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**Abstract**

This thesis deals with auxiliary verbs and copulas that occur in the first episode of the first season of the TV show *The Wire*. The Appendix part contains every example of these tokens and they are used for determining confirmations or disconfirmations of the predictions connected with morphosyntactic behavior of auxiliary verbs based on the concept of Distributed Morphology and, more specifically, Markedness Hierarchy and Impoverishment, presented in Parrott (2017). The thesis also improves on Pagáč (2017) in scope and attention to all auxiliary verbs, and includes *ain't* as one of them.
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**Anotace**
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# Introduction

The aim of this diploma thesis is to provide the reader with the insight into the matter of auxiliary verbs *be, have,* and *do*. To be more precise, the thesis works with the American TV show *The Wire* and it uses its script as a basis for the corpus. The first episode of the first season was used for creating a corpus of linguistic data. Some similarities in methodology can be found when compared to Pagáč (2017). However, said thesis used the script of the show to account only for the examples of *ain't* as this negative contraction was the main focus of the research. This diploma thesis builds on Pagáč (2017) in terms of the scope of the verbs included. Not only does it incorporate all the examples of *ain't* and their speakers from the first episode of the show; it also adds all the other auxiliary verbs to the corpus for further analysis and examination.

The predictions that this thesis sets to confirm or disconfirm are all connected to Parrott (2017). Parrott proposes that auxiliary verbs follow a Markedness Hierarchy and that their behavior is influenced by Impoverishment rules (for more details, see Chapter . This approach also encompasses auxiliary distribution, copula dropping (or copula deletion); linguistic phenomena which are also part of the focus of this thesis.

*Ain't* is again considered as one of the auxiliaries (a negated one, to be exact) in this thesis as well, and the first prediction to be confirmed or disconfirmed includes *ain't* as a factor:

Speakers who use *ain't* for *be* and *have* also use negated *do*, i.e. *don't,* in 3rd person singular paradigm. This means than one speaker is able to utter both sentences in ):

(1) (a) He **ain't** working.

(cf. He **isn't** working.)

(b) He **don't** work.

(cf. *He* ***doesn't*** *work*.)

Note that the interpretation and understanding of the sentence in b) is not hindered by its being "non-standard" for (not only) the speakers of African American Vernacular English (henceforward AAVE).

Second prediction goes as follows: Speakers use *be* more frequently than *have* and they also use *have* more frequently than *do*. This is related to the first prediction as it takes the markedness of auxiliaries into consideration. The distribution of auxiliaries is certainly not equal, i.e. we will not obtain results for frequency that suggest that speakers use *be* 33 % of the time, *have* 33 % of the time, and *do* 33 % of the time.Rather we should encounter numbers that indicate that auxiliaries are distributed according to their markedness, with *be* being the most marked, *have* being somewhere in the middle, and *do* being the least marked of all three.

Final prediction focuses specifically on copula *be.* As the research shows, all auxiliary verbs (*be, have, do*) can be deleted, or dropped. Observe in ), respectively (example number Vxxxx on the right indicates a token from *The Wire* corpus, see Section for more details):

(2) (a) You **∅** here early.

(V0322)

(cf. You **are** here early.)

(b) Snot **∅** been doing the same shit since...

(V0010)

(cf. Snot **has** been doing the same shit since…)

(c) **∅** Major know?

(V0154)

(cf. **Does** Major know?)

The claim is that *be* drops more frequently due to its being the most marked one of the auxiliary verbs which is the final prediction of this thesis. My aim is to find evidence of this, describe the conditions under which the dropping occurs for every auxiliary verb, and provide statistics for the drop rate across all auxiliary verbs.

A minor goal of this thesis is to also provide statistics concerning *ain't* numbers per speaker with relation to the frequency of other auxiliary verbs (*be, have,* and *do*) within that same speaker's utterances—something which Pagáč (2017) lacked as it provided only absolute numbers of *ain't* with no visible relation or statistical relevance to other auxiliary verbs.

Chapter 2 introduces the topic of Markedness Hierarchy and Impoverishment which are the necessary bases for all of the predictions and they require to be presented to the reader so that they follow the research process keeping in mind the theoretical framework of the thesis.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of all the three auxiliary verbs *be, do, have,* and also *ain't* and their morphosyntactic capabilities. To be specific, issues that are laid out in this chapter are complements of auxiliary verbs, their negation, how they behave in interrogative sentences, how they form codas (or question tags), and how they can convey emphatic meaning. The *ain't* part of this chapter refers to Pagáč (2017) as that thesis' main focus was this vernacular contraction, a substitute for all the other auxiliary verbs. This chapter not only outlines common features of auxiliary verbs, but it also presents characteristics that are unique to each of them, such as endings of aspect, possible deletion etc.

Chapter 4 presents the methodology used for acquiring tokens in the corpus. This methodology is similar to that used in Pagáč (2017) but it also expands on it in terms of the number of verbs and categories for closer description and analysis. The chapter also mentions research limitations encountered during the data collection process.

Chapter 5 features results obtained specifically for the confirmation or disconfirmation of the predictions and their subsequent analysis and interpretation. This concerns numbers for *ain't* for *be* and *have* and their relation to numbers for *don't* for 3rd person singular, the relative frequency of auxiliary verbs, their drop rate, and also numbers for *ain't* in general and how they fare in comparison to numbers for other auxiliary verbs in general and per specific speaker as well. The second half of this chapter presents a minor discussion on abandoned research questions concerning habitual *be* and the treatment of non-inversion examples in relation to their classification in the corpus.

It can be stated that all of the above predictions have been confirmed, using the data from the corpus and sorting them out in the way that was required for any potential confirmation or disconfirmation of the predictions.

# Markedness Hierarchy & Impoverishment

This chapter familiarizes the reader with the theoretical framework used in interpreting the collected data. It touches upon the linguistic approach of Distributed Morphology, and specifically Markedness Hierarchy and Impoverishment. The chapter uses Bobaljik (2015), Nevins (2016), and Parrott (2017) (for more specific insight, predictions, and their outcome) as the primary source of theory and reference.

The theory of Distributed Morphology follows the approach that morphemes are abstract units that, by combination, create not only words but also complex phrases. Moreover, there is no Lexicon of "words" within this framework; the features are distributed over other parts of grammar. Distributed Morphology works with lists of elements that are only later inserted into the positions of morphemes, or Terminals. What is of interest to the framework of this thesis are Vocabulary Items, as they are somewhat similar to "traditional" morphemes. These "Vocabulary Items compete with each other to apply to a morpheme" (Embick 2015: 94) at Spell-Out, which is the phonological representation of a Terminal, after all syntactic operations are concluded. This "competition for a position" is relevant to the predictions set up for this thesis.

