University of Sarajevo

Faculty of Philosophy

English Department

Master thesis:

Subject–auxiliary inversion after initial adverbials in the Hansard Corpus: Late stages of a change in English grammar /

Inverzija subjekta i pomoćnog glagola nakon adverbijala na početnoj poziciji u korpusu Hansard: Kasne faze jedne promjene u engleskoj gramatici

Student: Supervisor:

Nerma Adžemović   doc.dr. Nataša Stojaković

Sarajevo, 2021

Table of Contents:

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

By the 18th century, the English language had undergone major changes that shaped it into the language we know today. Changes that occurred until that time include the word order patterns. This paper will be dealing with the pattern according to which the finite verb comes second if there is an adverbial at the beginning of the sentence and the rest of the sentence elements follow the verb.

In the period of Old English (OE, c.450-1100), the pattern was present with the main verb without the category of auxiliary verbs, because that category had not been formed yet. This pattern remained until Modern English (ModE 1500-present day) with some adverbials which Denison calls "negative or semi-negative" (Denison, 1998, p.235), as shown by the following examples:

1) *Scarcely have I* had time to vent half the malice of my tenderness. (1786 Cowley, School for Greybeards II, as cited in Denison, 1998, p. 236)
2) *Not even now will I* mention a word of my affairs – (1819 Keats, Letters, as cited in Denison, 1998, p. 236)

Negative adverbials in these declarative sentences trigger the subject-auxiliary inversion (SAI), and, as Denison mentions, they are the vestige of the old Verb-Second rule. (Denison, 1998, p. 236).

Grammaticalised word order in Present-day English interprets the position of the NP before the verb as subject marking, while the reversal of the subject and the verb is called inversion, and it is a deviation from the norm. There are two types of inversion: subject-auxiliary inversion (SAI) – mentioned above, and full inversion (FI). This paper will be focused on the first type – SAI.

These two types of inversion are defined by whether the finite part or the entire VP precedes the subject. The difference is shown bellow:

3) Never before had a cat been in this house. (SAI)

4) Under the chair lies a cat. (FI) (Dorgeloh, 1997, p. 2)

The goal of this paper will be to establish how often the pattern where the subject and the finite verb are inverted with different initial adverbials is actually present in the recent history of the English language. The paper will also try to find the factors which influence the use of inversion, especially in the case of adverbials other than negative or near-negative.

The corpus used for this research is Hansard, the transcripts of Parliamentary debates in Great Britain. It is available on the Internet and it covers the period from 1803 to 2005.

Subject-auxiliary inversion is described as "elevated tone" (Denison, 1998, p. 236). Since the debates are formal in style, it is expected that inversion is used quite often in this type of text.

The paper will be divided into five chapters. Chapter one is the introduction of the topic. Chapter two will be dealing with a brief historical background of this structure in the English language, starting from the period of OE. In the third chapter, the period of Late Modern English (LModE, 1700-1900) and Present-day English (1900-today) will be discussed in detail, while the preliminaries will be introduced in Chapter four. Chapter five presents an analysis of examples with different adverbials. Last chapter is the concluding chapter.

Chapter 2

Brief historical overview

The Present-day English language (PdE, 1900-today) has a fixed word order. The elements of the sentence are organised in an order that expresses the grammatical relations in the sentence. In sentences that are declarative in force, it is a common characteristic that the subject precedes the verb even if another element preceding both of them is present. In this, English fairly differs from a number of other Germanic languages, such as German or Norwegian. The position of a finite verb in Modern Norwegian is second position in the clause, so languages of this type are known as V2 languages, or verb-second. These mentioned languages usually have an inversion of subject and verb in declarative clauses and they can begin with any type of element other than the subject. (Bækken, 1998, p. 2)

The sentence below is an example from Modern Norwegian:

5) Om morgenen, før jeg stod opp, gikk han.
   In the morning, before I got up, left he (Bækken,1998, p.8)

PdE is an SVO (subject,verb,object) language. This pattern is also known as the V3 or the verb-third pattern. It is important to say that this term cannot be used with certainty because in this case, the subject precedes the verb, and we already mentioned that the declarative clause can start with an element other than the subject itself. (Bækken,1998, p.2.)

There are several types of initial elements in the English language, so before we continue with this topic, we need to mention the rest of them. (Bækken, 1998, p.61):

       Direct and indirect objects

       Subject and object predicative

       One or more adverbials

       Non-finite verb forms

       Adjectives

This paper will use the abbreviation XVS for the pattern where an adverbial precedes the verb.

2.1. Old English

If we go back to the period of the Anglo-Saxon settlement in the Isles, we go back to the period of OE. The period covers the time from the fifth century until the Norman conquest that happened in 1066 with the famous Battle of Hastings. The situation with the English language back then was quite different when compared to the situation we have nowadays.

There are two main types of languages: analytic and synthetic. The analytic type of language, such as Chinese, uses very few bound morphemes (sufixes and prefixes) to express the relations within a sentence, while the synthetic type of language (Turkish and Inuit languages) combines large numbers of bound morphemes to form a single word. In the course of history, English shifted to an analytic type of language. (Barber, Beal, Shaw, 2009, p.26-27)

OE was a synthetic type of language and it gradually developed into an analytic type.

Traugott (1992, p.170) describes word order in OE as "organised according to two main principles: In main clauses the verb is typically in non-final position. In subordinate clauses, the verb is typically in final position."

Here is an instance of verb-final subordinate clause followed by a verb-non-final main clause:

6) Ða ic ða ðis eall gemunde, ða gemunde
   When I then this all remembered, then remembered
   ic eac hu ic geseah…
   I also how I saw… (Traugott, 1992, p.170)

It is important to mention that these word orders were not consistently followed.

OE did not have auxiliary *do*, so the questions and negative sentences were different.

7) Hwæt getacniaþ ðonne ða twelf oxan…?
   What signify then those twelve oxen…? (Traugott, 1992, p.170)

Multiple negation (or negative concord) was also used in the period of OE:

8) ne bið ðær nænig ealo gebrowen mid Estum
   not is there no ale brewed among Ests (Traugott, 1992, p.170)

8

Grammatical subject was not obligatory.

9) and him (DAT) ðæs (GEN) sceamode
and to him of that shamed (Traugott, 1992, p.170)

The use of subordinating particle þe was common:

10) Ohthere sæde þæt sio sci hatte Halgoland þe he on bude
Ohthere said that that shire was-called Halgoland PT he in lived (Traugott, 1992, p.171)

OE had two morphological markers for tense: past and non-past. In Ælfric's *Grammar*, there are instances where he uses adverbs instead of periphrastic constructions in order to differentiate tenses. (Traugott, 1992, p.180-181)

11) ...PRAESENS TEMPVS ys andwerd tid: *sto*, ic stande;
...PRAESENS TEMPVS is present tense: *sto*, I stand;
PRAETERITUM TEMPVS ys forðgewiten tid: *steti,* ic stod
PRAETERITUM TEMPVS is past time: I stood*;*
FVTVRVM TEMPUS is towerd tid: *stabo*, ic stande nu
FUTURUM TEMPVS is future time: *stabo*, I stand now
rihte oðð e on sumne timan ... PRAETERITVM
straightaway or at some time... PRAETERITVM
IMPERFECTUM, þæt is unfulfremed forðgewiten,
IMPERFECTUM, that is unfinished past,
swilce þæt ðing beo ongunnen and ne beo
such that thing may-be begun and not may-be
fuldon: *stabam*, ic stod. PRAETERITUM
completed: *stabam,* I stood. PRAETERITUM
PERFECTVM ys forðgewiten fulfremed: *steti*, ic stod fullice.
PERFECTVM is past completed: *steti*, I stood to-the-end
PRAETERITVM PLVSQVAMPERFECTVM is forðgewiten
PRAETERITVM PLVSQVAMPERFECTVM is past mare, þonne fulfremed, forðan ðe
hit was gefyrn gedon:
more than completed, for-that PT it was long-ago done:

9

steteram, ic stod gefyrn.

