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**ПЕРЕДМОВА**

Будь-яка мова схильна до невпинних змін. Проблема еволюції мови та її функцій продовжує залишатися актуальною, що підтверджується включенням її у десятку найважливіших проблем лінгвістики 21 столітті.

Діахронічна лінгвосінергетіка є новим ракурсом вивчення динамічної мовної системи, який допомагає виявити, описати і змоделювати регулятивні процеси самоорганізації на різних рівнях мовної системи.

Запропонований навчальний посібник являє собою лекційно-практичний курс, який побудовано на сучасних підходах до вивчення еволюції англійської мови.

Освітній компонент «Діахронічна лінгвосинергетика» є вибірковим освітнім компонентом освітньої програми «Середня освіта (англійська мова)» для здобувачів другого (магістерського) рівня.

Основна мета діахронічної лінгвосинергетики полягає в осмисленні станів становлення, у виявленні механізмів внутрісистемної реструктуризації з урахуванням зовнішніх чинників впливу, а також в моделюванні еволюції конконкретній мовної системи з прогнозуванням варіантів її подальших змін.

Завдання курсу полягають у наступному:

− ознайомити здобувачів вищої освіти з еволюцією англійської мови, а саме: розвитком фонетичної, граматичної систем, а також словникового складу мови в контексті синергетичного підходу;

− допомогти майбутньому фахівцю краще усвідомити певні мовні явища в їх історичному розвитку та успішно подолати методологічні труднощі, зумовлені специфікою розвитку англійської мови;

− показати місце англійської мови в мовному світі, її зв’язки та контакти з іншими мовами

− розвивати лінгвістичне мислення;

− закласти необхідну базу науково-дослідної роботи здобувачів вищої освіти на засадах гуманізації освіти, процесів глобалізації та створення умов вільного входження в європейську освітню зону у відповідності до Болонського процесу.

Предметом вивчення освітнього компонента є перехідні явища в мові, мовна система в стані «критичності» її розвитку, в режимі «з загостренням». Опанування теоретичних положень курсу здобувачами вищої освіти базується на теоретичних знаннях і практичних уміннях з таких освітніх компонентів як «Історія англійської мови», «Теоретична фонетика», «Лексикологія», «Теоретична граматика англійської мови», «Історія лінгвістичних досліджень», «Філософія».

Запропонований посібник є білінгвальним. Перший модуль «Мовні зміни та їх причини» представлено українською мовою, оскільки містить багато теоретичного матеріалу загальнонаукового, філософського та лінгвістичного плану, який може вимагати більше зусиль для опанування.

Другий модуль «Історія англійської мови як об’єкт діахронічної лінгвосинергетики» представлений англійською мовою. Він містить у собі такі теми як: «Зміни у фонетичній системі англійської мови», «Зміни у морфологічній системі англійської мови», «Зміни у синтаксичній системі англійської мови», «Зміни у лексичній системі англійської мови».

У посібнику представлено як лекційний матеріал, так і завдання до семінарських занять та самостійної роботи здобувачів освіти.

Посібник рекомендовано для здобувачів вищої освіти другого (магістерського) рівня спеціальності 014.021 Середня освіта (Мова і література (англійська)).

**ЛЕКЦІЙНІ МАТЕРІАЛИ**

**LECTURE MATERIALS**

**Змістовий модуль 1**.

**Мовні зміни та їх причини**

**Language changes and their reasons**

***Лекція 1.***

***ДІАХРОНІЧНА ЛІНГВОСИНЕРГЕТИКА: ОСНОВНІ ЕТАПИ СТАНОВЛЕННЯ НОВОЇ ПАРАДИГМИ***

**1. Природничо-теоретична і методологічна база синергетики.**

**2. Філософська компонента синергетики.**

**3. Багатомірність синергетики.**

**4. Методи синергетики.**

**5. Міждисциплінарність синергетики як основа для становлення лінгвосинергетики.**

**1. Природничо-теоретична і методологічна база синергетики.**

Стрімкий розвиток виробництва і наукомістких технологій на початку XX століття відродило поняття «система», відоме науці з часів античності. З'явилися наукові праці, яким було призначено докорінно змінити існуюче уявлення про світ і його устрій. Це роботи швейцарського лінгвіста Ф. де Сосюра, югославського математика М. Петровича, філософа, політичного діяча, вченого, економіста А. А. Малиновського, більш відомого під псевдонімом А. А. Богданов, американського біолога австрійського походження Л. Ф. Берталанфи.

А. А. Богданов, значно випереджаючи час, розробляв теорію про єдність системного устрою світу ̶ тектологію. Володіючи енциклопедичними знаннями в різних галузях природничих наук, учений намагався вивести універсальні принципи організації живої і неживої природи, сформулював гіпотезу ізоморфізму різнорівневих організаційних структур. Тектологія стала історично першим варіантом загальної теорії систем, наслідком прагнення вчених до побудови єдиної філософії систем і символізувала науковий монізм.

Таким чином, вектор подальших наукових пошуків у різних сферах знань був обумовлений прагненням побудувати єдину, комплексну наукову картину світу на основі спільності законів, що діють в живій і неживій природі.

Фундаментом для таких досліджень виступила системна методологія, а саме поняття «система» міцно увійшло в категоріальний апарат усіх сфер знання. З'явилося безліч передових теорій, які вивчали різні системи неживої природи і виробили спеціальний математичний апарат, яким згодом озброїлася синергетика для вивчення і моделювання складних систем різної онтології.

Величезну роль у становленні й подальшому розвитку синергетики зіграла теорія катастроф французького математика Рене Тома, який займався вивченням і математичним описом різких якісних фазових переходів у біологічних системах (так званих стрибків або катастроф) при зміні основних керуючих параметрів системи.

Свій вагомий внесок у формування дослідницького апарату синергетики внесли також *теорія коливань і теорія стійкості, теорія біфуркацій та теорія фазових переходів, теорія хвильових процесів і теорія дисипативних структур, теорія динамічного хаосу і теорія катастроф,* а також ряд інших теорій. Так, теорія коливань стала для синергетики прототипом науки, що займається побудовою моделей систем різної природи, які обслуговують різні галузі дослідження, а якісна теорія диференціальних рівнянь та розвинута з неї сучасна загальна теорія динамічних систем озброїли синергетику значною частиною математичного апарату.

«Передтечією» синергетики часто називають кібернетику ̶ науку про управління і зв'язок, основоположником якої вважають американського математика Н. Вінера (1894-1964). У фокусі кібернетики виявилися складні системи з так званим негативним зворотнім зв'язком, тобто системи, здатні повертатися в початковий стан, незважаючи на зовнішні впливи. Саме в рамках кібернетики виникає поняття гомеостазу структури (від грец. «незмінність стану»). Гомеостаз визнається одним з найважливіших аспектів системи, необхідних для підтримки стабільності функціонування складових її частин і збереження життєдіяльності системи в цілому. Сказане стосується не тільки «неживих» систем, але в рівній мірі й біологічних систем.

На відміну від кібернетики, об'єктом вивчення якої були стан гомеостазу, стійкості структури, синергетика зосереджує увагу на перехідних станах самоорганізуючої відкритої системи, «ставить у центр проблемного поля, бере в якості концептуального ядра ідею еволюції, становлення, процесуальності і емерджентність речей в світі».

Термін *Synergetics* (від грец. – співпраця, узгоджена дія) був уведений у науковий узус німецьким фізиком Германом Хакеном. Синергетикою Хакен назвав науку про спільну дію компонентів і підсистем у найбільш різних складних системах. Запропонована Г. Хакеном назва нового міждисциплінарного напряму привертала до нього набагато більше уваги, ніж будь-яка «правильна», але «нудна» і зрозуміла лише вузькому колу фахівців, назва.

Неможна заперечувати важливу, по суті, роль, яку відіграє природознавство (точніше, відкриття і досягнення з природознавства) у формуванні світогляду не тільки окремих людей, а й цілих поколінь. За словами І. Пригожина, відкриття складності і нестабільності елементарних часток не просто змінило погляди фізиків на навколишній світ, але спричинило рогляд проблеми «становлення»на всих рівнях фізики» і призвело до усвідомлення історичності Всесвіту

**2. Філософський компонент синергетики.** Спрямованість синергетики на об'єктивне пізнання дійсності, на виявлення загальних закономірностей і принципів світоустрою, на створення єдиної, цілісної картини світу зближує синергетику з філософією.

Одним із основних понять синергетики є поняття самоорганізації ̶ спонтанного впорядкування структури складноорганізованої відкритої системи при проходженні так званої точки біфуркації, тобто точки найменшої стійкості системи. Процес самоорганізації відбувається при фазових переходах, інакше кажучи, при переході системи в якісно новий стан.

Поняття самоорганізації і поняття фазового переходу нерозривним чином пов'язані з такими основними філософськими законами, як закон переходу кількості в якість і закон заперечення заперечення (боротьби протилежностей).

Відомо, що кількісні зміни можуть проявлятися як:

1) зміни в числі компонентів системи,

2) зміни в зв'язках між компонентами цієї системи,

3) зміни в швидкості, яка відбувається в системі реакцій. Оскільки практично всі існуючі системи є відкритими і, отже, схильні до впливу навколишнього середовища, обмінюються з нею енергією (речовиною, інформацією тощо) і, в свою чергу, надають зворотний вплив на середовище, то кількісні зміни в системі, зумовлені впливом зовнішніх факторів, у кінцевому підсумку, можуть спровокувати стрибкоподібну якісну зміну в цій системі, а саме: відбувається структурна переорганізація системи, система переходить у новий стан, виходить на новий рівень розвитку або відмирає, поступаючись місцем більш прогресивним формам. «Без заперечення старого новим неможливі народження і дозрівання нового, а отже, неможливий процес розвитку. Нове явище містить у собі свої протиріччя. Боротьба протилежностей зав'язується на новій основі і неминуче приводить до нового заперечення. І так до нескінченності».

Добре відомо, що закон про боротьбу протилежностей був сформульований Г. Гегелем (1770-1831) у його знаменитій тріаді «теза – антитеза – синтез», яку сьогодні можливо розглядати як етапи становлення відкритої системи. Під впливом будь-яких зовнішніх факторів система може вийти зі стану відносної стійкості («тезис») і потрапити в нестійкий стан, стан хаосу («антитезисис»). Прагнучи повернутися до попереднього стійкого стану або намагаючись знайти новий стійкий стан, система вибирає відповідну траєкторію руху і входить у відносно стійкий стан («синтез»). Через якийсь час рекурентність процесу спостерігається знову.

Синергетику з філософією зближує також принцип універсального взаємозв'язку субстанцій (або світової інгресії, що відбиває принцип безперервності матерії. Ще Платон (427 – 34 до н.е.) вважав, що «світ ̶ це не просто тілесний космос, і не окремі предмети і явища: в ньому загальне поєднане з одиничним, а космічне – з людським». Відомо, що Марк Аврелій (121 – 180 н.е.; римський імператор з 161 р.), будучи переконаним, що «Всесвіт ̶ тісно пов'язане ціле», завжди повторював своїм учням. «Найчастіше думай про зв'язок усіх речей, що знаходяться в світі, і про їх взаємовідносини».

Філософський принцип матеріальної єдності світу був підтверджений останніми відкриттями в галузі фізики, що свідчить, що Всесвіт є гігантською голограмою, де все взаємопов'язане і взаємозалежне, де кожна частина несе в собі інформацію про ціле.

Нескінченний процес вібрації матерії призводить до її нерівномірного стану, і тому все в навколишньому світі перебуває в постійному русі й в безперервному процесі змін. Мінливий характер світу помітив ще Геракліт з Ефесу (530 – 470 до н.е.). Це йому належать знамениті слова: «Все тече!», «В одну і ту ж річку не можна увійти двічі». На мову синергетики слова Геракліта можна перекласти цитатою: «Це світ нестійкостей і флуктуацій, у кінцевому рахунку, відповідальних за вражаюче розмаїття і багатство форм і структур, які ми бачимо в навколишній нас природі».

Синергетичне світобачення перегукується також і з деякими філософськими концепціями мислителів Стародавнього Сходу – про цілісність світобудови, про загальний закон, про циклічність, про шляхи Дао (єдиний шлях, яким слідує Всесвіт і людина). «У результаті формується принципово нова теорія і методологія пізнання, яка, спираючись на останні досягнення математичного моделювання за допомогою сучасної обчислювальної техніки, стала формувати сучасний науковий світогляд і виступає конкурентом філософії, колишній».

Філософська складова синергетики утворює основу так званого синергетичного стилю наукового мислення, що, в свою чергу, сприяє експансії синергетики в гуманітарній царині знання. В гуманітарних науках, синергетика постає, скоріше, як міждисциплінарний методологічний підхід до вивчення складних систем різної онтології. У науці про мову синергетика набуває статус наукової парадигми.

**3. Багатовимірність синергетики.** Синергетика являє собою багатовимірний феномен. Зокрема, пропонують виділяти такі вимірювання цього междісціплінарного напряму:

• Науковий вимір синергетики. Синергетика визначається як особливий напрямок наукових досліджень, сфокусованих на вивченні складності, нелінійності і хаосу, на виділенні і математичному моделюванні так званих режимів з загостренням, на описі механізмів формування локалізованих структур (самоорганізації), їх трансформаціі, нелінійного синтезу (коеволюції) і розпаду;

• Філософський вимір синергетики. Тут увагу зміщується на міждисциплінарний характер синергетики. Особливо підкреслюється, що синергетику було б некоректно зводити до конкретних природничих дисциплін, таких, як, наприклад, фізика або хімія, в надрах яких синергетіка виникла. Націлена на вивчення універсальних закономірностей самоорганізації, виникнення структур і коеволюції складних структур, синергетика «претендує на універсальне опис складного поведінки систем самого різного роду, обростаючи різноплановими і далекосяжними застосуваннями своїх моделей».

* Методологічний вимір синергетики полягає в тому, що в концептуальній мережі, за допомогою якої людина осягає навколишній світ, відбуваються значні зміни, що чинять світоглядний вплив на людину «Виникає нове синергетичне бачення світу, яке є еволюційним, нелінійним і холістичним. Відбувається ломка колишньої парадигми, зрушення від «буття» до «становленню», від стійкості та рівноважності до моментів нестійкості, які ведуть до якісних змін, до нелінійних фазових переходів систем, від порядку до хаосу, який виступає в якості основи для оновлення, інноваційних змін у складних системах». Синергетичне знання, що використовується як інструмент отримання нового знання, стає методом пошукової діяльності в науці.

• Епістемологічний вимір синергетики бачиться в застосуванні моделей в дослідженні когнітивних і креатівних процесів: такого роду дослідження сьогодні проводяться в світі в рамках так званого динамічного підходу в когнітивної науці.

• Соціальний вимір синергетики вбачається в застосуванні синергетичних моделей для вивчення складних соціальних процесів і прогнозування їх розвитку. Передбачається, що ці моделі можуть послужити підставою для подальшої наукової розробки так званих нелінійних методів соціального управління.

• Футурологічний, або прогностичний, вимір полягає в тому, що синергетика може служити в якості нової, нетрадиційної методології в дослідженні майбутнього (прогнозуванні): «Може бути досягнуто розуміння горизонту нашого бачення майбутнього, бо неминучі невизначенні й непереборні хаотичні елементи, дивні атрактори у розвитку складноорганізованих систем роблять майбутнє принципово непередбаченим і відкритим для нас, причому ці невизначеності обумовлені самою природою складного світу, в якому ми живемо».

Успішне застосування синергетичного категоріального апарату для опису явищ в історії, економіці та деяких інших гуманітарних наук вказало на спільність природи складних систем різної онтології. З'явилася можливість для міждисциплінарних досліджень.

Т. Домброван зазначає, що синергетиці притаманний ще один вимір – гуманітарним. Це застосування синергетичної методології до дослідження складних систем, пов'язаних з людиною, в тому числі й людською мовою як унікальної складноорганізованої мегасистемою. Цей вимір точно підходить до виділеного вище епістемологічного виміру синергетики. Але якщо останній пов'язаний з когнітивної діяльністю людини, то гуманітарний вимір фокусує увагу на складних системах як результаті діяльності людини, і в подальшому вивчає поведінку цих створених людиною складних систем. Іншими словами, епістемологіческое вимір і гуманітарний вимір синергетики можна розглядати в якості комплементарних, тобто які доповюють одне одного.

**4. Методологічна своєрідність синергетики**. Синергетика являє собою новий етап у розвитку теорії систем, у фокусі уваги якого виявляються питання еволюції і фазових переходів складних систем, що самоорганізуються.

Г. Хакен визначає складні системи як «системи, які складаються з багатьох частин, або елементів, або компонентів, які можуть бути однакової або різної природи». Складність системи визначається не тільки і не стільки великим числом компонентів (хоча це теж важливий фактор), але, головним чином, специфікою відносин між компонентами цієї системи. Система утворюється мережею пересічних зв'язків і взаємодій як на рівні елементарних складових системи, так і на рівнях різномасштабних підсистем. При цьому встановлюються локальні відносини, безпосередньо зв'язують компоненти, і опосередковані відносини, коли компоненти зв’язані багатоступінчатими відносинами.

Методологічна своєрідність синергетики полягає в дослідженні процесу розвитку як багатоетапного упорядкування певної структурної цілісності, що передбачає вирішення ряду завдань, серед яких:

• Вивчення різноманітних режимів відкритої, динамічної, нелінійної, самоорганізованої системи.

• Дослідження і моделювання процесів самоорганізаціі (фазових переходів) синергетичної системи.

• Виділення й опис етапів формування, функціонування і розпаду складних структур у нелінійному середовищі.

• Дослідження можливих альтернатив розвитку складної системи, переосмислення понять «випадковість», «хаос», «порядок» у світлі загальнонаукових концепцій синергетики.

• Опис синергетичної системи як об'єднуючої «різновікові» коеволюціонуючі складні подсистеми, що характеризуються різною швидкістю в них змін, які в них відбуваються.

Специфіка синергетичного підходу полягає в дослідженні:

• механізмів становлення когерентності, зв'язності подій, виникнення загальноприйнятих зразків когнітивного поведінки і мислення;

• ролі аналогів хаосу, різноманітності елементів знання і досвіду, випробування ряду ментальних альтернатив для сталого і продуктивного функціонування когнітивних систем;

• співвідношення елементів преддетермінаціі та відкритості еволюційних процесів, пов'язаних із подією випадіння на структуру-атрактор як на одну з спектру можливих структур знання, з вибором подальшого шляху еволюції;

• конструктивних механізмів коеволюції складних, ієрархічно організованих і «різновікових» структур індивідуальної свідомості, знання та колективної когнітивної діяльності;

• можливості ефективного управління нелінійними системами свідомості і знання за допомогою топологічно пра вильно організованих, так званих резонансних впливів.

Своєрідність синергетики полягає також і в тому, що вона пропонує під новим кутом зору поглянути на одну з фундаментальних проблем філософії – проблему відношення частини до цілого. Ця проблема, на думку О. М.  Князєвої та С. П. Курдюмова, є однією з найбільш цікавих у синергетиці й зв'язується з проблемою спільної еволюції (коеволюції) та її прискорення при правильному об'єднанні частин, які еволюціонують: «Як, за якими законами будується еволюційне ціле? Як збирається ціле з частин? Якою є геометрія, вірніше, стереометрія об'єднання? Цю частину синергетичного світобачення можна назвати еволюційним холізм».

**5. Міждисциплінарність синергетики як основа для становлення лінгвосинергетики.** Дисциплінарний підхід до вивчення об'єкта передбачає використання понятійного апарату і конкретних методик дослідження, вироблених в окремо взятій дисципліні. Міждисциплінарний підхід реалізується в двох напрямках: по-перше, він передбачає розширення понятійного апарату конкретної науки і методології дослідження за рахунок залучення категорій і методик аналізу інших наукових дисциплін.

І, по-друге, він має на увазі комплексне вивчення об'єкта дослідження, коли об'єкт дослідження потрапляє в поле наукової рефлексії представників різних наукових дисциплін.

В. Г. Буданов пропонує виділити п'ять типів «міждисциплінарних стратегій комунікації» і, відповідно, п'ять типів використання терміна «міждисциплінарність».

1. Міждисциплінарність як **узгодження мов** суміжних дисциплін. Йдеться про загальну для дисциплін феномен-логічної бази, в якій кожна використовує свій тезаурус. Такі відносини фізики і хімії, психології та соціології.

2. Міждисциплінарність, або **трансдисциплінарність**, як **трасузгодження мов** дисциплін, не обов'язково близьких. Мова йде про єдність методів, універсаліїв, загальнонаукові варіанти, що застосовуються різними дисциплінами. В першу чергу, це методи математики, системного аналізу та синергетики.

3. Міждисциплінарність як **евристична гіпотеза-аналогія**, яка переносить конструкції однієї дисципліни в іншу спочатку без належного обґрунтування. Наприклад, гіпотеза-аналогія хвилі-пілота в квантовії теорії не прижилася, але парадоксальний образ хвиль ймовірностей сьогодні загальноприйнятий в квантовій механіці.

4. Міждисциплінарність як **конструктивний міждисциплінарний проєкт**, організована форма взаємодії багатьох дисциплін для розуміння, обґрунтування, створення та, можливо, управління феноменами надскладних систем. У будь-якому випадку використовуються всі три попередні типи міждисциплінарної комунікації.

5. Міждисциплінарність як **мережева комунікація**, або **самоорганізована комунікація**. Саме так відбувається впровадження міждисциплінарної методології, трансдисциплінарних норм і цінностей, інваріантів і універсалій наукової картини світу, так розвивається синергетика, мережі наукових шкіл і асоціацій, Інтернет, мода і чутки.

Сучасне наукове співтовариство повною мірою усвідомлює нагальну необхідність інтеграції знання, спільної діяльності дослідників різних сфер науки, об'єднаними єдиним об'єктом вивчення, доказом чого може служити той факт, що «в документах ЮНЕСКО і в бюлетенях Асоціації складного мислення у Франції нерідко йдеться про *інженерії трансдисциплінарності*».

Стрімке кооперування різних дисциплін відбувається сьогодні у рамках синергетики – міждисциплінарного наукового напрямку, що займається дослідженням складних, відкритих, динамічних систем, що самоорганізуются та нелінійно розвиваются в різних онтологій. Міждисциплінарність синергетики полягає в синтезі методів і принципів дослідження складних систем, вироблених в рамках різних дисциплін, що об'єднуються об'єктом дослідження – складними системами, вивченням етапності їх самоорганізації, виявленням загальних закономірностей їх функціонування, встановленням загальних принципів їх розвитку.

Синергетика пропонує новий еволюційний погляд на світ, сутність якого полягає в цілісному, холістичний сприйнятті світобудови, в якому все – живе і неживе – тісно взаємопов'язано і знаходиться в безперервному процесі зміни і розвитку.

Синергетика виникла на фундаменті природознавства і дала шанс «постановки нових, нетрадиційних питань про світ, що стимулюють перспективні напрямки досліджень в спеціальних галузях». Г. Хакен переконаний, що принципи синергетики можна застосувати до численних систем, які відносяться до великого спектру дисциплін, і що це дозволило створити нові підходи до вивчення складних систем.

Зупинимося на сферах застосування принципів синергетики в сучасній науці.

• Матеріалознавство. Досягнення нелінійної динаміки сильно неврівноважених систем, що широко використовуються в матеріалознавстві.

• Математична фізика. Принципи та методи синергетики уможливили створення якісно нових підходів у вирішенні багатьох важливих проблем математичної фізики.

• Математична історія – новий міждисциплінарний напрямок, суть якого полягає в математичному моделюванні історичних процесів, у виявленні їх системних механізмів і провідних змінних: «Це дозволяє зробити історію не тільки описовою, але і прогнозуючою наукою. Реалізація цієї програми дає алгоритми і методи опису історичних альтернатив, дозволяє ввести в історію умовний спосіб. Реалізація цього підходу могла би зробити математичну історію основою для історичного і стратегічного прогнозу».

