

Articles

belong together with other *specifiers* or *determiners* such as the *demonstratives* and are a *part of speech* or *word class*. Articles are distinguished as **definite** *the* and **indefinite** *a(n)*. This distinction may be regarded as the realization of a *secondary grammatical category*, viz. **specificity**. The former developed out of the OE demonstrative; the latter, out of the unstressed numeral *oon* “one” to *alan*. In English pidgins and creoles the indefinite article often appears as *one*, cf. *it a wan naif* “there was a knife” (Bickerton 1981: 55). In OE both were marked for **case**, **number**, and **gender**.

The use of a demonstrative before a noun has the effect of emphasizing (and specifying) the following noun. In emphatic speech styles this must have been common usage. From what were initially singular cases speakers would have generalized this usage. In this way the original deictic sense (see *deixis*) would then have become less prominent and the sense of specification would have been generalized to nouns for which spatial deixis was not prominent, i.e. not just deictic *se fisc* (lit. “that fish”), but also *þurh þone hunger* (“by that hunger”), a much more abstract usage.

The paradigm for the articles in OE are given in the following tables.

Table Demonstratives (used as definite articles)

	<i>Masculine</i>	<i>Feminine</i>	<i>Neuter</i>	<i>Plural</i>
Nom.	<i>se</i>	<i>seō</i>	<i>þæt</i>	<i>þā</i>
Gen.	<i>þæs</i>	<i>þære</i>	<i>þæs</i>	<i>þāra</i>
Dat.	<i>þam</i>	<i>þære</i>	<i>þam</i>	<i>þām</i>
Acc.	<i>þone</i>	<i>þā</i>	<i>þæt</i>	<i>þā</i>
Instr.	<i>þȳ</i>	—	<i>þȳ</i>	<i>þam</i>

Table Numeral one (used as the indefinite article)

	<i>Masculine</i>	<i>Feminine</i>	<i>Neuter</i>	<i>Plural</i>
Nom.	<i>ān</i>	<i>ān</i>	<i>ān</i>	<i>āne</i>
Gen.	<i>ānes</i>	<i>ānre</i>	<i>ānes</i>	<i>ānra</i>
Dat.	<i>ānum</i>	<i>ānre</i>	<i>ānum</i>	<i>ānum</i>
Acc.	<i>āne</i>	<i>āne</i>	<i>ān</i>	<i>āne</i>
Instr.	<i>āne</i>	<i>ānre</i>	<i>āne</i>	<i>ānum</i>

The definite article is more widely used in some varieties of English than in StE. In Northern English vernaculars, reduction as in *t'farmer* “the farmer” may result in loss: *the* → *θ* → *t* → *?* → zero when unstressed, and there is some loss of both the definite and the indefinite article there in comparison to StE, cf. *I'm bloody champion* (B. Hines. *Kes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969, 17).

Bickerton, D. (1981) *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Bede

(672 or 673–735), widely known as the Venerable Bede, a monk at Wearmouth and Jarrow near Newcastle, was the author of *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* in Latin (*An Ecclesiastical History of the English People*), which was completed in about 731. In his history he focused on the English church (organization, heresies) thus generally ignoring the dynastic histories of the English kings and kingdoms unless of interest for church history. Bede's ...

Celtic Britain

was only one part of a once extensive Celtic civilization that spread over wide stretches of Europe. Population shifts due to migrations gradually impinged on this world subduing or driving away the once-dominated Celtic peoples. This took place on the Continent, and it was repeated in Britain. In Roman Britain the Celts and the Roman occupiers seem to have coexisted very well. However, perhaps because the Celts had relied too much on the Roman legions to protect them, they were exposed and threatened after the Romans withdrew in about 410. The major threat came from the north, from **the Picts and the Scots**, themselves both Celtic groupings. For protection the British Celts turned to Germanic warriors, inviting help from the Saxon leaders **Horsa and Hengist**, according to *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, who arrived in 449 and probably remained after dutifully warding off the Picts and the Scots.

The Saxons – and Angles, Jutes, and Frisians – subjugated the Celtic population, enslaving it or driving it away. With few exceptions, the Celtic-speaking British were soon to be found only in the far west: Cornwall, Wales, and Scotland. While Celtic culture and customs have often remained or been syncretized with Germanic elements, the use of Celtic languages has long been in decline. Today there has been a certain degree of stabilization in Wales; and Cornish and Manx – widely considered to have ceased to have any native speakers – are making a small come-back.

Deixis

is one of the areas of linguistics that has to do with language use, i.e. with how elements of the situation of use affect meaning. There are several different dimensions of deixis, the first and most basic of which is space.

Spatial deixis

is indicated according to relative proximity to or distance from the speaker. Examples include the adverbs *here* and *there*. English also has a two-term **demonstrative** system: *this/these* vs. *that/those*. (An older relict

term from an earlier three-term system is *yonder/yon*. Cf. Spanish *aquí/esto* – *ahí/eso* – *allí/aquello*.) How great the distance may be and how large the area of proximity may be is relative. There can also be **grammaticalization** of deixis though this does not occur often in English. Cf. earlier:

<i>hither</i> “to here”	<i>hence</i> “from here”
<i>thither</i> “to/toward there”	<i>thence</i> “from there”
<i>whither</i> “to what place”	<i>whence</i> “from what place”

Personal deixis

makes distinctions between speaker (first person), addressee (second person), and someone or something else (third person). The first is obviously near, the second more distant, and the third even more distant (cf. three-term **demonstratives**). Systems of person deixis vary considerably between languages. This might include the recognition of singular, dual, and plural as in Old English: *ic* – *wit* – *wē* “I – us two – us all.” Personal deixis may also include forms foreign to GenE such as we find in Tok Pisin with separate first person inclusive “you and me” (dual *yumitupela*; trial *yumitripela*; plural: *yumi*;) and first person exclusive pronouns “me and other(s)” (dual: *mitupela*; trial: *mitripela*; plural: *mipela*).

