Historical influence on the typology of English on the example of its lexis

Poslončec, Bonita

J.J. Strossmayer University in Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Teaching English as a Foreign Language, MA Programme and Hungarian Language and Communication, MA Programme

Bonita Poslončec

Historical influence on the typology of English on the example of its lexis

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić, Associate Professor

Osijek, 2018

J.J. Strossmayer University in Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Teaching English as a Foreign Language, MA Programme and Hungarian Language and Communication, MA Programme

Bonita Poslončec

Historical influence on the typology of English on the example of its lexis

Master's Thesis

Scientific discipline: Humanities

Scientific field: Linguistics

Scientific branch: English Studies

Supervisor: Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić, Associate Professor

Osijek, 2018

Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer i diplomski studij mađarskog – komunikološki smjer

Bonita Poslončec

Povijesni utjecaj na tipologiju engleskog s obzirom na njegov leksik

Diplomski rad

Mentor: izv. prof. dr. sc. Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić

Osijek, 2018.

Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer i diplomski studij mađarskog – komunikološki smjer

Bonita Poslončec

Povijesni utjecaj na tipologiju engleskog s obzirom na njegov leksik

Diplomski rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti

Znanstveno polje: lingvistika

Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentor: izv. prof. dr. sc. Tanja Gradečak-Erdeljić

Osijek, 2018.

Abstract

The history of the English language is divided into four major periods – the Old English, the Middle English, the Early Modern English and the Modern English Period. During these four periods, the language underwent a change from the morphologically synthetic type of language to the mixed type – a combination of synthetic and analytic type. This is primarily seen in English grammar, but the aim of this work is to examine and explain how this change affected the lexis of English. As in its 1500 years of existence English has almost constantly been under the influence of other languages a major portion of this work will deal with the changes in word formation (derivation and compounding) which were introduced under the influence of foreign languages. Three translations of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* belonging to different historical periods will serve as a basis for description of the evolution of the language and for the comparison of characteristics of word formation with native and non-native elements.

Key words: linguistic typology, English language, analytic languages, agglutinating languages, fusional languages

Contents

1. Introduction 6

2. Linguistic Typology 8

2.1. The Analytic Type 10

2.3. The Synthetic Type 11

2.3.1. The Agglutinating Type 12

2.3.2. The Fusional Type 13

3. The History of the English Language 14

3.1. The Old English Period 15

3.1.1. Old English Vocabulary 16

3.1.2. Typological Change of Lexis in the Old English Period 18

3.2. The Middle English Period 20

3.2.1. Middle English Vocabulary 21

3.2.2. Typological change of Lexis in the Middle English Period 23

3.3. The Early Modern English Period 24

3.3.1. Early Modern English Vocabulary 25

3.4. The Modern English Period 28

3.4.1. Modern English Vocabulary 28

4.3.1. Morphological Typology of Old English 33

Bibliography 45

1. Introduction

It is a natural tendency of every language to change and transform over time and the researches of such developments have interested linguists for quite some time. English is no exception in this matter and due to some of its traits this could be true for English at even a higher degree. As it is the Lingua Franca of today, the description of English language history undoubtedly represents an important undertaking useful for understanding the language itself as well as a means of further cross-linguistic researches.

In its 1500 years of existence the English language underwent changes in its grammar, lexis, pronunciation and spelling just like any other language, but it also exhibits another change not so typical when it comes to languages. In reference to morphological typology, present-day English is the mixed type of language, more specifically a combination of synthetic and analytic language type. While this may not seem unusual since there are both other languages of the mixed type and languages that have numerous traits of one type while typologically belonging to another group, the origin of English contributes to the oddity of its typological classification. As a language of Indo-European origin it started as a synthetic language, the type of language characteristic of this group, but unlike the majority of other languages of this family group, like Greek, Latin, German, French, etc., it lost much of its synthetic traits and slowly evolved towards analyticity. As a result English became a language of poor inflection, relying on the word order and functional words as a means of carrying the grammatical information necessary for conveying a message. While primary focus of linguistic typology is on the grammar, the question asked in this work is whether the change had affected lexis as well. From the aspect of grammar, it will be shown what information a different word could carry and how it would affect its form in different historical periods proving the typological status of the language. From the aspect of lexis in general, the main focus will be on the word formation, mainly derivation and compounding, and how it had affected the morphological status of words in regards to morphological typology on the basis of examples and by describing the general tendencies of word formation in said periods.

Another peculiarity of the English language which makes research of its historical development interesting is the influence other languages, mainly French and Latin, had on it in almost entirety of its existence. Foreign languages constantly flooded English with new words, thus bringing about shifts in word formation in the matter of quantity and by introducing new trends in morphological shaping of words. The question present here is how the word formation

processes involving non-native elements stand in comparison to word formation with native elements when it comes to morphological typology of derivatives and compounds.

As an answer to these two questions, in the following chapters the basic information about the linguistic typology will be explained, including the more detailed descriptions of language type characteristics present in English according to morphological typology, as well as the change in the language and its lexis throughout the history as a consequence of natural development and foreign influence.

2. Linguistic Typology

Linguistic typology is a branch of linguistics which classifies languages according to their structural characteristics.[1] Its aim is to describe and explain the common properties and structural diversity of the world's languages. Despite the fact that the differences between languages may seem vast, there is also a large number of characteristics that are common to all of them. Based on the overlapping similarities and differences between languages, linguists are able to assign languages to certain groups and determine types of languages. The most commonly observed structural and functional features in this branch of linguistics are phonological systems, morphological structure and word order patterns.

Phonological typology is the classification of linguistic systems based on phonological properties. It refers to the classification of the elements that make up a phonological system.[2] Despite some similarities occurring between languages it may often be seen as a less significant typological parameter since after dividing languages according to their phonological systems little can be further done in terms of the over-all typological structure of the languages in question.[3] However, there are some features used for classification. For example, languages can be divided into tonal and non-tonal ones. Tone is defined as the pitch contour on a word that can distinguish lexical meaning. Tonal languages – Chinese, Vietnamese, Thai, etc. – have same sounds that are pronounced with different tones and can refer to different things depending on their tone. For example, in Mandarin Chinese syllable *ma* with a falling tone means 'to scold' and with a rising tone it means 'hemp'.[4] Another such feature is stress. Two groups can be distinguished here - languages with fixed and free stress. In the languages with free stress, like English, the position of stress is unpredictable. Languages with fixed stress can be further divided into other groups depending on the syllable carrying the stress.

When it comes to phonological systems in general, languages may be observed from two aspects: their vowel and their consonant systems.[5] In this case, the study refers to the existence or non-existence of different vowels or consonants in a language, some of which are more common than others.

---

[1] Archibald, J. Katamba, F., O'Grady, W. Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction // 2011. p. 331

[2] Hammond, M. Phonological Typology // Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics / Ed. K.Brown. Boston: Elsevier Pergamon, 2006. p. 535

[3] Comrie, B. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology.// Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989 p. 39

[4] Grasu, D. Tonal vs. Non-Tonal Languages: Chinese vs. English // 2015

[5] Steinbergs, A. The Classification of Languages. // Contemporary Linguistics/ Eds. M. Dobrovolsky, F. Katamba, W. O'Grady, 1997. p. 375

The second feature through which languages are typologically classified – morphological structure – refers to the ways morphemes may or may not be combined to form words in a given language. Based on their differences when it comes to this feature, languages are divided into three major groups. Depending on the manner and extensiveness of the usage of bound morphemes, languages can be classified as isolating/analytic, polysynthetic, and synthetic (agglutinating or fusional). Owing to a large number and variety of languages, falling under a specific category is not a rule and is rarely, if at all, possible. Many languages, among which is English, exhibit characteristics pertaining to more than one group and are thus considered to be the mixed type.

The third branch of grammar according to which languages are classified into certain language groups is syntax, and within syntax it is word order patterns languages exhibit that play the major role. Word order refers to the order of appearance of function words, more specifically subject (S), verb (V), and direct object (O) in a declarative sentence. There are three most common patterns that are found in almost all languages. These are SOV, SVO, and VSO.[6] The common characteristic of all three is the precedence of subject over object. In most of the cases the word order is closely related to morphological structure. Languages with low range of inflection, such as English, have to rely on other grammatical features to carry some of the information that is in synthetic languages taken care of by inflection and one such grammatical feature is a fixed word order. [7]

Of all the tree mentioned areas the most important one for this paper is the morphological structure. As a mixed type, English has the characteristics of two language groups – synthetic and analytic. Starting off as a synthetic language, it transformed throughout the centuries towards analyticity until it reached the status of the mixed type it has today. In order to properly explain the changes it underwent and morphological status it had in different historical periods, analytic and synthetic (agglutinating and fusional) morphological types and their characteristics will be explained in the following sections.

[6] Steinbergs, A. Work cited. pp. 382-383

[7] Eifring, H., Theil R. //Linguistics for Students of Asian and African Languages: Chapter 4: Linguistic Typology.

2.1. The Analytic Type

Analytic languages, as opposed to synthetic ones, are characterised by the lack of morphological complexity of words. Due to that, all grammatical distinctions, such as tense, number or case are expressed by means other than inflectional morphemes, mostly by adding an unbound morpheme indicating particular grammatical category and relying on the word order.[8]

Although when it comes to morphological typology, the terms analytic and isolating are often used interchangeably, there is a difference between them. The defining feature of the analytic type of languages is the lack of complexity of grammatical words. In other words, the number of morphemes per word is extremely low and there are few, if any, bound morphemes indicating grammatical relations.[9] As it is also the trait of the isolating type, isolating languages tend to be analytic too, but this relation cannot be applied vice versa. In case of the isolating languages, this feature is extended even to the derivational morphemes. Also, isolating languages tend not to have obligatory grammatical categories such as tense and case or agreement of gender or number.[10]

Isolating and analytic languages can be seen as languages with no inflectional morphology, in the meaning that the words typically consist of a single root morpheme to which no affixes can be added[11]. An isolating language typically has a one-to-one correspondence between a morpheme and a word so every morpheme is an independent word[12]. Because of the lack of bound morphemes almost all concepts are expressed through additional separate morphemes[13].

