FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA UNIVERZITY PALACKÉHO

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Formal properties of the English verbs *dare* and *need*
(bakalářská práce)

Peter Vaňušanik
(Anglická filologie – Japonská filologie)

Vedoucí práce: doc. PhDr. Ludmila Veselovská, MA, Dr.

Olomouc 2011

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně a uvedl úplný seznam citované literatury.

V Olomouci dne …………..…   Peter Vaňušanik

Zoznam skratiek:

COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English
BNC   – British National Corpus
N/A   – Not applicable
N/C   – Not confirmed

Contents

1 ANALYSIS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ENGLISH MODAL VERBS

Marta Kukucz in her final thesis "Characteristics of the English Modal Verbs" presents a compilation work about English modal verbs while including examples she found in corpus. In Chapter 1, she describes modal verbs and describes their properties. In Chapter 2, she presents her methodology of working with corpus. The main part of her work is in Chapter 3, where she decides on the criteria she is going to use to classify modal auxiliary verbs and tests them, using examples from corpus. The verbs tested include: any lexical verb, *seem to, have to, have got to, dare & need to* and *must*. The list of criteria used to test the verbs includes: Operation in negation, Verb contraction, Negative contraction, Operator in inversion, Emphatic positive, Operator in reduced clause, Pre-adverb position, Independence of subject, Bare infinitival complement, Finite functions only, No –s forms and Abnormal time reference.

In the Chapter 4, she presents a general conclusion. She included a table of the results from corpus and states:

> "*There is a scale of verbs. Lexical verbs do not fulfill any of the auxiliary verb criteria. Central modals, on the other hand, follow nearly all of the criteria. There is only one exception, namely in verb contraction criterion where the central modal must similar to the lexical verb cannot be contracted in any way. Verbs taking place somewhere between these two border verbs differ in the number of positive responses to particular criteria. There is one visible feature in the behavior of verbs. The closer a particular verb stands to the central modal, the more positive responses we get.*" (Kukucz, 2009, 58-59)

After this conclusion, she describes the odd behavior of the verbs *dare* and *need*, which according to her "both can behave either as lexical verbs or as auxiliaries." (Kukucz, 2009, 59).

Her thesis is very comprehensive, yet she has missed very interesting points that do occur in the English language, including the English verbs *dare* and *need*. I would like to focus on providing more information about those special cases such as the verbs *dare* and *need*, and finding the most relevant property that can be used to differentiate between modal auxiliary and lexical variants.

2 Distinctive grammatical properties of Auxiliary Verbs

Before we can fully describe the properties of modal auxiliary verbs, we need to divide the English verbs according to the criteria, which are primary for the division of verbs to lexical or modal/auxiliary.

In her first chapter, Marta Kukucz (2009, 2) shows properties of modal auxiliary verbs and Non-modal auxiliary verbs along with examples. One of the main problems in it is that she does not follow one language theory source publication. Instead she combines two points of view. For the first view, she mentions the division according to Quirk et al. (1985, 96), who divide the verbs into **primary verbs**, which include *do, have* and *be*, **modal verbs**, which include *can, may, will, shall, could, might, would, should* and *must* and **lexical verbs**. For the other, she mentions division based on Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 74), who divide verbs into two major categories, **lexical verbs** and **auxiliary verbs**.

According to her labeling of sections, she is following the division based on Huddleston and Pullum, but later at section 1.2, she adds a criterion for modal verbs based on Quirk et al. division. Then, in Chapter 3, she also divides modal verbs into subcategories such as "semi-auxiliary", "modal idiom", "marginal modal" and "central modal" (Kukucz, 2009, 14).

All of these terms are defined in Quirk et al. (1985, 137). However, they do not appear in Huddleston and Pullum (2002). Moreover, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 92) state that idioms which contain some auxiliaries are not modal as a whole and that only the auxiliary itself is a modal. Quirk et al. (1985) do not mention this fact. Also, she never lists which modal verbs belong to her category of modal auxiliary verbs; therefore, the reader is unsure which verbs are the ones which do show her criteria.

I am going to follow the division based on Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 74). Therefore I will have two groups of verbs: **auxiliary** and **lexical**. **Auxiliary** will be further divided into **modal auxiliary verbs** and **non-modal auxiliary verbs**.

Both modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal auxiliary verbs have dramatically different properties than lexical verbs. We will thus construct the list of criteria to test the verbs against and see how they behave. According to the behavior shown, we then classify them to the verb groups.

2.1 Distinctive grammatical properties

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 92-107) define the distinctive morpho-syntactical properties which can be used to categorize verbs into auxiliary and lexical verb groups as the *NICE* [1] *construction – primary verb negation, subject-auxiliary inversion, emphatic polarity, code*; *position of adverbs, quantificational adjuncts, negative inflection* (related to the primary verb negation) and *reduced forms*.

Quirk et al. (1985, 120-127) define the properties as: *operation in negation with not, negative and verb contraction, Inversion of subject and operator, Emphatic*

---

1 NICE is acronym for Negation, Inversion, Coda and Emphasis, the four main behaviour patterns of auxiliary verbs. For more information see Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 93).

positive, Operator in reduced clauses, pre-adverb position, Quantifier position, and *Independence of subject.*

2.2   Methodology

In her thesis, Marta Kukucz (2009, 2-6) does not have a good division between lexical and auxiliary verbs. She does present various non-modal auxiliary verbs with various constructions; however, she never lists the distinctive grammatical properties that do apply both to the non-modal and modal auxiliary verbs. Her section on Non-modal auxiliary verbs only contains the basic operations that non-modal auxiliary verbs participate in, including tense and aspect creation, both of which are unrelated to her thesis. She, however, does list some of these distinctive grammatical properties for the division between lexical and auxiliary verb in Chapter 3 but without explaining their relevance to the rest of her thesis.

Therefore in my thesis, I have decided to list all the categories for the distinction between auxiliary verbs and lexical verbs. Since the two authors that I have based my work upon use their own terminology for the same property, I have decided to follow the terminology of Huddleston and Pullum (2002). As such, the distinctive grammatical properties I have decided to use in my thesis for dividing the verbs into the lexical and auxiliary groups are: *primary verb negation, subject-auxiliary inversion, emphatic polarity, code*, *position of adverbs, quantificational adjuncts,* and *reduced forms*. I have decided not to include *negative inflection* because it is related to the primary verb negation and is therefore already included.

In section 2.3, I will list all the grammatical properties and provide examples illustrating them. I will also include a cumulative table showing which properties apply to *lexical*, *modal* and *auxiliary*, using a "-" sign, when the property does not apply to the verb and "+" when it does. The ungrammatical examples will be marked with "*" symbol, as is the standard. "?" or "??" will indicate the oddity of such an example.

2.3   List of distinctive grammatical properties

In the following subsections, I will analyze my selected properties and decorate them with examples. I will also compare my list with the property lists used by Quirk et al. and Dušková et al. (1994) for the division between Lexical and Auxiliary verbs.

The examples will follow this notation style: examples labeled with A will always cover auxiliary verbs, and examples labeled with B will always cover lexical verbs. There might be possible examples labeled with C for some properties that show irregularity or special cases.

2.3.1   Primary verb negation

Negation is the first of the properties that can be used to distinguish between lexical and auxiliary verbs. Quirk et al. (1985, 121) call this property "Operation in negation". Both Quirk et al. (1985, 122) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 94) mention non verbal negation; however, only Quirk et al. mention the old form of Lexical verbs negated by the particle *not,* as you can see in the example (1Cc). However, Dušková et al. (1994, 174) never mention any non verbal negation with not nor the archaic usage of not particle.

(1) **Negation**

A. a. *She <u>mustn't</u> provide help.*
    b. *She <u>must not</u> provide help.*
    c. **She <u>doesn't must</u> provide help.*
B. a. **She <u>providesn't</u> help.*
    b. **She <u>provides not</u> help.*
    c. *She <u>doesn't provide</u> help.*
C. a. *She provides <u>not help but more misery</u>.*
    b. ** She <u>providesn't</u> help but more misery.*
    c. *Whether he will be there, I <u>care not</u>.*

As we can see in the examples (1Aa) and (1Ab), the auxiliary verb *must* does the negation either analytically with free morpheme *not* or by adding bound morpheme *n't* to the auxiliary verb. Using *don't/doesn't* as a way to do the negation is impossible for the auxiliary verbs, as we can see in the example (1Ac).

The lexical verbs, however, do need *don't/doesn't* as an operator to perform the negation, as we can see in the example (1Bc). Using *not* or the bound morpheme *n't* is not grammatically correct. The examples with incorrect negation are (1Ba) and (1Bb).

However, there is a similar structure possible with lexical verbs that look like a normal negation for the auxiliary verbs, which Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 94) describe as *non-imperative secondary negation*. In the example (1Ca), the verb is followed with the analytical free morpheme *not*; however, it does not belong to the modality of that sentence and instead negates the noun phrase *help*[2].