Social deixis

uses second person pronouns to show closeness and intimacy (T-forms [from Latin *tū*]) or distance and formality (V-forms [from Latin *vōs*]). German distinguishes *du* and *Sie* as with French *tu* and *vous* or Spanish *tú* and *Usted*. English once had a system somewhat similar to this with *thou* and *ye*, but it has been leveled to simple *you*. The distinction between *you all* and *you* is optional and has no social deixis of the T/V type.

Textual deixis

is a matter of cohesion within a text that can be maintained among other things by using the demonstrative **this** to refer to what is currently under discussion or what we (implicitly) identify with or approve of. In contrast, **that** may be used for what is contextually distance or which is rejected.

Temporal deixis

involves deictic reference with some of the same elements that are used for space, e.g. the demonstratives, e.g. *this/that time/year/etc.* as well as prepositions that are often identical to those used for space (*at a place/ time, on a line/duty, in a room/a week*, etc.). **Tense** itself is primarily connected with where a predication is located in time. It marks situations as being **anterior** (past), **simultaneous** (present), or **posterior** (future). The default time of reference is the time of speaking, for which present tense is commonly used. Past or remote tense is used to mark the deictically distal in regard to (a) time, (b) to identification with what is reported in indirect speech, (c) to the unreal in conditional constructions, and even to (d) the generic (which is not specified for time of reference). Furthermore, situations may be relative to each of these times (secondary tense, so to speak) as with the perfect forms of English (past perfect, present perfect, future perfect). In the case of the present perfect, the situation is not necessarily marked in terms of relative time, but may involve relevance in some other sense. Even a periphrastic form like *be going to* for the future may well be a deictic expression used for what may be understood as approaching and sure to happen.

Demonstratives, The

together with other *specifiers* such as the *articles* are a *part of speech* or *word class* and belong to the *determiners*. They function as *pronouns* and as *determiners* and are the only determiners that mark singular and plural. Example: *this-these*. Demonstratives are fundamentally *deictic* and basically emphatic. Since emphasis may tend to fade over time, as seen in the change from demonstrative to definite article in OE (see *articles*), emphatic *this here* and *that there* are a ModE but not fully standard way of re-introducing emphasis.

There was a split in the OE demonstrative paradigm resulting in a definite article (see *articles*), initially with singular *the* < OE *se* by analogy with the other *th-* forms and plural *tho*. The distal “half” of the deictic system emerged when *that* (plural *tho*, later *those*) took on the meaning of distance in the twelfth century. The second, proximal “half” was generalized from *þis*, the nominative and accusative singular of the emphatic OE demonstrative to which the plural adjectival ending *-e* was added giving us the pair *this/these* (Lass 1992: 2.9.1.2). The full paradigm of forms appears in the following table.

Table Demonstrative *this* in OE

	<i>Masculine</i>	<i>Feminine</i>	<i>Neuter</i>	<i>Plural</i>
Nom.	<i>þes</i>	<i>þeōs</i>	<i>þis</i>	<i>þās</i>
Gen.	<i>þises</i>	<i>þisse</i>	<i>þises</i>	<i>þissa</i>
Dat.	<i>þisum</i>	<i>þisse</i>	<i>þisum</i>	<i>þisum</i>
Acc.	<i>þisne</i>	<i>þas</i>	<i>þis</i>	<i>þās</i>
Instr.	<i>þys</i>		<i>þys/þeōs</i>	<i>þisum</i>

In some varieties, we find a three-stage system: *this/these* (near the speaker), *that/those* (near the hearer), and *yon(der)* (distant from both), which still reflects an earlier contrast. The distinction was not always carefully maintained, and the third member began to fade except in regional and traditional dialects. It is known, of course, to readers of Shakespeare, who are familiar with such lines as *But soft! what light through yonder [adverb] window breaks (Romeo and Juliette II.2)* or *Yon(d) [determiner] Cassius has a lean and hungry look (Julius Caesar I.2)* (§6.3.3.2).

Demonstrative *thae* (“those”) occurs in Northern English, but non-standard *them* is more frequent, as it is in non-standard GenE. In IrE the demonstrative *them* is used not only attributively as in *them houses* but also by itself pronominally, e.g. *Them was cornstalks* (Filppula 2004: 93).

Demonstratives in the English Southwest are differently distinguished. Like StE the system marks close and distant, singular and plural, but also has a further distinction between count and mass nouns. Here pronoun case leveling can still be seen in the now rare use of non-standard *they* for equally non-standard, but general *them*, e.g. *Well, like think one what’s in there now, her, for killing all **they** women* (Wagner 2004: 164).

Table Demonstratives in Southwest English (from Wagner 2004: 163) (§8.2.7.2)

<i>Deixis</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Mass</i>	<i>StE</i>
Close	singular	<i>these / thick</i>	<i>this (here)</i>	<i>this</i>
	plural		<i>these (here)</i>	<i>these</i>
Distant	singular	<i>thick, thicky (there)</i>	<i>that (there)</i>	<i>that</i>
	plural		<i>they, them there</i>	<i>those</i>

- Filppula, M. (2004) “Irish English: Morphology and Syntax,” In: B. Kortmann, K. Burridge, R. Mesthrie, E.W. Schneider, C. Upton (eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. vol. 2. *Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 73–101.
- Lass, R. (1992) “Phonology and Morphology,” In: N. Blake (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. vol. 2. *1066–1476*. Cambridge: CUP, 23–155.
- Wagner, S. (2004) “English Dialects in the Southwest: Morphology and Syntax,” In: B. Kortmann, K. Burridge, R. Mesthrie, E.W. Schneider, C. Upton (eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. vol. 2. *Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 154–174.

