✳

A Biography of the English Language

✳

A Biography of the English Language

THIRD EDITION

C. M. MILLWARD
Late, Boston University

MARY HAYES
University of Mississippi

WADSWORTH
CENGAGE Learning™

Australia • Brazil • Japan • Korea • Mexico • Singapore • Spain • United Kingdom • United States

This is an electronic version of the print textbook. Due to electronic rights restrictions, some third party content may be suppressed. Editorial review has deemed that any suppressed content does not materially affect the overall learning experience. The publisher reserves the right to remove content from this title at any time if subsequent rights restrictions require it. For valuable information on pricing, previous editions, changes to current editions, and alternate formats, please visit www.cengage.com/highered to search by ISBN#, author, title, or keyword for materials in your areas of interest.

WADSWORTH
CENGAGE Learning™

For product information and technology assistance, contact us at **Cengage Learning Customer & Sales Support, 1-800-354-9706**

For permission to use material from this text or product, submit all requests online at **www.cengage.com/permissions**. Further permissions questions can be emailed to **permissionrequest@cengage.com**.

Cengage Learning is a leading provider of customized learning solutions with office locations around the globe, including Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia, Mexico, Brazil and Japan. Locate your local office at **international.cengage.com/region**

Cengage Learning products are represented in Canada by Nelson Education, Ltd.

For your course and learning solutions, visit **www.cengage.com**.

Purchase any of our products at your local college store or at our preferred online store **www.cengagebrain.com**.

Instructors: Please visit **login.cengage.com** and log in to access instructor-specific resources.

Printed in the United States of America
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 14 13 12 11 10

1

❋

Introduction

Language is not only a construct,
a shelter, an edifice, an abode, but the
soul of humanity—container of infinity.

—WILLIAM S. BURROUGHS

E veryone knows intuitively what language is, but it is notoriously difficult to define. Rather than become entangled in an unresolvable argument, we will define language for our purposes as a systematic and conventional means of human communication by way of vocal sounds; it may include written symbols corresponding in some way to these vocal sounds. A single language, such as English or Hungarian, is a specific, established example of such a communication system used by the members of a particular community.

FEATURES COMMON TO ALL LANGUAGES

All Languages Are Systematic

All languages are systems, or, more precisely, series of interrelated systems governed by rules. Languages are highly structured; they consist of patterns that recur in various combinations and rules that apply to produce these patterns. A simple English example is the systematic alternation between *a* and *an* produced by the rule that *an* is used before words beginning with a vowel sound, and *a* is used otherwise. Much more complex rules account for the grammaticality of such verb phrases as *might have been picking* and *will have been picking* and the ungrammaticality of **might will been picking* or **might been have picking*.[1]

---

1. An asterisk (*) before a word, phrase, or other linguistic form means that it is either ungrammatical or a hypothetical, assumed to have existed but not actually recorded.

A moment's reflection will reveal that if languages were not highly systematic and ruled, we could never learn them and use them. Speakers learn the rules of their language(s) as children and then apply them automatically for the rest of their lives. No native speaker of English, for example, has to stop in the middle of a sentence and think about how to pronounce the plurals of *rate, race,* or *raid.* Even though the plurals of all three of these words are pronounced differently, we learned at a very young age that the different forms are predictable and how to predict them. Mistakes in usage occur in areas of language that lack systems or are exceptions to the rules. Children who say "My foots are dirty" are demonstrating not that they do not know the rules of English, but rather that they know the rules well; they just have not mastered the exceptions.

The interrelated systems of a language include phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and semantics. Languages that have a written representation (and not all languages do) also have a system of graphics. All languages have the same *set* of systems (with the possible exception of graphics), but the components of the systems and the interrelationships among the systems differ from language to language. Both German and Turkish have phonological systems, but the sounds that make up these systems differ from each other and from English sounds.

Phonology is the sounds of a language and the study of these sounds. The study of the sounds of speech taken simply as sounds and not necessarily as members of a system is called **phonetics**. The study of the sounds of a given language as significantly contrastive members of a system is called **phonemics**, and the members of the system are called **phonemes**. The distinction between phonetics and phonemics is important. For example, the English pronunciation of *p* in the word *pan* is accompanied by a strong puff of air called aspiration, whereas the *p* in the word *span* has no such strong aspiration. The two kinds of *p* are different phones, but not different phonemes; that is, the strong aspiration occurs only when *p* is at the beginning of the syllable and not when *p* follows *s*. Therefore the two varieties of *p* are not used to distinguish two different words, and the difference between them is not phonemic. On the other hand, the initial sounds in the words *pan* and *tan* serve to distinguish these two words; the *p* and the *t* contrast significantly and are classified as separate phonemes. Phonology is discussed in much greater detail in Chapter 2; for the moment, it is sufficient to note that phonemes are building blocks of language but have no meaning in and of themselves.

Morphology is the arrangement and relationships of the smallest meaningful units in a language. These minimum units of meaning are called **morphemes**. Although at first thought the word may seem to be the basic unit of meaning, words like *fireproof* and *snowplow* clearly consist of more than one meaningful element. Somewhat less obviously, the word *joyous* consists of a base word *joy* and a suffix morpheme *-ous*, which means something like "an adjective made from a noun" and appears on many other words, such as *poisonous, grievous*, and *thunderous*. The word *unsightly* consists of three morphemes: *un-, sight*, and *-ly*. Note that morphemes are not identical to syllables: the form *don't* has one syllable but two morphemes, *do* and *not*. Conversely, the word *Wisconsin* has three syllables but is a single morpheme.

It is often useful to distinguish between **free** and **bound** morphemes. Free morphemes can be used alone as independent words—for example, *take, for, each, the, panda*. Bound morphemes form words only when attached to at least one other morpheme; *re-, un-, -ing, -ful*, and *-tion* are all bound morphemes. The most familiar bound morphemes are **affixes** (that is, prefixes and suffixes), but even bases (forms to which affixes are attached) can be bound. An example of a bound base is the *-cept* of such words as *except, accept, deceptive*, and *reception*.

As noted, affixes may be either prefixes or suffixes. (Some languages also have infixes, which appear inside a word.) Another classification of affixes distinguishes **inflectional** and **derivational** affixes. An inflectional affix indicates a grammatical feature such as number or tense. For instance, the *-s* used to form plurals and the *-ed* used to indicate past tense are inflectional affixes. Present-Day English has few inflectional affixes; Old English had many more.

Derivational affixes may be either prefixes or suffixes. In English, most derivational prefixes simply change the meaning of the word to which they are attached (*uni*form, *trans*plant, *micro*wave, *un*believable, *de*sensitize), though some change the part of speech; for example the prefix *em-* changes the noun *power* to a verb, and the prefix *a-* changes the verb *float* to an adjective. Derivational suffixes normally change the part-of-speech category and may also change the meaning of the word to which they are attached. For example, the derivational suffix *-ive* in *generative* changes the verb *generate* to an adjective; the suffix *-ness* in *coolness* changes the adjective *cool* to a noun. In *joyless*, the suffix *-less* not only changes the noun to an adjective but also changes the meaning of the resulting word to the opposite.