• Історія. Розроблено ефективні алгоритми виявлення наявності хаотичних режимів в емпіричних часових рядах. Наявність систематизованих (кількісних) даних про динаміку того чи іншого історичного процесу допомагає вченим за допомогою наявних програм отримати відповідь на питання: чи перебував досліджуваний процес у нестійкому стані, «на шляху» до біфуркації.

* Соціологія. Синергетичні моделі вже були в ряді випадків успішно застосовані до пояснення соціальних явищ.

• Соціальне управління. «Що стосується соціального управління, людству доведеться навчитися описувати, розраховувати оптимальні для себе і в той же час здійсненні «сценарії» розгортання подій і контури майбутнього. Знаючи майбутній бажаний стан і слідуючи природній тенденції самоорганізації системи, людство в змозі скоротити час виходу на структуру-атрактор, на майбутню форму організації. Тим самим можна уникнути багатьох зигзагів поступового еволюційного шляху, прискорити еволюцію. Це ще один світоглядний орієнтир, що задається синергетикою».

• Психологія. Мережева модель фрактального світу відкриває можливості математичного моделювання в психології. Синергетика, орієнтована на розкриття універсальних механізмів самоорганізації складних систем будь-якого типу, в тому числі соціальних, може бути застосована до дослідження процесу еволюції індивідуальної і суспільної свідомості. Розвиваючи міждисциплінарний підхід в психології, вони приходять до висновку про те, що подібно до того як природа явищ самоорганізації пояснюється в фізиці наявністю мільйонів атомів, в біології – мільйонів клітин, що взаємодіють один з одним нелінійним чином, динаміка суспільної свідомості – це наслідок нелінійної взаємодії індивідуальних свідомостей складових його мільйонів людей. Отже, можна очікувати, що теорії атракторів і катастроф правомірно використовуваються для опису функціонування суспільної свідомості. Такий же висновок можна зробити і щодо вивчення проблем розвитку мови.

• Дослідження мозку. Застосування синергетики до аналізу функціонування нейронних мереж кори головного мозку привело до формування нового напрямку досліджень – нейросинергетики. Було з'ясовано, що людський мозок являє собою нелінійну складну систему, динаміка якої обумовлена атракторами різних типів.

• Медична діагностика. Застосування сучасних досягнень теорії динамічних систем і нелінійної динаміки для математичного моделювання функціонування та діагностики стану живих систем розглядається в якості нового і перспективного напрямку досліджень, що вимагає об'єднання зусиль фізиків, математиків, біологів і медиків: «у недалекому майбутньому серцево-судинна система людини буде адекватно описана математичною моделлю, параметри якої відповідають фізіологічного стану і вплив на які буде приводити до ліку нию тієї чи іншої хвороби».

• Освіта. Дослідники відзначають подвійну роль синергетики в освіті. З одного боку, мається на увазі розробка так званих синергетичних підходів освіти, синергетичних способів організації навчально-виховного процесу. З іншого боку, кажуть про освіту через синергетику, шляхом передачі й поширення синергетичних знань. «У першому випадку синергетика виступає як метод освіти, а в другому – як його зміст». Цікаво, що в світі накопичується досвід з використання досягнень синергетики в сфері освіти.

• Мистецтво. Об'єктом програми синергетичного методу у вивченні мистецтва є художні твори людини, що являють собою «сплав унікальних, індивідуальних особливостей і універсальних закономірностей». Культура в цілому і мистецтво зокрема, безсумнівно, являють собою динамічні самоорганізуючі системи, здатні до зміни своєї структури внаслідок відкритості даних, їх взаємодії з іншими системами оточення (тобто середовища існування).

• Метеорологія. Вчені бачать перспективність застосування синергетичних моделей для моделювання кліматичної мінливості, оскільки для вивчення погодних і кліматичних патернів і прогнозування змін у них вимагається облік одночасної взаємодії безлічі факторів, так званого «кооперативного ефекту», що може бути адекватно описано в категоріях синергетики.

* Прогностика. Висновки синергетики, в тому числі і про альтернативності майбутнього (цю тезу зазвичай формулюється як «майбутнє неодиничне»), відкривають можливості прогнозування і навіть управління майбутнім.

Виступаючи за застосування синергетичних стратегії не тільки в природознавстві, але і в гуманітарних науках, учені застерігають від бездумного жонглювання новими поняттями.

Синергетику розглядають як концептуально-методологічну основу для міждисциплінарного синтезу знання, своєрідного «методу наведення мостів» між природничими і гуманітарними науками.

Синергетику слід розглядати як новий, більш високий рівень системних досліджень, що увібрав у себе безліч суттєвих напрацювань окремих наукових дисциплін, що дозволяє конструктивно, не заглиблюючись в багатозначущі численності, здійснити синтез великої кількості розрізнених фрагментів у єдину наукову картину світу.

Синергетика покликана відігравати роль своєрідного комунікатора, що дозволяє оцінити ступінь спільності результатів однієї науки, їх корисність для інших наук [Домброван 2014].

***Лекція 2.***

***БАЗОВІ ПОНЯТТЯ ЛІНГВОСИНЕРГЕТИКИ.***

**1. Емердженсія та самоорганізація.**

**2. Лінійність / нелінійність.**

**3. Атрактор та репелер.**

**4. Фрактал.**

**5. Когерентність.**

**6. Флуктуація та біфуркація.**

**7. Дисипація.**

**8. Моделювання синергетичних процесів.**

**1. Емердженсія та самоорганізація.** Основа понятійного апарату сучасної науки про мову бере свій початок у глибокій традиції античності. Зсув ракурсу дослідження в бік еволюційної складності, необхідність адекватного опису і несуперечливого пояснення спостережуваних явищ постійно вимагають розширення і внесення деяких коректив у робочий категоріальний апарат, який використовується при міждисциплінарному підході до вивчення мови, і розробки так званого «словника складності».

У зв'язку з цим доречно навести слова P. Р. Піотровського, видатного лінгвіста XX століття, який одним з перших побачив перспективність синергетичного підходу для вивчення мови і фактично стояв біля витоків лінгвосинергетики: «Рішення синергетичних завдань вимагало застосування нової дослідницької технології, яка принципово відрізняється від тих прийомів, якими користувалися філологи, які працювали в руслі описової та структурної парадигм. Працюючи в кадрі синергетичної парадигми, дослідник не може обмежитися прямим спостереженням над досліджуваним об'єктом».

Базовий категоріальний апарат лінгвосинергетики в цілому та діахронічної синергетики зокрема, крім перевіреної часом і традиційною лінгвістичною термінологією, повинен включати такі поняття, як емердженция і самоорганизация, хаос і порядок, флуктуації, біфуркація, атрактор, керуючий параметр, фрактал, дисипативний процес та інші, привнесені в науковий обіг із природознавства. Однак слід узяти до уваги той факт, що «синергетика не імпортує точність своїх визначень у лінгвістику», але пропонує визначати поняття за допомогою концептуальної метафори. На відміну від синергетики та інших природничих дисциплін, де панує «точне», тобто кількісне опис досліджуваних об'єктів, лінгвістика належить до галузей якісного опису, що й обумовлює плідність використання концептуальної метафори. У цілому ж у науці постнеокласичного (сучасного) періоду намічається тенденція до відходу від чіткого, догматичного характеру дефініцій і переходу до узагальнено-метафоричного опису досліджуваних об'єктів.

Розглянемо зміст деяких основних понять лінгвосинергетики.

Поняття емердженції та самоорганізації взаємопов'язані найтіснішим чином. Цікаво зазначити, що англійський іменник *emergence*, від якого і походить термін ***емердженція***, означає «процес появи або впізнавання чого-небудь» ('the process of appearing or becoming recognized')". Іншими словами, емердженське явище поєднує в собі, здавалось би, несумісні риси – «виникають несподівано» та «виникає як наслідок». Для П. Хопера емердженція являє собою безперервний процес структуризації: «... це погляд на структуру як на щось завжди минуще, постійно гнучке і схильне до компромісів, і, по суті, епіфеноменальне, тобто структура є наслідком в тій же мірі, що і причиною, не більше і не менше».

З позицій діахронічної лінгвосинергетики емердженський характер носив процес зародження і формування англійської мови в результаті вторгнення різномовних германських племен на територію Британських островів (середина V ст. – VI ст.), географічної віддаленості цих племен від решти на континенті рідних, що позбавило носіїв мови можливості підтримувати «чистоту» мови цього племені. Сакси, англи та юти були змушені співіснувати на єдиній території і боротися зі спільним ворогом – скандинавами. Об'єднуючим початком могло слугувати тільки єднання мови. Мови племен, які згодом стали основою для регіональних діалектів, належали до однієї лінгвістичної групи – групи германських мов, що полегшило процес комунікації. Зовнішні умови існування, а також внутрішні фактори – все це створило сприятливий ґрунт для виникнення й розвитку нового народу і нової мови. Епіфеноменальність англійської мови полягає в тому, що її виникнення стало наслідком географічної ізольованості мов германських племен та історико-політичних ситуацій, що склалися у той час, при цьому генетична спорідненість мов племен-завойовників слугувала рушійною силою і однією з причин спонтанної кооперації (але не розчинення) мов племен у процесі структурування та самоорганізації нової нації та її мови.

Одне із завдань діахронічної лінгвосинергетики як раз і полягає в тому, щоб відтворити, хоча б у самих загальних рисах, процес складної міжрівневої і всереденірівневої взаємодії між численними компонентами мовної мегасистеми під впливом зовнішніх факторів.

Здатність складних систем до упорядкування своєї внутрішньої структури називається ***самоорганізацією*** (термін уведений У. P. Ешбі у 1947 р.). Самоорганізація може бути визначена як «виникнення (становлення) нового цілого, утвореного складним, але погодженим поведінкою складових елементів вихідного середовища». Процес самоорганізації системи передбачає встановлення нових зв'язків між елементами (частинами, підсистемами) цієї системи, при цьому колишні зв'язки можуть або зберігатися (що рідше), або перегрупуватися (як правило).

За Р. Хакеном, система може вважатися самоорганізованою, якщо вона набуває просторову, часову або функціональну структуру без будь-якого зовнішнього втручання. Б. Р. Юдін визначає самоорганізуючі системи як «системи, здатні при активній взаємодії із середовищем змінювати свою структуру, зберігаючи в той же час цілісність і діючи в рамках закономірностей, властивих оточенню, вибирати одну з можливих ліній поведінки» [Домброван 2014].

Отже, самоорганізація системи може розглядатися як результат переходу системи в новий стан.

Системи, що самоорганізуються, до яких належить і мова, здатні адекватно реагувати на зовнішні впливи, змінюючи свої параметри, структуру і функції, тобто проявляють властивість адаптації до середовища існування. У той же час самоорганізована система у відповідь на зовнішні подразники здатна активно впливати на своє оточення.

Таким чином, емердженция і самоорганізація – це дві сторони одного і того ж явища, пов'язані процеси виникнення нового і його автономного впорядкування. У процес «самобудування» мовної мегасистеми залучені всі її складові різнорівневі структури, які у свою чергу, знаходяться у стані постійного руху, змін і самоускладення.

Система, здатна до самоорганізації, повинна мати такі характеристики, як відкритість і нелінійність. Тільки ці властивості зроблять можливим упорядкування неорганізації «поведінки» елементів системи, створення нового режиму їх функціонування.

2. ***Лінійність / нелінійність***. Лінійність традиційно розуміється як причинно-наслідкова детермінованість, що виявляється в пропорційності реакції системи на силу зовнішнього впливу. Лінійність характеризується так званим принципом накладання, або суперпозиції, коли результат суми впливів дорівнює сумі результатів кожного з впливів окремо.

Синергетична парадигма фокусується на нелінійності, яка до сих пір залишалася поза увагою широкого кола науковців.

До категоріального апарату синергетики поняття нелінійності запозичене з математики, де воно включає особливий вид рівнянь, а саме рівняння з безліччю змінних, з різними коефіцієнтами тощо, що розширює спектр можливих пошуків рішень, залежних від значення змінних і / або коефіцієнтів. Іншими словами «нелінійні рівняння можуть мати декілька (більше одного) якісно різних рішень», а це відкриває безліч шляхів еволюції системи.

Крім «математичної» нелінійності виділяють також топологічну нелінійність, яка асоціюється з особливостями багатовимірних відображень, тобто фактично з виходом за межі самої топології, що вивчає властивості, які не змінюються при взаємно однозначних і неперервних відображеннях топологічних просторів.

Синергетика виявила також якісний аспект нелінейності, який проявляється у можливості появи не при детермінованих, не закономірних, не визначених заздалегідь, а випадкових властивостей і якостей певної самоорганізаційної системи. «Біфуркаційна криза, пороговий ефект, дивні атрактори життя як паттерни нелінійної динаміки».

Синергетичне світобачення дозволяє говорити про світоглядні аспекти нелінійності, яке есплікується за допомогою ідеї багатоваріантності, альтернативності шляхів еволюції, ідеї темпу еволюції (тобто швидкості розвитку процесів в середовищі) і ідеї незворотності еволюції.

Таким чином, поняття нелінійність значно розширило обсяг свого значення від вузькоспеціалізованого до філософськи-світоглядного. Сьогодні нелінійність сприймається не просто як фундаментальний концептуальний вузол нової парадигми, а значно ширше «нова парадигма є парадигма нелінійності».

Поняття нелінійності дозволило переосмислити єдність, різноманітного універсуму, усвідомити спільність еволюції матерії у «неживій» та «живій» природі, включаючи людину і суспільство. Зокрема, нелінійність мовної системи обумовлена «амбівалентністю досліджуваного об'єкта, можливістю несподіваних змін у розвитку мовних процесів. Пороговість виявляється при розпаді полісемії та утворенні омонімії, при будь-яких переходах кількісних змін у якісні».

**3. Атрактор та репелер.**

Aтрактор – ще одне поняття, яке прийшло в синергетику з природознавства і активно використовується при описі еволюціонних змін, що відбуваються у відкритих системах. Атракторами називають «відносно стійкі структури, які неминуче виходять процеси еволюції у відкритих нелінійних середовищах (системах)». Поряд з терміном «атрактор» у тому ж значенні широко вживається поєднання «структура-атрактор».

Передбачається, що відкрите нелінійне середовище (система) певні форми організації, або що то ж, що структури-атрактори потенційно закладені в середовищі (системі) і визначаються суто її власними нелінійними властивостями.

У теорії динамічних систем, що самоорганізуються (синергетика) зазвичай виділяють три типи атракторів: 1) статичні, 2) періодичні і 3) хаотичні. Статичний атрактop «захоплює», немов у пастку, траєкторію стану системи – її тимчасового ряду, в результаті чого система переходить у стан спокою, причому до стійкого стану. Періодично атрактор захоплює траєкторію в циклі стану, повторюваних за певний інтервал часу; в цьому випадку система переходить в коливальний, або осциляторний стан. Нарешті, хаотичний атрактор породжує квазівипадкову, хаотичну послідовність станів; система не переходить ані в стан спокою, ані в коливальний режим, а продовжує вести себе хаотично, але аж ніяк не безладно. У такій інтерпретації поняття «атрактор» зближується з поняттям «параметр управління», як таким собі організуючим початком, фактором, здатністю самоорганізації системи, її переходу до нового, упорядкованого, відносно стійкого стану.

Поняттю «атрактор» протистоїть поняття «репелер» (від англ. repel «відганяти, відштовхувати, відкидати, відхиляти») як набір параметрів їх значень, які «відштовхують» та самоорганізується в систему від стану рівноваги шляхом введення обмежень різної свободи природи на свободу прагнення цієї системи до рівноваги. Якщо атрактор позначає той стан рівноваги системи, який самоорганізовується, до якого вона прагне як до своєї мети, то репелер висловлює своїм змістом всі обмеження і заборони для системи. Ці два поняття – атрактop і репелер – відображають суперечливість характеристик мовної системи: з одного боку, динамічність, рухливість як прагнення системи до розвитку, зміни, а з іншого боку – консерватизм як тенденція до самозбереження шляхом мінімізації будь-яких інновацій.

**4. Фрактал.**

Термін «фрактал» (від лат прикметника «ламаний», «дробовий», «переривчастий» і від лат. frangere, що означає «розривати», «переривати», «абразовувати фрагменти») був утворений і введений до наукового обігу в 1975 році математиком Бенуа Малдельбротом (1924-2010), засновником так званої фрактальної rеометріі.

За словами В. Є. Войцеховича, фракталу (як загальнонауковому поняттю та головному конструкту синергетики). неможна дати визначення (тобто звести до старих, відомих поняттям). Фракталом називають явища масштабної інваріантності, коли наступні форми самоорrанізаціі (матеріальних і соціальних) систем нагадують за своєю будовою попередні. Іншими словами, малий фрагмент структури такого обсягу подібний до іншого, більш великому фрагменту або навіть структурі у цілому. Фрактали також означають нестійкий, перехідний стан еволюціонного об'єкта.

Основною властивістю фракталів вважається самоподоба, або властивість масштабної інваріантності (скейлинг), полягає в тому, що при зміні масштабу розгляду структури об'єкта залишається незмінною. І. А. Євін так описує алгоритм побудови фрактала: «самоподоба фракталів означає, що, взявши окрему частину зображення фрактала, можно в ній виявити ту ж саму структуру, що й в основному зображенні».

**5. Когерентність.** У хвильової фізиці це поняття використовується для позначення узгодженості коливальних процесів, при якій різниця фаз коливань не змінюється. Як термін синергетики, когерентність розширює свій обсяг значення і вказує на узгоджену поведінку компонентів складної системи в процесі її самоорганізаціі. «Когерентна поведінка елементів – основа для виникнення складних упорядкованих просторово-часових структур з хаосу» [Домброван 2014], при цьому важливо відзначити, що узгодженість взаємодії компонентів усієї системи не може бути зведена до суми «поведінки» кожного з елементів, що складають цю систему.

В аналітичному аспекті когерентність можна розглядати, залучаючи механізм резонансу; в якісному – спіраючись на явище кооперативності, коли в системі, при наявності багатьох одиниць, що реагує, реакція першої одиниці полегшує відповідь другої, реакція другої – відповідь третьої і т.д. Іншими словами, когерентність є системною (а не елементною) властивістю, що сприяє «перекладу» складових цієї системи в єдиний узгоджений темп існування і функціонування, що, у свою чергу, слугує однією з обов'язкових умов для успішного розвитку системи.

**6. Флуктуації і біфуркації** – це взаємопов'язані явища. Флуктуації означають випадкове відхилення від звичного режиму існування складної системи, втрату стійкості системи. Яскравий приклад флуктуацій наводиться в роботах Пригожина: «Ми можемо спостерігати в переохолодженій рідині флуктуації, що приводять до утворення крихітних кристалів, які то з'являються, то знову розчиняються. Але якщо утворюється великий кристал, то відбувається незворотна подія: кристалізація всієї рідини».

У результаті флуктуацій система може підійти до критичної точки, яка називається точкою біфуркації – своєрідної розвилці можливих режимів існування системи. Біфуркації називаються «м'якими», якщо перехід до нового стану здійснюється плавно, поступово і неперервно; «катастрофічними», якщо перехід здійснюється різко і під впливом, який визначає режим атрактора; і «вибуховими», якщо перехід здійснюється під дією раптової зміни дискретних чинників, що змушує систему перейти з одного режиму до іншого. Найчастіше вибір подальшого сценарію розвитку система здійснює випадково.

Біфуркації характеризують стан наростаючої нестійкості в системі. Нестійкість – одне з основних понять у синергетиці. Нестійкість мовної системи викликається дією зовнішніх факторів, що здійснюють неоднаковий вплив на різні підсистеми мови і підштовхують систему в цілому до так званого режиму з загостренням.

**7. Дисипація.** Терміном дисипація, або дисипативность (від англ. «розсіювання»), позначають процеси розмивання, розсіювання неоднорідностей у відкритих нелінійних системах. Дисипація означає переструктурування чужого у своє і розсіювання зайвого. Приклади дисипативних процесів у фізиці: дифузія, перетворення механічної енергії у теплову, тертя, випромінювання тощо. Відповідно, системи, в яких відбуваються дисипативні процеси, називаються дисипативними системами.

У мові дисипація проявляється у результаті взаємодії елементів системи між собою та із зовнішнім середовищем. Під впливом зовнішніх факторів можлива ініціація процесу відсіювання окремих лексичних одиниць, позбавлення від плеоназмів тощо. Прикладом дисипативного характеру мовної системи також може слугувати явище «реактивності слів», коли кожне слово в тексті та дискурсі передбачає наступні слова і є відгуком на попередні.

**8. Моделювання синергетичних процесів.**

Синергетична модель – це модель еволюціонуючого об'єкта, у нашому випадку – природної мови. Синергетична модель відображає не стільки характеристики оригіналу як такого або ієрархію його складових, скільки зміну режимів його існування. Синергетична модель англійської мови, зокрема, представлена фазовими переходами системи від одного стану до іншого, що в історії англійської мови може бути продемонстровано на прикладі типологічної трансформації англійської мови.

При моделюванні еволюціонуючого об'єкта важливо не тільки, щоб безліч властивостей отриманої моделі пересікалося з безліччю властивостей оригіналу в області, істотної для досягнення мети моделювання, а й щоб модель відображала динаміку зміни режимів існування досліджуваного об'єкта-оригіналу.

Метод моделювання набув широкого застосування в синергетиці, оскільки має величезний евристичний потенціал і наближає дослідників до розуміння механізмів самоорганізації та розвитку складних нелінійних систем.

Моделювання мови у рамках синергетичної парадигми пов'язане з визначенням послідовності зміни станів мовної системи, через які ця система проходить під впливом зовнішніх факторів. Основні стани, через які проходить система у своєму розвитку, утворюють циклічну спіраль і включають таку лінійну послідовність: стан стійкості -> втрата стійкості під впливом флуктуацій -> зона нерівноважності системи з точкою біфуркації -> перехід у новий стійкий стан. Якщо перехід у новий стан стійкості не відбувається, система може зруйнуватися.

Одним із перших лінгвістів, які застосували принципи синергетики для моделювання мовної системи, був видатний вчений сучасності Р. Г. Піотровський.

У своєму розвитку мова, будучи відкритою, динамічною системою, що самоорганізується, проходить аналогічні стадії. Так, вивчення історії англійської мови дозволяє виділяти кілька етапів у її розвитку:

1. Роз'єднані германські племена англів, саксів і ютів після поселення на Британських островах і утворення ворогуючих королівств все ж організовуються в єдину державу. Мови цих племен утворюють основу для діалектів давньоанглійської мови.

2. Під впливом скандинавських мов вікінгів, що переселилися на північно-східну частину Британських островів, англосаксонська мову входить у зону нерівноваженості і просувається до точки біфуркації, з якої спрямовується до нової області відносної стійкості, що в проєкції на граматичну організацію системи проявляється в прискоренні процесу відсіювання (дисипації) категоріальних флексій і поступової зміни типологічного ладу.

3. Каталізатором змін, що почалися в граматичному ладі англійської мови, виступили флуктуації внаслідок чергового суттєвого зовнішнього впливу на мовну систему, що розглядається, а саме – внаслідок норманського завоювання Британії і різкої зміни лінгвістичної ситуації в країні. Тривале (більше трьох століть) співіснування трьох мов – французької норманської (як державної мови), латини (як мови церкви, науки і освіти) й англійської (як мови «низів») зробило помітний вплив на подальший розвиток практично всіх підсистем англійської мови.

4. Зовнішні фактори (політичні – у т.ч. Сторічна війна з Францією (1337-1454), соціальні – у т. ч. різке падіння престижності французької мови та відродження національної самосвідомості) вивели мовну систему через біфуркації до нового стабільного стану – так званої реставрації англійської мови як державної та стандартизації норм її вживання.

5. Нові зовнішні чинники (зокрема політика імперської колонізації, що розпочалася в XVII ст.) викликали відцентровий вектор у розвитку англійської мови – поява регіональних і територіальних варіантів англійської мови. Англійська стає мовою міжнародного спілкування.