The expression of grammatical relations through unbound morphemes is shown in the example sentence in Vietnamese, a typical isolating language. In the sentence ‘We bought the rice’, plurality and past tense are indicated by unbound morphemes:

Chúng	tôi	mua	ã	g o
Pl.	I	buy	past	rice [14]

[8] Steinbergs, A. Work cited. p. 380
[9] Aikhenvald Y., A. Typological distinctions in word-formation. // Language Typology and Syntactic Description/ T. Shopen (Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. p. 27
[10] Aikhenvald Y.A. Work cited. p. 3
[11] Comrie, B. Work cited. p. 43
[12] Aikhenvald. Work cited. p.5
[13] Katamba, F. English words.//New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005. p 30
[14] Katamba, F. Work cited. p. 30

While it is not as drastic in reduction, English is similar in this regard. For example, in the sentence *I have a small house* there is not a single inflectional morpheme. The presence of a subject (I) is obligatory in the sentence as there is no other means to express it. In synthetic languages, the verb would contain a conjugational ending which would have the information necessary to recognise the subject of the sentence even without mentioning it directly. The same happens with the object of the sentence which has no grammatical markings and is only recognised as object due to its position in the sentence. In synthetic languages it would have a suffix showing its status as the direct object of the sentence.

Seeing as it has both derivational and inflectional morphemes, English is by no means considered to be an isolating type of language, but despite that English has many features related to analytic languages and can be considered such to a large extent. Due to the lack of inflectional suffixes, especially when compared to synthetic languages, a large portion of grammatical relations is expressed by function words and other separate words indicating certain grammatical functions. Owing to that, just like isolating languages, English is highly dependent on its syntactic features, the proof of which is the rarely omitted SVO word order.

2.3. The Synthetic Type

Synthetic languages are those whose words are created by the combination of morphemes and the syntactic relationships within sentences are expressed through morphemes added to a certain root or stem morpheme. Since the defining characteristic of such languages is the attachment of inflectional morphemes to the base, they are in the contrast with the isolating or analytic languages where inflection, which is an elementary trait of the synthetic type, is impossible. Grammatical relations, such as tense, person, gender, number, mood, voice, and case, are all expressed through large variety of attached morphemes. This method is applied with derivational morphemes, too.

There are two ways in which this can be accomplished – through agglutination and fusion, and so two distinct types of synthetic languages exist – the agglutinating and the fusional type.

2.3.1. The Agglutinating Type

Agglutinating languages involve a large number of suffixes and prefixes attached to the root morpheme as if they were glued together. This includes both derivational affixes allowing a large word formation productivity, and grammatical affixes used for denoting various grammatical relations. The specific trait which enables separate classification of such languages, especially in regards to fusional languages, is the possibility of a clear distinction between all components included in a word.[15] This is made possible by two characteristics of morphemes in agglutinating languages - segmentability and invariance of morphemes. No matter which morpheme combination occurs, each morpheme stays in its original form without any change in its spelling or pronunciation regardless of the context[16]. Based on a language's specified order, affixes are set together to express numerous grammatical meanings in a single word. Each such identified part a word contains carries a specific meaning and denotes a single grammatical function[17]. Functions and segmentability of morphemes can be shown in the following example of a Hungarian word:

Macskáimat

Macska -i -m -at

Cat Pl. my Direct object

As words may carry numerous affixes the resulting words are extremely morphologically complex. As a consequence, word order does not hold as great importance as it does with languages whose morphology is not as complex since expressing a desired message can easily be accomplished through words alone without depending on the specific word order.

Some examples of the languages of this group are Japanese, Korean, Uralic and the Turkic group of languages. Based on the fact that English has a large portion of analytic traits its inclusion in this group is obviously impossible. However, not belonging to any group, as previously mentioned, English still has certain characteristics of this type of language. English allows a limited range of agglutination. Word formation processes like affixation or compounding involve the combination of morphemes resulting in words like, for example, *politeness* (*polite* + *-ness*) and *sunflower* (*sun* + *flower*). Even more complex words formed by affixation are possible like *reinforcement* which includes four morphemes, all of which are identifiable and have their

[15] Steinbergs, A. Work cited. p. 381
[16] Comrie, B. Work cited. p. 46
[17] Steinbergs, A. Work cited. p. 381

meanings.[18] As a side-effect of the absence of morphological complexity present in agglutinating languages, English displays a great dependence on the syntax, which is another major difference excluding English from this group.

2.3.2. The Fusional Type

Similar to the agglutinating type, the fusional type also involves different grammatical morphemes attached to the base whose function is to express various grammatical relations. The major difference between these two types is in the meanings such morphemes may carry. In the case of the agglutinating type, clearly identifiable suffixes designating one specific grammatical relation line one after another. The number of grammatical relations expressed depends on the number of present suffixes. In the case of the fusional type, a single inflectional morpheme has the capacity to include more than one function, including grammatical and syntactic relations. Another important feature of fusional languages is, as the name says, that stems and suffixes often fuse together making it impossible to clearly distinguish between them. It is also impossible to make a clear dividing line between the suffixes themselves or to discern which part of the suffixes indicates which grammatical information.[19] For example, in the Croatian word *kuću* the *-u* suffix indicates feminine grammatical gender, singularity and the accusative case. When it comes to declension there are different variants for each case depending on a word's gender and number. Also, declension often varies with different words. In the case of conjugation a single suffix can express more than one grammatical feature including mood, voice, tense, aspect, person, gender and number. Because they are morphologically rich, fusional languages often do not require strict word order or the actual presence of the subject in a sentence since the verb in most cases already exhibits all the information necessary for the identification of it.

Some of the languages of this group are Latin, Greek, German, most Slavic languages and Romance languages. Since English is a descendant of a language belonging to this group it has some features of it. However, throughout the centuries it has lost many of its fusional characteristics that were once present and it is now closer to the analytic languages. One such thing would be the conjugation of verbs in English which was once similar to that of the fusional languages, and which is now reduced to the difference only in the third person singular in Present Simple tense, and conjugation of the verb *to be.* Despite that, some of the fusional features have

[18] Steinbergs, A. Work cited. p. 382
[19] Katamba,F. Work cited. p. 31

remained, the most obvious case being pronoun forms which undoubtedly represent the most synthetic word class present in the language. While nouns in English have only one case – genitive, *e.g. cat, cat's* - pronouns still have genitive and accusative forms: *e.g. he, his, him.*

3. The History of the English Language

As was described in the previous chapters, the English language is the mixed type of language, having the characteristics of both synthetic and analytic language type. Originating from a highly synthetic Proto-Indo-European language it started off as a synthetic language, gradually changing towards the analyticity over the centuries.

The primary sources for what developed as the English language were the Germanic languages spoken by a group of tribes from northern Europe who moved into the British Isles in the fifth century.[20] The period when the language was spoken in Europe is known as pre–Old English, as it was only after the English separated themselves from their Germanic cousins that the new distinct language, known today as English, emerged.[21] From the year 449, as its approximate starting point, until the present day the 1500 years of the existence of English are divided into four periods, each characterised by its distinctive features:

- the Old English (OE) period: 449 to 1100
- the Middle English (ME) period: 1100 to 1500
- the Early Modern English period: 1500 to 1800
- the Modern English period : after 1800

In each period English underwent certain changes in both its grammar and lexis, the details of which will be described in the following sections.

[20] Yule, G. The Study of Language (3rd Edition).// Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. p.186
[21] Algeo,J. The Origins and Development of the English Language.// Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2010. p. 78

3.1. The Old English Period

The year 449 marks the beginning of the Old English period. In that year began the invasion of Britain by the founders of the English nation – the Germanic tribes Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians.[22] The languages of the Anglo-Saxon invaders belonged to the West Germanic language group[23] and as they became predominant they became the languages of the island which evolved into what we know today as Old English.

As a Germanic language, Old English resembles modern German more than it does present day English. The differences between Old and Modern English include spelling and pronunciation, the lexicon, and the grammar. One of the most distinctive features of OE is the degree of syntheticity, most of which is lost today. The endings of nouns, adjectives, and verbs during most of this period are preserved more or less unimpaired. Due to that, the period is often described as the period of full inflection.[24] Unlike modern English, which makes extensive use of prepositions and auxiliary verbs and depends upon word order, OE uses elaborate systems of declension and conjugation to indicate grammatical relations.[25]

When it comes to verbs, Old English distinguishes two tenses – present and preterite (past) by inflection. It recognizes the indicative, subjunctive, and imperative moods and has the usual two numbers and three persons.[26] A peculiar feature of the Germanic languages, including OE, is the division of the verb into two great classes – the weak and the strong – known today as regular and irregular verbs.[27] Weak and strong verbs differ in their formation of preterites and past participles.[28] The strong verbs like *sing, sang, sung* had the power of indicating change of tense by a modification of their root vowel.[29] This is an inherited Indo-European process known as ablaut. OE weak verbs, which were in the majority, did so through the suffixation of *-d* or *-t* (as in modern *walk, walked, walked*). Both weak and strong infinitive forms carried the suffix *-an*.[30] Even though OE had a considerably larger number of strong verbs (about three hundred) than

---

[22] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. A History of the English Language, Fifth Edition.//Routledge: Pearson Education, 2002. p.46

[23] Beal, J. A National Language.// English in the World: History, Diversity, Change / Eds. P. Seargeant, J. Swan, New York: Routledge, 2012. p.54

[24] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 46 - 47

[25] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 50

[26] Algeo,J. Work cited. p.53

[27] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 54

[28] Singh, I. The History of English: A Student's Guide// London: Hodder Education, 2005. p. 86

[29] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 54

[30] Singh, I. Work cited. p. 85-86

Modern English does, their number was relatively small compared to weak verbs.[31] Through analogy with the larger number of OE verbs, many strong verbs eventually gained weak forms and over the time *-(e)d* has become predominant productive preterit/past participle suffix for English.[32] Many strong verbs have passed over to this conjugation and practically all new verbs added to the language are inflected in accordance with it.[33]

When it comes to declension, Old English shows complexity similar to that of its conjugation. OE had far more inflection in nouns, adjectives, and demonstrative and interrogative pronouns than Modern English does.[34] The language had a plethora of endings indicating case based on the function of a word in a sentence (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative and instrumental), number (singular and plural), and grammatical gender for nouns (masculine, feminine and neuter). The complexity does not stop here. These things show only when an ending of a noun would change, and not how. Nouns were also categorised into groups based on the stem pattern which indicated the manner of declension. The stems of nouns belonging to the vowel declension ended in one of four vowels in Proto-Germanic (although these have disappeared in OE): a, o, i, or u, and the inflection varied accordingly.[35] According to this pattern, there are six different types of declension in OE – the declension for masculine a-stem, neuter a-stem, r-stem, n-stem, ō-stem and root-consonant stem.[36] This morphological complexity enabled the language to be less dependent on the fixed SVO word order that is present today.