The same morpheme sometimes has different forms, depending on its environment. For example, the past-tense morpheme *-ed* is pronounced like *t* in *stopped* and *laughed*; like *d* in *stabbed* and *raised*; and like *ed* in *wanted* and *braided*. Each of these variants is called an allomorph of the past-tense morpheme. The words *attentive, contend, extension*, and *intense* all contain different allomorphs of a single bound morpheme going back to Latin *tendere* "to stretch."

Another distinction can be made between lexical and function morphemes and words. Lexical morphemes (usually nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs) are content words, words with referents in the real world. Examples are *radio, nasty* and *swim*. Function words or morphemes (usually conjunctions, pronouns, demonstratives, articles, and prepositions) signal relationships within the language itself; examples are *but, oneself, these, a, of*, and *than*. In practice, many morphemes or words have both lexical and functional aspects. For instance, *in* is primarily a function word in *we are in love* but also has a real-world spatial meaning of "within" in *there's a spider in the sink*.

Syntax is the arrangement of words into phrases, clauses, and sentences; loosely speaking, it is word order. A simple example like the difference between *I had stolen my car* and *I had my car stolen* illustrates how crucial syntax is in English. English speakers have more options with respect to syntax than they do with respect to phonology or morphology. That is, they cannot expect to be understood if they refer to a canine mammal as a *god* instead of a *dog*; but they do have the option of saying either *I like dogs* or *Dogs I like*. This freedom is limited, however, they cannot say *Like dogs I or *Like I dogs. We will see that

W 1.6 and W 1.7

the word order of the major elements of English sentences has become, with a few exceptions, more rigid over time but that many basic patterns of modern English syntax were already established by Old English times.

The **lexicon** of a language is the list of all the morphemes in the language. In linguistic terminology, a lexicon differs from vocabulary or a dictionary of a language in that it includes not only independent words but also morphemes that do not appear as independent words, including affixes such as *-ed*, *-s*, *mis-*, and *poly-* and bound forms like the *-clude* of *include*, *exclude*, and *preclude*, which appear only as parts of words and never as independent words. The lexicon of a language is much less obviously structured and predictable than are its phonology, morphology, and syntax. It is also much more susceptible to outside influences. One of the most remarkable features of English today is the great size and diversity of origin of its lexicon. The following chapters discuss how and when this great change in the English lexicon took place.

Semantics is the study of meanings or all the meanings expressed by a language. It is the relationship between language and the real world, between the sounds we make and what we are talking about. Like all other aspects of language, meanings change over time. There are a number of ways to classify types of semantic change, none of them totally satisfactory. In this book, we identify the following kinds of change:

- generalization and narrowing
- amelioration and pejoration
- strengthening and weakening
- abstraction and concretization
- shift in denotation
- shift in connotation

Generalization and Narrowing   Generalization is extension of meaning to cover wider semantic areas. For example, the Indo-European root *bhares-* meant "barley" (and is in fact the ancestor of the English word *barley*). But the Latin descendant of this root, *far*, could be used to mean cereal grain of various types and thus is the source of our word *farina*, a fine meal prepared from any cereal grain. Narrowing, a more common type of change in English than generalization, is a restriction in the range of meaning(s) of a word. An example of narrowing would be the English word *mead*, an alcoholic beverage made from fermented honey. Its origin is the Indo-European root *medhu-*, which referred to both honey and mead; because English has the word honey to refer to the unfermented fluid, the meaning of *mead* can be narrowed to refer only to the fermented product.

Amelioration and Pejoration   Amelioration, or a change to a more favorable meaning, can be exemplified by the English word *croon*, borrowed from the Middle Dutch word *kronen*. In Middle Dutch it meant to groan or lament, but in English it means to hum or sing softly. Pejoration, the opposite of amelioration, is a change to a more negative meaning. For example, the English word *fool*

comes from the Latin word *follis*, which originally meant only "bellows" but came to mean "windbag, airhead," that is, a fool, a pejoration that passed into English when the word was borrowed. Another example of amelioration can be seen in the word *blast*. It used to refer only to wind and now can refer to good times. We also see pejoration with the word *blast*, which can now mean "explosion."

Strengthening and Weakening   Strengthening, or intensification of meaning, is relatively rare. One example is the word *drown*, from the same root as the words *drink* and *drench*. Because of the universal tendency to exaggerate, weakening of meaning is much more common than strengthening. Two of the many possible instances of weakening between Old English (OE) and Present-Day English (PDE) are OE *sona* "immediately", PDE *soon*; and OE *cwellan* "kill, murder", PDE *quell*.

Abstraction and Concretization   Abstraction occurs when a specific, concrete meaning changes to a more abstract meaning. For instance, OE *hæþen* once meant simply, "one dwelling on the heath," but because of the association of heath with wilderness and lack of civilization, the term *heathen* acquired its present more abstract meaning of "irreligious, unenlightened, uncivilized." Another example of abstraction can be seen in the word *bedlam*, which was originally the name of St. Mary of Bethlehem in London that housed lunatics. Now, it means a situation in disarray or a general state of chaos. Concretization is the reverse process; as an example, one could cite the Indo-European root *albho-*, which meant "white." One of its reflexes (more modern versions) is OE *ælf*, PDE *elf*, a change in meaning from the abstract quality of whiteness to an instance of something concrete that has this quality.

Shift in Denotation   A shift in denotation occurs when the real-world reference of a word changes. For example, OE *clud* meant "rock, hill," but its PDE descendant is *cloud*. Computer and technology terms have caused shifts in denotation. The words *desktop, mouse*, and *cell* all have different meanings since the technology boom of the 1980s and 1990s.

Shift in Connotation   Shifts in connotation are similar to amelioration and pejoration but are not necessarily confined to simply positive vs. negative. Instead, the term refers to the entire set of associations that one makes to a word in addition to its literal sense. For example, in the lofty and dignified OE heroic poem *Beowulf*, after Beowulf and the dragon have killed each other, Beowulf's people prepare a solemn and majestic funeral for him. During the preparations, they must dispose of the dragon's corpse. The poet describes their actions as *dracan ec scufun, wyrm ofer weallclif* "moreover, they shoved the dragon, the serpent over the cliff." *Scufun* is from the verb *scufan* "thrust, push." The PDE verb *shove* still means "to push," but the verb is no longer used in such dignified contexts; we would scarcely say that after Adam and Eve had been banished from Paradise, the angel *shoved* the gates shut. Another word in this same line has undergone a

dramatic shift, involving both narrowing of meaning and, to a lesser extent, a shift in stylistic level. *Wyrm*, glossed here as "serpent," is the ancestor of PDE *worm*. Its PDE meanings, including its use as a contemptuous term for people, date back to earliest OE, but in OE it could also mean "dragon, serpent, snake," even in the most elevated contexts.

