This introduction to the historical study of language is designed to give ninth-grade students contact with the methods of historical linguistics in a relatively limited area--the study of the lexicon. The unit begins with a consideration of recent changes in the lexicon, especially those due to technological advances which have caused the use of old words in new senses and the coinage of new words from established root words. This preparatory material is followed by an examination of earlier lexical changes and their relationships to historical developments: wars, scientific advances, invasions of England, religious movements, and English colonization. Selections from early and contemporary writings are suggested as a basis for the study; and sample lectures, discussion questions, worksheets, and examination questions are included.
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MATERIALS NEEDED


PURPOSES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE UNITS

This unit is intended to introduce students to the historical study of language. In an introductory unit the crucial concern is teaching the historical method and specific historical data is of less importance. For this reason there is no attempt to develop the unit chronologically, nor is there any attempt to give the student the exact chronology of the history of the English language.

Instead this unit attempts to give students an understanding of the several kinds of linguistic phenomena which, when viewed historically, help to explain the way in which our language has developed. In other words, instead of treating the history of the English language in terms of a series of somewhat arbitrary historical periods, this unit attempts to see growth and change in language in relation to the history of the people speaking that language.

In addition, this unit limits itself to a consideration of the lexicon of our language. The major reason for avoiding the consideration of syntax, morphology, and phonology is that ninth grade students are not yet ready to treat these matters profitably in the context of historical study. These areas will also be covered in MPEC 1201.

In summary, this unit is designed to give students a contact with the methods of historical linguistics, in a relatively limited area, the study of the lexicon.

PROCEDURES

Procedures, Sample Discussion Questions, and Sample Lectures are supplied for your guidance. It is assumed that you will adapt these to your own classes and students. Special attention should be paid to the places in the unit where the word "ATTENTION" is used. This serves to call to your attention the specific kinds of important generalizations which should be drawn at that point.

The unit is designed for an inductive classroom technique, and the problems of developing materials for inductive teaching are numerous. The lecture and transition sections are artificial, and this would be obvious to students if these sections are read by the teacher exactly as they appear in the unit. The writers of the unit quite naturally render these passages in written style and frequently make them too formal for classroom reading. They are meant only as suggestions. The same statement must be made about the discussion questions and sample student responses. The teacher should freely change these suggested remarks and questions to suit himself. Students may seldom respond to questions in exactly the same way suggested here. The teacher will frequently find it necessary to ask additional questions and make additional comments to elicit similar answers to those included here.

NOTE TO TEACHER

The introductory section of this unit concerns itself with contemporary lexical changes. In order that students may receive the maximum benefits from this section of the unit, it is vital that the words or terms used as examples be as current, as new as possible. This means that the teacher should develop new examples for this section as frequently as possible.
I'd like you all to read the short excerpt that I'm distributing now. In this short selection Nathaniel Ward, a seventeenth century Englishman, comments on one of the things that baffled men in the seventeenth century, and continues to baffle men even now—women and their clothing. I'd like you to pay special attention to the words Ward uses in describing women's attempts to follow the dictates of fashion.

Look up words that you've never encountered before in your dictionaries. In fact make a list of words that you have never encountered before. If you cannot find definitions for a given term, just note that fact on your list. One problem that you will encounter in trying to do this is the great differences in the way that words were spelled in the seventeenth century and the way that they are spelled now. Try not to let the spelling throw you too much. Frequently words that seem to be new words for you may simply be variant spellings of words that you know quite well.

Now that you have completed your reading and your list of words, let's try to get some sort of list of the words that you found unfamiliar. We'll write them on the board.

1. Give me the terms on your lists for which you could find no dictionary entries.

(ken, transclouts, gant, bar-geese, shotten, drailes, gut-foundred, goosdom, surcingled, yoke-fellow, tripe-wifed, cladments, futilous, pettitoes, perquisquilian, mis-trying)
class if they were able to find the terms in question. Proceed in the same way in cases where variant spelling causes confusion.

The teacher may need to ask leading questions which direct student’s attention to the terms in questions. Some translation may also be necessary. Refer to the accompanying glossary.

Let me call your attention to another aspect of the problem we face in trying to read this selection.

2. Are there some words in this selection that you know, and which seem to have a meaning different from their current meaning?

   (yes)

3. What are some of these words?

   (dismantles, habits, fancy, convenient, mystery, caskes, shifted)

4. Now that we have discussed some of the words that Ward used in making his comments on women’s dress, what would you say about his vocabulary? How would you compare it to a modern writer’s vocabulary?

   (It is quite different. Many of the words that Ward uses seem to have either disappeared from the language, or to have changed their meanings.)

These problems with words, and our difficulties in becoming accustomed to seventeenth century spelling, make it difficult for us to understand some of the specific references Ward makes, even though we can understand the main point he is making. Perhaps a better way of saying the same thing is to say that our language has changed a good deal since 1647.
GLOSSARY

ken--knowing, ability to know
transclouts--to transform or disfigure with misshapen clothing
gant--gaping
bar-geese--a barnacle goose (silly, foolish person)
shotten--good for nothing
drailes--something trailed behind
gut-founded--on the point of starvation
goosdom--stupidity
surcingled--bound with a band used to tie down horses' packs
yoke-fellow--marriage partner
tripe-wifed--made themselves worthless wives
cladments--clothing
futilous--vain, foolish, hopeless
pettites--insignificant worthless things (pigs feet)
perquisquilian--thoroughly trifling or worthless
mis-trying--miss-attiring
dismantles--disfigures
habits--clothes
fancy--imagination
convenient--fitting, suitable, appropriate
mystery--the secret operations necessary to a particular trade
caskes--barrels (used disparagingly of clothing)
shifted--clothed
So far our discussion has been limited to one of the more obvious differences between English then and English now. We talked about the words that Ward uses, words that are not longer in our language, and words that seem to have a different meaning at present than they did when Ward used them. I'd like to have you hear one additional difference: I'd like you to hear the way the language sounded in the 17th Century. What you'll be hearing is the London dialect of that period. The speech you'll hear is from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

You've heard and read English as it was 350 years ago. It's not quite the same language, is it?

What do you suppose we would find if we were to look at English as it was 1000 years ago?

(Still greater differences)

Let's see if we're right. We'll begin by listening to English as it was 1000 years ago and then we'll try to read it.

What you'll be hearing is the Lord's Prayer.

Now let's look at what we just heard. We were right weren't we? Not only are there differences, but the differences are so great that we can't read or even understand when we hear it, our own language, as it was 1000 years ago.

How do you suppose this happened?

The students will probably not be able to make any specific answer to this question. They will suggest that words have been added to or dropped from the language, that the spellings have changed, that the ways that words are arranged is different, etc., but if they are pressed for
explanations about what might have caused such changes, they will generally be unable to answer. This response will set the stage for the next step in developing the lesson.

Attention

Summary

What we’ve discovered then, is that while we are able to note the obvious differences between our language as it was and our language as it is, we don’t have a very clear notion of what caused these differences, what caused these changes. During the next few weeks we’ll try to gain some understanding of what caused these changes. What we’ll be studying is the growth or the development of the English language, its history.

Before we start on that task, however, I think we ought to consider a couple of things. First of all, as you saw when looking at the examples of 17th Century and 10th Century English there are a very large number of changes that we might discuss; the differences in sounds, the differences in spelling, the differences in word arrangement, all provide possibilities for study. However, our time, and in some cases our knowledge, isn’t sufficient to permit us to do a good job in all of these areas of change. For this reason, we’ll concentrate on only one aspect of the changes in our language. We’ll be concentrating on the changes in the vocabulary, word stock, or lexicon of our language. My reasons for confining our study to this rather limited area will be a good deal clearer and easier to explain by the end of this unit than they might be now, and we’ll try to discuss them at that time.
The second point we should consider involves the method we will use in studying the lexicon of our language. We could start our study of the changes in the lexicon of our language in any number of ways. We could compare, for example, the earliest written records of our language with the written form of our language as we now know it, or we could trace the family history of our language, finding out what the distant relatives of our language are. We could talk about the political or social history of the people who spoke English or one of its earlier variations. All of these are good approaches and we'll use some of them before we're through. There is, however, a problem in beginning the study of the history of our lexicon in any of the ways we've already mentioned. All of them tend to make us forget that history is something that is happening, as well as something that has happened. What is happening now, at this moment, is history in action. The ways that our language is changing today, for example, are as much a part of the history of our language as are the ways that it changed in the past.