## Markedness Hierarchy

As stated above, the phonological features are added to these pieces of information at Spell-Out. However, before this happens, Vocabulary Items are inserted based on an order, or rather a hierarchy which is influenced by the markedness of these Vocabulary Items. This hierarchy cannot be pronounced; Vocabulary Items must be inserted linearly. As Vocabulary Items compete for insertion, the principle that governs the process of "winning" this competition is *specificity*: If more Vocabulary Items compete for insertion into a Terminal, the one that is more specific, or *marked*, wins (Nevins 2016: 23).

## Impoverishment

This section expands on the theory of Markedness Hierarchy and incorporates the operation of Impoverishment which is responsible for the morphosyntactic processes that gave rise to the formulation of the two of the predictions on copula-dropping and *ain't* for *be/have* and *don't.*

### Related to copula be deletion

Following Nevins & Parrott (2010) and Parrott (2017), the Markedness Hierarchy can be applied to the auxiliary verb/copula paradigm. Parrott (2017: 23) presents a Markedness Hierarchy concerning copulas and auxiliary verbs whose scale can be viewed in ).

(3) [+cop] > [–cop] > [+aux] > [–aux]

As the reader may see, Vocabulary Items with the feature of [+cop] are marked more than the other Vocabulary Items. This particular hierarchy is supported by Embick (2015: 95) who states that "more specified Vocabulary Items appear higher on lists". To generate a less specific Vocabulary Item, a morphological operation called Impoverishment comes into play. The result of this operation is that the most general exponent is inserted into the Terminal. In this case, Impoverishment deletes the feature of copula and "make[s] the terminal node less rich and less specified" (Nevins 2016: 33). Nevins continues with comments on this operation and its outcome:

"As a result, an unexpected, less-specified exponent can suddenly win, as the more specified exponent is rendered irrelevant, and knocked out of the competition, by the operation of an impoverishment rule that makes it no longer eligible."

(Nevins 2016: 33)

This "unexpected, less-specified" exponent in case of copula *be* is simply zero copula, a deleted exponent which takes the place of the Terminal here (see subsection 5.3.1 for the results and interpretation of copula-deletion).

This is where the prediction related to the dropping of copula *be* being more frequent than other auxiliary verbs *have* and *do* due to its markedness in terms of Distributed Morphology came to existence: "Impoverishment targets a marked Terminal and a less-specified Vocabulary Item is inserted into said Terminal after feature deletion" (Parrott 2017: 12).

### Related to ain't for be/have and don't

The other prediction, as the reader may recall, concerns speaker who use *ain't* for *be*/*have* and *don't* for 3rd person singular. This seemingly accidental connection can be described again using Distributed Morphology as a framework, falling specifically under Impoverishment rules as a result. The principle is very similar to that of the previous subsection, as in it works under the concept of specificity and markedness.

A Terminal that is normally occupied by auxiliary *be* or *have* is, according to the Impoverishment rules, replaced by *ain't*. This vernacular contraction deletes all φ features of that Terminal and, as a result, is therefore less specific, or marked, in terms of these features; there are fewer of them, hence the Item falls lower on the specificity list or Markedness Hierarchy. Moreover, whenever a speaker utters *ain't* for a Terminal which normally contains auxiliary verb *be* or *have*, they, in turn, utter *don't* for 3rd person singular because this Vocabulary Items is again less specific than the "standard", more marked *doesn't.* This still follows the Impoverishment rules described in general in Nevins (2016) and the leveling caused by these rules, connected to *ain't* and *don't*, proposed with more detail in Parrott (2017).

This thesis takes these rules of Impoverishment and bases another prediction on them using the corpus for empirical research and then interpreting the results.

### Related to frequency of auxiliary verbs

Where Markedness Hierarchy plays yet another role is the frequency of use of auxiliary verbs. As stated before, however, if one follows the rules introduced in Section 2.1, this hierarchy can be applied to the overall frequency of auxiliary verbs as well.

As seen in the previous sections, auxiliary verb *be* is the most marked of the three, i.e. it "wins" the competition for insertion into Terminals. The prediction concerning auxiliary verb frequency of utterance makes auxiliary *be* the most frequent one of the three since the most specified Vocabulary Item is inserted into the T-position. Based on Parrott (2017), auxiliary verb *have* is deemed the second most marked auxiliary verb and auxiliary verb *do* the least marked of them all, with their frequencies expected to correlate with their markedness

## Summary

This chapter presented explanations on the theoretical framework, namely Markedness Hierarchy and Impoverishment (under Distributed Morphology), as these serve as the bases for the predictions. Morphemes, or Vocabulary Items, are distributed according to a hierarchy, which in the process, restricts other morphemes for insertion. Some Vocabulary Items are blocked by others which creates a hierarchy with rules that are followed and can be traced when examining speakers' utterances.

# Auxiliary Verbs: An Overview

This chapter presents an overview of auxiliary verbs *be, have* and *do.* More specifically, it provides conditions of their morphosyntactic behavior, i.e. the various kinds of environments in which they can be found. Features shared by all of the three auxiliary verbs are to be presented here. Features individual to a specific auxiliary verb with required examples will be described in their respective sections.

## Shared morphology

All auxiliary verbs have their distinctive morphology, reflecting tense, person, and number. The most complex of the three is *be* with its five verbal forms (*am, are, is, was, were*), followed by *have* with three verbal forms (*have, has, had*). *Do* has the equal number of verbal forms (*do, does, did*) as *have*. When appearing in the T-position, they incorporate φ features and carry grammatical information.

## Distinctive complementation

*Be, have*, and *do* all require some kind of verbal complement to be treated as auxiliary verbs, otherwise they show behavior identical to that of lexical verbs. Examples for comparison can be found in ) below. Examples of auxiliary verbs are marked as (a-c) and in **bold**, whereas examples with lexical verbs of *be, have,* and *do* are marked as (a'-c') with the lexical counterpart underlined:

(4) (a) Yo, man, I**'m** trying to give you a little game… (V0385)

(a') But he's a company man. (V0486)

(b) I mean, they**'ve** dropped 10 or Beat three cases in court... (V0135)

(b') I don't have an H-file on Scroggins. (V0220)

(c) I mean, I **don't** know how you do shit up in the towers. (V0360)

(c') Then you don't do it at all. (V0464)

Note that when used as an auxiliary, *be, have,* and *do* appear in the T-position, carrying the tense, person, and number information. In this position, they also require a verbal complement: a main verb combined with the progressive aspect ending *–ing* in a) or the perfective aspect ending –*ed* in b), and the lexical verb in c).

