

JERZY NYKIEL
University of Silesia, Katowice

WHERE ONLY *DARE* AND *NEED DARE* – THE DEVELOPMENTAL PATHS OF THE TWO VERBS SINCE THE TIME OF SHAKESPEARE

The article embarks upon highlighting the syntactic evolution of *dare* and *need* which culminates in the verbs' present status of marginal modals. With the two verbs' fluctuations on the modal-lexical continuum in Old and Middle English taken for granted, three major stops emerge in this analysis, namely the language of Shakespeare, the language of Charles Dickens and Present Day English. Each time the occurrences of *dare* and *need* in the corpora come under scrutiny with a view to illustrating the overall syntactic profiles of the verbs.

1. Introduction

That *dare* and *need* provide grounds for grouping them together as marginal modals nowadays is far from implying any common roots of the verbs. Quite the opposite, *dare* and *need* follow two different lines of evolution.

Historically these two verbs [*dare* and *need*] are different, as *need* from being originally a "normal" verb with -s (-th) ending and *to* has approached the anomalous verbs, while the development with *dare* has been in the opposite direction: Old English 3rd person singular *dearr*, etc. (Jespersen 1924: 173)

With the workings of *dare* and *need* in Old English and Middle English already laid bare (cf. Molencki 2002 and Molencki 2005) we proceed to explore the mechanisms governing the syntactic behavior of the two verbs at the subsequent stages of their paths to the present-day status.

2. The Shakespearean era

Blake's (1989) reading of Shakespeare's English invokes the still-far-from solidified status of the verb in both its use and form. Parts of the reason are connected

with historical and dialectal factors: the 16th century bears witness to further enrichment of the tense system with the original present and preterite as the source, the subjunctive still holds its ground thwarting the fostering of auxiliary verbs and, at the same time, various dialects favor non-uniformity of inflections. To transfer such a degree of variety to particular cases, Blake (1989) reinforces the fluidity of the distinction between the two 3rd person present suffixes *-s* and *-th*, the choice of either being dictated by other than syntactic factors. Equally erratic is the formation of questions and negatives with or without benefit of the auxiliary *do*, as stressed by Schlauch (1965: 103–104).

It is in this little-restricted syntax that ample indication can be found that the full range of the applications of the auxiliary *do* remains partly shrouded in obscurity. A far-reaching ramification that this truth has is strikingly conclusive to the point that the traits nowadays reserved for modal verbs are bestowed upon lexical verbs as well, which goes a long way to blur the overall picture, especially when it comes to differentiating between modal and non-modal uses of *dare* and *need*. Our criteria for the identification of the modal uses are additionally diminished through frequent occurrences of the subjunctive in Shakespeare's plays. No single instance of a 3rd person singular present verb form devoid of the *-s* ending, with a meaning compatible with the subjunctive mood, straightforwardly blocks off the assumption that it might be a regular verb in its subjunctive rather than a modal auxiliary in the indicative.

2.1. Dare

From her foray into Shakespeare's language Ehrman (1966: 96) comes, nevertheless, convinced that '*dare* is fully modal and firmly established member of that closed class in Shakespeare's system' even in view of unquestionable evidence of *dare* stepping into the territory of lexical verbs, be it only an occasional lapse. Indeed, out of 374 occurrences of *dare* revealed by the corpus, 322 are modal given the slight liberalization of the criteria for reasons just discussed. At the same time, we come to pin down 52 lexical uses of *dare*.

The most spacious body of material to be discussed, constituted by modal *dare* in the present followed by a verb without *to* or else this verb being ellipted, embraces 254 occurrences that meet these criteria. The majority, i.e. 135 of these sentences are positive, 29 are interrogative or inverted for stylistic reasons, and 90 are negative. The last group patterns into 74 and 16 when projected onto the direct negation – indirect negation division, our prerequisites for assigning negative sentences to the classes of direct and indirect negation being borrowed from Kakietek (1972).

Yet, Shakespeare fails, on the whole, to dispense with any displays of modal *dare*'s slowly degenerating into a lexical verb. Table I illustrates Shakespeare's conjugation of modal *dare* in the present:

Table I. The conjugation of modal *dare* in Shakespeare

	Singular	Plural
1	I dare	we dare
2	thou darest / you dare	you dare / ye dare
3	he/she/it dares he/she/it dare	they dare

Remaining uninflected and thus adhering to the behavior expected from modal (and lexical too) verbs, the 1st person singular and plural as well as the 3rd person plural fail to make any intriguing research material. The 2nd person cases, due to their variety of forms to choose from, indicate certain tendencies in the 16th century English yet still stop short of pinpointing any cross-categorical shift of *dare*. Out of the three possible forms *thou*, *you*, *ye*, the former is the most frequent in Shakespeare, *thou darest* occurs 48 times. *Thou* imposes suffix *-(e)st* or *-t* as in the case of *shalt*, on the verb it precedes, be it a lexical or modal one. In Shakespeare *thou darest* may effectively fend off *you dare* but that *thou* continues to give way to *you* since the 14th century in an irreducible historical truth. There are only 20 instances of *you dare* among the modal uses of the verb in the corpus, though. *Ye dare* occurs twice, both times in a plural context, which is, however, in no way representative of Shakespeare's use of this pronoun. Albeit employed in the smallest number of cases, *ye* makes its presence in the corpus quite noticeable. It accompanies a variety of modal and lexical verbs in both singular and plural, a common practice since the 13th century according to OED (1975).

Much more remarkably, what impresses itself on a spectator viewing from a formal viewpoint is the *-s* ending rigorously clinging to 40 instances of *dare* in the 3rd person singular, 25 instances in the same person being spared the ending. No instance of the *-th* suffix added to *dare* appears in the corpus. With enough evidence pointing to modal *dare* being the case in all of these occurrences, the whole issue could be dismissed with an attitude equivalent to acknowledging Shakespeare's awareness of the advancing influence of lexical *dare*. Through availing himself freely of *dare* and *dares* in the 3rd person singular, perhaps with some stylistic merit in mind, Shakespeare voices the decay of *dare* as a modal verb. Much as this hypothesis explains away, it leaves too much unaccounted for, as it were.

There is a second theory that demands consideration. Blake (1989) notes that the subjunctive mood, although about to be pushed into collapse in the Elizabethan times, is still cherished far and wide by the speakers at that time. What is designated as the marker of the subjunctive by Blake (1989) is the basic uninflected form of the verb, which makes it an effective endowment in the 3rd person singular and the 2nd person if contrasted with the *-s* (*th*) and *-(e)st* endings in the indicative.

