

Toward a Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Periphrastic Usage of the Auxiliary “DO” in Eighteenth-century English (Abstract)

Naoshi Kiyomoto

INTRODUCTION

General → Specific

One reason of undertaking this study is that I encountered many examples of non-use of do (do-less) questions; “What happened ?” in present-day English. It is not clear why this structure remains even in present-day English. Many things have been said about the usage of do by many people.

For example, Visser referred to numerous examples of the usage of do. And Quirk described the present-day standard English usage of do. However, from the point of historical-linguistic approach it has not been explained why do-less questions are used even today.

After an interview about this with Nobuyuki Higashi, Professor of Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, he kindly advised me to follow the same methodology taken by Dr. Tieken. “By doing so, the result of the research will be comparable and it will enrich the value of the study.”, he said. So, my first approach to the periphrastic usage of do is the comparison of my result with Dr. Tieken's.

I started studying the periphrastic usage of do, following the methodology attempted by Dr. Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade of Leiden University; “The Auxiliary Do in Eighteenth-century English.” She separated periphrastic usage of do into ten types. The following is her category and examples of the sentence.

TYPE 1 Do-less negative sentence: I question not but...

TYPE 2 Do-less questions: How like you...?

TYPE 3 Subject-verb inversion without do: nor indeed know we...

TYPE 4 Not+infinitive: I not like him.

Dr. Tieken regarded from TYPE 1 to TYPE 4 as do-less periphrasis, whose usages are different from modern English. The interrogatives like “What happens ?” are classified into this type.

TYPE 5 Plain unemphatic do: I did call

TYPE 6 Do+adverbial+infinitive: I do firmly believe...

TYPE 7 Exclamatory how/what sentences: What dreadful days do we live in ...

TYPE 8 If-less conditional clauses: did I see...

TYPE 9 Adverbials as clause openers: Most sincerely do I condole with you

TYPE 10 Clauses opening with a foregrounded object: These great Things does Reason...do...

Dr. Tieken investigated the material in three genres to see stylistic distinction, namely: informative prose, epistolary prose and direct speech. But in my research, I investigated only prose works (informative prose). I wanted to examine the rise and fall of the periphrastic usages of do in historical principle.

Firstly, I divided 18th century into ten decades. Ten works by ten male writers are investigated in each decade of 18th century. This was attempted to see the change in historical principle. The corpus in each prose writer is limited to 25,000 words, roughly 60-70 pages of each book, as done by Dr. Tieken.

Secondly, Dr. Tieken put a stress on the stylistic distinction but my second approach to the periphrastic usage of do is gender differences. This was suggested by the recent results of the studies by J. Coates, W. Labov, T. Nevalainen. In this research, ten female writers' works were chosen in order to analyze gender differences in the periphrastic usage of the auxiliary “do.” The analysis should provide ideas about how, when, where and why the periphrastic do was used or not used by both sexes. It seems to me that my results show that the linguistic devices (in this case, the periphrastic do) are influenced by societal forces. I have discovered that the condition between 10 works of female writers and male writers is not quite equal.

Thirdly, one female writer, namely Fanny Burney, is taken up to observe the change of the usage over time in the language of one writer. The result of this analysis shows a style-shift in

one person on investigation of five works. Furthermore I observed how Fanny Burney differs in the usage of periphrastic do from 5 other female-writers.
Ten male writes, five female writers, one female writer, and their works are as follows:

Ten male writers

- G.Farquhar(1701): THE WORKS OF GEORGE FARQUHAR VOLUME I
CRARENDON PRESS · OXFORD 1988
- D.Defoe(1719):THE LIFE AND STRANGE SURPRIZING ADVENTURES OF ROBINSON
CRUSOE OF YORK, MARINER
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1990
- A.Pope(1725):The Prose Works of Alexander Pope Vol II The Major Works,1725-1744
ARCHON BOOKS 1986
- J.Swift(1733):DIRECTIONS TO SERVANTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PIECES 1733-1742
BASIL BLACKWELL OXFORD 1956
- S.Richardson(1740):Pamela
PENGUIN CLASSICS 1985
- S.Johnson(1759):The History of Rasselas Prince of Abissinia
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1988
- O.Goldsmith(1766):THE VICAR OF WAKEFIELD
PENGUIN CLASSICS 1986
- T.Smollet(1771):The Expedition of Humphry Clinker
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1988
- W.Beckford(1786):Vathek
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1983
- W.Godwin(1794):Caleb Williams
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1986

