Grammatical Change in the Verb Phrase in Contemporary Philippine English[1]

Peter Collins[2]
University of New South Wales, Australia

Abstract

This paper presents the findings of a diachronic corpus-based study of selected categories of the verb phrase – the progressive aspect, the passive voice, the present perfect aspect, the modals and quasi-modals – in contemporary Philippine English and its colonial parent variety, American English. Frequencies were determined for the verb phrase categories in the Philippine and American components of the early 2010s Corpus of Global Web-based English. These are compared with the findings of earlier studies by Collins and associates of Philippine English, and by Leech and associates of American English, in the 1960s and 1990s. The trajectories of the grammatical variables over the half-century from the early 1960s to the early 2010s are traced, and the implications of the findings for the contentious issue of the evolutionary status of PhilE are explored.

Introduction

This study investigates the evolution of several grammatical categories (specifically five verb phrase [VP] categories; the progressive, the *be*-passive, the present perfect, modals and quasi-modals) in Philippine English (PhilE). Comparisons are made with the parent variety, American English (AmE), with a view to ascertaining the extent of its influence in the trajectories of the five selected categories in the grammar of PhilE, over the last half-century of its development.

The transportation of English to the Philippines and subsequent evolution of a distinctive variety of World English, PhilE, is a quite recent phenomenon.

After the Spanish-American war, in 1898, the United States achieved authority over the Philippines and straight away took steps to establish English as the official language and the language of instruction in public schools. It was from around the mid-twentieth century, no doubt with momentum provided by such critical historical events as the 1946 Philippines Declaration of Independence and the end of WWII, that as an emergent nativising variety PhilE began to encounter greater acceptance and a gradual erosion of its hitherto exonormative orientation towards its postcolonial parent, AmE (Thompson, 2003; Schneider, 2011). By 1948, according to the 1954 Bureau of Census and Statistics, 37.2% of the population claimed to be able to speak English (304). Opinions vary on the extent to which present-day PhilE has entered the evolutionary phase that Schneider (2007) refers to as "Phase 4: Endonormative Stabilization," and describes as characterised by acceptance of, positive attitudes towards and stabilisation of the English variety; and literary creativity in and codification of the new variety (56). According to Schneider (2007) there are some signs of endonormativity in PhilE, such as the growth of a canon of Philippine literature in English and evidence of limited codification (141; see also articles in Bautista and Bolton, 2004). However, in his view it is little more than incipient, as evidenced by the persistence in some quarters of complaints about poor standards of expression. Borlongan (2011), by contrast, argues that the endonormativity of PhilE is quite advanced, citing as evidence the increasingly positive attitudes towards PhilE expressed by younger Filipinos.

The present study seeks to shed light on the contentious issue of the linguistic independence of PhilE, with VP frequencies derived from three corpora of PhilE, and three of AmE, spanning the half-century period from the early 1960s to the early 2010s. I shall begin with an overview of the findings of the previous corpus-based diachronic research on PhilE by Collins and colleagues, and then discuss the corpora used in this research and in the present study. I then present and discuss the findings of the study.

Diachronic Corpus-based Studies of PhilE

The scholarly investigation of PhilE was greatly facilitated by the release in 2004 of ICE-Phil, the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English (see Bautista, 2011). More recently, Ariane Borlongan and colleagues at De La Salle University in Manila compiled "Phil-Brown," a corpus that when used in conjunction with (the written component of) ICE-Phil has enabled the empirical investigation of diachronic variation in contemporary (written) PhilE. The design and sampling period (from the late 1950s to the early 1960s) of Phil-Brown are based on the original Brown family corpora, Brown and LOB (Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus). Unfortunately, the project had to be discontinued before the one-million word target was met. Nevertheless, it is an invaluable resource,

comprising 674,000 words of texts representing all four of the "macro-genres" that make up Brown and LOB: press (117,000 words), learned writing (83,000), fiction (166,000) and general prose (308,000).

Using data extracted from parallel categories of Phil-Brown and the written text categories of ICE-Phil (which comprises texts sampled in the early 1990s) linguists can explore changes that have occurred over the three-decade period defined by the sampling times of the two corpora. Fortuitously, this period of time is the same as that in Leech et al.'s (2009) landmark corpus-based research on British English (BrE) and AmE, enabling comparisons to be drawn with their findings. Recognising that PhilE – and AmE – have undoubtedly undergone further grammatical developments since the early 1990s, the present study makes use of the vast resources of the Global Web-Based English Corpus (GloWbE), which has the advantage of sampling recency, but the disadvantage of generic differences with the 1960s and 1990s corpora (see discussion below). In this study, where indicated, Phil-Brown and ICE-Phil frequencies are based on those provided in previous studies by Collins and associates (and based on selected genres of these corpora), while Brown and Frown frequencies are based, where indicated, on those presented in Leech et al. (2009). In some cases, where frequencies for VP categories in 1960s and 1990s PhilE were not available, these were calculated specifically for the present study. The corpora used in this study are set out in Table 1.