1. Do you suppose that if we were able to think about the way that our language is changing now or about the events or things are causing our language to change now, we could discover things that might help us to understand the way that our language changed in the past? (yes)
These are not obvious notions for 9th graders and the teachers will need to ask leading questions to get these responses.

The answers to these questions will not be apparent to students. The questions are, however, crucial, and it is essential that the students provide these answers. Therefore, it is imperative that the teacher use leading questions to elicit these answers. One effective means of doing this is to repeat the original question in response to students tentative answers. That is, if a student says "Because the history of our language is important," the teacher replies "Why is it important?", etc.

2. Why do you think this is so?

(Because the fundamental human situation is similar. People need to talk to each other now and needed to in the past. In either case, they talk about what is happening in the world in which they find themselves. Though that world has changed greatly, man's basic relation to it hasn't.)

3. Why do you think we should start with our own time? What advantage will we have?

(We know more about what's happening in our world and about the way we are changing our language to meet our needs in communicating with each other.)

There is one other question that we ought to ask before we turn to our study of the history of our lexicon. It is a question that teachers seldom ask and one that students often ask, although seldom of their teachers.

Why should we study the history of the English lexicon? What difference does all of this make? What will such a study teach us?

(Essentially study of this kind is valuable only in so far as it develops our sense of what it means to be human beings. That is, it is valuable only in so far as it reveals the peculiarly human quality of language.)

If this is the case, what do you think will be of major concern to us in our study of the history of our word stock?

(The forces, essentially human in origin, which lie behind the changes which we discover.)

We've got some good reasons then for studying the history of our lexicon, and for starting our study by looking at the current history of our language. Let's ask ourselves another set of questions.
Sample Discussion Questions

This series of questions is intended to be used to elicit a single response. This response is in parentheses below the questions. The teacher may

1. What will concern us as we look at the changes now taking place in our lexicon?

2. When we find some examples of change, what are we going to do with them?

3. If we list the changes, what will the lists show us?

4. Are we simply interested in a list of changes, or are we interested in something else?

5. What is that something else?

6. Do the changes in our lexicon have any purpose, or follow any pattern, or are they purposeless and patternless?

(We are interested in determining the causes of change. As we said a short time ago, the major focus of our study is on the human aspects of the history of our language. This means that we will be interested in noting the way that specific changes in the lexicon demonstrate general patterns of change, or in the way that they reveal certain forces that are at work to effect change.)

What we'll be looking, then, as we examine our language as it is today, will be the patterns of change, the reasons for change, the things which are causing us to add terms to, or subtract terms from, our lexicon. Hopefully, once we have done this we'll be able to look back at the previous history of our language and notice some similar or nearly similar situations. We can then test our explanations of the causes of changes in the lexicon against these actual situations. It would seem possible that given a set of changes, we would be able to infer the causes of such changes.

In other words, once we've figured out the forces that
Procedure: At this point distribute copies of selections from Time magazine, March 2, 1962; Vol. LXXIX, No. 9 of an article describing John Glenn's orbital flight.

Directions to Students:

Here again, what the students will, or will not, find in their dictionaries will be determined by the age and comprehensiveness of the classroom dictionaries that they are using.

Allow 15 minutes for this activity.

Sample Discussion Questions

Procedure: Use the same procedure as was used with the Ward selection. List student responses on the chalkboard.

The teacher may need to read aloud the text in order to elicit all of these responses. He may also have to ask students to check their dictionaries for terms that they have already come to accept so completely that the terms, or special senses

account for change in our own time, we should be able to discover some of the same forces operating in the past.

The selection I am passing out is from a Time magazine description of an orbital flight by John Glenn, an American astronaut.

In looking at it, remember that our interest is in changes in the word stock of English. Look for specific words that seem to you to be recent additions to your vocabulary, or that seem to you to be used in some new sense. Make a list of these words. Then check the words in your dictionaries. If you don't find entries for them, attempt to write a brief definition or description of what you understand the words to mean. In cases where the words in question are old words used in new senses, try to define the new senses of the words.

1. What are the new words, or the new senses of old words, that you found? (gentries, lift-off, capsule, programmed, booster, go, machine, G, astronaut, attitude, yaw, fly-by-wire, space-sick, roll, retro-rocket)

2. Did you find more new words, or did you find more old words used in new senses? (More old words used in new senses.)

3. Why do you suppose we find more old words used in new senses? (Our need to communicate with one another makes it necessary to keep change from taking place so rapidly that we cannot understand each other.)
ATTENTION

Question 3 will be difficult for students to answer, and the teacher may find it necessary to use an additional question, such as question 3A, to elicit the desired response from the students. It is especially important that students understand this generalization.

Having obtained this answer, the teacher would now restate question 3, and students should be able to supply the correct response.

If the students are unable to name these areas of change at first, the teacher may wish to supply them with some of the new terminology from these areas. Then ask the students to name the areas which supplied the terms. Sample terms are aureomycin, compact, kinescope, NATO, transistor, and DNA.

3A. What would happen if every time I encountered something I'd never seen before, and every time you encountered something you had never seen before, we labeled these things with words that had never before existed? Suppose, for example, that I had called this (holding up a piece of chalk) a "snerk," and you (pointing to or naming a student) had called it a "flack" and she (pointing to or naming another student) had called it a "blick." What would happen when the three of us tried to talk to each other about this thing?

(We wouldn't be able to understand each other.)

4. If the need to communicate with each other tends to slow down, or prevent change, what is the major opposing force which accelerates or causes change?

(Changes in the world that we live in.)

5. And what changes in the world we live in caused the changes in our lexicon that we have just noticed in reading the description of Astronaut Glenn's flight?

(Man's venture into space.)

6. Can you think of some other changes in our world which have caused changes in our lexicon?

(Recent developments in medicine, the automobile industry, television, world politics, electronics, science, etc. have all caused changes in English lexicon.)

In other words, when we encounter a new experience we need to change our language so that we can deal with the new experience. The caveman didn't need a word for the wheel until he had invented the wheel. We didn't need words for airplanes, automobiles, atom bombs, or space capsules until we invented these things. As the experience of man changes so does the lexicon of his language.
Now that we've agreed that changes in our stock are a product of changes in the world in which we live, let's try to get a little more specific about how we get out new words. Up to this point we've been lumping things together; we've been looking for the woods, now let's try to see the trees.

One of the specific ways that we get new words can be seen if we think for a minute about a word related to the space-man talk that we read a short time ago.

1. What does the word "sputnik" mean?
   (It refers to a Russian satellite.)

2. Why should we have a special word for Russian "satellites"?
   (There are three reasons: First, the Russians launched the first satellite and they called it Sputnik I. This meant that the word was widely circulated in our newspapers, on TV, in newsreels, magazines and books. The result of this wide circulation of the term was that we adopted the word.

The second factor which helped to bring this word into our language was the fact that the term "Russian satellite" was already being used in another sense in our vocabulary. We referred to countries which were in the sphere of Russian political, social, and economic influence as "Russian satellites."

The third factor which influenced our adoption of this word was the relationship which exists between the Soviet Union and our country. Because of the fierce competition between the two countries in all fields of endeavor there is a tendency for both sides to try to minimize the successes of the opposition. While it was impossible to ignore this Russian success, by naming the Russian
Sample Discussion Questions

Have students check these terms in a recently published dictionary if necessary.

ATTENTION

The teacher may wish to point out the similarity between this situation and that which existed during the second World War, when many German and Japanese words came into English.

The teacher may wish to provide an example. The Russians have adopted the term "astronaut" to distinguish between American cosmonauts and Russian cosmonauts.