6. Новітні (сучасні) зовнішні чинники (політичні, соціально-економічні, утворення єдиного інформаційного простору тощо) сприяють повсюдному поширенню англійської мови в масштабах планети і перетворенню її на Global English, який ми розглядаємо в якості нового періоду в історії англійської мови.

Виділені етапи – лише один з можливих варіантів періодизації історії англійської мови. Цей варіант базується на зміні станів мови як синергетичної системи [Домброван 2014].

**Змістовний модуль 2.**

**Історія англійської мови як об’єкт діахронічної лінгвосинергетики.**

**History of English as an Object of Diachronic Linguistic Synergetics**

**Lecture 3**

***CHANGES IN THE PHONETIC SYSTEM OF ENGLISH***

**1.Spelling and speech sounds**

**1.1. Phonemic**

**1.2. Digraphs**

**1.3 Standardisation**

**1.4 Etymological respellings**

**2. Changes in the vowel system.**

**3. Changes in the consonant system**

The Old English sound system underwent considerable changes in the Middle and Modern periods of the evolution of the English language. The following most noticeable features mark this process: the majority of sound changes in the Middle and Modern English were independent and spontaneous; widely-spread positional changes that often affected the quality of vowels in Old English were characteristic of the quantity of vowels in Middle English; changes of the quality of speech sounds often went together with changes in the quantity of speech sounds; long monophthongs and diphthongs in the accented syllables were more affected than short monophthong in their quality; vowels in the unstressed positions had a strong tendency to being reduced in their quality; the English consonant sounds were generally more stable than vowels, still some consonants were subject to vocalization and assibilation, some were lost and some new consonants emerged. The changes in the vocalic system were often connected and interrelated with the vocalization of the fricative and liquid consonants.

Modern English spelling is mostly etymological and its basic foundations, to a large extent, can be traced to Middle English spelling habits, since the extensive sound changes were not reflected in spelling in later periods. Generally, this contributed much to the discrepancy between Modern English pronunciation and spelling [Євченко 2016 : 88-89].

**1.Spelling and speech sounds**

English spelling used to represent speech sounds in a relatively simple way, but a variety of changes have led to a much more complex system.

Does spelling represent the pronunciation of words? Let's compare English spelling with Ukrainian. The word for *daughter* in is Ukrainian *дочка*. The letters *дочка* of represent the sounds of the spoken word. Generally, when these sounds occur in other words they are represented by the same letters. Now consider *daughter.* Clearly, the spelling does not represent the units of sound that make up the spoken word in a straightforward way. When these sounds occur in other words, they can be represented by other letters.

***Phonemic***

Unlike Ukrainian, English spelling is not always PHONEMIC. There is no simple one-to-one correspondence between phonemes – the smallest units of speech distinguishing one word from another – and the letters that represent them. However, this is not quite so true of spelling in the Old English period. For example, consider the words *twa* ('two') and *lang* ('long'). The *w* of *twa* was originally pronounced, and thus, unlike today, each letter of the spelling corresponded to a phoneme of the spoken word. Similarly, the final *g* of *lang* was pronounced, so that the pronunciation of the word would be [laηg]. Indeed, the final *g* of this word and of others (e.g. tongue, ring) is still pronounced in some west central areas of England.

So, generally, Old English spelling did not contain *'silent letters'*.

Why has the spelling system become less phonemic? Why is it now so complicated? History, as we shall see, can provide an explanation.

***Digraphs***

The first problem was that English adopted the Roman alphabet, in other words, the alphabet of another language – Latin. Today we have over forty phonemes in English, but only twenty-six letters by which to represent those phonemes. In particular, note that we have about twenty vowel sounds in English, but only five vowel letters. Even in Old English the Latin alphabet on its own was not enough. In addition to Latin consonant letters, the Runic '*thorn*' Þ and the Irish Gaelic '*eth*' **ð** were used, fairly interchangeably, for the phonemes [ð] and [θ] that we now represent with *th*. Some Old English phonemes were represented by pairs of letters, which we call ***digraphs***. For example, *sc* was used to represent the first phoneme [ʃ] in the Old English word *scep* 'sheep', and *cg* was used for the last phoneme [*dᴣ*] in the Old English word *ecg* 'edge'. In addition to Latin vowel letters, the letter 'ash' ***æ*** was developed by combining ***a*** and ***e***, and was used for the phoneme [*æ*] that we now represent with ***a***. Also, the digraphs ***ea*** and ***eo*** were used, as in the Old English words *eare* 'ear' and *beor* 'beer'.

A number of the apparent oddities of English spelling were introduced by Middle English scribes, particularly Norman scribes who adapted spelling to suit French spelling conventions. Digraphs promoted by Middle English scribes include:

• ***sh*** replacing ***sc*** in words like OE *scip 'ship'*.

• ***qu*** replacing ***cw*** in words like OE *cwen 'queen'*. (Note that *cw* was in fact a much more obvious representation of the first phonemes of words like *queen*.)

• ***gh*** replacing ***h*** in words like OE *riht 'right'*.

• ***ch*** replacing ***c*** in words like OE *cin 'chin'*.

• ***wh*** replacing ***hw*** in words like OE *hwæt* 'what'.

• ***c*** replacing ***s*** in words like OE is *'ice*'. (Consider the pronunciation of c in French words such as Citroen.)

• ***ou*** replacing ***u*** in words such as OE wund *'wound'*. (Consider the pronunciation of *ou* in French words such as *vous*.)

**Standardisation**

The advent of printing with William Caxton in 1476 was a step towards the STANDARDISATION of spellings. Printing was most economic if one set of spelling conventions reflecting one dialect was chosen.

For now, let's note that printing made possible the production of a vast amount of reading material using one set of spelling conventions: it could promote a 'standard' in spelling. This is not to suggest that the early printers entirely agreed on what the standard should be or were consistent in applying it. In some respects the printers added to the oddities of spelling. Many of the early printers were Dutch. Sometimes Dutch spellings influenced English words. For example, the word *ghost* in Old English was spelt *gast*, but the Dutch printers added an *h*, presumably influenced by the Flemish word *ghees*t. Furthermore, the Dutch printers used continental characters.

Thus non-Latin letters, such as '*thorn*' Þ, were not well represented. In fact, a *y* was chosen to represent 'thorn'. A remnant of this can be seen in the sign *Ye Olde Tea Shoppe*, where *Ye* is equivalent to *The*. This sign also illustrates other characteristics of Early Modern English spelling, which printers were at least partly responsible for.

Printers often added a superfluous *e* (e.g. *Olde*), doubled up consonants (e.g. *Shopp*e), or used *y* instead of *i* because they took up more space. This was done in order to increase the length of a line so that it would match the others of a text. All this added to the general variability in spelling. Line justification today, as in this very text, is automatically achieved on a word processor without varying the spelling.

**Etymological** **respellings**

In the sixteenth century, there was particular interest in the classical languages Latin and Greek, and these had much prestige. It was fashionable to respell words in order to make them look more like the originals, although this meant adding 'silent letters'. These ETYMOLOGICAL RESPELLINGS include:

ME langage > language (Latin lingua)

ME dette > debt (Latin debitum)

ME receite > receipt (Latin receptum)

ME samon > salmon (Latin sal mo)

However, sometimes the respellers got their etymology wrong. For example, it was assumed that ME *iland* came from French *isle*, and thus an *s* was added to make *island*. In fact, *iland* was an Old English word, and has Germanic roots

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, many words entered English from languages such as French (e.g. *grotesque, colonel*), Latin (e.g. *necessary, relaxation*), Greek (e.g. *chaos, pneumonia*), Italian (e.g. *piazza, piano*) and Spanish (e.g. *canoe, tobacco*). The important consequence is that English spelling contains the spelling conventions of other languages: it is an amalgam of various spelling systems. This process of borrowing from other languages has continued throughout the development of English. More recently, the spelling of the word *khaki* – the colour – reflects the fact that it is borrowed from Urdu, and the spelling of *kamikaze* reflects the fact that it is borrowed from Japanese.

Many people in the sixteenth century were highly critical of the tremendous variation in spelling, the addition of superfluous letters and so on. Also, from this time onwards dictionaries started to appear which people could consult for an authoritative spelling.

Coupled with printing, all this had the effect of fixing or standardising spellings. In fact, very few spellings have changed since Dr Johnson's dictionary of 1755. Unfortunately, spellings were fixed at a time of great confusion. Not only was there a great influx of words from other languages, but the language was also experiencing changes in pronunciation – changes which spelling failed to keep up with [Culpeper 2000].

Changes since the eighteenth century have mainly been to do with attitudes towards the spelling system that emerged. The old tolerance of spelling variation evaporated, and spelling came to be seen as an indicator of education and even intelligence. This century a number of attempts have been made to simplify spelling, the most famous campaigner for spelling reform being George Bernard Shaw.

However, spelling reform has so far failed to produce any changes in British English spelling. In American English, spelling reform – promoted in particular by Noah Webster – has achieved a measure of success, leading to such spellings as *color* and *center*.

**2. Changes in the vowel system.**

The phonetic structure of the English language has undergone significant changes during more than 1,500 years. If the Old English language still shows common features with other ancient languages of the Germanic group, then in the Middle Period of history and, especially, in subsequent centuries, the development trajectory of the English language abruptly goes “to the side”.

Observation of the historical development of the phonological system of the English language indicates that both quantitative and qualitative changes occurred in the vowel system. So, vowels in an unstressed position weakened and ultimately were reduced and / or lost. A number of vowels in stressed syllables were diphthongized, while existing diphthongs turned into monophthongs, and vocalization of consonants provoked the emergence of new diphthongs. Consonants were subjected less dramatic changes. These changes come down mainly to assimilation processes.

Historians of the English language as a characteristic feature of Old English vocalism note the stability of the back vowels and the mobility of combinatorial changes in the front vowels. It is noticed that the short vowels of the front row are distinguished by special mobility; they are diphthongized by fraction, velar mutation, after palatalized consonants [Algeo 2010].

Already in the Old English language, vowels (common German by origin) did not always have regular correspondences in Gothic or Old High German. In other words, already at the beginning of the Old English period (approximately the 6th century), an “offshoot” of the phonological system of the English language from systems of closely related Germanic languages emerged. Probably, one of the factors that contributed to similar phonological differentiation was the geographical remoteness of the Germanic tribes who settled on the British Isles from their continental relatives, which led to a significant weakening of communication between representatives of a uniform linguistic group.

Linguists were able to explain various regular changes in vowel systems of Indo-European languages, among the main process are Old English fracture (breaking), palatal mutation (i-mutation), diphthongization after palatal consonants, back, or velar mutation, mutation before *h*, and contraction.

However, it should be noted that the phonetic changes in the Old English language did not occur uniformly and “according to a single scenario” in all dialects. So, in Anglo dialects, instead of diphthongs, expected as a result of fraction before h, monophthongs appear [Algeo 2010].

Angl. “æhta” – Wessex “eahta”

On the other hand, diphthongization after palatalized consonants is observed only for the Wessex dialect.

Merc. “cald” – Wessex “ceald”.

However, according to the testimony of language historians, at the end of the Old English period in the Wessex dialect, there are often forms with monophthongs in place of the previous diphthongs. This phenomenon can be explained from a synergistic perspective in the following way: in the studied period the phonetic system of the English language, which was a conglomerate of individual dialects of kingdoms divided by feuds, was at stage of its development, i.e. in a chaotic state, in a state of seeking stability; this was affected by the absence of any external (power) parameters designed to order multidirectional fluctuations, bring the content into a single norm and, accordingly, standardize a single one, selecting it from the plural one. Hence the throwing of a self-organizing system in the phase space of possible states [Домброван 2014 : 133].

The most remarkable feature of the Middle English sound system is a growing tendency for dialectal variation. The sound changes of Middle English increased the divergence among the Middle English dialects, though this divergence already existed in Old English. The increasing tendency for dialectal variation was encouraged by and? To some extent? Was the result of the changes of sociolinguistic situation that arose in England after the Norman Conquest. There seem to have been two basic causes which supported in the Middle dialect variation. The first one was the decline of the written form of English because the English language was restricted in its social functions and was almost exclusively used for oral communication. Most of English-speaking people were peasants who were illiterate and the changes in oral communication are believed to be wide-ranging and fast-going, especially in pronunciation and grammatical forms. The second one was the use of the French language in the country for a considerable period of time and appearance of a large layer of bilingual population during the natural development of the society, a sociolinguistic direct consequence of which was the increased interconnection and interrelation between English and French in England [Євченко 2016 : 89].

In the Middle English period such basic changes in the system of vowels occurred:

1. The Old English long vowel sounds ē, ī, ō, and ū remained unchanged in Middle English although their spelling possibilities altered: thus Old English fēt, Middle English fēt, feet ‘feet’; OE rīdan, ME rīden, rӯden ‘to ride’; OE fōda, ME fōde, foode ‘food’; OE hūs, ME hous ‘house.’

2. Except for Old English æ and y, the short vowels of those Old English stressed syllables that remained short were unchanged in most Middle English speech.

3. Old English ӯ [u:] underwent unrounding to [i:], y [ü] was unrounded to [ɪ], in the Northern and the East Midland areas.

4. Old English ā remained only in the North (hām ‘home,’ rāp ‘rope,’ stān ‘stone’), becoming [e:] in Modern Scots, as in hame, rape, and stane. Everywhere south of the Humber, ā became [ɔ:] and was spelled o or oo exactly like the [o:] that remained from Old English, as in fo(o)de. To be sure how to pronounce a Middle English word spelled with o(o), one needs to know its Old English form; if the Old English was ā (ME stoon, OE stān), the Middle English sound is [ɔ:]; if the Old English was ō (ME root(e), OE rōt), the Middle English sound is unchanged [o:].

There are, however, some special or exceptional cases. The Middle English [o:] of twō (OE twā) and whō (OE hwā) developed from early Middle English [ɔ:] by assimilation to the preceding [w], which was then lost. Thus Old English twā and hwā regularly became early Middle English [twɔ:] and [hwɔ:], which assimilated to later Middle English [to:] and [ho:], the sources of Modern English two [tu] and who [hu] (spelling preserves the now archaic forms from early Middle English).

5. Old English [æ:] became Middle English [ɛ:]. Both [e:] and [ɛ:] were written e or ee in Middle English.

6. Old English short æ fell together with short a and came to be written like it in Middle English: Old English glæd became Middle English glad. In Southwest Midland and in Kentish, however, words that in Old English had short æ were written with e (for instance, gled) in early Middle English times – a writing that may have indicated little change from the Old English sound in those areas.

7. Diphthongs changed radically between Old English and Middle English. The old diphthongs disappeared and a number of new ones ([aɪ, eɪ, aʊ, ɔʊ, ɛʊ, ɪʊ, ɔɪ, ʊɪ]) developed.

8. The most significant change was monophthongization of Old English diphthongs. The sound that appeared as a result of this process were not new to the English language – they simply coincided with the sounds that already existed in the language, in many cases returning the vowel to its previous quality, which was changed in the course of breaking, diphthongization after palatal consonants, and mutations [Algeo 2010].

9. In the Middle English new diphthongs were developed.

10. In addition to the qualitative vowel changes mentioned above, there were some important quantitative changes, that is, changes in the length of vowels:

10.1. In late Old English times, originally short vowels were **lengthened** before **mb, nd, ld, rd**, and **rð**. This lengthening frequently failed to maintain itself, and by the end of the Middle English period it is to be found only with **i** and **o** before **mb** (clīmben ‘to climb,’ cǭmb ‘comb’); with i and u before nd (bīnden ‘to bind,’bounden ‘bound’); and generally before ld (mīlde ‘mild,’ yēlden ‘to pay, yield,’ōld ‘old’).

10.2. Considerably later than the lengthenings due to the consonant sequences just discussed, short **a, e**, and **o** were lengthened when they were in **open syllables**, that is, in syllables in which they were followed by a single consonant plus another vowel, such as bāken ‘to bake’ (OE bacan).

11. A long vowel before two consonants (including a geminated consonants marking a long consonant sound) is **shortened:** OE cēpan – cēpte, ME kepen, kepe – kept.

12. Vowels in **unstressed syllables** were **shortened.** Lack of stress on the second syllable of wisdom accounts for its Middle English shortening from the Old English dōm. Similarly, words that were usually without stress within the sentence were subject to vowel shortening—for example, an (OE ān ‘one’), but (OE būtan), and not (OE nāwiht).

13. **Shortening** also occurred regularly before two unstressed syllables, as reflected in wild–wilderness, Christ–Christendom, and holy–holiday.

14. The leveling of sounds – vowels in the unstressed syllables. not only in intervocal, but also in initial and other positions. **Vowels**in **unstressed position**were **reduced:** OE**a, o, u, у** – ME **e [ə].** These sounds were in the end of the word, and it neutralized the difference between the suffixes — the main grammar means: OE cara, caru, care – ME care [Algeo 2010].

The process of losing old diphtongs and parallel formation of new diphthongs dates back to the end of the Old English and the beginning of the Middle English period. Using the metalanguage of synergetics, we can say that the phonological subsystem of the language in the specified period passed through the bifurcation point, freeing itself (dissipating) from the old and acquiring new ones. The loss of a number of phonemes caused a violation of the symmetry of the phonological system of the language, which in turn necessitated an early restructuring of the system in order to get out of the existing disequilibrium [Домброван 2014 : 136].

It should be noted that the phonetic system of any language is subject to ongoing changes under the influence of many external factors. At the same time, individual changes in the system can provoke a large-scale restructuring of this system as a chain reaction. The process of gradual change is especially vividly reflected in the phenomenon of the so-called Great Vowel Shift, which, according to researchers, had begun in the 15th century and lasted for several centuries.

This change was a fundamental one, changing the entire vocalic system, and the essence of it is as follows. All long vowels narrowed, and the narrowest of them turned into diphthongs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Change illustrated | Examples |  |
| **ME** (intermediatestage) **NE** | **ME** | **NE** |
| i: > ai | *time* [ti:mə]  *ftnden* [‘findən] | *time*  *find* |
| e: > i: | *kepen* [ke:pən] | *keep* |
|  | *field* [‘fe:ld] | *field* |
| ε: > e: > i: | *street* [strε:t] | *street* |
|  | *east* [ε:st] | *east* |
|  | *stelen* ['stε:lən] | *steal* |
| a: > ei | *maken* ['mа:kən] | *make* |
|  | *table* ['ta:blə] | *table* |
| o: (open from OE ā) > о: > ou | *stone* ['sto:nə] | *stone* |
|  | *open* ['o:рən] | *open* |
|  | *soo* [so:] | *so* |
| о: > u: | *moon* [mo:n] | *moon* |
|  | *goos* [go:s] | *goose* |
| u: > au | *mous* [mu:s] | *mouse* |
|  | *founden* ['fu.ndən] | *found* |
|  | *now* [nu:] | *now* |
| au > o: | *cause* ['kauzə] | *cause* |
|  | *drawen* ['drauən] | *draw* |

The diphthongs that arose as a result of the Great Vowel Shift did not enrich the phonological system of the language; such diphthongs had already existed in Middle English. They arose in the process of vocalization of **g:** wey (from wej) had the same diphthong that appeared in wake.

Changes in pronunciation did not affect in writing, because by this time the spelling had been already stabilized. From here the discrepancy between modern English pronunciation and spelling originates.

The Early New England period is characterized by the appearance of new diphthongs as a result of vocalization of «r» at the end of the word and before the consonant. When a long vowel was followed by the consonant “r” the given consonant did not prevent the Great Vowel Shift but the resulting vowel is more open, than the resulting vowel in such cases when the long vowel undergoing the Shift was followed by a consonant other than "r". For example:

[ei] but [εə] fate *but* fare

[i:] but [iə] steep *but* steer

[ai] but [aiə] time *but* tire

[u:] but [uə] moon *but* moor

[аu] but [аuə] house *but* hour.

The stressed short vowels have remained relatively stable throughout the history of English. The most obvious changes affect Middle English short **a**, which shifted by way of [**a**] to [**æ**] (man, that), and Middle English short **u**, which was unrounded and shifted to [**ʌ**] (cut, sum), though its older value survives in a good many words in which the vowel was preceded by a labial consonant, especially if it was followed by l – for instance, bull, full, pull, bush, push, and put.

However, these processes depended to a certain extent upon the preceding sound. When the sound [**a**] was preceded by [**w**] it changed into [**o**]. Compare:

[a] > [æ] that

[a] > [o] was.

It was lengthened before some consonant clusters and turned into [**a:**] when followed by:

a + **th** father; rather; bath; path

a + **ss** pass; class; grass

a + **st** cast; last; fast; disaster

a + **sk** ask; mask; task; basket

a + **sp** clasp, gasp, grasp, raspberry

a + **1m** alms; balm; calm; palm

a + **lf** calf, half, behalf

a + **nt**, nd, nch etc. plant, command, branch

a + **ft** after; craft; daft

This change is not found in the American variant, where the sound **a** changed into **æ**.

When the same sound was followed by **1** + **consonant** (other that m and n) it turned into long [**o:**] all; call; talk; walk; stalk.

The exceptions from the general rule are: cant; scant; pant; grand where it turned into æ; gaunt, haunt where the sound o: appeared; in the wors like change, strange it turned into ei, and the syllable became open by adding mute e [Верба 2012]. Two out of the four Middle English diphthongs changed in New English, the diphthong [**ai]** becoming [**ei**] and the diphthong [**au**] contracted to [**o:**] For example:

[ai] > [ei] dai day

[au]> [o:] lawe law

**The reduction of unstressed vowels in the final position**.

A typological feature of Early Common Germanic was the possibility of any vowel, be it long, short or a diphthong, to stand in the unstressed position, but unstressed long vowels were gradually shortened in the final positions and unstressed diphthongs were replaced by monophthongs already in Late Common Germanic and later in pre-written periods of the development of separate Old Germanic languages [Євченко 2016 : 89].

Already in Old English, short vowels in an unstressed position were partially weakened. In the Middle English period, the tendency to weaken the vowels in the unstressed syllable intensifies. At the end of the word and in the endings, the vowels *a, o, u* were reduced to *e* [ə]. Generally speaking, the final position is considered vulnerable to both vowels and consonants.

From the 12th century, as it is commonly believed, in English the finite -e began to disappear, which was reflected both in the spelling of words and in their rhyme. It is known that in the works of J. Chaucer, depending on the metric of the verse, -e can be read and can be skipped. Obviously, J. Chaucer was able to capture the phase of instability of the phonetic system of his contemporary language.

A similar phonetic process is observed in early New English and modern English: the weakening of unstressed vowels in the middle syllable (that is, after the stressed syllable and before unstressed) leads not only to a decrease in the quality of the sound, but as a result to its almost complete loss. But since spelling standards have already been established, then the changes in the pronunciation of words are not reflected in spelling.

**3. Changes in the consonant system**

The development of the system of consonants has not been accompanied by numerous sharp sound change and the consonant sound system can generally be characterized as conservative, though few alterations that can be stated brought some changes into the inventory of consonants phonemes. The dominant changes in the transformation of consonant system were closely connected and sometimes interwined with the phonetic processes that modified the system of vowels, though the system of consonants showed more diachronic stability [Євченко 2016 : 105].

The system of the Late Old English consonants was characterized by the following features: the presence of the correlation *short/long,* the absence of counterpart to the voiceless sibilant [ʃ], the absence of sonority within the set of fricative consonants, that is the voiced and voiceless fricative sounds were allophones.

Phonetic processes in the Old English:

**1. Voicing of fricatives** in intervocal position:

**f > v** *ofer* (over)

*wif* - *wife, wifa* (wife - wives)

**θ > ð** *oðer* (other)

**s > z>r**

Voiced sibilant *z* was very unstable in Old English (and other west-Germanic languages), and very soon changed into *r.* This process is called **rhotacism:**

wesun - weren ( *now* were, *but* was)

2. **Palatalization** of the sounds k, sk and kƷ (marked as c, sc and cƷ) developed in assibilation, that is formation of a sibilant in places before front vowels.