Graphics as a linguistic term refers to the systematic representation of language in writing. A single unit in the system is called a **grapheme**. A single grapheme may represent a sound (e.g., the English letters *d* and *l*), a syllable, an entire word, or meaning itself with no correspondence to individual words, syllables, or sounds. (See Chapter 3 for a more in-depth discussion of graphics.)

All of these various systems of language—phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, semantics, and even graphics—interact in highly complex ways. Changes within one subsystem can produce a chain reaction of changes among the other systems. For example, in the history of English, a sound change that entailed the loss of final unstressed syllables of words drastically affected the morphology of English by eliminating most English inflectional endings. This change in the morphology meant that the relationships among words in a sentence could no longer be made clear by inflectional endings alone. Hence word order, or syntax, became much more crucial in distinguishing meaning and also much more rigid. At the same time, prepositions became more important in clarifying relationships among the parts of a sentence. New prepositions were borrowed or formed from other parts of speech, as was the case with *except* and *during*, thus adding to the lexicon of the language. Previously existing prepositions were extended in use and meaning, thus creating syntactic and semantic change. For instance, the word *to*, which in Old English was simply a directional preposition or an adverb, took on many additional, primarily grammatical meanings, such as indicating an infinitive (*to have, to worry*) or even a kind of possession (*the words to a song*). Ultimately there was even a graphic change that distinguished the preposition from the adverb; the former retained its original spelling *to*, but an extra letter was added to the adverb *too*.

Interactions can also take place in the opposite direction. For example, when the grapheme þ (representing /θ/ or /ð/, the initial sounds of *think* and *they*) was abandoned and replaced by *th*, some words which were previously spelled with *th* but pronounced /t/ came to be pronounced /θ/. This is what happened to the proper name *Arthur*, formerly pronounced as if it were spelled *Arter*. Here a graphic change—the loss of the letter þ—brought about a phonological change, minor though it was.

All Natural Languages Are Conventional and Arbitrary

All natural languages are both conventional and arbitrary. By natural language, we mean a language that is spoken or written by humans for everyday communication. The rules for natural languages come about organically. Natural languages are different from formal languages used in the fields of logic, mathematics, and linguistics, and constructed languages such as Esperanto, a language that comprises many of the world's languages and is meant to function as a

mutually intelligible second language. If the conventions are violated, communication fails. To take a simple example, English conventionally categorizes eating utensils as *forks*, *knives*, and *spoons*. A single English speaker cannot whimsically decide to call a *fork*, a *spoon* and a *knife*, a *kiuma*, a *volochka*, or a *krof*. On the other hand, there is no particular reason why a pronged eating implement should have been called a *fork* in the first place; the French do nicely calling it a *fourchette*, and German speakers find *Gabel* quite satisfactory. The relationship between the implement itself and the sounds used to refer to it are purely arbitrary.

All Natural Languages Are Redundant

Natural languages are also highly redundant; that is, the same information is signaled in more than one way. Redundancy may be either external or internal to language. If I make a face and point to food in a dish as I say, "I hate tapioca pudding," my distorted face signals the same thing as the word *hate*, and the pointed finger indicates the same thing as the phrase *tapioca pudding*. The face-making and finger-pointing are examples of external redundancy. Internal redundancy can be illustrated by an utterance like *He is a man*. Here the subject is signaled twice—by its position at the beginning of the sentence before the verb and by its form (*he* instead of *him* or *his*). Singularity is signaled four times: by *he* (not *they*), by *is* (not *are*), by *a* (instead of no article at all), and by *man* (not *men*). Masculinity is signaled by both *he* and *man*. Third person is signaled by *he* and *is*. Animate noun (a noun that refers to people, animals, and living beings) is signaled by *he* and *man*. Finally, the fact that this utterance is a statement and not a question is indicated both by word order (compare *Is he a man?*) and by intonation (if the utterance is spoken) or punctuation (if it is written). Few utterances are as internally redundant as this somewhat unlikely example, but a certain amount of internal redundancy is essential to all language in order to counteract the effects of potential ambiguity.

All Natural Languages Change

Finally, all natural languages change. Because they change, they have histories. All languages change in different ways, so their histories are different. The history of a given language is the description of how it has changed over time. The history of English is the record of how one dialect of West Germanic has changed over the past fifteen hundred years.

W 1.8

Events in language history are harder to define than most events in political history. Theoretically, a history of the English language could consist solely of statements like the following ones.

- On October 17, A.D. 784, Ecgfrith, son of Osric, used a dative *him* instead of an accusative *hine* as a direct object while speaking to his foster-brother Healfdane.

- Margery Fitzroy began pronouncing *city* with the major stress on the first syllable in 1379 after hearing her cousin Joanna, who was from London, pronounce it that way.

Metaphorical Doublets

All language and all languages use metaphors extensively. They may be obvious, like *the foot of the bed*, or much less obvious, like *lighthearted*. What is perhaps surprising is that, regardless of the language they speak, people tend to invent the same metaphors over and over. English has many metaphorical "doublets," pairs of expressions of which one is a colloquial, even slangy, native formation and the other is a more dignified, borrowed term from Latin, but both originating as metaphors using the same semantic associations.

For instance, *assail* is from Latin *assilire* 'to jump on'; compare this with the breezier English *to jump all over someone*. *Delirium* comes from Latin *delirare* "to be deranged" and ultimately from *de* 'away' + *lira* 'furrow, track.' That is, one who is delirious is *off the track*, *off his trolley*. The Latin loanword (word borrowed from another language) *punctual*, from Medieval Latin *punctualis* "to the point" is completely parallel to English *on the dot*. *Incur* (Latin *incurrere*) has the same metaphorical origin as *run into*. The notion of understanding as being a kind of seizing by the mind is reflected in both *comprehend* (from Latin *com* 'together' + *prehendere* 'seize') and native English *grasp*.

- On April 1, 1681, the pretentious young clerk Bartholomew Drew, while preparing a treatise on vinegar-making, decided that the English phrase "by drops" was inelegant and so paraded his learning by coining the adjective *stillatitious* from the Latin verb *stillare*.

Even assuming that we could retrieve and document such events, isolated examples of individual behavior like these are not historically significant in and of themselves. "Events" in the history of a language consist not of isolated deviations or innovations by single speakers but rather of changes in overall patterns or rules, changes that are adopted by a significant portion of the speakers of that language.

CHANGES IN LANGUAGE

What Is Language Change?

Because all language is systematic, the history of any language is the history of change in its systems. By change, we mean a permanent alteration. Slips of the tongue, ad hoc coinages that are not adopted by other users of the language, and "new" structures that result from one person's getting his or her syntax tangled in an overly ambitious sentence are not regarded as change. Ephemeral slang that is widely used one year but that has been abandoned five years later occupies a kind of no-man's-land here; it is indeed part of the history of the language but has no permanent effect. Examples of ephemeral slang include the *bee's knees*, *the skinny*, *glad rags*, *give you a jingle*, *back in a jiffy*, *grody*, *have a cow*, and *cool out*.