We can prove it by doing the negative contraction, i.e. transforming free morpheme *not* into the bound morpheme *n't*, as in the example (1Cb). We bind *n't* to *provide*, creating the word *providen't*, and if the contraction is not possible, we can see that *not* does not belong to the verb.

Table 2-1

	Auxiliary verbs	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	-

2.3.2 *Subject-auxiliary inversion*

Subject-auxiliary inversion is another property that auxiliary verbs have in common as opposed to the lexical verbs. All three authors, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 94), Quirk et al. (1985, 124) and Dušková et al. (1994, 174) mention this property and use it as one of the main properties separating lexical verbs Auxiliary verbs.

(2) **Inversion**

A. a. *<u>Must she</u> provide help?*
    b. ** <u>Does she</u> must provide help?*
B   a. ** <u>Provides she</u> help?*
    b. *<u>Does she</u> provide help?*

---

2 See Huddleston and Pullum, 94.

Auxiliary verbs perform questions through subject-auxiliary inversion, as in the example (2Aa), where auxiliary verb *must* switched position with the subject *she*. The example (2Ab) shows usage of *do/does* before the subject *she* is not permitted. We can compare it with examples (2B).

Lexical verbs do use the operator *do/does* to perform the inversion and cannot inverse themselves, as shown in the examples (2B).

Table 2-2

	Auxiliary verbs	**Lexical verbs**
Primary verb negation	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-

2.3.3 Emphatic polarity

(3) **Emphatic polarity**

Emphatic polarity is an operation which denies previously mentioned or implied negativity. As with Subject-auxiliary inversion property, both Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 97) and Quirk et al. (1985, 124) mention this property. However, Dušková et al. (1994) do not mention this property in their chapter on Auxiliary verbs.

A. a.   *She does not earn much, but she <u>MUST</u> provide help.*
    b.   * *She does not earn much, but she <u>DOES</u> must provide help.*
B. a.   * *She does not earn much, but she <u>PROVIDES</u> help.*
    b.   *She does not earn much, but she <u>DOES</u> provide help.*
C   *I told you, she <u>PROVIDES</u> help for poor!*

As we can see in examples (3A), the auxiliary verb *must* does not require *do/does* verb to place the stress and has stress on itself in emphatic polarity. Lexical words, as indicated in examples (3B) do require *do/does* as a verb where the stress is placed.

There is another context where lexical verbs can have stress on them, similarly to auxiliary verbs, as we can see in the example (3C). The difference is that this is not the case of emphatic polarity, but instead a case of emphasis on the lexical content[3.]

Table 2-3

	Auxiliary verbs	**Lexical verbs**
Primary verb negation	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-

2.3.4 Code structures

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 99) the code is a construction where the sentence is reduced with context providing all the semantics information. All three authors mention this property.

---

3 *For more information about the difference between emphatic positive and emphasis on the lexical content see Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 98) or Quirk et al. (1985, 1415).*

This property has also a very interesting feature, because the code structure does not have to contain the same verb that the main clause did; however, only Auxiliary verbs can be inside the code structure. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 99) mention this fact as "Old-verb stranding vs. new-verb stranding".

(4) **Code**
A.   a.   *I must provide help and so <u>must she</u>.*
        b.   * I must provide help and so <u>does she</u>.*
B.   a.   * I provide help and so <u>provides she</u>.*
        b.   *I provide help and so <u>does she</u>.*

In the example (4A) we can observe that the auxiliary verb *must* is performing coda function by making the shortest verb phrase containing the subject *she* and the auxiliary verb *must*. The sentence cannot use *do/does* for this construction.

Instead, the lexical verb, as can be seen in the (4Bb), does the coda construction with a subject *she* and *do/does* and cannot use the lexical verb itself (as is shown in the example (4Ba).

Table 2-4

	Auxiliary verbs	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-
Code structures	+	-

2.3.5 *Position of adverbs*

Both Quirk et al. (1985, 126) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 102) mention this property. However, Dušková et al. (1994) do not mention this property as one which could be used to divide Auxiliary verbs from Lexical verbs.

(5) **Position of adverbs**
A.   a.   *She <u>must often</u> provide help.*
        b.   *She often <u>must</u> provide help.*
B.   a.   *She <u>often provides</u> help.*
        b.   * She <u>provides often</u> help.*

The position of adverbs in the verb phase is different for the auxiliary verbs and the lexical verbs. Auxiliary verbs can have adverbs both before the auxiliary verb and after it, as we can see in the example (5A)[4].

On the other hand, the lexical verbs cannot have the post lexical verb position of adverbs; therefore example (5Bb) is ungrammatical, because *often* can't follow after the main verb *provides*.

In the table, the "+" sign means that Adverbs can take both pre and post position, while the "-" sign means that adverbs can only take the pre verb position.

---

4 For more information on the difference between the positions see Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 102).

Table 2-5

	Auxiliary verbs	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-
Code structures	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	-

2.3.6 Quantificational adjunct

This property is similar to the previous property, *Position of adverbs,* in terms that both Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 102) and Quirk et al. (1985, 126) mention this property, while Dušková et al (1994) do not explicitly mention this fact.

(6) **Quantificational adjunct**

A. a. *<u>All</u> girls <u>must</u> provide help.*
    b. *Girls <u>all must</u> provide help.*
    c. *Girls <u>must all</u> provide help.*

B. a. *<u>All</u> girls <u>provide</u> help.*
    b. *Girls <u>all provide</u> help.*
    c. * *Girls <u>provide all</u> a meal.*

C   *Girls provide <u>all help</u> you need.*

Quantification adjuncts, such as *all*, can occupy three positions with respect to the auxiliary verb; it can be fronted, before the auxiliary verb and after auxiliary verb, as it is described in example (6A).

With the lexical verb, as shown in example (6B), the quantificational adjunct *all* cannot occupy the post lexical verb position after *provide*.

However, a special case is shown in the example (6C), in which *all* looks like it is placed after the lexical verb *provide*, but it does not belong to the verb phrase. Instead it modifies the word *help*.

In the table, the "+" sign means that all three positions for quantificational adjuncts are possible, while the "-" sign means that only two positions (at the start of the clause and before the verb positions) are possible.

Table 2-6

	Auxiliary verbs	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-
Code structures	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	-
Quantificational adjuncts	+	-

2.3.7   Reduced forms

(7) **Reduced forms**

A.   a.   *She must /məs(t)/ provide help.*

           b.   *"Must"/'mʌst/ is a modal auxiliary verb.*

B.   a.   ? *She provides /pɹəvədz/ help.*

           b.   *"Provide" /pɹəˈvaɪd/ is a lexical verb.*

      The auxiliary verb *must* in example (7Aa) is presented in the normal context. Therefore, the most probable way of saying it would be with the reduced vowel ʌ replacing the central unstressed vowel ə. However, in the stressed (such as citation) form, as we can see in example (7Ab), it should be said with full vowel ʌ.

      But the lexical verb *provide*, as we can see in the examples (7Ba) and (7Bb), the phonetically reduced form without the stress and with reduced central vowel ə, during the normal speech, is not very probable. However, during fast or casual speech, the verb can be reduced.

      This property can be also observed on the morphology level with some auxiliary verbs, such as *have* and *will*. These auxiliary verbs do have a reduced form, where they not only reduce their vowels and stresses but also fuse with subjects as a bound morpheme[5].

Table 2-7

	Auxiliary verbs	**Lexical verbs**
Primary verb negation	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-
Code structures	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	-
Quantificational adjuncts	+	-
Reduced forms	+	-

---

5 See more about these reduced forms in Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1613-1616).

2.4   Summary

In the literature, all the authors I reviewed (Huddleston and Pullum, Quirk et al. and Dušková et al.) do mention at least some of these seven properties. They usually change the name of the property but do have it included. Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Quirk et al. (1985) have all seven properties included; however, Dušková et al. (1994) only cover *Primary verb negation*, *Subject-auxiliary inversion,* and *Code structures*, which, while sufficient and necessary properties, are not visible all the time. If we use all seven properties mentioned in the previous section, we can cover a lot more cases.

I will use these seven distinctive grammatical properties presented in this chapter as the most fundamental properties that can differentiate between lexical and auxiliary verbs. However, these distinctive grammatical properties are identical to both modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal auxiliary verbs. Therefore in the next chapter, I will list the properties which can differentiate between the modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal auxiliary verbs.

3 DISTINCTIVE GRAMMATICAL PROPERTIES OF MODAL AUXILIARY VERBS

Modal auxiliary verbs behave differently in the English language than non-modal auxiliary verbs; therefore they have different properties which mark them as modal. In this chapter, I would like to present a list of distinctive grammatical properties which only apply to the modal auxiliary verbs and do not apply to the non-modal auxiliary verbs.

3.1 Distinctive grammatical properties

Both main sources I work with, Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Quirk et al. (1985), have their own terminology for the properties which differentiate between the modal and non-modal auxiliary verbs.