Shakespeare holds ever-tighter to the subjunctive in response to its means of diversifying the meaning of the verb. Futile as it proves to search for this mood among the instances of *dare* in the 2nd person, the difference between the subjunctive and

the indicative in *you/ye dare* being most often unidentifiable whereas the corpus reveals no such case in which *thou* is not accompanied by *darest*; the subjunctive may be implicated in most of 25 instances of endless *dare* in the 3rd person singular, if not in all of them. Blake (1989) spots one such phenomenon:

Occasionally a verb in the main clause may be in the subjunctive implying a difference in thought or estimation from the use of the indicative. This is particularly the case with the verb *to dare*. This distinction can be seen very clearly in 'The Tempest' when Caliban is discussing with Stephano and Trinculo how to get the better of Prospero. Caliban says to Stephano:

If thy Greatnesse will
Revenge it on him, (for I know thou dar'st)
But this Thing dare not.

Here the 'this Thing' is Trinculo. The first example of the verb *dar'st* is clearly indicative, and the second *dare* is subjunctive. The meaning is that Stephano does dare (indicative) to tackle Prospero, but Trinculo would not dare approach him under any circumstances (subjunctive). This is an important shade of meaning which Shakespeare is able to convey through the different verbal moods. (Blake 1989: 86)

Thus, the application of the subjunctive to the analysis of *dare* in the 3rd person singular eliminates the vicissitudes in Shakespeare's resort to the *-s* ending or lack thereof, and imposes regularity on his system. At the same time, with the *-s* ending seeming obligatory in indicative sentences, it is worth emphasizing again, a dislodgement of *dare* from its position of a fully modal verb is evidenced. Yet, it is just the beginning of the verb's downfall, all the other syntactic features of modal auxiliaries being obeyed.

The quest for *dare* as a modal verb galvanizes our interest in the instances of the expression *dare say* in Shakespeare. All these occurrences, which total 13, are in the present tense and are written separately, all but two are in the 1st person singular – twice the usual subject *I* is taken over by *who* and *thou*. Sentence pattern analysis causes some concern since merely 4 cases of declarative *I dare say* cast against as many as 7 negatives with *not* inserted between *dare* and *say* bespeaks Shakespeare's more unrestricted appeal to the structure.

Overall, despite Ehrman's (1966: 96) lack of hesitation to call *dare say* 'a fixed expression', that Shakespeare bars any *dare say* from occurring in a past tense context proves a stumbling block on the way to concluding finally whether *dare say* constitutes an independent lexical entry or not. The only safe bet is to state that *dare say*, with some underlying inclinations, e.g. being bound to the 1st person singular, is still in the process of univerbation.

Furthermore, alongside the vast body of the instances of modal *dare*, we encounter what Ehrman (1966: 296) calls 'a marked past-tense form *durst*' which makes 55 appearances in the corpus. A threefold rationale runs across this group of sentences setting aside 46 instances of *durst* followed by the bare infinitive, 8 instances of *durst* followed by the perfect infinitive and 1 instance of *durst-to-infinitive*, the last case's modal nature being in question. That *durst* enters the modal auxiliary-

-perfect infinitive construction endows the verb with deeply-rooted membership in the class of modal verbs. The context for the dual existence of *durst-infinitive* and *durst-perfect infinitive* rests primarily on the factuality/non-factuality of past events expressed, *durst-perfect infinitive* providing a portent of non-factual unreal past, which finds confirmation in the following example:

- (1) *Cassius: When Caesar lived, he durst not thus have moved me.*
Brutus: Peace, peace! you durst not so have tempted him.
Cassius: I durst not!
Brutus: No.
Cassius: What, durst not tempt him!
Brutus: For your life you durst not. (Julius Caesar; IV.3)

Durst in the first three verses is charged with a load of speculation about the past in virtually the same ratio as *durst* in the last two lines is exempt from it, the factual events being spoken about in the latter two instances of *durst*. Another piece of ample indication of *durst-perfect infinitive* conveying past non-factuality is put forward by its occurrence in conditional sentences, e.g.

- (2) *So, I am free; yet would not so have been*
Durst I have done my will. (Julius Caesar; V.3)

Ehrman (1966: 96) argues in favor of *durst-infinitive* also 'carry[ing] hypothetical force' on occasion and illustrates her statement with

- [(3)] *Never durst Poet touch a pen to write,*
Vntill his Inke were tempred with Loues sighes:
 [Love's Labour Lost; IV.3] (Ehrman 1966: 96)

The same effect is achieved through a conditional sentence:

- (4) *Patience is for paltrons, such as he:*
He durst not sit here, had your father lived. (King Henry VI, Part II; I.1)

This line of thought is in tune with the meaning of modal auxiliaries and so is it an index of Shakespeare's insatiable drive to constantly seek different shades of meaning within the means available. Out of 46 instances of *durst-infinitive*, 15 maintain the declarative word order, 28 are negated (20 directly, 8 indirectly) and 3 are inverted.

What remains shrouded in problematicity is the only instance of *durst* followed by *to*-infinitive:

- (5) *Emilia: I durst, my lord, to wager she is honest,* (Othello; IV.2)

Visser's (1963–73: 1436) comment on the same quotation from Shakespeare is that 'as a rule the infinitive is plain, the use of *to* is exceptional.' At the same time, Visser (1963–73) strips *durst* in this sentence of any past references, rather, the verb is set to convey non-factuality in that its meaning goes along the lines of '*should (would) dare.*'

Nevertheless, Shakespeare's motivation for inserting *to* after *durst* is vague (rhythmical and stylistic reasons seem the most probable solution), even if the OED (1975) ascertains correctness of such a construction, with, however, its concomitant relegation to the sphere of lexical *dare*.

On finally entering the domain of lexical verbs, *dare*, however unimpressive a number its 52 occurrences constitute, runs the whole gamut of the resultant freedom. A lexical verb in the Verb Phrase, *dare* appears 35 times in the present tense context, most frequently, i.e. 29 times as a transitive verb which requires a direct object (6), (7), and marginally as a verb followed by another lexical verb with *to* e.g. (8) – the corpus boasts 5 such instances.

(6) *I dare your worst objections.* (King Henry VIII; III.2)

(7) *I dare you to this match.* (Cymbeline; I.4)

(8) *In their so sacred paths he dares to tread
In shape profane* (The Merry Wives of Windsor; IV.4)

To be sure, *dare* is nowhere to be found in the progressive.