Steteram, I stood long-ago (Traugott, 1992, p.181)

Non-past tense referred to the present ("now"):

12) Ic Beda... sende gretan ðone leofasten cyning

I Bede...   send to-greet that most-beloved king

Ceolwulf, & ic ðe sende þæt spell…

Ceolwulf, and I to-thee send that narrative... (Traugott, 1992, p.181)

Non-past tense could also refer to timeless present, habitual action, and the future. Such instances will be shown in sentences below:

13) He sæde þeah þæt þat land sie (SUBJ) swipe

He said however that that land is very

Lange nortþ þonnan

far north from-there

He said, however, that the land runs very far north from there. (Traugott, 1992, p.182)

14) ... & ic arise of deaðe on þam þriddan dæge

...and I will-arise from death on that third day (Traugott, 1992, p.182)

The marker for past tense is used to refer to past time:

15) Fæder min, se tima com

Father mine, that time came (Traugott, 1992, p.183)

As was mentioned above, OE used adverbs to differentiate tenses. What about auxiliary verbs? Auxiliary verbs were present in the period of OE as cognates with PdE auxiliary verbs, but they behaved as main verbs which also had some characteristics of PdE auxiliaries. These auxiliaries were used to express tense, aspect and modality along with their full lexical meaning of possession, existence, ability etc.

Traugott (1992, p.186) states that "the most notable among them were the *BE*-verbs (*beon*, *wesan*, *weorþan*), *habban*, *willan*, **motan*, **sculan*, *magan* and *cunnan*."

Beon, *wesan* and *weorþan* were used in the V-*ende* construction. That is an expanded form of the verb that indicated the ongoing action or provided a frame of reference for some other activity. The BE+*ende* construction was restricted to activity verbs (verbs of doing rather than verbs of being). Some of these OE constructions (not all) can be translated by the PdE BE+*ing* construction, and that is the reason why these two constructions (BE+*ende* and BE+*ing*) are not exactly equivalent.

BE+ende was used with verbs such as *wunian* "live", *faran* "go", *feohtan* "fight", *libban* "live", *cweþan* "speak", and *growan* "grow". This construction signalled an action that continued through a limited period of time. (Traugott, 1992, p.187)

Sentences below show the use of the BE+ende construction:

16) … þæt scip wæs ealne weg yrnende under segle

...that ship was all waygoing under sail

17) Petrus wearð æfterweard þus cweðende

Peter was afterward afterward thus saying (Traugott, 1992, p.187)

When it comes to pluperfect and the semantic perfect in the period of OE, we can say that they were depicted by the simple past. For instance, the word from Latin, that is in perfect "*peccavi*" (I have sinned) could be interpreted by the simple past as "*fader, ic syngod*" (father, I sinned / have sinned). Terms such as *fullice* (fully) and *fulfremed* (fulfilled) were used in Ælfric's *Grammar* to help differentiate Latin perfect from the imperfect. (Traugott, 1992, p.190)

There was one phrasal construction with a verb in past participle form that involved *habban* "to have" with a main verb. If this past participle modified an accusative object, it could be inflected for case, number and gender, but it could never be inflected with objects in genitive or dative, prepositional phrases or complements that functioned as objects. These inflected constructions were never predominant in the period of OE. (Traugott, 1992, p.190)

We mentioned before that the word order in the period of OE was organised according to two rules, so now is the time to say something more on that topic. There were various types of word order patterns that co-existed in the period of OE.

Traugott (1992, p.273) supports the observations made by Greenberg (1966) and Hawkins (1983) about word order in the languages of the world. According to these observations there are essentially two patterns of word order: verb-final and verb non-final.

A language of one type may change and become a language of the other type, and patterns of different types may co-exist. In such cases, the change will usually occur in main clauses before it occurs in subordinate clauses.

Verb-final pattern**s** usually follow Modifier-Head sequence (*I John saw*). Possessor-Head sequence (*the cat's tail*) is a frequent pattern of that type**.** If these patterns dominate in a particular language, that language is usually postpositional or has case inflections. In the second pattern, the sequences are Head-Modifier (*then saw I him, I saw him*) and Head-Possessor (*the tail of the cat*). Languages where these patterns are prevailing are typically prepositional. (Traugott, 1992, p.273)

The instances below show the main typological contrasts:

Verb-final	Verb non-final
OV him saw	VO saw him
V Auxil gone have	Auxil V have gone
AN young thief	NA thief young
Dem N that woman	N Dem woman that
Poss N bird's feather	N Poss feather of bird
N + Case bird's	Prep N of bird, in London
N Post London in	

The word order pattern that was predominant in most subordinate clauses in the period of OE, was V2 (verb-second), or verb-final, unlike the PdE, which is mainly verb non-final. For example, this pattern was typically present in clauses (subordinate clauses; main clauses could

contain other word patterns) with pronominal adverbs of locative origin such as *þær* (there), *þa* (then), *na* (not at all, never)*, ne* (not) as shown below:

18) ða eode se biscop into þære oþere cyrcan þær se martyr inne læig

then went that bishop into that other church where that martyr inside lay… (Traugott, 1992, p.267)

19) Ne sind we na Abrahames cynnes flæsclice, ac gastlice

Not are we not Abraham's of-kin physically, but spiritually (Traugott, 1992, p.270)

According to Stockwell (as cited in Dorgeloh, 1997, p.30) the V2 rule is characterised as an optional rule, not entirely gramaticalised.

Schmidt (as cited in Dorgeloh, 1997, p.30) adds that the V2 rule is almost obligatory after *þa* and *ne*.

V2 rule was also present in either SVO or XVS sentence patterns.

Traugott (1992, p. 275) describes V2 as "the placement of finite (i.e. tensed) verbs following an initial constituent, typically an adverb."

This pattern is not concerned with the number of words that precede the finite verb but rather with the number of constituents. In the following example, the initial constituent is an adverbial phrase that has its dependent clause:

20) On þæs caseres dagum þe wæs gehaten Licinius wearð

In that emperor's days PT was called Licinius was

astyred mycel ehtnys ofer þa Cristenan

stirred-up much persecution over those Christians (Traugott, 1992, p.275)

This sentence also demonstrates that V2 is not connected to subject position in a clause. Subject can precede and follow V2.