Table 1: Corpora used in the study

	PhilE	AmE
Early 1960s	Phil-Brown 674,000 wds	Brown c.1,000,000 wds
Early 1990s	ICE-Phil (written) c.600,000 wds	Frown c.1,000,000 wds
Early 2010s	GloWbE Phil 43,248,407 wds	GloWbE US 386,809,355 wds

Table 2 presents the composition of the matched subcorpora of Phil-Brown and ICE-Phil used in the previous studies upon which sections of the present paper are based. Representing the 2010s in the present study were the Philippine and US components of GloWbE. GloWbE is based on 1.9 billion words of text, from the second decade of the twenty-first century, from 20 different countries. About 60% of the texts are informal blogs, and 40% are other somewhat more formal web-based materials, such as newspapers, magazines and company websites.

Table 2: Selected text categories from Phil-Brown and ICE-Phil

	Phil-Brown		ICE-Phil	
	Category	No. of words (approx)	Category	No. of words (approx)
Press	A Press reportage B Press editorials C Press reviews	118,000	W2C Press news reports W2E Press editorials	68,000
Learned	J Learned	83,000	W2A Printed information (learned)	88,000
Fiction	K General fiction N Adventure and western P Romance and love story	167,000	W2F Creative writing	48,000

The massive size of GloWbE makes it suitable for studying the low-frequency phenomena for which the Brown and ICE corpora were not designed (for example, one of the items in the present study, the modal *ought*, has a raw frequency of 1613 in GloWbE Philippines, but there are merely three tokens in the subcorpus of ICE-Phil used in Collins, Borlongan and Yao, 2014). Recently Mukherjee (2015) has explored the contrasting make-up of GloWbE and smaller, controlled, corpora. The latter are typically designed according to the principle of representativeness in corpus design, which is based on "the underlying assumption that corpus findings are characteristic of a prototypical average speaker of the language variety at hand" (Mukherjee 35). By contrast, the composition of GloWbE is described by Mukherjee as "aggregative," its text-type specification being minimal, merely the blogs vs websites split (even that split not being differentiated in the corpus itself). Mukherjee's sage advice, which in fact mirrors that of Davies and Fuchs (2015) and with which I comply in this study, is to use GloWbE with a measure of caution, and preferably in combination with smaller, representative corpora.

While the release of GloWbE is a very welcome development, making it possible to examine the most recent developments in PhilE and AmE, the use of this corpus in the present study means that all diachronic comparisons made must be subject to caveats regarding differences in corpus composition between it and the smaller corpora. This is not to suggest that there are no generic similarities whatsoever between GloWbE and the smaller corpora. The publication-types and level of formality of the non-blogs section of GloWbE are similar to those of the smaller corpora. In addition, it is worth noting that there are some similarities between the informal blogs of GloWbE and the fiction texts – particularly the dialogic sections therein – that constitute 25% of each of the

Brown-family corpora, and 10% of the ICE (written) subcorpora.[3]

Several recent studies which make use of data from Phil-Brown and ICE-Phil suggest that it may be premature to claim that PhilE has achieved full linguistic autonomy/endonormativity. A strong tendency for PhilE to co-pattern with AmE is found, for example, in its strong AmE-like support for the relativiser *that* (Collins, Yao and Borlongan, 2014); in its continuing preference for the subjunctive over *should*-periphrasis in mandative constructions (Collins, Borlongan, Lim and Yao, 2014); and in its strong frequency increase for the quasi-modals (Collins, Borlongan and Yao, 2014). The special status of PhilE as the only Postcolonial World English with an American rather than British "parent," suggests that the co-patterning identified in these studies is not merely ascribable to the global transnational attraction of AmE. Other studies point to changes underway in the grammar of PhilE, finding a mixture of convergences with, and divergences from, American trends (see Collins, 2015 on the progressive; Collins, Borlongan and Yao, 2014 on the modals).

This paper builds on the findings of previous studies of PhilE during the period from the 1960s to the 1990s focusing on developments that have taken place since that period via analyses of GloWbE, with a view to shedding further light on the issue of PhilE autonomy. I now present and discuss the findings of my corpus-based analyses of the progressive, *be*-passive, present perfect, modals and quasi-modals. Details of the search routines used in the study can be found in the Appendix.[4]

The Progressive Aspect

The progressive aspect is a VP category realised by a combination of a form of auxiliary *be* and an *ing*-participle. *Be* may be tensed (present or past) or non-tensed, the latter when the progressive combines with the perfect aspect (e.g. *have been driving*) or a modal (e.g. *may be driving*) or infinitival *to* (e.g. *to be driving*). In this study we will trace progressive frequencies in PhilE and AmE over the fifty-year period from the early 1960s to the early 2010s.

The progressive aspect prototypically expresses progressive aspectuality, a semantic category that is associated with such meanings as progressivity, imperfectivity and dynamicity, but also more recently with a number of uses that are somewhat tenuously related to progressive aspectuality, insofar as the speaker's attitudes and subjectivity are arguably more salient than aspectuality – hence Smitterberg's (2005) term "not solely aspectual uses" – as exemplified in examples (1-4) below from GloWbE-Philippines: see further Comrie (1995),

---

[3] Note in this regard Mair's (2015) observation: "What the precise relationship is between informal digital literacy and actual spoken language is an extremely tricky issue, and so is the question whether blogs constitute a recognisable genre" (30-31).

