

# The rise of *do*-support during Scots anglicisation: Insights from the *Parsed Corpus of Scottish Correspondence*

Lisa Gotthard, University of Edinburgh

This paper explores the rise of *do*-support in Scots, and investigates whether it exhibited similar functions to English ‘intermediate’ *do* (as analysed by Ecay (2015)) before regularising into its current function. In doing so, this study provides more insight into syntactic change in Scots during the period of *anglicisation*, starting in the 16th century, when English became favoured over Scots in writing. While *anglicisation* is usually discussed in terms of lexis and orthography (e.g. Devitt (1989); Meurman-Solin (1993b); Kniezsa (1997)), the 16th to 18th century has been obscure within Scots syntax research; aided by the new *Parsed Corpus of Scottish Correspondence* (PCSC; Gotthard 2022), this gap now begins to be filled.

*Do*-support is the mandatory insertion of the auxiliary *do*, which has historically been bleached of its semantic meaning and today has a strictly morpho-syntactic function: carrying tense and agreement features when the transfer of these features between the subject and main verb is interrupted and no other auxiliary is present (E.g., *I do not eat cake*). English *do*-support is extensively researched (e.g., Ellegård 1953; Denison 1985; Ecay 2015; Garrett 1998; Kroch 1989; Nurmi 2011; Poussa 1990; Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1990; van der Auwera and Genee 2002; Warner 2002), but the feature in Scots has received less attention. It has been suggested that Scots *do*-support is a transfer from English, supported by that the feature emerged in Scots during the height of anglicisation (Gotthard 2019, 2022, 2023; Meurman-Solin 1993a), and that it remains variable in more traditional dialects (Jamieson 2015; Jonas 2002; Smith 2000), but it could also have developed independently, from the causative *do* auxiliary inherited from Old English. Based on observations already made by Ellegård (1953), Ecay (2015) identifies an ‘intermediate’ *do* auxiliary in English pre-1575; an agentive marker which merges in a lower syntactic position than post-1575 *do*. This leads to the question of whether Scots *do* follows the same path, or is adopted with the same function as post-1575 English *do* – if a candidate feature emerges in the receiving language in its fully grammaticalised form, then it is more likely to be a transferred feature (e.g. Pa-Tel 2013).

In order to investigate (i) the emergence and trajectory of *do* in Scots, and (ii) whether Scots *do*-support is a plausible outcome of anglicisation, proportions of affirmative and negative declarative *do* in the PCSC are calculated across different syntactic contexts. The likelihood of the feature being an anglicisation outcome is evaluated by assessing the results against criteria for contact-induced change (e.g., Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Thomason 2001; Pa-Tel 2013; Robbeets and Cuyckens 2013; Poplack and Levey 2010). It is found that Scots *do* emerges towards the end of the 16th century, and remains at low proportions (around 20%) until ca.1700 when it increases more dramatically, and initially behaves largely consistent with what Ecay (2015) observed for ‘intermediate’ *do* in English. The social context and timing of the rise of Scots *do* suggest that it is a contact-induced change, but the fact that the auxiliary shows ‘intermediate’ *do* qualities warrants further discussion; if this is truly an intermediate stage in the grammaticalisation of *do* then the analysis is compromised, but this *do* auxiliary may also be as different type of *do*, spreading northward from English into Scots.

## References

- Denison, D. (1985). The origins of periphrastic do: Ellegård and visser reconsidered. In Eaton, R., Fischer, O., Koopman, W. F., and van der Leek, F., editors, *Papers from the 4th international conference on English historical linguistics* 4th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, pages 45–60. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Devitt, A. J. (1989). *Standardizing written English: diffusion in the case of Scotland, 1520-1659*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Egay, A. (2015). *A multi-step analysis of the evolution of English do-support*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Ellegård, A. (1953). *The auxiliary do: The establishment and regulation of its use in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Garrett, A. (1998). On the origin of auxiliary do. *English Language and Linguistics*, 2:283–330.
- Gotthard, L. (2019). Why do-support in Scots is different. *English Studies*, 100(3):1–25.
- Gotthard, L. (2022). *Syntactic change during the anglicisation of Scots: Insights from the Parsed Corpus of Scottish Correspondence*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Gotthard, L. (2023). Subject-verb agreement and the rise of do-support during the period of anglicisation of Scots. To appear in proceedings of ICEHL21, Leiden 2021.
- Jamieson, E. (2015). An investigation of verb raising in the Shetland dialect of Scots. Master's thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Jonas, D. (2002). Residual V-to-I. In Lighfoot, D., editor, *Syntactic effects of morphological change*, pages 251–270. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kniezsa, V. (1997). The origins of scots orthography. In Jones, C., editor, *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language*, pages 24–46. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kroch, A. (1989). Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language variation and change*, 1:199–244.
- Meurman-Solin, A. (1993a). Periphrastic do in sixteenth- and seventeenth century Scots. In Meurman-Solin, A., editor, *Variation and change in early Scottish prose*, pages 259–276. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Meurman-Solin, A. (1993b). *Variation and change in early Scottish prose*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

- Nurmi, A. (2011). The rise and regulation of periphrastic do in negative declarative sentences: a sociolinguistic study. In Kastovsky, D. and Mettinger, A., editors, *The History of English in a Social Context: A Contribution to Historical Sociolinguistics*, pages 339–362. New York: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Pa-Tel, N. (2013). Contact or inheritance? criteria for distinguishing internal and external change in genetically related language. *Journal of Language Contact*, 6(2):313–28.
- Poplack, S. and Levey, S. (2010). Contact-induced grammatical change: A cautionary tale. In *Language and Space – An international handbook of linguistic variation: Volume 1 – Theories and methods*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Poussa, P. (1990). A contact-universals origin for periphrastic do with special consideration of old english-celtic contact. In Adamson, S., Law, V., Vincent, N., and Wright, S., editors, *Papers from the 5th international conference on English historical linguistics*, volume 65. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Robbeets, M. and Cuyckens, H. (2013). *Shared Grammaticalization: With Special Focus on Transeurasian Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Smith, J. (2000). 'you ø na hear o' that kind o' things': Negative do in Buckie Scots. *English World Wide*, 21(2):231–259.
- Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, S. G. and Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (1990). The origin and development of periphrastic auxiliary do: A case of destigmatisation. *NOWELE. North-Western European Language Evolution*, 16(1).
- van der Auwera, J. and Genee, I. (2002). English do: on the convergence of languages and linguists. *English Language and Linguistics*, 6:283–307.
- Warner, A. (2002). What drove do? In Kay, C., Horobin, S., and Smith, J., editors, *New perspectives on English Historical Linguistics*, volume I, pages 229–242. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.