All this clearly indicates synthetic nature of Old English. In addition, the boundaries between morphemes do not exhibit a high degree of transparency, nor are the endings always predictable based on the character of the stem, which further pinpoints this language as fusional.[37]

3.1.1. Old English Vocabulary

In its Anglo-Saxon years, English was quite conservative. Old English vocabulary was primarily Germanic, with comparatively smaller amounts of loans from Latin, Celtic and Old Norse.[38] Being

[31] Algeo,J. Work cited. p.101
[32] Singh, I. Work cited. p. 87
[33] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 55
[34] Algeo, J. Work cited. p 92
[35] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 50
[36] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 94
[37] Haselow, A. A. Typological Changes in the Lexicon: Analytic Tendencies in English Noun Formation.// Berlin: De Gruyer Mouton, 2011. p. 43
[38] Singh, I. Work cited. pp. 89-90

extremely homogeneous, especially if compared with present-day English,[39] it heavily relied on compounding and affixation, mainly with native elements, as productive processes of lexical augmentation.[40] As a consequence, the vocabulary was characterised by large morphologically related word families, where the relationship was transparent both formally and semantically. Instead of borrowing foreign words, when there was a need for them, a so-called loan translation was created in which a notion was expressed by using existing native words and applying native word-formation rules. An example can be seen in OE word for *interjection*. The Latin word *interiectio* was translated as *betwuxalegednys* – a combination of words *alecgan* (put down) and *betwux* (between).[41]

A part of the flexibility of the OE vocabulary comes from the generous use made of prefixes and suffixes to form new words from old words or to modify or extend the root idea. In this respect it also resembles modern German. The language was rich with prefixes and suffixes used to derive verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs from different types of words.[42] The most common prefixes of the period are the following: *a-, æ-, æf-, and-, be-, bi-, ed,-,fær-,for-,ge-, mis-, or-, sam-, sin-, un-, wan-.*[43]

Suffixation was the most productive means of word derivation in OE. The most common nominal suffixes were *-d/-t/-{o)p, -dom, -el(e)/-l(a)/-ol, -els, -en, -end, -ere, -estre, -et{f), -had, incel, -ing, -lac, -ling, -ness, -ræden, -scipe, -ungl-ing,* and *-wist.* Common vebral suffixes include *-ett(ari), -læc(an), -n{iari)* and *-s(iari).*[44] The use of these suffixes enabled the expression of even difficult ideas adequately and often with variety. For example, the word *gaderscipe* (matrimony) comes from the verb *gadrian* (to gather), *giestlīþnes* (hospitality) from words *giest* (stranger) and *liþe* (gracious), *gītsung* (covetousness) from verb *gītsian* (to be greedy), etc.[45]

The other frequently used method of creating new words was compounding. Modern English still uses this method, as can be seen in words like *greenhouse, railway,* or *sewing machine.* However, this method was particularly prevalent in OE. Where in English today we often have a borrowed word or a word made up of elements derived from Latin and Greek, OE relied on compounding. The same rules that were used for loan translations were applied for

---

[39] Kastovsky, D. Semantics and Vocabulary// The Cambridge History of the English Language: Volume I The Beginnings to 1066/ Ed. R. M. Hogg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. p. 299
[40] Singh, I. Work cited. pp. 89-90
[41] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. 294
[42] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 60
[43] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. 378
[44] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. 391
[45] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 60

various other concepts for whose expression arose a need. Thus we have *lēohtfæt* 'lamp' (*lēoht* light + *foet* vessel), *meduheall* 'mead-hall', *doegred* 'dawn' (day-red), *frumweorc* 'creation' (*fruma* beginning+work), and many more. These compounds are transparent in that their elements are discernible[46] and the meanings are self-evident so they are called self-evident compounds. By using these methods, OE seems never to have been at a loss for a word to express even the most difficult concepts, including the words related to science, theology, and metaphysics. The capacity of English nowadays to make similar words, though it is a little less frequently employed than formerly, is an inheritance of OE tradition, when the method was universal. [47]

3.1.2. Typological Change of Lexis in the Old English Period

As Old English makes uses of inflection instead of periphrases it uses today, the language of that period was undoubtedly synthetic. Furthermore, the lack of transparency present in affixation indicates fusional character of the language. Despite syntheticity being decidedly more obvious in grammar, it is present in the formation of lexis as well. This can be measured in terms of the frequency of use of derivational affixes used for the encoding of lexical categorical information, and in terms of the transparency of morpheme boundaries.[48]

Even though the language is still synthetic at this point, a certain change which allowed for further shift towards analyticity was already in the process. A very important feature of analytic languages is invariability of the base, which at the beginnings of OE still was not present and words exhibited various changes as a consequence of affixation. This variability of Old English stems from Indo-European root-based morphology, in which a word was composed of three morphological elements: a root, a stem-formative and an inflectional ending. The base was word-class neutral ant the information of word class was indicated by alternation of the root vowel and/or the addition of particular stem-formatives, which became derivational elements. The result of this process was ablaut which indicated aspectual categories and tense. The formatives then were followed by inflectional endings that had to be added to create a word. A result of this process was a primary derivative which could be used as a base for further derivations called secondary derivations, for the formation of which the same process was repeated again.[49] The increase in secondary formations caused the fossilisation of primary derivatives and their reinterpretation as

[46] Singh, I. Work cited. pp. 89-90
[47] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 59-60
[48] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 18
[49] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 217

morphologically simple words that survived into OE as non-complex stem-forms.[50] In OE, the morphological structure of words was reduced from three constituents (root, stem-formative, inflectional ending) to two (stem + inflection). In such system base forms are non-segmentable but they still require inflectional endings since stems depend on the attachment of bound morphemes in order to occur as independent lexical items with a particular grammatical status, which indicates synthetic character of the language.[51] Despite being less frequent when compared to root-based based morphology, stem-variability in Old English is represented both in inflexion and word-formation as a relic of certain sound changes in Germanic.[52] The proof of that is Indo-European/Germanic ablaut that stayed preserved not only as a feature characterising verbal inflexion with strong verbs, but also within the derivational system. It was no longer really productive in the Old English period as the causes for its presence were no longer systematic and transparent, but it permeates the vocabulary in so far as deverbal nouns, adjectives and verbs very often exhibit the same ablaut alternations as found in their verbal bases. For example, Old English verb *drincan* 'drink' is a strong verb with forms *dranc, druncon, gedruncen.* Nouns derived from it can have diferent bases: *drincer* 'drinker', *drunce* 'drunkeness '.[53] Other changes also may occur within a stem. While the prefixes do not cause morphophonemic alternations in the lexemes to which they are added, suffixes may do so. The most notable alternation is *i*-mutation, e.g. in *wealcan- gewikþ* 'rolling', *feallan-fillen* 'falling'. But from the point of view of late Old English none of these suffixes produces *i*-mutation completely consistently in all possible instances and there are always at least some formations without umlaut.[54] Thus, OE had instances of root-morphology typical of fusional languages, as can be seen on the example of strong verbs, but such morphophonemic variations were not productive anymore and OE was losing its fusional encoding strategies of lexical information.[55]

Some of these characteristics that are synthetic in nature slowly disappeared by the end of this period when the language moved towards the invariability of the stem. From a typological perspective, morphological operations of this type are based on isolated morpheme boundaries that do not vary in form and are therefore characterized by a lower degree of fusion between the base and a suffix.[56] The instances of fusion still remain but they are usually restricted to the

[50] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 223
[51] Haselow, A. Work cited. pp. 221, 224
[52] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. 298
[53] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. 297
[54] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. 382
[55] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 44
[56] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 224

transition zone between a base and a suffix, and a lexical stem is much less liable to fusion.[57] One of the most noteworthy changes at the end of this and the following period, therefore, was the almost total loss of stem variability and its replacement by stem-invariancy as a new morphological principle. This change was brought about by the complete collapse of the Old English morphophonemic system because of its rapidly growing opacity.[58] In additon, the approach towards the invariability of base and affixes shows a progressive shift towards the agglutinating type, especially when it comes to derivation. This may be interpreted as a step closer to the isolated morpheme boundaries and thus towards strictly invariant lexical and derivational morphemes as well as analytic grammatical features of language English exhibits today.[59]

3.2. The Middle English Period

The second major period of the English language lasted from approximately 1100 until 1500. The beginning of this period coincides with the major political change in England. In 1066 the Normans conquered England, replacing the native English nobility with Anglo-Normans and introducing Norman French as the language of government in England.[60] This period is marked by changes more extensive and fundamental than those that have taken place at any time before or since. Some of them were the result of the Norman Conquest and the conditions which followed that event. Others were a continuation of tendencies that had begun to manifest themselves in Old English. The events of this period affected English in both its grammar and its vocabulary.[61]

The most important grammatical change of this period – the levelling of unstressed vowels – led to the loss of inflections characteristic of OE, making this period known as the period of levelled inflections.[62] A number of originally distinct inflectional endings were reduced to a uniform *-e* and grammatical distinctions they formerly expressed were no longer conveyed making the ending useless. By the end of the twelfth century case, number and gender disappeared from inflectional paradigms of OE nouns.[63]

Nouns did, however, continue to mark plurals and genitives, using inflections inherited from Old English declensional patterns.[64] In Early Middle English two methods of indicating the

[57] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 225
[58] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. p.298
[59] Haselow, A. Work cited. pp. 225-226
[60] Algeo, J. Work cited. p. 112
[61] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 146
[62] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 46
[63] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 146-147
[64] Singh, I. Work cited. p. 119

plural remained fairly distinctive: *-s* or *-es* from the strong masculine declension, and *-en* from the weak declension. The suffix *-s* was used for the nominative and accusative plural. These two cases of the plural were those most frequently used and so the *-s* came to be thought of as the universal sign of plural and by the end of this period it was extended to all plural forms.[65] In the adjective the levelling of forms had even greater consequences. The uniform *-e* extended to all cases of singular and plural and was left without any distinctive grammatical meaning.[66]

Similar process applies to the verb as well. The older endings *-an* (infinitive), *-on* (indicative preterite plurals), and *-en* (subjunctive preterite plurals and past participles of strong verbs) all fell together as *-en*. With the later loss of final inflectional *-n* only *-e* [ə] was left, and in time this was also to go. Of all conjugational endings, only third person singular remains.[67]

Another principal change in the verb during the Middle English period was the serious loss suffered by the strong conjugation which was relatively small compared to the large and steadily growing body of weak verbs. While an occasional verb developed a strong past tense or past participle by analogy with similar strong verbs, new verbs formed from nouns and adjectives were regularly conjugated as weak. This applies to verbs borrowed from other languages as well, the number of which was abundant in this period. After the Norman Conquest the loss of native words further depleted the ranks of the strong verbs and many have changed to the weak inflection. Nearly a third of the strong verbs seem to have died out early in the Middle English period.[68]

As a result of the levelling of inflections, syntactic and semantic relationships that had been signalled by the endings on words now became ambiguous. Whereas in Old English the grammatical functions of nouns were clear from their endings, in Middle English their functions might be uncertain. The most direct way to avoid this kind of ambiguity is through limiting the possible patterns of word order.[69] These changes in grammar reduced English from a highly inflected language to an extremely analytic one.[70]