**k'>t***∫* cild (child)

**sk'> *∫***sceal (shall)

**k**Ʒ**' > dƷ** brycƷ (bridge)

Back **y** sound before palatal consonants turned into **Ʒ** – Ʒear (year). This process seems to have occurred in Late Old English. So, the words that started with **sc** or **Ʒ** acquired a sibilant or **Ʒ**; if we find that a word still has **Ʒ** or **sc/sk** at the beginning there is a strong probability that it was borrowed from Scandinavian and replaced the Old English form (e.g. give, skin) or together with the old word formed a pair of etymological doublets (shatter/scatter, shirt/skirt). Some words of Greek origin (school, scheme etc) will also have **sk**.

3. **Assimilation before t**. The sound **t** when it was preceded by a number of consonants changed the quality of a preceding sound.

**velar + t > ht** brinƷan —> brohte (bring - brought)

**labial +1 > ft** Ʒesceapan —> Ʒeaseaft (creature);

**dental + t > ss** witan —> wisse (instead of witte – knew);

**fn > mn** stefn —> stemn (voice);

**fm > mm** wifman —> wimman (woman);

**dð > t** bindð —> bint (binds).

4. **Loss of consonants in certain positions**. Besides *h* that was lost in intervocal position, the sounds *n* and *m* were lost before *h*, entailing the lenghthening of the preceding vowel:

bronhte – brōhte (brought)

The nasals were not lost in German, so the corresponding German words are fünf, ander and Mund.

Other examples of similar loss was the loss of Ʒ before d and n; the vowel was lengthened, too: mæƷden – mǣden (maiden)

5. **Metathesis** of r. In several Old English words the following change of the position of consonants takes place:

**cons+ r + vowel** > cons + vowel + r

ðridda – ðirda (third)

Metathesis of sounds is observed also with other sounds:

ascian – axian (ask)

6. West Germanic **gemination of consonants**.

In the process of palatal mutation, when j was lost and the preceding vowel was short, the consonant after it was doubled (geminated):

fulian – fyllan (fill) [Верба 2012].

The state mode of any evolving system, including the linguistic one, is subject to change, which forms the basis of the spiral cyclicity in the development of this system. The change of modes at the micro level can explain the following phonetic change:

[*ð*]→[d], [d] →[*ð*].

An earlier example of a chain change in the system of phonemes is a complex of interconnected changes in Germanic languages – the so-called the First Consonant Shift (Grimm's Law), that is a characteristic of the old period.

The phonological results of the changes in Middle English consonant system are as follows: the correlation *voiced/voiceless* penetrated into the subsystem of the fricative phonemes and embraced the whole system of plosive and fricative phonemes with the exception of the voiceless [ʃ] which still lacked a voiced correlative phoneme; the number of forelingual fricative phonemes doubled, as a result of the split of forelingual fricatives; in Middle English the subsystem of fricative phonemes lost the mediolingual fricatives [j] and [x’] and backlingual fricatives [y] and [x] as the result of the vocalization; the correlation *long/short* was lost. There wqa no marked regional variation of consonants phonemes in Middle English, except the southern dialects in which the voicing of fricatives was seen [Євченко 2016 : 106].

Throughout the history of English, consonants have remained relatively stable, compared with the notable vowel changes that have occurred. Important spelling differences occur, however, most of them due to Anglo-Norman influence.

1. The Old English sequences **hl, hn**, and **hr** (as in hlēapan ‘to leap,’ hnutu ‘nut,’and hraðor ‘sooner’) were simplified to **l, n, and r** (lēpen, nute, rather). To some extent **hw**, written wh in Middle English, was also frequently reduced to **w**, at least in the *Southern dialect*. In the *North*, however, the **h** in this sequence was not lost. It survives to this day in some types of English, including the speech of parts of the United States.

2. The Old English voiced velar fricative **[g]** after **l** or **r** became **w**, as in halwen ‘to hallow’ (OE halƷian) and morwe(n) ‘morrow’ (OE morƷen).

3. Between a consonant, particularly **s** or **t**, and a **back vowel**, **w** was lost, as in sǭ (OE swā) and tō ‘two’ (OE twā). A number of spellings with “silent w” continue to occur—for example, two, sword, and answer (early ME andswarien).

4. In unstressed syllables, -ch was lost in late Middle English, as in -ly (OE – lic). The form ī for the first person nominative singular pronoun is a restressing of the simple i that remained of ich (OE ic) after this loss.

5. Before a consonant, sometimes with syncope of an unstressed vowel, **v** was lost in a few words like hēd (by way of hēvd, hˉ ęved, from OE hēafod), lōrd (lōverd, OE hlāford), hast, hath, and had (OE hæfst, hæfð, and hæfde).

6. The Old English prefix **Ʒe**- became **i- (y-),** as in iwis ‘certain’ (OE Ʒewiss) and ilimpen ‘to happen’ (OE Ʒelimpan).

7. **Final inflectional n** was gradually lost, as was the final n of the unstressed possessive pronouns mīn and Þīn and of the indefinite article before a consonant: compare Old English mīn fæder ‘my father’ with Middle English mӯ fader (but mӯn eye ‘my eye’).

8. Many words were borrowed from Old French (and less frequently from Latin) beginning with [v] (for instance, veal, virtue, visit) and later with [z] (for instance, zeal, zodiac). As a result, these sounds frequently appeared in initial position, where they had not occurred in Old English.

9. Initial [**θ**] in words usually unstressed (for instance, the, this, they) was voiced to **[ð].**

10. With the eventual loss of final -e [ǝ], [v], [z], and [ð] came to occur also in final position, as in give, lose, bathe.

As a result of the last four changes, the voiced fricatives, which in Old English had been mere allophones of the voiceless ones, achieved phonemic status [Algeo 2010].

The changes that affected consonants in New English are not very numerous. They are as follows.

1) Appearance of a new consonant in the system of English phonemes – [**Ʒ**] and the development of the consonants [**dƷ**J and [**t∫**] from palatal consonants.

Note should be taken that the above-mentioned change took place in borrowed words, whereas the sounds [t∫], [dƷ], [∫] which appeared in Middle English developed in native words.

2. Certain consonants disappeared at the end of the word or before another consonant, the most important change of the kind affecting the consonant [**r**]:

farm, form, horse, etc.

3. The fricative consonants [**s**], [**θ**] and [**f**] were voiced after unstressed vowels or in words having no sentence stress –the so-called "Verner's Law in New English": possess, observe, exhibition; dogs, cats; the, this, that, there, then, though, etc.

In synergetics, any disposal of the system from unnecessary elements is considered as a dissipative process – cutting off heterogeneities and moving them outside the system. Moreover, in dissipation they even see an analogue of the biological factor of natural selection. The presence of dissipative processes at the phonetic level of the language indicates the openness of the system.

Dissipation is opposed to the process of borrowing as a result of external influences on the system from other languages.

The phonetic system of the English language was formed independently and, unlike other subsystems of the language (for example, lexical), practically did not change under the influence of other foreign languages [Доброван 2014 : 159-160].

***Lecture 4***

***CHANGES IN THE MORPHOLOGICAL SYSTEM OF ENGLISH***

**1. Changes in English noun**

**1.1. The category of case.**

**1.2. The category of number.**

**2. Changes in adjectives, pronouns, adverbs.**

**3. Changes in the system of English verb.**

**4. Grammaticalization.**

In the course of its evolution, the Old English morphological system of highly developed inflexions underwent serious changes which led to the simplification of its inflexional character in later periods. The main reasons for this transformation were the reduction of unstressed syllables, partial or complete, the result of which was the functional weakening of endings; fluctuations of some grammatical endings and their homonymy in Old English that favoured the development of numerous formations by analogy. The process of simplification of the inflectional system is thought to have been intensified by the influence of Scandinavian dialects in which this process of simplification went faster and obviously this influence was more felt in the Northern dialects, whereas the Southern dialects remained more conservative.

**1. Changes in English noun.**

Changes in the noun system are observed through the modifications of all grammatical nominal categories. It is generally assumed that the grammatical category of gender in the system of the noun fell into decline presumably in the eleventh-twelfth centuries. This process went intensively already in the tenth century in the Northern dialects and led to early elimination of gender noun distinctions. The main factors that caused the process of gender simplification are supposed to have been morphological, syntactical and semantic. Morphological causes are seen in the weakening of the endings due to the reduction of unstressed vowels the evident result of which was the development of homonymous forms in the morphological system and in the operation of analogy which resulted in shifting endings from larger morphological groups to smaller ones, thus destroying the former system of stem-declensions. The evident result of the action of analogy was also fluctuations in gender of some nouns [Євченко 2016 : 113].

The most important syntactical factor that occasioned changes of the grammatical category of gender was the loss of the inflectional endings in the declension of adjectives and demonstrative pronouns the morphological forms of which were one of the ways to show the gender attribution of the noun with which the adjectival and pronominal forms were agreed.

The grammatical gender classification of nouns gradually gave place to a semantic division of nouns into animate and inanimate. By the time of Chaucer, the grammatical category of gender of nouns is thought to have completely disappeared. Some stylistically marked references to gender through personification can still be found in Modern English.

On the whole, the elimination of the grammatical category of gender was a gradual and complicated process in which many operating factors were at work. This process is characterized:

- by the unification and elimination of stem-division of nouns which was the result of homonymy of inflectional forms and their weakening due to the reduction of unstressed vowels and the operation of analogy;

- by gender fluctuations and the contradiction between the lexical and grammatical meaning of some nouns;

- by the weakening of the agreement in the syntactical structure of a sentence through the simplification of the reduction and the loss of inflectional endings;

- by the probable influence of Scandinavian dialects which quickened this process in the Northern dialects through the confusion of gender endings.

The grammatical category of number has been preserved in Modern English but the means of its expression have changed. One of the most important differences between Old English and today's English is that in Old English grammatical information was typically signalled by the inflections or endings of words. Today, inflections there is one main inflection for nouns: a final -s (or -es) to signal number. By and large, if a noun has no -s, it is singular; if it has an -s, it is plural.

In Old English the plural endings were dependent on gender and on the stem declension of noun. If you look at Table 1, you'll see that there are six Old English nouns listed: *hund* (= any dog, not just a hound), *deor* (= any animal, not just a deer), *cild* (= child), *oxa* (= ox), *fot* (= foot) and *lufu* (= love). Each noun carries a set of different inflections that make up a declension for that noun. So, you can appreciate how complex the inflections of nouns used to be, and so that it can explain some of the features of English we use today.

Table 1. Old English noun inflections

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Singular | Nominative | hund | deor | cild | oxa | fot | lufu |
|  | Accusative | hund | deor | cild | oxan | fot | lufe |
|  | Genitive | hundes | deores | cildes | oxan | fotes | lufe |
|  | Dative | hunde | deore | cilde | oxan | fet | lufe |
| Plural | Nominative | hundas | deor | cildru | oxan | fet | lufa |
|  | Accusative | hundas | deor | cildru | oxan | fet | lufa |
|  | Genitive | hunda | deora | cildra | oxena | fota | lufa |
|  | Dative | hundum | deorum | cildrum | oxum | fotum | lufum |

As you can see, these nouns vary according to number and according to case.

What legacy did these noun inflections leave Modern English. Today's plural marker - the final *-s* - survives from the *-as* nominative/accusative plural form, as exemplified by *hundas*. In Old English there were other types of nouns with different plurals.

Over time the *-s* plural marker took control of most nouns. However, some of the other types of plural marking have survived and this has led to some variability today. *Deor*, to the right of *hundas*, has zero marking for plurality. This has survived today. It would sound awkward, if you spoke about '*deers*'. *Sheep* also belongs to this noun declension, as did a lot of other nouns which have now been taken over by the -s plural.

*Cild*, the next declension, has an interesting plural. In Old English the plural was *cildru.* This form developed into *childer*. Have you heard the word *childer*? If you live in the north of England, it is possible that you have heard it. The *-n* of children was not present in Old English. Children acquired a second plural ending, the -n that is used in the noun declension to the right exemplified by *oxan*. *Brethren* has a similar history. The use of *-n* as plural ending used to be popular. In the Early Modern English period one often finds examples such as *eyen*, *shoen, housen*, *treen*, and the first two of these can still be heard in Scottish English. Now, in the majority of dialects, they all take the *-s* plural ending. The only pure survivor of this declension is *oxen*.

The following declension, exemplified by *fot,* is characterised by the fact that it not only had inflections but also changed the vowel of its basic form. Today, that vowel change *foot/feet* is a mark of the plural, but in Old English note that it is also found in the dative singular and that not all plural forms had it. Only later did it become a distinctive marker of plurality. It survives in words such as feet, a distinctive marker of plurality. It survives in words such as *feet, geese, teeth, mice, lice and men* [Culpeper 2000].

Already in Old English there appeared a tendency for the unification of plural endings in the noun paradigm. This process was intensified in Early Middle English due to some factors the most powerful of which were the weakening of endings because of the reduction of unstressed vowels and the operation of analogy. In Middle English the number of plural inflexions was reduced to five basic types: -es, -en, -ø, -e, and the inner inflexion of the former Old English root-forms. Out of the wide diversity of Middle English plural endings the inflexion –es appeared to be the most clearly marked, phonetically stable and functionally dominant. It was shifted to other nouns historically of different stem-declensions. By the end of the Middle English period this inflexion had become the common plural inflexion of nouns in Midland and Northern dialects. In the 16th-17th centuries this plural endings became the standard literary norm [Євченко 2016 : 116].

Loan-words from other languages, if not fully assimilated, have kept the original plural forms, for example, phenomenon – phenomena, radius – radii. Some loan-words have two variant forms, for example, medium – media, mediums.

On the whole, the unification the plural endings in English is closely connected with the decay and ruin of the grammatical category of gender and with the modifications in the noun paradigm. The appearance of a unified type of the plural ending made the number distinctions in Modern English noun more vivid and clearly cut. The Modern English plural –es goes back to the Old English plural endings of the a-stem.

The result of the development of the grammatical category of case has been its. The Old English four-case system was reduced to a three-case system in Late Old English and in Middle English it was further simplified as a result of the action of two factors: changes in the formal structure of the noun paradigm that were caused and quickened by the reduction of unstressed vowels in inflections and changes in the semantic structure of cases [Євченко 2016 : 117].

In Old English, nouns used to have inflections which indicated the function or relationship of words to other words in the sentence; that is to say, these nouns had case endings. There were four main cases – nominative, accusative, genitive and dative – each signalling a different function:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Case* | *Typical grammatical functions* |
| nominative | the subject of the sentence (e.g. **Australia** beat England) |
| accusative | the direct object of a sentence (e.g. Australia beat **England**) |
| genitive | the possessor or source (e.g. Jonathan's book) |
| dative | the indirect object or recipient (e.g. I gave the librarian a book) |

An important point to note about today's English is that one can change grammatical functions simply by changing the word order. For example, by swapping the countries *England* and *Australia* we change what is the subject and what is the object. *Australia beat England* is not the same as *England beat Australia*. In Old English, case endings signalled the grammatical roles of nouns in sentences [Culpeper 2000].

Today, we rely much more on word order to help us work out grammatical function. Usually the subject comes first, followed by the verb, and then the other parts of the sentence such as the object. This pattern was common in Old English as well, but word order was generally more flexible. Let's take an example from the Text:

*Erest weron bugend bises landes brittes*

(first were inhabitants of this land Britons)

'The first inhabitants of this land were Britons'

Note that the verb *'were'* occurs much earlier in the Old English sentence than in the present-day translation. Today we would generally put the whole of the subject – *'the first inhabitants of this land'* – before the verb. This particular Old English example also illustrates the genitive case. Where today we would use the preposition of to indicate the relationship between the *'inhabitants*' (*bugend*) and 'this *land'*, in Old English they would use the genitive inflection -*es* (*Þises landes*). Generally, prepositions such as *of* were used less in Old English. It might be noted at this point that this particular inflection - the *-es* - gave rise to the apostrophe*-s* which we use today.

Word order and prepositions, are now being used to express some of the grammatical functions formerly achieved with case. The case that merits our particular attention is the genitive case, since it is from this that we get the *apostrophe-s.* The most common genitive singular marker was the *-es* inflection. This genitive inflection was extended to other nouns, just as the -as plural inflection was extended to nouns that originally marked the plural in other ways. In fact, these two inflections merged: by Middle English both were written *-es*. So, for example, OE *hundes* (genitive singular) and OE *hundas* (the plural) both became ME *houndes*. During Middle English virtually all nouns were reduced to two forms: one without *-es* to indicate a singular, and one with -*es* to indicate either a genitive singular or a plural. Most other inflections had died out.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Middle Grammatical | English function | Today's Grammatical | English function |
| hound(e) | singular | hound | singular |
| hound(e)s | genitive singular | hound's | genitive singular |
| hound(e)s | plural | hounds | plural |
| hound(e)s | genitive plural | hounds' | genitive plural |

This situation is not so very different from that of today. In speech, there are also two forms: so, hound has one form without [z] at the end and one with. The idea of using a written apostrophe before the *s* to identify a genitive singular was not adopted until the seventeenth century, and the idea of using it after the s to identify a genitive plural was not adopted until the eighteenth century. Today, there is quite a lot of confusion in actual usage.

On the whole, the Old English noun paradigm was greatly transformed in Middle English and the system of nominal categories can be said to have undergone the metamorphosis in its evolution.

**2. Changes in adjectives, pronouns, adverbs.**

The Old English **adjective** had rather a complicated system of grammatical forms which showed the grammatical agreement with the grammatical characteristics of the noun that the adjective modified. The grammatical forms of the adjective showed the grammatical categories of gender, number, case, degrees of comparison and the category which was called by prof. A. I. Smirnitsky the grammatical category of definiteness / indefiniteness and which was showen through strong and weak forms of the declension of the adjective. The weak/strong distinction in adjectives,characteristic of OE and still vestigial in ME, is no longer observed in ENE. In Middle English the inflectional endings of the adjective were strongly weakened through the reduction of unstressed vowels in final syllables and completely dropped out in the 12-19th centuries. Some adjectival inflections can still be met in the 14th century but in the 15th century the adjective finally lost all grammatical forms of agreement with the noun and became an uninflected part of speech [Євченко 2016 : 119].

The only change of the form that was left to it was the formation of the grammatical forms of the degrees of comparison that was shared by it with the adverb. By the beginning of the Early New English period, adjectives carried only comparative and superlative inflections ***(–er*** and ***–est*** respectively) but these degrees of comparison were also signalled by the respective use of ***more*** and ***most.*** Comparison of adjectives ismuch as in Present-day English, except that there is more frequent variation between the FREER/MORE FREE types, giving examples such as *perfecter* (where Modern English would have MORE PERFECT), *more sweet* (where Modern English would tend to have SWEETER). Sometimes the two methods of comparison can be combined, e.g. *the most unkindest cut of all* [Smith 1999].

With the loss of inflections in adjectives and nouns the agreement as a means of expressing syntactical relations in the noun-group lost its importance. This contributed much to the development of a more stable word order in the sentence.

Important changes happened in the **pronouns,** which are the most highly inflected part of speech in present-day English, thus preserving the earlier synthetic character of the language in a small way.

After ME some major changes affected the pronoun system. One was simple: it developed a new genitive, ***its***. The other was lengthy, complicated and still not fully understood – the singular *thou/thy/thee* paradigm was lost and *you* took on nominative and oblique functions for both numbers, while the old genitive plural ***your*** came to serve as both singular and plural.

***I*** came to be capitalized, not through any egotism, but only because lowercase i standing alone was likely to be overlooked, being the smallest letter of the alphabet [Smith 1999].

The system of possessive pronouns underwent some changes too. First of all, they lost agreement with the nouns they modify that was still slightly expressed in Middle English. The second person singular is still used, though is gradually on the decline, together with the personal pronouns. As in Middle English, the forms of the first and the second person possessive pronouns have variant forms *my/mine, thy/thine,* The full forms *(mine* and *thine)* were used with the nouns beginning with a vowel, and *my* and *thy -* those that began with a consonant sound. The forms *mine* and *thine* may also be used absolutely. In the ENE period, the distribution became grammatical: *my* and *thy* functioned as possessive pronouns in attributive use (that is, they modified the noun that names the object which is ‘possessed’) and *mine/thine* as possessives in nominal use [Верба 2012].

**Adverbs.** It is commonly believed that changes in the system of the adverb led to the appearance of a new dominant regular adverb-forming suffix in Middle English when the Old English suffix ***–e*** was gradually superseded by the suffix –***ly***. Old English adverbs were regularly formed from adjectives with the help of suffix –e, for example, OE dēope *deeply* from OE dēop *deep*, OE dēoplīce *deeply, profoundly* from OE dēoplīc *deep*. The traditional explanation that was firstly given by the famous scholar Henry Sweet suggests that numerous OE formations like OE dēoplīce favoured the consideration that –līce was an independent adverb-forming equivalent to –e so that already in OE there appeared some adverbs endings in the suffix –līce that had no parallel adjectival formations, for example, OE holdlīce *faithfully*, hwætlīce *quickly*.

In general, ENE **adverbs** follow the same patterns as in PDE. One slight difference from PDE practice is the occurrence of forms which are identical in form with the adjective, e.g. ‘*Tis Noble spoken* IT IS NOBLY SPOKEN. Such forms derive from analogy with those adverbs which ended in *-e* in OE, e.g. *fæste* FIRMLY (cf. PDE FAST in STAND FAST, etc.). Another difference between Eerly New English and PDE is the wide range of intensifying adverbs in use, e.g. *sore*, *right, passing,* where PDE would use VERY [Smith J. 1999].

**3. Changes in the system of English verb.**

As with nouns, verbs have experienced a dramatic loss of inflections. This has been counter-balanced by a rise in the use of auxiliary verbs.

Why is it that to form the past tense of the verb walk we add -ed, whereas to form the past of the verb drink we change the vowel so that we get drank? This is one of a number of present-day irregularities in English that can be explained by looking at the development of English. As with nouns, we need to look at how verbs signal their grammatical function, and how this has changed over time.

Table 1gives an idea of how present-tense verb inflections have changed from Old English to the present day. Where alternative forms exist, they are given in parentheses. An important point to note is that - as with nouns – the general process over time has been one of simplification, with the gradual erosion of inflections. In fact, the situation used to be even more complicated, because there was also a set of inflections for the past Table 1 Old English present tense verb inflections

Number Person Today Early Middle Old

Modern English English

English (Midlands)

Singular 1st I walk sit thanke drife

2nd you walk sittest thankest drifest

3rd he/she/it walks sitteth (-s) thanketh (-es) drifeð

Plural 1st we walk sit thanke(n) (-es) drifað

2nd you walk sit thanke(n) (-es) drifað

3rd they walk sit thanke(n) (-es) drifað

Let's start by focusing on the one remaining inflection for person in today's English, the -s of the third person singular. In fact, in some varieties of today's English - some dialects of East Anglia, for example – even this inflection has been lost. If you look down the line to the far right, you'll see that in Old English there was no -**s**, but instead an **eð**. (Remember that the **ð** character was later replaced by **th**). In Middle English we get both forms. Note that here the Midlands dialect is represented. (Chaucer wrote in what was essentially the East Midlands dialect.) Why did the *-s* suddenly appear as an option in the Middle English Midlands dialect? To answer this we must look further north. The Scandinavians who settled in the north had provided English with the **-s** inflection. Over time this spread southwards through the rest of the country. By the Early Modern English period the -**eth** inflection was in serious decline, and came to be seen as rather archaic. It survived longest in the words hath and doth which are still found in the eighteenth century.

Let's turn to tense. We noted earlier that the regular way of forming the past tense in English is simply to add the inflection -**ed**. However, there are a number of irregular verbs. English, in common with other Germanic languages, divides its verbs into two groups - so-called weak and strong – according to how they form their past tense and past participle. Here I've only shown inflections for the present tense.

Present Past Past participle

kiss kissed kissed

fill filled filled

build built built

hear heard heard

The vast majority of verbs in English form their past and past participles in this way.

Strong verbs do not add an inflection, but change the vowel of their base form:

Present Past Past participle

ride rode ridden

speak spoke spoken

see saw seen

drink drank drunk

All strong-verb past participles originally had the inflection **-en** at the end and also **ge**- at the beginning. So, in Old English the past participle of the verb *ride* is *geriden*.