Another thing that is important when it comes to the word order in OE is the placement of light forms (mostly adverbial or pronominal). These forms typically occupied initial position in a

clause while the heavy ones (complex phrases and subordinate clauses) were clause final. This preference is a remnant from the earlier period when pronominal adverbs such as *her* and *þa* typically triggered V2. (Traugott, 1992, p.276)

The fact that OE preferred heavy forms clause final influenced the word order – OV was not in constant use in subordinate clauses. If the verb final order were consistent, we would expect the finite verb to occur clause final (including after prepositional phrases), but there were instances when a prepositional phrase would appear at the end of the clause:

21) Ða he þiderweard seglode fram Sciringes heale, þa wæs

   When he thither sailed from Skiringssalr then

   Him on þaet bæcbord Denamearc

   to-him on that larboard Denmark (Traugott, 1992, p.277)

OE set the foundations for a number of changes in the syntax of the next period, which this paper is about to cover.

2.2. Middle English

The transitional period from 1100 to 1500 is known as the period of Middle English (ME, 1100-1500). It is transitional in terms of changes that took place in the structure of English. In the period of OE, the syntax was relatively stable, while in the period of ME the change was obvious.

The word order became more strict – which is a consequence of the shift towards the analytic type of language.

The language of this period relied more on periphrastic constructions such as constructions with auxiliary verbs and prepositional phrases. (Fischer, 1992, p.207)

As was mentioned before, word order in the period of ME was more strict – subject and object functions could be distinguished by their positions in the sentence: immediately before and after the verb. Verbs in OE could take arguments in the genitive, dative or accusative, but this was

reduced to just one case that is usually termed as oblique case for the period of ME. (Fischer, 1992, p. 233-234)

Many verbs occurred with the oblique case as well as a prepositional phrase. In the early texts, for example, the preposition that was used as a replacement for the genitive case was *of*, while other prepositions appeared later on. (Fischer, 1992, p. 234)

In the period of ME, predicates that in OE had zero arguments appear with the subject position almost always filled by a so-called dummy *(h)it*. In OE, they would occasionally occur without a syntactic subject.

22) Now it shyneth, now it reyneth faste, (Fischer, 1992, p. 234)

As the subject became more or less obligatory in ME due to the fixed SVO order, the dummy *(h)it* became more frequent towards the end of the period. In the SVO word order, the subject comes first, so there was a change in impersonal constructions as well. OE used sentences such as:

23) Þam cynge (dat.) licodon (pl.) peran (nom.)
    To the king   liked   pears

This changed in the period of ME to:

24) the king (subj.) liked (sg.) pears (obj.) (Fischer, 1992, p.235)

ME had two morphological tense categories for non-past and past. Periphrastic constructions such as perfect, pluperfect and future were also used in the tense and aspect system of the period. Non-past was used to express general truths and repated, habitual actions (same as in the period of OE).

25) Eft me seið & soð hit is, þet a muche win *alið* wið alute rein, ant te sunne þrefter *schine*
    þe schenre
    'Often people say, and true it is, that a strong wind subsides with a
    little rain, and the sun shines the more brightly afterwards.'   (Fischer, 1992, p.240)

26) Fro Ethiope men *gon* into ynde be manye dyuerse contreyes... (Fischer, 1992, p.240)

Non-past covered the function of the progressive in PdE:

27) Thow *walkest* now in Thebes at thy large, /And of my wo thow
yevest litel charge. (Fischer, 1992, p.240)

28) 'What! Alison! Herestow nat Absolon, /That *chaunteth* thus under
oure boures wal?'   (Fischer, 1992, p.240)

Future was still expressed by non-past:

29) And wel I woot, as ye goon by the weye, /Ye *shapen* yow to talen
and to pleye; (Fischer, 1992, p.241)

30) And whase wilenn shall þiss boc efft oþerr siþe writtenn, / Himm
bidde icc þatt het *write* rihht, swa summ þiss boc himm tæcheþþ.

'And whoever shall wish to copy this book at some other time, him I ask that he copies it
correctly, just as this book shows him.' (Fischer, 1992, p.241)

Non-past was used in adverbial clauses with refrerence to the future:

31) For after this I hope ther cometh moore (Fischer, 1992, p.241)

Mustanoja (1960) and Visser (1963) give some instances "that show that forms of the verb *be*
still regularly express futurity as they did in Old English." (Fischer, 1992, p.241)

32) ... vor ase softe ase he is her, ase herd he *bið* ðer, and ase milde ase he is nu her, ase
sturne he *bið* þer.

'... for as soft as He is here, as hard He will be there, and as mild as He
is now here, as stern He will be there.' (Fischer, 1992, p.241)

Non-past was still used to specify that an action that had origins in the past was relevant in the
present, which is typically expressed with the perfect:

33) Considered this, that ye thise monthes tweyne/ Han taried, ther ye

seyden, soth to seyne, / But dayes ten ye nolde in oost sojourne - /

But in two monthes yet ye nat *retourne*.

'When one considers this, that you have tarried for [the past] two months, whereas you said, truly, that you would only stay ten days with the host, but yet in these two months you return not [you have not returned].'   (Troilus as cited in Fischer, 1992, p.242)

The second tense was past tense used to express actions that were completed in the past. It was common in a narrative context along with past-time adverbials:

34) And ȝee schull vndirstonde... þat myn hom comynge I cam to

Rome & schewed my lif to oure holy fadir the Pope & was assoylled of all þat lay in my

conscience... (Mandev as cited in Fischer, 1992, p.245)

In the ME period, past tense could stand side by side with perfect forms. The past within the past was expressed by preterite and pluperfect.

When we started talking about the period of ME, we briefly mentioned periphrastic constructions. Their use increased in this period, especially the perfect and future-tense. The auxiliary *do* has its roots in this period along with the periphrasis with the aspectual verb *ginnen* (this construction was not present in the period of OE). (Fischer, 1992, p.250)

The inverted patterns were common in the period of ME probably because the change in basic word order did not cause problems in syntax. Verb second persisted longer than the SOV pattern. When SV became the standard pattern in most clauses in the period of ME (subjectless clauses developed a dummy subject *it/there*), it also became the rule in clauses with an initial adverb. Verb second also appeared after *wh*–elements and adverbial phrases, while in the period of OE it could be found after the negative element *ne*. In this case, when *ne* was initial, the inversion of the subject and the verb was certain. (Fischer, 1992, p.376)

The use of *ne* was lost in the period of ME, and the negative element that replaced it usually followed the verb. This could be the reason why inversion disappeared in these negative clauses.

The earlier system and the fact that many negative adverbials were used in the initial position probably influenced grammaticalisation of the inversion verb second rule after negatives and implied negatives.

Sentences below show the use of inversion with negatives and implied negatives:

35) … and thus they lete hym lye; / But *nevere gronte he* at no strook but
    Oon, … (Fischer, 1992, p.377)

36) *...scarsly shaltou* fynden any persone that may kepe conseil secrely. (CT VII. 1143 [10: 1143] as cited in Fischer, 1992, p.377)

This paper will cover the topic of inversion in detail together with the periods of Late Modern English (LModE,1700-1900) and Present-day English (PdE, 1900-today) in Chapter three.