Probing further into this group, we learn that 30 of these occurrences retain the declarative word order, one is interrogative, auxiliary *do* lending its help to the formation of the question:

(9) *Do you dare our anger?* (Timon of Athens; III.5)

whereas 4 are negated. Once it is the case of indirect negation and 3 times *dare* undergoes direct negation brought about by the application of *not*. Interestingly enough, not so much is the novelty of direct negation here achieved by the very appearance of *not*, we are still mindful of the uniformity in negating both lexical and modal verbs in the 16th century, as it is by consigning *not* to the pre-verbal position as in (10):

(10) *A prison for a debtor, that not dares stride a limit,* (Cymbeline; III.3)

Consistent with Table I is the conjugation of lexical *dare* in Shakespeare. An almost exclusive pronoun in the 2nd person is *you, ye* making no appearance and *thou darest* marking its presence only once. A plausible explanation may be that *thou*, emphatic and heavy as it is, is intimately bonded with the original modal construal of *dare*. The 3rd person singular instances of lexical *dare*, which total 17, engender problematicity redolent of that of modal *dare*. In 13 of them, *dare* receives the *-s* ending as should be expected but 5 instances, most probably due to the interference of the subjunctive, are left endingless.

(11) *Though Suffolk dare him twenty thousand times* (King Henry VI, Part II; III.2)

(12) *What dares not Warwick, if false Suffolk dare him?* (King Henry VI, Part II; III.2)

Having then entered the territory reserved for lexical verbs, *dare* can be passivized (3 times in the corpus), emerges as an infinitive (2 times) and also fills the slot of the lexical verb which follows the modal (6 times):

- (13) *Nay, he will answer the letter's master how he
Dares, being dared.* (Romeo and Juliet; II. 4)
- (14) *There's not the meanest spirit on our party
Without a heart to dare or sword to draw* (Troilus and Cressida; II.2)
- (15) *Unless a brother should a brother dare
To gentle exercise and a proof of arms.* (King Henry IV, Part I; V.2)

The passive participle of *dare* in (13) serves best to illustrate the ease with which the verb explores the vast possibilities the syntax of lexical verbs offers.

Only occasionally does *dare* find its way to the turbulent past tense system in the corpus. There are 5 instances of *dare* embedded in Present Perfect sentences whose construction is at one with the tenets of modern English:

- (16) *You have not dared to break the holy seal.* (The Winter's Tale; III.2)
The Simple Past and Past Perfect welcome *dare* as well, one time each, though:
- (17) *How did you dare to trade and traffic with Macbeth?* (Macbeth; III.5)
- (18) *Those many had not dared to do that evil,* (Measure for Measure; II.2)

Still, it would be a fallacy to assume that the lexical ventures of *dare* are a novelty introduced in Shakespeare's era. The process can be traced to Old English when, as observed by Traugott (1992), *dare*'s usage is in practice tantamount to that of main verbs in that the verb possesses means of being used both transitively and intransitively. The subsequent period welcomes further enrichment, Warner (1993: 101) remarking that 'the infinitive of *dare* and past participle of *dare*, (...) appear in the course of Middle English.'

Undoubtedly, in the time of Shakespeare, *dare*, with its 374 occurrences, is surrounded with an aura of exuberant vitality, even though its significance is played down by, as evidenced by Kakietek's (1972) research, far more frequent appearances of other modals. Part of the reason for this more intensive reliance on *dare* can be linked to the speakers' eagerness to experiment with the access to the non-modal use of *dare*. Still, the lion's share of attention is garnered by modal *dare* with its 322 occurrences which translate into 87% of all instances of *dare* found in the corpus. Residing somewhere on the margin, the set of 52 instances of lexical *dare*, but for its awe-inspiring diversity of application, which augurs well for its future encroaching onto the territory of modal *dare*, might as well plummet toward oblivion. It is noteworthy that the strength of the influence of lexical *dare* does not materialize so much into the number of occurrences as into certain syntactic features of lexical *dare* filtering through to the modal use of *dare*, as it is with the *-s* ending in the 3rd person singular. Nonetheless, *dare* cast into the role of a modal verb vehemently asserts itself in Shakespeare in both the present and past, with only *durst-perfect-infinitive* being about to fall into abeyance.

Obviously, there can be no denying, that the semantics of *dare*, with some of the verb's meanings conforming to the laws of modality (cf. Palmer 1986) and others failing to do so, curbs the syntactic behavior of *dare* throughout the periods discussed. Any semantic considerations, however, fall outside the scope of this paper. A similar precaution applies to our survey of *need* as well.

2.2. Need

Given Jespersen's (1924) remark concerning the lexical origin of *need*, as quoted above, as well as *need's* gradual encroachment upon the syntax and semantics of the modal verb *tharf* initiated in late Middle English, as elaborated on by Molencki (2005), it can be expected that *need* is a syntactic reverse of *dare* in the time of Shakespeare. Predominantly lexical, *need* crops up 163 times in the corpus, which translates into frequency more than twice poorer than that of *dare*. With 136 instances of lexical *need*, the verb's modal side is significantly eclipsed, the corpus engendering as few as 27 instances of *need* functioning as a modal auxiliary.

In our focus on lexical *need* in Shakespeare, we are led to see that *need*, rendering obeisance to the normative syntactic behavior of a lexical verb, through its 136 occurrences in the corpus, either fills the slot of the tensed verb (74 times) or, in its infinitival form, assumes various sentence positions (24 times) or else, enters fossilized lexical expressions (38 times). In the foremost group, the present tense usage of *need*, 69 instances, is favored by Shakespeare, the past tense instances being hardly noteworthy for merely 5 reinforcements. For the significance of its semantic role as the carrier of the negative meaning of *must*, *need* realizes itself most fully in negative and non-assertive contexts. It is then no simple happenstance that, in the present, *need* comes 46 times in negative sentences, direct and indirect negation each taking an equal share of 23 instances.

Little, if any, change affects the mechanism of negation which we have already seen work for *dare*, so does it for *need*. The urge for simply following *need* with *not* prevails in 21 direct negation instances, which must irrevocably be considered a norm in the conduct of the verb.

(19) *Therefore stay yet; thou need'st not to be gone.* (Romeo and Juliet; III.5)

2 instances (20), (21) stand out by virtue of having recourse to auxiliary *do* in forming the negation:

(20) *Prince Henry: Lead me, my Lord? I do not need your help:* (King Henry IV, Part I; V.4)

(21) *Doth the King lack subjects? Do not the rebels need soldiers?*
(King Henry IV, Part I; I.2)

Interestingly enough, in (21) we observe not only negation brought about by *do not* but also further disentanglement from the 16th century syntactic norms in the shape of the interrogative made possible by the inversion of *do not* with the subject. In this sense however, (21) is a solitary example in the whole corpus, the predominant way of forming interrogatives remaining the inversion of *need* with the subject.

As for declaratives which involve *do* preceding *need* in the present – 'originally employed for emphasis' and 'often found in more inflated language' (Blake 1989: 82–83) – the corpus adduces 3 such instances, e.g.