REGULARISATION

One should bear in mind here that not all speakers of English make the same distinctions between the past and past participle, often using one form for both. Thus, today many speakers of English use **done** as both past participle (*It was done well*) and simple past (*She done well*), and many are using drunk for the simple past (e.g. She drunk the milk). These variations reflect a general process of ***Regularisation*** or simplification of verb forms.

The most important change to these weak and strong verb patterns is the conversion of the minority of strong verbs to the weak pattern. According to one estimate, five-sixths of the 360 or so strong verbs have changed. At various points in time, you can find both strong and weak forms of a verb. Thus, in the sixteenth century you can find both *laughed - low*, *crept - crope*, *helped - holp*.

**Auxiliary verbs. Main verbs**

It's worth noting that all new verbs follow the -ed weak pattern. In other words, if we want to indicate the past tense or make a participle, we put an ***-ed*** on the end of the word. For example, a British television advertisement for the soft drink Tango converts the brand name into a verb and makes it a past participle by adding ***-ed***: *You know when you've been tangoe'd.*

Let's turn to AUXILIARY VERBS. What are auxiliary verbs? Let's introduce a distinction between MAIN VERBS and auxiliary verbs by way of some examples:

(1) I *may* drive

(2) I *do* not drive

(3) It *is being* driven

It *has been being* driven

In each case the main verb is drive. The italicised auxiliary verbs help the main verb in some particular way; they perform functions that in other languages might be performed by inflections. I'm going to focus on the use of do as an auxiliary verb, as illustrated in example (2). However, a general point to note about auxiliary verbs is that the further you go back in time the less likely you are to find a series of auxiliary verbs. In fact, neither of the examples in (3) above existed in Early Modern English, and the final (admittedly rare) example ***It has been being driven*** is a twentieth-century development.

The development of the auxiliary verb do represents one of the most important changes in the English language. Today, it can be used as an auxiliary in a variety of ways: for emphasis in statements (e.g. *They do look for trouble*), to form a negative statement (e.g. *They do not look for trouble*), and in questions (e.g. *Do they look for trouble*?).

In Old English the use of *do* was somewhat different. As a main verb, it seems to have originally meant 'to put or place something somewhere': *'ðæt mon his sweord doo ofer his hype*' (= literally, that man his sword places over his *hip*). Indeed, *do* can still be used as a main verb today with the sense of '*putting*', '*giving*' or '*performing*'. Consider: *to do to death*, *to do someone credit*, *to do some work*. It was not until Middle English that it developed as a common auxiliary.

From Late Middle English (fourteenth to fifteenth centuries) ***do*** became popular as a '*dummy*' auxiliary, that is to say, an empty or meaningless auxiliary. It was particularly popular in Early Modern English. Sometimes do was used somewhat like today to add emphasis in statements, but often it served no particular function.

If you interpret every example of *do* in Shakespeare as adding emphasis, you will be misreading Shakespeare, particularly as Shakespeare and other literary writers often used *do* if they needed an extra syllable to make up a metrical line.

The typical way of forming questions in Old English had been to reverse the normal subject-verb order. This question-forming method was still used in Early Modern English. Thus, Shakespeare could write *'Spake you of Caesar*?' (Antony and Cleopatra III.ii.ll), reversing the normal order for a statement: *You (subject) spake (verb) of Caesa*r. But by Shakespeare's time questions were being formed simply by placing *do* before the subject: *'Do you see this*?' (Hamlet IV.v.197).

In Old English, negative statements could be formed by supplying the word ***ne*** (usually before the verb): *'he ne iaf him al'* (Peterborough Chronicle, 1140) (= *he did not give him all*). They could also be formed by adding ***ne*** before the verb and ***not*** after: *We con ic noht singan'* (King Ælfred, Csedmon's Hymn, ninth century) (= *I know not [how] to sing*).

In Middle English *ne* ceased to be used, leaving just not: *'they were not gylt*y' (William Soper, late fifteenth century). This method of forming negative statements carries on well into the Early Modern English period. But at this time we also find *do* being used. So, in John Bunyan's The Pilgrim's Progress (1678) we can read both *'I care not what I meet*' and *'I did not put the question to thee*.'

We have seen some radical changes in English in the way inflections of words have been lost. But why did English lose them English underwent a phonological change leading to a grammatical change: the inflections at the ends of many words ceased to be stressed, and were thus liable to blend with other inflections and disappear altogether (since people could not hear them so well). Furthermore, given that British English has experienced contact with an array of different languages (i.e. Celtic, Scandinavian and French), there may well have been pressure for regularisation, in order to make it easier for people to communicate. Outside Britain, English has come into contact with many languages, creating yet further pressure to simplify the inflectional system.

**SUMMARY**

The most dramatic change in English grammar has been the loss of inflections. English has moved from being an inflectional language to being an isolating language.

• The inflectional complexity of the past has its legacy in irregular plurals (e.g. sheep) and in the apostrophe-s of written English.

• Today, there is much confusion over the usage of the apostrophe-s.

• Today, personal pronouns are almost as complex as they were in Old English. Second-person pronouns used to be more complex, and in the Early Modern English period were used to signal social information [Culpeper 2000].

***Lecture 5***

***CHANGES IN THE ENGLISH SYNTAX***

**1. Old English Syntax**

**1.1. The Phrase. Noun, Adjective and Verb Patterns.**

**1.2. The Simple Sentence.**

**1.3. Compound and Complex Sentences. Connectives.**

**1.4. Word Order.**

**2. Middle English Syntax**

**3. Early New English Syntax**

1**. Old English Syntax.**

1**.1. The Phrase. Noun, Adjective and Verb Patterns.** The syntactic structure of OE was determined by two major conditions: the nature of OE morphology and the relations between the spoken and the written forms of the language.

OE was largely a synthetic language; it possessed a system of grammatical forms which could indicate the connection between words; consequently, the functional load of syntactic ways of word connection was relatively small. It was primarily a spoken language, therefore the written forms of the language resembled oral speech – unless the texts were literal translations from Latin or poems with stereotyped constructions. Consequently, the syntax of the sentence was relatively simple; coordination of clauses prevailed over subordination; complicated syntactical constructions were rare.

The syntactic structure of a language can be described at the level of the phrase and at the level of the sentence. In OE texts we find a variety of word phrases (also: word groups or patterns). OE noun patterns, adjective patterns and verb patterns had certain specific features which are important to note in view of their later changes.

A noun pattern consisted of a noun as the head word and pronouns, adjectives (including verbal adjectives, or participles), numerals and other nouns as determiners and attributes. Most noun modifiers agreed with the noun in gender, number and case, e.g.:

on Þ*sem oÞrum Þrim* dasum ... “in those other three days” — Dat. Pl. Masc.

Ohthere sæde his hlāforde, *Ælfrede cynin*Ʒ*e* “Ohthere said to his lord, king Alfred” — the noun in apposition is in the Dat. sg like the head noun.

Nouns which served as attributes to other nouns usually had the form of the Gen. case: *hwāles bān, dēora fell* “whale's bone, deer's fell”. Some numerals governed the nouns they modified so that formally the relations were reversed: *tamra dēora ... syx hand* “six hundred tame deer”; *twenti*Ʒ *scēapa* 'twenty sheep' *(dēora, scēapa*— Gen. pl).

An adjective pattern could include adverbs, nouns or pronouns in one of the oblique cases with or without prepositions, and infinitives, e. g.:

*him* wæs *manna* Þearf – “he was in need of men”

Verb patterns included a great variety of dependant components: nouns and pronouns in oblique cases with or without prepositions, adverbs, infinitives and participles, e.g.:

brinƷ Þ*a Þins* “bring those things” (Acc.)

Hē ... sealde *hit* hys *māder* “he ... gave it to his mother” (Acc., Dat.)

Infinitives and participles were often used in verb phrases with verbs of incomplete predication (some of these phrases were later transformed into analytical forms): *mihtest findan* “might find”, *hē wolde fandian* 'he wanted to find out.

**1.2. The Simple Sentence.** The following examples show the structure of the simple sentence in OE, its principal and the secondary parts:

Sōðlice sum *mann hæfde* twēƷen suna *(mann* — subject, *hæfde* — Simple Predicate) “truly a certain man had two sons”. Predicates could also be compound: verbal modal and nominal:

Hwæðre Þū *meaht sin*Ʒ*an “*nevertheless you can sing”. Hē *was* swŷðe spediƷ *mann* “he was a very rich man”.

The secondary parts of the sentence are seen in the same examples: *twe*Ʒ*en suna* “two sons” – Direct Object with an attribute, *spediƷ* “rich” *-* attribute. In the examples of verb and noun patterns above we can find other secondary parts of the sentence: indirect and prepositional objects, adverbial modifiers and appositions: *hys mēder* “to his mother” (Indirect Object), *tō his suna* “to his son” (Prep. Object), *his hlāforde,Ælfrede cyninƷe* “his lord king Alfred” (apposition), etc. The structure of the OE sentence can be described in terms of Mod E syntactic analysis, for the sentence was made up of the same parts, except that those parts were usually simpler.

The connection between the parts of the sentence was shown by the form of the words as they had formal markers for gender, case, number and person. As compared with later periods agreement and government played an important role in the word phrase and in the sentence. Accordingly the place of the word in relation to other words was of secondary importance and the order of words was relatively free.

The presence of formal markers made it possible to miss out some parts of the sentence which would be obligatory in an English sentence now. For example, the subject is not repeated but the form of the predicate shows that the action is performed by the same person as the preceding action.

The formal subject was lacking in many impersonal sentences (though it was present in others); cf.:

NorÞan snȳwde (it snowed in the North);

him Þūhte (it seemed to him).

One of the conspicuous features of OE syntax was multiple negation wiihin a single sentence or clause. The most common negative particle was *ne,* which was placed before the verb; it was often accompanied by other negative words, mostly *nāht* or *nōht* (which had developed from *ne* plus ā*-wiht* 'no thing'). These words reinforced the meaning of negation.

*Ne* con īc *nōht* sinƷan... īc *nāht* sinƷan *ne* cūðe “I cannot sing” (lit. "cannot sing nothing"), “I could not sing” *(noht* was later shortened to *not,* a new negative particle).

Another peculiarity of OE negation was that the particle *ne* could be attached to some verbs, pronouns and adverbs to form single words:

:..hē ne mihte *nān* ÞinƷ sesēon “he could not see anything” *(nān* from *ne ān* 'not one')

hit *nā* būton gewinne *næs* “it was never without war” *(næs* from *ne wæs* 'no was'; NE *none, never, neither* are traces of such forms).

**1.3**. **Compound and Complex Sentences. Connectives.**

Compound and complex sentences existed in the Old English language. Both asyndetic and syndetic sentences are found in OE texts.

The asyndetic type: OE *fand Þā Þǣr-inne æÞelinƷa Ʒedriht swefan æfter symble; sorƷe ne cūÞon, wonsceaft wera –* ModE (he) found in there a troop of warriors sleeping after the feast; they did not know any trouble, misery of men.

In a syndeton compound sentence clauses may be connected by one of the conjunctions: *and* (and), *oÞÞe* (or), *ac* (but): OE *wǣs hē, sē mon, in weoruldhāde Ʒeseted oÞ Þā tide, Þē he wǣs Ʒelēfedre yldo, ond hē næfre næniƷ lēoÞ Ʒeleornade* – ModE he, that man, was a layman until he reached an eldery age, and he had never learned any song.

Types of subordinate clases

* Subject clauses;
* Object clauses (conjunction *Þæt* or *Ʒif*; interrogative pronoun or adverb; asyndetically);
* Attributive clauses (pronouns *Þe, sē, sēÞe*);
* Adverbial clauses (conjunctions *Þǣr, Þā, Þonne, oÞÞæt, for, ÞēahÞу* and others)

Some clauses are regarded as intermediate between coordinate and subordinate: they are joined asyndetically and their status is not clear: OE *Þā wæs sum consul, Beothius wæs hāten* – Mod Eng There was then a consul, Boethius was called.

**1.4. Word Order.**

1) All nouns (or rather, noun phrases) were **Case-marked**:

Þæt wīf Ʒeaf Þǣm menn Þā bōc.

*the.NOM wife.NOM gave the.DAT man.DAT the.ACC book.ACC*

“The wife gave the book to the man”.

2) Possibly due to rich noun and verb morphology, **word order was freer** in OE:

a. Þæt wīf Ʒ**eaf** Þā bōc Þǣm menn.

b. Þǣm menn Ʒ**eaf** Þæt wīf Þā bōc.

c. Þā bōc Ʒ**eaf** Þæt wīf Þǣm menn.

3) However, it was not totally free — for example, **the (finite, inflected) verb had to be in a specific**

4) NPs were similar to NE, but **adjectives or demonstratives *could* follow the noun**:

micle meras fersce (‘big fresh lakes’, literally: *big lakes fresh*)

To get an idea of **OE syntax in context** (full sentence), take a look at some excerpts from Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*:

Breoton is ƷarsecƷ**es** ealond, Þæt wæs iu Ʒeara Albion **haten**.

*Britain is ocean’s island that was formerly yore Albion called*

“Britain is an island of the ocean, which was called Albion in days of yore”

Hit is weliƷ, Þis ealond, on wæstm**um** and on treow**um** misenlicr**a** cynn**a**,

*it is wealthy this island in fruits and in trees many kinds*

and hit is Ʒescræpe on læsw**e** sceap**a** and neat**a**,

*and it is suitable for pasture sheep and cows*

and on sum**um** stow**um** win Ʒeard**es** Ʒ**rowa**ð.

*and in some places vineyards grow*

“It is wealthy, this island, in fruits and trees of many kinds, and it is suitable for the pasturing of sheep and cattle, and in some places, vineyards grow”.’

For OE syntax, there are **five principle properties** to note:

1. *The verb is last in* ***subordinate clauses*** *(“Verb Final” indicating original OV order):*

Þa ic Þa Þis eall Ʒ**emunde**…

*when I then this all remembered*

“Then when I remember all this…”

2. *The verb comes second in* ***main clauses*** *(“Verb Second” / V2 where V moves quite high):*

…Þa Ʒ**emunde** ic eac hu ic Ʒeseah…

*then remembered I also how I saw*

“… then I also remember how I saw…”

(from King Alfred’s preface to his translation of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care*)

In this complex sentence, you see **both phenomena** side by side on one line:

Þa hi eten **hæfdon**, hi **wunedon** ðær.

*when they eaten.PART had.3PL they stayed.3PL there*

“When they had eaten, they stayed there”.

3. *The verb also comes second in* ***direct questions*** *(in other words: no* do*-support as in NE)*

Hwæt **sæ**Ʒ**est Þ**u, yrtlinƷc?

*what sayest thou earthling*

“What do you say, ploughman?”

(from Ælfric’s *Colloquy*)

4. *No* ***expletive/pleonastic* it *or* there** *(“missing” in contexts where it’s obligatory in NE):*

Ʒif **Ø** on sæternesdæƷ Ʒedunrat…

*if (EXPL) on Saturday thunders*

“If it thunders on Saturday…”

5. *OE had* ***negative concord*** *(semantic negation expressed by negating all possible elements):*

**Ne** bid ðær **nænig** ealo Ʒebrowen mid Estum.

*not is there no ale brewed among Estonians*

“There is no ale brewed among the Estonians.”

(cf. non-standard NE ‘*There ain’t no able brewed among the Estonians.*’)

Note that these syntactic properties are all found in Early Middle English (EME), but none of them exists in standard varieties of Modern English (NE). **Look across NE:**

1-4 are typical of **West Germanic**, found in Dutch, German, and their dialects

5 is found in **West Flemish** (a dialect of Dutch) and other (West Germanic) dialects.

***Impersonal Construction***

We have already seen the **absence of expletives**. Another instance is shown below:

NorÞan sniwde **Ø**.

*from.the.north snowed (EXPL)*

“From the north it snowed”.

(from ‘The Seafarer’ of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*)

Beyond weather-verbs, however, his is a more general property of **impersonal verbs –** these are **verbs whose subject (if there is one) does not appear in nominative**:

a. **Him** ofhreow Þæ***s mannes***.

*Him (DAT) pitied (3SG) the (GEN) man (GEN)*

“He experienced pity because of the man”.

(from Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*)

b. Siddan **him** hinƷrode. *[impersonal with implicit cause]*

*afterwards him (DAT) hungered (3SG)*

“Afterwards he hungered”.

(from Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*)

But the verb *ofhreowan* was used both **impersonally** (a) and **transitively** (b):

a. Þa ofhreow **Þam munece** Þæs hreoflian ***mæ***Ʒ***enleast***.

*then pitied (3SG) the (DAT) monk (DAT) the (GEN) leper (GEN) feebleness (NOM)*

“Then the monk pitied the leper’s feebleness”

(from Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*)

b. …**se mæssepreost Þæ*s mannes*** ofhreow.

*The (NOM) priest (NOM) the (GEN) man (GEN) pitied (3SG)*

‘…the priest felt pity for the man.’

(from Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints*).

**2. Middle English syntax.** The structure of the sentence retains the features characteristic of the Old English sentence. Word order is still rather liberal, and in some cases influenced by the French language. Post position of the adjective which is characteristic for the French penetrates into the English syntax, especially when the adjective is borrowed from French.

The preference for **VO** word-order evident in the OE corpus continued into the ME period, as did the comparatively less frequent use of **OV** structures. If the object of a sentence was a pronoun, word order was typically **OV**:

Yef thou me zayst

**S O V**

*if you say to me* .

Subject-verb inversion (in structures with basic VO order) occurred in imperatives and after adverbs of place, time and manner:

Imperatives:

Clothe ye him, brynge ye a fat calf . . .

**V S O / V S O**

*(you) clothe him and (you) bring a fatted calf*

After adverbs of place, time, manner

here lieth counforte

**V S**

*here lies comfort*

Another ME structural feature we should note concerns the placement of **modifying adjectives** in noun phrases. Adjectives tended to **pre-modify** nouns (as they do in modern English), but in ME verse they sometimes followed them, as in *sceld deore* “beloved shield”. In cases where more than one adjective was used in a noun phrase, one would typically function as a pre-modifier, and the other (or others) as post-modifiers, as in *he milde man was and softe and god* (“he was a gentle man and soft and good”).

The ties between the words in the sentence remain basically the same – agreement, though it lost some positions as compared with the Old English. Now the predicate of the sentence agrees with the subject, repeating the person and the number of the noun or pronoun. As the forms of the verb by this time have acquired several homonymic endings this agreement is especially prominent with the third and the second person singular. Notably, the ending of the second person is often blended with the pronoun thow/thou.

As the category of number is still preserved (though the ending of the plural

-e is fairly indistinct) adjectives and pronouns – partly – agree in number with the nouns they modify.

Middle English impersonal sentences still are used without formal subject. But at the same time the first instances of the use of the formal subject it are already registered.

The ME corpus also shows an increasing use of *to be* as the auxiliary verb in passive constructions, as well as the use of *by* to introduce the agent of the action (as in modern *my car* ***was*** *destroyed* ***by*** *my little brother*). Alternative structures did, however, exist: *worthe* (“to be”, “to come to be”), as in *blessed thou worth* (“may you be blessed”), was used, for example, until the fourteenth century. In early ME, an indefinite pronoun *men* (in unstressed form *me*) was often used to express the passive, as in *me henged up bi the fet and smoked heom mid ful smoke* (“they were hung up by the feet and smoked with foul smoke”).

The verb *do* also began to develop a variety of functions in ME. It retained its OE function as a “substitute verb” in sentences such as modern *Mark loves watching TV and I* ***do*** *too*. In some ME dialects, *do* also meant “make” or “have” – a usage still retained in phrases such as *let’s do lunch*. The past tense form *did* was sometimes used to signal past tense (as in *did carye* ‘carried’), a construction which was used productively in Early Modern English. Its other uses, such as an auxiliary in negative statements and questions, which have become part of modern English usage (as in *they don’t eat liver* and *do you hate cats too?*), had begun to appear, but would not become a consistent part of usage until approximately the seventeenth century.

Finally, as the importance of prepositions grew in ME (as the synthetic nature of English diminished), new creations joined this word class. Many emerged through semantic change, as in the case of *among*, whose OE antecedent Ʒ*emon*Ʒ meant “in a crowd”, or through compounding (as in *in+to*) and borrowing, as in the case of *till* (borrowed from Old Norse) and *except*, from Latin.

In subordinate clauses, nouns used as objects might also precede verbs: *“And we, thet . . . habbeth Cristendom underfonge,”* (“And we, that . . . have Christian salvation received”). In the frequently occurring impersonal constructions of Middle English, the object regularly preceded the verb: *me mette ((it) to me dreamed /* I dreamed); me thoughte ‘((it) to me seemed).

Negation in the Middle English sentence in expressed in the same way it was in Old English. Negative particle *ne* is used, like in Old English. The same particle merged with some words and such formations as *nought, nat* appeared – first they were equivalent to pronoun *nothing* but finally acquired the function of a new negative particle *not*. Other negative words were *noone* (none), *nevere* (never), *nolde* (did not want), *nadde* (had not), *nas* (was not). One predicate group could contain several negative words (multiple negation was quite common).

**3. Early New English syntax**.

Word-order patterns in Early New English are much like those in ME and in PDE, contrasting with OE usage. The usual order of elements, in both main and subordinate clauses, is SP (i.e. subject-predicator), where the predicator immediately follows the subject, e.g.:

*This Scul has laine in the earth three & twenty years*

*which he would call abhominable.*

When a complex verb phrase is employed, the lexical element can still occasionally be separated from the auxiliary, e.g.:

*Whose Ransomes, did the generall Coffers fill*

*Which he did thrice refuse.*

“Predicator-subject” word order is still found fairly frequently in ENE, especially when the clause begins with an adverbial, e.g.:

*Heere hung those lipps*

*then am I the Prisoner.*

As in PDE, PS-order appears in questions, e.g. *is he dead*?, and, also as in PDE, with the DO-auxiliary, e.g:

*Did this in Cӕsar seeme Ambitious?*

Of course, these prototypical patterns of word-order may be departed from for stylistic reasons, e.g.:

*Plots haue I laide* (with initial direct object).

Like OE and ME, ENE has a range of different clause-types, both coordinated and subordinated. As in ME, clause-types in ENE are no longer generally distinguished by element-order.

**Coordinating conjunctions** in ENE include *and, but,* etc.

As in OE and ME, in ENE there is a range of **subordinating conjunctions**. As in ME, the forms of these conjunctions are much as in PDE, except that the particle *that* often appears after *if, when,* etc., e.g.:

*When that the poore haue cry’de*

The choice of relative pronoun is determined in ENE, as in PDE, by a range of quite complex factors. Another usage is to omit the relative pronoun altogether, e.g.:

*The labour we delight in, Physicks paine (*THE LABOUR (WHICH) WE ARE PLEASED TO DO IS A CURE FOR PAIN)

*heere’s a night pitties neither Wisemen, nor Fooles (*HERE IS ANIGHT (WHICH) PITIES NEITHER WISE MEN NOR FOOLS)

Constructions such as *The labour we delight*…still occur in PDE; constructions such as *heere’s a night*…, where the omitted relative pronoun occupies the subject position within the relative clause, are no longer found. Both constructions are of course found in ME.

Relative clauses can frequently be separated from the phrases they modify, e.g.:

*the Sword is out/That must destroy thee (*THE SWORD WHICH MUST DESTROY YOU IS DRAWN).

Other clause types, e.g. **adverbial, comparative,** follow broadly the same pattern as in PDE, with some minor variations in usage.

The **impersonal construction** is still in use in EModE, but has become much restricted in use in comparison with ME.

*Me thinkes there is much reason in his sayings.*

**Negation** was usually expressed either by placing *not* after the finite verb *(I know not)* or between *do* and the finite verb (*You do not giue);* the negating particle could also be suffixed to auxiliaries such as *can,* e.g.:

*since I cannot proue a Louer.*

Multiple negation is still occasionally found in Shakespeare’s writings, e.g.:

*I cannot goe no further (*I CANNOT GO ANY FURTHER), but it is becoming rarer. There is evidence that the PDE abbreviated negative auxiliaries DON’T, WON’T, CAN’T etc. were in existence in speech in Shakespeare’s time.