Their lexical counterparts, however, occupy the main/lexical verb position (except for lexical *be* whose position remains the same in both cases) and take different complements: lexical *be* can take an AP (e.g. *They are* [AP *extremely happy*]*.*), PP (e.g. *They are* [PP *in the park*].) or an NP as in a'), lexical *have* takes an NP as in b'), and lexical *do* takes an NP as its complement in c').

## Negation

All auxiliary verbs form their negation in the same manner using *not* or its contracted variant *–n't* both of which occur in the position immediately following theirs as in c'). However, this operation applies to forming negative *declarative* sentences only. The following section deals, in part, with the changes that are specific when it comes to inverting the elements of (not only) auxiliary verbs for the purpose of creating (negative) interrogative sentences.

## Interrogative sentences

As mentioned above, special operation is required to create interrogative sentences in English. Unlike e.g. Czech where there very often is no need for a syntactic operation of any kind (merely adding changing intonation in spoken language), English uses inversion of auxiliary verbs to create questions: The auxiliary element is fronted to indicate an interrogative sentence and the T-position remains empty this time. See the inverted variants of a-c) in a-c), respectively, below:

(5) (a) Yo, man, **am** I \_\_ trying to give you a little game…?

(b) I mean, **have** they \_\_ dropped 10 or Beat three cases in court...?

(c) I mean, **don’t** I\_\_ know how you do shit up in the towers?

Note the contracted *–n't* complies with the rules of inversion and moves the to the front of the sentences with its respective auxiliary (in this case, *do*). However, if we were to observe behavior of an non-contracted *not* in *(6*a), we notice a difference in this fronting in *(6*b):

(6) (a) … but this case **is** **not** going to sprawl. (V0476)

(b) … but **is** this case **not** going to sprawl?

The negative *not* does not move the front with the auxiliary verb and remains in its original T-position, thus exhibiting the difference in behavior compared to its contracted variant which should be noted with regards to morphological forms and syntactic operations concerning auxiliary verbs.

The following sections demonstrate various examples of auxiliary verbs that can be extracted from the corpus of the first episode of the first season of *The Wire.*

## Coda

Auxiliary verbs are also used in codas, or question tags. Question tags consist of an auxiliary verb *be, have* or *do* with polarity opposite to that of the main clause, and an anaphoric referent to the subject of that clause. Observe this phenomenon with an example of the auxiliary verb *have* in *(7*):

(7) Jacki has traveled with that agency before, **hasn't he**i?

The capability to appear in question tag applies to all three auxiliary verbs, not only *have.* The polarity of a question tag must always be reversed in relation to the rest of the sentence; in case of a positive sentence, the negation in a question tag can be contracted as in ) or it can be used in full compliant with the word order of negated auxiliary verbs in interrogative sentences introduced in Section 3.3 (…*has he not?*). Question tags are also unique in that respect that they are created by auxiliary verbs only—no lexical verb can ever appear in a question tag. Moreover, there must be an anaphoric referent of the subject present in the question tag; repetition of the subject itself is not possible. The following sentences in ) are ungrammatical.

(8) (a) \* Jack has traveled with that agency before, has he?

(b) \* Jack has traveled with that agency before, traveled he?

(b) \* Jack has traveled with that agency before, hasn't Jack?

## Emphasis

A specific feature typical only for auxiliary verbs is the possibility to utilize them for emphatic speech. The auxiliary verb (not the lexical one) can take stress in utterance for pointing out the importance of the verbal activity.

(9) (a) Eventually, he **did** show up!

(b) *\* Eventually, he* ***showed*** *up!*

## Be

What follows are examples of auxiliary verb *be* and its morphological forms found and collected for the corpus. Missing tokens—(11d) and (11e)—do not signify that none can be found within the range of the show. This episode alone simply did not prove to be sufficient when it came to supplying enough variety in the examples. Further collection of data and examination may be suggested, not limited to this particular episode, if one desires to find more tokens of morphology of auxiliary verbs.

() Present *be*

singular

(a) 1st I**'m** saying…

(V0012)

(b) 2nd You**'re** typing.

(V0231)

(c) 3rd He**'s** running this detail.

(V0483)

plural

(d) 1st We**'re** backing into some Dominicans up there.

(V0424)

(e) 2nd You guys **are** getting out of drugs?

(V0429)

(f) 3rd My people **are** going down to do some hand-to-hands.

(V0474)

() Past *be*

singular

(a) 1st I **was** in the booth of 221.

(V0048)

(b) 2nd **Were** you on this?

(V0115)

(c) 3rd He came at me like he **was** crazy.

(V0272)

plural

(d) 1st NONE FOUND

(e) 2nd NONE FOUND

(f) 3rd What **were** your duties on that date?

(V0047)

As stated above, the morphology for the verb *be* is the same for its auxiliary and lexical variant, however, complementation differs. All examples in (10) are those of auxiliary verb *be,* part of the progressive aspect **endings** (e.g. *are**go****ing***)in that they require a verbal complement in the form of *–ing* ending. All examples in (11), on the other hand, show the behavior of copula *be*: Examples (11a) and (11b) are complemented by PPs (*in the booth of 221, on this,* respectively), example (11c) by AP (*crazy*), and (11f) by NP (*your duties*).

## Have

This section provides the reader with the examples of the auxiliary verb *have*. See the following subsection for a detailed distinction among these auxiliary forms.

() Present *have*

singular

(a) 1st …I**'ve** ever worked.

(V0411)

(b) 2nd … you **∅** gotta do it your own self.

(V0163)

(c) 3rd The crew that**'s** been running Franklin Terrace for a year.

(V0125)

plural

(d) 1st Yeah, we **∅** got them.

(V0549)

(e) 2nd Y'all niggas **∅** been burnt.

(V0361)

(f) 3rd … they **∅** got the whole damn thing.

(V0356)

No tokens of auxiliary verb *have* have been found within this episode. The specificity for the use the past perfective verbal form (i.e. describing events that happened in time before the past) can be responsible for the absence of these examples in the corpus.