Ecclesiastical history

served as the basis for the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as well as later works. It began with Caesar’s campaign in 55 BCE and continued up to his own times. The survival of some 160 manuscripts of the *Ecclesiastical History* attests to its popularity. Bede also composed *De Arte Metrica* and *De Schematibus et Tropis* as well as works on grammar and biblical studies. The non-historical works contributed greatly to the **Carolingian reforms**. Bede was not an innovative religious thinker. He produced no original writings or thoughts on the beliefs of the church, instead working to synthesize and transmit the learning from his predecessors. See §§2.2; 2.2.2; and 2.5.3–4.

Example of historical reconstruction (See under *Processes and models of change*)

Germanic and classic pantheons

have a number of “parallel” gods: the Germanic gods have some underlying similarities to other gods within Indo-European traditions. Most prominent are

<i>Germanic</i>	<i>Roman</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>For</i>
Tiw / Tyr (Tuesday)	Mars (French Mardi)	Ares	war
Woden/Odin (Wednesday)	Mercury (Mercredi)	Hermes	war, travel, etc.
Thor (Thursday)	Jupiter (Jeudi)	Zeus	the chief god
Frige/Frigg (Friday)	Venus (Vendredi)	Aphrodite	love, fertility

Furthermore, the sun and moon, which give us Sunday and Monday, were also honored. This leaves only Saturday with a non-Germanic background, namely Saturn (Greek: Chronos), for whom there is no clear Nordic counterpart. Renaming could go in both directions, from Latin to Germanic as with the names of the week-days or from Germanic to Latin as with the syncretistic association of Germanic gods with Christian saints as when Thor is exchanged for (St.) Peter in place names.

Germanic migrations, The

were large-scale movements of whole tribes as they looked for “greener pastures” or tried to escape a situation of overpopulation and/or resource scarcity. Movements continued for an extended period of time

starting as early as the middle of the first millennium BCE and continuing up to around 1000 CE. The early movements were probably due to climate change and the final movements, those of the Vikings, were due to population pressure and opportunities for settlement which the British Isles and the Continent, but westward as far as North America offered. The goals of migration were the sub-Scandinavian Continent, initially in the north, but later the Crimean region, the Roman Empire including Asia Minor, the Balkans, Italy, the Iberian peninsula, and North Africa. At a much later time the Vikings invaded and/or traded in Russia and the Middle East, in France, Italy, and the British Isles, and of course to the west in Iceland, Greenland, and Vinland (Newfoundland).

Germanic peoples, The

moved southward from Scandinavia and northern Germany in the first millennium BCE. They came under the influence of the more or less autochthonous Hallstatt und La Tène cultures as well as the Roman Empire, as it gained control over Gaul (France) and the Low Countries. Germanic peoples farmed and kept domestic animals and had, in parts, strong relations with the Roman Empire. Germania Inferior (essentially the Netherlands) and Germania Superior (Middle and Upper Rhine) were two provinces of the Empire that included Germanic peoples. Germanic peoples living outside the Empire also carried on trade with the Roman Empire and were influenced by Roman ways. This influence may be seen in many of the words borrowed from Latin (see §1.4.2 and Table 1.6).

Universal grammatical categories

are assumed to occur in all languages. Examples would include parts of speech such as nouns and verbs and maybe such secondary grammatical categories as *TMA (tense, modality, aspect)*. One of the greatest problems in approaching the question of universals is the difficulty that exists in deciding what is comparable in different languages. The criteria can be (1) structural or (2) semantic-functional, whereby the latter is the most likely and best approach according to Croft (1990: 11). The semantic-functional approach includes pragmatic phenomena (discourse structure; forms of greeting; discourse-defined connectives; politeness expressions) – “all essentially external” to the language itself. The suggested procedure would be: (a) pick a semantic-pragmatic feature or situation; (b) see what morphosyntactic constructions are used to express it; and (c) look for relationships of dependency between the semantic-pragmatic feature and other linguistic factors expressed by the construction (ibid.: 12). Note that difficulties arise when a given form has multiple functions.

This might be illustrated by looking at whether all languages have subjects. Structurally the notion of subject might be expressed (1) by case or prepositional marking; (2) by agreement (usually subject-verb concord); or (3) by word order. However, (1) and (2) are not always easy to recognize. A semantic-pragmatic approach might use a criterion such as “agent of an action” or topic of a sentence (ibid.: 13). In OE the subject was marked by case. As the case endings decayed, the subject was increasingly marked by word order and identified as the topic. For a broader initial look at universals, see Siemund 2009, especially 323–335 on some of the various types of linguistic universals.

Croft, W. (1990) *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: CUP.

Siemund, Peter (2009) “Linguistic Universals and Vernacular Data” in: M. Filppula, J. Klemola, and H. Paulasto (eds.) *Vernacular Universals and Language Contacts. Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*. London: Routledge, 323–348.

Grammatical categories

Consist of the primary division of all words into parts of speech (or word classes) and secondary association of categories of tense, modality, and aspect with the verb and case, number, and gender with the noun.