3.2.1. Middle English Vocabulary

While French only aided already occurring grammatical changes, it was a major contributor to the changes in vocabulary. During this period the unquestionable predominance of Germanic

[65] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 147-148
[66] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 148
[67] Algeo, J. Work cited. p. 129
[68] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 150 - 151
[69] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 154
[70] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 146

vocabulary in the Old English period (with only as three percent of non-native words)[71] reaches its end. English borrowed significantly from French in this period and it is traditionally held that these loanwords entered the language in two main phases. A typical estimate is about 10,000 loans. In the first stage of borrowing (by the year 2500) a relatively small number of loanwords entered English primarily from Norman French.[72] Some of these earliest loans include governmental, law and administrative words, ecclesiastical words, army and navy words. [73] After 1250, the majority of loanwords were taken from the fashionable French of the Parisian court. Thus, borrowings continued in the domains mentioned above but also entered fashion, domestic settings, hunting and riding, architecture, literature and medicine.[74]

The influx of French words into English is not the only innovation in the language. Overabundance of new words allowed for modifications in derivation of new words as well. As the number of new words from French increased, old methods of word formation slowly decreased. OE enlarged its vocabulary chiefly by a liberal use of prefixes and suffixes and an easy power of combining native elements into self-explaining compounds. In this way the existing resources of the language were expanded at will and any new needs were met. In the centuries following the Norman Conquest, however, there is a visible decline in the use of these old methods of word formation.[75] One reason for that could be the lack of need for the creation of new words since the language already received numerous foreign words that could be used just as well. This is apparent in the diminished use of native suffixes and prefixes. For example, out of the seventeen different noun suffixes used in OE only nine suffixes including the zero-morpheme were left in late ME.[76] The situation is similar with prefixes as well. Many of the OE prefixes gradually lost their ability to enter into new combinations. For example, the OE prefix *for-* was often used to intensify the meaning of a verb or to add the idea of something destructive or prejudicial. For a while during the ME period it continued to be used occasionally in new formations (e.g. *forhang* (put to death by hanging), *forcleave* (cut to pieces), and *forshake* (shake off)), but it seems to have had no real vitality. None of these new formations lived long, and the prefix is now entirely obsolete. The only verbs in which it occurs in Modern English are *forbear, forbid, fordo, forget, forgive, forgo,*

[71] Haselow, Work cited. p. 205
[72] Singh, I. Work cited. pp. 124-125
[73] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 155-161
[74] Singh, I. Work cited. pp. 124-125
[75] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 168
[76] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 210

forsake, forswear, and the participle *forlorn*.[77] Some of them remain today, but only in their fossilized forms as the prefix in question is no longer productive.

While native affixes were in decrease, French and Latin were on the rise. New French words were quickly assimilated and entered into a fusion with the native elements resulting in adoption of foreign affixes.[78] Derivational affixes could not be borrowed as such, but had become productive in English only after loan-words with those affixes were completely assimilated.[79] Some of those affixes are extremely productive today and include prefixes like *counter-, dis-, re-,, trans-, or de-*, and suffixes like *-ment or -ion.* This is true for Latin affixes as well. Many Latin words with endings like *-able, -ible, -ent, -al, -ous, -ive* became familiar in English and now form common elements in English derivatives.[80]

3.2.2. Typological change of Lexis in the Middle English Period

The transformation from syntheticity towards analyticity continues in this period as well. The language that became stem-based in the previous period continued to change until it became word-based language achieving a very important trait of analytic language type it has today. The changes in inflectional morphology had typological consequences for the overall morphological system and thus for derivation as well.[81] When inflectional endings were lost and when elements that originally had the status of suffixes were reinterpreted as part of the stem, stems were reanalysed as words. Since several types of morphological operations lost their functional importance the progressive loss of the internal complexity of words followed. The isolation of the morpheme boundary of lexical bases led to a system in which morphology was not obligatory to create words from lexical stems since in word-based morphology the categories *lexeme* and *word* coincide. Morphological marking thus became optional, a device to express additional information, but not needed to create words out of stems. In other words, English came to operate with unmarked, invariant base forms that functioned as words without any inflectional or derivational material.[82]

Suffixation processes on a native basis did not cause change in the form of the base, which means that English developed a system in which affixes are attached to morphologically and

[77] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 168-169
[78] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 166
[79] Development of the English Vocabulary from the 12th to 19th c.: French Influence on the Vocabulary in Middle English
[80] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 172
[81] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 232
[82] Haselow, A. Work cited. pp. 234-235

phonologically invariant base forms. Typologically speaking, such a structure corresponds to agglutination since the input to morphological processes is an invariant form and instances of fusion at the morpheme boundary are usually absent. Morphemes tend to be grouped together to larger units, but they preserve their formal shape and each of the morphemes is clearly segmentable and often without change.[83]

The new, stem-invariant pattern led to more transparency, both in inflection and derivation, but, in combination with a significant reduction in the use of affixes, it also resulted in a reduction of the complexity of word-fields in the sense that it reduced the occurrence and the growth of larger families of derivationally related words.[84] Due to the reduction of word families, Middle English, just like present-day English vocabulary, can be said to be 'dissociated'. Very often besides a native lexical item there are semantically related non-Germanic derivatives – *mouth* and *oral, father* and *paternal, sun* and *solar,* etc.[85]

While the derivation of this period does not exhibit analyticity some contributions were made. The optional status of morphological marking may have accelerated the loss of morphological exponents in both derivation and inflection. With isolated morpheme boundaries, the indication of categorical information tended to be realized outside the morpheme boundary of lexical bases, thus becoming predominantly analytic. [86] In addition, foreign sources which were of great importance to word formation in Middle English played equally as important a role in phrase creation. French contributed a large number of verbal phrases which are an important part of today's lexis. The structure of such phrases usually consisted of a verb followed by an abstract noun or adverbial phrase. So now we have expressions like *do homage, do mischief, do justice, make complaint, have compassion on, have mercy on, take pity on, take keep, hold dear,* etc.[87] Such expressions also may be seen as analytic as we use separate lexemes expressing one notion.

3.3. The Early Modern English Period

The beginning of the Early Modern English Period is placed at the year 1500. At that time various conditions came into play causing the English language to transform further. The new factors that caused the language to undergo alterations once more were the printing press, the rapid spread of

[83] Haselow, A. Work cited. pp. 213 - 214
[84] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 233
[85] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited p. 294
[86] Haselow, A. Work cited. pp. 234-235
[87] Burnley, D. Semantics and Vocabulary// The Cambridge History of the English Language: Volume I 1066-1476/ Ed. N. Blake. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. p. 449-450

popular education, the increased communication and means of communication, the growth of specialized knowledge, and the emergence of various forms of self-consciousness about language. These developments generated the need to create a uniform, standard language with its own language policy. These factors mostly affected vocabulary, while the changes in grammar had shown themselves to be relatively slight.[88]

English grammar in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century is marked more by the survival of certain forms and usages than by any fundamental developments.[89] The actual grammar of Early Modern English differed in relatively minor respects from that of either late Middle English or our own time.[90] The only two remaining noun inflections we have today – the plural and possessive singular *-s* – are in use during the Early Modern English period. They are still, however, accompanied by other forms, like plural *-n* (as in *oxen*).[91] When it comes to the genitive, there are two constructions typical of this period – *his*-genitive and the group possessive. In the former case, the possessive relation was expressed through pronouns his, her and their as in "Augustus his daughter".[92] The group-genitive construction, as in "King Priam of Troy's son", is a development of the Early Modern English period. "Group" in the term for this construction refers to the fact that the genitive *'s* is added to whatever word ends a phrase including such a noun.[93]

In the pronoun three changes occurred: the disuse of *thou, thy, thee,* the substitution of *you* for *ye* as a nominative case, and the introduction of *its* as the possessive of *it*.[94] Another noteworthy development of the pronoun in the sixteenth century is the use of *who* as a relative pronoun, which, before this period, was non-existent.[95]

During the Middle English period the regular ending of the third person singular in the south and south-eastern part of England was *-eth.* In the fifteenth century, forms with *-s* occasionally appeared in the Northern dialect. These forms had spread and by the end of the sixteenth century forms like *tells, gives, says* predominate, and during the next century *-s* became universal in the spoken language.[96]

3.3.1. Early Modern English Vocabulary

[88] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 187-189
[89] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 224
[90] Algeo, J. Work cited. p.160
[91] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 225
[92] Algeo, J. Work cited. p.162
[93] Algeo, J. Work cited. pp. 162-163
[94] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 226
[95] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 228
[96] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 230

As was stated the vocabulary was the most affected domain of the language in the early Modern English period. The Renaissance was a period of increased activity in almost every field and these activities required adequate vocabulary. Despite becoming the standard language, English was undoubtedly inadequate compared with classical languages. As a result, English vocabulary relied heavily on borrowing and during this period it acquired thousands of new and strange words. As classical language, Greek was an important source of new words, French continued to be one of the major contributors to vocabulary, and many words were borrowed from other languages, mainly from Italian and Spanish. But the greatest number of these new words was borrowed from Latin.[97] Borrowing in this period resulted in the fastest vocabulary growth in the history of English in proportion to the vocabulary size of the time[98] and loan words constituted a higher proportion of all neologisms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than the three major word-formation processes of affixation, compounding and conversion put together.[99] Loan words did not affect the number of words only. They increased synonymy in the language by supplying new names for different concepts and thus providing alternatives of saying the same thing in different registers.[100]

Another important aftereffect was the increase in the number of new productive elements that owe their existence to borrowed lexis.[101] Many affixes coming from Latin were naturalised and borrowed unchanged. Suffixes such as -ence, -ancy, -ency (Latin -entia, -antia, -y), -ius, -ia, -ium, -ous, -os, -us, -ate and prefixes such as ante-, post-, sub-, super- became part of the productive morphology of English.[102] The process was much more productive in this period than it is today, resulting in words such as *fleshment, insultment, phraseless, rumourer,*[103] but most of these words became obsolete and disappeared during their first decade. These cases may indicate an overzealous desire to enrich the Early Modern English lexicon.[104] Other neologisms might have been rejected because they violated the principles of Latin word-formation.[105]

Like affixes, some words in entering the language retained their original form, while others underwent change. Words like *climax, appendix, epitome, exterior, delirium,* and *axis* still have their Latin form. The adaptation of other words to English was effected by the simple process of

---

[97] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 200-202

[98] Nevalainen, T. Early Modern English Lexis and Semantics// The Cambridge History of the English Language: Volume III 1476 – 1776/ Ed. R. Lass. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. p. 336