It can be stated that every auxiliary verb *have* is complemented by a lexical verb and the participle **ending** *–ed* to create the perfective aspect verbal form (e.g. *has**travel****ed***). However, there are specific differences in interpretation to be found when examining some of the examples in ).

### Perfective have, possessive have, and obligatory have

First, the "clear" perfective auxiliary verb *have* is found in examples (12a), (12c), and (12e). This auxiliary variant is simply complemented by any lexical verb to express the perfective aspect of the verbal action.

Second, examples (12d) and (12f) represent the behavior of possessive have. This variant in combination with lexical verb *get* (or rather, *got*) expresses possession exclusively but uses *have* in its auxiliary form, occupying the T-position, not the **lexical** verb position (e.g. *Yeah, we* ***have*** *them; They* ***have*** *the whole damn thing.*) This possessive *have+got* is typical for the British English variant. Its American form (not only AAVE) loses the auxiliary *have* and keeps the meaning by using only the lexical *got*, as examples (12d) and (12f) clearly show.

Third, example (12b) is a variant called obligatory *have* which expresses an obligatory action. Its meaning is synonymous with that of the modal verb *must* or semi-modal *have to.* Originally, its form was shaped as *have got to*, but in the process, auxiliary verb *have* was dropped, and *got to* merged into *gotta* for phonetic reasons, making this variant of *have* a colloquial one.

Notice that all the examples of auxiliary verb *have* (whether perfective, possessive or obligatory) demonstrate the possibility of deletion (or dropping) of the auxiliary verb *have*. See Section 5.3 for more details on dropping of auxiliary verbs.

## Do

This section is concerned with examples of auxiliary *do* found in the corpus for the demonstration of its morphological forms.

() Present *do*

singular

(a) 1st I **don't** know shit about jail.

(V0267)

(b) 2nd You **don't** know that.

(V0456)

(c) 3rd **Doesn't** seem fair.

(V0005)

plural

(d) 1st … how much **do** we have on this guy?

(V0342)

(e) 2nd You all **don't** need a prosecutor, you need a fucking referee.

(V0471)

(f) 3rd … murders that **don't** mean a shit to anybody.

(V0226)

() Past *do*

singular

(a) 1st I **didn't** know…

(V0227)

(b) 2nd So what **did** you do?

(V0517)

(c) 3rd But he **didn't** call me back.

(V0061)

plural

(d) 1st NONE FOUND

(e) 2nd NONE FOUND

(f) 3rd Why **∅** they put you down here, yo? (V0339)

Auxiliary verb *do* in its forms is specific because, unlike the other auxiliary verbs *be* and *have,* it is unpronounced in positive declarative sentences, both in present and past simple. This is its inherent morphosyntactic feature. It emerges only in interrogative or negative sentences, as in e.g. (13d) and (13e), respectively.

Again, a drop, in this case of auxiliary verb *do*, can be found in (13f). Section 5.3 provides more details for this dropped auxiliary verb as well.

## *Ain't*

The research conducted on *ain't* throughout Pagáč (2017) has shown that this vernacular negative contraction can substitute all auxiliary verbs *be, have,* and *do.* I refer the reader to that thesis to observe examples of all possible substitutions. However, note that the information in (15) presents which tokens of auxiliary verb, tense, person, and number have not been found within the entire first season of *The Wire*:

() (a) *ain't* for present *be*, 2nd p., plural

(b) *ain't* for present perfective *have*, 1st p., plural

(c) *ain't* for present obligatory *have*, 1st+3rd p., singular

(d) *ain't* for present obligatory *have*, 1st-3rd p. plural

(e) *ain't* for present *do*, 1st-3rd p. plural

(f) *ain't* for past *do*, 1st p. plural

(g) ***ain't* for past *be*, all persons**

(h) ***ain't* for past *have*, all persons**

In addition—and as confirmed in Pagáč (2017)—utterances of examples in (15g-h) cannot be attested in any modern AAVE variant, not only across the first season of *The Wire.*

## Summary

This chapter presented the variety of English auxiliary verbs *be, have,* and *do* and their morphosyntactic behavior. It showed what is shared and what is specific to each of the auxiliary verbs. The chapter also described negation, inversion, and specific details connected to the three auxiliary verbs, including their vernacular substitution *ain't.* Some of the examples of all three auxiliary verbs (and copula *be*) can be dropped or deleted, Section 5.3 offers more information and a closer analysis of this phenomenon.

# Methodology

This chapter will familiarize the reader with overall approach to the data collecting process. The structure and content details of the corpus will be provided. It will also briefly introduce the show and its premise, as well as some limitations that arose during research. Alvarez and Simon's *The Wire: Truth Be Told* (2009) serves as the main source for the factual part of the chapter that is concerned with the show.

## Briefly on *The Wire* as a TV show

*The Wire* is an American TV show created by David Simon for the HBO network. It takes place in the city of Baltimore, Maryland, and its five seasons span over the period from 2002 to 2008. Each season shares the same main characters but focuses on a different problematic aspect of the inhabitants, the city life, and social as well as racial issues. If the first season takes the war on drugs as its premise, the second season continues this story but expands its scope to include the struggle of the working-class citizens of Baltimore. The show as a whole can be perceived as a probe into various areas of the urban America during the period after the September 11 attacks. Its commentary on these environments is invaluable and that is one of the reasons that it has gained such status and popularity, as well as it has been praised by critics over the years.

The first season, as stated above, presents the conflict of the detectives (consisting of both white and black native speakers) and the so-called "Barksdale gang" which is predominantly represented by black native speakers, utterers of the AAVE variant.

## Collecting the tokens

The process of gathering data itself can be described as twofold.

First, the scripts for the entire first season of *The Wire* were obtained, episode by episode, from a website dedicated to the scripts for every episode across the five seasons of the show. These scripts served as great aid in accounting for every occurrence of every auxiliary verb. Then an Excel spreadsheet started being produced consisting of these examples, relying only on the script for the first episode of the first season of *The Wire*. Once all of these tokens were transcribed into the spreadsheet, it needed to be finished with any missing ones, and (more importantly) all the examples needed to be assigned to their respective speakers—the scripts feature only dialogue spoken on the show, without mentioning the characters who pronounce said dialogue.