1. Have students check these terms in a recently published dictionary if necessary.

ATTENTION

The teacher may wish to point out the similarity between this situation and that which existed during the second World War, when many German and Japanese words came into English.

2. Satellite with another name we were still able to launch the first satellite, even if in name only. This is essentially a psychological attempt to hide from ourselves the true state of affairs, and while it was not as important a factor in leading us to adopt the word "sputnik" as the others we've mentioned, it probably did have some effect.

You'll notice that the word "sputnik" comes into use in connection with a new experience. However, unlike most of the terms we found in the description of Glenn's flight, it is not an old word used in a new sense. It is a word totally new to our language and it comes to us directly from the Russian language.

3. What language do the words "bolshevik," "commisar," "intelligentsia," "troika," and "cosmonaut" come from?
   (Russian)

4. What generalization could we make about the current relationship between the English and Russian languages on the basis of the words we just mentioned?
   (English is borrowing words from Russian.)

5. Why do you suppose this is true?
   (The Russian-speaking peoples of the world are becoming more influential, and the conflict between the English and Russian-speaking peoples had led to an increasing contact between the two languages. Another way of saying this might be to say that what the Russians do is of greater concern to us than it used to be, and therefore, the words that they use in explaining what they have done are sometimes borrowed.)

6. Do you suppose that the Russians borrow English words?
   (yes.)

7. Do you suppose that other languages borrow from both English and Russian?
   (yes.)
The teacher may wish to provide some examples of the current influence of English and French. (See, for example, "An Attack Terrible on les Anglo-Saxons," by Herbert R. Lottman, published by Columbia University Forum, Spring, 1964.)

**Summary**

In other words, borrowing from other languages is an accepted way of bringing new words into a language. And since our English language comes into contact with many other languages, our lexicon can be and is changed through borrowing. The degree to which such change will occur depends on many factors. We have noted some of the factors which are increasing the influence of Russian on English. If we examined the current contact between Italian and English, we would find a set of factors which have caused Italian to have a decreasing influence on English. We will discuss the way that such factors operate in later sections of this unit. At present we only need to point out that borrowing is one of the methods of changing the lexicon of our language.

While we're thinking about the fact that English is only one language in a multi-lingual world, let's consider another aspect of our relationships with the rest of the world, and the effects of these relationships on our language. Frequently we hear people talking about the way that our world is shrinking.
1. What do people mean when they make statements like this?

   (Advances in our methods of communication and transportation have increased contact between the various peoples of the world.)

   In addition to faster and more effective means of communication and transportation, the current political and military situations in the world tend to tie us more closely to the rest of the world. All of these factors have had an influence on our lexicon. For example,

2. Can you think of the names of some of the world organizations that the United States belongs to?

   (UN, NATO, SEATO, UNESCO, WHO, SHAPE, etc.)

3. Are these simply our own terms for these organizations or are these words used by people who speak other languages?

   (The terms are used all over the world by speakers of most of the world's languages.)

   In other words, the terms we have been discussing demonstrate both our own attempts to give names to the increasingly complex political, military, and social relationships we are establishing with the rest of the world, and the extent to which our language is, through our involvement in these organizations, affecting the other languages of the world.

   These words, of course, demonstrate only a limited part of the effect that our increasing contact with the rest of the world is having on us and on the rest of the world. Military
Sample Discussion Questions

In most cases the boys will not be able to answer this question. When this happens ask the girls to supply the answer.

1. Can any of the boys in this class tell me the difference between a "chemise" and a "mu-mu"?

(The chemise is a dress that hangs straight from the shoulders, and which has no belt. The mu-mu is similar but is much fuller than the chemise. Perhaps another way of distinguishing the two would be to point out that the chemise could be worn to a dance, while the mu-mu is more like a robe or house dress that could only be worn on less formal occasions.)

It looks like the problem that faced Nathaniel Ward is still with us. Of course, we've obviously got some that he didn't have. Take automobiles, for example. It might be hard to explain the differences between the Ford, the Chevrolet, and the Dodge; and even more difficult to explain the difference between the Impala and the Biscayne. And as if all of that weren't complicated enough, the fact that English isn't the only language in the world, and that people who speak other languages make cars complicates it even more.

5. What language group produced the VW (Volkswagen)?

(The Germans)
6. And what automobile firm produced the Karmann Ghia? (The Volkswagen people)

7. Well now, let’s see, if the Volkswagen was produced by Germans, and the Karmann Ghia is a special kind of Volkswagen, the the words "Karmann Ghia" must be German words that we have borrowed. Is that right?

(Not exactly, the name "Karmann" is German and comes from the name of the German firm that produced the special body that is mounted on the Volkswagen chassis to make the car. The name "Ghia," however, comes from the name of the Italian designer who designed the special body.)

8. Do you mean to say that if we could ever get poor Mr. Ward to understand what a Volkswagen was, and that if he then asked us what a Karmann Ghia was, we would have to tell him that it was a German car, of the compact class, produced by the same outfit that produces VWs, and that it had the same chassis as the VW, but the body was designed by an Italian, and produced by another German firm?

(yes)

I think Mr. Ward might be a little perplexed.

9. Now what does all of this have to do with our discussion of the changes currently taking place in the lexicon of our English language?

(Whether we’re talking about cars, women’s fashions, world peace, war, world politics, or health, the English lexicon is being influenced by cultures of societies outside of our own.)

In other words, changes in our lexicon through the creation of new words, through changes in the meanings of old words, can be at least partially explained by the fact that we must deal with people who speak other languages, who comes from other areas of the world. The more we become citizens of the world as well as citizens of our own English-speaking country, the more our lexicon must, and does, change.
For the past few days we've been discussing the way that our contact with the rest of the world is influencing our language. But all the forces affecting our language aren't coming from outside of our society. For one thing there are any number of smaller groups within our society which have special lexicons of terms that they use in communicating with one another. We've already seen how some of these special terms become a part of the general lexicon. The terms John Glenn and his fellow astronauts use are a case in point. (Earlier this year we talked about some other group variations when we talked about the way that education, occupation, avocations, age and sex cause our language to vary.) Let's consider some other subgroups of our culture and the way that they affect our language.

1. What are "sit-ins" and "wade-ins"?
   (Civil rights demonstrations.)

2. To what group within our society can we attribute these terms?
   (The people who have been involved in the attempts to gain for the Negro his rights as a citizen of this country.)

3. Why do you suppose that these terms became a part of the general vocabulary?
   (Because the demonstrations that these terms name achieved their purpose and attracted—with the help of the mass media—national attention to certain racial injustices.)

4. To what group can we attribute the special senses that the words "fix," "snow," "pusher," and "junkie" have acquired?
   (Those who use or deal with people who use narcotics.)
The teacher may find it necessary to use leading questions to bring students to this answer.

The teacher might wish to explore with students the implications of the fact that the civil rights terms have come into the lexicon much more rapidly than the terms connected with drug addiction. Such a discussion would touch on the notion of taboos and codability. (See units 1003 and 1004)

5. Did these terms become part of the general vocabulary in the same way that "wade-in" and "sit-in" did?

(No. While the terms "sit-in" and "wade-in" were used in naming certain actions which were intended to attract attention, the terms "fix," "snow," etc. were a kind of code used by drug addicts to communicate secretly with one another. They became a part of the general lexicon only because the law enforcement officials who dealt with this problem began to use these terms in describing the activities of the addicts. As the problems of addicts became more widely known, the terms moved into the general vocabulary.)

Two very different subgroups of our culture, then, have caused changes in our lexicon, and the ways that these groups have caused the changes in question are as different as the groups themselves. The civil rights workers are a pressure group attempting to change our social system, attempting to remedy certain social ills. Their success in attracting the attention of the nation to the problem of civil rights is the factor which has caused the addition of their new terms to our language. The drug addicts, on the other hand, are a group of people who most doctors would agree are sick, and who are engaged in an extra-legal trade. Their special terminology has become a part of the lexicon in spite of their efforts at secrecy, and the terms and the acts they name are regarded with distaste by most of the society. Yet, the terms serve a useful function in enabling us to talk about this problem, and therefore, have become a part of our vocabulary.
We could go on indefinitely naming various groups within our society which have caused changes in our lexicon. For the present we will only mention a few other examples. To the sphere of politics we owe such new words as "bircher" and "frontlash." In the field of electronics we have "transistor" and "computer." From education we have "team-teaching" and "programmed instruction."