Five femalewriters

- 1700's
- 1710's
- 1720's
- 1730's
- 1740's S.Fielding(1744):The Adventures of David Simple
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1987
- 1750's G.Lennox(1752):The Adventures of David Simple
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1989
- 1760's
- 1770's F.Burney(1778):Evelina
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1982
- 1780's F.Burney(1782):Cecilia
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1988
- 1790's
- E.Inchbald(1791):A SIMPLE STORY
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1988
- F.Burney (1793):Camilla
THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1983
- S.Rowson (1794):Charlotte Temple and Lucy Temple
EARLY AMERICAN WOMEN WRITERS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1986
- H.W.Foster (1797):The Coquette
EARLY AMERICAN WOMEN WRITERS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1986

One femalewriter

F.Burney(1768-78):The diaries and letters of Fanny Burney The John Day Company 1976
 F.Burney(1778):Evelina THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1982
 F.Burney(1782):Cecilia THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1988
 F.Burney(1793):Camilla THE WORLD'S CLASSICS OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 1983
 F.Burney(1796):Selected Letters and Journals CLARENDON PRESS • OXFORD 1986

RESULT

I started the research from 1740's; S.Fielding(1744) to 1790's; H.W.Foster(1797).

The body of the research is compiled at the end of this paper as one a part of reference.

The charts shown below are completed after the investigation of the above mentioned books.

[Chart-1] Investigation of the auxiliary do through eighteenth-century authors

| Eighteenth Century Authors | Sex | Do-less sentences | | | | Unemphatic do | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|-----|-------------------|----------|-----------|------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------------|-------------------|-------|
| | | | | | | no inversion | | Inversion | | | | |
| | | TYP E1 | TYP E2 | TYP E3 | TYP E4 | TYP E5 | TYP E6 | TYP E7 | TYP E8 | TYP E9 | TYP E10 | |
| | | negative | question | inversion | not+finite | plain | do+ad+infin | H/W question | If less | adverbials | object foreground | |
| Farquhar | M | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 24 |
| Defoe | M | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Pope | M | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 31 |
| Swift | M | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Richards on | M | 18 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Johnson | M | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Goldsmith | M | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Smollet | M | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Beckford | M | 33 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 49 |
| Godwin | M | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Subtotal | | 130 | 25 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 207 |
| Fielding | F | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| Lennox | F | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Inchbald | F | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 21 |
| Rowson | F | 30 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 38 |
| Foster | F | 42 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 48 |
| Subtotal | | 109 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 140 |
| Burney 1768 | 1F | 20 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 1778 | 1F | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 |
| 1782 | 1F | 21 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 1793 | 1F | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 1796 | 1F | 21 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Subtotal | | 91 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 124 |
| Total | | 330 | 41 | 21 | 1 | 11 | 28 | 15 | 1 | 21 | 2 | 471 |

Most female works of the 18th century were of ecclesiastical in nature, in fact, most were not of the prose.

3) The treatment of the data

Chart-1 shows three groups (1.men 2.women 3.one woman writer) of the ten types of the periphrastic usage of the auxiliary do. The comparison is made by simple additions of 1)men's data vs women's data and 2)five women's data vs F.Burney. Thus Chart-2 has been made.

[Chart-2] The gender differences in the periphrastic usage of the auxiliary do.

| Sex | Do-less sentences | | | | Unemphatic do | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|----------|-----------|------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|---------|------------|---------------|
| | | | | | no inversion | | inversion | | | |
| | TYPE 1 | TYPE 2 | TYPE 3 | TYPE 4 | TYPE 5 | TYPE 6 | TYPE 7 | TYPE 8 | TYPE 9 | TYPE 10 |
| | negative | question | inversion | not+finite | plain | do+adv infinitive | H/W question | If-less | adverbials | object foregr |
| Male | 130 | 25 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 2 |
| % | 39 | 60 | 52 | 0 | 54 | 71 | 33 | 100 | 33 | 100 |
| Female | 200 | 16 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| % | 61 | 40 | 48 | 100 | 48 | 29 | 66 | 0 | 66 | 0 |

Different ratios between genders are clearly shown in TYPE1, TYPE2, TYPE6, TYPE7 and TYPE9. It should be recognized that almost no instances of TYPE4, TYPE8 and TYPE10 could be found throughout 20 works investigated. And also it should be recognized that there is no gender difference of TYPE3 and TYPE 5. From these reason, only TYPE1, TYPE2, TYPE6, TYPE7 and TYPE9 will be discussed. Here I'm only going to try to illustrate why major gender differences of the above mentioned TYPES of “do” occur.