[4] The GloWbE interface does not allow very complex searches, an inadequacy that requires me to add a further caveat regarding the reliability of the corpus comparisons.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002), Smitterberg (2005), Collins (2008) and Kranich (2010).

(1) By the way, the newlyweds *are leaving* tomorrow for their La Vegas honeymoon. [futurate]
(2) Make sure the sound system you *will be having* in your reception venue will complement your music selection. [future-as-a-matter-of-course]
(3) In effect, what Roque *is saying* is that it is unfair to blame the judge [interpretive]
(4) The ladies that looked after her *were* always *fussing* over her [habitual *always*]

The progressive aspect has undergone a strong increase in its frequency of use from Late Modern English (LModE) to the Present Day (Mair and Hundt, 1995; Smith, 2002; Hundt, 2004; Römer, 2005; Smitterberg, 2005; Mair and Leech, 2006; Leech et al. 2009; Kranich, 2010). Possible factors include colloquialisation, as evidenced by the characteristically persistently higher representation of the progressive in speech than in writing (see Allen, 1966; Quirk et al., 1985; Biber et al., 1999; Mindt, 2000; Römer, 2005; Collins, 2008; Leech et al., 2009). Another is the filling out of the formal progressive paradigm, including modal progressives and passive progressives. And, finally, there is the emergence of the special "not solely aspectual" uses exemplified in (1)-(4) above.

In Collins's (2015) study of the progressive in written PhilE it was found that between the 1960s and 1990s the progressive was consistently more popular in AmE than PhilE. Furthermore, the percentage increase in the frequency of the progressive saw the two varieties virtually running in tandem over this period (PhilE +9.5% vs AmE +9.3%). The GloWbE frequencies obtained in the present study and presented in Table 3 (AmE 2,930 pmw; PhilE 2519 pmw) show that in the early 2010s AmE has maintained its lead over PhilE (a conclusion that, like all those in this paper, is subject to the caveat regarding compositional differences between GloWbE and the earlier smaller corpora).

The present study reflects the importance of looking at post-1990s data. Studies of the progressive based on the Brown and ICE corpora (Smith, 2002; Collins, 2008; Leech et al., 2009; Rautionaho, 2014; Collins, 2015) note a continuation of the increasing tendency that – as noted above – has been in evidence since LModE. The present study suggests that, since the 1990s, the progressive has gone into decline, with AmE leading the way over PhilE in the decline: see Table 3.

Table 3: Frequencies (pmw) of the progressive in PhilE and AmE from the early 1960s to the early 2010s

	1960s	1990s	% change	1990s	2010s	% change	% change 1960s-2010s
PhilE	2417	2647	+9.5%	2647	2519	-4.8%	+4.2%
AmE	3090	3376	+9.3%	3376	2930	-13.2%	-5.2%

Consider next the frequencies for formal categories of the progressive, presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Frequencies (pmw) of formal subcategories of the progressive in PhilE and AmE from the early 1960s to the early 2010s*

		1960s	1990s	% change	1990s	2010s	% change	% change 1960s-2010s
Present tense	PhilE	1042	1100	+5.5%	1100	1333	+21.2%	+27.9%
	AmE	1134	1422	+26.5%	1422	1644	+15.6%	+45.0%
Past tense	PhilE	997	1087	+9.0%	1087	635	-41.6%	-36.3%
	AmE	1302	1279	-0.9%	1279	680	-46.8%	-47.8%
Perfect	PhilE	281	256	-8.9%	256	251	-2.0%	-10.7%
	AmE	227	224	-1.3%	224	271	+21.0%	+19.4%
Non-F/ Modal	PhilE	97	204	+110.3%	204	300	+47.1%	+209.3%
	AmE	188	190	+1.1%	190	335	+76.3%	+78.2%

* The 1960s and 1990s AmE figures are based on whole Brown and Frown corpora, from Table A6.1 of Leech et al. (2009: 288).

In both PhilE and AmE the simple present and past forms account for the bulk of progressive tokens. If we compare their contrasting fortunes, we gain insights into what is happening more generally. In AmE the strong increase of the present progressive from the 1960s to the 1990s, subsequently slows (from 26.5% to 15.6%) while in PhilE it grows (from 5.5% to 21.2%). In both varieties, the past progressive declines sharply after the 1990s, more strongly in AmE and sufficiently to drag the overall frequency for the progressive (Table 3) into decline. The frequencies for the perfect and non-finite/modal categories are too small to affect the general trends.

The Passive Voice

The term "passive voice" applies to a set of constructions in which the subject has the role of an affected patient. This study is limited to the central construction, the *be*-passive, as exemplified in (5), from GloWbE.

(5) in Chicago, USA in 1886, a bomb *was thrown* by an unknown person.