(22) *Your friends at Pomfret, they do need the priest;* (King Richard III, III.2)

Among 69 instances of *need* in the present, 51 times *need* emerges as a transitive verb which requires the direct object, and 18 times it is followed by the *to*-infinitive. There is 1 instance of *need* undergoing passivisation. Shakespeare's conjugation of *need* in the present is summarized in Table II:

	Singular	Plural
1	I need	we need
2	thou need'st / you need	you need
3	he/she/it need he/she/it needs	they need

Clearly, Shakespeare's prescriptions in the matter of the conjugation of lexical *need* and modal *dare* unequivocally melt into one. Concord markers are assigned only to the 2nd and 3rd person singular, and these two need to be desiccated and focused on. That *need* is somehow estranged from the 2nd person context can be inferred from very poor frequency of such instances which total 8. The decline of *thou* takes its toll leaving only 2 instances of *thou need'st* in the corpus, *ye* is entirely absent whereas *you need* crops up 6 times. Our attempt to explore the 3rd person singular instances of *need* stumbles upon the same hindrance that we have to wrestle with in the case of *dare*. Among 30 such instances, 27 are perfect embodiments of the syntactic prerequisites for lexical verbs in that they all take the *-s* ending. (23) is the only case of *need* accompanied by emphatic *do* which takes over the function of marking concord in the present:

(23) *They say 'A crafty knave does need no broker;'* (King Henry VI, Part II; I.2)

These 27 instances contrast with 3 ones in which *need* (once followed by the direct object and twice by *to*-infinitive) is expressly deprived of the inflectional ending.

(24) *That you may know one another's mind, and
The boy never need to understand any thing;* (The Merry Wives of Windsor;
II.2)

With the matter of the subjunctive being elaborated on in the section on *dare*, an implication is that it is primarily this mood which is most likely to assume responsibility for the loss of the *-s* ending. That there are as few as 3 instances of endless *need* is, at the same time, striking testimony to *need* being less susceptible to subjunctive treatment than *dare*.

Standing loyal and true to the formulas prescribed for lexical verbs, *need* occurs as a head verb immediately following a modal auxiliary 22 times, *shall* being picked up most often to be coupled with *need*. One of these instances is visited by the *need of* construction which is per se the only mark this construction leaves in the whole corpus:

(25) *Is it not well? What should you need of more?* (King Lear; II.4)

Further, (26) presents itself as one of 2 instances of the infinitival form of *need* being utilized in the corpus:

(26) *It shall please my country to need my death.* (Julius Caesar; III.2)

A glancing account of the past tense use of lexical *need* unveils 5 instances falling under this category. That this number equals that of the past tense instances of lexical *dare*, *dare* being only marginally lexical in the 16th century, testifies to Shakespeare's radically infrequent turning to the past tense vehicle in the case of *need*. Even more astonishing is Shakespeare's abiding by the marked emphatic construction with the past form of auxiliary *do* contrasted with only one-time lapse into the use of the unmarked past form *needed*. The latter instance demands presentation by virtue of *needed* being followed by a *that*-clause.

(27) *But I, who never knew how to entreat,
Nor never needed that I should entreat,* (The Taming of The Shrew; IV.3)

The remaining 4 instances are all declarative, with one embedded in an *if*-clause.

Quite a large number of the instances of lexical *need* – 38 – would require separate treatment as they are part of lexical expressions such as *What need(s)...?*, *There needs...*, and *It needs...* But this falls outside the scope of our paper.

Furthermore, a generous recognition is entitled to ensue of the achievement of *need* as a modal auxiliary. The significance of modal *need* may not lie so much in the number of its occurrences, merely 27, as in the rigidity with which the verb approaches the requirements set for the modal. No worse is the modal profile of *need* than that of verbs with much longer modal descent to boast, in that it fits in easily with all its forms remaining uncontaminated by inflection in any person in both the singular and plural, except, of course, for 2 instances of *thou need'st*. Yet, with their fewness in number, the inflected forms triggered by the use of *thou* fail to cast any permanent cloud over as many as 11 cases of *need* accompanied by *you*. Stripped of any problematicity are 4 3rd person singular instances of modal *need* inasmuch as they steer clear of any endings whatsoever. Neither these instances nor the rest bear the salient scar of lexical verbs in the shape of the full infinitive following.

Captured merely twice in a declarative sentence, modal *need* gravitates toward negative contexts, a foil to the meaning of *must*. At the heart of negated *need*, 22 times Shakespeare places direct negation, with 3 occurrences of indirect negation always adjusted to the inverted word order. No instance of an interrogative with modal *need* can be singled out in the corpus. Shakespeare does not stretch the range of application of modal *need* to the past tense context; needless to say, the *needn't-perfect-infinitive* construction makes no appearance in his discourse either.

Thus, it would be a fallacy to conclude that we emerge from this research of Shakespeare's language both ever-doubtful whether there is any substantial modal potential in *need*, and more than slightly inclined to ascribe the 27 instances into which the verb's 'budding' modality materializes, to a mere aberration in its lexical

uses, not a little consentient with a myriad of free variants deeply engrained in the 16th c. linguistic system.

Rather, the percentage of modal uses already comes as a blow to the prestige of the verb's lexicality, no less than a mark of *need* sinking into nothing, if not a cautious, albeit inexorable enough, drift toward a predictably double identity in the years to come.

3. The language of Dickens

The intervening years between Shakespeare and Dickens, which amount to over two centuries, do not leave, according to Schlauch (1965: 142–144), the syntax of the English verb intact:

1. all the inflectional endings with the exception of *-s* in the 3rd person singular are filtered out of the system,
2. by the 19th century the role of auxiliary *do* gains momentum,
3. the enthusiasm for the subjunctive ebbs away in the 18th century.

3.1. Dare

The first glance at the number of the occurrences of *dare* in the corpus – 89 – prompts a conclusion that the popularity of the verb seems to dwindle away. No striking shift is signaled in the modal/non-modal profile of the verb, modal *dare* gains the upperhand by virtue of 70 occurrences against merely 18 instances of lexical *dare*. One instance of a hybrid between the two models is cast into view.

By all estimates, modal *dare* fails to prosper anywhere but in fixed expressions. Quite matter-of-factly, but for *dare say* and *How dare you...?* as few as 15 occurrences of modal *dare* outside these expressions in the corpus, would hardly manage to constitute 'a force to be reckoned with.' What is more, within these 15 occurrences *dare* seems to eschew present tense contexts, there being merely 7 such instances, which are overshadowed by the remaining 8 occurrences, shared by *durst* and *dared*, belonging to the realm of the past tense. Thriving as it does in the environment of lexical expressions, modal *dare* appears 44 times in *dare say* and 11 times in *How dare you...?*

The application of *dare say* in Dickens in 43 out of 44 occurrences partakes of a unique sense of consistency. Unveiled by the corpus, they are all as if mirror images of one another in that each time the subject is provided by the 1st person singular, *I*, *dare* and *say* are always printed separately, each *dare say* is inserted into a present tense context and never is it negated or inverted, an index of the construction making significant progress in earning itself the status of an independent lexical entry by the latter 19th century.