Linguistic changes are recognized to be progressing if the analysis of variants applied to the data such as ages, styles, sex difference doesn't show the coherence. Irregularity between sexes shows that linguistic changes are in progress (Labov, W YEAR??).

TYPE 1 Do-less negative sentences: I question not but...

[Chart-3] The frequency of the verbs used as “Simple do-less negative”

| | What words are & How often are they used as a simple do less negative? | | | | | | | | Total |
|----------|--|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|--|---|-------|-------|
| | 8 times | 7 times | 6 times | 5 times | 4 times | 3 times | 2times | 1time | |
| 10 Male | | <i>know</i> | | <i>let</i> | <i>fail</i> | <i>affirm</i> <i>doubt</i> <i>think</i> <i>want</i> | <i>seem</i> <i>speak</i> | 25 | 61 |
| 5 Female | <i>know</i> | <i>think</i> | <i>let</i> | | | <i>wish</i> | <i>add</i> <i>love</i> <i>mean</i> <i>trust</i> | 28 | 60 |
| Burney | | | <i>know</i> | | <i>doubt</i> | | <i>see</i> <i>fail</i> <i>make</i> <i>suffer</i> | 40 | 58 |

*Words which bestride between more than two groups are italicized.

The word “know” appears 21 times in total among the texts of three groups (the first place), this is the first and last word which is used commonly and broadly in three groups. Why was this word so commonly and broadly used ?

Social network theory has something to do with this field. And it was in the paper “Samuel Richardson's Role as Linguistic Innovator: A sociolinguistic Analysis” published by Dr. I. Tiekens that I first found the social network theory help analyze this field. Social network theory reveals 1)Gender difference, 2)Class and Role difference, 3)Area difference.

1) Gender difference

Among the verbs used as in simple do-less negative, the verb “know” comes in the first place. 21 examples are found in 20 works of the 18th century authors. When we overlook the ratio of the verb between male authors to female authors, it is about 1 to 2. “Hedges” like “You know”, “sort of”, “just” are said that they are intended to be used to soften the atmosphere.

-Need to explain the meaning of headaches

But the examples of female writers collected here are not that of so called “hedges.” “Simple do-less negative” is a very old type of negation. Some of west Germanic languages like Dutch and German still have this type of negation. The Dutch and German equivalents of “I know not” are “Ik wet niet.” And “Ich weiß nicht.” These equivalents are still in general use. Women stuck to an orthodox or prestigious type of negation. But men were heading for not using “Simple do-less negative.”

The trends of the data are quite different between sexes, men are on the decrease. On the contrary, women maintain it and the variation is older than men. In other words, women preserve heritage but men renew it.

The conclusion drawn from my research is quite different from L. Milroy. (L. Milroy 1980) Milroy explains as follows: “In Western urbanized society one of the most general findings of all recent studies is the sexual differences in language usually take the form of women approximating closer to the prestige pattern, and style-shifting more extensively, than men. Women are also sometimes thought to initiate linguistic change.”)

The case study by W. Labov at Martha's Vineyard is quoted in many books and it is still effective(???) on the study of linguistic change. He maintains that linguistic change in New York city is caused by females but in Martha's Vineyard it is different, it is not by females but

males who take the leadership in linguistic change. He exemplified this with the study of diphthongs [au] in house and [ai] in white. In this island [a] sound was centralized and became pronounced [ɨ]. In other words, [au] changed into [ɨu] and [ai] into [ɨi]. In the case of Martha's Vineyard, fishermen in Chilmark recognized this centralization of the diphthongs as a powerful symbol of group identity. Linguistic changes are led by the sex who commits him/herself into the value of the society deeper than another sex.