The second part was to watch the episode and find the speakers for the existing utterances. This was important with regards to two of the predictions: The one concerning the speakers who use *ain't* for *be* and *have* and are able to use *don't* in 3rd singular, and the prediction that speakers use auxiliary verb *be* more frequently than they do *have*,and that speakers use *have* more frequently than they do *do.* Without the assigned speakers, no confirmation or disconfirmation of any of these predictions would be possible.

At this point, the coding process could begin to produce what is now the Appendix section of this thesis: the corpus of every auxiliary verb found in the first episode of the first season of *The Wire*, with its relevant coded categories.

The categories include a number (NO.) of each example in the format of VXXXX; the "V" stands for "verb" and its purpose is to differentiate between the examples taken from the corpus and the examples found within the text of this thesis, to avoid confusion. The next category is QUOTE which contains a speaker's utterance and the auxiliary verb relevant for the research. The category EPISODE remains for further study of the show (see Subsection 4.3.2); for now it only states "S01E01" for the first episode of the first season but can be expanded in future by further research for the remainder of the show if need be.

AUX/V describes the nature of the auxiliary verb (*be*, *have*, and *do*, in general). The column titled AIN'T states if the auxiliary is substituted by the negative contraction *ain't*. This column makes use of the corpus for the first episode of the first season of *The Wire* found in Pagáč (2017)—every example of *ain't* has already been accounted for*.* To examine each auxiliary verb even more precisely, the category TENSE with values PAST or PRESENT was added. More exact sorting of data for posterior research was made possible by the category V FORM which specifies the particular form of the verb. All forms of *be*, *have*, and *do* were expected, plus an "X" was added in cases where no visible form of an auxiliary verb could be identified (for more details on this, see Section ).

The next categories further specify the auxiliary verbs in question with SUBJ PERSON and SUBJ NUMBER, using values 1-3 and SG and PL, respectively. NON-INVERSION presents interrogative sentences which fulfill the syntactic properties of declarative sentences (see Section 5.5 for more). The column CONTR indicates if the auxiliary verb underwent contraction with any sentence member. The next two categories FULL NEG and CONTR NEG identify negative auxiliary verbs which are either accompanied by the negative by the negative particle *not* in its full form, or contracted with it. This serves the prediction concerning utterances of *ain't* for *be* and *have,* and *don't* in the 3rd person singular.

The columns COP BE, DROP TYPE, and HAB BE describe copula *be,* the type of the auxiliary dropped or deleted (if any), and if the *be* in question falls under habitual *be*, respectively (see Section for details on habitual *be*). And finally, CHARACTER and RACE feature the name and race for each character which, as mentioned earlier, provides confirmation or disconfirmation of the two of the predictions.

Examples for two tokens taken from the spreadsheet created for the corpus are shown in below.

**Figure 1**: Examples V0138 and V0086 from the corpus

The corpus in its entirety forms the Appendix part of this thesis.

## Research limitations

The following section of the thesis deals with the obstacles that had to be considered and resolved during the research process.

### Corpus authenticity

In Pagáč (2017), I discussed the question of authenticity when using a scripted TV show as a source for a corpus of tokens. I refer the reader to that thesis which worked with *ain't* examples only but used almost the same approach and methodology. It can only be stated here that *The Wire* can be considered a reliable source of data to be utilized for token collection, analysis, and hypothesis confirmation or disconfirmation.

### How many examples is too many?

Originally, every single example of auxiliary verb *be, have,* and *do* from the entirety of the first season of *The Wire* was to be recorded, coded, used in further analyzing, and confirming or disconfirming hypotheses set at the beginning of the research process. This plan had to be altered for one very simple reason. By extrapolation, it was expected to obtain around 7800 of total token from the first season of *The Wire*, again before any coding and other data processing. Therefore the scope of the thesis was changed to a specific episode and not the whole season but the focus remained on auxiliary verbs nonetheless. This approach still proves as an extension on ideas proposed and examined in Pagáč (2017) as can be seen in the following chapters.

# Results & Analyses

This chapter provides the actual numbers for auxiliary and their respective predictions. What constitutes a part of each section is also a subsequent analysis of the results and their interpretation in light of the theoretical framework and the predictions based on it, and comments on the results in general. There is also a short discussion on some minor issues that arose when interpreting the result values.

## Prediction regarding *ain't* for *be*/*have* and *don't*

This section deals with what the corpus provides in terms of the tokens used for confirmation or disconfirmation of the first prediction which, as the reader recalls, states that speakers who use *ain't* for *be* and *have* also utter *don't* for 3rd person singular paradigm.

When the corpus is sorted for these relevant examples of *don't* (according to the categories TENSE, V FORM, SUBJ PERSON, and CONTR NEG, in that particular order) for these are expected to be less specific and therefore frequent, it provides tokens demonstrated in ), along with the speakers who pronounce them.

(16) (a) Like our major don't know what that tastes like?

(V0156, Herc)

(b) Don't it make your dick bust concrete…?

(V0311, Sgt. Jay Landsman)

(c) … so it don't seem so white.

(V0346, Bubbles)

(d) He pay you, don't he?

(V0510, Shardene)

The speakers who would potentially attest for this specific prediction are Herc, Sgt. Jay Landsman, Bubbles, and Shardene.

What needs to be done next is to isolate the individual speakers ()and find evidence of their *ain't* utterances for *be* and *have.* This can be performed by sorting the data according to AIN'T, CHARACTER, AUX/V, in that order. When this is done, the corpus provides enough data to cover for the character of Shardene and offers only one relevant token for the character of Bubbles, as it does not contain enough tokens of *ain't* in and of itself. However, Pagáč (2017) in the Appendix section provides the corpus of every *ain't* in the first season of *The Wire.* If we look for results there, we find the examples of *ain't* for *be* and *have* presented in ) (the format Axxx refers to the format of *ain't* examples in the corpus for Pagáč 2017, for possible reference).

(17) (a) Herc: It ain't right. (A047)

(a') Lieutenant, we ain't got- (A243)

(b) Sgt. Jay Landsman: NONE FOUND

(c) Bubbles: Shit, man, you ain't even fucking beige. (V0392)

(c') I ain't even asked for nothing. (A234)

(d) Shardene: Good, 'cause I ain't no whore. (V0508)

(d') You ain't touched that drink. (V0505)

Examples (a-d) indicate tokens of *ain't* for *be*, whereas examples (a'-d') refer to examples of *ain't* for *have.* It is apparent that even though one of the characters (Sgt. Jay Landsman) cannot be provided enough data to confirm or disconfirm the related prediction, the other three characters turn out to have a substantial enough number of examples to support and confirm said hypothesis. In conclusion, the prediction regarding *ain't* for *be*/*have* and *don't* can therefore be treated as confirmed.