Secondary grammatical categories

are relevant when speaking of *nouns*, *pronouns*, and *verbs*. In a more limited way *adjectives* and *adverbs* as well as *determiners* are also differentiated according to secondary grammatical categories. In the case of nouns the secondary grammatical features in OE were *number*, *case*, and *gender*, but in ModE only number continues to be relevant. For pronouns number, case, and gender continue to be marked in ModE. The verb has the secondary categories of *tense*, *modality*, and *aspect* (*TMA*) and some marking of *number concord* and *voice*. Some adjectives and adverbs undergo comparison (the comparative and superlative). Some determiners (the *demonstratives*) have number.

Horsa and Hengist

two brothers, were the leaders of the Saxons (and Angles and Jutes), mercenaries who were invited to Britain in 449 by the Celtic leader Vortigern, who needed military help to ward off the marauding bands of Picts and Scots from the north and Germanic raiders from the sea. The account of these two leaders relies largely on Gildas's history (early sixth century in Latin) and reappears in *Bede's Historia ecclesiastica* (completed in 731) and in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as well as other sources. The dates given are certainly not exact and the names and battles vary considerably. Yet the year 449, given in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the leader Horsa and Hengist, and the place of invasion (Kent) have often been conveniently passed on.

Introduction to Old English at: <https://www.routledgetextbooks.com/textbooks/9781138501096/learning-resources.php>

La Tène culture

(450–first century BCE) dominated in a wide area of northern Europe in the period when the Germanic tribes were beginning their southward migrations. This culture, which is usually associated with Celtic-speaking peoples, represents the height of material development in the non-Mediterranean North. The basis of its subsistence was farming and animal husbandry, and it engaged in trade with the Mediterranean area, exporting minerals (salt, tin, copper) and animal products (wool, leather, fur) as well of amber and gold. The La Tène culture came under pressure from the south, as Rome expanded, and the north, as the Germanic tribes, themselves influenced by La Tène culture, intruded.

Models and processes of change

General principles of change

state the regularities of change, and **motivation for change** involves a variety of motivations as elaborated under *psychological approaches* and various models of change.

Psychological approaches

are concerned with the way our brains perceive and conceive of in-coming language data. This includes *interference*, *abduction*, *attrition*, and the effect of innate *universals* of the *bioprogram*.

Attrition

is the loss of language, usually due to lack of use. Example: when an immigrant from a non-English language community who no longer uses his or her original language forgets more and more words.

Bioprogram

refers to the theory that there is an innate set of linguistic distinctions that everyone is born with and that determine the way an emerging creole will develop when not subject to the influence of already existing languages. Example: The *TMA* (tense-modality-aspect) system is pre-programmed to be realized by grammatical markers in precisely this order if “left alone.”

Interference

is the tendency for language learners to carry over aspects of their L1 to the new language. In the case of *English as a Second Language (ESL)* this may show up as *substrate* influence. Example: a native speaker of Chinese may fail to distinguish /l/ from /r/ and pronounce *very* as *velly*.

Abduction

is a form of logic based largely on association. It is instrumental in the development of new meaning. Example: Someone is going (*progressive*) somewhere (movement toward a goal) to do something (intention); therefore the thing to be done is future. The transfer of future meaning from a consequence of movement and intention to the primary meaning of “be going to do something” is a case of abduction, which is explained at greater length in the following. **Abductive logic** can perhaps best be understood in contrast to two other, more familiar forms of syllogistic logic, viz. **deductive** and **inductive logic**.

Deductive logic

is reasoning that starts with a general principle or law, establishes a particular case, and then concludes that the law applies to this case. The **classical deductive syllogism** goes in three steps (major premise, minor premise, and conclusion). The first is a **general principle**, the second **an instantiation**, and the third the **logical conclusion**. If the first two are true, the conclusion is also true.

How does it function?

Deductive syllogism:

LAW: “all men are mortal” (a)

CASE: “Socrates is a man” (b)

RESULT: “Socrates is mortal” (c)

Deductive logic: a – b – c

Deductive logic is useful for dealing with inclusion, e.g. classes and their members. If a class has certain features, then each member of that class may be expected to have them as well. Consequently, if you know something about operas and you know that *Aida* is an opera, then you know something about *Aida*. This is a part of everyday lexical semantics, where we deduce knowledge from the class to one of its members.

Inductive logic

has been central to Western science, where it has worked chiefly with a different type of logical syllogism: It looks at cases and their features and comes to a conclusion on the basis of what is observed. Inductive logic comes much closer to modeling how we make conclusions about our world in a useful way, showing how we make generalizations from limited evidence.

How does it function? The logical structure of induction involves a shuffling of the order of the three parts, a, b, and c since it differs from deduction by observing the individual case in order to reach a conclusion, viz. the principle or law.

Inductive syllogism:

CASE: “Socrates is a man” (b)

RESULT: “Socrates is mortal” (c)

LAW: “all men are mortal” (a)

Inductive logic: b – c – a

While deduction is subject to proof, i.e. can be verified, this is not the case with induction. We can never preclude the possibility that the next case will not fit the law. This is why we say that we cannot verify a hypothesis, but only falsify it by discovering contradictory evidence. We use it to make conclusions about the nature of the world around us (including how a language works).

Abductive logic

uses inference and association; “... it is a weak form of reasoning, ... the only kind of reasoning by which new ideas [can] originate” (Hopper and Traugott 2003).

How does it function? Abductive logic uses a change in the order of a, b, and c:

c a result is construed

a based on universal principles

b the result somehow fits the observed results

Abductive syllogism:**RESULT:** “Socrates is mortal” (c)**LAW:** “all men are mortal” (a)**CASE:** “Socrates is a man” (b)**Abductive logic:** $c - a - b$

This is fallible reasoning because the observed result may be matched with the wrong law and lead to a false conclusion. This may be true, but it need not. For example, Socrates might turn out to be my pet dog (and not a man at all). Abductive logic can explain the mechanism behind language change such as grammaticalization or semantic shift. Abduction leads to reanalysis, which is confirmed by induction (many individual cases) (b), which confirm the principle (a).