The passive voice has existed since the Middle English period, but has been in decline throughout the twentieth century in British English (BrE) and AmE. Leech et al. (2009) report a decline in the use of the passive between the 1960s and 1990s in which BrE (-14.0%) is lagging behind AmE (-28.2%) (148). They suggest that the Transatlantic difference may be attributable to the stronger prescriptive censure of *be*-passives encountered in the USA. Table 5 presents frequencies for PhilE and AmE.

Table 5: Frequencies (pmw) of the *be*-passive in PhilE and AmE from the early 1960s to the early 2010s*

	1960s	1990s	% change	1990s	2010s	% change	% change 1960s-2010s
PhilE	6370	9338	+46.6%	9338	6857	-26.6%	+7.6%
AmE	10634	7633	-28.2%	7633	5741	-24.8%	-46.0%

*AmE 1960s and 1990s frequencies are from Leech et al. (2009:297) Table A7.1

The frequencies presented in Table 5 indicate that in AmE the passive has undergone a consistent decline over the past half-century. According to Leech et al. (2009:297), the frequency of *be*-passives fell from 10,634 pmw in Brown to 7,633 in Frown, while the GloWbE US frequency of 5741 pmw suggests that the passive has continued to decline, at a steady rate, into the present millennium. On the other hand, PhilE enjoyed a spectacular increase between the 1960s and 1990s, before going into decline post-1990s with a rate of change (-26.6%) similar to that experienced in AmE (-24.8%). This finding is difficult to explain: it is to be hoped that, if it is supported by subsequent more fine-grained research, more light can be provided into the contributing factors.

The Present Perfect Aspect
Elsness's (1997) corpus-based study indicates that the present perfect in English enjoyed an increase in frequency until around the mid-eighteenth century, after which it began to decline, more markedly in AmE than in BrE. This decline appears to have slowed towards the end of the twentieth century (with a mere 1% drop in frequency in its frequency in AmE found in Hundt and Smith's 2009 study): see Table 6 below. However, the GloWbE figure (2253 pmw) suggests that the decline of the present perfect may have gained momentum again in the new Millenium.

Table 6: Frequencies (pmw) of the present perfect in PhilE and AmE from the early 1960s to the early 2010s*

	1960s	1990s	% change	1990s	2010s	% change	% change 1960s-2010s
PhilE	5697	5982	+5.0%	5982	1864	-68.8%	-67.3%
AmE	3488	3453	-1.0%	3453	2253	-34.8%	-35.4%

*The AmE frequencies for the 1960s and the 1990s are based on Table 1 on p.63 of Hundt and Smith (2009).

In both AmE and PhilE there is only a miniscule change from the early 1960s to the early 1990s, but a sharp drop – one considerably stronger in PhilE (-68.8%) than in AmE (-34.8%) – between the early 1990s and the early 2010s.

Many studies have explored the changing relationship between the present perfect and simple past (e.g. Elsness, 1997; Hundt and Smith, 2009; Yao, 2014). Hundt and Smith (2009), comparing AmE and BrE, say:

> With a decline of present perfects in twentieth-century English we might expect a concomitant increase of the simple past. But… SPs have also decreased over time. As a result, when it comes to relative frequencies of the present perfect and the simple past in BrE and AmE, we are – again – dealing with stable regional variation rather than ongoing diachronic change. (51)

Moving into the 2010s, however, we observe that the 1960s-1990s stability to which Hundt and Smith refer has been disrupted in AmE, with a relative increase in the proportion of present perfects (from 8.6% in the 1960s and 8.7% in the 1990s, to 13.4% in the 2010s) resulting from its slightly less spectacular decline. The pattern in PhilE has, however, been quite different, with a rise in the proportion of present perfects from the 1960s to the 1990s (from 12.7% to 17.3%), but then a decline in the 2010s to a level below that of the 1960s (10.5%). These observations are of course offered, once again, with the proviso that we heed the possible effect of generic differences between the 1960s and 1990s on the one hand, and the 2010s corpus data on the other hand.

Table 7: Relative frequencies of the present perfect and the simple past in PhilE and AmE from the early 1960s to the early 2010s*

	PhilE			AmE		
	1960s	1990s	2010s	1960s	1990s	2010s
PP	5,697 12.7%	5,982 17.3%	1,864 10.5%	3,488 8.6%	3,453 8.7%	2,253 13.4%
SP	39,072 87.3%	28,580 82.7%	15,856 89.5%	37,223 91.4%	36,250 91.3%	14,622 86.6%
Total	44,769	34,562	17,720	40,711	39,703	16,875

*The AmE frequencies for the 1960s and the 1990s are based on Table 1 on p.63 of Hundt and Smith (2009).