Note: This variable *don't* leveling described in Parrott (2017) is prominently featured in the speakers AAVE. However, the character of Herc and his actor, Domenick Lombardozzi, are of Italian-American descent and therefore of white race (as found in the corpus under the category RACE)—an interesting variation on the *don’t* leveling expected mainly in AAVE speakers.

## Relative frequency of auxiliary verbs

The overall frequency of utterance of auxiliary verbs in the first episode of the first season of *The Wire* can be seen in Table 1 below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of examples | % |
| All auxiliary verbs | 551 | 100 |
| *Be* | 348 | 63.2 |
| *Have* | 78 | 14.1 |
| *Do* | 125 | 22.7 |

**Table 1: Overall relative frequency of auxiliary verbs**

The information in the table above shows that the most frequent verb out of all the auxiliary verbs is *be*, with its frequency nearing 2/3 of all auxiliary verbs. Far behind in second place comes *do* with percentage close to 1/4 of auxiliary verbs in the first episode of the show. The least frequent auxiliary verb is *have* which appears only 14.1 % of the time.

This partly confirms the prediction that expected auxiliary verb *be* to be the most frequency in utterance. However, the result goes against the claim that auxiliary verb *have* is the second most marked and therefore frequent auxiliary for this position has been taken by auxiliary verbs *do*. This means that, in terms of markedness and its hierarchy across auxiliary verbs, *be* is truly the most marked, the second most marked is *do*, and the least marked is *have*, according to the data provided by the first episode of the first season of *The Wire.*

## Drop rate

What follows is a continuation from Chapter 3 since that chapter dealt with many cases of drops or deletions which are addressed in this specific section. Just to remind the reader, and to provide examples for this phenomenon, various drops or deletions of all auxiliary verbs are shown in *(18*) below:

(18) (a) He **∅** gonna kill Snot. (V0009)

(b) **∅** You mess with the count or something? (V0340)

(c) Jimmy, man, I**∅** gotta change my clothes at least, come on. (V0526)

(d) I got **∅** something for you. (V0538)

The non-inverted interrogative sentence in b) and the construction it represents in general is given special attention in Section 5.5.

The table below shows numbers for drops found in the corpus when sorting according to the category DROP TYPE:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number in total | Number of drops | % of drops |
| *Be* | 348 | 65 | 18.7 |
| *Have* | 78 | 56 | 71.8 |
| *Do* | 125 | 39 | 31.2 |

**Table 2**: Number of drops per auxiliary verb and copula *be*

Recall from that the total number of examples of auxiliary verbs is 551. In relation to this number, *be* seems to drop more frequently than the other two auxiliary verbs; *have* follows as the second most deleted auxiliary, and *do* has the least number of drops. However, if we take into consideration the total number of the respective auxiliary verbs in and look for their percentage of drops, we see that the highest percentage of drops, in fact, goes to auxiliary verb *have* with 71.8 %*.* This high number for *have* deletion evident from the table above is due to the deletion in the construction (*have) got* and *(have) gotta* in the American English variant which is very prominent not only in AAVE. The second place in terms of occurrence of the auxiliary verb and its subsequent deletion would then go to *do* with 31.2 % of drops, and the last place would be occupied by *be* with 13.4 %. To sum up, auxiliary *be* gets dropped more frequently by the numbers which confirms the prediction, but in percentage, auxiliary *have* takes the spot of the most dropped auxiliary verb.

### Copula be and its drops

This subsection deals with copula *be* in more detail. The examples of copula *be* represent a large portion of the total number of *be* examples (217 tokens out of the total 348 of the verb *be*) and therefore deserve a separate section as their deletion is a prominent feature of AAVE.

Recall that copula *be,* unlike the "regular" auxiliary *be,* takes different complements, namely AP, NP, and PP. Examples in ) provide specific sentences featuring copula deletion:

(19) (a) This **∅** America, man. (V0021)

(b) True, you **∅** right. (V0270)

The sentences maintain the same meaning and interpretation as if the copula stayed in the T-position. It is true that auxiliary *be* can also be deleted, much the same as copula *be.* However, this zero copula, sometimes called *null copula* based on the information gathered at Yale Grammatical Diversity Project (see also Green 2002), appears more often than other auxiliary drops. If we isolate the drops for copula *be* alone, we acquire numbers shown in :

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number in total | Number of drops | % of drops |
| Copula *be* | 217 | 29 | 13.4 |

**Table 3**: Copula *be* and its drops

When compared with the number of total drops for *be* from , it can be observed that the number of copula drops constitutes almost a half of the *be*-drop examples (29 out of 65). This significant number of drops suggests that copula *be* is deleted very frequently due to its being a marked exponent.

The results can be sieved even further, according to the RACE category, to account for the drops within white speakers and black speakers of AAVE. When completed, shows the outcome.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of copula *be* drops | % of drops |
| Total number | 29 | - |
| AAVE speakers | 26 | 89.7 |
| White speakers | 3 | 10.3 |

**Table 4**: Copula *be* and its drops within white and black speakers (AAVE)

The results are in favor of the speakers of AAVE who drops copula *be* almost 90 % of the time, whereas the white speakers who do the same in only three cases which amounts to only around 10 % of the time. Incidentally, the three examples of copula *be* drops belong to a single white speaker, the character of Det. McNulty.

## *Ain't* frequencyrelative to other auxiliary verbs

If we were to illustrate the frequency and distribution for *ain't* in a similar fashion but in relation to other auxiliary verbs it can substitute, it would appear in numbers shown in :

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of examples | % |
| *Ain't* in total | 38 | 100 |
| *Ain't* for *be* | 25 | 65.8 |
| *Ain't* for *have* | 9 | 23.7 |
| *Ain't* for *do* | 4 | 10.5 |

**Table 5: Distribution of *ain't across auxiliary verbs***

This table further proves the high frequency of auxiliary *be* even more with nearly 66 % of occurrences when being substituted by *ain't*. Interestingly, *ain't* substituting *have* is more frequently encountered that *ain't* substituting *do*, contrary to the distribution numbers presented in . A possible extension of research of the entire show could provide more insight into the statistics of *ain't* and its frequency when compared to the other "standard" auxiliary verbs.