Quirk et al. (1985, 127-128) define those properties as *constructions with the bare infinitive, finite functions only, no 3rd person inflection* and *abnormal time reference*.

Similarly, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 106-107) list five properties: *only primary forms*, *no agreement, bare infinitival complement, remote conditionals* and *modally remote preterite*.

3.2 Methodology

Kukucz (2009, 6-10) presents six behavior patterns, or properties, of modal auxiliary verbs. The properties she listed at the start of the section 1.2 are: "*only primary forms*", "*no agreement*", "*bare infinitival complement*", "*remote conditionals*", "*modally remote preterite*", and "*abnormal time reference*" (Kukucz, 2009, 6-8).

When we compare her list of properties with the properties both Quirk et al. (1985) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002) list, we can see that it does not follow one of the divisions. Instead it combines both lists, which creates confusion.

As an example of the confusion caused by the combination of both her main sources can be seen in the fact that two of her criteria, *modally remote preterite* and *abnormal time reference*, are according to her text, two different criteria; however, those two criteria refer to the same phenomenon, where the modal auxiliary verb in distinctive preterite form (such as *might*)

"*can be used with the modal remoteness meaning without the grammatical restrictions that apply in the case of other verbs, where it is found only in a small set of subordinate constructions*" (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, 107).

3.3   List of distinctive grammatical properties

In my thesis, I decided to follow the properties listed by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 106): *only primary forms*, *no agreement*, *bare infinitival complement*, *remote conditionals* and *modally remote preterite*.

I will illustrate these categories with examples, including both non-modal auxiliary and modal auxiliary verbs, along with a lexical verb.

I will continue to update the table from previous chapter; however, the auxiliary verbs column will be divided into two columns, modal auxiliary verbs and Non-modal auxiliary verbs. Since the properties for modal auxiliary verbs discussed in Chapter 2 apply for both modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal auxiliary verbs, both modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal Auxiliary verbs columns will contain the same value as auxiliary verbs in the previous table.

The notation from the previous chapter will be increased by the examples related to modal auxiliary verbs. Examples labeled with letter A will show modal auxiliary verbs, examples labeled with latter B will show non-modal auxiliary verbs and examples C will show lexical verbs.

3.3.1   Only primary forms

One of the properties of the modal auxiliary verbs is the fact that they lack the non-primary forms. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 106) say that "*modal auxiliaries have no secondary inflectional forms and hence cannot occur in constructions which require one*" (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, 106).

Dušková et al (1994, 181) mention that modal auxiliary verbs lack the usual verb paradigm and only have preterite/present form, usually in pairs. However, I think that while these have historically been real past/present tense verbs, nowadays, especially if we look at the *Modally remote preterite* property (see section 3.3.5), the meaning of the tense is disappearing.

(8) **Only primary forms**
A.   a.   * I would like <u>to must</u> provide help if I can.
         b.   * I <u>will must</u> provide help tomorrow.
         c.   * <u>Must</u> help forever!
         d.   * I feel sorry for not <u>musting</u> help you.
         e.   * I have <u>must/musted/musten</u> provide help before.
B.   a.   I would like <u>to </u>be able to provide help if I can.
         b.   I <u>will be able</u> to provide help tomorrow.
         c.   <u>Be able</u> to help forever!
         d.   I feel sorry for not <u>being able</u> to help you.
         e.   I <u>have been able</u> to provide help before.
C   a.   I would like <u>to provide</u> help if I can.
         b.   I <u>will provide</u> help tomorrow.
         c.   <u>Provide</u> help forever!
         d.   I feel sorry for not <u>providing</u> help to you.
         e.   I <u>have provided</u> help before.

In the example (8Aa), we can see that the modal auxiliary verb *must* cannot participate in constructions which require the *to* infinitive, while the non-modal auxiliary *be* (as seen in (8Ba)) and the lexical *provide* (as seen in (8Ca)) can participate in such constructions.

The examples (8Ab) and (8Ac) show that *must* also cannot participate in neither constructions with bare infinitive nor imperative constructions, respectively, while non-modal auxiliary and lexical (examples (8Bbc) and (8Cbc) respectively) verbs can participate in such constructions.

The gerund construction is also impossible for the modal auxiliary verb *must*, as is shown in the (8Ad), while *be* and *provide* can participate, as is shown in examples (8Bd) and (8Cd).

Another construction in which modal auxiliary verbs like *must* cannot participate is past participle. In the example (8Ae) we can see that *must* cannot follow *have* in the past participle meaning, while in examples (8Be) and (8Ce) we can observe that both *be* and *provide* can.

Table 3-1

	Non-Modal Auxiliary verbs	**Modal Auxiliary verbs**	**Lexical verbs**
Primary verb negation	+	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	+	-
Code structures	+	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	+	-
Quantificational adjuncts	+	+	-
Reduced forms	+	+	-
Only primary forms	-	+	-

3.3.2   *No agreement*

One of the properties of modal auxiliary verbs is their frozen structure. Typical examples of this property include the fact that they do not show usual agreement with the subject. According to Quirk et al. (1985, 128) they "*are not inflected in the 3rd person singular of the present tense; ie, they have no –s form*" (Quirk et al., 1985, 128).

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 107) call this property a morphological oddity. While I have followed the naming scheme as it is in Huddleston and Pullum (2002), I do not think naming the property as *No agreement* is very clear, since there is an agreement between the modal auxiliary verb and the subject, which we can see by observing example sentence (9Aa). The subject *she* is indeed in the subject case, or *nominative* case, which in the English language is not the unmarked case; therefore, there must be a case assigner to which this pronoun is agreeing to, i.e. the verb *must*. Therefore, I think the better naming scheme would be the one proposed by Quirk et al. (1985, 128) *No 3rd person inflection*.

(9)   **No agreement**

A.	a.	*She must provide help.*
	b.	* *She musts provide help.*
B.	a.	* *She have provided help before.*
	b.	*She has provided help before.*
C.	a.	* *She provide help.*
	b.	*She provides help.*

Comparing examples (9Aa) and (9Ab), we can see that the modal auxiliary *must* does not follow the agreement rules with the subject. But if we compare examples (9Ba) and (9Bb) and examples (9Ca) and (9Cb), we can see that non-modal auxiliary verbs such as *have* and *provide* do strictly follow the agreement with the subject and omitting such agreement would be seen as ungrammatical.

Table 3-2

	Non-Modal Auxiliary verbs	Modal Auxiliary verbs	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	+	-
Code structures	+	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	+	-
Quantificational adjuncts	+	+	-
Reduced forms	+	+	-
Only primary forms	-	+	-
No agreement	-	+	-

3.3.3 *Bare infinitival complement*

The general rule is that if a verb is following a modal auxiliary verb, it must be in the bare infinitival complement[6]. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 107) mention that lexical verbs can also be followed by a *bare infinitival complement*, if there is a NP inserted between the first lexical verb and the second lexical verb.

Quirk et al (1985, 127) mention four exceptions to the *bare infinitival complement* part of the *only primary forms* property. They are: *used, ought, dare* and *need*. I will deal with verbs *dare* and *need* in Chapter 5; however, I do not think that *used* should be listed with modal auxiliary verbs. I think that *used* is regular past form of lexical verb *use* with shifted meaning towards modality. It does require the *do* operator to perform negation, inversion and coda; therefore, it cannot be an auxiliary verb.

While *ought* is the only different from the modal auxiliary verbs because it is the only modal auxiliary verb followed by the *to*-infinitive, according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 109), the verb *ought* is actually progressing towards *bare infinitival complement*, especially in the non-affirmative context.

6 *An interesting observation from the combination of this property and the only primary form property is that it leads us to the fact that modal verbs cannot ever be followed by modal verbs, due to the fact that modal verbs do not have bare infinite form of the verb. To see more, see Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 107)*

(10) **Bare infinitival complement**

A.	a.	*She <u>must provide</u> help.*
	b.	* *She <u>must to provide</u> help.*
B.	a.	* *She <u>has provide</u> help.*
	b.	*She <u>has to provide</u> help.*
C.	a.	*I <u>know</u> it <u>to be</u> true.*
	b.	*He <u>saw</u> it happen.*

In the example (10Aa) and (10Ab), we can see that *must* followed by *to provide* is ungrammatical, while *must* followed by the bare infinitive *provide* is not. The non-modal auxiliary verb *have* in the examples (10B) shows that it must be followed by the *to*-infinitive and not by its bare infinitive.

However, lexical verbs can be followed by both bare infinitival complements and *to* infinitival complements. In the example (10Ca), the lexical verb *know* is followed by the *to*-infinitive form of the non-modal auxiliary verb *be* ; however, in example (10Cb), the verb *saw* is followed by the Lexical verb *happen*. There are a couple more verbs which behave like that in the English language[7].