2.3. Early Modern English

The most important changes such as the reduction of the inflectional endings along with the reorganisation of word order patterns had already occurred in the previous period. These changes could be felt in the first two centuries of the ModE period (1500-1700). The language of the authors from the 16th century reflected the heritage from the period of ME in terms of rich constructions and variations, and we could say that the standard written English from the 18th century resembles the language we have nowadays. (Rissanen, 1999, p.187)

By the end of the 17th century, the present-day grammar had already been established for the most part. There were very few changes or innovations that occurred later.

As has already been said, works from the 16th century were rich in constructions that were inherited from the previous period, and to some extent, influenced by Latin. These variants were reduced later on.

It is less complicated to study the language of the EModE period due to the availability of texts that belong to a wide variety of styles and registers. The 16th and 17th centuries were the period of change in cultural and social spheres in England starting with the printing press, the revived

focus on classical literature and advances in science. The interest in the languages of the world grew along with the interest in human language in general. (Rissanen, 1999, p.188)

Developments that took place involved the auxiliaries that indicated future, pluperfect, the progressive (*be+-ing*) and *do* periphrasis. The syntax of the verb was in focus. The word order pattern that was established in statements and impersonal constructions was subject – verb. (Rissanen, 1999, p.198)

In the first two centuries of the ModE period, there were changes whose product was the verb system of the PdE. The most affected were the subjunctive, modal auxiliaries, tense auxiliaries, passive and the progressive. As was mentioned before in the section that discussed the period of ME, English has two traditional tense forms: present (non-past) and preterite (past). Future, according to some grammars, is not considered to be a tense, because it is expressed periphrastically with auxiliaries. The roots for the periphrastic forms are found in the period of OE and established in the period of ME. (Rissanen, 1999, p.210)

The pattern according to which *shall* is used as the future auxiliary with the first person subject and *will* as the auxiliary for the second and third person is traced to the period of EModE.

The perfect and pluperfect also have their roots in the period of OE. *Be* and *have* were both used in OE as (plu)perfect auxiliaries as they are in EModE.

Have was preferred when emphasising the action indicated by a verb:

37) fel in into the wast, and their dyd stycke, and I had bene drowned if the
    tide *had come*, and espyinge a man a good waye of, I cried as much as I
    could for helpe.   (Harman 68 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.213)

Be has a role similar to a copula in some sentences such as:

38) after diner I went abroad, and when I *was come* home I dresed some sores:
    after, I hard Mr Rhodes read.   (Hoby 171 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.213)

The present tense was referred to as the unmarked tense that indicated action at the moment of speaking along with general truths and habitual action. (Rissanen, 1999, p.219)

39) Aetius *writeth* that the causes of the stone *are* continuall crudities or raw-
   nesse, or vndigested humors wherof is *gathered* togither great plenty of
   vndigested and raw matter, when a burning *riseth* about the kidneys and
   bladder, which *burneth* them and *maketh* them go togither in one, and
   maketh therof an hard stone.   (Rissanen, 1999, p.220)

Past tense was less natural in generalising statements:

40) somwhat it was *alway* that the cat wynked whan her eye was out. (More *Complete Works*
   331 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.220)

Present tense was used in sentences where the PdE would use progressive:

41) *Pol*. What doe you reade my Lord.
   Haml. Words, words, words.   (Shakespeare *Hamlet* II.ii as cited in Rissanen, 1999,
   p.221)

42) Am I a Lord,. . . Or *do* I dream? or haue I dream'd till now? I *do not sleep*:
   I see, I heare, I speake (Shakespeare *Taming of the Shrew* I.ii as cited in Rissanen, 1999,
   p.221)

Future time was expressed through the periphrasis formed with the auxiliaries *shall*/*will* and
through the present tense:

43) *He* that *shall* diligently examine the Phaenomena of this Experiment, *will*,
   I doubt not, find cause to believe, that…(Boethius Preston 180 as cited in Rissanen,
   1999, p.213)

44) *Bo*. What *will* follow then? (Boethius Preston 180 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.213)

45) If you *go* out in your owne semblance, *you die* Sir Iohn, vnlesse you go out disguis'd.
   (Shakespeare Merry Wives of Windsor IV.ii as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.222)

As in PdE, present tense is used in adverbial clauses that imply futurity:

46) We shall find the Charms of our Retirement doubled, when we *return* to
    it.   (Vanbrugh II.i as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.222)

Past tense was the unmarked tense that expressed past events and actions. If a clause contained an adverbial that implied the time of the action along with the time of speaking, the use of past and perfect tenses varied:

47) Sirs, quod she, I *sawe* no man entre into this house *this nyght*. (Berners Froissart III 320
    as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.224)
48) I *saw* the man *today*: his names Parrolles. (Shakespeare All's Well that Ends Well V.iii
    as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.224)

Sentences with perfect are given bellow:

49) instead of one half-penny Loaf, you *have eaten* two; and instead of one
    pint of Ale, you *have had* a quart, and all this you *have had* today already. (Penny
    Merriments 267 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.224)
50) Worthy Menenius Agrippa, one that *hath* always *loved* the people. (Shakespeare
    Coriolanus I.i as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.224)

Past tense was used to express an action that occurred in the prepast:

51) Also, Ser, on the Frydday after ze [=ye] *departyd* come John Sayville. (E. Beaumont 3
    as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.225)

The role of subject was mentioned earlier in the paper. It was said that in the periods of OE and ME it was possible to leave the personal subject unexpressed in some instances, and even though the situation in EModE changed – the subject became obligatory – there were some instances when it was left out. (Rissanen, 1999, p.249)

52) *Pray* let me see it. (Middleton 3 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.249)
53) *Beseech* you, Father. (Shakespeare Tempest I.ii as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.249)

Subject was left out in instances where it was obvious from the context:

54) that done they ledde hym faste bounde in chaynes of yren in to Babylone,

    and there was set in pryson (Fisher 134 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.249)

The inversion of subject and verb was still present, especially when an adverbial was in the initial position.

In texts that were studied, the inversion occurred after the initial *there, now*, *then*, *so*, *yet* and *therefore* in nearly half of the instances from 1370 to 1500. In the material from the 17th century there was a sudden drop. (Rissanen, 1999, p.264)

Rissanen (1999, p.264) says that "the relative weight of the finite verb and the subject had an influence on their mutual order: the heavier element tends to follow the lighter."

In other words – there were instances in some later texts where nominal subjects could be found in a postverbal position, rather than light – weight pronominal subjects, as given below:

55) *Then came in a Scotch Archbishop* (Evelyn 896 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.265)

For the same reason the subject is placed after an auxiliary or the copula (easier than after some weightier verbs):

56) *There did I* finde the truely Noble and Right Honourable Lords (John Taylor 135 C1as

    cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.265)

Verbs such as *have*, *say*, *come* and *stand* also favour inversion even in later texts:

57) *Hence is our language*, far from being defective, more rational than those

    which (II 73–4 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.265)

Instances with inversion after adverbials negative in force can be found in the period of PdE. The situation was similar with the non-negatives in the period of EModE. The inverted word order was a rule after the initial *never*, *neither* and *nor* and later on with *seldom* and *hardly*.