Perhaps we should look at one example of the extent to which the specialized vocabulary of a subgroup of our society can depart from the norms of general usage. Here again, the group in question is, to a certain extent, trying to prevent those outside of the group from understanding the special language of the group. I will begin by reading this selection out loud; then I'll distribute copies of the selection, and you can try to paraphrase it. Finally, I will pass out a glossary of the terms in the selection, and we'll go over it together.

The point of this exercise is fairly obvious isn't it? A subgroup of our society can develop a special variety of English which is almost unintelligible to the person who is not an initiate of that group. I suspect we might have the same difficulties if we tried to read an electronics manual or a medical textbook.
In a word, the various groups into which our society divides itself, invariably develop some specialized terms. Their reasons for developing special lexicons are as varied as the groups themselves. In most cases one of the underlying reasons for the special vocabularies is the need for a group to develop some sort of separate and unique identity. That is, the special language of the group is one of the things that makes it a group.

Given this tendency, these groups become the source of a good deal of lexical change in our language. In other words, teenagers, Texans, and technicians as well as age groups, geographical groups, and professional groups, within our society are as important a force in changing our lexicon as are our contacts with other cultures.

Now that we have discussed the way that our international contacts affect our language and the way that large and small subgroups of our culture affect the lexicon, let's carry our discussion down to the smallest unit of the linguistic community, the individual.

We all have a good deal of interest in our language, and most of us have a pretty free and easy attitude toward it. We are quite willing to play games with it. Perhaps the easiest way to show you what I mean is to talk about puns.
Sample Discussion Questions

1. What is a pun?
   (It is a kind of joke which involves the different meanings of words that sound alike.)

This kind of fooling with words is characteristic of the attitude which most of us have toward our language. This attitude sometimes leads to lexical change.

2. Where did the terms "fern" and "clyde" get the special meaning that they have at present?
   (Steve Allen has used these words extensively in his conversations on his nationwide TV broadcasts.)

3. Do "fern" and "clyde" mean anything special?
   (No. The terms seem to have no particular meaning; Allen uses them in a great variety of situations. It may be that they are used as substitutes for certain words and expressions that are tabooed and, therefore, can't be used on a television broadcast.)

4. If these don't have any meaning, if they don't name anything specific, why are they used at all?
   (They are used because Allen is a very popular personality, and the humorous effects he achieves by using the words is such that other imitate his usage to achieve similar effects. In a sense the words do have connotative meanings. That is, though the words don't have any dictionary definition (at least not in this special sense) they do elicit certain emotional responses associated with Allen and his particular brand of humor.)

TV comedians aren't the only people who fool with words. I'd like you all to look at the poem I'm distributing now. It's a famous poem from a famous book that many of you have probably read. The book is Through the Looking-Glass, and the poem is The Jabberwocky. Lewis Carroll, the man who wrote them, is one of the people who really feels free to use...
WORKSHEET #1

In doing this assignment you'll be trying to study the way in which belonging to a subgroup affects your own language. You are a member of a subgroup called "teenagers" and you know that teenagers have a special vocabulary. You use certain terms and phrases which demonstrate that you belong to this subgroup, or, you may be familiar with a special language used by a special interest group. Using these special terms, write a paragraph like the "Sam City" excerpt that you just read. Try to use as many of your special expressions as you can. In writing the paragraph, you'll probably find it easier if you try to describe something you know about like your town or city, your school, or your home. Finally, make a glossary of the special words and terms you use.

PARAGRAPH

GLOSSARY
The teacher should suggest that in cases where the students are not sure about a word they can look it up in the dictionary.

Undoubtedly the teacher will encounter difficulties in trying to get students to correctly classify some of the words in Carroll's poem. The words "burble" and "whiffling," for example, will probably be listed as nonsense words by many students. These words have been in the language since the Middle English period. A factor which complicates this matter further is that many classroom dictionaries will not have listings for "burbled" and some may even fail to list "whiffling." Similarly, the words "beamish" and "galumphing" will not be listed in some dictionaries, although both are listed in both Webster's Second and Webster's Third International Dictionaries. The key word for most students will be the word "chortle." Few will list this word as a nonsense word. Moreover, most dictionaries will list "chortle" as a word coined by Carroll. The teacher therefore should be able to begin by discussing "chortle" using the following questions. He can then return to the more problematic words pointing out on the one hand (using the words "whiffling" and "burbled") how the writer's use of old words gives them new life, and on the other (using "beamish" and "galumphing") how the writer is able to bring new words into the language. The accompanying sheet of dictionary entries, Excerpt #8, should be distributed to students in the event that they have dictionaries that have no listings for these terms. This exercise might well be used to review the earlier work students have done in the dictionary unit (Unit 902).

I notice that most of you don't feel that the word "chortle" is a nonsense word.

6. What does "chortle" mean?

(It refers to a particular type of laughter.)

7. Did any of you look this word up in your dictionary?

(If none of the students have looked the word up, have them do so at this point. Then proceed to the next question.)

8. Where does the word "chortle" come from? How did it get into our English language?

(The word was coined by Lewis Carroll; it is a word formed by putting together parts of two other words: chuckle and snort.)
Let's look at some of the other words in Carroll's poem. Here is a set of definitions for "chortle" and four other words from the poem. Some of you have identified these words as nonsense words. While this was once the case with some of them, they are all now a part of the lexicon. The dictionary that these definitions were taken from names Carroll as the source of two of these words ("beamish" and "galumphing"), and shows that the other two words ("whiffling" and "burbled") have been in the language for quite a while, roughly 700 years as a matter of fact.

Look at these two sentences.

"We played with the whiffle ball."

"The faucet burbled."

9. Would you still classify the words "whiffle" and "burbled" as nonsense words?

(No.)

10. What made you identify them as nonsense words in the first place?

(The fact that they were used in a poem which is composed in the main of nonsense words.)

11. Do the words "whiffle" and "burbled" seem to have the meanings indicated in the definitions when Carroll uses them?

(Yes, but the terms are here applied to some kind of living thing, and this is unusual.)

Let's try and summarize just what effects this poem of Lewis Carroll's has had on our lexicon. First, Carroll has contributed three new words to the language, the words "chortle," "beamish," and "galumphing." In addition, Carroll uses two words
beamish - adj. Beaming. (BEAM + ISH; coined by Lewis Carroll in *Through the Looking-Glass*)

burbled - v.i. & v.t. to bubble; gurgle. 2. to talk excitedly and confusedly.

chortle - v.i. & v.t. To utter or utter with chuckles of glee. --n. A chuckle; joyful vocal sound. (Blend of CHUCKLE AND SNORT; coined by Lewis Carroll in *Through the Looking-Glass*)

galumphing - v.i. To clump along pompously. (GAL (lop) + (tri) UMPH; coined by Lewis Carroll)

whiffling - v.i. 1. To blow with puffs or gusts; shift about, as the wind. 2. to vacillate; veer. --v.t. 3. To blow or dissipate with or as with a puff.

Definitions are from *Thorndike-Barnhart Comprehensive Desk Dictionary*. 
that have been in the language for some time. However, they were not widely used terms (this is a partial explanation of your tendency to view them as nonsense words), and he applied them in a new way. I suppose the logical question is "So what?" What difference does it make? Steve Allen uses "ferm" and "clyde" in a goofy way, Lewis Carroll coins a few new words, Franklin Roosevelt establishes "boondoggle" as a part of the lexicon, Shorty Powers coins the word "A-OK," Winston Churchill names the "iron curtain" -- let me put the question to you.

12. What does all this show us about the way that our lexicon changes?

(That, fundamentally, the source of lexical change is the individual.)