Table 3-3

	Non-Modal Auxiliary verbs	**Modal Auxiliary verbs**	**Lexical verbs**
Primary verb negation	+	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	+	-
Code structures	+	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	+	-
Quantificational adjuncts	+	+	-
Reduced forms	+	+	-
Only primary forms	-	+	-
No agreement	-	+	-
Bare infinitival complement	-	+	-/+

3.3.4 Remote conditionals

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 149), remote conditionals are composed of the subordinate clause, which must contain a preterite or irrealis *were*, and the matrix clause, which must contain a modal auxiliary verb in preterite, if possible.

There is no mention about this property in the section about differences between modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal auxiliary verbs neither in Quirk et al. (1985) nor in Dušková et al. (1994).

---

7 For more information, see Duffley (1992) or Dušková (1994, 553).

(11) **Remote conditionals**

A.   *If she had been in work yesterday, she <u>must</u> have provided help.*

B.   ** If she had been in work yesterday, she <u>were able to</u> have provided help.*

C.   ** If she had been in work yesterday, she <u>provided</u> have help.*

If we compare example (11A) with examples (11B) and (11C), we can observe that the modal auxiliary verb *must* is located in the matrix clause of example (11A); therefore it is a correct remote conditional sentence. In the other two examples, *were able to* and *provided* are not applicable in the matrix sentence; therefore, those remote conditional sentences are grammatically incorrect.

Table 3-4

	Non-Modal Auxiliary verbs	**Modal auxiliary verbs**	**Lexical verbs**
Primary verb negation	+	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	+	-
Code structures	+	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	+	-
Quantificational adjuncts	+	+	-
Reduced forms	+	+	-
Only primary forms	-	+	-
No agreement	-	+	-
Bare infinitival complement	-	+	-/+
Remote conditionals	-	+	-

3.3.5   *Modally remote preterite*

The final property which can distinguish between modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal auxiliary verbs is the modally remote preterite. This property only applies to the modal auxiliary verbs which have a distinct preterite form, such as: *could, might, would* and *should*.

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 107), these preterite modal verbs have ambiguous meaning in some cases, because they can refer not only to the past but also to other tenses without any limitations.

A similar phenomenon called the "Abnormal time reference" property is described by Quirk et al. (1985, 128). The only difference is that Quirk et al. mention that backshifted modal auxiliary verbs without a preterite form can refer to the past, such as must.

(12) **Modally remote preterite**

A.   a.   *I <u>wish you</u> <u>could</u> provide help when he was drowning.*

          b.   *<u>Could</u> you provide help <u>tomorrow</u>?*

	c.	*Could you provide help yesterday?*	
B.	a.	*I wish you were able to provide help when he was drowning.*	
	b.	?? *Were you able to provide help tomorrow?*	
	c.	*Were you able to provide help yesterday?*	
C.	a.	*I wish you provided help more often...*	
	b.	?? *Did you provide help tomorrow?*	
	c.	*Did you provide help yesterday?*	

In examples (12Aa), (12Ba) and (12Ca), we can see that with the preterite complement of the verb *wish*, all the preterits have modal remoteness meaning. However, while all preterite forms of verbs can have the past meaning (as can be seen in the case of *were you able to* and *did you provide* in the examples (12Bc) and (12Cc)), only *could* in examples (12Ab) has the meaning of present/future tense, even though it is in the distinct preterite form. Examples (12Bb) and (12Cb) therefore sound nonsensical because verbs *were able to* and *did provide* refer to the past while the adverb of time *tomorrow* refers to the future.

Table 3-5

	Non-Modal Auxiliary verbs	Modal Auxiliary verbs	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	+	-
Code structures	+	+	-
Position of adverbs	+	+	-
Quantificational adjuncts	+	+	-
Reduced forms	+	+	-
Only primary forms	-	+	-
No agreement	-	+	-
Bare infinitival complement	-	+	-/+
Remote conditionals	-	+	-
Modally remote preterite	-	+	-

3.4   Summary

In this chapter, I presented five distinct grammatical properties that can distinguish between the modal auxiliary verbs and non-modal auxiliary verbs. I have also included a comparison to lexical verbs, and highlighted the fact that lexical verbs have the same properties as non-modal auxiliaries in almost all cases. Therefore, it is obvious that while modal auxiliary verbs share some of the properties with non-modal auxiliary verbs (as I discussed in Chapter 2), they are very different to both non-modal auxiliary verbs and lexical verbs, and as such, they have their own category.

4 SUMMARY

In the previous two chapters, I have presented a set of properties that modal auxiliary verbs have in common. These properties included both the properties that modal auxiliary verbs share with non-modal auxiliary verbs and the properties that can be used to distinguish between non-modal auxiliaries and modal auxiliary verbs.

The complete list of all the properties from Chapters 2 and 3 is:

- **Primary verb negation**
- **Subject-auxiliary inversion**
- **Emphatic polarity**
- **Code**
- **Position of adverbs**
- **Quantificational adjunct**
- **Reduced forms**
- **Only primary forms**
- **No agreement**
- **Remote conditionals**
- **Modally remote preterite**

In the following Chapter, I will use **ten**[8] of these properties and test two modal auxiliary verbs which are labeled by Quirk et al. (1985, 138) as marginal modals: *dare* and *need*. These modal verbs show both the properties of lexical and modal auxiliary verbs; therefore, I propose that there are homonymic variations of the verbs *dare* and *need*, both lexical and modal auxiliary, and so I would like to find the properties which are sufficient for the distinction between lexical and modal auxiliary variants.

---

8 I will, however, omi thet Reduced forms property, due to the fact that I am unable to confirm it in the corpus because the corpus does not preserve phonetic data and because both modal auxiliary variants of dare and need do not have reduced forms; however, that is common within the realm of modal auxiliary verbs.

5   *DARE* AND *NEED*

(13) Differences between lexical and modal auxiliary verbs *dare* and *need*
A. a.   <u>*Dare*</u> *he speak of him in my presence?*
    b.   <u>*Need*</u> *he speak with me?*
B. a.   <u>*Does*</u> *he* <u>*dare*</u> *to speak of him in my presence?*
    b.   <u>*Does*</u> *he* <u>*need*</u> *to speak with me?*

Both verbs *dare* and *need* behave strangely in the English language. Quirk et al. (1985, 198) label them as *Marginal modals*. The reason behind this is that both of these verbs have more than one behavior pattern.

In certain cases it could appear that both *dare* and *need* are lexical verbs, such as in examples (13B), but they can also appear to behave like modal auxiliary verbs, such as in examples (13A).

Since both previous example sets are correct, verbs *dare* and *need* are unable to fit into the general auxiliary and lexical verb categories. However, I do not believe that there is no system in the English language; therefore, I agree with Quirk et al. (1985, 138), who claim that there are two distinct homomorphic forms of both verbs *dare* and *need*. One is lexical *DARE* and *NEED*, which behave as lexical verbs. The other is modal auxiliary verb *dare* and *need*, which behave like modal auxiliary verbs.

5.1 *Dare* and *Need* and their properties

In this section, I will test these two forms of the verbs *dare* and *need* against the properties I have presented in Chapters 2 and 3 (for complete list see Chapter 4) and illustrate them with the examples. I will, however, omit the Reduced forms property, because I am unable to confirm it with the corpus.

To evade confusion between homomorphic variants, I will use the following notation:

- ***dare, need*** – Modal-Auxiliary verb variant of dare, need
- ***DARE, NEED*** – Lexical verb variant of dare, need

For the example notation, I will use examples A for illustrating the verb *dare* and examples B for illustrating the verb *need*.

5.1.1   Primary verb negation with verbs <u>*dare*</u> and <u>*need*</u>

Quirk et al. (1985, 138) mention that modal auxiliary variant of *dare* and *need* only appear in "non-assertive contexts", thus they should not appear in positive declaration sentences.

In primary verb negation, the distinction between *dare/need* and *DARE/NEED* is clearly shown in the examples (14). Both types of clausal negation is possible with both *dare* and *need*. Therefore, I conclude that the examples using the *do* operator (in the example (14Ab) *do not dare linger* and in the example (14Bb) *do not need linger*) is the

lexical variant *DARE/NEED*, while *dare/need* in the examples (14Aa) *dare not linger* and (14Ba) *need not linger* are the modal variants[9].

However, because of the possibility of the lexical verb being followed by the particle *not*, I do not think this is a sufficient property for the difference between Modal auxiliary and Lexical variants of *dare* and *need,* even if it is necessary property.

(14) **Primary verb negation *dare* and *need***
A.   a.   *We <u>dare not</u> linger here to debate.*
       b.   *We <u>do not dare</u> to linger here to debate.*
B.   a.   *We <u>need not</u> linger here to debate.*
       b.   *We <u>do not need</u> to linger here to debate.*

Table 5-1

	dare	*DARE*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	+	-

5.1.2 Subject-auxiliary inversion with verbs <u>dare</u> and <u>need</u>

Subject-auxiliary inversion is another basic property that is used to differentiate between modal auxiliary verbs and lexical verbs. In example (15Aa) we can see that the verb *dare* is modal because it performs the inversion with the subject *he*; however in example (15Ab), the verb *dare* does not perform inversion, and as such it is the lexical verb *DARE*.