Changes in language may be systematic or sporadic. The addition of a vocabulary item to name a new product, for example, may be a sporadic change

that has little impact on the rest of the lexicon. Words like *Kleenex, Xerox*, and *Chapstick*, however, have indeed become part of the lexicon.

Even some phonological changes are sporadic. For instance, many speakers of English pronounce the word *catch* to rhyme with *wretch* rather than with *hatch*. In their dialects an isolated sporadic change has occurred in the distribution of vowels—parallel words such as *hatch, batch, match*, or *scratch* have not undergone the change.

Systematic changes, as the term suggests, affect an entire system or subsystem of the language. These changes may be conditioned or unconditioned. A conditioned systematic change is brought about by context or environment, whether linguistic or extralinguistic. For many speakers of English, the short *e* vowel (as in *bet*) has, in some words, been replaced by a short *i* vowel (as in *bit*). For these speakers, *pin* and *pen*, *him* and *hem* are homophones (words pronounced the same). This change is **conditioned** because it occurs only in the context of a following *m* or *n*; *pig* and *peg*, *hill* and *hell*, *middle* and *meddle* are not pronounced alike by these speakers.

An **unconditioned** systematic change is one for which no specific conditioning factor can be identified. An example is the tendency among many speakers of American English to move the stress of bisyllabic words from the second syllable to the first, as in *pólice, défense*, and *ínsurance*. We can speak vaguely of a general historical drift of English to move the stress toward the beginning of the word, but the fact remains that English today is characterized by variable stress placement; indeed, many words are distinguished in pronunciation primarily on the basis of differing stress (such as *píckup/pick úp; pérvert/pervért, áttribute/attríbute*). We cannot explain the change from *políce* to *pólice* as reflecting a simple underlying rule that all words should be stressed on the first syllable.

In simplest terms, all change consists of a loss of something, a gain of something, or both—a substitution of one thing for another. Both loss and gain occur in all the subsystems of natural languages. For example, over the centuries, English has lost the distinction between long and short vowels (phonological loss), between dative and accusative cases (morphological loss), the regular inversion of subject and verb after an adverbial (syntactic loss), the verb *weorðan* (lexical loss), the meaning "to put into" for the verb *do* (semantic loss), and the letter *ð* (graphic loss). English has gained the diphthong represented by the spelling *oi* (phonological gain), a means of making nouns like *dropout* out of verb + adverb combinations (morphological gain), a distinction between past perfect (*I had painted my room*) and past causative (*I had my room painted*) (syntactic gain), the word *education* (lexical gain), the meaning of "helper" for the word *hand* (semantic gain), and the distinction between the letters *u* and *v* (graphic gain).

Loss may be absolute, as exemplified by the loss of *h* before *l*, *r*, and *n* (Old English *hlude, hring, hnutu*; Present-Day English *loud, ring, nut*), where the *h* (aspiration) simply disappeared. Other loss may be the result of a merger of two formerly distinct units, as when Middle English [x], a heavily aspirated *h*-like sound, collapsed with /f/ in words like *tough, rough*, and *enough*. Such a merger is sometimes called **fusion**.

Similarly, gain may result from the introduction of an entirely new unit; an example is the addition in Middle English, cited above, of the diphthong

oi through such French loan words as *joy, poison*, and *joint*. Or the gain may result from the split of a single unit into distinct units. For instance, Middle English *discret(e)* underwent both semantic and graphic splits to become modern English *discrete* and *discreet*. Such a split is sometimes called **fission**.

Losses and gains, especially in phonology, morphology, and syntax, are normally considered irreversible but occasionally are only temporary. For example, several dialects of American English had lost the phoneme /r/ except when it appeared before a vowel but now once again have /r/ in all positions. (Although in some areas of the United States of America, *fort* and *fought* still sound alike). Conversely, the use of *do* as a marker of the simple indicative (as in Shakespeare's *The cry did knock against my very heart*) was added in Early Modern English but has since disappeared.

All changes, whether major or minor, conditioned or unconditioned, disrupt a language, sometimes rather violently. But any living language is self-healing, and the permanent damage resulting from change is usually confined to the feelings of the users of the language. Many people deplore the recent introduction of *hopefully* as a sentence modifier, but the English language as a whole is none the worse for this usage. Similarly, the distinctions in meaning lost through the abandonment of the now nearly extinct subjunctive mood are today made through adverbs, modal auxiliaries, and word-order changes.

Change occurs at different rates and times within the subsystems of a language. A new loan word may be introduced and become widely accepted within a period of a few days, as with the Russian loan *sputnik* in 1957. In the twenty-first century, electronic and wireless communication has changed the way we sometimes represent words in writing. For example, in SMS language (text messaging), the sentence "I have a question for you" is "?4u." Changes in phonology, on the other hand, operate much more slowly than isolated changes in lexicon. For any given speaker, a change in a pattern (rule) may be instantaneous, but for the total community of speakers it sometimes takes centuries for completion. The loss of aspiration in such words as *which*, *whip*, and *white* began perhaps as long as a thousand years ago and is still not complete for all dialects.

In sum, for all natural languages, change is both inevitable and constant; only dead languages (languages with no native speakers) do not change. Because change is constant and has always been so, there is no such thing as a "pure" or a "decadent" language or dialect. There are only different languages and dialects, which arose in the first place only because all languages change.

The history of the English language, then, is the record of how its patterns and rules have changed over the centuries. The history of English is not the political history of its speakers, although their political history has affected their language, sometimes dramatically, as was the case with the Norman invasion of England in 1066. Nor is the history of the English language the same as the history of English literature, even though the language is the raw material of the literature. Indeed, the nature of any language influences its literature and imposes certain limitations on it. Compared to other languages, English is difficult to rhyme in because of its stress patterns and the great variety of syllable endings. However, because of its stress patterns, English, unlike French, lends itself easily

to alliteration. Any language with a literary tradition and extensive literacy will be affected by that literature. Grammatical structures originating in writing are transferred to the spoken language. Vocabulary items and phrases introduced in literature enter the spoken language. The written tradition tends to give rise to concepts of correctness and to act as a conservative influence on the spoken language.

Why Does Language Change?

Three basic principles govern spoken language development. **Articulatory ease** refers to the facility with which a particular sound can be made. In general, consonant clusters over the centuries have reduced (such as the /hr/ in Old English) to a single consonant. In the case of /hr/, it reduced to /r/. **Auditory distinctiveness** means the difference between a sound and other sounds such that it is intelligible from them. **Gestural economy** means that if a language has a particular sound such as the /t/ in "tie," it is likely to have other sounds made with the tongue tip, such as "die" and "nigh." Sounds evolve in particular patterns, a concept that we will pursue in discussions of phonology in later chapters. These principles govern spoken language. Before the dawn of the technological boom of the late twentieth century, most language change took place in the spoken language before it moved into writing, as spoken discourse is widely believed to have primacy over the written.