2) Class and Role difference

Four types of classification were made by Labov. They are 1)Upper Middle Class 2)Lower Middle Class 3)Working Class 4)Lower Class . I don't think it possible to classify 18th century authors into 4 classes as done by Labov. (Labov 1972)

I just try to classify three classes 1)Upper Class 2)Middle Class 3)Lower Class.

The social status of the 18th century writers I chose were all very high. They were all well off and above the standard of the time. I still have doubt as to how much their status affects their style in their works. In general it's very possible to maintain that class difference affects the language they speak as Labov asserts. But in most cases, the only well-educated people lived by writing. It's not acceptable to classify that any of writers I discuss belong to the Lower Class. -very hard to find the data for -but see Austin

Among the writers Goldsmith, Beckford and Foster are exceptions according to Chart-1. Goldsmith is poles apart from Beckford and Foster. In Goldsmith, he used almost no "do" regarding ten TYPES. Beckford and Foster used TYPE1 extraordinary often. Beckford accounted for 1/4 of the men's total number of TYPE2 listed in Chart-1.

I attempted to make an investigation into the occupations of the writers and their parents to see the social status of writers.

However it must be recognized that some occupations, such as admiral, member of the House of Common, and politicians, suggest that some writers may have influenced by considerably outside the scope of the average writer.?????

Regardless of sex difference, the status of Beckford was the highest among the writers of 18th century I studied. His speech and activities were very much influential in the area he lived. Because he was a member of House of Commons. Foster shows the same tendency toward TYPE1.

Her work "The coquette" is thought to be the one of the earliest female works written in America. Her social status would be above standard but not as high as Beckford. She tended to use TYPE1 extremely. But her style didn't exert influence on her contemporaries.

The general trend of the "do-less negative sentence" in the 18th century was on the decrease. Nowadays "do-less negative sentences" are completely replaced by "periphrastic do negative." In this sense, Beckford and Foster were vanguards but Goldsmith was an innovator of TYPE1. I have no clue to reveal Beckford's and Foster's excessive use of TYPE1.

3) Area difference

The living area of most of the writers was in England and Ireland.

-present systematically

Exceptions among them were Foster, and Rowson. Foster was born and brought up in America in the 18th century. Rowson was born in England. Later she emigrated to America and came and went between England and America. From a geographical standpoint, it is very clear that they lived far away from England. Though Beckford lived in London, he was said to live alone in a stately mansion with big fence. Conditions surrounding Foster, Rowson and Beckford were quite different from other writers. But they have something in common. The language they used was not the one spoken among 18th century writers in London. But it doesn't mean that they spoke the vernacular. Their language was archaic standard English.

[Chapter-4] Social status and living areas of 18th century writers

| Authors' Name | SEX | Occupation | | Social class | Living area |
|---------------|-----|----------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Author | Family | | |
| G.Farquhar | M | actor, later dramatist | | | Dublin Univ. |
| D.Defoe | M | journalist, novelist | hosier Anti-Anglican Animal oil candle maker and butcher | | London |
| A.Pope | M | writer | linen merchant | | London Windsorforest |
| J.Swift | M | politician, Tory secretary | Officer of Tiperary (Ireland) | ×U M | Dublin & London Moorpark |
| S.Richardson | M | novelist, printer | Cabinetmaker | M | Derbyshire & London |
| S.Johnson | M | master writer | bookkeeper | ×U M | Richfield Staffordshire |
| O.Goldsmith | M | novelist, poet, dramatist | cleric | U | Ireland & Dublin |
| T.Smollet | M | surgeon | | | Scotland Dumbartonshire |
| W.Beckford | M | member of House of Common | mayor of London councilor | U | Fonthill |
| W.Godwin | M | novelist, publisher | cleric | | London Cambridgeshire |
| S.Fielding | F | writer | Admiral brother? | ×U M | Somersetshire London! |
| G.Lennox | F | Writer | | | Born in N.Y. |
| E.Inchbald | F | novelist, dramatist | | | |
| S.Rowson | F | novelist, educator | | | Portsmouth |
| H.W.Foster | F | Novelist | | | America |
| F.Burney | F | novelist, court lady | historian of music organist | ×U M | |

1)Upper Class=U, 2)Middle Class=M, 3)Lower Class=L