Still, no less discernible is the far-reaching, albeit one-shot, presence of the past form of *dare say* in the shape of *durst say*:

- (28) *To this Mrs. Nickleby only replied that she durst say she was very stupid.*
(NN 55)

The same instance is quoted by Visser (1963–73: 1433); his comment on this occurrence being that ‘the preterite *I dared (durst) say* is rare, but it is sometimes used in indirect speech’. From our viewpoint, a crucial observation is Dickens’ preference given to the older preterite *durst* rather than to lexical *dare*-induced *dared* in this inherently modal construction, as well as the fact that the still disjointed structure of *dare* and *say* in *dare say* renders it natural to use the past form of the former rather than that of the latter, which is, according to OED (1975) utilized in some dialectal varieties of English.

An obvious novelty in the usage of modal *dare* in Dickens, is its involvement in the *How dare you...?* construction. Entirely absent from the language of Shakespeare, it makes its debut in the 19th century part of our corpus, although its roots should undoubtedly be traced back to earlier times. The grounds for singling out this particular use of *dare* and for regarding it as a lexical expression consist in the unchanging indispensability of its constituents: unfailingly *How dare* followed by the 2nd person pronoun *you* and the bare infinitive. Optionally, the infinitive can be ellipted. The modal character of *dare* is here unquestionable, the verb being inverted with the subject and requiring the infinitive without *to* to follow. With all of these conditions held in reverence, the construction makes 11 appearances in the corpus, including 3 instances with the infinitive ellipted.

- (29) *Damn you, Tim Linkwater, how dare you talk about dying?* (NN 35)
(30) *You naughty child, how dare you? Go and sit down this instant.* (GE 23)

Vehement rebuttal to the above considerations is made by the following sentence culled from the corpus:

- (31) *How dared you to come betwixt me and a young woman I liked?* (GE 53)

Bearing an uncanny resemblance to *How dare you...?*, this use of *dare* constitutes the hybrid already hinted at in this section. The past form *dared* undergoes inversion with the subject in a way no different than modal *dare* does but, at the same time, *to* is inserted into the slot between the subject and the infinitive that follows, a peculiarity symptomatic of lexical *dare*. The motivation for this construction is obscure, given that, (31) being the only trace it leaves in the corpus, Visser (1963–73), OED (1975) and other sources refrain from attesting a possibility of such a construction.

As our crusade for modal *dare* enters the seemingly proper phase, i.e. the territory of modal *dare* not subordinated to any lexical expressions, we are faced with severe disappointment. As few as 7 occurrences of *dare* in the present and 8 occurrences of *dared/durst* in the past, if cast against 254 and 55 such occurrences respectively in Shakespeare, can be considered no great achievement in comparison.

The group of 7 instances of modal *dare* stops short of responding to anyone’s craving for a full view of Dickens’ conjugation of the verb in the present. The view that we do attain, hampered by all the gaps in it, proves less than revealing:

Table III. The conjugation of modal *dare* in Dickens

	Singular	Plural
1	I dare	No occurrence attested
2	you dare	you dare
3	No occurrence attested	they dare

Unlikely as it is that Dickens plugs any innovations into the conjugation of *dare* in the 1st person plural, the total absence of *dare* in the 3rd person singular is a stumbling block of major proportions. Above all, it dispels any conclusion as to the possible corollaries of the influence of lexical *dare* upon modal *dare*, the latter's 3rd person singular form being exceptionally amenable to this influence in Shakespeare. Less importantly, it does not aid to bear out the decline of the subjunctive.

The information retrievable from these 7 instances of modal *dare*, urges that the verb be treated as a genuine modal, though. In 6 instances, *dare* is directly negated by *not* following it, one is positive, none being inverted. 4 times the bare infinitive covers the slot immediately following *dare* whereas in 3 cases, the infinitive is ellipted. The triumph of the 2nd person pronoun *you* (it occurs twice) makes obvious the decay of both *thou* and the resultant inflections. Thus, it should be restated that if it was not for the gaps in the 3rd person singular forms of *dare* in the corpus, the verb's 'coming of age' as a modal auxiliary within the spell of over 200 years would prove unquestionable. The following sentences, (32), (33), epitomize Dickens' use of modal *dare* in the present:

- (32) *By this right – that, knowing what I do, you dare not tempt me further,*
(NN 54)
- (33) *'Follow your leader, boys and take pattern by Smike if you dare.'* (NN 13)

The application of modal *dare* in the present (barring the lexical expressions) seems to pale more and more into insignificance in Dickens. For the first time, past tense occurrences – 8 – outnumber the instances of modal *dare* in the present – 7, and *dared*, in Shakespeare a past equivalent of lexical *dare* exclusively, lends its availability to modal *dare*. 3 instances of impeccably modal *dared* crop up in the corpus. Once it is negated indirectly:

- (34) (...) *child (...) whom the father believed dead, and dared make no stir about;*
(GE 5)

whereas twice direct negation is reinforced by *not* which occupies the prescribed position between *dared* and the bare infinitive, as in (35):

- (35) *On the present occasion, though I was hungry, I dared not eat my slice.*
(GE 2)

OED (1975) dispells any hopes of the modal use of *dared* being any novelty and identifies an occurrence of this type dating back to 1641.

Nevertheless, *durst*, a past form of undeniably longer modal descent, wins the claim to the position of dominance over *dared* on the strength of its 5 occurrences in the corpus. Within these occurrences, the *durst-infinitive/durst-perfect infinitive* differentiation still holds true, by virtue of one appearance of the latter, though. What is more, not far, if at all, removed from its function in Shakespearean language, this appearance is immersed in a conditional, therefore non-factual, context in Dickens:

- (36) (...) *it naturally occurred to him that he would have done just the same if any audacious gossipier durst have presumed in his hearing to speak lightly of her.*
(NN 43)

One occurrence of *durst-perfect infinitive* notwithstanding, to occur once is to occur hardly at all and be about to fall into abeyance.

Durst embedded in the remaining 4 cases is no less syntactically modal than *dared*. Each time it is accompanied by the bare infinitive, once it is positive whereas twice it is negated, one time directly, 2 times indirectly. Not surprisingly, direct negation in the case of *durst* mirrors the formula set for modal verbs.