Electronic means of communication are affecting the way the written language change. For example, widely used abbreviations are becoming standard. We might say that three principles govern changes in written discourse: universal access to the medium (as almost everyone now owns a computer and/or a cell phone), speed of communication, and a lack of recognized authority. As we see in workbook exercise 7.3, the use of written language by uneducated speakers led to some very consistent patterns in misspelling. Writings on the Internet by people who don't write for a living makes misspellings (such as *significant* for *significant*) almost routine. The speed of exchange is also a factor. Whereas before it would take weeks to send a letter, we expect instantaneous responses to email, thus placing a premium on speed rather than accuracy in grammar and spelling. There is also no recognized authority governing language in commercial use, over the Internet, and via cell phones. The Modern Language Association (MLA) and the American Psychological Association (APA) are examples of institutions that offer guidelines for writing in the humanities, but there are no such agencies actively policing language used commercially and technologically.

W 7.3

From one point of view, it is strange that human beings speak so many languages and that these languages undergo any changes at all. Other human activities are identical and unchanging everywhere—all human beings smile, cry, scream in terror, sleep, drink, and walk in essentially the same way. Why should they differ in speech, the one aspect of behavior that is uniquely human? The answer is that, whereas the capacity to learn language is innate, the particular language that anyone uses is learned. That is, the ability to learn languages is universal and unchanging, but the languages themselves are diverse and constantly changing.

Given that learned behavior can and often does change, what are the forces that trigger change? Three principles govern language changes in speaking and writing: least effort, analogy, and imperfect learning.

One explanation for linguistic change is the principle of least effort. According to this principle, language changes because speakers are "sloppy," and they simplify their speech in various ways. Accordingly, abbreviated forms like *math* for *mathematics* and *plane* for *airplane* arise. *Going to* becomes *gonna* because the latter has two fewer phonemes to articulate. Intervocalic *t* becomes *d* because, first, voiced sounds require less energy to produce than voiceless sounds, and, second, the speaker does not have to switch from voiced to voiceless and then back to voiced again in a word like *little*. On the morphological level, speakers use *showed* instead of *shown* as the past participle of *show* so that they will have one less irregular verb form to remember.

The principle of least effort is an adequate explanation for many isolated changes, such as the reduction of *God be with you* to *good-bye*, and it probably plays an important role in most systemic changes, such as the loss of inflections in English. However, as an explanation for *all* linguistic change, it has shortcomings. How exactly are "difficulty" and "ease" to be defined? Judging by its rarity among the languages of the world and by how late English-speaking children master it, the phoneme /θ/ (the first sound of *think*) must be difficult to articulate and hence highly susceptible to change. Yet it has survived intact throughout the entire history of English. Further, many changes cannot be explained either by basic communicative need or by a principle of least effort. An example is the development in Middle English of the extremely complex system of definite (*the*) and indefinite articles (*a, an*) in English, a system that is the despair of so many foreign learners of the language. Old English got along nicely with no indefinite article at all and with a form of *that* as both demonstrative and definite article.

Many languages today (e.g., Russian, Chinese, and Japanese) have no articles. The principle of least effort by itself simply cannot explain the rise of articles in English.

Another explanation for language change is analogy. Under analogical change, two things or rules that were once different become identical or at least more alike. The principle of analogy is closely related to the principle of least effort; analogy is one way of achieving least effort. By analogy, a speaker reasons, usually unconsciously, that if A is like B in several respects, then it must be like B in other respects. If *beans* is a plural noun naming a kind of vegetable and has the singular form bean, then *peas*, which also names a kind of vegetable, must also be a plural and must have the singular form pea. (Historically, peas, or pease, was an uncountable singular noun; cf. the nursery rhyme "Pease porridge hot," which means simply "hot pea soup.")

Analogy can operate at all levels of a language. On the semantic level, many people use the word livid to mean "bright," especially bright red, as in anger. Though historically livid means "pale," its sound association with vivid has led to analogical semantic change. Even spelling may be affected by analogy. The word delight historically contained no -*gh*-, but acquired these letters by analogy with such rhyming words as *light*, *fright*, *sight*, and *might*.

In general, the more common a word or construction, the less susceptible it is to change by analogy. Less frequently used words or constructions are more likely to be altered to fit the patterns of more common ones. Thus the verb *to be* remains wildly irregular in English because it is learned so early and used so often. But the relatively uncommon verb thrive, once conjugated as thrive: throve: thriven, is well on its way to becoming a weak (regular) verb.

Still another explanation frequently offered for language change is that children learn their native language imperfectly from their elders. Imperfect learning is surely one factor, but it cannot explain all change. For permanent linguistic change to occur, all children of a given speech community would have to make exactly the same mistakes. This intuitively seems unlikely. Further, there is ample evidence that linguistic change occurs beyond the childhood years. Many adults, consciously or unconsciously, alter their speech in various ways, changing even their phonology. For example, twenty years after Celia Millward moved to New England as a young adult, her own phonology changed to such an extent that her New York family commented on it. For a few words, this change was deliberate; because her Rhode Island neighbors mistook her pronunciation of the street on which she lived (*Forest Street* for *Fourth Street*), she deliberately altered her pronunciation of *Forest* to make the first syllable a homophone of *far* instead of *for*. In other instances, the change was unconscious; she was not aware that her pronunciation of words like *class*, *past*, *half*, and *aunt* had changed until acquaintances pointed it out.

More important than such anecdotal evidence is the fact that linguistic change occurs in aspects of language not even used by children learning the language. For instance, over the centuries, English has developed complex structures of subordination that did not exist in Old English. Consider the sentence *Having no weapon with which to attack the mosquitoes whining around my head, I could only curse Joel for persuading me to come camping in an area that was noted for its ferocious predators.* Underlying this compact sentence are at least seven separate "simple" statements: (1) I had no weapon, (2) I could not attack the mosquitoes, (3) The mosquitoes whined around my head, (4) I could only curse Joel, (5) Joel persuaded me, (6) I came camping in an area, and (7) This area was noted for its ferocious predators. Young children today do not spontaneously produce such elaborate structures; even adults have to be trained in their use. Clearly these changes were introduced by adults.