Now let's think back over what we've said and done for the past few days. What we've been talking about is the way our language is changing right now. Our reason for all of this you'll remember, was to get some notions about lexical change which would help us to understand the way our lexicon has developed historically. I think we're about ready to turn to the past. Let's try to tie together what we've found out by looking at the present.

First of all we have discovered the basic types of lexical change. Probably the most common kind of change in our time is the use of old words in new senses. This is the kind of change that we saw operating in the description of John Glenn's orbital
flight. Words like "go," "booster," "capsule," and "machine" took on new meanings. A second very active type of lexical change taking place currently involves borrowing words from other languages. We saw, for example, that words as different as "chemise" and "sputnik" or "commissar" and "Volkswagen" come to our language as a result of a wide variety of very different kinds of contact between our society and the rest of the world. The third type of lexical change which we discussed accounts for far fewer changes than either shifts in meaning or borrowing. Making up new words from the roots of older words has never played as large a part in building the English lexicon. Lewis Carroll's words, "chortle" and "beamish," and words like "NATO" do demonstrate that we continue to build new words.

We have also determined that the fundamental cause of changes in the lexicon is changes in the world which the lexicon attempts to describe. In other words, we don't need a name for the space capsule into space. In addition to noting this basic cause for change, we have discussed three sources of lexical change. Our contact with other cultures produced borrowings, newly constructed words, and shifts in meaning. The words "troika," "UN" and "satellite" respectively demonstrate each of these types of lexical change, and in each case the changes are a result of our contact with
other cultures. Similarly the various subgroups of our own society have produced lexical changes of each of the three types. Literary critics, for example, have borrowed the word "genre" from French; hipsters have caused a shift in the meaning of the word "cool," and electronics specialists have created the word "transistor." Finally, individuals create words like "chortle," borrow words like "Cosa Nostra" (a phrase which members of the Black Hand or Mafia use in referring to their organization and which has come into general usage because a former member of the organization, Joseph Velachi, used this Italian phrase in testifying before an investigating committee of the Congress), and change the meanings of words like "whiffling."

One more thing should be said before we turn to the history of our lexicon. Up to this point we have been discussing the various types and causes of lexical change as though they always operated in a very simple fashion. We have made it seem as though each of these factors operates independently; as a matter of fact, frequently, many or all of these factors may operate at the same time. Some examples will help you to see what I mean.

The words "astronaut" and "cosmonaut" will demonstrate some of the complexities of the situation. The word "astronaut" was formed by combining the roots "astro" and "naut." "Astro" comes from the Greek word _astron_ which means "star." "Naut" comes from the
Greek word *nautilos* which means "sailor." On these grounds we might well say that the word "astronaut" is a borrowed word. However, there were no "star-sailors" in ancient Greece, and the word "astronaut" never was a part of the Greek lexicon. Actually, the English language has been using Greek and Latin roots to create new English words for a number of centuries. Therefore, we would be just as correct if we said that the word "astronaut" was a newly created English word. The picture with respect to this word becomes even more complicated if we know that the Greek words *astron* and *nautilos* were originally borrowed by speakers of the Latin language, and that it is quite possible that English borrowed these second-hand words from Latin and not from Greek. In other words, "astronaut" is a borrowed-borrowed-made-up word.

If we turn now to the word "cosmonaut" we find that it also has a Greek-Latin background. "Cosmo" comes from the Greek word *cosmos* meaning "universe." There weren't any "universe-sailors" in ancient Greese either, though, and therefore, "cosmonaut" is a made-up word. But it wasn't made up in English. The Russians, who are as willing to steal from the ancient as we are, made up the word and we borrowed it from them. In other words, "cosmonaut" is a borrowed-borrowed-made-up borrowed word.
As if all of this weren't enough, if you think back to our original discussion of these words, you'll remember that though the two words were created to name people who travel in space, they have come to mean in the one case, American space-travellers, and in the other Russian space-travellers. That is, the meanings of the words have shifted.

I would like you to look at still another example of the kind of complexity that is actually possible when we add to our lexicon. The excerpt that I am distributing is a kind of record of some of the things that did happen when we added the word "sputnik" to our language. Let's read over this selection and talk briefly about what we find.

There are two things I think we can see immediately, if we think about the linguistic data which Mr. Muinzer provides for us here. First of all, not only did we borrow the word "sputnik," but we immediately began to use the last syllable of that word, nik to make up new English words. Again we see borrowing and the creation of new words intermingling to enrich our vocabulary. The second thing we can see is that as soon as we borrow a word we feel quite free to use it a number of very different ways. When we use "sputnik" as a verb or an adjective, not only are we changing the way the word functions in English sentences, but we are changing or shifting its meaning. Here again, then, all three types or methods of change are involved.
If we consider all three of the words we've been discussing (astronaut, cosmonaut, and sputnik) from another point of view, we can see that the sources or causes of change operate in a complex fashion. First of all, these new words are quite obviously the result of a new experience. The launchings of sputniks, astronauts, and cosmonauts, are parts of a totally new experience. Quite naturally, man's language had to find a way of dealing with this experience.

Further, if we recognize that two of the words we have been discussing we borrowed as a result of our present involvement with the Russian culture, and the third comes to us from an ancient culture that continues to influence us even though it no longer exists, it is apparent that contact with other cultures is operating in changing our lexicon. Similarly, the fact that the word "astronaut" was first used by a subgroup of our culture, demonstrates that this source of change in the lexicon was also operating in bringing "astronaut" into our language.

Finally, let's consider the role that the individual played in adding the terms "astronaut," "cosmonaut," and "sputnik" to our lexicon. Quite probably, some one person is as responsible for these terms as Colonel Powers is for the word "A-OK." We cannot identify these individuals, however, and since that is the case, if we wish to talk about the interactions between individual coinages and the lexicon, we will need to use different examples.
The most obvious thing we can say is that although individuals can coin words or phrases, the simple fact that a term is coined doesn't make it a part of the lexicon. Lewis Carroll, for example, coined a large number of words besides "beamish," "galumph," and "chortle," and the vast majority of his coinages never became a part of the language. Colonel Powers coined the term "A-OK," but it wasn't widely accepted until the astronauts used it during nationally televised orbital flights. Sometimes the individual can cause a given term to be more widely accepted. Franklin D. Roosevelt was partially responsible for the adoption of the word "boondoggle," and Winston Churchill had a part in naming the "iron curtain." In each of these cases the word or phrase in question had previously been coined, but was not widely known or used. The prestige of the individuals using the terms "boondoggle" and "iron curtain" causes them to be widely adopted.

The individual is free to borrow words, create words, or give words new meanings. Frequently, the individual as a member of a subgroup of the culture coins, borrows, or changes the meanings of words, and the subgroup adopts the term; the subgroup then causes the words to pass into the general lexicon. Finally, the individual may be in close contact with another culture, and this contact may lead him to borrow, create, or change the meanings of words. In other words, as we've said earlier, the individual is behind all lexical change.
The point of our discussion of all of these causes and methods of change is perhaps obvious, and perhaps we have spent too much time making it, but it is a very important notion for you to have. The causes of lexical change are usually complex and so, therefore, are the ways that words are added to our lexicon.

Our preamble to the study of the history of our lexicon has been lengthy, but I think you'll find the material we're going to study more understandable and more interesting because we have studied our language as we now know it. In studying the history of our word stock, we will not be concerned with the exact chronology of time sequence of events, nor will we be very concerned with exact dates. Instead we will try to see how the causes and means of change, which we have found operating in our own time, have operated in the past.

We'll begin by discussing borrowing since it is perhaps the major source of new terms for our lexicon. English has always been willing to steal words from other languages. Even before the oldest version of English got to England, it was stealing words from Latin. You see, there was a time when English wasn't spoken in England. The ancestors of Modern English were a group of Germanic languages spoken by peoples who lived on the European continent.
Let me show you a map of the area where these peoples were located before they moved to England. The Jutes, Angles, Saxons and Frisians spoke dialects of the language we now call Old English or Anglo-Saxon. We won't worry about these dialects, nor will we worry about the Celts, the people who were inhabiting England while the Jutes, Angles, Frisians, and Saxons were still on the continent. If we were interested in a sequential treatment of the history of England, or of the English language, these matters would concern us. For our purposes, these facts are not necessary. All we need to know is that in the 5th century, while still on the continent, these Germanic peoples were borrowing Latin words.