Hopper, P.J. and E.C. Traugott (2003) *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.

Transmission and diffusion

“*Transmission* is seen as the product of children’s cognitive capacities as language learners: it is the basic process responsible both for stability and for the regularity of change within the speech community. *Diffusion* across speech communities, on the other hand, is seen as the product of the more limited learning capacity of adults” (Labov 2010: 11).

Trudgill points out (1) the pivotal role of young children; (2) second generation children do the actual generating. The motor is accommodation (Trudgill 2004: 27). In contrast, adults “are normally able to go only some way in talking ‘like others talk’, even in situations where all the ‘others’ talk the same. For adults, incomplete accommodation and imperfect language-learning and dialect learning are the norm” while “... most of the complicated work leading to the eventual establishment of a new, single norm will be carried out by children under the age of eight [...] hence the deterministic nature of the process, and the similarity of outcomes from similar mixtures” (ibid.: 28).

Labov argues here “that the primary source of diversity is the transmission (and incrementation) of change within the speech community, and that diffusion is a secondary process of a very different character.” This shows up in city vs. surrounding area; or Inland North vs. Canadian system and Midland system. In Europe the distinction between transmission and diffusion is less dramatic: “We do not find there many reports of changes from below that depend upon transmission through incrementation, as in the new sound changes of North America.” In Labov’s argumentation: “linguistic changes that involve grammatical conditioning, word boundaries, and the systemic relations that drive chain shifting” are important (Labov 2010: 309).

A great deal of doubt is cast on change via diffusion, e.g. Winford (2003: 64), who “concludes that ‘[t]he case for direct borrowing of structure in any of these [bilingual] situations has yet to be proved’...” Sankoff (2002: 658) “concludes that the notion of a ‘cline of borrowability’ must be upheld.”

“Though most language contact situations lead to unidirectional, rather than bidirectional linguistic results, conditioned by the social circumstances, it is also the case that linguistic structure overwhelmingly conditions the linguistic outcomes. Morphology and syntax are clearly the domains of linguistic structure least susceptible to the influence of contact, and this statistical generalization is not vitiated by a few exceptional cases.”

(Labov 2010: 310)

This suggests that “the contrast between transmission and diffusion is absolute.” (ibid.)

Closer looking shows that structural borrowing often comes by way of lexical borrowing, which is the easiest type. Except for Thomason and Kaufman (1988) there is agreement “that there are structural limitations on what types of linguistic patterns can be transmitted across languages” (Labov 2010: 311).

“It is proposed here that the contrast between the transmission of change within speech communities and the diffusion of change across communities is the result of two different kinds of language learning. On the one hand, transmission is the product of the acquisition of language by young children. On the other hand, the limitations on diffusion are the result of the fact that most language contact takes place among adults. It follows that structural patterns are not as likely to be diffused, because adults do not learn and reproduce linguistic forms, rules and constraints with the accuracy and speed that children display.”

(311)

- Labov, W. (2010) *Principles of Linguistic Change*. vol. 3. *Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sankoff, G. (2002) “Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact,” in: P. Trudgill, J. Chambers, and N. Schilling-Estes (eds.) *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 638–668.
- Thomason, S.G. and T. Kaufman. (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2004) *New-Dialect Formation. The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: EUP.
- Winford, D. (2003) *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

System maintenance and analogical extension

are processes which reinforce the functionality of languages. In this *History of English* several prominent instances of this have been introduced. One of these involves **typological change** from a highly inflectional language (OE) to an analytic language (ModE), which depends to a great extent on word order to make many of the distinctions that OE could make with inflectional endings. The second example has to do with the **grammaticalization** of modal auxiliaries. Example: Even in OE WILLAN was beginning to be used to denote habitual and future actions. As the use of modal WILL to express volition attenuated to all but a few non-assertive contexts such as in questions and under negation, a new modal (semi-) auxiliary, WANNA, developed: *I will go* is basically future/predictive; for volition the option exists to say *I wanna go*. A final example of analogical extension under system maintenance is the use of {-s} to mark the plural. This ensured the maintenance of the plural by extending a marker of the plural once restricted to the *a*-stem declension in the nominative and accusative cases to virtually all other count nouns.

Historical reconstruction and the comparative method

represent a way of using existing language evidence to show the phonological, lexical, and grammatical relations between languages which evolved out of a common source language. Example: German and English both evolved out of **Proto-Germanic**. Example: Comparing older forms of English *stone*, Dutch *steen*, German *Stein*, Swedish *sten*, and others allow reconstruction of Proto-Germanic **stainaz*. In the context of historical linguistics in the nineteenth century the idea of a balanced, gapless, regular system grew up. Sound changes as in the case of the Germanic Sound Shift were considered to have no exceptions. Where **Grimm’s Law** was “violated” **Verner’s Law** could supply the needed explanation by discovering a process of **bleeding** which insured that some sounds were removed from the effects of Grimm’s Law. In this way, it was possible to maintain the principle of fully rule-governed change. For all the optimism of early historical linguistics, exceptions have continued to exist (pace Grimm and Verner).