### Ain't frequency per speaker

For this subsection, the corpus has been sorted according to the following categories: CHARACTER, AUX/V, and AIN'T. This enables for a comparison of *ain't* examples to other auxiliary verbs within individual speakers in the first episode of the first season of *The Wire.* From all the characters in this episode, 14 attest for *ain't* examples and therefore are included in this subsection. presents the information on this.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of *ain't* | Number of *be* | Number of *have* | Number of *do* |
| Dee | 9 | 42 | 7 | 14 |
| Bunk | 6 | 29 | 9 | 7 |
| Avon | 3 | 10 | 5 | 6 |
| McNulty | 3 | 56 | 12 | 27 |
| Snotboogie's friend | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| addict | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Kima | 2 | 18 | 7 | 6 |
| Nakeisha Lyles | 2 | 7 | 0 | 2 |
| Shardene | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Wallace | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| Bubbles | 1 | 10 | 4 | 2 |
| Stringer | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Tiffany | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 |
| Wee-Bey | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 |

**Table 6**: *Ain't* examples to other auxiliary verbs within individual speakers

The information in the table above merely provides an insight into the numbers of all the auxiliary verbs in relation to the numbers of *ain't*. It basically mirrors the frequency of auxiliary verbs in general (see Section 5.2) and puts these number into the context of the examples of *ain't.* For the future, it could be expanded and cover the entirety of the first season, or even the whole TV show *The Wire,* to account for frequency of *ain't* and other auxiliary verbs more thoroughly.

## Classifying non-inversion

Some of the examples pose a challenge for clear ) classification. Observe in

(20) (a) You called the guy Snot? (V0002)

(b) He give you the shooter? (V0024)

As it is clear, both tokens are missing an auxiliary verb in the T-position because they for an interrogative sentence but the auxiliary is also absent from the fronted position where it appears after inversion for questions. These examples are both classified under NON-INVERSION in the corpus but there is a difference between them. Example (20a) features a lexical verb with grammatical information for past tense (*call****ed***). Example b), however, while missing its auxiliary much the same as (20a), does not contain any grammatical information due to this and is classified as a non-inverted dropped auxiliary in the corpus. It contributes to the number of drops. The difference in interpretation could also be that (20a) is a question of affirmation and b) is a simple interrogative sentence falling under the rules of inversion but omitting the auxiliary. More of these examples can be found in the corpus, and while this phenomenon goes beyond the scope of this thesis, it would be worthwhile to investigate and describe its behavioral pattern more closely in the future.

## Notes on habitual *be*

Habitual *be,* called by the Yale Grammatical Diversity Project "invariant *be*",is a feature typical for AAVE. Examples of it are presented in ):

(21) (a) You be saying that all the time…

(V0290)

(b) Money be green.

(V0365)

(c) So, like, he be talking…

(V0413)

Its morphology is specific in that it always takes form seemingly infinitive be with no morphological variation for person or number whatsoever, and very frequently takes a lexical verb ending in –ing. Its interpretation, however, is not a continuous action, as the ­progressive aspect ending would suggest; it is rather a regular verbal activity, similar in meaning to that of the present simple form in combination with the proper adverb of frequency (i.e. re-written from ): *You say that all the time****…****;* see Green 2002; Lippi-Green 1997).

Habitual *be* was originally part of the predictions and research questions. This thesis was to describe its morphology and syntactic patterns since it is featured prominently in AAVE which is the variant in focus of the thesis. In addition, the relevant research questions were connected with habitual *be*:

* How does one negate habitual *be*?
* What is the difference in the morphosyntactic behavior of habitual *be* and auxiliary or copula *be?*

However, the only examples found in the first episode of the first season of *The Wire* were those shown in ) above—no more can be found in this episode. The three examples in total were not sufficient for building enough research data and arguments. A future work in search for more tokens of habitual *be* is suggested using the TV show *The Wire* as a corpus of data in order to establish a framework for this linguistic phenomenon and to confirm its behavioral patterns and morphosyntactic possibilities.

## Summary

In this chapter, the results of the research and their analysis were presented, providing confirmations and disconfirmations for the predictions.

This chapter confirmed the prediction that speakers who use *ain't* for *be* and *have* also use *don't* for 3rd person singular paradigm.

The prediction that the most frequent auxiliary verb is *be* has been confirmed, however, the second most frequent auxiliary turned out to be *do,* with *have* as the last.

Another partial disconfirmation has come in form of dropping of auxiliary verbs: Auxiliary verb *be* is, indeed, the most frequent do be deleted in terms of numbers of drops but with regards to the percentage of drops, it is overshadowed by *have.* This is caused by the frequent American variant *got/gotta* with no auxiliary *have* occupying the T-position.

A small section devoted to the number of *ain't* in relation to other auxiliary verbs was presented to compensate for the absolute numbers of *ain't* in Pagáč (2017) and the phenomenon of non-inverted question was addressed.

Moreover, habitual *be* examples proved to be insufficient in this episode alone and further research into the matter is encouraged.

# Conclusion

This diploma thesis took as its goals to address every auxiliary verb and copula in the first episode of the first season of TV show *The Wire,* create a corpus, and use the examples for confirming or disconfirming the predictions. The methodology and approach to handling the corpus are similar to Pagáč (2017), however, this thesis expanded to all auxiliary verbs to account for broader of examples.

All three predictions are based on Parrott (2017). The first one stated that speakers (AAVE or others) who use *ain't* for *be* and *have* also tend to utter *don't* for 3rd person singular verb form. This is based on Impoverishment rules. If the corpus is sorted properly according to the specific categories, the speakers who use *don't* for 3rd person singular emerge. However, this prediction was confirmed by using the corpus of *ain't* examples from Pagáč (2017) as the corpus of auxiliary verbs for this thesis did not provide enough example.

The second prediction focused on frequency of auxiliary verbs in that the auxiliary verbs differ in their frequency of use, i.e. they are not spread evenly across the examples of utterance, 33 % each. This was not the case as research shows: *Be* is the most frequent with 63.2 % of occurrence as it falls under the Markedness Hierarchy as the most marked, auxiliary verb *do* is the second most frequent with 22.7 %, and the least frequent auxiliary verb is *have* with 14.1 %.

The final prediction concerned dropping of auxiliary verbs. The corpus shows that all auxiliary verbs have the capability of dropping or deletion. *Be* was again predicted to drop most frequently due to its markedness. This was confirmed in Section 5.3; auxiliary *be* has the highest number of dropped examples in the corpus. However, by percentage for one auxiliary the auxiliary which drops most frequently is *have*. This is caused the American variant for possessive and obligatory *have* which deletes auxiliary *have* in the majority of examples.