The verb *need* has, as we can see if we compare examples (15Ba) and (15Bb), two different behavior patterns. In the first, it does Subject-auxiliary inversion, and in the second, it instead uses the *do*-operator for the inversion.

(15) **Subject-auxiliary inversion *dare* and *need***
A.   a.   *<u>Dare he</u> oppose me?*
       b.   *<u>Does he dare</u> to oppose me?*
B.   a.   *<u>Need he</u> oppose me?*
       b.   *<u>Does he need</u> to oppose me?*

Table 5-2

	dare	*DARE*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	+	-

9 *There are, however, possible grammatically correct examples such as "He <u>dares</u> not to eat." which have <u>DARE</u> with the particle <u>not</u>. All of these cases can be taken as form of nonverbal negation or old usage of particle not, such as "he knows not". For more information about non verbal negation see Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 806). For the old usage of particle not, see Quirk et al. (1985, 122).*

5.1.3 Emphatic polarity with verbs _dare_ and _need_

Emphatic polarity is similar to the previous Subject-auxiliary inversion property. The verb _dare_, similar to its behavior with the Subject-auxiliary inversion property, shows two distinct behaviors. In example (16Aa), the Emphatic polarity is performed by emphasis on the verb _dare_; however, in example (16Ab), _DARE_ requires the _do_ operator to perform the emphasis.

The verb _need_ follows the previous property as well, having two behavior patterns. Example (16Ba) shows emphasis on the verb _need_, marking it as a modal auxiliary verb, and in example (16Bb), _NEED_ uses the _do_ operator, thus marking itself as a Lexical verb.

(16) **Emphatic polarity _dare_ and _need_**

A. a. _He <u>dare</u> oppose me!_
    b. _He <u>does</u> dare to oppose me!_
B. a. _He <u>need</u> oppose me!_
    b. _He <u>does</u> need to oppose me!_
    c. _* He <u>does</u> need oppose me!_

Table 5-3

	dare	_DARE1_	_need_	_NEED_
Primary verb negation	+	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-	+	-

5.1.4 Code structures with verbs _dare_ and _need_

Code structures with the verbs dare and need are similar to previous properties, in theory. The modal auxiliary verb _dare_ will behave as in example (17Aa), and the lexical verb _DARE_ needs the _do_ operator to perform coda, as in example (17Ab).

Need behaves similarly as well, with example (17Ba) showing the verb _need_ doing the coda structure, thus, it is marked as a modal auxiliary verb. In example (17Bb), it needs the _do_ operator for the coda structure, thus, it is marked as the Lexical variant of verb _NEED_.

However, all those examples are only illustrational due to the fact that either because of the search limitations and/or no examples of neither lexical nor modal auxiliary variants in both BNC and COCA.

(17) **Code structures _dare_ and _need_**

A. a. _He dare say that, <u>daren't he?</u>_
    b. _He dares to say that, <u>doesn't he?</u>_
B. a. _He need say that, <u>needn't he?</u>_
    b. _He needs to say that, <u>doesn't he?</u>_

Table 5-4

	dare	*DARE*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	+	-
Emphatic polarity	N/C	N/C	+	-
Code structures	+	-	+	-

5.1.5 *Position of Adverbs with verbs* <u>*dare*</u> *and* <u>*need*</u>

There are 40 hits for pre adverb with lexical variant of the verb *DARES*[10] and only 7 hits for the verb *DARES* followed by adverb in the corpus. After checking those seven examples, it can be seen that those adverbs are either related to the plural form of the noun "dare" or with the following phrase, not with the verb phrase. Thus we can see that example (18Ab), as compared to example (18Ac) is grammatical, while the other one is not. Lexical variants of *dare* can have both pre and post position of adverbs.

If we compare corpus search for *needs often* as compared to *often needs*, *often needs* has 25 hits and *needs often* has 12 hits. All 12 hits of the second are not related to the verb *NEED* but are related to the plural form of the noun "need" and is thus unrelated to our verb property. Therefore, the example (18Bc) is ungrammatical while (18Bb) is possible for lexical variant of verb *NEED*. Modal auxiliary variants of the verb *need* can have both pre and post verb position of adverb, as we can see in example (18Ba).

(18) **Position of Adverbs *dare* and *need***
A. a. *She <u>often dare/dare often</u> refuse you.*
    b. *She <u>often dares</u> to refuse you.*
    c. * *She <u>dares often</u> to refuse you.*
B. a. *She <u>often need/need often</u> refuse you.*
    b. *She <u>often needs</u> to refuse you.*
    c. * *She <u>needs often</u> to refuse you.*

Table 5-5

	dare	*DARE*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-	+	-

10 The reason for searching third person singular is to be sure that we are searching in terms of Lexical variant of <u>DARE/NEED</u>.

Code structures	N/C	N/C	+	-
Position of Adverbs	+	-	+	-

5.1.6 Quantificational Adjuncts with verbs <u>dare</u> and <u>need</u>

Due to the facts that the verb *dare* is not frequently used in the language and that COCA does not have a tag for quantificational adjuncts, I was unable to find relevant data from the corpora. While the combination of the verb *need* and quantificational adjunct *all* will yield enough examples, none are related to this property, and the rest are quantification of following constituent instead. Due to the fact that I was unable to confirm this property because I was unable to find the modal auxiliary variant of the verbs *dare/need* followed by quantificational adjunct, I will not include it in the testing nor in the final table.

5.1.7 Only primary forms with verbs <u>dare</u> and <u>need</u>

In the corpus, there are both variants with the *to*-infinitive and bare infinitive following the verb *dare*, which itself is not in the primary form (it is instead in the to infinitive/gerund form). However, due to the fact that there are two variants of the lexical verb *DARE*, one that is complemented by the bare infinitive and one that is complemented by the to infinitive, we cannot use this property to clearly determine whether it is modal auxiliary or lexical variant[11]. Thus examples (19A) are only illustrational.

However, the situation is clear with the verb *need*. There was only one example with *need* in the non-finite form (thus lexical) and followed by the bare infinitive (thus modal auxiliary) in the corpus, compared to the 287 results of *need* in non-finite form followed by the to infinitive complement. Thus, we can conclude that the modal auxiliary variant of *need* can't be in the constructions that require non-primary forms, such as in example (19Ba); however, the lexical variant can, as in example (19Bb).

(19) **Only primary forms *dare* and *need***
A.   a.   *She <u>was going dare</u> refuse you.*
           b.   *She <u>was going to dare to</u> refuse you.*
B.   a.   * *She <u>was going to need</u> refuse you.*
           b.   *She <u>was going to need to</u> refuse you.*

Table 5-6

	dare	*DARE*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	+	-
Emphatic	+	-	+	-

---

11 See more in the section 5.1.9

polarity				
Code structures	N/C	N/C	+	-
Position of Adverbs	+	-	+	-
Only primary forms	N/A	N/A	+	-

5.1.8 No agreement with verbs <u>dare</u> and <u>need</u>

Both *dare* and *need* clearly show the difference between modal auxiliary variant and lexical variants. There are no examples[12] of either modal auxiliary *dare* nor modal auxiliary *need* that is followed by the to infinitive (see more in section 5.1.9), but there are both variants with the lexical verbs. Thus, we can see that examples (20A) and (20B) show that the modal auxiliary variants of both *dare* and *need* do not show agreement with the subject, while lexical variants *DARE, NEED* will.

(20) **No agreement *dare* and *need***
A.   a.   <u>*She dare* refuse you!</u>
          b.   <u>*She dares* to refuse you!</u>
B.   a.   <u>*She need* refuse you!</u>
          b.   <u>*She needs* to refuse you!</u>

Table 5-7

	dare	*DARE*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-	+	-
Code structures	N/C	N/C	+	-
Position of Adverbs	+	-	+	-
Only primary forms	N/A	N/A	+	-
No agreement	+	-	+	-

5.1.9 Bare infinitival complement with <u>dare</u> and <u>need</u>

One of the most interesting results of previous corpus searches was the *Bare infinitival complement property*. According to my section 3.3.3, modal auxiliary verbs should have a bare infinitival complement while lexical verbs should have, in general, *to*-infinitival complement. However, as I mentioned in section 3.3.3, not all verbs follow

---

12 There are more examples with the raw search; however, they are only inversions with lexical variants.

this tradition. There are many verbs, such as *hear*, which do have both bare and *to-*infinitival complements.

The interesting point, however, is the fact that while *DARE* is both *to* and bare infinitival, the modal auxiliary verb *dare* only has one, as I will try to examine in the corpus. I will also try to confirm the duality of the verb *DARE* and include it in the table as *DARE1* and *DARE2,* where *DARE1* indicates that the verb is followed by the *to-*infinitive, and *DARE2* indicates that the verb is followed by the bare infinitive.