58) *Never was there* anye man that layed thynge to my charge. (Mowntayne 207 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.265)

59) I am not noble, yet I am a gent: *neither am I* a sword man. (Essex 15 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.265)

60) I do repeat it, my Lord,…I never did know Nelthorp, never did see him before in my Life, *nor did I know* of any body's coming, but Mr.Hicks…(Lisle 122 Cii as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.265)

61) *Seldom is shooting* named, and yet it dyd the moste good in warre (Ascham Toxophilus 76 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.266)

62) *hardly* can we discerne the things that are on earth…(Hooker 5 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.266)

Inversion was common in clauses with the initial *not only:*

63) *Nott only was this couple* unfortunate in the children, butt in one another…(Halkett 19 as cited in Rissanen, 1999, p.265)

This paper will discuss some of these adverbials in chapter five**,** which deals with the analysis of examples from Hansard, and will try to explain the phenomenon of inversion in the next chapter, which covers the periods of Late Modern English (LModE, 1700-1900) and Present-day English (PdE, 1900-today).

Chapter 3

Late Modern English and Present-day English

This chapter is focused on the period of Late Modern English (LModE, 1700-1900) along with the period of PdE.

On the syntactic level, the English language had undergone most of the changes that shaped it into the language we use today. Older word order patterns that differentiated OE from PdE with the verb at the clause end or in the second position, had been replaced by the SVO (subject-verb-object) or SVC (subject-verb-complement) sequence. Nouns and adjectives had also gained their vestigial inflectional systems. The system of auxiliary verbs had developed to cover a wide range of mood and aspect marking. There were some structures with finite and nonfinite subordinate clauses that could not be found in the period of OE but were available by the period of LModE. (Denison, 1998, p.92)

The syntax of the auxiliary verbs did not change in the period of LModE. For example, in sentences with *have* in present tense, a verb would form a present perfect, and in those with *have* in past tense we would have a sentence in pluperfect. (Denison, 1998, p.135)

In the period of PdE, both the present perfect and the past perfect express anteriority, as shown below (Huddleston, 2002, p.140):

64) At that time I had written two chapters.
65) Now I have written four chapters.

The first sentence is in the past perfect and the second one is in the present perfect. They both locate the writing anterior to the time of speaking – the only difference is in the auxiliary verb (there is only one past tense here).

Many researchers believe that the perfect is historically connected to the conclusive perfect construction:

66) 'That loss hurt me more than any other in my life,' said McEnroe
      recendy. 'Even now I think about it. And it was my own dumb
      fault. *I had it won*!' (1992 The Guardian p. 18 (5 Dec.) as cited in Denison, 1998, p.135)

Have was not the only auxiliary used throughout the period. Another auxiliary verb, namely *be*, was given in the instances above along with the instances with *have* in the earlier sections of this chapter. This auxiliary was known as the rival of *have* if the meaning of the lexical verb implied the change of state, as shown below:

67) now they'*re* both *gone* and I can't replace them. (1917 Bell, Letters 1.396 (2 Feb.) as cited in Denison, 1998, p.135)

The progressive *be + ing* had been established by the period of EModE and its use has increased since.

In the period of LModE, the subject was obligatory in all clauses except in imperatives. There were instances when the position of the subject was filled with the anticipatory *it*. Sentences below show the use of anticipatory *it* with identifiying *be* (the animacy of the complement is not relevant):

68) a. To be sure! *it is* Mr. *Triplet*, good Mr. Triplet of
      Goodman's Fields theatre.
      b. Who *is it*? *It's* me.   (1852 Taylor&Reade, Masks and Face I.i. p.129 as cited in
      Denison, 1998, p.212)

The use of subject *it* with an animate NP as complement and classifying *be* was no longer present in declaratives in the 17th century, while in the 19th it was present in exclamatives. As shown below:

69) What a cold-blooded rascal *it* is! (ibid. Ill.iii p. 208 as cited in Denison, 1998, p.213)

Word order did not change in the period of LModE. SVO remained fixed with some alternative forms such as subject-auxiliary inversion. Grammaticalised word order in English interprets the position of the NP before the verb as subject marking, while the reversal of subject and the verb is the deviation from the norm. As has already been mentioned in the introduction, there are two types of inversion: subject-auxiliary inversion (semi-inversion) or SAI and full inversion (FI). They differ in whether the finite part or the entire VP precedes the subject. (Dorgeloh, 1997, p2.)

The paper will focus on the declarative clauses where the inversion is triggered by a negative or semi-negative adverbials in clause-initial position, as shown below:

70) *scarcely have I* had time to vent half the malice of my tenderness (1786 Cowley, School for Greybeards II p. 24 [ARCHER] as cited in Denison, 1998, p.236)

71) *Not even now* will I mention a word of my affairs — (1819 Keats, Utters 158 p. 431 (3 Oct.) as cited in Denison, 1998, p.236)

72) and if I once get on the scent, *never will I leave it* till the guilty are hunted down. (1863 Hazlewood, LadyAudleys SecretIl.ii p. 259 as cited in Denison, 1998, p.236)

73) *Only later did he* glance at Herndon, then kneel and feel for his pulse. (1953 Wright, The Outsider p. 220 [ARCHER] as cited in Denison, 1998, p.236)

 SAI can also be compared to a conditional *if*-clause. As shown below:

74) & you say now you wd. have come *had I* answered about the doctor. (1872 Amberley Papers 11.522 (23 Aug. As cited in Denison, 1998, p.236)

Denison (1998, p.236) states that "SAI requires an operator." According to this, inversion with a lexical verb was an archaism:

75) We could not love each other so well, *loved we* not our work and duty more. (1891 Sidney Webb, Utters 159 1.298 (14 Sep.) as cited in Denison, 1998, p.236)

Dorgeloh (1997, p.16) states that "[a]n inversion always involves that some sentence constituent other than the verb is shifted to the front of the clause and is followed by subsequent VS (FI) or AuxSV (SAI) order."

In order to have an inversion, one language must have the basic pattern according to which the subject and the verb can invert.

According to one broad definition, inversion is seen as the declarative construction where the subject follows the VP or a part of it. FI and SAI can be included into this definition, because both of these types are, as Dorgeloh (1998, p.21) states *"marked* alternatives" for the canonical word order (CWO).

In SAI, the subject follows the first auxiliary of the VP. Dorgeloh (1998, p. 26-28) mentions four types of SAI: Pro–inversion, Corr–inversion, Add–inversion, and Neg–inversion.

Pro–inversion occurs in sentences introduced by *so*, *such*, *thus*, *as*, *nor*, and *neither* (when their function is not that of negative additive adverbs). In these cases, the auxiliary *be* can introduce a subject that is placed in the final position of the sentence. As given below:

76) That was written in a cold noisy, flappingpress tent [...], as was the
     following forecast.   (Guardw, 27 Dec.92, p.24 as cited in Dorgeloh, 1998, p.26)

77) Thus was born the Barbados Coup, a variation of the Grosvenor Gambit, in which you
     can ruff a loser [...].   (Guardw, 3 Jan.93, p.23 as cited in Dorgeloh, 1998, p.26)

78) Food and sweets, fuel and light are not taxed; nor are books, magazines, children's
     clothes, some kitchen equipment, sheets and towels. (Dorgeloh, 1998, p.26)

Corr–inversion covers the SAI types in correlative constructions that are linked by *so/such...that*, *more/-er/less...than*, *the...the*, *not only...but also*, *if/as...so*:

79) So great is the apathy that the Government could probably go in or
     stay out without vitally offending either its own followers or the
     country. (LOB, ed. as cited in Dorgeloh, 1998, p.27)

80) So wholly disparate do they seem, indeed, that it comes as some-
   thing of a shock [...].   (LOB, bbe. as cited in Dorgeloh, 1998, p.27)

Add–inversion covers pro–forms such as *nor* and *neither* when they are used as additive adverbs:

81) [...] they do not come to its meetings, nor are they informed of its
    decisions. (LOB, ed. as cited in Dorgeloh, 1998, p.28)

Neg–inversion occurs in cases when SAI is obligatory after negative and restrictive adverbs such as *only*, *scarcely*, *hardly*, *never*, *little*, and *less.* As shown below:

82) Never before have fans been promised such a feast of speed. (LOB, rep. as cited in
    Dorgeloh, 1998, p.28)

The English language is known as a grammatical word order language, so this type of inversion along with some other syntactic structures shares the status of a non-canonical sentence. As has been mentioned, SAI requires an operator (the use of a lexical verb had become archaism).