**SUMMARY**

Syntactic change differs from lexical change in at least two important ways. First, it generally unfolds much more slowly, sometimes taking hundreds of years to run its course to completion, and secondly, it tends to proceed below the threshold of speakers' conscious awareness, which makes impressionistic or introspection-based statements on ongoing changes in English grammar notoriously unreliable. A third difficulty in pinning down syntactic change in present-day English is that a rather small number of alleged syntactic innovations are strongly stigmatised.

When it comes to analysing syntactic change, there are two approaches. Where the focus is on the diachronic development of grammars as decontextualised linguistic systems, syntactic change is often seen as an abrupt or discrete alteration of structures, rules and constraints. But where the starting point for the analysis of historical change is the study of recorded performance data in their linguistic and social context – as, for example, in grammaticalisation theory (Hopper/ Traugott, 2003) or the budding field of historical sociolinguistics (cf. Nevalainen/ Raumolin-Brunberg, 2003) – the picture that emerges is one of gradual evolution rather than abrupt change. Syntactic changes are seen as embedded in a context where semantic, pragmatic and sociolinguistic factors assume roles as determinants of change.

A typical list of changes suspected to be going on in present-day standard English is the following one, which is largely based on Barber (1964, p.130-144):

a. a tendency to regularise irregular morphology (e.g. dreamt → dreamed)

b. revival of the "mandative" subjunctive, probably inspired by formal US usage (we demand that she take part in the meeting)

c. elimination of shall as a future marker in the first person

d. development of new, auxiliary-like uses of certain lexical verbs (e.g. get, want – cf., e.g., The way you look, you wanna / want to see a doctor soon)

e. extension of the progressive to new constructions, e.g. modal, present perfect and past perfect passive progressive (the road would not be being built/ has not been being built/ had not been being built before the general elections)

f. increase in the number and types of multi-word verbs (phrasal verbs, have/take/give a ride, etc.)

g. placement of frequency adverbs before auxiliary verbs (even if no emphasis is intended – I never have said so)

h. do-support for have (have you any money? and no, I haven't any money Æ do you have/ have you got any money? and no, I don't have any money/ haven't got any money)

i. demise of the inflected form whom

j. increasing use of less instead of fewer with countable nouns (e.g. less people)

k. spread of the s-genitive to non-human nouns (the book's cover).

One factor intrinsic to the functioning of any language at any time is grammaticalisation – which, as we saw in the cases of the progressive and the semi-modals, may take centuries to come to full fruition. A second factor is socio-cultural, and hence more specific to the social context of English in the 20th century: colloquialisation, or the tendency for written language to adopt features associated with spoken language. There are strong indications that such a process has been at work in the written language for centuries [Mair, Leech 2006].

***Lecture 6***

***CHANGES IN THE ENGLISH VOCABULARY***

**1. Borrowing words.**

**2. New words from old. Word-formation.**

**3. Changing meanings.**

One of the most dramatic changes in the English language has been the expansion of vocabulary. In particular, this has been achieved by importing words from other languages.

The extract below is from the BBC comedy series *Yes Prime Minister,* whose principal characters are the government minister James Hacker and the civil servant Sir Humphrey. In his diary, Hacker recalls the time when Humphrey told him that he was going to move to another department:

*Humphrey had said that 'the relationship, which I might tentatively venture to aver has not been without a degree of reciprocal utility and even perhaps occasional gratification, is approaching the point of irreversible bifurcation and, to put it briefly, is in the propinquity of its ultimate regrettable termination'.*

*I asked him if he would be so kind as to summarise what he's just said in words of one syllable. He nodded in sad acquiescence. 'I'm on my way out', he explained.*

(J. Lynn and A. Jay, *The Complete Yes Prime Minister,*

(London: BBC, 1989) p. 16)

Sir Humphrey uses a mysterious bureaucratic language to disguise the indiscretions of government and defuse any moments of potential embarrassment. Hacker is a relatively straightforward person who needs things to be put in simple language. It is almost as if they speak two different languages.

There is a contrast between the loftiness of Sir Humphrey's first utterance and the mundane tone conveyed by the vocabulary of his final speech. This, as you will have discovered, can be explained by noticing that the two sets of words differ in their origin: the majority of the first set comes from Latin or French; the second set is part of the Anglo-Saxon word stock of Old English, and as such it is Germanic. In the course of this unit you will find out about the different sources of our vocabulary, and about the different associations words of different origin have acquired.

Let's begin a brief history of English borrowing by noting that even before the Angles, Saxons and Jutes had arrived in England bringing their Germanic dialects that gave rise to English, they had borrowed some Latin vocabulary. However, as far as we know, this amounted to only a few dozen words (e.g. *wall, street, cheap, wine),* and thus Old English vocabulary was overwhelmingly Germanic.

Thus, it contained very few LOANWORDS, contrasting with the situation in Middle English and Modern English, where loans proliferate.

One estimate is that 3 per cent of Old English vocabulary consisted of loanwords, whereas 70 per cent of today's English consists of loanwords. This difference is of great importance in explaining how the English language has changed over time.

Many Germanic Anglo-Saxon words have survived into Modern English with very little change in either form or meaning (e.g. *god, gold, hand, land, under, winter, word).* The majority of the few loanwords in Old English were from Latin. This is no great surprise, given the fact that religious texts were written in Latin and the early Christian missionaries were influential in spreading literacy. They introduced some 450 Latin words into the language, mainly to do with the Church (e.g. *altar, angel, cleric, nun, temple, psalm, city, master, demon).*

The Scandinavian Vikings invaded and settled in England from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. Anglo-Saxon English and the Scandinavian languages (Old Norse and Old Danish) were all Germanic languages, and to some extent mutually comprehensible.

This close similarity made it easy to adopt words into all areas of vocabulary (e.g. *are, die, leg, want, get, both, give, same, they, them, their),* not just words with specialised content, such as religious vocabulary. About 1,800 words of Scandinavian origin have survived into present day English, including very common words. The word *are,* for example, became part of the verb *to be* - the most common verb in English.

After the Norman invasion of 1066, French became the official language of law and administration. The ruling classes spoke French, and popularised French dress, cooking and etiquette. Even when English displaced French after about 200 years, French culture exerted a powerful influence. Over 10,000 words were adopted from French during the Middle English period (e.g. *parliament, baron, manor, noble, liberty, government, arrest, judge, jury, prison, beef, lettuce, mutton, pork, sausage, dress, jewel, cloak, virtue, art, beauty, romance).* In many cases Old English words were replaced by French ones (e.g. OE *stow -* Fr. *place,* OE *wyrd -* Fr. *fortune).* Where both survived, meanings would drift apart. Consider the pairs OE *house -* Fr. *mansion,* OE *bloody -* Fr. *sanguine.*

An enormous number of the French borrowings had originally come from Latin. There were also several thousand direct Latin borrowings into English, particularly towards the end of the Middle English period. Most of these were from areas such as religion, science, law and literature (e.g. *scripture, client, conviction, library, scribe, dissolve, quadrant, medicine, ulcer).* However, it was not until the Renaissance in the sixteenth century that borrowing from Latin took off. The Renaissance saw the development of new concepts and techniques, the flowering of the arts and sciences, as well as further exploration of the world. Much of this took place on the continent of Europe. Learning was given a boost by printing, and books became widely available. However, many literary, scientific and religious texts were in Latin, since Latin was the language of scholarship and scholarly literature. To make these texts more widely available, people began to translate them into English, often using a Latin word in the translation when no good English equivalent could be found. The upshot of these developments was that words from many languages were adopted into English, but especially words from Latin and the Romance languages French, Italian and Spanish. Around 13,000 new loanwords entered the language in the sixteenth century alone, and of these some 7,000 were from Latin.

Examples of Latin loanwords include *absurdity, benefit, exist, exaggerate, external, obstruction, relaxation, relevant, vacuum, virus, excursion, fact, impersonal, expectation, exact* and *eradicate.*

More recently, there seems to be a general decline in borrowing from Classical and Romance languages. French borrowing has been in decline since the Middle English period, and Latin since the end of the seventeenth century. Why is this? One possible reason is that these languages experienced a decline in prestige: towards the end of the Middle English period, the upper classes ceased to speak French, and English became the language of administration; towards the end of the seventeenth century, English took over from Latin as the language of scholarship. Another reason is that English has gone global: it comes into contact with languages right round the world.

As a consequence, English is now borrowing from languages which have not been traditional sources for vocabulary. For example, one study suggests that Japanese accounts for 8 per cent of borrowings in the last fifty years, and African languages for 6 per cent. A further reason is that although borrowing used to be an important source for new words, it is now of relatively minor importance, accounting for around 4 per cent of new words. Nowadays most new words are formed from the resources we already have, by compounding words, for example.

Today, it is clear that Germanic, French or Latin vocabulary has acquired a distinctive flavour of its own, and is used in different contexts and for different purposes.

The more common words of English, particularly the words of speech, tend to be Germanic in origin, whereas Latin words tend to be rare and appear more often in written language. Germanic words are more likely to be used in informal, private contexts, whereas Latin words are the words of formal, public occasions. Germanic words tend to be simple, often words of one syllable, whereas Latin words are usually polysyllabic. Concrete things are often referred to by words of Germanic origin (e.g. *wood, earth, house, pot, pan, knife, fork),* whilst Latin words tend to refer to more abstract concepts. Germanic words often express some kind of attitude, whether negative or positive, whereas Latin words tend to be more neutral (for example, compare the pairs *whore - prostitute* and *cheap - inexpensive).* In terms of these scales, French words tend to lie between Germanic and Latin vocabulary.

*Germanic <*—> *Latin*

frequent <—> rare

spoken <—• written

informal <—> formal

private <—• public

simple <—> complex

concrete <—> abstract

affective <—> neutral

An important issue is *why* these areas of vocabulary have acquired particular characteristics. This can be explained by looking at the historical development of English loanwords. The bulk of Latin vocabulary entered the language during the Renaissance, which was a period of lexical upheaval. The important point is that, unlike the earlier borrowing of French vocabulary into speech, Latin vocabulary was the language of the written medium, the language of books or the 'inkhorn'. Much of it was difficult to understand (and still is!), and was perceived as 'alien' by some. Not surprisingly, it is in the sixteenth century that the first dictionaries appeared, in order to help people cope with these 'hard words'. This state of affairs gave rise to the so-called INKHORN CONTROVERSY, a debate about the merits Inkhorn Controversy or otherwise of the acquisition of 'artificial', 'bookish' Latin vocabulary - the vocabulary coming from the inkhorn - in place of 'natural', 'common' Germanic vocabulary. Some strands of the Inkhorn Controversy are still current today. The quest for a pure Anglo-Saxon vocabulary has continued over the centuries. However, as we have seen, there never was a pure Anglo-Saxon vocabulary: Latin loanwords were part of English vocabulary even before English came to England. A more practical consideration - and one that will become clear in the following unit - is that Latin and Germanic vocabulary are so thoroughly mixed that they would be very difficult to separate [Culpeper 2000].

**The etymological structure of the English vocabulary**

**The native element:**

I. Indo-European element

II. German element

III. English proper element (not earlier than the 5th c. A.D.)

**The borrowed element:**

I. Celtic element (the 5th–6th cc. A.D.)

II. Latin:

1st group—the 1st c. B.C.

2nd group—the 7th c. A.D.

3rd group—the Renaissance period

III. Scandinavian (the 8th–11th cc. A.D.)

IV. French:

(a) Norman borrowing (the 11th–13th cc. A.D.)

(b) Parisian borrowings (Renaissance)

V. Greek (Renaissance)

VI. Italian (Renaissance and later)

VII. Spanish (Renaissance and later)

VIII. German

IX. Indian

X. Russian

Some other groups

**There are some periods in the English language origin:**

1. The first century B.C.: most of the territory now known to us as Europe was occupied by the Roman Empire. The tribal languages contained only Indo-European and German elements. Since this period in English appear words from Latin (*butter*, *cheese*, *pea*, *plant*, *kitchen*, etc.).

2. The fifth century A.D.: several of Germanic tribes (Angles, Saxons, and Jutes) migrated across the sea now known as the English Channel to the British Isles. They were controlled by Celts. Since this period in English appear words from Celtic (*cradle*, *river*, *water*), from Latin (*street*, *wall*).

3. The seventh century A.D. This century was significant for the Christianization of England. Latin was the official language of the Christian Church. It is a period of the Latin borrowings (*priest*, *bishop*, *scholar*, *magister*).

4. From the end of the 8th c. to the middle of the 11th c., England underwent several Scandinavian invasions, which inevitably left their traces on the English vocabulary (*die*, *cast*, *law*, *husband*, *ski* (all combinations with *sk-*), *weak*, *loose*).

5. 1066. It is Empire of Norman Conquest. The epoch can well be called eventful not only in national, social, political and human terms, but also in linguistic terms. England became a bilingual country. There are a lot of French borrowings in this period (*government*, *power*, *court*, *judge*, *army*, *enemy*, *science*, *pen*, *autumn*, *dinner*, *plate*).

6. The Renaissance period: a lot of borrowings from Latin and Greek (*major*, *intelligent*, *elect*, *create*, *datum*, *music*, *atom*, *esthete*), Parisian dialect of French: *police*, *scene*, *machine*, *technique*.

**The Indo-European element** in the English language represents words of roots common to all or most languages of the Indo-European group. English words of this type denote the following: family relations: *mother*, *brother*, *step-brother*; parts of human body: *foot*, *lip*, *heart*; animals: *cow*, *goose*, *snake*; plants: *tree*, *birch*, *corn*, *cherry*; time of the day: *day*, *afternoon*, *night*; celestial bodies: *sun*, *star*, *moon*; many adjectives: *new*, *yellow*, *sad*, *blade*, *narrow*; the numerals from *one* to *a hundred*; some pronouns: *you*, *he*; numerous verbs: *to be*, *to stand*, *to sit*, *to eat*, *to bring*.

**The German element** implies words of roots common to all or most Germanic languages. The groups represent: parts of human body: *arm*, *bone*, *hand*; animals: *bear*, *calf*, *pork*; plants: *oak*, *grass*; natural phenomena: *snow*, *lightening*, *frost*; seasons: *winter*, *spring*, *summer*; landscape features: *sea*, *land*, *valley*; human dwellings and furniture: *room*, *flat*, *bench*; transport: *ferry*, *ship*; adjectives: *green*, *small*, *thin*, *old*; verbs: *to see*, *to say*, *to tell*, *to talk*, *to give*.

**Latin loans** can be classified into the following subgroups:

1. Early Latin loans. Those are the words which came into English through the language of Anglo-Saxon tribes. The tribes had been in contact with Roman civilisation and had adopted several Latin words denoting objects belonging to that civilisation long before the invasion of Angles, Saxons, and Jutes into Britain (*cup*, *kitchen*, *mill*, *port*, *wine*).

2. Later Latin borrowings. To this group belong the words which penetrated the English vocabulary in the 6th and 7th centuries, during the conversion to Christianity (*priest*, *bishop*, *nun*, *candle*).

3. The third period of Latin includes words which came into English due to two historical events: the Norman conquest in 1066 and the Renaissance or the Revival of Learning. Some words came into English through French but some were taken directly from Latin (*major*, *minor*, *intelligent*, *permanent*).

4. The latest stratum of Latin words. The words of this period are mainly abstract and scientific words (*nylon*, *molecular*, *vaccine*, *phenomenon*, *vacuum*).

**Norman-French borrowings** may be subdivided into such subgroups as:

1. Early loans: the 12th–15th century. These are simple short words, naturalised in accordance with the English language system (*state*, *power*, *war*, *pen*, *river*).

2. Later loans: beginning from the 16th century. These borrowings can be identified by their peculiarities of form and pronunciation (*regime*, *ballet*, *scene*, *bourgeois*).

**2. New words from old**

One way of creating new vocabulary has been to use already existing words. Over time, this method has become increasingly important.

Where do new words come from? In the last unit we looked at words borrowed from other languages, and in this unit we are going to look at how new words have been created from old. However, you may be wondering about words that are completely original creations, words that have no roots. The fact of the matter is that these are few and far between. One estimate is that below half a per cent of new vocabulary over the last fifty years is original. *Googol* – the word for the number 1 followed by a hundred zeros – is an example. It was brought into the world by a nine-year-old boy when his father, a mathematician, asked him for a suitable name for the number. Some rootless words are supposed to have been created to represent sounds, they are echoic or ***ONOMATOPOEIC***. *Cuckoo* is the classic example and there are many others (e.g. *bleep, honk, bang).* Rootless words tend to crop up in literary texts, particularly fantasy and science fiction, but they rarely move into common usage, exceptions perhaps being *hobbit* and *triffid.* The point is that the vast majority of words have some kind of etymology – they have roots.

How are words formed from the resources that we already have? Below is a checklist that outlines some of the ways in which words are formed.

***AFFIXATION*** – *adding affixes to form another word.* Affixes are short elements which usually do not exist as words in their own right, but are tacked on to a root word in order to form another. Affixes that are placed at the beginning of a word are called ***PREFIXES*** (e.g.*undress, decompose, misfortune, recall)* and affixes placed at the end of a word are called ***SUFFIXES*** (e.g. *troublesome, harmonise, singer, sinful).* Old English was well stocked with affixes, some of which are still amongst the most commonly used in English (e.g. *happy, quickly, blackness, foolish, heartless).* Some Old English affixes are no longer used or are falling out of use. For instance, the prefix *for* and the suffix *-lock* were once relatively frequently used, but now are largely confined to the words *forgive, forgo, forbid, forbear, forlorn, forsake* and *forswear,* and *wedlock* and *warlock.* Other Old English affixes fell out of use, but then experienced a revival. This happened to both *-dom* and *-wise,* which reappeared in words like *stardom, officialdom, likewise* and *pricewise -* a revival that in both cases was led by American English. The major change in English affixes over time has been expansion due to the acquisition of affixes from other languages. Just as English borrowed words, it also borrowed affixes. Examples include *anti-, -ism* and *micro-* from Greek (e.g. *anti-climax, Communism, microwave), -al, ex-, multi-, non-* and *re-* from Latin (e.g. *accidental, exchange, multi-racial, nonstop* and *rebuild),* and *-ette* and *-esque* from French (e.g. *kitchenette* and *picturesque).*

***BACK FORMATION*** *- subtracting elements (often affixes) to form another word.* For example, the word *editor* appeared before the word *edit.* With the subtraction of the affix *-or,* English gained the word *edit,* the verb describing what the editor did. Similarly, *burglar* came before the verb *burgle.* An interesting example of back formation is the word *pea,* which comes from *pease.* Originally, *pease* was both the singular and the plural. However, because it sounded as if it had a plural ending, people invented *pea* to talk about a single pea.

***COMPOUNDING*** *– combining words to form another word.* There are, in fact, three forms of compound: there are open compounds (e.g. *new born),* *hyphenated compounds (e.g. new-born) and solid compounds (e.g. newborn).* These compounding conventions are rather arbitrary, and there are differences between British and American English (for example, American English tends to avoid hyphenated forms). But, generally, older and shorter compounds are more likely to be solid.

The above example is more likely to be solid than the more recent compounds new town or new wave. In fact, some very old compounds are barely recognisable as such. The word lord is an example. It began life as the compound *hlaf-weard,* meaning *'loaf-keeper',* but even in Old English it had contracted to *hlaford.*

***BLENDS*** *– fusing elements of two other words.* In a sense, this is an extreme form of compounding. Classic examples include *smoke +fog > smog; motor + hotel > motel; breakfast + lunch > brunch.* Such blending of words occurs at the time the word is formed, and thus it is distinguished from a word like *lord* where fusion occurs over time.

***FUNCTIONAL CONVERSION***– *using one part of speech as another.* For example, consider the conversion of nouns into verbs, or, more specifically, body-part nouns that have been used as verbs: to *head* a department, to *eye* someone up, to *nose* into somebody's affairs, to *neck* with someone, to *shoulder* or *elbow* somebody aside, to *hand* in an assignment, to *finger* one's watch, to *leg* it, to *knee* someone in the . . . , and so on. Shakespeare added 'to *lip* a wanton wench', though this did not gain general currency. Not only can nouns be converted into verbs, but it seems that almost any part of speech can be used as another. The words *up* and *down* would seem to be fairly limited words, but they too can be converted into nouns, as in expressions like *I'm coping with the 0 and downs of life.*

One kind of functional conversion is when personal names (proper nouns) are converted into other types of word. A surprising number of such words or ***EPONYMS*** have been created this way. Use a dictionary to find out which people gave their names to the following words: *lynch, dunce, boycott, sandwich, cardigan, Wellingtons, pasteurise, sadism, atlas, jovial, venereal, tantalise.*

***CLIPS*** *– shortening a longer word (usually by removing syllables).* Clips involve the creation of a new shortened form of a word, which, in most cases, supplants the original word. Thus, we talk about a *bus* rather than an *omnibus.* For some peculiar reason, the set of vocabulary related to underwear consists largely of clips: *vestment >vest, pantaloons > pants, knickerbockers > knickers, brassiere* > *bra.* Interestingly, British and American English sometimes varies with regard to the extent of a clip. Compare *advert* and *ad.*

***ACRONYMS***– *combining the initial letters of words or syllables.* Some words are quite clearly acronyms, for example, *TV (television), TB (tuberculosis), VD (venereal disease),* and *DIY (do it yourself).* Other words are less transparently acronyms, for example, *radar (radio detecting and ranging)* and *laser (light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation).*

There are two important points to bear in mind about these ways in which words can be created. First, they can overlap. There are a number of affixes, for example, which can also function as independent words, and so sometimes it is not clear whether affixation or compounding is involved. There is an issue, for example, with the suffix *-able.* The suffix is actually a borrowing of the Latin suffix *-ibilis,* which in French and later in English was sometimes spelt *-able.* However, in form it is identical to the adjective *able* (e.g. *He is able to do it),* which comes via French from the Latin word *habilem.* Thus with relatively recent words ending *-able* (e.g. *analysable, killable),* it is not clear whether we have a case of affixation or compounding. Second, these ways of creating words are not equally productive in generating vocabulary. Consider these approximate figures for sources of new vocabulary over the last fifty years:

Compounding 36%

Affixation 27%

Functional conversion 17%

Shortening (back formations, clips, acronyms) 9%

Blending 6%

In fact, compounding used to be even more important in English. This is not surprising, given that compounding is popular in Germanic languages and that English used to be more Germanic in character. However, with the great influx of loanwords, the development of English, unlike that of Modern German, did not have to rely so much on internal resources. For example (to continue the underwear theme of this unit!), English adopted the word *bra (brassiere)* from French; Modern German has the compound *bustenhalter* (literally, 'bust-holder').

What types of language contain many new word formations? Literary texts are often said to be a source. In particular, Shakespeare is credited with many coinages, though one can never be entirely sure whether he really invented them or whether he was simply the first person to record what was already in the language. For example, by adding the affix *-less,* he made an adjective out of the verb *to count* in the line 'One sweet kiss shall pay this *countless* debt.' A new coinage, such as this, which enters the general word stock is called a ***NEOLOGISM***. However, many words are formed for the 'nonce': they are one-off coinages for the particular purpose in hand; they tend to have relatively limited circulation and are quickly forgotten. These are called ***NONCE-FORMATIONS***. For instance, Shakespeare's line 'Would'st thou be window'd [i.e. placed in a window] in great Rome' contains the nonce-formation *window'd;* though we now can talk about *framing* somebody, we cannot talk about 'windowing' them. As with literary texts, the language of advertising often displays word formation creativity in an attempt to capture the reader's attention. Sometimes product names enter the language as general vocabulary items. Consider terms for adhesive tape: Scotch tape (common in the United States) and Sellotape (common in the United Kingdom) are both registered trademarks.