Need is not affected by this duality of infinitives, and as we can see in examples (21B) and all previous examples in section 5.1, the modal auxiliary variant *need* will always have the bare infinitival complement, and the lexical variant *NEED* will always have the *to-*infinitival complement.[13]

(21) **Bare infinitival complement *dare* and *need***

Due to the duality of the verb *DARE*, I will need to check previous sections 5.1.1-5.1.8 to see whether it will always show the dual behavior or not.

5.1.9.1 Primary verb negation

All four examples where *dare* is followed by *not* then the *to-*infinitival complements are related to non-verbal negation, where the next constituent, and not the verb *dare*, is negated. Also, there were only four examples in the corpus, compared to when *dare* is followed by *not* and bare infinitival complement, which has 208 examples. Thus, we can see that the modal variant of *dare* can only be followed by the bare infinitival complement, thus making example (21Aa2) ungrammatical.

For the lexical *DARE*, both to and bare infinitival is possible. In the corpus, there were 273 examples with *DARE* followed by bare infinitival complement while there were 291 examples with *DARE* followed by to-infinitival complement. Thus, we can conclude that both these variants are grammatical, and so are examples (21Aa3) and (21Aa4).

A.   a.   1.   *She <u>dare not</u> refuse you.*
         2.   * *She <u>dare not to</u> refuse you.*
         3.   *She <u>didn't dare</u> refuse you.*
         4.   *She <u>didn't dare to</u> refuse you*

5.1.9.2 Subject-auxiliary inversion

With the modal auxiliary variant of *dare*, there are 972 examples of it being followed by a bare infinitival complement when in inversion. Comparing it to the 129 examples of *dare* in inversion with a *to-*infinitival complement, it would not be a sign of ungrammaticality. However, all of those examples are unrelated to subject-auxiliary inversion, mainly because the verb *dare* is not the main verb nor is it inversed, even though the query would suggest otherwise. Therefore, we can conclude that the example (21Ab2) is ungrammatical.

---

13 *The corpus will show about 3373 examples of needs being followed by a verb, however, after examining some of the results, it appears that needs is plural form of noun "need", not a 3rd person singular agreeing form of verb <u>NEED</u>.*

There are 114 examples of *DARE* being followed by the *to*-infinitive with a *do*-operator. When we compare it to the 413 examples of *DARE* being followed by a bare infinitive with the *do*-operator, we can conclude that *DARE2* is the more prominent variation out of two. However, the 114 examples of *DARE1* are a large enough sample to conclude that both variants are grammatical, as are the examples (21Ab3) and (21Ab4).

    b.   1.   *<u>Dare</u> she refuse you?*
          2.   * *<u>Dare</u> she <u>to</u> refuse you?*
          3.   *<u>Does</u> she <u>dare</u> refuse you?*
          4.   *<u>Does</u> she <u>dare to</u> refuse you?*

5.1.9.3 Emphasis polarity

Emphasis polarity is impossible to distinguish from the regular use of the modal auxiliary variant of *dare* due to the fact that the corpus does not provide stress data and that most of the texts are written language as well. Thus, examples (21Ac12) are only for illustration; however, there is no indication that a modal auxiliary variant would use *to*-infinitival complement.

The lexical variant of *DARE1* has only 8 examples in the corpus, while *DARE2* has only one example. Therefore, we cannot confirm the conclusion with a high degree of certainty. While there is no indication that *DARE2* is not used, more data is needed to be completely sure.

    c.   1.   *She <u>DARE refuse</u> you!*
          2.   * *She <u>DARE to refuse</u> you!*
          3.   *She <u>DOES dare refuse</u> you!*
          4.   *She <u>DOES dare to refuse</u> you!*

5.1.9.4 Code structures

There were no examples of the modal auxiliary variant of *dare* in the coda structure, with any infinitival complement. This is due to the fact that *"The auxiliary construction with dare and need is rarer in AmE than BrE, where it is also quite rare."* (Quirk et al., 1985, 138). But checking for coda structures in the BNC will yield at least one usable example that does not use a *to*-infinitival complement. This is not enough data to include; however, again, there is no indication that modal auxiliary variants would be deviant in making code structures compared to all other modal auxiliary verbs. Thus examples (21Ad12) are most likely correct.

Unfortunately, due to the difficulties with building query and/or the fact that there are no examples for lexical variants of *DARE* in both the COCA and BNC, I am unable to confirm the status of *to*/bare infinitival complements for Code structures. Therefore, the examples (21Ad3) and (21Ad4) are only informational.

    d.   1.   *She <u>dare</u> refuse you, <u>daren't she</u>?*
          2.   * *She <u>dare to</u> refuse you, <u>daren't she</u>?*
          3.   *She <u>dare</u> refuse you, <u>doesn't she</u>?*

4.   *She <u>dare to</u> refuse you, <u>doesn't she?</u>*

5.1.9.5 Position of Adverbs

The position of adverbs is not as easy to confirm as other properties, mainly due to the fact that you cannot use this property to test whether there are *to*-infinitive vs. bare infinitive lexical variants of *DARE*. However, since the post verbal position of an adverb is only possible for the modal auxiliary variant of *dare*, we can use the corpus data to test the bare infinitival complement of the modal auxiliary *dare* variant.

There are 17 examples of the modal auxiliary *dare* followed by a *to*-infinitival complement; however, all of them are unrelated to the verb-adverb position and are instead related to the next constituent. However, there are 34 examples of the modal auxiliary *dare* followed by adverb and by bare infinitival complement, thus we can say, that example (21Ae2) is ungrammatical.

The only possible way to confirm the *to* vs. bare infinitival complement for lexical verbs is with the 3rd person singular agreement forms of verbs; however, that will limit the number of searched results. There are 40 examples of an adverb preceding the lexical variant *DARE1* which is then followed by a *to*-infinitival complement. There are only 4 examples of *DARE2*.

e.   1.   *She <u>dare often</u> refuse you.*
        2.   ** She <u>dare often to</u> refuse you.*
        3.   *She <u>often dares</u> refuse you.*
        4.   *She <u>often dares to</u> refuse you.*

5.1.9.6 Only primary forms

Again, this property is somewhat tricky to examine in the corpus data. The initial search yields 119 examples where *dare* is directly proceeded with another verb (the most frequent was *would*) and is then followed by a *to*-infinitival complement and another verb. There are 168 examples where *dare* is directly proceeded with another verb (again, most frequent is verb *would*) then followed by a bare infinitival complement and another verb. According to the previous data, the one which has the *to*-infinitival complement must be lexical variant *DARE1*; however, it is impossible to distinguish whether the bare infinitival complement group is *dare* or *DARE2* because both are possible. However since the modal auxiliary verb *dare* has no primary forms, it must be *DARE2,* which is the one pairing up with the bare infinitival complement and not the modal auxiliary *dare*.

Thus, the examples (21Af) are only possible with the Lexical variants of *dare*.

f.   1.   ** She <u>will dare</u> refuse you tomorrow!*
        2.   ** She <u>will dare to</u> refuse you tomorrow!*
        3.   *She <u>will DARE2</u> refuse you tomorrow!*
        4.   *She <u>will DARE1 to</u> refuse you tomorrow!*

5.1.9.7 No agreement

The situation is bit clearer with No agreement property and its relation to the Bare infinitival complement property. There are 23 results of *dare* without agreement preceded by a 3rd person pronoun and followed by a *to*-infinitival complement and a verb; however, all those results are questions and use the lexical verb *DARE1* instead. There are 4 examples where *dare* is in the same situation as previous results; however, it is followed by a bare infinitival complement. Thus, even if the numbers are little on the small side, we could agree that only bare infinitival complement is possible for the modal auxiliary variant *dare*, thus making example (21Ag2) ungrammatical.

There are 33 results of bare infinitival complement for the lexical variant of *DARE* in the corpus. If we compare it to the 56 examples of *to*-infinitival complement of *DARE1*, we can see that even though *DARE1* is a little bit more frequent, *DARE2* is also present in the English language, making examples (21Ag3) and (21Ag4) both correct.

g. 1.   *She dare refuse you.*
    2.   ** She dare to refuse you.*
    3.   *She dares refuse you.*
    4.   *She dares to refuse you.*
B. a.   *She need (*to) refuse you.*
    b.   *She needs to refuse you!*

Table 5-8

	dare	*DARE1*	*DARE2*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	-	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-	-	+	-
Code structures	+	N/C	N/C	+	-
Position of Adverbs	+	-	-	+	-
Only primary forms	N/A	N/A	N/A	+	-
No agreement	+	-	-	+	-
Bare infinitival complement	+	+	-	+	-

5.1.10 Remote conditionals with <u>dare</u> and <u>need</u>

I have found 0 examples of both *need* and *dare* used in the remote conditionals due to the corpora limitations and their infrequency of the use. Thus I cannot use this property in my final table.