- (37) (...) *he thought it very distinctly, he durst not move his lips lest the old woman*
(...) (NN 47)

Lexical *dare*, having aroused great levels of expectations as to the prospects of its future development, may seem tamed and tranquilized in Dickens in view of its 18 occurrences. Yet, by no means is the verb in a standstill in the 19th century. Slow but persistent progress in lexical *dare*'s conquering more and more territory of modal *dare* is proclaimed in percentage terms. The 18 occurrences equal 20% of all the occurrences of *dare* in the corpus, which marks a 7% increase in comparison with Shakespeare. And if the lexicality of *dare* already ripens into the 18 cases, the 15 cases of modal *dare*, those unsullied by any suggestion of their belonging inside any lexical expressions, cannot be said to cement the verb's role as a fixture within the sphere of modal verbs.

Furthermore, behind these statistical fluctuations lies lexical *dare*'s genuine venture into more and more syntactic areas where only lexical verbs dare. The analysis of the corpus unfolds two such areas: *dare*'s participle form appears twice in non-finite clauses:

- (38) *Kate had sat as silently as she could, scarcely daring to raise her eyes, (...)*
(NN 19)
- (39) *'Yes, ma'am,' replied Kate, not daring to look up;* (NN 10)

With *to* coming before the infinitive in both cases and *scarcely* preceding *daring* in (38), *dare* presents itself lexical to the core. The other area is 'a number of threats and commands (imperatives) with *dare*' (Visser 1963-73: 1439) as illustrated by (40):

- (40) *You do it, and you never dare to say a word or dare to make sign concerning your having seen such a person as me.* (GE 1)

Visser (1963–73) also finds confirmation of modal *dare* being used imperatively as early as in the 17th century, this ability gradually leaning toward lexical *dare*.

The final addition to the list of lexical applications of the 19th century *dare* largely runs aground on those already unearthed in the Shakespearean plays. 8 instances of lexical *dare* serving as the tensed verb in the present tense context add to the accumulation of such cases spotted in Shakespeare. And if Shakespeare sees *dare* coupled with a direct object rather than followed by *to*-infinitive, Dickens would rather his *dare* opted for the latter – 7 times, the verb insisting on a direct object just once. That 6 of these instances are positive, one is interrogative and one indirectly negated also invite comparisons with Shakespeare, which, this time, eventuate in eliciting largely similar inclinations. The pre-verbal position of *scarcely* in (41), which is responsible for indirect negation of *dare*, helps attest to the fully lexical perception of *dare*.

(41) (...) *if this is what I scarcely dare to hope it is, you are caught, villains.*

(NN 54)

As to the only interrogative employing lexical *dare*, the sentence cannot dispense with the aid of auxiliary *do*:

(42) *'Does any man dare to speak to me of a noose, (...)* (NN25)

Nor can it overestimate that of the *does* form in the 3rd person singular, which leads us to the notion of the conjugation of lexical *dare* in Dickens. All the 5 instances of *dare* in the 3rd person singular receive the *-s* suffix, which places the seal of approval on the withdrawal of the subjunctive. Obviously, no other inflectional endings than this one are attached to *dare* in any person or number.

With much diffidence, somehow, lexical *dare* feeds on other sentential functions in the 19th century for whom, in Shakespeare, the verb proclaims much more enthusiasm. In Dickens, one-time appearances turn out to be the final result of *dare*'s pursuit of such roles as that of the *to*-infinitive (43) and that of the bare infinitive following a modal (44):

(43) (...) *which stimulated Joe to dare to stay out half an hour longer on Saturdays than at other times.* (GE 10)

(44) (...) *do you mean to tell me that any man would dare to box the ears....*

(NN 40)

Also with poor frequency lexical *dare* allies itself with past tense contexts. With *dared* being a natural nominee for the past form used, the verb emerges 3 times in the Simple Past and once in the Present Perfect. Out of the 3 Past Simple occurrences, one is positive, one is directly negated (45) and also one indirectly negated (46):

(45) (...) *and that Mr. Lillyvick didn't dare to say his soul was his own, such was the tyrannical sway of Mrs. Lillyvick,* (NN 48)

(46) *Nicholas hardly dared to look out of the window;* (NN 13)

The Present Perfect occurrence is positive and fully laden with the periphrastic load indicative of such structures:

- (47) *As to what I dare, I'm a old bird now, as **has dared** all manner of traps since first he was fled,* (GE 40)

Clearly, the natural movement of lexical *dare* is distorted and clogged despite its auspicious potential incubated in the language of Shakespeare, which we would expect to have taken root by the 19th century. And if, in Shakespeare, we can speak of the conjugation of modal *dare* in the 3rd person singular being extensively defiled by the lexical *dare*-induced *-s* suffix, then, in Dickens, the leak is stemmed. How much of an avenue to increased lexicality is this broken linkage between modal and lexical *dare* is yet to be seen.

3.2. Need

A brief look at the occurrences of *need* in Dickens resolves itself into a contention that the slight stagnation in the syntactic evolution of *dare* cannot hold back that of *need*, even if we take into account the two verbs keeping pace with each other in the 16th century in terms of yielding the syntactic transformations. The grounds that bulwark this view are two-fold: on the one hand, the frequency of *need* is translatable in almost the same terms as that of *dare*, *need* occurring 75 times altogether. And if confronted with 89 instances of *dare*, the result is awe-inspiring, given the 16th century disproportion in the frequency of the two verbs. On the other hand, the 19th century sees *need* go from denouncing its image of a predominantly lexical verb to making a 180 degree turn so as to take on features characteristic of a verb which is more often than not, modal. The statistics prove this statement true: the corpus analysis reveals 47 instances of modal *need* and 28 cases of lexical *need*. A major milestone as it is in the development of the verb, *need* commences to imitate the syntactic patterns of *dare*.

The impoverished frequency of lexical *need* mingles with the verb's relegation to past tense contexts rather than to present tense ones. 15 occurrences out of 28 are past, an index of a thorough turnaround since the Shakespearean era when 5 instances out of 163 are set in the past tense environment. The remaining instances of lexical *need* in the corpus either come in the present (6 times) or follow modal auxiliaries (4 times) or else employ the verb's passive or participial forms (2 and 1 time respectively). Also, the shift from Shakespeare to Dickens is aided by the fact that '*need* in questions gradually changed from "impersonal" to "personal", just as it did in the declarative syntactical units' (Visser 1963-73: 1429). What this statement entails is the ousting of such constructions as *What need(s)...?* which make such remarkable presence in Shakespeare. What is still left out of the force behind the impersonal use of *need* is 4 instances of *it needed*, though.