Example of historical reconstruction

Observations of the earliest recorded forms of words are used as the starting point. Using the example of *stone* (as above), we first make a comparison of older forms: Old Frisian *stēn*, ON *steinn*, Gothic *stains*, and OE *stān*. This allows us to make a reconstruction of Proto-Germanic **stainaz*. Further substantiation may be drawn from other non-Germanic sources such as Old Church Slavonic *stěna* “wall”; Old Indic *styājate* “coagulating”; Greek *στία* / *στίων* “pebble”; Latin *stīria* “frozen drop.” The latter together with the Proto-Germanic form allows the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European **steiā* + the suffix *-no*.

The family model

is a way of explaining linguistic similarities between languages that can be traced back to the same source. Example: In the Germanic family tree Dutch and English are sister languages with the same Proto-West Germanic mother. The idea of the inheritance of features (from mother to daughter) and of family resemblances (similarities between sisters) is a useful metaphor, but one that can be misleading since the direction and the degree of change can vary enormously from language to language regardless of how close the family ties may seem to be. Example: English and German are closely related as a look at vocabulary will reveal, but English has lost most of its inflectional endings (*beside a young woman*) and largely abandoned verb-second word order ([1] *tomorrow* [2] *I* [3] *'m leaving*) while German remains highly inflected (*neben einer jungen Frau*) and strictly observes verb-second word order in main clauses ([1]: *morgen* [2 = verb]: *gehe* [3]: *ich*).

The wave theory

is a model of language or dialect diffusion in analogy to the rings of waves that spread over the surface of water when someone throws a stone in a pond. This analogy is misleading since there is a significant tendency for forms of a language to jump from city to city and to fill in the space in between much later. Change also spreads socially within identity groups even faster.

The generation model

describes language shift among (many) immigrant groups. The first generation retains the heritage language as the home language at a rate of about 90%; in the second generation the rate falls to around 60%; in the third, to under 10%. This model also describes the *koinéization* process quite nicely.

Koinéization

is a process of accommodation (see next) in which there is **rudimentary leveling** at the first stage (generation one). It involves (limited) accommodation in face-to-face interaction by adults. It insures loss of most traditional-dialect features. It may, for example, have taken place “at sea,” especially on the long journey from Britain to Australia. But significant port cities could also have played a role. Saliency plays a role in rudimentary leveling. For example: negative normative attitudes toward rural speech originating in Britain were maintained (Trudgill 2004: 89–93). Note that children at later stages (= generations two and three) “would have been more successful at mastering phonetic detail, and at correctly analyzing the structure of phonological systems” than adults (ibid.: 99). Demography tends to win out in generation three, when “minority-variant users accommodate to majority-variant

users as koinéization progresses, and the majority form wins. Accommodation as a process is therefore clearly central to the new-dialect formation process. Note, however, that it is operative only at Stage I (by adults) and Stage III (by children), and not at the second stage of new-dialect formation, ...” (Trudgill 2004: 127).

Trudgill, P. (2004) *New-Dialect Formation. The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: EUP.

Example of koinéization

The forms used by speakers born in England around 1815 (including traditional dialect forms – though rare) were taken to New Zealand from 1840 on. They underwent, in Stage I, rudimentary leveling (on the boat or soon after arrival) with accommodation in face-to-face interaction, leading to interdialect phenomena (partial accommodation and hyperadaptation = imperfect accommodation). In Stage II children born in New Zealand had a free choice (158). In Stage III there was focusing: new-dialect formation proceeded by koinéization (= leveling, unmarking, and reallocation) guided by majority variants (Trudgill 2004: 158–160).

Trudgill, P. (2004) *New-Dialect Formation. The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: EUP.

Accommodation; communication accommodation theory

represent an approach to understanding and explaining how people assimilate to the way their communication partners use language in order to show closeness. This may involve any aspects of language (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, communication strategies, etc.). Features may fully converge with those of other speakers at the one extreme. At the other, people’s linguistic behavior may *diverge* and increase the distance to others. Example: an American who says *draughts* rather than *checkers* to show greater closeness to a British interlocutor.

Substrate influence

is one of the results of language contact in which the language of one community is imposed on another. As Mesthrie observes: “The robustness of the substrate languages in Africa and Asia makes the likelihood of their influence on ESL very great.” This is especially the case in phonology “and only slightly less so in syntax, pragmatics and lexis” (Mesthrie 2004b: 808). When imposition is followed by nativization, processes are set in motion in which substratum influences together with *universals of language* creation shape the form and features of the contact varieties of English. These universals are understood as the principles of language acquisition, including second language acquisition (SLA) (cf. Winford 2009: 209). As Mbangwana/Sala express it, “... Cameroonians in CamE cannot be helped by Cameroonians and are more or less resources [rather] than problems” because they grow out of categories in the L1 which are missing in English (2009: 246). See *History of English* §12.4.

Labov, W. (2010) *Principles of Linguistic Change*. Vol. 3. *Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mbangwana, P.N. and B.M. Sala (2009) *Cameroon English Morphology and Syntax: Current Trends in Action*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Mesthrie, R. (2004) “Introduction: Varieties of English in Africa and South and Southeast Asia,” In: B Kortmann, K. Burridge, R. Mesthrie, E.W. Schneider, and C. Upton (eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. vol. 2. *Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 805–812.

Trudgill, P. (2004) *New-Dialect Formation. The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: EUP.

Winford, D. (2009) “The Interplay of ‘Universals’ and Contact-Induced change in the Emergence of New Englishes,” In: M. Filppula, J. Klemola, and H. Paulasto (eds.) *Vernacular Universals and Language Contacts. Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*. London: Routledge, 206–230.

Ptolemy

was an early (second century CE) geographer whose description of the world was very popular and to which maps of Britain and Ireland were added in later versions. Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus), was a Roman citizen and Egyptian mathematician, astronomer, geographer, and astrologist. The World Map is based on his *Geography* (c. 150 CE), but is not original to it.