[99] Nevalainen, T. Work cited. p. 370

[100] Nevalainen, T. Work cited. p. 332

[101] Nevalainen, T. Work cited. p. 351

[102] Minkova, R. Stockwell, R. English Words: History and Structure// Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. p. 42

[103] Nevalainen, T. Work cited. p. 341

[104] Nevalainen, T. Work cited. p. 349

[105] Nevalainen, T. Work cited. p. 341

cutting off the Latin ending. *Conjectural* (L. *conjectural-is*), *consult* (L. *consult-are*) *exclusion* (L. *exclusion-em*), and *exotic* (L. *exotic-us*) are examples of this. But more often a further change was necessary to bring the word into accord with the usual English forms. The Latin ending *-us* in adjectives was changed to *-ous* or was replaced by *-al* as in *external* (L. *externus*). Latin nouns ending in *-tas (brevitas*) were changed in English to *-ty* (*brevity).* Adjectives ending in *-bilis* take the usual English (or French) ending *–ble* (*considerable, susceptible).* Many English verbs borrowed from Latin at this time end in *-ate (create, consolidate, eradicate).*[106]

The Middle English morphology was already established as word-based. The morphological system of French and Latin, however, was not, which means that together with the large number of lexical items and the use of affixes that were separated from these, stem-based morphology was added to the native, word-based system and changed the typological pattern of English word formation. Unlike words that are the result of derivation by the use of native elements, non-native derivations may exhibit phonological and morphological alternations. This is not true for all such derivatives since originally non-native lexemes may have been nativised and integrated into the native pattern of derivation and therefore, word-formation on a non-native basis may both be word-based and stem-based.[107] Also, suffixes may carry stress themselves or may induce a shift of the stress pattern of their bases. This shift of stress in turn affects the quality of those vowels that are originally stressed and which become unstressed after suffixation (e.g. *diploma – diplomacy*), which leads to phonologically conditioned alternation of the base form. Further instances of alternation of the base form occur as the consequence of shortening processes, such as velar softening and trisyllabic shortening (*sane* /ei/ - *sanity* /æ/). Finally, non-native affixes may be subject to variation and they create fusion at the morpheme boundary like the negative prefix *in-* which can be realised in a word as *il-, ir-, or im-,* or the suffix *-ion* (*-ation, -tion, -sion*).[108] These changes indicate that the derivation of the language, which was in the previous period established as word-based derivation characterised by invariability, which is typologically agglutinating, went a step back in this period, once again showing the traits of fusion which was in this case not a product of inherent language change, but of the introduction of non-native elements.

[106] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 209
[107] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 237
[108] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 238

3.4. The Modern English Period

From the nineteenth century to this day English has been in its modern period. The events of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries affecting the English-speaking countries have been of great political and social importance, but in their effect on the language they have not been revolutionary.[109] The changes from the previous periods led towards establishing the language as the mixed type in reference to morphological typology. Once a highly synthetic language in its present-day form exhibits only a small number of characteristics inherent to such languages. Previously complex systems of inflection have been reduced to only two grammatical endings for nouns – plural and genitive *s* – and three for verbs: *-s, -ing,* and *-en.* Pronouns 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. [110] As with the fusional languages, pronouns change their form depending on a case and a single morpheme may indicate person, number, gender and case[111] (e.g. pronoun *his,* third person singular, masculine, genitive). The pronouns change their forms for the genitive case – I – my, he – his, she – her, we – our, they – their. The same thing happens to their forms in object position: I – me, he – him, she – her, we – us, they – them.[112]

Despite its roots, modern day English resembles analytic languages more than synthetic ones. As the number of inflectional morphemes is insufficient for expressing the most of grammatical relations through that means, it is done through separate words in verbal forms (e.g. 'I *will* call you.'), [113] and through function words (e.g. My sister is *in* the house.). As it is the case with other analytic languages, the lack of inflection necessitates a high level of reliance on the word order.

3.4.1. Modern English Vocabulary

While changes in this period in grammar have been slight, the vocabulary continued to expand as in the previous periods. Wars, the great reform measures, the growth in importance of some of England's larger colonies are reflected in the English vocabulary. But more influential in this respect are the great developments in science and the rapid progress that has been made in every

[109] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 279
[110] Algeo, J. Work cited. pp.164-165
[111] Steinbergs, A. Work cited. p. 382
[112] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 2
[113] Steinbergs, A. Work cited. p. 382

field of intellectual activity in the last 200 years which is accompanied by a corresponding increase in new words.[114] The two most often used methods of word formation are compounding with both native elements (*lifestyle, jet lag*) and borrowed ones *(stethoscope, telephone),* and affixation (*immunology, preview).*[115] These methods are followed by shifting (e.g. *shoulder* as both a verb and a noun), shortening *(*e.g. *taxi* from *taximeter cabriolet)* and blending (e.g. *brunch*). Borrowing foreign words constitutes only two percent of new words.[116]

While the language is predominantly analytic when it comes to expressing grammatical relations since inflection is present only in situations already mentioned, word formation exhibits characteristics of three different typological types: fusional, agglutinating and analytic.

Modern English derivation with native elements is regularly word-based,[117] meaning that both the affixes and a word they were added to remain unchanged and the base can exist without an affix (e.g. *help-er, help-ing*; *un-tie*[118]; *un-learn-ed*[119]). The same happens with compounds like *house-door* or *sun ray.* [120] Such formations are agglutinating as morphemes are attached to one another without causing morphophonemic alternations of lexical base forms and affixes. [121]

The same does not always apply to non-native elements. Here the words can be word-based well as stem-based,[122] stem-based having fusional characteristics like alterations in the stem or affix or inability to function as a word without an affix of some sort.

When it comes to analytic features of lexis it is difficult to determine a word as being such. However, as English is analytic language to a large extent, certain analytic features can be observed. Lexical analytic constructions are forms in which word-formation meanings, that is, abstract categorical meanings, are expressed outside the lexical base. For example, German *raus-gegen*, a single word, has an equivalent in English, only it is expressed by more than a single word – *to go out*. Based on that, analyticity in the lexicon may, in very general terms, be conceived of as the split of a once complex morphological unit into several autonomous ones. Thereby, the new structure may be a combination of lexemes and thus still be a lexical unit, or a syntactic unit, in which case it would not be part of the lexicon, but still relevant for showing the analytic character of the language.[123]

---

[114] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 279-280
[115] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. pp. 285-286
[116] Algeo, J. Work cited. pp. 224-245
[117] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 238
[118] Kastovsky, D. Typological Change in Derivational Morphology//The Handbook of the History of English / Eds. A.V. Kemenade, B. Los. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. p. 159
[119] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 238
[120] Kastovsky, D. 2006.Work cited. p. 159
[121] Haselow, A. Work cited. pp. 266-267
[122] Kastovsky, D. 2006. Work cited. pp. 157-159
[123] Haselow, A. Work cited. p. 32

4. The Typological Change of English from Old to Modern English Period

The typological development of English will be described in the following chapters on the example of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* The aim of the research based on this work is to show how encoding information evolved during the years of the existence of the English language. This includes grammatical information that is expressed by means of lexis proving the development from syntheticity to analyticity as well as the manners in which the language expressed various concepts throughout the history. The examples will be provided to show how the language shifted from the use of native elements toward foreign ones and how the introduction of foreign elements changed the characteristics of word formation and frequency of use of this method instead of borrowing ready-made words from other languages.

4.1. Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*

The typological development of English will be described in the following chapters on the example of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* The original work was written in Latin and completed in 731. It tells the story of the conversion of the English people to Christianity describing England in the period from 597 to 731. As it is an essential source of information about English history of that time it is one of the most important works of Old English literature. As a consequence it was translated into English a number of times and there are versions belonging to all major periods of the English language history, all of which may serve as representatives of their respective language periods.

This work will include three excerpts from three translations. The first is the Old English version translated by an unknown translator in the late ninth century. The second one is translated by Thomas Stapleton at the end of the Middle English period. A twentieth century translation by A. M. Sellar will serve as a representative of both Early Modern and Modern English. The excerpts will include the beginnings of the book (Book I, Chapter I) corresponding to the first thirteen lines of the Old English translation. These excerpts describe England by stating its geographical position and listing some of its natural riches. As the first translation is abbreviated and the following ones are direct translations of the original Latin work, the newer translations include the lines that were omitted in the first translation.

The study of these excerpts will constitute of descriptions of morphological structuring of the example words present in the texts and comparison of words' characteristics in different periods including the manners of inflection, derivation and compounding. As in the texts of later periods the number of words of non-native origin will prove themselves to be significantly higher in number in comparison to the original translation, the impact the words of foreign origin had on the morphological structure of words will be observed as well. The findings will be corroborated by additional examples extracted from the dictionaries of corresponding periods.

4.2. Excerpts from Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People

OLD ENGLISH:[124]

> Breoton ist garsecges ealond, ðæt wæs iu eara Albion haten: is
> geseted betwyh norðæle and westdæle, Germenie Gallie Hispanie
> þam mæstum dælum Europe myccle fæce ongegen. þæt is
> norð ehta hund mila lang, tu hund mila brad. Hit hafað fram
> suðdæle þa mægþ ongean, þe mon hateþ Gallia Bellica. Hit is
> welig þis ealond on wæstmum on treowum misenlicra cynna ;
> hit is gescræpe on læswe sceapa neata ; on sumum stowum
> wingeardas growaþ. Swylce eac þeos eorþe is berende missenlicra
> fugela sæwihta, fiscumwyllum wæterum wyllgespryngum.
> her beoþ oft fangene seolas hronas and mereswyn; her beoþ
> oft numene missenlicra cynna weolcscylle muscule, on þam
> beoð oft gemette þa betstan meregrotan ælces hiwes. her beoð
> swyþe genihtsume weolocas, of þam bið geweorht se weolocreada
> tælgh, þone ne mæg sunne blæcan ne ne regn wyrdan ; ac swa he
> biþ yldra,swa he fægerra biþ. Hit hafað eac þis land sealtseaþas ;
> hit hafaþ hat wæter, hat baðo ælcere yldo hade ðurh todælede
> stowe gescreepe.