The advertising and technology boom of the late twentieth century has brought about numerous changes in language. We used to say "shop at Macy's" but this has been shortened to "shop Macy's," as if partially a command. Convenience stores are named Quik-E-Mart and Kum and Go, their misspelling of words meant to be shorter (indicating the speed with which you will be served) and charmingly off-beat. Purposeful misspellings are more permissible in email than in regular written discourse. We might spell the word *tonight* as *tonite* and *delight* as *delite*. Use of computers and the writing of blogs has given rise to a number of abbreviations, such as *lol* (laughing out loud), *lmao* (laughing my ass off), *nm* (not much), and *ttyl* (talk to you later). Text messaging has also dramatically changed the language. Instead of "see you later," we are more likely to abbreviate this and say "c u l8ter." If angered, we might say "wth!" ("what the

heck!"). A simple string of question marks (????) can mean "what did you say?" or "I don't understand."

Internal and External Pressures for Change

In discussing the history of a language, it is useful to distinguish **outer history** (or **external history**) from **inner history** (or **internal history**). The outer history is the events that have happened to the speakers of the language leading to changes in the language. For example, the Norman invasion brought French-speaking conquerors to England and made French the official language of England for about three hundred years. As a result, the English language was profoundly affected. The inner history of a language is the changes that occur within the language itself, changes that cannot be attributed directly to external forces. For instance, many words that were pronounced as late as the ninth century with a long *a* sound similar to that of *father* are today pronounced with a long *o*: Old English *ham*, *gat*, *halig*, and *sar* correspond to modern *home*, *goat*, *holy*, and *sore*. There is no evidence of an external cause for this change, and we can only assume that it resulted from pressures within the language system itself.

Among external pressures for language change, foreign contacts are the most obvious. They may be instigated by outright military invasion, by commercial relations, by immigration, or by the social prestige of a foreign language. The Viking invasions of England during the ninth and tenth centuries added, not surprisingly, many lexical items to English. Less obviously, they contributed to (though were not the sole cause of) the loss of inflections in English because although Norse and English were similar in many ways, their inflectional endings were quite different. One way of facilitating communication between speakers of the two languages would have been to drop the inflectional endings entirely. An example of the effects of the prestige of another language would be the spread of /ž/ (the sound of *s* in *usual*) in French loanwords to environments where it had not previously appeared in English; examples include *garage*, *beige*, and *genre*.

We also see external changes operative in the news media. It often takes old words and reinvents them with new meanings. *Desktop*, *laptop*, *mouse*, *cell*, and *web* have all acquired completely new meanings since the advent of new technology in the 80s and 90s. *Avatar*, which used to mean solely "embodiment; new personification of a familiar idea," now means "a computer user's representation of him or herself as an alter ego" and is sure to become permanently attached to this new meaning in light of James Cameron's recent film (2009) by the same name.

Internal pressures for language change most often appear when changes in one system of the language impinge on another system. For example, phonological changes caused the reflexes (the "descendants" that have undergone change) of OE *lǣtan* 'to allow' and OE *lettan* "to hinder" to fall together as *let*. The resulting homonymy (two words have the same spelling and pronunciation but different meanings) was unacceptable because the two verbs, opposite in meaning, often occurred in identical contexts, leading to ambiguity and a breakdown in communication. Consequently, the *let* that meant "hinder" has been all but lost in modern English, surviving only in such set phrases as the legal term *without*

let or hindrance. On the morphological level, the verb *wear*, a weak (regular) verb in OE, has become a strong (irregular) verb in modern English, despite the fact that the trend has been overwhelmingly in the opposite direction. This change can be explained by the rhyme analogy of *wear* with strong verbs like *bear*, *tear*, and *swear* and also, perhaps, by the semantic association of *wear* and *tear*.

Still other changes fall on the borderline between internal and external. British English still uses stone as a unit of weight for human beings and large animals, although the weight of other commodities is normally expressed in pounds. American English uses the pound as a measure for both large animals and other items. One of the reasons why stone has remained in British English may be that pound is semantically "overloaded" by being both a unit of weight and the national monetary unit. Similarly, in some parts of Great Britain, at least, a small storage room—the American English closet—is referred to as a cupboard. The avoidance of the term closet is probably explained by the fact that what speakers in the United States refer to as a toilet or john is called a W.C. (for water closet) in Britain. The mild taboo associated with the term water closet, even in its euphemistic abbreviated form, has led to its avoidance in other contexts.

Predicting Change

Even though we can frequently offer convincing post hoc explanations for language change, we can seldom predict specific changes, at least not until they are under way. Obviously, extralinguistic events like invasions and sweeping technological changes will result in additions and losses to the lexicon. Once certain changes have begun, we can with some confidence predict that other changes will follow. For example, in recent American English, a *t* sound that appears between vowels and after the major stress of a word becomes the *d* sound (consider the similar pronunciations of *writer* and *rider*). Because we know that the sounds *t* and *d* are paired in a system of consonants that also pairs *k* with *g* and *p* with *b* (see Table 2.1), it is quite possible that, under the same circumstances, *k* will become *g* and *p* will become *b*. Indeed, these changes have already been heard in the speech of some individuals and seen in occasional misspellings such as *signifigant*. Seventy years ago, we could have accurately predicted that *t* would *not* become *u* or *f*, but we could not have predicted that it would become *d*. In sum, linguistic training and knowledge of linguistic history may allow us to predict which sorts of changes are likely but seldom precisely which changes will actually take place.

Factors Impeding Change

As a rule, if there are extensive ongoing changes in one subsystem of a language, other subsystems tend to remain fairly stable. For example, over the centuries, English, has undergone drastic changes in its morphology but has been relatively conservative in its phonology. In fact, the last major phonological change in English, the Great Vowel Shift, began only as the vast morphological alterations were ending and the morphology of English was settling down to what is essentially its present state. German, although closely related to English, has undergone

many more phonological changes but has been much more conservative than English in its morphology. Just as redundancy in language allows changes to occur in the first place, the necessity for redundancy prevents too many changes from occurring at the same time. Uncurbed change would lead to a total breakdown in communication.

Changes in the graphic system of a language come much more slowly than changes in other systems. English has not adopted a totally new grapheme (though a few have been lost and the distribution of others has been modified) since it began to be written in the Latin alphabet. Despite vast changes in pronunciation, English spelling has not been revised in any fundamental way for the past five hundred years, until the electronic age. The third-person singular indicative ending –th (as in *doth*, *hath*) was still being written as late as two hundred years after all speakers were using the current -s ending in speech.

However, electronic media, such as email, blogging, computer games, and cell phones, have caused drastic changes in spellings. Abbreviations and accepted misspellings abound. And now we use emoticons for whole sentences. The emoticon (☺) means "I am happy." This can also be done with a computer keyboard. The symbol ";)" means "I am smiling and winking at you."

There are multiple reasons for this relative conservatism of writing systems, most of them external to language itself. First, although speech is ephemeral, writing provides a permanent reference; we can go back to check what was written. Digital texts survive even longer than printed ones. We can save computer files and emails forever. In some ways, though, writing has also become less permanent. Digital files can be "eaten" by an untrustworthy computer. We can change schools or businesses and lose all of the items in our inbox. And while we can't take back something we've said in anger, we can vent in a "hate email" to someone and then just hit the delete key.