Modals

The recent diachronic fortunes (and misfortunes) of the modals and quasi-modals in late twentieth century English were extensively investigated by Leech et al. (2009), on the basis of data from the original Brown quartet (Brown, LOB, Frown and FLOB) (71-117). More recently Mair (2015), using data from the recently completed B-Brown Corpus, has shown that the 12.2% decline noted in Leech et al. (2009) for the 1960s to 1990s reverses a rising trend (12.0%) for the 1930s to 1960s. Nevertheless, Leech (2011) finds an overall fall – of 20.9% for the twentieth century as a whole – for the modals as a category in the Corpus of Historical American English (COHA), a 400 million-word multi-genre corpus whose design is quite similar to that of the Brown family. Leech's COHA analysis was prompted by Millar's (2009) study of the modals in the 100 million word TIME magazine corpus (1923-2006), some of whose findings – particularly those on *may* – contradicted Leech et al.'s (2009) and Leech and Smith's (2009) finding of declining modal frequencies. Leech (2011) acknowledges that the Brown family corpora suffer from limitations of size and widely spaced sampling points, but argues that a large monogeneric (in fact, single publication) corpus of the type used by Millar does not provide representative results.

The findings confirm Leech et al.'s (2009) finding that the general decline of the modals has had a considerably weaker impact on those of high frequency (*will*, *would*, *can* and *could*) than it has had on those of lesser frequency. In the AmE data the moderate declining tendencies of all four modals between the 1960s and 1990s subsequently shift substantially: the two preterite forms *would* and *could* decline more strongly, while the present forms *will* and *can* change direction and rise strongly, resulting in an overall rise for both modals. In the PhilE data preterite forms undergo an overall decline, as in AmE (although in the case of *would* this results from a falling/rising trajectory); *will* and *can* enjoy spectacular frequency increases in PhilE, far outstripping those in AmE.

Table 8: Frequencies (pmw) of the modals in PhilE and AmE from the early 1960s to the early 2010s*

		1960s	1990s	% change	1990s	2010s	% change	% change 1960s-1990s
will	PhilE	1896	2671	+40.9%	2671	3696	+38.4%	+54.1%
	AmE	2702	2402	-10.3%	2402	3089	+28.6%	+14.3%
would	PhilE	2239	1760	-25.4%	1760	2056	+16.8%	-8.2%
	AmE	3053	2868	-5.2%	2868	2695	-6.0%	-11.7%
can	PhilE	1740	2624	+50.8%	2624	3594	+37.0%	+106.6%
	AmE	2193	2160	-0.7%	2160	3021	+39.9%	+37.8%
could	PhilE	1411	1188	-15.8%	1188	1182	-0.5%	-16.2%
	AmE	1776	1655	-6.0%	1655	1336	-19.3%	-24.8%
may	PhilE	1206	1361	+12.9%	1361	1182	-13.2%	-2.0%
	AmE	1298	878	-31.8%	878	959	+9.2%	-26.1%
might	PhilE	418	254	-39.3%	254	416	+63.8%	-0.5%
	AmE	665	635	-3.7%	635	563	-11.3%	-15.3%
must	PhilE	1028	777	-24.4%	777	633	-18.5%	-38.4%
	AmE	1018	668	-33.8%	635	489	-23.0%	-52.0%
ought	PhilE	58	13	-78.1%	13	37	-18.5%	-36.2%
	AmE	69	49	-28.4%	48	39	-23.0%	-43.5%
shall	PhilE	656	270	-58.9%	270	171	-36.7%	-73.9%
	AmE	267	150	-43.3%	150	166	+10.6%	-37.8%
should	PhilE	1167	1155	-1.0%	1155	1151	-3.5%	-1.4%
	AmE	910	787	-12.8%	787	1192	+51.5%	-31.0%
Total	PhilE	11819	-	-	-	14118	-	+19.5%
	AmE	13951	-	-	-	13549	-	-2.9%

* The American frequencies are derived from Leech et al.'s (2009:283) Table A4.2.

Consider next the lower-frequency modals. In the case of *may*, AmE undergoes a greater decline overall than PhilE: its advancement/leadership contrasting with the relative conservatism of PhilE. With *might*, AmE has undergone a progressive, mild decline, but it has undergone a recent revival in PhilE. *Must* is in a steady decline, one slightly stronger in AmE than in PhilE (but arguably not sufficiently stronger to be suggestive of endonormativisation). *Ought* has declined in both varieties, marginally more strongly in AmE. *Shall* has undergone a massive decline in PhilE, by comparison with AmE. With *should*, we find endonormative divergence, with post-1990s PhilE staying relatively steady-state, but AmE enjoying a frequency surge.

The total frequencies presented in the bottom rows of Table 8 support Leech's argument in the Millar-Leech debate that the modals as a category are declining (at least, in AmE). Interestingly, however, the overall frequency for the modals category in PhilE is enjoying an increase (of 19.5%), the diverging patterns between the two varieties suggestive of PhilE endonormativisation.

Quasi-modals

Leech et al.'s (2009) research indicates that, by contrast with the modals, the quasi-modals have mostly enjoyed an increase in BrE and AmE. Notice that I hesitate to talk about the "class" of quasi-modals, given that as Mair (2015) observes they lack the clearly defined structural properties of the modals, constituting instead a somewhat heterogeneous and open-ended set of constructions (36). The fairly representative set of quasi-modals used in the present study is the same as that selected in Collins, Borlongan and Yao (2014): a more comprehensive account might have also included *be about to*, *have got to*, *had better*, *be to*, amongst others. Historical studies (e.g. Krug, 2000) have established that the quasi-modals – which Krug refers to as "emergent modals" – have been undergoing grammaticalisation in recent centuries, and in some cases (*be going to* and *have to*) from as far back as late Modern English/Early Modern English. Consider Table 9.