5.1.11 Modally remote preterite with verbs <u>dare</u> and <u>need</u>

Modally remote preterite is another one of those properties that are impossible to confirm correctly because of the corpora limitations. However, we can at least examine the preterite form of both verbs *dare* and *need* and see whether they have *to*-infinitival or bare infinitival complement, or both.

There are 413 examples of *dared* followed by bare infinitival complements, compared to 809 examples of *dared* followed by *to*-infinitival complements. However, since both modal auxiliary and lexical variants can have bare infinitival complements, we cannot decide on whether there is modal auxiliary variant of *dared* from the results. However, we can decide that there is lexical variant of *DARED* in the English language due to the present *to*-infinitival complementation.

The frequency between *to*-infinitival complement vs. bare infinitival complement is huge between *need* (1887) and *NEED* (16853); however since both are possible, we can deduce that both lexical and modal auxiliary variants have distinct the preterite form *needed*/*NEEDED* and they can be told apart based on the infinitival complementation.

(22) **Distinct preterite form** *dare* **and** *need*
A.   a.   *She dared refuse you.*
            b.   *She dared to refuse you.*
B.   a.   *She needed refuse you.*
            b.   *She needed to refuse you.*

Table 5-9

	dare	*DARE1*	*DARE2*	*need*	*NEED*
Primary verb negation	+	-	-	+	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	-	-	+	-
Emphatic polarity	+	-	-	+	-
Code structures	+	N/C	N/C	+	-
Position of Adverbs	+	-	-	+	-
Only primary forms	N/A	N/A	N/A	+	-
No agreement	+	-	-	+	-
Bare infinitival	+	+	-	+	-

complement					
Distinct preterite form	N/C	N/C	+	+	+

6   Necessary and Sufficient Diagnostic Properties

In Chapter 5, I have presented 9 properties which are summarized in Table 5-9. Out of the 11 starting properties, I have decided against having two of them included in the table due to technical limitations of the corpus work.

Some of the properties, however, can't be used to distinguish the difference between Modal auxiliary and Lexical variants, especially not in all the contexts. For instance, we cannot decide between stress on lexical content of *DARE/NEED* or emphatic polarity when we have stressed *dare/need* in the sentence. However, when it is emphatic polarity with lexical variant, it will have a distinct *do* operator which will be used as a place where the stress will be applied.

Thus, in this section, I will go over all the results and find all the necessary and sufficient properties. Necessary properties are ones that will always be followed by any operation, and sufficient ones are those which can be used to determine the variation between variants in the most cases.

6.1   Sufficient diagnostic properties

If we look at the corpus data with the verb *need*, one of the properties is unchanged for the variation no matter the circumstances. It is the *bare infinitival complement* property. No matter the construction, the lexical verb *NEED* always requires a *to*-infinitival complement while the modal auxiliary verb *need* requires bare infinitival complement. Therefore, with the verb *need*, should we need to decide between lexical or modal auxiliary, the best property to look at is *bare infinitival complement.*

The same property is not true for the verb *dare*, because both modal auxiliary and one variant of lexical *DARE* share the fact that they both do not require *to*-infinitive complementation. However, we can look at it from the different point of view, and decide that verb is lexical if it has to-infinitival complementation, because modal auxiliary variant of verb *dare* will never under any circumstances have *to*-infinitival complementation.

6.2   Necessary diagnostic properties

The most basic diagnostic property is the relationship to the do operator that lexical verbs have and modal auxiliary verbs do not. If we look at the table, we can see that there was no deviation neither for modal auxiliary nor lexical variants of both *dare* and *need*. Thus under the circumstances that show the need for the *do* operator, such as negation, polarity questions or coda, we can be sure that if the verb *dare* or *need* uses the *do* operator, it will not be the modal auxiliary version but the lexical version, and vice versa.

However, if we have a positive sentence, we cannot use these properties to determine if the verb is modal auxiliary or lexical. But if the subject is in the 3rd person singular case, we can observe the agreement and whether it shows on the verb. If it does, it is lexical, and if it doesn't, it is modal.

These two properties, under normal circumstances, should provide enough data about the verbs to determine whether they are modal auxiliary or lexical variants. We

can use *position of adverb*, *quantificational adjuncts*, if we need to do so; however, their frequency is limited.

7 CONCLUSION

In my thesis, I focused on the phenomenon of homonymic, so-called marginal modals *dare* and *need*. My inspiration came from the work by Marta Kukucz's "The characteristics of the English modal verbs", which was her master's diploma thesis. She presented various properties of modal auxiliary verbs in her work and analyzed how they differ from lexical and non-modal auxiliary verbs in particular. However, a lot of corner cases were simply marked as "both can behave either as lexical verbs or auxiliaries" (Kukucz, 2009, 59). I disagreed with her statement and instead supported the theory that there are two homonymic variants of both *dare* and *need*. Additionally during the corpus search, I have found that there are not two variants of verb *dare* but three.

All the properties I discussed in chapters 2 and 3 were used as the basis for the corpora examination which I did in chapter 5. However, I had to remove three of those properties due to the technical limitations. The final list of properties which I included is:

- Primary verb negation
- Subject-auxiliary inversion
- Emphatic polarity
- Code structures
- Position of Adverbs
- Only primary forms
- No agreement
- Bare infinitival complement
- Distinct preterite form

In chapter 6, I discussed the application of these properties in situations when we need to decide whether the verb is lexical or modal auxiliary and came up with the sufficient diagnostic property: **bare infinitival complement**. Even though there were both modal auxiliary *dare* which has only bare infinitival complement and lexical *DARE*2, which, too, had only bare infinitival complement, the lack of *to*-infinitival complement is what we can use to determine the lexical/modal variety. If the questioned verb *dare* does indeed have *to*-infinitival complementation, it is most certainly a lexical verb.

The same applies to the verb *need*; however, the ambiguity between lexical forms is gone. There is only one lexical variant of the verb *NEED*, which does use *to*-infinitival complementation and cannot use a bare one. The modal auxiliary variant of *need,* too, can only use one form of verb complementation: the bare infinitival one.

There is a difference between verbs *dare* and *DARE1*, denoted as *DARE2,* as we can see when we compare the results in table 5-9. As we can see in the comparison table 7-1 (7-2 for *need* and *NEED*) where the verbs *dare* are placed on the opposition to the Modality-Lexical scale, we can see that the verb *dare* will follow all the properties of modal Auxiliary verbs while *DARE1* will follow all the properties of lexical verbs.

If we focus on the property changes, we can see that *dare* is very different from both *DARE1* and *DARE2*. Thus, they should have different usage patterns for English speakers. According to Quirk et al. (1985, 138) the modal construction is restricted to "non-assertive contexts, i.e. mainly negative and interrogative sentences." However, there are examples in the corpus such as *He dare [v]* which suggest that it is not true. However, they are always lexical variants of *dare* which are in the inversion form.

Then what about the difference between *DARE1* and *DARE2?* The formal properties are nearly equivalent, and the only difference is between their bare infinitival complement and *to*-infinitival complement. I have found two possible explanations for this phenomenon.

One way to look at it is through semantics. Duffley (1992, 103-104) explains it with respect to the "realities" or "before-position"[14] and (this one applies for both *dare* and *need*)

> *"When, however, need and dare are used non-assertively, it is possible for speaker to feel that there is nothing real (no real need or daring) ... The difference between need and dare and the modals is simply that the latter are by the very nature of their lexical meaning incapable of evoking a reality, while the former can evoke potentialities only in non-assertive use"* Duffley (1992, 104)

For the difference between *DARE1* and *DARE2,* Duffley (1992, 113) explains that there is a similarity between *dares to/needs to* with *how to* and that

> *"all of these uses evoke the speaker's view of the possibility of someone being so audacious as to perform the event denoted by the infinitive, and all imply a negative prejudice against such a thing being possible. This relates them to all the other uses of blend and modal dare seen above, dare itself being conceived as a mere possibility, thereby negating or questioning its existence as reality constituting a before-position with respect to the event performed die to the daring (that expressed by the infinitive). Since the speaker is discussing the possibility and not the reality of daring, he feels that there is no real daring occupying the before-position that daring normally occupies with respect to the event dared, and consequently does not use to in these contexts."* Duffley, (1992, 113-114)

However, Veselovská (2010) presents a different point of view on the differences between *DARE1* and *DARE2*. She claims that

> *"On the other hand, the distinction between the B and C forms, i.e. the distinction within one class, is between two kinds of lexical Verbs, the forms showing characteristics of grammaticalised item in being restricted to unique subcategorisation. The process of grammaticalisation (i.e. lexical verb becoming a functional verb) is a diachronic process which can be signalled by a possible gradual loss of some (semantics) characteristics but becomes evident above all by a distinct syntax, e. g. a specific change of subcategorisation frame. However, subcategorisation frames of lexical Verbs are acquired individually and once a lexical entry is acquired with a specific subcategorial frame, there would seem*

---

14 before-position is term used in the book, which would mean temporal position of previous verb is before the verb pointed by to, while if there is bare infinitival complement, it will be just two coexisting verbs with no time frame reference. For more information, see Duffley (1992, 15-19).

no big reason to modify it, especially if the interpretation distinction is minimal or perhaps non-existent." Veselovská (2010)

These two points are not in agreement with each other on the points of meaning and how it applies to form. I agree with Veselovská because I do not believe that a normal, conscious mind would, during normal speech, try to differentiate between subtle versions *DARE1* and *DARE2*, and most of the examples from Duffley were taken from literature, which make stylistic changes and is thus unnatural and only perceived change.