Roman Empire, The

existed over an extended period from the Roman Republic (ca. 500 to the second half of the first century BCE) to the fall of Rome to the Germanic invaders under Odoacer in 476. (The Eastern Empire, or Byzantium, continued until the fall of Constantinople in 1453.) The Roman Empire had a considerable amount of military, economic, and cultural influence on the Germanic tribes both in and outside of the Empire. Germanic soldiers served in the Roman army and many of them returned to Germania with new ideas about military organization (more hierarchical), new concepts of life style (appreciation of luxury goods), and the subsequent need to engage in trade. For our purposes the expansion of the Empire to include Gallia (Gaul, present-day France), Germania Inferior and Superior, and Britannia is of central interest. Roman occupation of much of what is now England led to the introduction of Roman ways of urban life, especially in the southeast of England. After the Roman legions left around 410 CE, the country was open to Celtic and Germanic attack from the outside. Eventually, the Germanic troops initially invited to protect **Celtic Britain** from other Celts ended up taking over and settling the country in a process that began about 449 CE.

Substrate influence (see under *Models and processes of change*)

Tense

is a deictic instrument (see **deixis**) that locates a situation above all in time. From a morphological point of view, tense in English is a category with only two terms: present/unmarked/non-remote and past/marked/remote. Many people think, however, in a three-term way: past-present-future. Nevertheless, future is not morphologically or systematically marked in English; rather, the future is indicated in a variety of ways, such as by using a modal auxiliary, a periphrastic structure, or by using the simple or progressive forms in the appropriate context. (*Tense* is also a wholly different term for a feature of the *vowel*, where it stands in contrast to *lax*.)

In OE

we can find the modal future alongside of the morphological present and past tenses. Examples: Present tense: *Brittene igland is ehta hund mila lang*; past: *Erest weron bugend þises landes Brittes*; modal future: *þer ge magon eardian gif ge willað* (Text 2.5, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ninth century).

In ME

the situation was not decisively different. The use of auxiliary verbs was still emerging, but the preterite-present verbs (mostly modals) were already quite prominent and the perfect was developing as an alternative way of designating past time. Examples: present tense: *And smale fowles maken melodye* (l. 9); past: *In Southwerk at the Tabard as I lay / Redy to wenden on my pilgrimage ...* (20f); but also the perfect: *Whan that Aprille with his shoures sote / The droghte of Marche hath perced to the rote* (1f; much as in ModE) or: *The holy blisful martir for to seke, / That hem hath holpen, whan that they were seke* (17f; for past time and no longer possible in ModE); modal future: *Wel nyne and twenty in a companye / ... / That toward Caunterbury wolden ryde* (24, 27) (Chaucer. *Canterbury Tales*, “Prologue,” late fourteenth century). By the end of EModE period the use of tense was essentially as it is today.

Word formation processes

include four basic types with a number of prominent sub-types. The following table illustrates them.

Table Word-formation processes

Process	Combination	Deletion	Example
Composition: affixation; compounding	yes	no	<i>undo</i> <i>computer mouse</i> ;
Shift or conversion	no	no	(<i>to</i>) <i>read</i> → (<i>a</i>) <i>read</i> , a shift from verb to noun
Blending	yes	yes	<i>infomercial</i> < information commercial
Shortening	no	yes	<i>tech(nology)</i>

Derivation

is one of two processes of **word formation** (the other is **compounding**). Derivation is commonly carried out by means of affixation, adding a prefix or a suffix. This was already the case in OE. Examples: prefixing: *ofslōh* “kill” (Text 3.1) < *of* “off” + *sloh*, the past of *slēan* “beat”; suffixing: *softe* “softly” (Text 3.3) < *soft(e)* + *-e*, the adverbial suffix. A further means of derivation is **ablaut** or vowel change/gradation (see **strong (aka vocalic) type of verb**). See also **blending**, **conversion**, **shortening**, and **compounding**.

Affixational derivations

consist of one or more free morphemes (a word that can stand alone) and at least one bound morpheme (affix). Example: *handyman* < {hand} + {y} + {man}, where {hand} and {man} are free and {y} is bound. The following types of affix occur in English:

prefixes come before. Example: *in-coming*

suffixes follow after the free form: Example: *sisterhood*

infixes are rare in English (informal, vulgar, or obscene). Example: *three-goddamn-thirty in the morning*

Combining forms

are bound forms that differ from affixes in tending to be technical (usually from Latin and Greek), e.g. {bio-} in *bio-degradable*; they may combine with other combining forms without a free morpheme in between. Example: *Anglophone* < {Anglo} + {phone}. This is something that prefixes and suffixes cannot do.

Compounding

is a means of **word formation** in which two independent words (free **morphemes**) are combined to form a new word. Example: OE *mægð-man* “virgin, maiden” literally *maid* + *person* (*History of English*, Text 2.1).

Reduplication

lies between affixation and compounding. In reduplication a word or a part of a word is repeated. Examples: *talk-talk* (or **pidgin** *tók-tók*) or **StE** *helter-skelter*. The effect of reduplication may be an intensification of meaning as with *talk-talk* including plural, repetition, indivisibility, or intensification as with *helter-skelter*.

Shifts aka zero derivation or conversion (also: functional shift; multiple class membership)

involve a change in word class (or part of speech) without any formal alteration in the word involved. This became more frequent as English lost its distinctive part-of-speech inflections. Examples: an *update* (noun < verb); a *fun* thing (adjective < noun); to *smart-bomb* (verb < noun). There are also **secondary shifts**, which are shifts within one word class. Example: the intransitive verb *walk* in *She was walking* shifts to transitive in *She was walking the dog*.