Ever since the advent of printing, there have been practical arguments against graphic reform. The introduction of a revised spelling would entail a great deal of relearning by millions of literate adults, would necessitate complete revision of dictionaries, and would mean that earlier classics of English literature would be rendered inaccessible to current and future generations. If new letter forms were introduced for the miserably represented vowel system of English, then all existing keyboards and fonts would immediately become obsolete. Agreement on whose pronunciation the revised spelling should be based upon would probably be impossible to achieve. Still another factor acting against graphic reform is the fact that the written language is, to a much greater degree than the spoken language, under the control of the highly educated or well-to-do, the most conservative groups in a culture.

It is surprising, though, how the use of electronic media has changed spelling systems and how these changes have been absorbed by large numbers of people, the educated and uneducated alike. I am a medievalist in my thirties, and I use the expressions *lol*, *c u l8ter*, *wth!*, and *;)*. I will excuse a student for misspelling *significant* (*signifigant*) or *tonight* (*tonite*) in an email but will dock him or her a letter grade for making such errors in a formal papers. I just assume that he or she was writing fast in an email and did not spellcheck. So perhaps it's better to

say that for formal discourse it would require reeducation of millions of adults to introduce radical spelling changes. This, however, is not entirely accurate, either. I have read James Joyce's novel, *Finnegans Wake*, which is written in a multilingual language and filled with portmanteau words (words made up of two other words, in this case, in different languages). At first, I had to use the notes, but after a while I found I was able to pick up on familiar words from foreign languages. Perhaps it's best to say what Noah Webster and Benjamin Franklin said about creating a uniquely American spelling (in Franklin's case, with a revised alphabet): that if the revised spelling of words (such as *tung* for *tongue*) made more sense, people would learn them and use them.

Not only are graphic systems themselves resistant to change, but combined with a high level of literacy, they act as a brake on change in the spoken language and, occasionally, even reverse changes that have occurred in it. The reintroduction of postvocalic /r/ in some American English dialects would have been impossible without the written language, because speakers would not have known where to put the /r/ without a written model. The commonly heard /t/ in *often*, /p/ in *clapboard*, and /h/ in *forehead* are all the results of spelling pronunciations. Hundreds of lexical items survive only because they have been preserved in the written language; examples include not only nouns naming obsolete objects such as *firkin*—an Old English unit of volume used to measure a fourth of a barrel or beer or ale—but even structural words like the conjunction *lest*.

DEMARCATING THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH

Although linguistic change is a slow but unceasing process, like a slow-motion movie, we must present them as a series of still photographs, noting what has changed in the interval between one photograph and the next. This procedure fails to capture the dynamism of linguistic change, but it does have the advantage of allowing us to examine particular aspects in detail and at a leisurely pace before they disappear. The history of the English language is normally presented in four such still photographs—Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, and Present-Day English. We will retain these traditional divisions, but also glance at the prehistory of English and speculate to some extent about English in the future.

The dividing lines between one period of English and the next are not sharp and dramatic: the English people did not go to bed on December 31, 1099, speaking Old English and wake up on January 1,1100 speaking Middle English. Nevertheless, the changes that had accumulated by the year 1100 were sufficiently great to justify a different designation for the language after that date. And we can point to significant events in the biography of English, as we do in the timeline in the appendix.

Old English (OE) is that stage of the language used between A.D. 450 and A.D. 1100. The period from 1100 to 1500 is **Middle English** (ME), the period between 1500 and 1800 is **Early Modern English** (EMnE), and the period since 1800 is **Present-Day English** (PDE). For those familiar with English history,

these dates may look suspiciously close to dates of important political and social events in England. The beginning of ME is just a few years after the Norman conquest, the beginning of EMnE parallels the English Renaissance and the introduction of printing into England, and the starting date for Present-Day English is on the heels of the American Revolution.

These parallels are neither accidental nor arbitrary. All of these political events are important in the outer history of English. The Norman conquest had a cataclysmic effect on English because it brought thousands of Norman French speakers to England and because French subsequently became the official and prestigious language of the nation for three centuries. The introduction of printing, among other effects, led to a great increase in literacy, a standard written language, concepts of correctness, and the brake on linguistic change that always accompanies widespread literacy. The American Revolution represents the beginning of the division of English into national dialects that would develop more or less independently and that would come to have their own standards.

Linguistically, these demarcation points of 450, 1100, 1500, and 1800 are also meaningful. The date 450 is that of the separation of the "English" speakers from their Continental relatives; it marks the beginning of English as a language, although the earliest surviving examples of written English date only from the seventh century. By 1100, English had lost so many of its inflections that it could no longer properly be called an inflecting language. By 1500, English had absorbed so many French loans that its vocabulary looked more like that of a Romance language than that of a Germanic language. Further, the very rhythms of the spoken language had changed under the influence of the differing stress patterns of these French loans. By 1800, the vast numbers of Latinate loans brought in by the English Renaissance had been absorbed, along with hundreds of exotic, often non-Indo-European words introduced through British exploration and colonization. Also, the grammar of English had, in most important respects, become that of the present day.

EVALUATING SOURCES OF INFORMATION

W 1.11, W 1.12, and W 1.13

Our primary source of information about earlier stages of English is written texts. Except for the most recent times, texts outweigh in importance all other sources put together. Fortunately for the historian of the language, English has been written down almost from the beginning of its existence as an identifiable dialect of West Germanic; the earliest English texts date from the seventh century A.D.

Texts are not, however, without their problems. First, there simply are not enough of them. Further, no matter how many manuscripts we had, we would always be missing just what we needed from a given geographical area or time period. Or the text would perversely fail to contain crucial diagnostic forms. We cannot, of course, question a text to find out about words or structures that it does not include.

Second, texts must be interpreted. We can rarely take whatever we find at face value. Seemingly deviant forms may well be nothing more than clerical

errors, the result of carelessness or of woolgathering on the part of the scribe, or, later, typesetter, data entry person, or proofreader. Here, patterns are important. For example, it would normally be of no particular significance if a writer of PDE spelled the word *platter* as *pladder* on one occasion. If, on the other hand, he or she also spelled *traitor*, *deep-seated*, and *metal* as *trader*, *deep-seeded*, and *medal*, respectively, and if he or she spelled *pedal* and *tidy* as *pettle* and *tighty*, we would have good reason to suspect that this writer did not distinguish /t/ and /d/ when these two came between two vowels and after the major stress of the word.

In using texts as a source of information, we also try to evaluate the extent to which tradition and convention have concealed real differences and similarities or, conversely, may have indicated differences or similarities that did not exist. If we had only spelling as evidence, we would have to assume that speakers today pronounce *I* and *eye* very differently; on the other hand, we would not know that there are two distinct pronunciations for the sequence of letters *wound*.