1. Why would the Latin language be a source of loan words for these northern, Germanic tribes during this period? (Because by the fifth century the influence of the Roman Empire had already spread across most of the European continent.)

Cultural contact between the Romans and the Jutes, Angles, Saxons, and Frisians brought some Latin words into the Anglo-Saxon or Old English lexicon even before the first speakers of English got to England. Words that seem to have come into the language as a result of this early contact are: copper, mint (in the sense of coining), cheese, disc, and bishop. If we think for a moment about these words, we can note again how the addition of words to the lexicon of a language reflects changes in the experience of man.
2. What was the level of the Roman culture by the 5th century AD?

   (It was a highly developed culture.)

3. What was the culture of the Jutes, Angles, Saxons, and Frisians like in the 5th century?

   (The culture of these Germanic tribes was at a much lower level of development.)

4. How do the words that were borrowed by the Germanic tribes reflect these differences?

   (Because of its lower stage of development, the German culture borrowed certain things and ideas from the Romans, and since they had not previously encountered these things or ideas, they had no words in their languages to name these things. Therefore, they borrowed the Latin terms for these things and ideas. In other words, the Romans must have introduced copper to these tribes, provided them with their first contact with minted money and the process of minting, given them their first taste of cheese, put their food on dishes (disc) for the first time, and introduced the tribes to the Christian religion.)

The important thing for us to notice about these early borrowings is the fact that they exemplify a tendency on the part of even the earliest speakers of our language to borrow words from other languages, especially when the language group from which the words are being borrowed introduces new or different experiences.

The tendency to borrow words which we discovered in the earliest forms of the English language persists, as we have already seen, into our own time. Let's look at some further examples to see if we can isolate some of the factors that influence the way in which, or the extent to which, borrowing occurs.

About 300 years after the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians had moved into England and driven out the Celts who were there before them, another group
of Europeans began to make raids on the northern coast of England. These people were essentially of Scandinavian stock. They were the pirates of their day. These "Vikings" raided not only England, but the entire coast of Europe. It is even possible that they were the first Europeans to reach North America. In other words, they were a pretty rough bunch.

Like almost all other groups of pirates, these raiders eventually got tired of fighting and running all the time, and they then looked for a place to settle down. Some of them took a liking to England and settled there. The end result of the Viking raids was a gradual intermingling of the Scandinavian invaders with the people of northern England.

The language spoken by these invaders, Old Norse, like Old English, was a Germanic language, and was therefore quite similar to Old English. This similarity and the intermingling of the two peoples caused the addition of a large number of Scandinavian loan words to the English word stock.

Let's look at some of the words that did come into our language from Old Norse. From the Vikings we get nouns like: axle-tree, band, bark, bull, calf (of leg), crook, dirt, egg, freckle, gap, guess, keel, kid, leg, link, loan, race, rift, scab, scales, scrap, sister, skin, skirt, sky, snare, steak, thrift, want, and window; adjectives like: awkward, flat, loose, low, muggy, odd, rotten, scant, tattered, tight, and weak;
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verbs like: bask, call, cast, clip, crave, crawl, die, droop, gape, gasp, give, glitter, lift, lug, nag, ransack, raise, scare, scowl, take, and thrust.

1. Do these words refer to simple or complex things, to affairs of state or to household living?

(The terms are the simple words of everyday living and conversation.)

2. What can we conclude about the contact between the Norse-speaking invaders and the English-speaking natives on the basis of this list of words?

(The words that came into the Anglo-Saxon lexicon from Old Norse were common everyday words because the two races intermingled at the level of the common man. The first Scandinavians to settle in England were not nobles or kings. They were the common soldiers and sailors. Their contacts with the Anglo-Saxon natives were direct. They became neighbors of the common Anglo-Saxon farmers and craftsmen, and married Anglo-Saxon women.)

Let's jump ahead in time now and see what happens when another group of invaders land in England. In 1066 William the Conqueror, a Norman French prince, made good his claim to the English crown by defeating an English army commanded by King Harold at the battle of Hastings. When the battle was over, England was ruled by people who spoke French. For the next 200 years French was the official language of the English government. In the courts, in the schools, in government documents, in the churches, French was the language that was used. English continued to be the language of the common man, but all of his rules spoke French. As you would expect, during this period a large number of French words became a part of the English lexicon.
3. On the basis of what I have just told you, what kinds of words would you guess were borrowed from French at this time?

( Words that were more closely related to the concerns of the French-speaking ruling class, words relating to government, churches, law, military matters, and the customs and fashions of the ruling class.)

If our guess about the types of words borrowed from the French during this period is correct, the words should be of a very different kind than those borrowed as a result of the Scandinavian invasions. Let's check to see if our guess is correct. I'd like you to read the excerpt that I'm distributing now.

In this selection Mr. Albert Baugh, a linguistic historian, discusses the addition of French words to the English lexicon during the period from 1100 to 1500. This period, as you will notice when you read the selection, is called the Middle English period. The period before 1100, as you might suspect, is called the Old English or Anglo-Saxon period, and the period after 1500 is called the Modern English period. Let me caution you that these dates and labels are very artificial, and that you shouldn't expect to find any great differences between English as spoken in 1499 and 1501. You could expect, however, between the English language as it was spoken in 750 and the language as spoken in 1300 or 1700. In other words, these dates and names are simply convenient ways of labeling certain developments in the history of the English language.
In reading this excerpt try to decide whether or not our guess that the French loan words would reflect the concerns of the ruling class more than those of the common man, is correct. Perhaps you might even try to decide to what extent we were correct in our guess. Pay particular attention to the distinction that Mr. Baugh makes between the words borrowed before 1250, and those borrowed after 1250.

4. What would you say about our guess concerning French loan words? Do these loan words seem to reflect the concerns of the ruling class?

(At least partially the guess was correct. French words adopted before 1250 demonstrate the ruling class influence most clearly. After 1250 a much wider range of terms comes into the lexicon from French. As Mr. Baugh points out, this is probably a result of the fact that the French nobility began to use English as a basic language and frequently were forced to use French words to supplement their English vocabularies.)

5. How could you compare and contrast the Scandinavian and French influences on our lexicon?

(Both influences are a result of invasions by groups speaking languages different than English. English borrowed words from both languages. However, in the case of the Scandinavian borrowings the similarities between Old Norse and Old English, the intermingling of the two groups, and the failure of the Vikings to achieve complete dominance immediately, and to maintain dominance for any extended period, led to the borrowing of fewer words. The words that were borrowed tended to be basic words of the common man, part of the everyday working vocabulary.

In the case of Norman French, the dissimilarity between the two languages which made borrowing more difficult initially, was overcome by the long period of contact between the two language groups. The words borrowed reflect the fact that French was the language of the ruling class. Finally, the total range of borrowings from French is much greater.)
In other words, the duration of the contact between cultures and the way in which that contact takes place will effect the number and kinds of words which are borrowed by one group or the other.

Finally, you'll remember that Mr. Baugh, in the excerpt that you just read, suggests that the French culture was more advanced at the time of the Norman invasion than was the English culture and that this was another reason for the heavy borrowings of French terms. In contrast, the Scandinavian was, at best, equal to the English culture when the groups began intermingling, and the number of terms borrowed was fewer. This again points up the fact that we noted earlier in talking about the Latin borrowings that became a part of the language of the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians while they were still on the European continent. The culture which brings new things or experiences to speakers of English, the culture which is more advanced, will usually provide more loan words.

Let's consider another cause of borrowing. Look at this group of words.

alb, altar, anthem, apostate, apostle, baptist, candle, canon, canticle, chapter, church, chrism, christian, cowl, disciple, verse, litany, mass, martyr, monk, pope, preach, priest, saint, psalm, temple, tract, hymn.