The 6 present tense instances of lexical *need* split into 3 cases in which *need* is complemented by the direct object and 3 in which *need* takes the *to*-infinitive, 5 of these instances being positive and one directly negated. Negation, in fact, manifests

itself as the area in which our assumptions as to *need*'s unswerving attitude to syntactic lexicality are dissolved. Lexical *need*, in Dickens, still undergoes negation according to the modal verb convention:

- (48) *What Tim Linkingwater said, or what he brought with him that night, needs not to be told.* (NN 55)

The incongruity of this negation has a question mark written all over especially in light of Shakespeare's already availing himself of auxiliary *do* on occasion, yet Visser (1963–73) hastens to remark that *need* somehow lags behind in terms of accepting the periphrastic form of negation.

The conjugation of lexical *need* in Dickens is more reassuring. The *-s* ending seems an indispensable attachment to the only instance of *need* in the 3rd person singular (cf. (48) above), the rest of the instances being spared any inflections.

Despite scaled-down frequency, lexical *need* still enters various sentential positions characteristic of a lexical verb. 4 times *need* comes following modal auxiliaries, it undergoes passivization twice and, an innovation when compared with Shakespeare's system, once the participial form of *need* is assigned to serve in a non-finite clause:

- (49) (...) *something so gentle in her, so much needing protection on Mill Pond,*
(GE 46)

Nevertheless, the past tense context seems a burgeoning area in which over a half, i.e. 15, of all the instances of lexical *need* foster. 2 of these instances stand out by virtue of entering the only Past Perfect clause which is part of a conditional sentence:

- (50) *She (...) would have won me even if the task had needed pains.* (GE 33)

whereas the other goes a long way to be followed by the Perfect Infinitive with *to*:

- (51) (...) *and that one he who needed to have been most happy?* (NN 43)

The remaining instances share full equality in the vast alliance forged to carry the Simple Past context. 6 of these occurrences are positive, also 6 are indirectly negated whereas one is directly negated, the last one demanding consideration for, at least, two reasons. Firstly, it, belonging to non-standard English, has the right to take advantage of the pronoun *thee*:

- (52) *Thee didn't need help, if thee warn't as silly yoongster as ever draw'd breath.*
(NN 39)

Secondly, that the periphrastic form of negation with *need* appears for the first time in this sentence, bears out a view that, prior to filtering through to written language, the negation by means of auxiliary *do* functions in spoken English and its dialectal varieties.

Not infrequently though it is that *need* treads the path of lexicality, its predominant use, flail as we may, falls into the tight grip of modality. No less genuinely

modal than *dare*, through its 47 occurrences in the corpus, *need* achieves a louder voice exclusively in the present, banishing any trace of even the *needn't-perfect infinitive* construction in the corpus. That this structure is, however, in use at the time is evidenced by Visser (1963–73: 1428) who, besides catching Dickens himself resorting to it in his another novel *Dombey and Son*, attests its earliest appearance in 1743. Gone are any inflections along with the recession of *thou*. Thus, the 19th century conjugation of modal *need* subscribes to the PDE description of the modal auxiliary syntax:

Table IV. The conjugation of modal *need* in Dickens

	Singular	Plural
1	I need	we need
2	you need	you need
3	he/she/it need	they need

A persistent current, noticeable in Shakespeare and even more solidified in Dickens, has the modal *need* occurrences flock toward negative contexts. Invariably followed by *not* and the bare infinitive (which sometimes, however, gets evacuated due to ellipsis) and often contracted to *needn't*, as many as 30 directly negated instances 'deliver the goods' mostly as the negative equivalents of *must*. Further 9 occurrences of indirectly negated modal *need* illustrate another actualization of the negative form of the verb taking precedence over the other types of the utterances present in the corpus. Although leaving nothing to be desired syntactically, the total number of the positive instances of modal *need* which equals 7, indicates no considerable progress since the 2 such instances in Shakespeare. Nor can the first, and solitary, fully-fledged interrogative with modal *need* aspire to be termed any grand accomplishment:

(53) *'Soft Head! Need you say it face to face?* (GE 20)

What, however, comes about as an inexorable dent in the otherwise unassailably modal behavior of *need* is the seemingly unconstrained position of the adverb which accompanies *need*:

(54) *'you scarcely need ask me whether I will again.* (NN 44)

(55) *That (...) need scarcely be remarked.* (NN 28)

(56) *That he need never know how his hopes of enriching me perished.* (GE 54)

That the adverb can alternate between the pre-verbal position (54), and the post-verbal position (55), (56), is a formidable notion. Jespersen (1924: 181) endorses the post-verbal insertion of the adverb, yet Dickens apparently has untrameled freedom of choice in this case.

The impetus to *need* gliding toward modality rather than lexicality impresses itself vividly on the researcher's consciousness. It is only occasionally that exam-

ples of lexical *need* dot Dickens' landscape, the present tense forms being kept in the background altogether.

4. Present-day English: *dare*

In the PDE corpus, the instances of *dare*, can be accreted to a radically small number, 47. When it is compared with 437 occurrences of *need* in the corpus, the downward drive in the frequency of *dare*, which sets in in the 16th century, cannot be made more obvious. Nor can we settle for terming the shift in the modal/non-modal profile of *dare* a mere change since doing this would boil down to an understatement of major proportions in this case. The shift in PDE, albeit predictable, still exhibits revolutionary characteristics: apparently readied for full release prior to the time wherein our present research material is embedded, the lexical side of *dare*, through its 25 occurrences, gains momentum at the expense of modal *dare*, which, with its 16 occurrences, 'plays only the second fiddle'. The 6 instances of *dare* not included in either of the groups constitute what Quirk et al. (1985: 136) would refer to as 'blends between the auxiliary construction and the main verb construction (...).'

Less distinguished due to their transition from the majority group to a minority group, the modal *dare* occurrences, which total 16, evidence the eased twinges of modality upon *dare*. In merely 4 cases of *dare say* and no case of *How dare you...?* the verb loses another avenue to increased frequency, a serious lapse in the development of modal *dare* given the outburst of such forms in the 19th century. In PDE, modal *dare* diverges from past tense contexts by appearing only twice with its past forms, the rest of the verb's occurrences being absorbed into the present.

No taint of frequency abatement is encountered when dealing with lexical *dare*. As evidenced by its 25 occurrences, lexical *dare*, it seems clear, funnels language users away from modal *dare* to the effect that a lot of what would have been expressed by means of modal *dare* in the 19th century or earlier, is more likely to be poured into lexical *dare* toward the end of the 20th century. And this points to the truth outlined by Jespersen (1924) concerning the interchangeability of modal and lexical *dare* in PDE. The prosperity of lexical *dare* translates, then, into its 8 occurrences in the present and 6 occurrences in the past. Various modal auxiliaries choose the bare infinitive of *dare* to follow them 6 times, the participle form of *dare* being employed 5 times.