In this respect, the semi-educated are better informants about how a language is actually pronounced than are well-educated writers. For example, we would never know from reading the works of Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island, that American colonists were regularly "dropping their *r*'s" in unstressed syllables at the ends of words and after certain vowels. Williams had a Cambridge education and had learned conventional English spellings. However, legal records written by less well-educated town clerks have scores of spellings like *therefo*, *Edwad*, *fofeiture*, and *administe* (for *therefore*, *Edward*, *forfeiture*, and *administer*), clear evidence that *r*-dropping goes back several centuries in New England speech.

In interpreting texts we must also bring to bear all the extralinguistic evidence we can garner. If a contemporary Canadian man writes *The wind bloweth where it listeth*, we know that he has some familiarity with the King James Bible and also that he does not normally use the ending *-eth* for the third-person singular present indicative of verbs. Similarly, when an educated Englishwoman writes *There is a nice distinction to be made here*, we do not assume that she means "pleasant distinction," nor do we assume that every native speaker of English has the meaning "subtle, sensitive, precise" for the word *nice*. Such assumptions are relatively easy to make for Present-Day English texts because we are contemporaries of the writers, sharing their culture. The further back in time we go, the more difficult it is to appraise written texts because we have irretrievably lost so much information about the cultural background that surrounded the writers. Earlier connotations and stylistic levels of words are especially hard to determine with confidence.

A third problem with written texts as sources of information is that, at least for the first thousand years of English history, so many of the texts are translations, primarily from Latin or French. This fact limits the subject matter—and hence the vocabulary—of the text. More important, the original language may have influenced the vocabulary (loanwords), the syntax, and even the morphology. Anyone who has ever translated a text from a foreign language into English knows how difficult it is to produce a smooth English translation that is not influenced by the vocabulary and word order of its original. Certain Old English

words or structures appear *only* in translations, evidence that Old English translators had the same difficulty; still, because most of the available texts are translations, the scholar has no alternative but to use them.

Apart from written texts, other sources of information about language change include descriptive statements, recordings, contemporary dialects, loanwords in English, and contemporary spellings. All of these sources are severely limited in their usefulness. Descriptive statements about English do not appear until late; there are none of any significance prior to the seventeenth century. In addition, it is frequently difficult to interpret these early descriptions and to translate them into modern terminology. Few such early statements were intended to be objective. Their purpose was usually prescriptive, instructing readers in appropriate pronunciation and usage; hence they were biased toward what the author considered elegant speech. Indeed, if such an author says that one must *not* pronounce a word in a certain way, we can be fairly sure that many speakers of the time *were* pronouncing it that way.

Recordings of spoken English date only from the late nineteenth century. Many of them are less than satisfactory, particularly if the speaker is reading rather than speaking spontaneously. Also, if speakers know they are being recorded, they usually become self-conscious and even deliberately edit certain usages or pronunciations out of their speech.

The contemporary pronunciation of loanwords from other languages is helpful primarily in dating sound changes in English or the approximate time when the loanword entered English. For example, PDE *dish* and *discus* are both from Latin, but the pronunciation of the final sound in *dish* shows that it is a very early loanword, borrowed before a sound change in which *sk* came to be pronounced like *sh*; *discus*, borrowed much later, was not affected by this change.

Dialectal differences in contemporary English also provide some information about earlier stages of the language. Remoter, more rural dialects often preserve older morphological forms and vocabulary items lost in the standard dialect. Differing pronunciations of the same words also may help the scholar reconstruct earlier stages of the language. For instance, Irish and American English pronounce *beet* in essentially the same way. However, in American English *beat* is a homophone of *beet*, whereas, to American ears, the Irish pronunciation of *beat* sounds like that of *bait*. (Compare the pronunciation of the name of the Irish poet *Yeats* and that of the English poet *Keats*.) This dialectal difference, combined with the spelling difference of *ea* and *ee*, strongly suggests that Irish dialects reflect an earlier stage of English when *beat* and *beet* were not homophones.

Because English spelling is so conservative—it has not had a thoroughgoing reform in five hundred years—it has become a museum of the history of the language, and, as such, is helpful in reconstructing earlier stages. Spellings like *sword*, *knee*, *though*, and *dumb* preserve consonants long lost in the spoken language. But museum though English spelling is, it is a museum with poorly labeled contents and even with a fair number of bogus reconstructions. The "silent" consonants in *island*, *ghost*, and *whole*, for example, are frauds; the *s*, *h*, and *w* in these words never have been pronounced in English. Hence English spelling by itself, without corroborative evidence, is not a reliable source of information.

In the later chapters of this book, as we examine the prehistory and then the history of English, we will see many of the principles introduced here applied to the English language itself. Before we begin discussing the lineage of English, though, we must make a quick excursus into the phonology of Present-Day English and another into the nature of writing systems. These brief digressions will provide a point of reference and a vocabulary of technical terms necessary for understanding the remaining chapters.

ESSENTIAL CONCEPTS

- All languages are systematic. They are governed by a set of interrelated systems that include phonology, graphics (usually), morphology, syntax, lexicon, and semantics.

- All natural languages are conventional and arbitrary. They obey rules, such as assigning a particular word to a particular thing or concept. But there is no reason that this particular word was originally assigned to this particular thing or concept.

- All natural languages are redundant, meaning that the information in a sentence is signaled in more than one way.

- All natural languages change. There are various ways a language can change and various reasons for this change.

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Arlotto, Anthony. *Introduction to Historical Linguistics.*

Barber, Charles. *The English Language: A Historical Introduction.*

Baron, Naomi. *Always On: Language in an Online and Mobile World.*

Bauer, Laurie, and Peter Trudgill. *Language Myths.*

Baugh, Albert C., and Thomas Cable. *A History of the English Language.*

Bragg, Melvyn. *The Adventure of English: The Biography of a Language.*

Brinton, Laurel J., and Leslie K. Arnovick. *The English Language: A Linguistic History.*

Burnley, David. *The History of the English Language: A Source Book.*

Bynon, Theodora. *Historical Linguistics.*

Coates, Jennifer. *Language and Gender: A Reader.*

Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language.*

Crystal, David. *Language and the Internet and Txtg: The Gr8 Db8.*

Fennell, Barbara. *A History of English: A Sociolinguistic Approach.*

Harris, Roy. *The Language Makers.*

Hock, Hans Henrich. *Principles of Historical Linguistics.*

Hoenigswald, Henry M. *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction*.

Jeffers, Robert J., and Ilse Lehiste. *Principles and Methods for Historical Linguistics*.

Kenneally, Christine. *The First Word: The Search for the Origins of Language*.

Lerer, Seth. *Inventing English: A Portable History of the Language*.

Pedersen, Holger. *The Discovery of Language: Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*.

Robins, R. H. *A Short History of Linguistics*.

Samuels, M. L. *Linguistic Evolution: With Special Reference to English*.

Trudgill, Peter. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*.

Yule, George. *The Study of Language*.

Zdenek, Salzmann. *Language, Culture, and Society: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*.