A small statistical piece of information was also set up in this thesis: To provide numbers for *ain't* and its speakers, something that Pagáč (2017) lacked. The statistics can be found in Section 5.4. To sum up, *ain't* substitutes *be* most frequently, then *have*, and then *do.*

The thesis in its Chapter 2 introduced the ideas of Distributed Morphology, Markedness Hierarchy, and Impoverishment to familiarize the reader with these concepts as they were used for formulating predictions. Bobaljik (2015), Embick (2015), and Parrott (2017), specifically, served as bases for these predictions as they deal with Distributed Morphology.

Chapter 3 introduced the morphosyntactic possibilities of auxiliary verbs *be, have,* and *do.* Shared characteristics, such as complementation, inversion in interrogative sentences or negation, were stated as well as distinctive examples of unique behavior for each auxiliary verbs, e.g. copula *be*, obligatory *have* or unpronounced *do,* among others.

Next, Chapter 4 presented the methodology used for research. *The Wire* was briefly introduced as it served as the corpus of data. Then the collection and coding process were described. Research limitations were also pointed out, such as the scale of the examples in the entire first season.

Chapter 5, Results & Analyses, is the point where the confirmations of the predictions can be found. As mentioned above, it contains sections on drops or deletions, notes on habitual *be,* and non-inverted examples of interrogative sentences.

Future work within this area of morphosyntax could include investigation on habitual *be* specifically as it is a distinct feature of AAVE which surfaces throughout the corpus for the first episode of the first season of *The Wire.*

Another point which could offer interesting results when researched is the non-inversion in questions. These examples proved to be slightly conflicted when put into categories (do they definitively fall under NON-INVERSION or rather DROP?). The matter could be looked into more closely in the future works.

The size of a potential corpus for the first season (or even the entire show) appeared to be an issue when collecting data for the corpus as it would far exceed the scope of this thesis; the next step in examining *The Wire* as a socio-linguistic corpus could be inclusion of the remaining episodes and collecting all the necessary tokens for the respective research.

# Resumé

Cílem této práce je poskytnout čtenáři vhled do otázky pomocných sloves *be, have* a *do.* Práce používá TV seriál *The Wire* jako zdroj korpusových dat; první epizoda první řady tohoto seriálu byla užita pro vytvoření korpusu. Práce se vyznačuje podobnou metodologií jako Pagáč (2017), nicméně zmíněná práce použila pouze příklady *ain't,* neboť tato negativní stažení byla hlavním zaměřením výzkumu. Tato diplomová práce rozšiřuje práci Pagáč (2017), co se týče rozsahu zahrnutých sloves: Jsou začleněny všechny příklady *ain't,* stejně jako všechny ostatní pomocná slovesa pro další analýzu a rozbor.

Předpovědi, jež má tato práce za cíl potvrdit či vyvrátit, jsou založeny na práci Parrott (2017). Parrott tvrdí, že pomocná slovesa se chovají podle *Markedness* *Hierarchy*" a že jejich chování je ovlivněno pravidly *Impoverishment* (viz Kapitola 2). Pod tyto koncepty též spadá distribuce pomocných sloves, vynechání spony; lingvistické fenomény, jež jsou též zaměřením této práce.

První z předpovědí má za cíl určit, zda mluvčí, kteří používají *ain't* místo *be* a *have*, používají *don't* ve 3. osobě jednotného čísla.

Druhá předpověď se týká často výskytu pomocných sloves a říká, že mluvčí používají pomocné sloveso *be* častěji než *have* a *have* častěji než *do.* Tato předpověď se opět zakládá na *Markedness Hierarchy* a *Impoverishment*.

Poslední z předpovědí je zaměřena na sponu *be.* Všechna pomocná slovesa mohou být vynechána v kladných oznamovacích větách. Pomocné sloveso *be* má tendenci být vynecháno nejčastěji, protože je nejvíce *marked.* Mým cílem je najít důkazy pro tuto předpověď, popsat podmínky tohoto vynechávání a poskytnout statistiky pro všechna pomocná slovesa a jejich vynechávání.

Všechny předpovědi byly potvrzeny. První předpověď bylo třeba doložit korpusem z práce Pagáč (2017), aby poskytl dostatek příkladů. Druhá předpověď byla potvrzena částečně: Pomocné sloveso *be* je nejčastěji používané, avšak druhé místo patří slovesu *do* a pomocné sloveso *have* je používáno nejméně. Třetí předpověď potvrdila sloveso *be* jako nejčastěji vynechávané v počtu příkladů. Procentuálně ve vztahu k ostatním výskytům pomocného slovesa toto místo ale patří slovesu *have*, což je způsobeno častým vynecháváním *have* v typicky amerických konstrukcích *possessive* a *obligatory* have (viz Sekce 3.8).

Práce také poskytla statistiky pro výskyt *ain't* ve vztahu k ostatním pomocným slovesům; toto bylo nedostatkem práce Pagáč (2017).

Kapitola 2 seznamuje čtenáře s koncepty *Distributed Morphology, Markedness Hierarchy* a *Impoverishment*, jež tvoří základ předpovědí.

Kapitola 3 zpracovává morfosyntaktické chování pomocných sloves, jako je společná morfologie, inverze a negace, a také poukazuje na specifika každého z pomocných sloves, např. nevyslovené *do* v kladných oznamovacích větách či právě *possessive* a *obligatory have.*

Kapitola 4 nabízí pohled na metodologii výzkumu, jež byla zvolena pro vytvoření korpusu, který je přílohou této práce. Kapitola uvádí TV seriál *The Wire* a také popisuje omezení výzkumu, jako bylo množství příkladů v celé první sérii či autentičnost korpusu.

Kapitola 5 poskytuje výsledky a analýzy výzkumu. Je to právě zde, kde čtenář může nalézt potvrzení všech předpovědí. Sekce této kapitoly zahrnují také výskyty vynechaných pomocných sloves, poznámky na příklady *habitual be* a non-inverzi, která se projevila jako problematická při kategorizaci příkladů v korpusu.

Další výzkum by mohl mít za cíl právě *habitual be* a non-inverzi, popř. by mohlo dojít k vytvoření korpusu pro celou první sérii TV seriálu *The Wire* či v celém jeho rozsahu pro bližší analýzu a interpretaci.
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