The analysis of examples taken from the corpus will be presented in pages that follow.

Chapter 4

Preliminaries

XVS is the abbreviation that is used through some parts of the paper. It stands for the word order in which a verb precedes the subject if there is another element in the initial position. In this case, the element is an adverbial, and it causes SAI.

Our focus is on adverbials that appear in the initial position. The adverbials *never*, *hardly*, *neither, thus,* and *scarcely* are analysed with the help of the above mentioned corpus.

As was mentioned before, Hansard covers the period from 1800 to 2005. This paper will follow the same timeline.

Due to the limited scope of research, the adverbials mentioned above are combined with two auxiliary verbs – *have* and *do*, which are comparable in number of forms in present (*have/has* and *do/does)* and past tense *(did* and *had*).

Auxiliaries have the ability to act as operators when they occur in the finite verb phrase in the initial position (as the first verb). (Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985, p.120)

The verb *have* functions both as an auxiliary and a main verb. *Have* is used as an auxiliary to make present perfect and past perfect. *Do* can also be an auxiliary (it has no nonfinite forms when used as such) and a main verb.(Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985, p.128-132)

Sources used for this research describe the chosen adverbials as adverbials that trigger inversion when placed in the sentence initial position. Due to this, the above mentioned adverbials and auxiliary verbs were entered in the Search engine after the interpunction marks <?|.|!|;|:>.

Instances that did not contain inversion were manually counted and excluded.

The analysis of selected adverbials and auxiliary verbs will be presented in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

Analysis

One of the sources describes inversion as the elevated tone common for texts formal in style, but there is the fact that these instances of inversion found in Hansard are actually transcriptions.

Written language underwent change in the period of the 19th and 20th centuries and became somewhat similar to spoken language or spoken registers. There was also an evolving trend of public colloquial style through which the spoken language influenced written language. (Leech, Hundt, Mair & Smith, 2009, p.240)

When compared to written language, these transcripts are less formal in style. Some of the instances with inversion will be introduced below.

5.1. *Never*

Negative adverbials in the initial position also require the inversion of subject and verb. One of those adverbials is *never.*

According to the study conducted by Bækken (1998, p.273) for the period of EModE, structures with initial *never* are infrequent – only 19 occurrences altogether. The average inversion rate is 36.8 %.

We will first investigate examples of inversion with *never* and the auxiliary *have/has*.

1) ***Never has*** he attempted to take so great a stride before...(Irish Habeas Corpus Suspension Bill, 1805)
2) ***Never have*** I said, never was it in my intention to say...(Defence of Portugal, 1811)
3) ***Never has*** a fly walked or flown...(Iron And Steel Bill, 1948)

Table 1 shows the frequency of inversion of the negative adverbial *never* combined with *have/has.* As has already been said, instances that do not contain inversion were excluded and the final number for every decade was normalised to the frequency per million words. The highest normalised frequency is found in 1810s.

Table 1: Frequency of inversion with *never have/has* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0	2	0.04
1810s	7.1	2	0.28
1820s	11.6	1	0.08
1830s		0	
1840s	30.4	5	0.16
1850s	33.0	3	0.09
1860s	34.2	4	0.11
1870s	37.1	2	0.05
1880s	60.0	9	0.15
1890s	51.2	6	0.11
1900s	64.7	4	0.06
1910s	79.8	3	0.03
1920s	71.7	2	0.02
1930s	95.2	10	0.10
1940s	94.8	8	0.08
1950s	121.0	4	0.03
1960s	152.0	5	0.03
1970s	163.3	5	0.03
1980s	183.7	12	0.06
1990s	177.1	3	0.01
2000s	88.4	2	0.02

The instances below are instances of inversion with *do* and *does*:

4) ***Never do*** I remember it, during the 16 years I have been in this House...(Supply 7th November, 1921)

5) ***Never does*** one of them write a letter but he encloses a stamped envelope...(House of Commons, 1921)

Table 2 shows the frequency of the negative adverbial *never* combined with *do/does.* No cases of inversion detected until 1920. The highest frequency of inversion with *never do/does* is found in 1920s.

Table 2: Frequency of inversion with *never do/does* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1		
1820s	11.6		
1830s	28.1		
1840s	30.4		
1850s	33.0		
1860s	34.2		
1870s	37.1		
1880s	60.0		
1890s	51.2		
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7	5	0.06
1930s	95.2	4	0.04
1940s	94.8	4	0.04
1950s	121.0	7	0.05
1960s	152.0	6	0.03
1970s	163.3	4	0.02
1980s	183.7	5	0.02
1990s	177.1		
2000s	88.4	1	0.01

The instances below show the inversion with *did/had*:

6) ***Never had*** he given a vote with more reluctance than he should that night...(Conduct Of The Duke of York, 1809)

7) ***Never did*** the country produce a man who had received so large a measure...(Grant To The Marquis Of Wellington, 1812)

8) ***Never did*** I speak truer words...(International Terrorism, 2001)

Table 3 shows the frequency of inversion with *never did/had*. The presented numbers vary, but the highest rate in normalised frequency when it comes to the past tense is noted in 1810s.

Table 3: Frequency of inversion with *never did/had* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0	5	0.05
1810s	7.1	17	2.39
1820s	11.6	19	1.63
1830s	28.1	25	0.88
1840s	30.4	20	0.65
1850s	33.0	15	0.45
1860s	34.2	3	0.08
1870s	37.1	2	0.05
1880s	60.0	12	0.02
1890s	51.2	5	0.09
1900s	64.7	10	0.15
1910s	79.8	5	0.06
1920s	71.7	4	0.05
1930s	95.2	6	0.06
1940s	94.8	11	0.11
1950s	121.0	10	0.08
1960s	152.0	6	0.03
1970s	163.3	6	0.03
1980s	183.7	9	0.04
1990s	177.1	9	0.05
2000s	88.4	1	0.01

5.2. *Hardly*

Hardly with the negative meaning such as "barely", "only just", and "scarcely" dates back to 1553 or the period of EModE. (Bækken, 1998, p.280)

In the following instances *hardly* is combined with *have/has*:

9) ***Hardly has*** he arrived at the Board of Trade…(War Situation, 1942)
10) ***Hardly have*** we ceased doing so… (Consumer Protection Bill, 1987)

Table 4 shows the frequency of inversion with *hardly have/has*. The highest normalised frequency, and the first instance of inversion as well, is found in 1870s.