MIDDLE ENGLISH:[125]

---

[124] Miller, T. The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of English People // London: N. Trubner and Co, 1890. pp. 24,26

[125] The history of the Church of Englande. Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman. Translated out of Latin in to English by Thomas Stapleton student in diuinit

Britāny an Iland of the Oceane, which of owld time was called Albion, doth stande betwext the north and the west, right ouer against Germany, Fraunce, and Spayne, iij of the greatest countries of Europe. Which being eight hundred myles longe Northward, is but ij hundred myles broade, excepte yow reckon the cabes or poyntes of the mountaynes which runneth owt a long far into the sea, wherby the Iland is in cumpasse* forty and eight times lxxv myles. Of the sowth side it hath Flaunders, the first hauen towne wherof to arriue at for a man comyng owt of England is called Ruthubi, the hauen whereof is now corruptely called Reptacester 50 myles of from Calleis, or as some write 60. myles. On the back syde of it where it lyeth open vnto the mayne Oceane, it hath the Iles called Orcades. It is an Iland very batfull of corne, frute and pasture. In sum places it beareth vines, it hath plentif of fowles of diuerse sortes, both by sea and by land, of sprynges also and riuers fulal of fysh but specially of lampriles and eles. Ther be many times also takē, Dolphyns and whales, beside many kynde of shellfishes, among other of muskles, in whom be founde per|les of all coulours as red, purple, crymson, but specially white: ther is also great store of cockles, whereof is made the dye of crymson, whose rudd will be appalled nether with heate of sonne nether with wette of wether, but the oulder it is, the more bright and beutifull glasse it casteth. It hath also sprynges fitt to make, and others of whott waters, where ar buylded seuerall pla|ces meete for all ages as well for men as women to bathe them selues.

MODERN ENGLISH:[126]

Britain, an island in the Atlantic, formerly called Albion, lies to the north-west, facing, though at a considerable distance, the coasts of Germany, France, and Spain, which form the greatest part of Europe. It extends 800 miles in length towards the north, and is 200 miles in breadth, except where several promontories extend further in breadth, by which its compass is made to be 4,875 miles. To the south lies Belgic Gaul. To its nearest shore there is an easy passage from the city of Rutubi Portus, by the English now corrupted into Reptacaestir. The distance from here across the sea to Gessoriacum, the nearest shore in the territory of the Morini, is fifty miles, or as some writers say, 450 furlongs. On the other side of the island, where it opens upon the boundless ocean, it has the islands called Orcades. Britain is rich in grain and trees,

[126] Sellar, A. M. Bede's Ecclesiastical History of England by Saint the Venerable Bede.//London: George Bell and Sons, 1907. pp. 35,36

and is well adapted for feeding cattle and beasts of burden. It also produces vines in some places, and has plenty of land and water fowl of divers sorts; it is remarkable also for rivers abounding in fish, and plentiful springs. It has the greatest plenty of salmon and eels; seals are also frequently taken, and dolphins, as also whales; besides many sorts of shell-fish, such as mussels, in which are often found excellent pearls of all colours, red, purple, violet and green, but chiefly white. There is also a great abundance of snails, of which the scarlet dye is made, a most beautiful red, which never fades with the heat of the sun or exposure to rain, but the older it is, the more beautiful it becomes. It has both salt and hot springs, and from them flow rivers which furnish hot baths, proper for all ages and both sexes, in separate places, according to their requirements.

4.3. Typological Change Based on Translations of Different Historical Periods

As translations of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* includes words typical of their respective periods, they will serve as bases for the explanation and exemplification of morphological changes which occurred in English words in different historical periods.

4.3.1. Morphological Typology of Old English

As was already stated, one of the most distinctive features of Old English is the degree of syntheticity which is apparent from various inflectional endings present in the most of the nouns, pronouns, verbs and adjectives in the Old English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* While there are nouns, like *ealond* ('island'), *regn* ('rain') and *sunne* ('sun'), and adjectives, like *wælig* ('rich'), that aren't inflected for case, these nouns and adjectives are mostly in the nominative case which corresponds to the words' base forms, as can be seen in the following example sentences:

Breoton ist garsecges *ealond.* (Britain is an island in the ocean)

... þone ne mæg *sunne* blæcan ne ne *regn* wyrdan. (...that the sun may not bleach, nor rain ruin.)

There is another instance of a noun occurring in its base form – *wæter* ('water'):

... hit hafaþ hat *wæter*. (…it has hot water.)

The word wæter belongs to the a-stem (n.) declension category meaning that its accusative form remains the same as the nominative form:

	Sg.	Pl.
Nominative	wæter	wæter
Accusative	**wæter**	wæter
Genitive	wæteres	wætera
Dative	wætere	wæterum

Not counting these examples, the text is full of nouns inflected for cases in the remaining cases like *wæstmum* (westm ‘plant’) - dative, *mīla* (mīl 'mile') – genitive, *mǽgþe* (mǽgþ 'clan, family, tribe, province'). Besides inflectional suffixes the stems show no changes in their form clearly indicating stem-based morphological status of the language. In this text there is one exceptions to this. The declination of the word *seolh* (‘seal’), which in accusative plural is *sēolas,* deviates from the agglutinating tendencies of suffix attachment, but the fusion which is disappearing from the language here occurs on the boundary between the stem and the suffix which shows that language has been moving away from its earlier fusional tendencies.

The same applies to verbs as well as they all have inflectional endings showing grammatical information like Sg.3 *hāteþ* (hatan 'to call, name') and *grōwaþ* (grōwan 'to grow') or having their infinitive ending *-an* as in *blæcan* (‘bleach’) and *wyrdan* (‘ruin, corrupt’). Besides these examples, irregular verbs *beon* 'to be' and *habban* 'to have' change their forms when conjugated and show their entirely synthetic character:

Beon 'to be': Sg.1 bēo|bēom
Sg.2 bist
Sg.3 biþ
Pl. Bēoþ

Habban 'to have': Sg.1 hæbbe
Sg.2 hæfst|hafast
Sg.3 hæfþ|hafaþ
Pl. habbaþ

Another exception to the stem-based system is seen in the words that completely change when they are declensed as the demonstratives *sē, se* (m.), *þæt* (n.), *sēo* (f.), *þā* (Pl.) which can today be translated as *the, that* or *those.*[127]

When it comes to word-formation there are numerous instances of derivation and compounding. The first compound occurring in the text is *gársecg* (‘ocean, sea’). The word was replaced in the Middle English period by the Old French word *ocean,* which comes from Latin

[127] Algeo, J. Work cited. p. 96

oceanus and Ancient Greek *Ὠκεανός*. It is composed of two words – *gár* 'a spear' and *secg* 'man'. Unlike the other compounds in the text, its meaning is not transparent but comes from the myth of the Ocean, personification of the Roman god Neptune who is recognisable by holding a trident in his hands, thus giving the word *gársecg* the meaning *spear-man, the ocean*. The rest of the compounds in the text are clear in their meanings:

eálond es; *n. An island; insula*

- eá *n.;* gen. ié, é; *dat.* ié, ee; *dat. pl.* eáuum, éum. *A river*
- land es; I. *Land* as opposed to water or air, *earth*

  II. *A land, country, region, district, province*

wingeard eard, es; *m. A vineyard*

- wín es; *n. Wine*
- geard es; *m. An inclosure, inclosed place,* yard,garden, *court, dwelling, home, region, land;*

sæwiht e; *f. A sea animal*

- sǽ *m. f.; gen.* sǽs, sǽes, sǽ, sǽwe, seó; *nom. pl.* sǽs, sǽ; *dat.* sǽm, sǽum, sǽwum. *Sea.*
- wiht e ; *f.* : es; n.I. *a wight, creature, being, created thing*

willgespryng es; *n. A spring*

- will es;*m. A well, spring, fountain*
- gespryng *a spring*

mereswín es; *n. A sea-pig, porpoise, dolphin*

- mere es; *m.f(?). The sea*
- swín es;*n, A swine.*

meregrota an; *m. A perl*

- mere es; *m.f(?). The sea*
- grot es;n. *A particle*

weolocscill e; *f. A shell-fish, a whelk, cockle*

- weoloc es; *m. A kind of shell-fish, a whelk, cockle;* also *the dye obtained from such fish*
- scill scell, scyll, e; *f. A shell,*

weolocread *adj. Of the red colour that is got from the* weoloc, *scarlet, purple*

- weoloc es; *m.A kind of shell-fish, a whelk, cockle;* also *the dye obtained from such fish*
- reád *adj. Red*

sealtséaþ es; *m. A salt-pit, salt-spring*

- sealt es; *n. Salt*
- seáþ es; *m. A pit, hole, well, reservoir, lake*

In any of these examples the meaning of a compound can be induced. Furthermore, not one of them exhibits fusion of any kind clearly showing them to be agglutinating in their morphological structure. Present-day English compounds show the same feature, but these examples show how some of the things changed, mostly in the choice of words. Many words here are no longer being used in English and are replaced by foreign ones. For example, Old English *sæwiht* and Modern English *sea animal* correspond perfectly, but native word *wiht* is replaced with non-native *animal. Mereswín* is replaced by French *pourpois* (porpoise) and *daulphin* (dolphin). *Weolocread* is replaced with *scarlet, purple* or *crimson,* all three of which are borrowed from French, Latin and Spanish respectively. An interesting change happened with *wingeard,* Old English equivalent of vineyard, whose components were replaced by French cognates of the words.

In the case of derivation, the text offers examples of such word formation as well, like *missenlíc* ('variously, diversly, differently') coming from *missen* (different, dissimilar, diverse, various) and *-lice* ('-ly'). Other examples are *gemette, geweorht* and *geseted* with the prefix *ge-*, which is one of the most frequent prefixes in Old English. In some cases the prefix makes little change in the meaning of the verb it was attached to as can be seen in the example from the text – *gemetten.* The prefixed and unprefixed verb have almost the same meaning:

gemétan -méteþ, -métt, -mét; *p.* -métte, *pl.* -métton; *pp.* -méted, -métod, -métt, -mét.

To find, find out, discover, come upon, meet with

métan *p.* te *To meet with, come upon, come across, find*

When the prefix does have a specified meaning its function is usually to denote perfectivity or a result[128] like in *geweorht* 'is made':

wyrcan, weorcan *p.* worhte ; *pp.* worht.I. *to work, labour*

gewyrcan -wyrcean; *p.* -worhte, ðú -worhtest; *pp.* -worht.I. *to work, make, build, form, dispose, do, perform, celebrate, commit*

How often prefixes were used to modify the meaning of verbs can be seen on the example of *settan* ('set'). In the Bosworth-Toller Anglo-Saxon dictionary the verb occurs with twelve different prefixes: *á-, an-, be- for-, ge-, in-, of-, on-, tó-, un-, wið-* and *ymb-*:

settan *p.* sette; *pp.* seted, set[t]

I. *to set, place, put, cause to take a certain position* II. figurative, *to set* to work, *set* before one a choice, *set* a mark, a name, one's mind, *lay* a charge, a curse, etc. , upon one, *put* one in a position, *put* into one's power, etc. III. *to set, plant* IV. *to set, fix, implant* V. *to set, fix, appoint* a

[128] Kastovsky, D. 1992. Work cited. p. 380

limit, time, place (cf. *set* day, time in A. V.) VI. *to set* a task, *ordain, establish* a law, regulation, *appoint* a condition VII. *to build, erect* VIII. *to set up, institute, found, establish* IX. *to set, base, found* X. *to appoint* an officer or a person to an office or duty XI. *to settle* a quarrel, *allay* animosity, *compose* a difference XII. *intrans. To settle, abate, subside* XIII. *to compose* a book, etc.