Table 7-1

	Modal auxiliary verbs	*dare*	*DARE2*	*DARE1*	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	+	-	-	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	+	-	-	-
Emphatic polarity	+	+	-	-	-
Code structures	+	+	N/C	N/C	-
Position of adverbs	+	+	-	-	-
Only primary forms	+	N/A	N/A	N/A	-
No agreement	+	+	-	-	-
Bare infinitival complement	+	+	+	-	-/+

Table 7-2

	Modal auxiliary verbs	*need*	*NEED*	Lexical verbs
Primary verb negation	+	+	-	-
Subject-auxiliary inversion	+	+	-	-
Emphatic polarity	+	+	-	-
Code structures	+	+	-	-
Position of adverbs	+	+	-	-
Only primary forms	+	+	-	-
No agreement	+	+	-	-
Bare infinitival complement	+	+	-	-/+

These so-called **marginal modals** *dare* and *need* are fascinating verbs due to their homonymic appearance, and therefore, I believe they should be studied in more depth.

8 ZHRNUTIE

Gramatika anglických modálnych slovies je veľmi komplexná problematika, ktorej vysvetlenie je náročné i pre jazykovedcov zaoberajúcich sa anglickým jazykom. V magisterskej diplomovej práci „Characteristics of the English Modal Verbs" sa o to pokúša autorka Marta Kukucz. Jej práca však nie je natoľko komplexná, aby svojou analýzou dokázala pokryť všetky aspekty problematiky. Vo viacerých ohľadoch sa nevenuje zaujímavým prvkom, ako je napríklad využitie anglických modálnych slovies *dare* a *need*, ktorých spôsob využitia poskytuje vhodné údaje do analýzy a jej konečného vyhodnotenia.

Táto práca nadväzuje na už rozpracovanú analýzu v práci Marty Kukucz, pričom sa pokúša uceliť problematiku a hlbšie analyzovať aspekty využitia slovies *dare* a *need*. Jedinečnosť slovies *dare* a *need* spočíva v odlišnosti ich použitia v porovnaní s ostatnými modálnymi slovesami v anglickom jazyku. Je však nutné zdôrazniť, že modálne slovesá tvoria v jazyku veľmi heterogénnu skupinu, pričom v ich používaní sa prejavujú určité odlišnost. V prípade slovies *dare* a *need* je tento rozdiel pomerne výrazný, a to do takej miery, že slovesá *dare* a *need* sa javia ako dve dvojice homoným, ktorých použitie ich v jednom význame formálne a gramaticky zaraďuje do kategórie slovies modálnych, v druhom význame do kategórie slovies lexikálnych. V prípade lexikálneho variantu slovesa *dare* je evidentné, že existujú dve homonymá, ktoré vykazujú charakteristiku lexikálneho slovesa a jediným rozdielom v ich použití je skutočnosť, že neurčitok jedného tvaru sa tvorí s využitím častice *to* a druhého tvaru bez nej.

Na základe literárnych zdrojov sme v kapitole 2 a 3 formulovali celkovo 11 kritérií, pomocou ktorých je možné v rozhodujúcej miere posúdiť odlišnosti v používaní modálnych slovies v porovnaní s používaním slovies lexikálnych a pomocných. Tieto kritéria sú:

- Primárna slovesná negácia
- Inverzia podmetu a pomocného slovesa
- Empatická polarita
- Kóda
- Pozícia prísloviek
- Členy vyjadrujúce počet
- Skrátene formy
- Iba primárne formy (dokonavosť)
- Žiadna zhoda
- Vzdialené kondicionály
- Modálne vzdialené preteritum

Pri vyhľadávaní fráz v korpuse však niektoré kritériá nemohli byť posúdené a preto boli z výslednej tabuľky vynechané. (Tab. 8-1: sloveso *dare*, Tab. 8-2: sloveso *need*). Výsledky analýzy vykazujú jednoznačný rozdiel medzi modálnymi a lexikálnymi formami slovies *dare* a *need*, z čoho vyplýva, že v anglickom jazyku existujú homonymné tvary týchto slovies, ktorých použitie je odlišné. Na záver sa v práci

snažíme uvažovať o aspekte rozdielnosti medzi homonymami. Je možné domnievať sa, že odlišnosti v ich používaní sa vzťahujú len na štýl použitia, pričom uvedený rozdiel medzi lexikálnymi formami slovesa *dare* je možné považovať za zanedbateľný.

Table 8-1

	Modálne slovesá	*dare*	*DARE2*	*DARE1*	**Lexikálne slovesá**
Primárna negácia	+	+	-	-	-
Inverzia podmetu a pomocného slovesa	+	+	-	-	-
Empatická polarita	+	+	-	-	-
Kódové štruktúry	+	+	N/C	N/C	-
Pozícia prísloviek	+	+	-	-	-
Iba primárne formy	+	N/A	N/A	N/A	-
Žiadna zhoda	+	+	-	-	-
Holý infinitív	+	+	+	-	-/+

Table 8-2

	Modálne slovesá	*dare*	*DARE2*	*DARE1*
Primárna negácia	+	+	-	-
Inverzia podmetu a pomocného slovesa	+	+	-	-
Empatická polarita	+	+	-	-
Kódové štruktúry	+	+	-	-
Pozícia prísloviek	+	+	-	-
Iba primárne formy	+	+	-	-
Žiadna zhoda	+	+	-	-
Holý infinitív	+	+	-	-/+

9 ANOTÁCIE

Příjmení a jméno autora: Peter Vaňušanik

Název fakulty: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého

Název práce: Formal properties of the English verbs dare and a need

Vedoucí práce: doc. PhDr. Ludmila Veselovská, MA, Dr.

Počet znaků: 71763

Počet titulů použité literatury: 8

Klíčová slova: modal auxiliary verbs, auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, dare, need, lexical verbs, primary verb negation, subject-auxiliary inversion, emphatic polarity, quantificational adjuncts, position of adverbs, only primary forms, no agreement, bare infinitival complement, remote conditionals, modally remote preterite, code structures.

Charakteristika diplomové práce: Táto bakalárska práca sa zaoberá špecifikami používania anglických modálnych slovies, menovite slovesa dare (vyjadrujúce vôľu, odvážiť sa niečo vykonať) a slovesa need (vyjadrujúceho potrebu niečo vykonať), ich unikátnym spôsobom zaradenia do skupín anglických slovies. Výsledky vyhľadávania v korpuse sú konzultované s teoretickými zásadami na základe komplexných kritérií formulovaných napr. Quirkom a spol., prípadne Huddlestonom a Pullom. Na základe týchto výsledkov je možná bližšia špecifikácia týchto dvoch slovies.

Characteristics of the diploma thesis: This bachelor's diploma thesis focuses on the details of the English modal verbs, specifically the verbs *dare* (which express the boldness of such an action) and *need* (which specifies necessity in the action) and their unique system of interpolation into the scale of English verbs, The results from searches in corpora are incorporated with theory on the comprehensive set of grammar rules of the English language published by Quirk et al. or Huddleston and Pullum. A more-precise classification of these two verbs is possible because of the results from the corpus.

10 WORKS CITED

Duffley, Patrick. 1992. The English infinitive. Longman, London.

Dušková, Libuše. 1994. Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny. Academia, Praha**.**

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kukucz, Marta. 2009. "Characteristics of English Modal Verbs" Master thesis, Palacky University, Olomouc.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman, London.

Veselovská, Ludmila. 2010. The verb dare in Modern English. In: In Theories in Practice: Proceedings of the First International Conference on English and American Studies. September 7, 2010. Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Czech Republic. (in print)

11 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brigham Young University. 2011. "British National Corpus (BYU-BNC)". http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/.

Brigham Young University. 2011. "Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)". http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/.

Duffley, Patrick. 1992. The English infinitive. Longman, London.

Dušková, Libuše. 1994. Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny. Academia, Praha**.**

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kukucz, Marta. 2009. "Characteristics of English Modal Verbs" Master thesis, Palacky University, Olomouc.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman, London.

Veselovská, Ludmila. 2010. The verb dare in Modern English. In: In Theories in Practice: Proceedings of the First International Conference on English and American Studies. September 7, 2010. Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Czech Republic. (in print)