Table 9: Frequencies (pmw) of a representative set of quasi-modals in PhilE and AmE from the early 1960s to the early 2010s*

		1960s	1990s	% change	1990s	2010s	% change	% change 1960s–2010s
be able to	PhilE	188	216	+14.6%	216	444	+105.6%	+136.2%
	AmE	191	202	+6.7%	202	370	+83.2%	+93%
be going to	PhilE	114	70	-39.0%	70	183	+161.4%	+60.5%
	AmE	216	332	+55.0%	332	224	-32.5%	+3.7%
be supposed to	PhilE	58	79	+37.0%	79	59	-25.3%	+1.7%
	AmE	48	55	+15.6%	55	80	+45.5%	+66.7%
have to	PhilE	549	711	+29.5%	711	946	+33.0%	+72.3%
	AmE	627	639	+2.8%	639	988	+54.6%	+57.6%
need to	PhilE	41	149	+267.9%	149	598	+301.3%	+1358.5%
	AmE	69	154	+125.1%	154	649	+321.4%	+840.6%
want to	PhilE	326	365	+12.1%	365	916	+151.0%	+181.0%
	AmE	323	552	+72.4%	552	911	+65.0%	+182.0%
Total	PhilE	1,276	-	-	-	3,146	-	+146.6%
	AmE	1,474	-	-	-	3,222	-	+118.6%

*Frequencies for AmE in the 1960s and 1990s are from Leech et al. (286) Table A5.1

Table 9 paints a picture of sweeping increases, with *need to* undergoing the most spectacular rise, followed by *want to*. One factor in both cases is likely to be semantic developments in the deontic realm. While the deontic necessity meaning of *need to* (instantiated in example [6] from GloWbE-Philippines) has already made significant inroads into its core intrinsic necessity meaning, the deontic use of *want to* (as in [7] below) has yet to pose a threat to the dominance of its dynamic volition meaning (see further Collins, 2009; Nokkonen, 2006).

(6) You need to be passionate about it, you *need to* be able to consistently deliver a quality product

(7) Your first time shouldn't be with just anybody. You *want to* do it with a great guy.

Consider next the individual quasi-modals in Table 9 in turn. Both varieties are embracing the quasi-modal *be able to*, PhilE only slightly more enthusiastically than AmE, so there is insufficient evidence to suggest endonormative divergence. The fluctuating frequencies for *be going to* in both varieties, with AmE undergoing the first growth spurt, are difficult to interpret but indicative more of endonormativity than exonormativity. There is divergence between PhilE and AmE in the case of *be supposed to*, with PhilE in decline but AmE increasing. With *have to*, there is a rising tendency in both varieties, one more pronounced in PhilE. *Need to* has enjoyed an unprecedented rise in recent decades: the similarities between the two varieties (from around 50pmw in 1961 to around 150 in 1991, to around 600 in 2009) suggestive of exonormativity. With *want to* as for *need to*, the two varieties show a very similar rise.

As for the overall frequencies, the similarities between the strongly rising tendencies in the two regional varieties (PhilE +146.6%, and AmE +118.6%) arguably outweigh the differences, leading me to conclude that this is a case of PhilE exonormativity rather than endonormativity.

Conclusion

In order to provide a quantitative basis for our discussion/conclusions regarding the evolutionary status of PhilE, I present a scoring system – whose basis is undisputably somewhat arbitrary – in Table 10. The table allows two points for each of the five VP categories, one point for a major subcategory, and 0.2 for a minor subcategory, and allocated to either an "exonormative" classification (if the comparison between the frequencies/rate of change in PhilE and AmE suggests that the latter continues to influence the former), or "endonormative" (if the comparison reveals a divergence between PhilE and AmE that is suggestive of independence/autonomy).

The justification for the allocation of scores in Table 10 is as follows:

1. Progressive: AmE is leading the way over PhilE in both overall frequencies and the rate of recent decreases. PhilE and AmE co-pattern in all of the formal progressive subcategories except the perfect progressive.
2. *Be*-passive: The post-1990s decline of the *be*-passive in PhilE is similar to that experienced in AmE.
3. Present perfect: The post-1990s decline of the present perfect in PhilE is similar to that in AmE. Quite different patterns of change were noted

in the relative frequencies of the present perfect and the simple past: the rise/fall for the present perfect in PhilE contrasting with its continuous rise in AmE.

4. Modals: The strong increase for the category as a whole in PhilE, contrasts with the almost steady-state situation in AmE. Divergent patterns between PhilE and AmE are found with six individual modals (*will, would, may, might, shall* and *should*), but parallel or similar patterns are found with four (*can, could, must* and *ought*).