ásettann *p.* -sette ; *pp.* -seted, -sett.
I. *to set, put, move* an object to a place II. of building, *to set, place, build* III. *to put* in, out of an office, &c. IV. *to lay, impose* punishment, &c. V. *to set, propose* a riddle, &c.VI. síþ asettan *to make a journey;*

ansettan *to impose,*

besettan *p.* -sette, *pl.* -setton; *pp.* -seted, -sett; I. *to beset, appoint, to place, own, possess;*
II. *to surround, besiege* III. *to set* with something inserted

forsettan *p.* -sette, *pl.* -setton; *pp.* -seted, -sett
I. *to stop up, block, obstruct*
II. *to press down, oppress, repress*

fórsettan *p.* -sette. *pl.* -setton; *pp.* -seted, -sett *To set before*

gesettan *p.* -sette; *pp.* -seted, -set, -sett
I. *to set, put, place, lay* II. *to cause* a person *to take a position* III. *to assign* something to a person, *allot, appoint* IV. *to occupy* V. *to decree, ordain* VI. *to settle, fix.* VII. *to put together, compose, constitute* VIII. *intrans.* of living creatures, *to place oneself, settle,* of water, *to settle, subside*

geinsettan *to institute*

insettan *p.* te *To appoint, institute*

ofsettan *to beset, press hard, oppress*

onsettan I. *to impose, place* one object on another II. *to oppress, impede*

tósettan *p.* te *To set things apart from one another, to dispose;*

unsettan *to displace, put down*

wiþsettan *p.* te *To oppose, resist*

ymbsettan *p.* te.
I. *to set round, put round, surround* II. *to plant* with something

Derivation with the use of prefixes in these examples results in additional different meanings and derivatives, usually without changes in the stem or prefix, with the only exception of *wið – wiþsettan* with the sound change on the boundary between the prefix and the base, showing the agglutinating character of such words formation of this period.

4.3.2 Morphological Typology of Middle English

The Middle English period is said to be the period of greatest change in the language both in grammar and lexis. This is immediately proven by a mere glance at excerpts which show a stunning difference from their OE equivalents. The Old English text has little resemblance to Modern English and is unintelligible to an average present-day reader. The later (MidE?) version barely has any elements which would pose a threat to understanding even the nuances of the text let alone the general idea. This is true for both understanding grammatical relations and lexis, both of which underwent great changes in this period.

The greatest change in grammar in this period is the loss of inflection stripping the words of grammatical information characteristic of synthetic words. Without grammatical endings the language became analytic in nature. The language of the period still retains some of the inflectional endings, the examples of which are present in the text together with words indicating what kind of suffixes had completely disappeared.

When it comes to verbs, there are three grammatical suffixes in the text: present participle *-ing* and past participle *-ed (is called, ar buylded, be appalled, being)* in the form and usage as we have today, and third person singular in Present Simple tense conjugational ending, although realised as *-eth* instead of the modern *-s* (*runneth, hath, beareth, lyeth, casteth*). Besides these, all

other conjugational endings present in the previous period are lost. Declination is even less preserving with the only inflectional ending present in the text being the plural *-s* (e.g. *myles, sortes, perles*). The number is incomparably smaller than that in Old English period as can be seen in the examples from the Old English text where there are numerous different inflectional endings for different cases, e.g. nominative plural *meregrota-n,* accusative plural *læsw-e, sæwiht-a, winegard-as,* genitive singular *hiw*-es, genitive plural *mil-a, fugel-a,* dative singular *treow-um* and dative plural *mæst-um.* Another Middle English characteristic is the uniform ending *-e* which is the final letter of many words even though it has no functional value. It is present mostly in nouns (*oceane, towne, syde, frute, kynde, heate, wette*), but also in adjectives (*broade, longe*) and even prepositions as in *excepte.* The loss of inflectional endings is also reflected in the word order making sentences in which the object precedes the verb impossible, unlike in Old English when both OV and VO were possible as illustrated in the Old English text: "…ðæt wæs iu eara Albion haten" and "... þe mon hateþ Gallia Bellica." The verb *hatan* 'to call, name' follows the object in the first sentence and precedes it in the second.

When it comes to vocabulary there are two major differences in comparison with the Old English text. The first is that the majority of words is recognisable and in use today, and the second is that the Middle English version includes a number of foreign words, mostly Latin in origin and borrowed from French. The text has an average of one such word borrowed from French during the Middle English period in every line, those being *countrie* (F countrie, L. terra contrata), *excepte* (F.excepter, L. exceptus), *montaine* (F Montaigne, L. montanea), *cumpasse* (F. compass, L. compassus), *arriue* (F. ariver, L. arripare), *corruptely* (F. corrupt, L. corruptus), *frute* (F. fruit, L. fructus), *pasture* (F. pasture, L. pastura), *vine* (F. vigne, L. vinea), *plentif* (F.plente, L. plentatem), *diuerse* (F. divers, L. diversus), *riuer* (F. riviere, L. riparius), *lamprile* (F. lampreie, L. lampreda), d*olphyn* (F. daulphin, L. delphinus), *perle* (F. perle, L. perna), *cockles* (F. coquille), *appalle* (F. apalir, L. palir), *beutifull* (F. beauté, L. belitas).

While there are not many words here having derivational affixes, those that are present show how the words assimilated into English. *Corruptely* and *beutifull,* both words of French/Latin origin readily take native affixes *-ly* and *–ful(l),* thus preserving the agglutinating word formation characteristics. The same happened with majority of other words that became naturalised. For example, the native adverbial ending *-ly* seems to have been added to adjectives almost as soon as they appeared in the language. The adverbs *commonly, courteously, eagerly, feebly, fiercely, justly, peacefully,* and many more occur almost as early as the borrowed adjectives they were derived from. For example, the adjective *gentle* is recorded in 1225 and within five years we have it compounded with an English noun to make *gentlewoman* (1230). A little later we find *gentleman*

(1275), *gentleness* (1300), and *gently* (1330). The new French words were quickly assimilated, and entered into an easy and natural fusion with the native elements in English.[129]

Many borrowed words came into the language already affixed and through analogy the affixes present in them became productive elements of English together with the native ones. An example can be given by the word *diuerse* 'diverse' from the text. In the Middle English period it was already a base for derivation of other words with both native and non-native affixes. With native affixes it is used to derive noun *diverseness*, adjective *undiverse* and adverb *diversely*, and with non-native *diversity* and *diversify.* The same is with *corrupt,* which is a base for numerous words used nowadays with native and non-native affixes like *corruptedly, corruptedness, corrupter, corruptor, corruptive, corruptively, corruptly, corruptness, noncorrupt, noncorruptly, noncorruptnes, noncorrupter, noncoruptive, overcorrupt, overcorruply, precorrupt, precorruply, precoruptness, precorruptive, uncorrupt, uncorruptly, corruptness, uncorrupted, unccoruptedly, uncorruptedness, uncorrupting, uncorruptive.* This combining of bases and affixes works the other way around as well and many native words were used as bases for derivation with foreign affixes as well. Native words like *place, run* or *heat* could take French and Latin affixes introduced in the Middle English period to derive words such as *place, placement, displace, rerun or reheat*. There are, however, native words that come with restraints. *Bro*ad and *great,* for example, only take native affixes.

As was explained, many of the Old English affixes disappeared, either as a result of borrowing or by naturally falling out of use. For example, prefixes like OE *ge-* that caused little change in the meaning of the words might have disappeared due to their redundancy. The introduction of foreign affixes thus preserved derivation in the language. As a result of these developments, the language is full of etymologically hybrid forms – words composed of morphemes of different origin. Despite being hybrids, the words retain their agglutinating characteristics. It applies to both derivation and compounding in which either of the two elements could be of either origin, as can be seen in the following examples: [130]

- Compounding: English + French: *breast-plate, freemason, knight errant*
  French + English: *commonweal, cornerstone, gentleman*
- Derivation: English roots + Romance suffixes: *talkative, unknowable*
  Romance roots + English suffixes: *colourless, cheerful, spousehood*

[129] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 166
[130] Minkova, R. Stockwell, R. Work cited. p. 38

4.3.3 Morphological Typology of Modern English

In its last five hundred years of existence English preserved the simplicity of grammatical morphological structure achieved by the loss of almost all of its inflectional endings. As is exemplified by the text, the grammatical structure of words in the modern period differs from the Middle English structure, which was already immensely simplified, only in the conjugational ending for the third person singular which has been established as *-s* we have today rather than *-th,* which was used in the past. One of the last remnants of past extensive inflection – the final ending *-e* which was prevalent in the Middle English, as seen in the excerpt above – finally disappeared from both writing and speech, which is no wonder as it no longer served any purpose and was thus undoubtedly redundant. Another trend that has not stopped is the use of foreign words which have flooded the language and altered the natural development of the language towards further simplification which will be shown in the examples present in the Modern English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and related dictionary entries.

The only internal complexities the words exhibit today are the few remaining inflectional endings, rare irregularities like irregular plural forms and strong verbs as the remains of root morphology, and derived words, especially those of non-native origin, the number of which is by no means negligible.

In the ModE excerpt there are more than forty words of French and Latin origin, which is more than the double amount that was present in the Middle English period. The majority of these words was borrowed in the Middle English period, but their increased use shows growing popularity of such words in some forms of communication. As a result, English vocabulary is said to have three layers – popular, literary and learned – popular being native in origin, literary being French and learned Latin.[131] The choice of words affects not only the aesthetic features of language but also the morphological ones as will be shown on the examples of foreign words from the excerpt. These words are the following: face (F. face, L. facies), form (F. forme, L. forma), except (F. excepter, L. exceptus), several (L. separalis), considerable (F. considerer, L. considerare), distance (F. distance, L. distantia), coast (F. coste, L. costa), part (L. partem), extend (L. extendo), promontory (L. promontorium), compass (F. compass, L. compassus), passage (F. passage), city (F. cité, L. citas), corrupted (F. corrupt, L. corruptus), territory (L. terra - torrium), grain (F. grain, L. granum), adapted (F. adapter, L. adaptare), cattle (F. chattel, L. capitalis), beast (F. beste, L. bestia), vine (F. vigne, L. vinea), plenty (F. plenté, L. plentatem), diverse (F. divers, L. diversus),

[131] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p.174

sort (F. sorte, L. sortem), remarkable (F. remarquable), abounding (L. aboundare), salmon (F. saumon, L. salmo, salmon), frequently (F. frequent, L. frequens), dolphin (F. daulphin, L. delphinus), excellent (F. excellent, L. excellens), pearl (F. perle, L. perna), colour (Anglo-Norman color), purple (L. purpura), violet (F. violette, L. viola), chiefly (F. chief, Vulgar Latin capum, L. caput), abundance (F. habundance, L. abudantia), scarlet (F. escarlate, L. scarlatum), beautiful (F. beauté, L. belitas), fade (F. fade 'weak'), exposure (F. exposer + ure, L. expono + tura), furnish (F. furniss), proper (F. proper, L. proprius), sex (F. sexe, L. sexus), separate (L. separatus), according (F. accorder, L. accordo), requirement (F. requerre, L. requiro).

