) has found 7 examples with the φ-inf out of 22 in *The Secrete of Secretes* composed in a1500 (about 32 percent). Setting aside Chaucer's extraordinary use of the φ-inf in the fourteenth century, we confirm that at least in the fifteenth century, the φ-inf is not rare in the "*ought* + infinitive" construction, as Ono (1969) points out.

References

Ando, S. 2007[2003]. Four chapters for the history of the English language, pp. 181-192 of *Eibumpo-o Saguru*. Tokyo: Kaitaku-sha.

Beadle, R. & Richmond, C. (eds.) 2005. *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*. Part III. Early English Text Society, S.S., 20. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Biber, D. et al. (eds.) 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson.

Davis, N. 2004[1971/76]. *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*. Parts I & II. Early English Text Society, S.S., 20. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Declerck, R. 1991. *A Comprehensive Descriptive Grammar of English*. Tokyo: Kaitaku-sha.

Fischer, O. 1992. (Middle English) syntax, pp. 207-408 of *The Cambridge History of the English Language,* vol. II, 1066-1476, ed. by N. Blake. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Fischer, O. 2007. *Morphosyntactic Change*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Griffiths, P. 2006. *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.

Horobin, S. 2007. *Chaucer's Language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the ·English*

Language. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Iyeiri, Y. 2007. *A Basic Guide to the History of the English Language*. Tokyo: Hitsuji-shobo.

Koma, O. 1996. *Fundamentals of Historical English Linguistics*. Tokyo: Hitsuji-shobo.

Konishi, T. & Minamide, Y. (eds.) 2001. *Taishukan's Unabridged Genius English-Japanese Dictionary*. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Kurath, H. et al. (eds.) 1956-2001. *The Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: The Univ. of Michigan Press.

Leech, G. N. 1987. *Meaning and the English Verb*. 2nd edition. Harlow: Longman.

Los, B. 2005. *The Rise of the To-Infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Matsuse. K. 1987. *On the Use of the Infinitive in* The Canterbury Tales. Unpublished MA thesis submitted to Kyushu University.

Matsuse, K. 1996. Some morpho-syntactic phenomena in the fifteenth century prose versions of the *Secreta Secretorum. Kumamoto Studies in English Language and Literature,* 39, 67-85.

Mitchell, B. & Robinson, F. C. 2007. *A Guide to Old English*. 7th edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Murray, J. A. H. et al. (eds.) Prepared by J. A. Simpson & E. S. C. Weiner. 1989. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mustanoja, T. F. 1960. *A Middle English Syntax*. Part I. *Parts of Speech*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.

Nordlinger, R. & Traugott, E. C. 1997. Scope and the development of epistemic modality: evidence from *ought to. English Language and Linguistics*, 1 (2), 295-317.

Ono, S. 1969. *The Development of the English Modal Auxiliaries*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Tajima, M. 1989. The development of the modal auxiliary *ought* in late ME, pp. 227-248 of *Studies in English Philology in Honor of Shigeru Ono,* ed. by K. Jin et al. Tokyo: Nan'un-do.

Terasawa, J. 2008. *Changing English: The Stories from the Past to the Future*. Tokyo: Chuokoron-shinsha.

Traugott, E. C. 1992. (Old English) syntax, pp. 168-289 of *The Cambridge History of the English Language,* vol. I, *The Beginnings to 1066,* ed. by R. M. Hogg. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Traugott, E. C. & Dasher, R. B. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Uchioke, S. (ed.) 2004. *A Concordance to Paston Letters*. CD-ROM edition. Okayama: Daigaku-kyoiku Shuppan.