All in all, it seems clear that, on the eve of the 21st century, not only is lexical *dare* admitted to full equality in the vast alliance with modal *dare*, but also the former's position, due to the balm of its increased frequency, in this alliance gains more prestige than the latter. This state of affairs adduces the main piece of evidence that urges that Leech's (1991) far-slung statement be appreciated that *dare* is a predominantly lexical verb.

4.1. Need

If *dare* suffers from large infrequency in PDE, the fewness of instances available is not any of the ills under which *need* labors in the same period. Indeed, the evolution of *need* rushes on without respite bringing in its wake a noticeable advancement in the verb's popularity in the last decade of the 20th century. The unmatched number of its occurrences, which equals 437, comparable only with the frequency of *dare* in Shakespeare, marks the point in which *need* inevitably joins the ranks of the most frequently-used verbs in English. And interestingly enough, this frequency boost is provided by nothing else than the lexical side of *need*, an index of the verb making a turn away from its 19th century modality-dominated image and giving a nod to its lexical roots. As a result, lexical *need* is reinforced 412 times, whereas modal *need*, with its 25 occurrences, enjoys a notably peripheral status. Clearly, unlike in the case of *dare*, the co-existence of the lexical and modal faces of *need*, all the tension between them notwithstanding, does not result in any hybrids of the two.

On many a level the gains of lexical *need* are substantial in PDE. Far removed from the 19th century state of being eclipsed by modal *need*, it surges forth rising up to its status of a fully-fledged lexical verb. Its 412 occurrences further subdivide to the effect that the majority, i.e. 221 is garnered by *need* in the present, another indication of the verb's disavowing its 19th century commitments. The past-tense occurrences total 84; their significance may be diminished in percentage terms, but still they constitute a second force. In accord with the practice established in the earlier times, yet even more extensively than before, various forms of lexical *need* are assigned other sentential functions which the lexicality of the verb renders it eligible for. Namely, *need* undergoes passivization 50 times, it finds placement after modal auxiliaries 45 times, it emerges as a present participle 11 times, and finally, to make the picture complete, we cannot get past this topic without mentioning a solitary instance of the *to*-infinitive of *need* in the corpus.

Disqualified in the 20th century from the sweepstakes for prevalence, or at least, equal terms with the lexical side of *need*, modal *need* may be, in fact, fighting a losing battle. And that the verb, set into the form of the *needn't*-Perfect-Infinitive construction 6 times, appears in the past for the first time does not aid the proliferation of its occurrences. The actual number of the instances of modal *need* in the corpus – 25 – equals 7% of all the occurrences of *need* and legitimizes the conviction of the increasingly peripheral standing of the verb. At the same time, the syntactic performance of modal *need* is not impaired by any breach of the theoretical description depicting the behavior of modal verbs, which is not however enough to 'save the day' for the verb.

5. Conclusion

Over the ages the two verbs inevitably transcend toward different beings in that they gradually break the verb category bounds. Despite their pledging allegiance to the opposing verb categories (pre-modal *dare* vs. lexical *need*) in OE (cf. Molencki, 2002) and their not-so-strict obeisance to the patterns imposed by these categories throughout ME (cf. Molencki 2005), *dare* and *need* finally abandon their original fealty in the 16th century. The culmination of this process is best expressed in Denison's (1993: 297) statement that 'in Present-day English it is common to assume that there are two homonymous and synonymous verbs *dare* and *need*, the modal (...) and the non-modal (...).'

Nevertheless, the shift observed in the 16th century is but a subtle signal broadcast by the verbs. It is within the next 200-odd years that the paths of *dare* and *need* separate in terms of the pace at which the verbs accept the transformation. *Dare* persists in flirting with the lexical use yet, in its essence, stays modal, while *need*, in flight from its originally lexical frame, for the first time overtly reveals its gravitational pull toward the patterns of *dare*. Still it is in the 20th century that the greatest amount of turbulence crosses the routes of the two verbs. *Need*'s extensive participation in the current of modality was only momentary and now it continues its enraptured flow, though in the opposite direction as if to recover its lexical source. *Dare*, in the 20th century, reaches the point visited by *need* in the 19th century, in that the former finally approaches the other polar i.e. lexicality-dominated framework. Cumulatively then, it seems that the distance traversed by *need* is twice as long as that walked by *dare*, the question arising whether *dare* will ever swing away from the lexical use and dwindle back into its modal shape.

If we stand back from the data presented in this article, the wedding of the appellation of *marginal modals* to *dare* and *need*, whatever consciously premeditated design it comes from, is hammered home through the verbs' inexorable commerce with the lexical category traits. And as long as we agree that even a small portion of modality, which resides in the two verbs, legitimizes their labeling as modal rather than lexical, that stance can be reasonably upheld.

Sources

Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations* <http://www.bibliomania.com/Fiction/dickens/Expectations>.

Dickens, Charles. *Nicholas Nickleby* <http://www.bibliomania.com/Fiction/dickens/Nickleby>.

The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary. Vol I & II. 1975. Oxford: OUP.

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. 1992. CD-ROM. Creative Multimedia Corporation.

The Guardian 1993 on CD-ROM. Distributed by Chadwyck-Healey, produced by FT Profile.

The Independent and The Sunday Independent 1993 on CD-ROM. Distributed by Chadwyck-Healey, produced by FT Profile.

Bibliography

- Blake, N.F. (1989). *The Language of Shakespeare*. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Denison, D. (1993). *English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions*. London: Longman.
- Ehrman, M. (1966). *The Meanings of the Modals in Present-Day English*. The Hague: Mouton & co.
- Jespersen, O. (1920). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Part IV. Syntax. Third Vol.* London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.
- Kakietek, P. (1972). *Modal Verbs in Shakespeare's English*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Leech, G. (1989). *An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage*. London: Nelson.
- Molenccki, R. (2002). The status of *dearr* and *þearf* in Old English. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 35. 363–380.
- Molenccki, R. (2005). The confusion between *durren* and *thurven* in Middle English. In: N. Ritt and H. Schendl (eds). *Rethinking Middle English: Linguistic and Literary Approaches*. Frankfurt/Main, etc: Peter Lang. 147–160.
- Palmer, F.R. (1986). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartnik J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Schlauch, M. (1965). *The English Language in Modern Times (since 1400)*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Visser, E.T. (1963–73). *A Historical Syntax of the English Language. 3 Volumes*. Leiden: EJ Brill.
- Warner, AR. (1993). *English Auxiliaries*. Cambridge: CUP.