Foreign words affected word formation in two ways. The first is that, in some cases, foreign words that were borrowed as a single base simplified the structure of a concept in morphological terms as many non-native words replaced the native ones that were the result of compounding, as was the case in the examples from the text – *weolocread* ('red colour got from the weoloc'), which was later replaced by *scarlet* or *purple*, and *meregrot* 'pearl' – or the word *coast* used in this text which is in Old English *sæland, sægeset, særima*, all three compounds.

The second way in which foreign words affected words formation is the introduction of new derivational affixes that came with foreign words in the sense that they replaced the native affixes that had become lost by the end of Old English period. *-able, -ance, -ure, -ment* that are parts of the words from the text *(considerable, remarkable, abundance, exposure, requirement)* are only some of the examples. The words extracted from the text show how derivatives can be made of only native or non-native elements as well as be etymologically hybrid:

NATIVE: formerly, boundless, feeding

NON-NATIVE: considerable, remarkable, abundance, exposure, requirements

HYBRID: facing, plentiful, frequently, chiefly, beautiful, according, abounding

In native derivatives both the bases and suffixes remain unchanged in their morphological and phonetic forms and the bases may function independently without an affix proving the word-based morphology characteristic of the native elements in the language. Derivatives that include a non-native element may undergo a change, especially on the boundary between the base and an affix. In some cases parts of such words may not even function independently which is usually the case in languages with fusional features, clearly deviating from the previously established word formation rules. *Requirement* and *remarkable* have all of the characteristics of words with native elements, but *exposure,* for example does not as the final sound in *expose* /ɪkˈspəʊz/ is pronounced differently when added the suffix *–ure:* /ɪkˈspoʊʒə/. The same happens with adapt when it is converted into a noun by adding *-ion:* /əˈdæpt/-/əˈdæpʃən/. Different realisations of such sounds

are more fusional than agglutinating in nature. There are even examples of words having affixes that cannot be removed if they are to be used independently. *Distance*, for example has *-ance*, which could be replaced with *-ant* to form an adjective, but cannot function on its own without any suffix. This fusional feature does not exist with native derivatives. As a conclusion, foreign lexis affected the typology of English by reintroducing fusional features that had previously disappeared from the language.

Also, there are many words used today that were not borrowed in a way that would show their complex structure they have in languages of their origin. The vast majority of the words used in the text that are of non-native origin are the result of derivation in their respective languages. For example, *territory* in Latin comes from *terra* ("the earth") and *-torium* – a suffix denoting a place of occurrence. *Adapt* which cannot be disassembled in English, in Latin can – as *ad* ("to") + *aptare* ("to make fit"). Abundance comes from Latin *ab-* ("from, down from") + *undō* ("surge, swell; fluctuate") + *-antia* (suffix used to form an abstract noun, usually from an adjective or a present participle stem).

When it comes to verbs, especially the ones of native origin, agglutinating and fusional modes of word formation can also be accompanied by analytic one. Many verbs that are complex in structure, but simple ones as well, can be replaced by the most common verbs followed by a preposition or an adverb and in that way modify the meaning of the base verb or create a completely new meaning. *Back, blow, break, bring, call, come, fall, get, give, go, hold, lay, let, make, put, run, set, take, turn,* and *work* are all native verbs and have entered into 155 combinations with more than 600 distinct meanings or uses.[132] *Separate* and *consider* from the text are good examples for this. In the sense 'to remove something from the group' *separate* can be replaced with *keep apart, set apart, come apart, come away, come between, break off* or *split up*. In the sense 'isolate, segregate' it could be *break off, close off, cut off, draw apart, rope off, single out, split up. Consider* has even more such variants. In the sense 'regard in a certain way', depending on the context, the word can be replaced with *care for, look upon, reckon with, set down, take for, think of* . If it means 'to turn over in one's mind', it could be said *as allow for, assent to, chew over, dream of, mull over, reckon with, see about, take under, take up, think out, think over,* etc. Because these words can be replaced by single words with the identical meaning, the use of this type of formation shows English preference for simple divided forms. While today we have a foreign verb *separate,* which is fusional in character, and multi-word verbs like *set* or *keep* apart, that may be seen as analytic as we have a separate word modifying the meaning of a verb,

[132] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. Work cited. p. 327

in OE there was a native word modified by prefixes: *on-sundrian, ge-sundrian, a-sundrian, tō-sundrian,* all having the meaning 'to separate' and all agglutinating in form. Constructions such as phrasal verbs may reflect the tendency of English to use analytic constructions to express lexical meanings as well and not only grammatical ones. The example for that could be phrasal verbs that have idiomatic meanings and are often used instead of single words expressing the same notion.

5. Conclusion

Our analysis has shown that as a language of Indo-European origin the beginnings of English are characterised by a high degree of syntheticity. In the first period of its existence (the Old English period) the language exhibited all characteristics of such languages which is apparent in both Old English grammar and lexis. This is most apparent in the morphological complexity of words which carried various grammatical information, the majority of which the language had already lost by the next period. The situation was similar with word formation as well, considering how the language intensively and efficiently used derivation and compounding resulting in new words of synthetic – both fusional and agglutinating – character. Despite its synthetic character in the first five centuries, the language was already going through a change slowly displaying less and less synthetic traits. As foreign influences held little importance over the language, the shift towards analyticity in grammar and agglutination in derivation and compounding the language developed can only be seen as a natural flow of the language in its own regard.

In the following period, the Middle English period, the language went through the loss of inflections, thus grammatically becoming analytic in character. Even though in this period English was immensely subjected to foreign influence, this change cannot be ascribed to it as the foreign languages which brought about significant changes in English – French and Latin – were synthetic. The same, however, does not apply to English vocabulary which was affected in two ways. The influx of new words diminished once prolific native word formation processes as the language received an abundance of ready-made words. This does not, however, mean that the language ceased to produce new words through derivation or compounding, only that some aspects of it changed. The loss of native derivational affixes was made up for by the introduction of non-native affixes which came together with the new vocabulary and became just as effective. But these words and affixes came from synthetic languages and so preserved their synthetic nature even when they became naturalised. Derivation by using native elements developed as word-based by the end of

Old English period and the beginning of the Middle English period meaning that affixes added to a base effect no change in its form. Also, the base itself does not require an affix of any form to function as an independent word. The words in that regard show analytic and agglutinating traits. The derivation which involves non-native elements, whether bases or affixes, may involve morphophonemic changes which do not comply with native principles and deviate from already established developments. Such words may be fusional and stem-based if they cannot operate without an affix, once again returning the English lexis back to its previous condition and re-introduction of fusional character of lexis.

This trend has continued in the subsequent periods as well, meaning that the English lexis of today consists of words that have both fusional and agglutinating traits – agglutinating regularly applying to native words and non-native words varying between the two types. In addition to that, analyticity present in grammar also appears in vocabulary as can be seen in phrasal verbs which are common in the language despite there often being corresponding verbs that carry the entire notion in their single form.

In the end, all of this indicates that the development of English grammar and vocabulary over the centuries moved towards the simplification with the difference in that the grammar established itself as analytic without much influence coming from foreign sources, while the vocabulary moved in two directions – showing already established agglutinating characteristics and reverting back to fusional ones in some cases under the influence of foreign languages.

Bibliography

Aikhenvald Y., A. (2007). Typological distinctions in word-formation. (p. 1-64).In T. Shopen (Ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Algeo,J. (2010). The Origins and Development of the English Language. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Baugh, A.C., Cable, T. (2002). A History of the English Language, Fifth Edition. Routledge: Pearson Education.

Beal, J. (2012). A National Language. In P. Seargeant, J. Swan (Eds.) *English in the World: History, Diversity, Change*. New York: Routledge.

Burnley, D. (1992). Semantics and Vocabulary. In N. Blake (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of the*

English Language: Volume I 1066-1476. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1989). Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Eifring, H., Theil R. (2005). *Linguistics for Students of Asian and African Languages: Chapter 4: Linguistic Typology*. Downloaded: 6 July 2016 https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/ikos/EXFAC03AAS/h05/larestoff/linguistics/Chapter%204.(H05).pdf

Grasu, D. (2015). Tonal vs. Non-Tonal Languages: Chinese vs. English. Downloaded: 12 July 2016 http://www.lexington.ro/en/blog/item/29-tonal-vs-non-tonal-languages-chinese-vs-english.html

Hammond, M. (2006). Phonological Typology. (pp. 535-525). In K.Brown (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Boston: Elsevier Pergamon

Haselow, A. (2011). A. Typological Changes in the Lexicon: Analytic Tendencies in English Noun Formation. Berlin: De Gruyer Mouton.

Kastovsky, D. (1992). Semantics and Vocabulary. In R. M. Hogg (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language: Volume I The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kastovsky, D. (2006). Typological Change in Derivational Morphology. In A.V. Kemenade, B. Los. (Eds.) *The Handbook of the History of English*. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing.

Katamba, F. (2005). English words. New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library

Miller, T. (1890). *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of English People.* London: N. Trubner and Co.

Minkova, R. Stockwell, R. (2001). English Words: History and Structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nevalainen, T. (1999). Early Modern English Lexis and Semantics. In R. Lass (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language: Volume III 1476 – 1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sellar, A. M. (1907.) *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of England by Saint the Venerable Bede.* London: George Bell and Sons.

Singh, I. (2005). The History of English: A Student's Guide. London: Hodder Education.

Steinbergs, A. (1997). The Classification of Languages. (p. 372-388). In M. Dobrovolsky, F. Katamba, W. O'Grady (Eds) *Contemporary Linguistics.*

Yule, G. (2006). The Study of Language (3rd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Development of the English Vocabulary from the 12th to 19th c.: French Influence on the Vocabulary in Middle English. Downloaded: June, 2018. https://studfiles.net/preview/5186224/page:3/

The history of the Church of Englande. Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman. Translated out of Latin in to English by Thomas Stapleton student in diuinite. Downloaded: July, 2018. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A07396.0001.001/1:8.1?rgn=div2;view=fulltext