1. What subgroup of the culture would you associate these words with?

(Religious groups--in particular Catholics.)
When the Jutes, Angles, Saxons and Frisians landed in the British Isles there was already a flourishing culture there, the Celtic culture. We mention the Celts early in our discussion of borrowing. By the time the Germanic tribes arrived, the Celtic language had been influenced by a Roman invasion and the Latin language. When the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians landed they drove the Celts before them, they did not live with the Celts, they did not marry the Celts. Eventually, they drove the Celts into the mountainous regions on the east coast of England, to Ireland, and into Scotland. On the basis of the rather sketchy history of this invasion that I have given you, what would you guess about the influence of Celtic on English? Write a paragraph indicating what effect you think Celtic had on the English lexicon and explain your reasons for the conclusions you reach. Use the information you have about the Scandinavian and Norman influence on our lexicon to guide you in this assignment.
2. What language do you think these words are borrowed from?

(Latin.)

3. If I told you that all of these words were a part of the language by the end of the 8th century and that few were in the language before 600, what would you guess about how these came into our language?

(Sometime around 600 somebody decided to convert the English and brought the Christian religion and church Latin to England.)

4. Where would you guess the missionaries that brought Christianity to England came from, and why?

(Rome. Because the center of all Christianity around 600 was Rome and most missionary activity was at least partially related to conquests and colonizations of the Roman Empire.)

We've been able to guess quite a bit about how the list of words we've been discussing came into our language, and our guesses are essentially quite accurate.

In 597 a group of monks, led by Augustine, landed in Kent in the southeast of England. They began the Christianization of England and in so doing they brought these Latin words into the English language.

In other words, a religious subgroup, which originally developed through contact without an outside culture, once it was formed inside the culture, caused the borrowing of a number of new terms.

Finally, let's consider the role that the individual can play in borrowing words. Here is a list of words that appear in written English for the first time in the works of William Shakespeare. Most of them are borrowed from French or Latin, although the word "assassination" comes originally from Arabic, and "pedant" comes from Italian.
accomodation, apostrophe, assassination, dextrously, dislocate, frugal, indistinguishable, misanthrope, obscene, pedant, premeditated, reliance, submerged.

We should be careful to recognize that though these words first appeared in print in Shakespeare's plays and poems, they may not have been borrowed by Shakespeare himself. They may have been widely used by many people in the spoken language and Shakespeare may simply have been the first to use them in the written language (or at least, in the portion of the writing of 16th and 17th century writing which has been preserved.)

1. If this is the case, if we cannot even claim with any degree of certainty that Shakespeare was the first man to borrow these words, if these words might have become a part of the language even if Shakespeare hadn't used them, what effect did he, as an individual, have on the borrowing of these words?

(Shakespeare's prestige as a user of the language, his ability in using the language, helped these borrowed words to become a part of the English lexicon more quickly. In some cases it may even be that though these words were in limited use before Shakespeare used them, they weren't widely accepted until he did. After all, when a word is contained in a play that comes to be considered a masterpiece, that is performed time and time again in all periods, it does have a good grip on its place in the lexicon.)

The individual, then, can affect the borrowing of words in two important ways. First, he can originally borrow the words and second, he can use a newly borrowed word, and in using it, help to establish the words as a part of the lexicon.

It is also worth noting that Shakespeare belonged to an age when borrowing words, particularly Latin,
Greek, and French words, to enrich the English vocabulary was a widely accepted practice. Because the scholars of Shakespeare's day, and the elementary schools of his day, studied the Latin and Greek languages, and the literature written in these languages, and because the French culture was a very literate culture during this period, the majority of the borrowings came from these three languages. But as even this short list demonstrates, English speakers borrowed from other languages as well.

1. What does this willingness to borrow words from other languages show us about the attitude that Shakespeare and his contemporaries had toward their language?

(The willingness of Shakespeare and his contemporaries to add to the English lexicon through borrowing would suggest that the people of this period had a relatively free and easy attitude toward their language.)

We'll keep the idea that Shakespeare and his contemporaries had a free wheeling attitude toward their language in mind. So far our evidence that this is true isn't very substantial, but if we find that some other kinds of evidence support this conclusion as we proceed in our study of the history of the English word stock, we'll be able to make this statement with more confidence.

Let's try to summarize some of the things we've found out about borrowing.

1. What would you say is the basic cause of borrowing? (cultural contact)
2. What have we discovered about the way in which the kind of cultural contact that occurs affects borrowing?

   (The duration of the contact, the way in which the contact occurs, the relative stage of development of the cultures in question, all affect the direction, nature, and extent of borrowing.)

3. Is this the only factor that causes borrowing?

   (No)

4. What other factors cause borrowing?

   (The operation of subgroups and individuals in a given society.)

Another type of lexical change that we discovered in looking at the present day growth of our word stock is shifts in the meanings of terms. We can find many examples of this type of change in the English lexicon if we turn to the history of our language. Here are two lists of terms which demonstrate such shifting.

Write these pairs of words on the chalkboard.

1. cow ................. beef
2. calf ................. veal
3. swine ................. pork, bacon
4. sheep ................. mutton
5. deer ................. venison

1. What can you tell me about the meanings of these sets of terms? Do we use the terms in each of these sets to refer to the same thing? How do the terms in each set differ in their meanings?

   (While it is true that the terms in each set do refer to the same thing, they refer to it in different forms. We use the terms cow, calf, swine, sheep, and deer to refer to living creatures and the terms beef, veal, pork, bacon, mutton, and venison to refer to the flesh of the animals in question when it is being eaten by human beings.)
Now suppose that I told you that before William the Conqueror landed in England only one group of terms was used, that people ate cow, calf, swine, sheep and deer.

2. What language would you guess the terms beef, veal, pork, bacon, mutton, and venison came from?
   (French)

3. If the original meanings of the terms cow, calf, swine, sheep, and deer included both the living animal and its flesh, what would you say happened to the meanings of these words?
   (The meanings shifted.)

4. What caused these shifts in meaning?
   (The borrowing of the French words beef, veal, pork, bacon, mutton, and venison.)

5. And why were the French words borrowed?
   (Because a French-speaking nobility ruled England for a long period of time after William's invasion.)

6. Would you say that this is an example of cultural contact causing a shift in meaning?
   (Yes.)

7. Why do you suppose the French words came to be used to refer to cows, calves, swine, sheep, and deer when they were being served at meals, and the Old English word continued to be used to refer to the living animals?
   (Because the English-speaking lower class was more involved in raising or preparing the cows, calves, sheep, and deer for the tables of the French-speaking nobility, and the nobility were more concerned with eating them.)

In other words, not only does this groups of words show us the way in which cultural contact can cause shifts in meaning, but it shows us something about the
kind of contact that the two cultures made.

Let's consider some other examples of shifts in meaning to see if we can discover the way in which pressure groups can affect the meaning of terms.

1. If I say to you that John Doe has a puritanical view of language, what do I mean?
   (I mean that he is overly concerned with using "proper" language, that he is intolerant of errors in usage, etc.)

2. What word does the word "puritanical" derive from?
   (Puritan.)

3. Can you tell me anything about the history of the word "puritan?"
   (The word was the name of an English religious sect that colonized New England.)

4. Do you suppose that the Puritans thought that the word "puritan" had the same negative sense when they used it to talk about themselves that we think it has when we use it today?
   (No.)

5. How could you explain this difference in meaning?
   (When the Puritans used the word they were referring to the sum total of their religious heritage, to the values by which they lived. When we use the term we are referring to a part of the Puritan culture, a certain dignity, a tendency to be overtly rule bound, to be close-minded.)

We could explain these variant uses of this term by saying that since the Puritan society gradually disintegrated, and since the greater portion of the total beliefs of the Puritans was lost in this disintegration, the meaning of the term "puritan" has changed, and it has come to refer to only certain values of the Puritans, and these values have themselves come
to be viewed in a negative light. In other words, the disintegration of a subgroup of our culture has caused a shift in the meaning of the term that named that subgroup.