5. Quasi-modals: Overall the increases for the set of quasi-modals investigated run in parallel in PhilE and AmE. Divergent patterns between PhilE and AmE are found with three individual quasi-modals (*be going to, be supposed to* and *have to*), but parallel or similar patterns are found with four (*be able to, need to* and *want to*).

Table 10: Exonormative vs endonormative scores for the five VP categories

VP category	Major/minor subcategory	Exonormative	Endonormative
1. Progressive	N/A	2	
	Formal subcategories	1	
2. *Be*-passive	N/A	2	
3. Present perfect	N/A	2	
	Pres perf vs simple pres		1
4. Modals	N/A	2	
	will		0.2
	would		0.2
	can	0.2	
	could	0.2	
	may		0.2
	might		0.2
	must	0.2	
	ought	0.2	
	shall		0.2
	should		0.2
5. Quasi-modals	N/A	2	
	be able to	0.2	
	be going to		0.2
	be supposed to		0.2
	have to		0.2
	need to	0.2	
	want to	0.2	
Total		12.4	2.8

It can be seen that, for the five VP categories studied, findings suggestive of exonormativity (12.4) predominate over those suggestive of endonormativity (2.8). What this suggests is that the findings of earlier studies based on 1960s and

1990s corpora (Collins, Borlongan and Yao, 2014; Collins, Borlongan, Lim and Yao, 2014; Collins, Yao, Xinyue and Borlongan, 2014; Collins, 2015), that the grammar of PhilE has yet to achieve linguistic autonomy, remain valid into the current millennium, and support Schneider's (2007) claim that PhilE has not yet fully entered his Phase 4 (Endonormative Stabilisation).

This is the first diachronic study that I know of which exploits the resources of the massive GloWbE corpus. Inevitably, I have had to hedge my aims and findings with candid caveats regarding disparities in the generic composition between GloWbE and the earlier Brown- and ICE-"family" corpora used. This raises the more general issue of the acute need for up-to-date representative corpora designed as parallels to earlier-sampled publicly-available corpora. The recent addition of BE06 and AE06 to the Brown family (see https://cqpweb.lancs.ac.uk/) has opened up rich new possibilities for diachronic research on recent changes in written BrE and AmE.[5] Those involved in the compilation of the present ICE family – mostly sampled in the early 1990s – need to begin planning soon for the second generation of their family, to identify an appropriate sampling time in the not-too-distant future for the capture of their present-day spoken and written data.

Appendix

Frequencies for Brown and Frown were taken from Leech et al. (2009); q.v. for details of search routines. Frequencies for Phil-Brown and ICE-Phil(wr) for modals and quasi modals are from Collins, Borlogan and Yao (2014); q.v. for details of search routines. Frequencies for Phil-Brown and ICE-Phil(wr) for progressives are from Collins (2015); q.v. for details of search routines.

GloWbE frequencies were determined via orthographic forms and/or items from the UCREL CLAWS 7 Tagset, as follows:

Progressive: am VVG + is VVG + are VVG + be VVG + was VVG + were VVG + been VVG; Passive: am VVN + is VVN + are VVN + be VVN + was VVN + were VVN + been VVN; Present perfect: has VVN + have VVN + had VVN; Preterite: VVD; Modals: Via orthographic form, which unfortunately also captures as false positives the nouns *will*, *can*, *May*, *might*, *must*; Quasi-modals: *Be able to*: able to (unfortunately captures such false positives as *appear able to*); *be going to*: VVGK; *be supposed to*: supposed to; *have to*: has to + have to + had to + having

---

[5] As one anonymous reviewer succinctly observes: "given the many caveats offered by the author and others (including Mark Davies himself) on the lack of comparability between GloWbE and the other corpora, it's hard not to take the findings with a pinch of salt…. Until a similar study is conducted on BE06 and AE06, these findings are nevertheless useful and can provide some preliminary insight."

to; *need to*: need to (unfortunately captures such false positives as *have a need to*); *want to*: want to + wants to + wanting to.

Works Cited

Allen, Robert. *The Verb System of Present-day American English*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

Bautista, Ma. Lourdes S. "Introducing the Philippine component of the International Corpus of English circa 2010." *Studies of Philippine English: Exploring the Philippine Component of the International Corpus of English*. Ed. Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista. Manila: Anvil Publishing, 2011. 3-22.

Bautista, Ma, S. Lourdes and Kingsley Bolton, eds. "Philippine English: Tensions and Transitions." Special Issue of *World Englishes* 23.1 (2004): 1-5.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman, 1999.

Borlongan, Ariane Macalinga. "Relocating Philippine English in Schneider's Dynamic Model." Paper presented at the 17th International Association of World Englishes Conference, Melbourne, Australia, 2011.

Bureau of Census and Statistics, Department of Commerce and Industry, Republic of the Philippines. *Summary and General Report on the 1948 Census of Population and Agriculture (Part I: Population)*. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1954.

Collins, Peter. "The Progressive Aspect in World Englishes: A Corpus-based Study." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 28.2 (2008): 225-49.

