Contents

Acknowledgements xi

Principles of Presentation and Provenance of the Papers xiii

PART I: Frame of Reference 1

1. Introduction to a Diachronic Study of Variation 1

1.1. Aims 1
1.2. Method 3

2. Early American English 6

2.1. Background to the Study of Early American English 6

2.2. Focus on the New England Idiom 9
2.2.1. Identity in Region 9
2.2.2. Identity in Time 13
2.2.3. Early British vs. American English: Standards of Comparison 17

2.3. An Old Language in a New Setting: Forces and Directions of Development 18
2.3.1. Roots in Britain 18
2.3.2. Factors Promoting and/or Retarding Change 20
Conservatism vs. Innovation; Unification vs. Diversification 20
Geographical and Social Mobility 21
Interest in Education 24
Social Networks 26

3. A Corpus of Early American English 27

3.1. Corpus-Based Study of Diachronic Variation 27

3.2. The Relationship of the Text to Spoken Language 28

3.3. Selectional Criteria and Classification of Texts 30
3.3.1. Characteristics of Early New England Writing 30
3.3.2. Practical Restrictions Governing the Choice of Texts 34
3.3.3. Textual Parameters 37
The Selectional Criteria Considered 37
Non-Speech-Based vs. Speech-Based Production 38
Level of Formality 39
Text Type 41
Informant Properties 42

3.3.4. The Structure of the Corpus of Early American English 45

3.4. Widening the Temporal and Geographical Scope 51
3.4.1. A New Variety in the Context of the Development of English 51
3.4.2. Evidence for the Study of the Structure of English: The *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* 53

4. Variation Analysis and the Historical Study of Modals 56

4.1. The Study of Modal Auxiliaries: Past and Present 56
4.1.1. A Variety of Approaches 56
4.1.2. On Approaches to the Study of Modals and Semantic Change 59

4.2. Variation Analysis and Modal Auxiliaries 67
4.2.1. The Rationale of Diachronic Variation Analysis 67
4.2.2. Contextual Factors and Variant Set-Ups Considered 73

5. Concluding Remarks 78

PART II: Studies 81

A. CAN (COULD) vs. MAY (MIGHT) 81

Chapter 1 83

MAY and *MIGHT* Indicating 'Epistemic Possibility' in Early American English 83

1. Introduction 83
2. Epistemic Meaning and the Variant Forms 84
3. Historical Background 87
4. The Use of MAY and MIGHT 89
5. Syntactic and Semantic Environments 93

Final Remarks 96
References 97

Chapter 2 99

On the Use of the Modal Auxiliaries Indicating 'Possibility' in Early American English 99

1. Introduction 99
2. Material and Method 102
3. The Criteria of Classification 103
4. Results 107

Appendix: Figures 124
References 128

Chapter 3 131

CAN (COULD) vs. *MAY (MIGHT)* in Old and Middle English: Testing a Diachronic Corpus 131

Introduction 131
The Old and Middle English Corpora Studied 134
The Linguistic Factors Studied 139
Full Verb vs. Modal Auxiliary 143
Epistemic Uses 149
'Non-Epistemic Possibility' 158
Notional Sub-Categories 165
Final Remarks 172
Appendix 1 174
Appendix 2 176
Appendix 3 177

Chapter 4 181

CAN (COULD) vs. *MAY (MIGHT)*: Regional Variation in Early Modern English? 181

1. Introduction 181

2. Variational Study of Modals in Early Modern English, British vs. American 183

3. Textual Evidence for Studying Regional Variation in Early Modern English 186
3.1. Aspects of Early American English Writing 186
3.2. The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts 189
3.3. The Sub-Corpora Studied 192

4.	Analysis	198
4.1.	Criteria for Classifying the Data	198
4.2.	Choice of the Variant Form in Declarative Sentences	202
4.2.1.	Variant Forms in 'Full Verb' and 'Auxiliary' Use	202
4.2.2.	Overall Survey of 'Auxiliary' Uses	203
4.2.3.	Negation	209
4.2.4.	Textual Distributions of the Variant Forms in 'Affirmative' Uses	213
4.2.5.	Distributions of the Variant Forms in Different Clause Types; Passive Constructions	218
4.2.6.	Notional Sub-Categories	223
4.2.6.1.	'Permission' and 'Ability'	223
4.2.6.2.	'Neutral Possibility'	226
4.2.6.2.1.	Textual Distributions of the Variant Forms	226
4.2.6.2.2.	Author's Sex and Participant Relationship	231
4.2.6.2.3.	Constructions in Comparative and Relative Clauses	235
4.2.6.2.4.	The Use of the Variant Forms with Animate and Inanimate Subjects	237
4.3.	Choice of the Variant Form in Direct Questions	240
5.	Final Remarks	241
Figures		243
Primary Texts		250
References		251

B. SHALL (SHOULD) vs. WILL (WOULD) 259

Chapter 5 261

The Use of *SHALL* and *WILL* from Middle to Early Modern English 261

1. Introduction 261
2. The Sub-Corpora Studied 263
3.1. Overall Distributions of the Variant Forms 268
3.2. Textual Distributions of the Variant Forms 269
4. Final Remarks 273
Figures 274
References 275

Chapter 6 277

SHALL (SHOULD) vs. *WILL (WOULD)* in Early British and American English: A Variational Study of Change 277

1. Introductory Remarks 277
2. Early Modern British English vs. American: Textual Evidence for a Study of Diachronic Variation 278
3. Diachronic Study of SHALL (SHOULD) and WILL (WOULD) Variation: Classificational Considerations 285
4. Full Verb Uses 290

5.	Auxiliary Uses	291
5.1.	Grammatical Person: Overall Distributions of the Variant Forms	291
5.2.	The Influence of the Type of Text and Level of Formality on the Choice of the Variant Form	294
5.3.	Tense and Aspect	301
5.4.	Clause Type	305
5.5.	'Active' and 'Passive' Constructions	308
5.6.	Animate and Inanimate Subject in Third Person Uses	310
5.7.	Dynamic/Stative Meanings of the Main Verb	312
5.7.1.	First Person Uses	313
5.7.2.	Third Person Uses	319
5.8.	Notional Sub-Categories	321
5.8.1.	'Epistemic' Uses	323
5.8.2.	'Root' Uses	324
5.9.	Two Sociolinguistic Variables: The Sex and Participant Relationship of the Author	326
5.10.	The Choice of the Variant Forms in Questions	329
6.	Concluding Remarks	331
Figures		334
Bibliography		337
	Primary Sources	337
	References	339

C. Summary of Results 345

PART III: Bibliography for Parts I and II 355

I Primary Sources 355

1. Early American English 355

2. Sources for the Texts Selected from the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal* 359

   A. Old English 359
   B. Middle English 361
   C. Early Modern British English 368

3. Other Corpora 375

II References 376

Abstract 419