**3. Changing meanings.**

Changes in the meanings of words – semantic change – can be amongst the most striking and accessible examples of language change. However, one needs to be aware that meanings are subtle and complex, and not simply captured within a dictionary – type definition. If you want to find out what a word means, what do you do? Most people would look the word up in a dictionary. Dictionaries can indeed shed light on meanings and how they arose, but must be treated with caution, because word meaning is more than a compact definition of the type we see in dictionaries. Word meaning, one might say, is like an onion: it consists of many layers, and its taste will vary according to how people use it - whether in a curry sauce or a bolognaise sauce. Knowing the meaning of a word is knowing how it is used. As words become used in different ways and in different contexts, they acquire different associations and so the meaning changes.

One way in which dictionaries try to give us clues about usage is by providing quotations where the word is used. However, even the dictionaries that do contain quotations cannot, for practical reasons, contain every usage of a word. It becomes a matter of selection and interpretation by the editor, and inevitably dictionaries lag behind actual usage. Let's compare two dictionary entries for the word *darky* (or darkie): A Negro. [Informal] (Thorndike English Dictionary, 1948)

A darkie is a very offensive word for someone who has brown or black skin. (Cobuild English Language Dictionary, 1995)

The difference between the definitions is vast. The Thorndike prioritises the denotative meaning 'A Negro'; the issue of usage is relegated to parentheses and limited to a remark on the degree of formality. In contrast, the Cobuild dictionary is centrally concerned with the context of usage, in particular, what effect the word is likely to have ('very offensive'). It is clear that as a description of the meaning of darky the Thorndike dictionary is hopelessly inadequate, and as a guide to a student of the English language it borders on criminal negligence. We can speculate on why it is deficient: is it the policy of the dictionary to concentrate on denotative meaning, or is it a reflection of racist attitudes of the editor or even of the society of forty years ago? For the purposes of this unit it serves as a warning not to think that a word's associative meaning, acquired according to how a word is used, is less important than its denotative meaning.

In fact, sometimes the associative meaning of a word becomes the defining denotative meaning of a word. For example, sinister, a borrowing from Latin, originally meant 'left' or 'left hand'. But even in Latin it had associations of bad luck. By the seventeenth century these associations formed the denotative meaning of the word, the notion of 'leftness' having died out.

The main ways in which words may change meaning include:

***SPECIALISATION*** – narrowing of meaning. For example, the word *meat* used to refer to any kind of food, but now refers specifically to flesh. The word *deer* used to refer to any kind of beast, but now refers to a particular four-legged wild animal.

***GENERALISATION*** – widening of meaning. For example, the word *clerk* started with the sense of 'a member of the clergy'. This was extended to include 'scholar' and then 'types of office worker', and in American English to include 'a shop/hotel worker'. Similarly, the word *business* originally meant 'a state of being active', but the meaning was extended over time to include 'occupation', 'a piece of work', 'a concern, matter, affair', 'dealings', 'trade' and 'a commercial enterprise'.

***AMELIORATION*** – elevation of meaning. For example, the word *pretty* began with the negative sense of 'cunning, crafty', and the word shrewd began with the negative sense of 'depraved, wicked'.

***PEJORATION*** – degradation of meaning. King James II (1685-8) upon seeing the new St Paul's cathedral described it as 'amusing, awful and artificial', by which he meant it was *wonderful*. *Amusing* had the sense of 'capturing one's attention'; *awful* of 'being impressive, *majestic* (literally, full of awe)'; and artificial of 'being skilful, displaying art'.

***TRANSFER*** of meaning. Sometimes the meaning of a word shifts, so that the word refers to a different – though often closely associated – set of things. For example, the list below charts the main shifts in the meaning of the word *bureau*:

twelfth century – coarse woollen cloth

thirteenth century – cloth covering tables or counters

fourteenth century – counting table

fifteenth/sixteenth century – writing table

seventeenth century – room containing the table

people working in the room

department

agency

One specific way in which meaning can be transferred is through ***metaphor***. A metaphor involves talking about something in terms of something else. When a metaphor is used frequently, it becomes conventional and we gradually stop perceiving it as a metaphor. Such metaphors are called dead metaphors. For instance, the word *candid* now means 'frank, open, not hiding one's thoughts', but in its earliest history in English it could mean 'white' – the sense of the Latin word *candidus* from which it is derived.

Of course, the above list of ways in which words have changed meaning, though fairly comprehensive, is not complete. Also, remember that (1) some words can be classified along a number of different dimensions, and (2) sometimes words shift their meaning as part of a set of words. In fact, some of the most interesting changes in word meaning have taken place in whole sets of related words.

**SUMMARY**

• The dramatic expansion of English vocabulary has been achieved through loanwords, mostly from French and Latin but also from Greek, Italian and Spanish.

• In more recent times, English has borrowed from a more diverse range of languages, and, more generally, borrowing as a method of increasing vocabulary has become less important.

• English words of different origin have acquired different stylistic associations, and tend to be used in different contexts.

• People have particular attitudes to words of different origin. Few English words are original creations; most are borrowed from other languages or formed from existing vocabulary.

• The most important processes of word formation in English are compounding, affixation and functional conversion.

• Compounding was the most important way of generating new vocabulary in Old English. In the history of English, compounding seems to decrease in importance when borrowing increases.

• English has significantly increased its stock of affixes by borrowing from other languages.

• Words are formed with no apparent regard as to where the original elements come from, resulting in hybrid forms. These, as well as other new forms, have been the subject of complaint

• Dictionaries are an important resource in discovering the meanings of words, but a dictionary is not the ultimate authority: it is shaped by the attitudes, abilities and policies of the editor and the compilers.

• The meaning of a word is not simply a list of distinctive features, the denotative meaning, but includes the equally important associative meaning, acquired according to how a word is used.

• Some of the main ways in which meaning has shifted include specialisation, generalisation, amelioration, pejoration and transfer [Culpeper 2000].

**Матеріали до семінарських занять**

**Materials for seminars**

***CHANGES IN THE PHONETIC SYSTEM OF ENGLISH***

**I. Theoretical problems**

**1.English Phonology**

**2. Phonemic**

**3. Digraphs**

**4. Standardisation**

**5. Etymological respellings**

**6. Great Vowel Shift**

**II. Practical Assignments**

1 Given that spelling used to represent much more closely the pronunciation of words, what can you infer about changes in the pronunciation of the following words? (Hint: consider the letters that do not correspond to any of the sounds in your own pronunciation of these words.)

*two, sword, answer*

*walk, half, folk*

*wreck, write, wring*

*gnat, gnarl, gnaw*

*knee, know, knight*

2. It should be remembered that in Old English and Middle English there were no firm conventions for spelling. Greater variation was tolerated than would be today. In particular, a writer's spelling would tend to reflect whatever dialect they happened to speak. The OED attempts to list the variant spellings of words. To get an idea of the degree of spelling variation, check the spellings of the following words: *spear, sword and shield*.

3. Study the spelling in Texts 1 and 2. What inconsistencies in the spelling can you find? Can you explain why some of these occur? Consider the use of the letters ***v*** and **u**. At this time a ***v*** could be used for a *u* and vice versa, but they were not completely interchangeable. What determines the use of one letter or the other? The letters ***i*** and ***y*** are sometimes said to be interchangeable. How true is this of Text 1?

4. In this unit we have primarily considered spelling in terms of whether there is a correspondence between phonemes – the units of speech - and the letters of words. In fact, the relationship between spelling and spoken words may be systematic, but more complex than simple one-to-one correspondence of phonemes and letters. Let's take an example. How would you pronounce the word *ghoti*? Most of us, I guess, would pronounce it as *'goaty*'. Bernard Shaw coined this word to illustrate the apparent absurdities of spelling. He claimed that it should be pronounced like *fish*: ***gh*** as in *enough*, ***o*** as in *women*, and ***ti*** as in *nation*. But clearly spelling does not work like this; 'goaty' is the more obvious pronunciation of ghoti. Shaw fails to take into account the more complex ways in which spelling indicates pronunciation, such as by the position of letters in a word.

Construct an attack on Shaw's claim. What evidence can you give to support the claim that *ghoti* should be pronounced '*goaty*'and not like *fish*? (Hint: think of other words that begin or end with the same letters.)

3.5 (a) Many of the final *-es* on words are remnants of old grammatical endings, and were pronounced as a 'schwa' (a short vowel sound, as in the first phoneme of the word about). Towards the end of the Middle English period these final -*es* ceased to be pronounced. However, whilst they no longer corresponded in a simple way with single phonemes, many did provide useful information about the pronunciation of a word. Consider the words *fate, bite* and *mop*e, with and without the final *-es*. What pronunciation information does the final *-e* convey? Can you find examples where this generalisation doesn't work?

(b) In Old English a doubled consonant would affect the pronunciation of that consonant, as is the case in Italian. Today this is no longer the case: ***t*** would be pronounced the same as ***tt***. However, doubling a consonant does provide *pronunciation information. Consider the following pairs of words: sitter/seater, shutter*/*shooter, chatting*/ *charting,* *wedding/wading*. What pronunciation information does the doubled consonant convey? Can you find examples where this generalisation doesn't work?

3.6 In one particular study, the following were found to be common misspellings: *gallary, succesful, exibition, definate, politition, extasy*, *morgage.* (1) On the basis of these misspellings, describe some potential problems in English spelling. (2) Discover why these words have troublesome spellings. (Hint: trace the origins of these words.)

**DISCUSSION POINT**

Imagine you are asked to reform the spelling system. What changes would you make? Would you change the whole system or only part of it? What difficulties might you encounter in making your changes? If you are part of a group, you may wish to create a debate on spelling reform. Divide the group into two. One half should argue in support of spelling reform, and the other against it, defending spelling as it is now.

**TEXT 1** This text is part of William Caxton's prologue to the Eneydos (his translation of the French version of the Latin poem The Aeneid by Virgil), printed in 1490. He recounts a story about some merchants who tried to ask for eggs in Kent.

And certaynly our langage now vsed varyeth ferre from that, whiche was vsed and spoken whan I was borne / For we englysshe men / ben borne vnder the domynacyon of the mone. whiche is neuer stedfaste / but euer wauerynge / wexynge one season / and waneth & dyscreaseth another season / And that comyn englysshe that is spoken in one shyre varyeth from a nother. In so moche that in my dayes happened that certayn marchauntes were in a shippe in tamyse [= the river Thames] for to haue sayled ouer the see into ᴣelande [= Holland] and for lacke of wynde thei taryed atte forlond. [= Foreland] and wente to lande for to refreshe them And one of theym named sheffelde a mercer cam in to an hows and axed for mete, and specyally he axyd after eggys And the good wyf answerde. that she coude speke no frenshe. but wold haue hadde egges / and she vnderstode hym not / And thenne at laste a nother sayd that he wolde haue eyren / then the good wyf sayd that she vnderstod hym wel / Loo what sholde a man in thyse dayes now wryte. egges or eyren / certaynly it is harde to playse euery man / by cause of dyuersite & chaunge of langage.

**TEXT 2** These extracts are from the Authorised Version of the Bible, which was published in 1611. Extract (a) is from the New Testament, Luke 6: 27-32; extract (b) is from the Old Testament, Ezekiel 28: 1-4.

(a)

But I say vnto you which heare, Love your enemies, doe good to them which hate you,

Bless them that curse you, & pray for them which despitefully vse you.

And vnto him that smiteth thee on the one cheeke offer also the other: and him that taketh away thy cloke, forbid not to take thy coat also.

Give to euery man that asketh of thee, and of him that taketh away thy goods, aske them not againe.

And as yee would that men should doe to you, doe yee also to them likewise.

For if yee love them which loue you, what thanke haue ye? for sinners also loue those that loue them.

(b)

The word of the LORD came againe vnto me, saying,

Sonne of man, say vnto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thine heart is lifted vp, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seate of God, in the middest of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God.

Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel: there is no secret that they can hide from thee.

With thy wisdome and with thine vnderstanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and siluer into thy treasures.

**INDEPENDENT STUDY**

**1. Explain the sound correspondence in the following pairs of words choosing the correct answer from the list:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Goth. sah > OE seah | a) Grimm’s Law |
| 2. Angl. hira > WS hiora | b) Verner’s Law |
| 3. ON skaft > OE sceaft | c) i-mutation |
| 4. Lat. plenum > OE full | d) OE breaking |
| 5. OHG hros > OE hors | e) rhotacism |
| 6. Skr. Sapta > Goth. sibun | f) palatal diphthongization |
| 7. Goth. satjan > OE settan | g) back mutation |
| 8.OCS bosǔ > OE bær | h) West Germanic germination |
| 9. Goth. domain > OE dēman | i) metathesis |
| 10. Russ. могу > Goth. maƷan |  |

**2. Define what phonetic and graphic changes took place in the following pairs of words:** OE dæƷ – ME day, OE Þæt – ME that, OE pleƷian – ME to pleye(n), OE hūs – ME hous, OE wīа – ME wyf, OE wīfes – ME wifes, OE dohtor – ME doghter, OE healf – ME half, OE nieht – ME niht, OE stān – ME stone.

**3. Read the text. Analyse the relationships between the letters and sounds in the given extract. Define phonetic and graphical changes in the italicized words.**

**3.1.** Whilom, as olde stories tellen us,

Ther was a duc that highte Theseus;

Of Atthenes he was lord and governour,

And in his tyme swich a conquerour,

That gretter was ther noon under the sonne.

Ful many a riche contree hadde he wonne,

What with his wysdom and his chivalrie;

He conquered al the regne of Femenye,

That whilom was ycleped Scithia,

And weddede the queene Ypolita,

And broghte hir hoom with hym in his contree,

With muchel glorie and greet solempnytee,

And eek hir yonge suster Emelye.

(G. Chaucer “Canterbury Tales”)

Once on a time, as old stories tell to us,

There was a duke whose name was Theseus:

Of Athens he was lord and governor,

And in his time was such a conqueror

That greater was there not beneath the sun.

Very many rich countries had he won;

What with his wisdom and his chivalry

He gained the realm of Femininity,

That was of old time known as Scythia.

There he married the queen, Hippolyta,

And brought her home with him to his country.

In glory great and with great ceremony,

And, too, her younger sister, Emily.

**3.2**. And certes, if it nere to long to heere,

I wolde have toold yow fully the manere

How wonnen was the regne of Femenye

By Theseus, and by his chivalrye,

And of the grete bataille for the nones

Bitwixen Atthenes and Amazones,

And how asseged was Ypolita

The faire hardy queene of Scithia,

And of the feste that was at hir weddynge,

And of the tempest at hir hoom-comynge;

But al the thyng I moot as now forbere,

I have, God woot, a large feeld to ere,

And wayke been the oxen in my plough,

The remenant of the tale is long ynough.

I wol nat letten eek noon of this route,

Lat every felawe telle his tale aboute,

And lat se now who shal the soper wynne;-

And ther I lefte, I wol ayeyn bigynne.

(G. Chaucer “Canterbury Tales”)

And truly, were it not too long to hear,

I would have told you fully how, that year,

Was gained the realm of Femininity

By Theseus and by his chivalry;

And all of the great battle that was wrought

Where Amazons and the Athenians fought;

And how was wooed and won Hippolyta,

That fair and hardy queen of Scythia;

And of the feast was made at their wedding,

And of the tempest at their home-coming;

But all of that I must for now forbear.

I have, God knows, a large field for my share,

And weak the oxen, and the soil is tough.

The remnant of the tale is long enough.

I will not hinder any, in my turn;

Let each man tell his tale, until we learn

Which of us all the most deserves to win;

So where I stopped, again I'll now begin.

4. Show the modern spelling can help to reconstruct the phonetic history of the words, use the following words as examples: ***write, take, knight, lead, foot, mice, low, blood, five, mercy, thumb,*** and ***house.***

***CHANGES IN THE MORPHOLOGICAL SYSTEM OF ENGLISH***

**I. Theoretical problems.**

**1. Changes in English noun**

**1.1. The category of case.**

**1.2. The category of number.**

**2. Changes in the system of English verb.**

**3. Grammaticalization.**

**II. Practical Assignments**

**Noun**

**1.** Words borrowed from other languages can cause problems when it comes to deciding on how to make them plural or singular, because they do not take the regular English -s inflection. Are the following words plural or singular to you: *data, criteria, index, focus, formula*? How do you go about signalling a change from one to the other, or do you use the same form for both singular and plural?

**2**. (a) In case you are feeling confused, bear in mind that personal pronouns are almost as complex now as they were in Old English, yet we use them without trouble. Like Old English nouns, they are marked for case. Underline the pronouns in the examples below according to whether they are nominative (the subject), accusative (the object) or genitive (the possessor).

1 He sees him

2 Him he sees

3 He sees his face

(b) Second-person pronouns used to be more marked for case and number than they are now. If you compare Table 1 for Middle English and Table 2 for today's English, you'll see that you has become the predominant form.

***Table 1*** Second-person pronouns in Middle English

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grammatical function | Singular | Plural |
| Subjective (nominative) | thou | ye |
| Objective (accusative) | thee | you |
| Possessive (genitive) | thy/thine | your/yours |

***Table 2*** Second-person pronouns in today's English

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grammatical function | Singular | Plural |
| Subjective (nominative) | you | you |
| Objective (Accusative) | you | you |
| Possessive (genitive) | your/yours | your/yours |

The Early Modern English period was one of transition with a mixture of you forms and thou forms. Interestingly, the factors that determined the usage of second-person pronouns in this period were not simply grammatical. The situation was somewhat like that in today's French (tu and vous) or German (Sie and du). *You* became a prestige form associated with the upper classes, whereas the opposite happened for *thou*. Speakers often exploited these associations: for example, *you* could be used to express politeness, whereas thou could be used to express condescension.

Look carefully at the usage of second-person pronouns in *Texts 3(a) and (b) and* 4. What is determining their usage? (Hint: Start by considering they simply follow the grammatical pattern given in Tables 1 and 2) Can you explain why the second-person pronouns in Text 6 are governed by different principles?

3. Look through the texts in the 'mini-corpus' and try to find examples of the genitive marked with an *-es* inflection (i.e. nouns to which we would today add an *apostophe-s*).

4. Investigate the confusion today about the usage of the *apostrophe-s*. Collect examples of incorrect usage. You are more likely to find them in informal writing. As well as collecting various nouns with the apostrophe-.s, watch out for that notorious problem: confusion between its (= the genitive) and it's (= a contraction of it is). Does your collection of examples provide evidence that the use of the apostrophe-s may be changing?

5. In English there are two ways of expressing possession: the *s-genitive* (e.g. Jonathan's book) or using the preposition of (e.g. the book of Jonathan). Collect examples of the s-genitive (possibly drawing upon your collection in Exercise 3), and then discover what kinds of noun in today's English tend to carry the s-genitive. Consider, for example, whether the noun is animate or inanimate.

**DISCUSSION POINT**

How much further do you think this process of inflectional simplification will go? Can we get rid of irregular plurals (e.g. feet, children) or non-native plurals (e.g. criteria, indices)? Can we get rid of the apostrophe-s? Are there varieties of English where this happens already? If English is simplified, what will be the advantages and for whom? If English is simplified, what will be the disadvantages and for whom?

**Verb**

1. In inflectional terms, present-day English regular verbs are very simple. Take the base or root form of a regular verb (e.g. walk). How many different inflections can you put on the end of it? Now, try to work out the grammatical function of each of these inflections (it may help, if you devise short sentences to test the verb form).

2. Can you explain why *Text 6,* the Authorised Version of the Bible, is dominated bv -*eth*?

3. Old forms of participles have survived in some contexts. Where might you hear:

*drunken* as opposed *to drunk*

*molten* as opposed *to melted*

*stricken* as opposed *to struck*

*shrunken* as opposed *to shrunk*

4. Which of the following pairs would you use: *dived - dove*, *hanged - hung*, *weaved - wove*, *strived - strove*, *digged - dug*? Would you use both, but in different contexts?

**DISCUSSION POINT**

Note that, as in the example from Ælfred above, a regular way of forming a negative statement in the past has been to use more than one negative word. In what varieties of today's English are you more likely to meet double or multiple negatives? What are the social implications of using double or multiple negatives? Is there any linguistic reason why they are a problem (consider whether communication is impaired or made more effective)?

*TEXT 3*

The first two extracts below come from Shakespeare's Richard III. In extract (a) Richard of Gloucester and his supporter, the Duke of Buckingham, are stage-managing an appearance before the people, in which Richard poses as a saintly religious figure. In extract (b) Richard is now king. Buckingham attempts to collect his reward, promised for loyal support. Extract (c) comes from All's Well That Ends Well. Here the Countess is attempting to establish whether Helena loves her son. The spelling and punctuation are not original in any extract.

(a)

GLOU.: [ ... ] what is your Grace's pleasure?

BUCK.: Even that, I hope, which pleaseth God above,

And all good men of this ungovern'd isle.

GLOU.: I do suspect I have done some offence

That seems disgracious in the city's eye,

And that you come to reprehend my ignorance.

BUCK.: You have, my lord. Would it might please your Grace,

On our entreaties, to amend your fault!

GLOU.: Else wherefore breathe I in a Christian land?

BUCK.: Know then, it is your fault that you resign

The supreme seat, the throne majestical [ ... ]

(III.vii.108-18)

(b)

BUCK.: I am thus bold to put your Grace in mind

Of what you promis'd me.

K. RICH.: Well, but what's o'clock?

BUCK.: Upon the stroke of ten.

K. RICH.: Well, let it strike.

BUCK.: Why let it strike?

K. RICH.: Because that like a Jack thou keep'st the stroke

Betwixt thy begging and my meditation.

I am not in the giving vein to-day.

BUCK.: May it please you to resolve me in my suit.

K. RICH.: Thou troublest me; I am not in the vein.

(IV.ii.114-22)

*TEXT 4* These extracts are from the Authorised Version of the Bible, which was published in 1611. Extract (a) is from the New Testament, Luke 6: 27-32; extract (b) is from the Old Testament, Ezekiel 28: 1-4.

(a) But I say vnto you which heare, Love your enemies, doe good to them which hate you,

Bless them that curse you, & pray for them which despitefully vse you.

And vnto him that smiteth thee on the one cheeke offer also the other: and him that taketh away thy cloke, forbid not to take thy coat also.

Give to euery man that asketh of thee, and of him that taketh away thy goods, aske them not againe.

And as yee would that men should doe to you, doe yee also to them likewise.

For if yee love them which loue you, what thanke haue ye? for sinners also loue those that loue them.

(b) The word of the LORD came againe vnto me, saying,

Sonne of man, say vnto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thine heart is lifted vp, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seate of God, in the middest of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God.

Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel: there is no secret that they can hide from thee.

With thy wisdome and with thine vnderstanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and siluer into thy treasures.

**INDEPENDENT STUDY**

1. **Read the text. Give a morphological (grammatical) analysis of the words in bold type and a phonetic analysis of the italyzed words. Comment on the syntax.**

Þa [for](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [he](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [þa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [Ʒiet](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [norþryhte](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [swa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [feor](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [swa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [he](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [meahte](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [on](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [þæm](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [oþrum](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [þrim](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [daƷum](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [Ʒesiglan.](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank)

[Þa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) beaƷ *þæt* land [þær](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) eastryhte, oþþe seo **sæ** [in](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [on](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [þæt](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) lond, [he](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) nysse hwæþer, buton [he](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [wisse](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [þæt](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [he](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) þær bad westan windes [ond](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) *hwon* norþan, [ond](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) siglde [þa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) *east* be [lande](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [swa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [swa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [he](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [meahte](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) [on](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank) ***feower*** **daƷum** [Ʒesiglan (“The Voyage of Ohthere”).](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/ohthglos.htm#_blank)

Then he travelled north still as far as he could sail in the next three days.

Then the land turned eastward there, or the sea [turned] into the land, he did not know which, but he knew that he waited there for a wind from the west and a little from the north, and then sailed east along the land as far as he could sail in four days.