---. "Modals and Quasi-modals in World Englishes." *World Englishes* 28 (2009): 281-92.

---. "Recent Diachronic Change in the Progressive in Philippine English." *Grammatical Change in English World-Wide*. Ed. Peter Collins. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015. 271-96.

Collins, Peter, Ariane Macalinga Borlongan and Xinyue Yao. "Modality in Philippine English: A Diachronic Study." *Journal of English Linguistics* 42.1 (2014): 68-88.

Collins, Peter, Ariane Macalinga Borlongan, Joo-Hyuk Lim and Xinyue Yao. "The Subjunctive Mood in Philippine English: A Diachronic Analysis." *Contact, Variation, and Change in the History of English*. Eds. Simone E. Pfenninger, Olga Timofeeva, Anne-Christine Gardner, Alpo Honkapohja, Marianne Hundt and Daniel Schreier. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2014. 259-80.

Collins, Peter, Xinyue Yao and Ariane Borlongan. "Relative Clauses in Philippine English: A Diachronic Perspective." *Corpus Interrogation and Grammatical*

Patterns. Eds. Lieven Vandelanotte, Kristin Davidse, Caroline Gentens and Ditte Kimps. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014.

Comrie, Bernard. "Tense and Aspect." *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Vol. 9.2. *Syntax. Ein Internationales Handbuch Zeitgenössischer Forschung*. Eds. Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld and Theo Vennemann. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995. 1244-251.

Davies, Mark and Robert Fuchs. "Expanding Horizons in the Study of World Englishes with the 1.9 Billion Word Global Web-based English Corpus (GloWbE)." *English World-Wide* 3.1 (2015): 1-29.

Elsness, Johan. *The Perfect and the Preterite in Contemporary and Earlier English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey Pullum. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Hundt, Marianne. "Animacy, Agentivity, and the Spread of the Progressive in Modern English." *English Language and Linguistics* 8.1 (2004): 47-69.

Hundt, Marianne and Nicholas Smith. "The Present Perfect in British and American English: Has There Been any Change, Recently?" *ICAME Journal* 33 (2009): 45-54.

Kranich, Svenja. *The Progressive in Modern English: A Corpus-Based Study of Grammaticalization and Related Changes*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010.

Krug, Manfred. *Emerging English Modals: A Corpus-based Study of Grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000.

Leech, Geoffrey. "The Modals ARE Declining: Reply to Neil Millar [2009]." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 16 (2011): 547-64.

Leech, Geoffrey and Nicholas Smith. "Change and Constancy in Linguistic Change: How Grammatical Usage in Written English Evolved in the Period 1931-1991." *Corpus Linguistics: Refinements and Reassessments*. Eds. Antoinette Renouf and Andrew Kehoe. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009. 173-200.

Leech, Geoffrey, Marianne Hundt, Christian Mair and Nicholas Smith. *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.

Mair, Christian. "Cross-variety Diachronic Drifts and Ephemeral Regional Contrasts: An Analysis of Modality in the Extended Brown Family of Corpora and What it Can tell us About the New Englishes." *Grammatical Change in English World-Wide*. Ed. Peter Collins. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015. 119-146.

Mair, Christian and Marianne Hundt. "Why is the Progressive Becoming more Frequent in English? A Corpus-based Investigation of Language Change in Progress." *Zeitschrift fur Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 43.2 (1995): 111-22.

Mair, Christian and Geoffrey Leech. "Current Changes in English Syntax." *Handbook of English Linguistics*. Eds. Bas Aarts and April McMahon. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. 318-42.

Millar, Neil. "Modal Verbs in *Time*: Frequency Changes 1923-2006." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 14 (2009): 191-220.

Mindt, Dieter. *An Empirical Grammar of the English Verb System*. Berlin: Cornelsen, 2000.

Mukherjee, Joybrato. "Response to Davies and Fuchs." *English World-Wide* 36.1 (2015): 34-37.

Nokkonen, Soili. "The Semantic Variation of *need to* in Four Recent British English Corpora." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 11.1 (2006): 29-71.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1985.

Rautionaho, Paula. *Variation in the Progressive: A Corpus-based Study into World Englishes*. Tampere: Tampere UP, 2014.

Römer, Ute. *Progressives, Patterns, Pedagogy. A Corpus-driven Approach to English Progressive Forms, Functions, Contexts and Didactics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005.

Schneider, Edgar. *Postcolonial English: Varieties of English around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Schneider, Edgar. *English around the World: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.

Smith, Nicholas. "Ever Moving On? The Progressive in Recent British English." *New Frontiers of Corpus Research: Papers from the Twenty First International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Sydney 2000*. Eds. Pam Peters, Peter Collins and Adam Smith. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002. 317-30.

Smitterberg, Eric. *The Progressive in 19th century English. A Process of Integration*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

Thompson, Roger. *Filipino English and Taglish: Language Switching from Multiple Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003.

Yao, Xinyue. "Developments in the Use of the English Present Perfect: 1750-present." *Journal of English Linguistics* 42.4 (2014): 1-23.