Blends aka telescope or portmanteau words

are – like compounds – combinations of two other words, at least one of which has been shortened. They often have a shared element. Examples: *motel* < *motor* and *hotel* with shared; or *squatter* + *aristocracy* = *squat-tocracy* (see *History of English*, Table 11.6) without a shared element.

Shortenings

consist of **initialisms** (**abbreviations** and **acronyms**), **back-formation**, **clipping**, and **ellipsis**.

Abbreviations (a.k.a. letter words)

are the first letters of each of the words in a longer expression pronounced as a series of letters. Example: *BO* (< *body odor*). Abbreviations and acronyms together make up **initialisms**.

Acronyms (a.k.a. syllable words)

are a means of **word formation** in which the initial letter or letters of a longer expression are used as an independent word. Example: *South West Township* (of Johannesburg) goes under the acronym. *Soweto*. Acronyms and abbreviations together make up **initialisms**.

Back formation

is a means of **word formation** in which a “simpler” word that did not previously exist is derived from a more complex one on the basis of a well-established pattern. Example: *edit* is a formation backward from *editor* on the pattern of *bake* forward to *baker*.

Clipping

is a process in which a part of an original word is removed. Example: *mob* is a seventeenth century clipping of Latin *mobile vulgus* “vacillating crowd.” This includes the following subtypes:

front-clipping leaves out an initial element. Example: *neighborhood* > *hood*.

back-clipping leaves out a final element. Example: *detox* < *detoxification*.

medial-clipping removes something from the middle. Example: *vegan* < *vegetarian*.

Ellipsis

refers to a compound, part of which is deleted; the remaining part takes on the meaning of the whole. Example: *mobile/cell phone* > *mobile* (in BrE) or *cell* (in AmE).

Multi-word expressions, including fixed expressions

consist of more than one word that together form a unit with a meaning that cannot be concluded from the combination of the meanings of each. The major types include, **binomials** (including **doublets**) and **trinomials**, **idioms**, and **phrasal and prepositional verbs**. Collocations and proverbs (including clichés and commonplaces) are often regarded as fixed expressions, but have no real place in word-formation because they are much more the product of syntax than of morphology.

Binomials (including doublets) and trinomials

are instances in which two or three words are coordinated. The words are usually from the same **part of speech** and may have overlapping or shared meaning. Example: *pe consuetude and pe custom* (*History of English*: Text 5.6). Or they may be alliterative. Example: *stif & starc & strong* (Text 4.8). Or they may rhyme. Example: *harryng and garrying* (Text 5.1). ModE bi- or trinomials are often irreversible. Example: the meronyms *hook, line, and sinker*. Or they may be a fixed expression. Example: *bacon and eggs*.

Idioms

are multi-word expressions that are less than a full sentence and are not semantically transparent. Example: *to pull someone's leg* “to kid someone.” The words do not contribute individually to the meaning, i.e. replacement of *pull* by the synonym *tug* is not possible. Rather, the meaning of the idiom is derived from the whole. Both **pragmatic idioms** and **phrasal verbs** belong to the idioms but are often treated separately.

Pragmatic idioms

are idioms that are bound to a communication situation such as greeting or leaving-taking, complimenting, or apologizing. Examples (of personal address plus an apology): *My dear, I ask ten thousand pardons* (Witwoud in Congreve's *Way of the World*: I:vi).

Phrasal verbs (see Chapter 4)

Word order in English

has chiefly, in the context of this book, to do with the relative sequence of Subject, Verb, and Object in a sentence. In OE it was relatively free with SVO, AdvVSO, and SOV as the main variants, often however, conditioned by clause type. ModE is more rigid using chiefly SVO in most declaratives and (Wh-word) V_{aux}SVO in most questions.

Under a number of conditions SV order inverts to VS. Most obviously, this is the case with questions (see *NICE*). Verb-second order, as this is sometimes called, is the case not only in SVO, but also after initial adverbials (AdvVSO), where it became increasingly infrequent, yielding to AdvSVO. Note that AdvVSO is still common in two variants. Variant (1) non-assertive adverb + auxiliary + S+V. Examples: *Seldom does she agree with me*; *Never had I seen such a sight*. Variant (2), optional after initial adverbial expression of place or direction/goal and less strongly prescribed than (1) has Adverb of place + V + S. Examples: *Into the Valley of Death rode the six hundred* (Tennyson: “The Charge of the Light Brigade” 1854) or *The inkypink spider went up the water spout / Down came the rain and washed the spider out / ...; Down the road came the bus; There goes John*. Optional inversion of a noun subject and lexical verb also occurs when direct speech is given. If the subject is a pronoun, inversion is restricted to the verb *say*. Examples: “*Never,*” *replied the captive*. Or: “*Never,*” *said he*. Inversion of auxiliary and subject is found after initial negatives and semi-negatives (see *negation*).

In OE the difference from ModE is especially clear in subordinate clauses, in which there was a clear tendency for the verb to appear at the end of the sentence. Example: *Gif cyning æt manes hām drincæð*, literally “If king at a man’s home drinketh” (Text 2.1, *Æðelbirht’s Laws*, 602 or 603, where all the *gif*-clauses share this word order pattern). Without doubt, the Norman Conquest had a massive effect on vocabulary, changed patterns of word formation, and altered the phonological structure of the language. However, there is less agreement about its effects on word order and inflection even though there is considerable evidence of change between OE and ME – whatever the grounds for is may have been.