Table 4: Frequency of inversion with *hardly have/has* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1		
1820s	11.6		
1830s	28.1		
1840s	30.4		
1850s	33.0		
1860s	34.2		
1870s	37.1	1	0.03
1880s	60.0		
1890s	51.2		
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7		
1930s	95.2		
1940s	94.8	2	0.02
1950s	121.0	1	0.00
1960s	152.0		
1970s	163.3		
1980s	183.7	3	0.02
1990s	177.1	1	0.00
2000s	88.4	1	0.01

The instance below shows the inversion with *do/does*:

11) ***Hardly do*** I come across any man...(House of Commons, 1858)

The results in Table 5 show the normalised frequency of use with *hardly do/does*. There is only one instance of inversion with the auxiliary *do,* as shown in the sentence above.

Table 5: Frequency of inversion with *hardly do/does* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1		
1820s	11.6		
1830s	28.1		
1840s	30.4		
1850s	33.0	1	0.03
1860s	34.2		
1870s	37.1		
1880s	60.0		
1890s	51.2		
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7		
1930s	95.2		
1940s	94.8		
1950s	121.0		
1960s	152.0		
1970s	163.3		
1980s	183.7		
1990s	177.1		
2000s	88.4		

The sentences below show instance of inversion with *hardly had*.

12) ***Hardly had*** Viscount Hardinge quitted his dominions when the new King took the most emphatic and decided course...(House of Commons, 1858)

13) ***Hardly had*** he become fully seised of it...(National Expanditure Control, 1918)

The results in Table 6 show the frequency of inversion with the adverbial *hardly* combined with the auxiliary *have* in the past tense (*had*). Instances with *did* were not found. The highest normalised frequency rate is detected in 1850s.

Table 6: Frequency of inversion with *hardly had* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1		
1820s	11.6		
1830s	28.1		
1840s	30.4		
1850s	33.0	2	0.06
1860s	34.2	2	0.05
1870s	37.1	2	0.05
1880s	60.0	1	0.01
1890s	51.2	3	0.05
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8	2	0.02
1920s	71.7	2	0.02
1930s	95.2	3	0.03
1940s	94.8	2	0.02
1950s	121.0	4	0.03
1960s	152.0	1	0.00
1970s	163.3	4	0.02
1980s	183.7	8	0.04
1990s	177.1	1	0.00
2000s	88.4	1	0.01

5.3. *Neither*

According to the study conducted by Baekken (1998, p.268) structures with initial *neither* show an average inversion rate of 98,5 %, for the period of EModE.

Neither combined with *have/has*:

14) ***Neither have*** they forgotten the attempt made by the Noble Lord...(State Of Ireland, 1843)

15) ***...neither have*** I said a word on the subject...(Loan Discount Bill, 1847)

16) *Neither has* the general vindicated the honour of the Russian flag...(Outrage On A Flag Of Truce, 1855)

Table 7 presents results that show frequency in inversion with the negative adverbial *neither* combined with *have/has*. Numbers vary through the decades. The highest normalised frequency is in 1850s.

Table 7: Frequency of inversion with *neither have/has* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1	1	0.14
1820s	11.6	2	0.17
1830s	28.1		
1840s	30.4	4	0.13
1850s	33.0	8	0.24
1860s	34.2	3	0.08
1870s	37.1	3	0.08
1880s	60.0	6	0.01
1890s	51.2	7	0.13
1900s	64.7	3	0.04
1910s	79.8	9	0.11
1920s	71.7	10	0.13
1930s	95.2	2	0.02
1940s	94.8	17	0.17
1950s	121.0	12	0.09
1960s	152.0	17	0.11
1970s	163.3	11	0.06
1980s	183.7	11	0.05
1990s	177.1	17	0.09
2000s	88.4	9	0.10

The following instances are examples with *neither do/does*:

17) *Neither do* I intend the slightest censure… (King's Speech, 1803)

18) ***Neither do*** we intend to have recourse to them (Parliamentary Reform Bill,1831)

19) ***…neither does*** his Royal Highness recollect… (Orange Lodges Adjourned Debate, 1835)

Table 8 presents the results for the frequency of inversion with the negative adverbial *neither* combined with *do/does*. The highest normalized frequency rate is in 1800s.

Table 8: Frequency of inversion with *neither do/does* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0	8	1.61
1810s	7.1	3	0.42
1820s	11.6	9	0.77
1830s	28.1	16	0.56
1840s	30.4	27	0.72
1850s	33.0	25	0.75
1860s	34.2	34	0.99
1870s	37.1	25	0.67
1880s	60.0	34	0.56
1890s	51.2	45	0.87
1900s	64.7	46	0.71
1910s	79.8	92	1.15
1920s	71.7	46	0.64
1930s	95.2	46	0.48
1940s	94.8	95	1.30
1950s	121.0	112	0.92
1960s	152.0	99	0.65
1970s	163.3	111	0.67
1980s	183.7	112	0.60
1990s	177.1	96	0.54
2000s	88.4	74	0.83

The instances bellow show examples with *neither did/had*:

20) ***Neither did*** he think that they would… (Witnesses Indemnity Bill, 1806)

21) ***…neither did*** they care for parliamentary reform… (Roman Catholic Petition, 1805)

22) ***neither had*** he said that the deficiencies of the army… (Militia Enlistment Bill, 1089)

Table 9 shows the frequency of inversion with *neither did/had*. The highest normalised frequency with *neither did/had* is in the period of 1820s.

Table 9: Frequency of inversion with *neither did/had* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0	25	5
1810s	7.1	31	4.36
1820s	11.6	68	5.86
1830s	28.1	133	4.73
1840s	30.4	107	3.51
1850s	33.0	91	2.75
1860s	34.2	60	1.75
1870s	37.1	99	2.66
1880s	60.0	67	1.11
1890s	51.2	35	0.68
1900s	64.7	32	0.49
1910s	79.8	20	0.25
1920s	71.7	10	0.13
1930s	95.2	15	0.15
1940s	94.8	11	0.11
1950s	121.0	14	0.11
1960s	152.0	20	0.13
1970s	163.3	18	0.11
1980s	183.7	14	0.07
1990s	177.1	22	0.12
2000s	88.4	13	0.14

5.4. *Thus*

In the study conducted by Bækken (1998, p.258), the inversion rate in structures with initial *thus* is 22,2% in the period of EModE.

Inversion with initial *thus* combined with *have/has* is shown in the instances below:

23) *thus has* he acquitted the catholics… (Roman Catholic Petition, 1805)

24) *Thus have* they called upon this house… (The Lord's Commissioner's Speech, 1808)

25) *Thus have* I stated a few of the remarks… (Foreign Treaties, 1815)

Table 10 shows the frequency of inversion with initial *thus* combined with *have/has*. The highest normalised frequency is found in 1810s.