**Glossary for the text**

**þe** *rel. part.:* that, which

**he** *3rd pers. pron.:* he

**Ʒiet** *adv.:* yet, still

**norþryhte** *conj:* northwards; to the north

**swa . . . swa** *correl. adv and conj.:*so . . . as; as . . . as; so much the more . . . so much the more;

**feor** *adv:* far

**maƷan** *pret. pres.:* be able, can, be competent

**þa**  - dem. prn., pl.

**oþer** *adj., pron.:* other, another, next, remaining

**þrie, þry** *num.:* three

**dæƷ** *m., n., a:* day

**Ʒeseglian** *inf:* sail

**buƷan** *v 2:* bow down, turn, bend, stoop

**þæt** *conj.:* that, so that

**land** *n. т. a:* land, country

**eastryhte** *adv:* eastward

**oþþe** *conj.:* or

**seo** *dem. pron.:* the, that

**sæ** n.*f.i.:* sea

**nysse, nyste** *= ne wisse,* *pret 3s:* did not know

**hwæþer** *pron:* which (of two)

**buton** *prep.:* without, except, but, only

**witan** *pret. pres.:* to know, to understand, to be aware of

**þær** *adv, conj:* there, where

**bidan** *v 1:* wait (for) *with genitive of object*

**westan** *adj:* from the west

**wind** n.*m.:* wind

**hwon** *adv.:* a little

**norþan** *adj.:* northerly; from the north

**east** *adv.:* eastwards

**be** *prep.:* by, alongside, to the (north, etc.), according to

**feower** *num.:* four

**2. Read the text. Make the grammatical analisys of the words in bold.**

2.1. This [duc](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) of **whom** I make mencioun,

Whan he **was come** almoost unto the [toun](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank),

In al his [wele](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) and in his **mooste** pride,

He was [war](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank), as he caste **his** eye aside,

**Where** that ther **kneled** in the hye weye

A compaignye of **ladyes**, **tweye** and tweye,

[Ech](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) **after** [oother](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank), [clad](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) in clothes [blake](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank);

But [swich](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) a cry and [swich](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) a [wo](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) they make,

That in **this** world nys creature lyvynge

That [herde](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) [swich](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) another [waymentynge](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank);

And of this cry they nolde **nevere** stenten,

Til they the reynes of his brydel henten.

*(G. Chaucer “Canterbury Tales”)*

This duke of whom I speak, of great renown,

When he had drawn almost unto the town,

In all well-being and in utmost pride,

He grew aware, casting his eyes aside,

That right upon the road, as suppliants do,

A company of ladies, two by two,

Knelt, all in black, before his cavalcade;

But such a clamorous cry of woe they made

That in the whole world living man had heard

No such a lamentation, on my word;

Nor would they cease lamenting till at last

They'd clutched his bridle reins and held them fast.

2.2.

**The eldeste** lady of [hem](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) alle spak-

Whan she **hadde swowned** with a [deedly](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) [cheere](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank),

That it was routhe for **to seen** and heere-

And seyde, "Lord, to whom Fortune hath [yiven](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank)

Victorie, and as a conqueror to lyven,

Nat [greveth](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) **us** **youre** glorie and youre honour,

But we biseken mercy and socour.

Have mercy on **oure** [wo](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) and oure distresse,

Som drope of pitee [thurgh](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank) thy **gentillesse**

Upon us wrecched **wommen** lat thou falle;

For [certes](http://www.librarius.com/gy.htm#_blank), lord, ther is **noon** of us alle,

That she **ne hath been** a duchesse or a queene.

*(G. Chaucer “Canterbury Tales”)*

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH SYNTAX**

**I. Theoretical problems.**

**1. Old English Syntax**

**1.1. The Phrase. Noun, Adjective and Verb Patterns.**

**1.2. The Simple Sentence.**

**1.3. Compound and Complex Sentences. Connectives.**

**1.4. Word Order.**

**2. Middle English Syntax**

**3. Early New English Syntax**

**II. Practical Assignments**

**1.** Find out correlative conjunctions in the following sentences. Decide whether they are coordinative or subordinative.

1) sē Þу nāÞor nele ту leornjan ne tǣcan;

2) ǣlc stemn is oððe andƷytfullīс oððe ƷemenƷed;

3) Þā hē tō ðǣre byriƷ cōm, Þānolde sēō burhwaru būƷan;

4) Þonne hys Ʒestrēōn bēōð Þus eall āspended, Þonne byrð man hine ūt.

**2.** Find out instances of the syntactic word order.

1) Þone sīð fæt snotere ceorlas lȳt-hwōn lōƷon, Þēah hē him lēof wǣre (*this voyage clever men somewhat blamed on him, though he was liked by them*);

2) Þā hē Þā Þās andsware onfenƷ, Þā onƷan hē sōna sinƷan (*when he had received this answer, he soon began to sing*).

3) [He Ʒeband þa his sunu, and his sweord ateah, þæt he](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) hine Ʒeoffrode [on þa ealdan](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) wisan.

4) [and þone wudu ƷeloƷode swa swa he hit wolde habban to his suna bærnette siððan he ofslæƷen wurde.](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank)

**3.** For each of the following Old English sentences, comment on a point of syntax

(i.e., how is it different from Modern English?).

1) Ne ure næniƷ his lif ne fadode swa swa he scolde…and na∂er ne heldan ne lare ne laƷe ne manna swa swa we scoldan. (*Not of us none his life not arranges as he ought to and neither not (we) observe neither teaching nor law nor men as we ought to*).

2) Hwilce fixas Ʒefehst Þu? (*Which fishes catch you?)*

3) Þa cwæÞ se fæder to his Þeowum…(*then said the father to his servants…)*

4) hie comon him to (*they came him to*).

**4.** Read, translate and analyze the sentences.

[God](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [wolde](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [þa](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [fandian](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [Abrahames](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [Ʒehiersumnesse](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank), [and](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [clipode](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [his](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [naman](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank), [and](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [cwæð](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [him](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [þus](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [to: “Nim þinne ancennedan sunu Isaac, þe þu lufast, and far to þam lande Visionis](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) hraðe, [and Ʒeoffra hine þær uppan anre dune”. Abraham þa aras on þære ilcan nihte, and ferde mid twam cnapum to þam fierlenan lande, and Isaac samod, on assum ridende. Þa on þam þriddan dæƷe, þa hie þa dune Ʒesawon þær þær hie to scoldon to ofsleanne Isaac, þa cwæð](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [Abraham to þam twam cnapum þus: 'Anbidiað](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [eow her mid þam assum sume hwile. Ic and þæt cild Ʒað unc to Ʒebiddenne,](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [and we siððan cumað](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) [sona eft to](http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/eduweb/engl401/texts/abrgloss.htm#_blank) .

5. Analize the peculiar features of the syntax.

1) Didst thou not heare a noyse?

2) You all did see…I thrice presented him a Kingly Crowne.

3) Noy that I think you did not love your father.

4) And yet me thinks I see it in thy face.

5) Mother, you have my father much offended.

**INDEPENDENT STUDY**

**1. State the features of the OE syntax:**

a) relatively word order;

b) multiple negation;

c) invertion and auxiliary verb “do” in general questions;

d) verb final in subordinate clauses;

e) verb second in subordinate clauses.

**2. Point out as many differences as possible between the word order of the following Old English fragments and Contemporary English:**

1. þa wæron hie mid metelieste gewægede

X v S O V

‘then they were afflicted with lack of food’

2. ... ond him wið gefuhton

O v

‘... and fought against him’

3. þær wearð Ordheh cyninges þegn ofslagen ond monige oþre cyninges þegnas

X v S V S

‘then king Ordheh’s man and many other of the king’s men were slain’

**3. The following OE fragment contains eight subordinate clauses. Find them and mark the position of the inflected verb in each one of them. Then place them in the correct position in the grid provided. Say whether word order in these examples fits in the position for inflected verbs in other modern Germanic languages. Can you find a global explanation for the diverging patterns?**

Þa se þa geseted wæs, comon seofon Breta biscopas and ealle þa geleredestan men, þa wæron swiðost of Boncra byrig. Þære tide Dinoð wæs haten þæs ministres abbod. Þa heo to þæm gemote ferdon, þa comon heo ærest to sumum ancoran, se wæs mid him halig and wiis. Frugnon heo hine and ahsodon hwæðer heo secoldon heora gesetenesse and heora þewas to Agustinus lare forletan. Ondswarede he him: ‘Gif he Godes man sy, fylgað ge him’. Cwædon heo him: ‘Be hwon magon we ðæt witan?’ Cwæð he: ‘gif Agustinus is milde and eadmodre heortan, þonne is he gelyfed þæt he Cristes geoc bere’.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | SUBORDINATE CLAUSES | |
|  | Word order like other Germanic languages | Word order different from other Germanic languages |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |

**4. Link each of the syntactic concepts in the column on the left with the example that illustrates it in the column on the right.**

**A** *Sentence brace* and þone bur beeode ær hine þa men onfunden **1**

**B** *Split coordination*  se micla here, þe we gefyrn ymbe spræcon **2**

**C** *Omission of the object* he ne meahte ongemong oðrum monum beon **3**

**D** *Topicalisation inside subordination*genim þære ilcan wyrte and wyl on wætere **4**

**E** *Stranded preposition*  þa þe on Norþhymbrum bugeað and on East Englum **5**

***CHANGES IN THE ENGLISH VOCABULARY***

**I. Theoretical problems.**

**1. Borrowing words.**

**2. New words from old. Word-formation.**

**3. Changing meanings.**

**II. Practical Assignments**

**Borrowing words.**

**1. (**a) What impression do the extracts in Text 7 (a) and (b) give? Describe the vocabulary used (use a dictionary to trace the origins of the words). Why is this particular vocabulary used in these particular extracts?

(b) Using a dictionary, compare the vocabulary of Text 5 with the vocabulary of Text 6. Why is this particular vocabulary used in these particular extracts?

2. Read through the list of words below and give a rating out of five for each word, according to how formal you think it is (0 = very informal, 5 = very formal). (Hint: Think about whether you have come across the word before, and, if so, how formal the context was (e.g. ordinary conversation, religious or legal texts).)

fire = fear

holy = ascend

trepidation = flame

rise = sacred

conflagration = terror

mount = consecrated =

Now rearrange the words above to form four rows of synonyms (i.e. words of similar meaning). Organise your rows so that they are in columns according to language of origin (e.g. Germanic, French or Latin). (Use a dictionary to find this etymological information.)

Germanic French Latin

1

2

3

4

How does etymology correlate with formality? If you can, check your ratings with someone else's.

3. Keith Waterhouse, a contemporary commentator on the English language, offers the advice below. What seems to be the underlying basis for his advice? (Hint: consider the origins of the words he focuses on.) Are these words synonymous, as he implies – can we simply use one for the other? Is his advice helpful?

• Prefer short, plain words to long, college-educated ones. End, not terminate.

• Use concrete words, not abstract ones. Rain, not inclement weather.

• Avoid abstract adjectives. Penniless, not penurious.

• Do not use foreign words if you can help it. Ј20,000 a year, not Ј20,000 per annum.

**DISCUSSION** Sometimes present-day debates about keeping English plain and POINT simple sound rather similar to the Inkhorn Controversy. What are the positive or negative aspects of using Latin or Germanic vocabulary? Can the avoidance of Latin vocabulary be helpful? Or, does the avoidance of Latin vocabulary have some negative consequences? In what way does it depend on what you are trying to do with your language (give some examples)?

If you are part of a group, set up a debate: half argue for Germanic vocabulary and half for Latin vocabulary.

**2. New words from old. Word-formation.**

1. More than one affix can be used to create a word. How many affixes are in the following word, and from which languages have they been borrowed?

antidisestablishmentarianism

(Hint: Remember that many dictionaries list affixes as well as words, so you can check that what you think is an affix really is an affix.) Affixes can bring about a change in meaning or a change in grammar (e.g. the addition of -ness to the word happy results in a change from adjective to noun). Beginning with the root word establish, add on affixes and each time describe what changes occur.

2. Use a dictionary to discover the words involved in the following compounds:

*lady, gossip, daisy, nostril, sheriff, goodbye*

3 How old is the open compound *acid rain*? Have a guess. Now go and use a dictionary to see whether you were right.

It is very difficult to guess accurately the age of new words. Sometimes apparently new words have been lurking for years at the edges of vocabulary – often as specialised vocabulary – and only later make their way into mainstream usage. *Computer terminology*, for example, seems fairly new. However, most of it was coined in the 1950s and 1960s, and only with the advent of the PC in the 1980s did it become mainstream vocabulary.

4. One kind of functional conversion is when personal names (proper nouns) are converted into other types of word. A surprising number of such words or EPONYMS have been created this way. Use a dictionary to find out which people gave their names to the following words: *lynch, dunce, boycott, sandwich, cardigan, Wellingtons, pasteurise, sadism, atlas, jovial, venereal, tantalise.*

5. There are selected ten words for each of the twentieth, seventeenth, fourteenth and eleventh centuries from the OED, paying little attention to how the words came to exist in English. Go through the lists below and label the words using the same categories as above (i.e. compounding, affixation, functional conversion, shortenings, blending and borrowing). For instances of borrowing, also note which was the direct donor language. Don't try and trace the etymology of the words right back. For example, *introspect* is a seventeenth-century borrowing from Latin, and, for the purposes of this exercise, you can label it as such. However, if one went further back, one would find that it originated in Latin through a process of affixation: *intro* (meaning 'inside') plus *spicere* (meaning 'to look').

Twentieth Seventeenth Fourteenth Eleventh

century century century century

AIDS antihypnotic ability afterward

backslash brilliant colony climb

Rambo homework colourless consul

camcorder introspect communication coolness

upgradable delinquence handmaid guilty

buyout diagnosis labour marshmallow

mousse (verb) enema predicament millstone

trueish piano pupil shepherd

perestroyka undercurrent presently shorten

spreadsheet manufacture sixpence undergo (verb)

Look across the centuries to see how frequently words were created via a particular process. Bear in mind that the sample of words you have for each century is extremely small, so concentrate on the bigger differences. What changes have occurred? In the light of the commentary in this and the last unit, can you explain why these changes have occurred?

**DISCUSSION POINT** Think of as many new word forms as you can. Now go and check them in a dictionary. Are they genuinely new or are they just, for example, colloquial forms that have been in the language for years?

If you are part of a group, set up a competition to think up the newest word forms.

**3. Changing meanings.**

1. (a) If we had to think of a list of features or criteria that defined both the words *woman* and *lady*, one might suggest that they include being human, female and adult. A definition based on these lines would be the DENOTATIVE MEANING of the two words. But there must be more to meaning than this, since we know that there is a difference between these two words - we know they can be used to mean different things. Consider these words placed in the context of the sentences below.

She's only thirteen, but she's a woman already

She's only thirteen, but she's a lady already

What differences in meaning - what different associations or CONNOTATIONS – do the words have?

(b) The meaning of words can be influenced by the words with which they tend to co-occur. *Pretty* and *handsome* both mean 'good-looking', but may be distinguished by the range of nouns with which they are likely to co-occur.

Which of them would you put with the nouns below?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_village \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_garden

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_woman \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_inheritance

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_colour \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_proportions

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_contribution \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_flower

On the basis of your choices, try to describe the differences in meaning between the two words. You may well have hesitated over woman. Both pretty and handsome could be used here, but each suggests a different kind of attractiveness.

(c) Words can carry with them stylistic associations – associations with particular types of language. In what types of language would you expect to find the words in the following sets: *cast - throw - chuck, steed - horse - nag*"?

2. Spot the metaphor: look through the list below and tick the examples which you think contain a metaphor.

(a) My teacher is a wonderful person

(b) My teacher is an encyclopedia

(c) My teacher causes daily earthquakes in the classroom

(d) My teacher frightens me enormously

(e) My teacher never runs out of batteries (I wish I could find the off button)

(f) My teacher is definitely not good-looking

(g) My teacher talks in fast forward

(h) My teacher fills my days with light

3 Metaphors are often used in the language of science and technology. A relatively new metaphor is the one used in the software advertisement below:

destroyed files, changed or corrupted data ... you can

avoid this with one shot of Norton Anti Virus Vaccine

. . . NAV is ready and waiting for the next strain of virus to appear .. . viruses sneak in undetected, but NAV spots them first

What's the main metaphor used in this area? Why do you think it is used? Do you know of any computer virus names that involve this metaphor?

4. Using a dictionary, investigate the dead metaphors in *comprehend, dilapidated*, *dependent, petrified.*

5 The development of terms used to refer to women is particularly interesting. Using a good dictionary or an etymological dictionary, investigate the meaning of the words below. In particular, consider whether it has always been the case that these words only refer to women, and whether they originally had a neutral or favourable meaning, but have experienced pejoration.

*dragon, hag, harpy, hussy, minx, mistress, scold, shrew, witch .*

**DISCUSSION POINT** Are there word meanings you have used - or you have seen or heard used – which have been criticised (perhaps by a parent or a teacher)? For example, some people object to the use of the word aggravation to mean 'trouble caused by aggressive behaviour or harassment'. Talk to some other people, in order to compile a list of 'pet hates'. Why do you think people object to these meanings? How do they justify their objections? Do they appeal to a particular authority? Do you agree with them?

If you are part of a group, divide the group into two. Get half the group to write down their understanding of the words infer and disinterested, and the other half to write down their understanding of the words imply and uninterested. Now compare results. Is there a general distinction between infer and imply, and disinterested and uninterested? If no distinction arises, use a dictionary to find out if a distinction was made in the past. Is it a useful distinction?

**TEXT 5** This text is part of William Caxton's prologue to the Eneydos (his translation of the French version of the Latin poem The Aeneid by Virgil), printed in 1490. He recounts a story about some merchants who tried to ask for eggs in Kent.

And certaynly our langage now vsed varyeth ferre from that, whiche was vsed and spoken whan I was borne / For we englysshe men / ben borne vnder the domynacyon of the mone. whiche is neuer stedfaste / but euer wauerynge / wexynge one season / and waneth & dyscreaseth another season / And that comyn englysshe that is spoken in one shyre varyeth from a nother. In so moche that in my dayes happened that certayn marchauntes were in a shippe in tamyse [= the river Thames] for to haue sayled ouer the see into gelande [= Holland] and for lacke of wynde thei taryed atte forlond. [= Foreland] and wente to lande for to refreshe them And one of theym named sheffelde a mercer cam in to an hows and axed for mete, and specyally he axyd after eggys And the good wyf answerde. that she coude speke no frenshe. but wold haue hadde egges / and she vnderstode hym not / And thenne at laste a nother sayd that he wolde haue eyren / then the good wyf sayd that she vnderstod hym wel / Loo what sholde a man in thyse dayes now wryte. egges or eyren / certaynly it is harde to playse euery man / by cause of dyuersite & chaunge of langage.

**TEXT 6**

This text is from John Milton's Areopagitica, published in 1644.

I deny not, but that it is of greatest concernment in the Church and Commonwealth, to have a vigilant eye how Bookes demeane themselves as well as men; and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors: For Books are not absolutely dead things, but doe contain a potencie of life in them to be as active as that soule was whose progeny they are; nay they do preserve as in a violl the purest efficacie and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. I know they are as lively, and as vigorously productive, as those fabulous Dragons teeth; and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men. And yet on the other hand unlesse warinesse be us'd, as good almost kill a Man as kill a good Book; who kills a Man kills a reasonable creature, Gods Image; but hee who destroyes a good Booke, kills reason it selfe, kills the Image of God, as it were in the eye

**TEXT 7 (a)** is an insurance condition that appears on the back of Comet Superstore receipts. It is supposedly legally binding.

All of the express terms, conditions and exceptions applicable to the insurance of the product are set out in the Certificate. The scope and extent of the insurance cannot be extended without the express written authority of the Insurer.

**TEXT (b**) is the first part of a text that accompanies an advertisement for a child's drink.

Who understands I need almost as much iron as Daddy?

It may surprise you to learn that from the age of 6 months, a baby needs 90% as much iron as a 30 year old man. However, cow's milk is too low in iron and vitamins A & D to be a main drink for a growing baby.

**INDEPENDENT STUDY**

**1. State the origin of the Old English words choosing the correct answer from the list:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. cyse “cheese” | a) Latin borrowing |
| 2. Ʒrene “green” | b) Celtic borrowing |
| 3. bannoc “a bit, a piece” | c) Scandinavian borrowing |
| 4. eorl “nobleman” | d) Native |
| 5. fōt “foot” |  |
| 6. deofol “devil” |  |

**2. Define the type of word-formation in the following words:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. broÞorræden “fellowship” | a) Suffixation |
| 2. eaƷsyne “visible for the eye” | b) Prefixation |
| 3. Ʒeseon “see” | c) Compounding |
| 4. scipere “sailor” |  |
| 5. ārīsan “arise” |  |

**3. State the origin of the following words choosing the correct answer from the list:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. world | A. French borrowing |
| 2. skill | B. Native |
| 3. reluctant | C. Scandinavian borrowing |
| 4. curtain | D. Latin borrowing |
| 5. add |  |
| 6. gap |  |
| 7. wing |  |
| 8. table |  |
| 9. genius |  |
| 10. teach |  |

**4**. **Read the text. Supply a historical explanation for the underlined words: probable origin, spelling, pronunciation, grammatical forms and their meanings.**

*Stew.* A proclam’d prize: most happie

That eyelesse head of thine, was first fram’d flesh

To raise my fortunes. Thou old, vnhappy Traitor,

Breefely thy selfe remember: the Sword is out

That must destroy thee.

*Glou.* Now let thy friendly hand

Put strength enough too’t.

*Stew.* Wherefore, bold Pezant,

Dar’st thou support a publish’d Traitor? Hence,

Least that th’infection of his fortune take

Like hold on thee. Let go his arme.

*Edg.* Chill not let go Zir,

Without vurther ’casion.

*Stew.* Let go Slaue, or thou dy’st.

*Edg.* Good Gentlemen goe your gate, and let poore

volke passe: and ’chud ha’bin zwaggerd out of my life,

‘twould not ha’bin zo long as ‘tis, by a vortnight. Nay,

come not neere th’old man: keepe out che vor’ye, or ice try

whither your Costard, or my Ballow be the harde;

chill be plaine with you.

*(From W. Shakespeare’s “The Tragedie of King Lear”)*

**ПІСЛЯМОВА**

Важливість історичного підходу до вивчення мовних явищ не викликає сумніву, оскільки лише в ретроспекції можливо виявити динаміку взаємодії одних мовних явищ із іншими, вплив культурно-історичних факторів на еволюційні зміни в мові, і таким чином розкрити сутність явищ, які вивчаються та забезпечити більш повне розуміння їхнього сучасного стану.

Використання нових для філології принципів синергетичного аналізу дозволило внести важливі доповнення в теорію еволюції природної мови як відкритої, нерівноважної, нелінійної, мегасистеми, що розвивається.

У результаті вивчення навчального курсу «Діахронічна лінгвосинергетика» магістранти оволоділи знаннями про загальні принципи еволюції мови взагалі та англійської мови зокрема; базові поняття лінгвосинергетики; основні етапи становлення діахронічної лінгвосинергетики; особливості розвитку фонетичної, граматичної та лексичної системи англійської мови; опанували вміння застосовувати здобуті знання у своїй науково-дослідницькій роботі при виконанні магістерських кваліфікаційних робіт та у післядипломному навчанні та дослідницькій праці за фахом.

Запропонований навчальний посібник сприяв формуванню та розвитку у здобувачів вищої освіти важливих компетентностей, необхідних для майбутнього професіонала, зокрема здатності до системного наукового мислення, самостійного опанування нових знань; здатності критично оцінювати набутий досвід з позицій останніх досягнень науки та соціальної практики, здатності до пошуку, оброблення та аналізу інформації з різних джерел, здатності застосовувати знання у практичних ситуаціях, здатності і готовності застосовувати знання про сучасні методи дослідження, проводити наукові експерименти, оцінювати результати досліджень; здатності аналізувати, синтезувати і критично резюмувати інформацію, здатності й готовності продемонструвати сформовану мовну і мовленнєву компетентності в процесі професійної і міжособистісної комунікації, здатності визначати комунікативну, пізнавальну, номінативну, емоційно-експресивну та інші функції мови, характеризувати мовні та мовленнєві одиниці, здатності критично осмислювати історичні надбання та новітні досягнення філологічної науки; інтерпретувати й зіставляти мовні та літературні явища, використовувати різні методи й методики аналізу текстів тощо.
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