Table 10: Frequency of inversion with *thus have/has* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0	2	0.40
1810s	7.1	3	0.42
1820s	11.6	1	0.08
1830s	28.1	3	0.10
1840s	30.4	4	0.13
1850s	33.0	4	0.12
1860s	34.2		
1870s	37.1	1	0.02
1880s	60.0	2	0.03
1890s	51.2		
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7		
1930s	95.2		
1940s	94.8		
1950s	121.0	1	0.00
1960s	152.0		
1970s	163.3		
1980s	183.7		
1990s	177.1	3	0.01
2000s	88.4		

The sentences bellow are with initial *thus do/does*:

26) ***Thus do*** I trust that I have succeeded in making...(Finances Of The Country, 1830)

27) ***Thus does*** the noble Viscount threaten us...(Goverment of Jamaica, 1839)

Table 11 shows the frequency of inversion with initial *thus do/does*. The highest normalised frequency of use is in 1830s.

Table 11: Frequency of inversion with initial *thus do/does*:

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1		
1820s	11.6		
1830s	28.1	3	0.10
1840s	30.4	2	0.06
1850s	33.0		
1860s	34.2		
1870s	37.1	2	0.05
1880s	60.0		
1890s	51.2		
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7	2	0.02
1930s	95.2	2	0.02
1940s	94.8	1	0.01
1950s	121.0		
1960s	152.0	2	0.01
1970s	163.3	1	0.00
1980s	183.7		
1990s	177.1	1	0.00
2000s	88.4	1	0.01

Here are some instances with initial *thus did/had*:

28) ***Thus did*** Lord Hawkesbury remove without another word...(War With Spain, 1805)

29) ***thus had*** they had the benefits ...(Progress Of Socialism, 1840)

Table 12 presents the frequency of inversion with initial *thus did/had*. The highest normalised frequency is found in 1810s.

Table 12: Frequency of inversion with initial *thus did/had* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0	1	0.20
1810s	7.1	7	0.98
1820s	11.6	2	0.17
1830s	28.1	11	0.39
1840s	30.4	8	0.26
1850s	33.0	6	0.18
1860s	34.2	1	0.02
1870s	37.1	1	0.02
1880s	60.0	1	0.01
1890s	51.2		
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7		
1930s	95.2	1	0.01
1940s	94.8		
1950s	121.0		
1960s	152.0	1	0.00
1970s	163.3		
1980s	183.7		
1990s	177.1		
2000s	88.4	1	0.01

5.5. *Scarcely*

The earliest use of *scarce/ly* dates back to the 1590s, according to the study conducted by Baekken (1998, p.284). In the periods of OE and ME the form *uneath* was used, and it almost had the same meaning as *scarce/ly* (there were two clause-initial occurrences).

Inversion with initial *scarcely have/has* is shown in the following examples:

30) ***Scarcely has*** an observation fallen...(Address In Answer To Her Majesty's Speech, 1845)
31) ***Scarcely have*** they established their tribunal...(Securities For Advances Ireland Bill, 1850)

Table 13 shows the frequency of inversion with initial *scarcely have/has*. Instances of inversion were not found before 1840s. The highest normalised frequency is found in 1840s and 1850s.

Table 13: Frequency of inversion with initial *scarcely have/has* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1		
1820s	11.6		
1830s	28.1		
1840s	30.4	1	0.03
1850s	33.0	1	0.03
1860s	34.2		
1870s	37.1		
1880s	60.0		
1890s	51.2	1	0.01
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7		
1930s	95.2		
1940s	94.8	1	0.01
1950s	121.0		
1960s	152.0		
1970s	163.3	1	0.00
1980s	183.7	1	0.00
1990s	177.1		
2000s	88.4	1	0.01

Instances with initial *scarcely do/does* are not available in the corpus, therefore this paper continues with this adverbial combined with *did/had*, as found in the following example:

32) ***Scarcely had*** Majoochi commenced his examination...(Report Of The Secret Committee, 1820)

Results in Table 14 include instances found with initial *scarcely had* (as shown in the sentence above). The highest normalised frequency is found in 1820s. Instances with *scarcely did* were not found.

Table 14: Frequency of inversion with initial *scarcely had* in Hansard

Decade	Size (in millions of words)	Frequency	Frequency per million words
1800s	5.0		
1810s	7.1	1	0.14
1820s	11.6	5	0.43
1830s	28.1	4	0.14
1840s	30.4	4	0.13
1850s	33.0		
1860s	34.2	3	0.08
1870s	37.1	2	0.05
1880s	60.0	1	0.01
1890s	51.2		
1900s	64.7		
1910s	79.8		
1920s	71.7	1	0.01
1930s	95.2		
1940s	94.8		
1950s	121.0		
1960s	152.0		
1970s	163.3		
1980s	183.7	1	0.00
1990s	177.1		
2000s	88.4		

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to try to establish how often the pattern where the subject and the finite verb were inverted with different initial adverbs was actually present in the recent history of the English language. The focus was on the Hansard corpus. It was said that the grammar of the present-day English language had been largely established by the 17th century and the word order was strict, and in some ways, fixed. The exception to this was a non-canonical XVS word order that appeared in the above mentioned type of inversion – namely SAI.

We began the discussion with a brief historical overview from the period of Old English to the periods of Late Modern English and Present-day English. We showed the shift from a synthetic to an analytic language. The definition of inversion was given at the beginning, stating which type would be of interest for this paper.

The inversion of subject and auxiliary verb was described as elevated tone, so it was expected that formal texts found in Hansard use inversion quite often. Adverbials that appeared initially, *never*, *hardly*, *neither*, *thus*, and *scarcely*, were presented and analysed individually with present and past forms of the auxiliaries *have* and *do*. What is important to point out is the fact that no instances of inversion with *hardly did* and *scarcely do/does* and *did* were found. The number of examples found with initial *thus* were not sufficient to notice possibly relevant factors affecting adverbials other than negative or near-negative when it comes to the use of inversion. An adverbial that was initially included in this research was *now*. This adverbial along with *thus* was included as a non-negative adverbial. Instances retrieved for the period of the 19th century did not provide examples of inversion which would fall under the scope of this research and make a comparison with *thus* possible.

It was stated that transcribed texts were less formal in style, and that both written and spoken registers had undergone stylistic change. This change made them more similar to the spoken language. The results showed how frequency of use varied, and that the highest frequency rate was mostly for the decades of the 19th century, which indicated a declining trend in the use of these constructions.

References

Barber, Beal, Shaw. 2009. *The English Language*: *A Historical Introduction, Second Edition*, pp.26-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bækken, Bjørg. 1998. *Word order patterns in Early Modern English*. Oslo: Novus Press.

Denison, David. 1999. 'Syntax'. In Romaine, Suzanne (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Vol. IV, 1776-1997*, pp. 92-329. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Dorgeloh, Heidrun. 1997. *Inversion in Modern English: Form and Function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fischer, Olga. 1992. 'Syntax'. In Blake, Norman (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Vol. II, 1066-1476,* pp. 207-408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Leech, Geoffrey, Marianne Hundt, Christian Mair & Nicholas Smith. 2009. *Change in Contemporary English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Rissanen, Matti. 1999. 'Syntax'. In Lass, Roger (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Vol. III, 1476-1776,* pp.187-331. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Traugott, Elizabeth. 1992. 'Syntax'. In Hogg, Richard M. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Vol. I, The Beginnings to 1066,* pp. 168-289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Huddleston, Rodney. 2002. 'The verb'. In Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.) 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey N. Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.