Let me complicate this discussion further. Originally, the term "puritan" was applied to this religious group in a mocking way. That is, when it was first used in naming this subgroup it had negative connotations. This is also true of the terms, "Quacker," "Methodist," and "Baptist." But while the term Puritan, even though it did become a positive term for a while, has returned to its original negative sense, the terms "Quacker," "Methodist," and "Baptist" have all developed and maintained a positive tone. That is, the religious subgroups of our culture that are named by these terms do not view these names as being attempts at mockery; instead they accept these terms as names which are representative of the particular sets of religious values which unify them as subgroups of the culture.

1. How would you explain the difference between what has happened to the term "Puritan," and what has happened to the terms "Quacker," "Methodist," and "Baptist?"

(While the Puritan subgroup disintegrated the others did not, and as a result the sum total of their values continue to be associated with the terms in question. While not everyone may agree with these values, the continued existence of these subgroups prevents the kind of misunderstanding which was responsible for the original mocking tone of the terms "Puritan,"
"Quacker," "Methodist," and "Baptist" and which is responsible for the use of the term "Puritan" in its present negative sense.)

2. Would you say then that these religious subgroups have caused and are causing shifts in the meanings of the terms used to name them?

(Yes.)

3. What would you say is the main thing that causes variations in meaning of this kind?

(Changes in the prestige or reputation of the subgroup named by the terms in question.)

We could, of course, find other examples of the way in which a subgroup of the culture has caused shifts in the meanings of words. We need only think, for example, of the way in which doctors have caused the term "medicine" to shift its meaning. However, I think the point is made, subgroups have historically caused shifts in the meanings of terms, and continue to do so.

Now we can consider the way in which individuals can cause shifts in the meanings of words. To see this kind of change in the lexicon we only need to turn to some famous American writers. In their works we can find many old words used in new senses. To begin with we'll simply list the terms and the author who first used them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>betsy (a gun)</td>
<td>David Crockett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dummy</td>
<td>James Fenimore Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belittle</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goner</td>
<td>Henry David Thoreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almighty dollar</td>
<td>Washington Irving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swimming hole</td>
<td>George Washington Harris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now let's consider these terms in three groups examining the way that the meanings of these words have been shifted.

1. How have the meanings of "betsy" and "dummy" been shifted?

(In these cases the words in question have simply been applied in new ways and a new meaning has resulted. In one case a woman's name has come to be used to refer to a gun, and in the other, a word used to refer to a person who cannot speak has come to be used to refer to a person who is unintelligent.)

2. How have the meanings of "little" and "gone" been shifted as they appear in "belittle" and "goner?"

(In the case of both "belittle" and "goner" the addition of affixes has caused a shift in the meanings of the original term. By means of the addition of the prefix "be," little is made to mean "to make small" and by the means of the addition of the suffix "r," gone is made to mean "one who is dying." The use of "going" and "gone" to mean "dying" and "dead" respectively is, of course, itself an example of shift in meaning.

3. Finally, how are the meanings of the terms in the phrases "almighty dollar," and "swimming hole" shifted when these terms are combined?

(In these cases it is the combination of the words that accounts for the shifting. In the phrase "almighty dollar" the notion of divinity in the word "almighty" is carried over to the dollar and as people worship "the Almighty," people worship the dollar.

In the phrase "swimming hole" the literal meanings of the words would lead us to believe that the reference is to a hole that is swimming but the meaning is shifted to indicate a place where one swims.)

Here, then, as with Shakespeare we can see the individual causing changes in the English word stock. However, we should keep in mind the same cautionary note that we made when we talked about Shakespeare's
contributions: while it is true that the writers we will mention are the first to use the terms attributed to them in the written language, this is no guarantee that they originated the terms. As we pointed out before, their use of these terms probably did help to make the terms a permanent part of the lexicon.

Just as with borrowings and shifts in meaning, English has created its new words as a result of cultural contacts, subgroup pressures, or individual whim.

Look at this list of terms.

beachhead, parachutist, paratroop, landing strip, crash landing, roadblock, jeep, fox hole, decontamination, task force, resistance movement, radar.

1. What fairly recent historical event would you associate these terms with?

(The Second World War.)

2. Would you be willing to classify the war as an example of cultural contact?

(Yes.)

As a matter of fact, if you think about it, wars are at least partially responsible for both the French and Scandinavian influences on English. It is more or less to be expected then, that a global conflict like the Second World War would also have its effects on the language. Of course, the kind of cultural contact that we're talking about when we speak of war is very different from the contacts we've discussed earlier. But it is worth noting that during the Middle English
Period in addition to terms for manners, dress, food, and government, the French language gave us a good-sized war vocabulary. Similarly, from the first Scandinavian terms found in Old English, are terms for warships, fleets, pirates, warriors, and battles. Finally, English got to England in the hands of some northern European invaders. In a word, while war does not seem a desirable form of "cultural contact," it is perhaps the oldest form and has had a continuing effect on the history of our language.

In the case of the Second World War this cultural contact produced these new words as well as a host of borrowings. Here then, is a case where cultural contact has necessitated the creation of new words.

Now let's turn to the way in which subgroups of the culture create new words and in doing so let's consider the way that scientific terms have been added to our language. The excerpt I am distributing is a very brief summary of the problem that caused scientists to develop a special vocabulary, and an explanation of the historical reasons which caused scientists to choose the particular method of naming new things that they most generally use.

1. What languages, according to Mr. Asimov, do scientists use in forming most of their new words?

   (Greek and Latin)
2. Why do scientists use these languages?
   (Because these languages were the languages of the learned during the 16th century, the period in which modern science was born.)

3. Why, according to Mr. Asimov, does this practice continue even though the study of Latin and Greek is no longer an integral part of the educational system?
   (Using the Greek and Latin roots to create new scientific terms makes it easier for scientists who speak different languages to understand one another.)

4. Can you think of any other reasons for the continuation of this practice?
   (Using these strange sounding Latin and Greek compounds helps to identify the speaker with the subgroups of scientists and helps the subgroup itself to maintain its identity.)

Now that we have some notion of why English-speaking scientists create new English words from Latin and Greek bases, let's examine an example of how this practice can affect the English word stock. Let's look at the history of the word electron as Mr. Asimov outlines it.

In other words the Greek word "electron" had produced the English word "electricity" by the end of the 16th century. Since that time this borrowed Greek word has been used to create a number of new English terms.

Take out your dictionaries and look up the words electron, electricity, and then write out a list of any other terms listed in the dictionary which seem to be related to these terms, which seem to have come from the same source.
Students should arrive at a list similar to this.

Have one of the students read his list aloud and then ask for additions.

Sample Lecture-Discussion Continued

electric, electrical, electrical transcription, electric chair, electric eel, electric field, electric furnace, electrician, electricity, electric organ, electric ray, electrify, electrize, electro, electroanalysis, electrochemistry, electrocute, electrocution, electrode, electodeposit, electrodynamic, electrodynamics, electrodynamometer, electroencephalogram, electrograph, electokinetics, electrolier, electrolysis, electrolyte, electrolytic, electrolytic cell, electrolytic dissociation, electrolyze, electromagnet, electromagnetic, electromagnetism, electrometallurgy, electrometer, electromotive, electromotive force, electromotor, electron, electronegative, electron gun, electronics, electron lens, electron microscope, electron tube, electronuclear machine, electrophone, electrophoresis, electrophorus, electropate, electropositive, electroscope, electroshock, electrostatics, electrotherapeutics, electrotherapist, electrotherapy, electrotonus, electrotype, electrotypy.

The point of all this is that the Greek word first borrowed by a 16th century scientist has been used to generate a large number of English words. Scientists operating as a subgroup of our culture are responsible for the creation of most of these words. We can take any number of scientific terms and discover the same kind of changes taking place. The simple Greek term "tel," meaning "far" has produced telescope, telephone, television, telegraph, telstar, and so on. If we wanted to we could think of other subgroups of our culture who have created new words. Politicians, advertising men, car manufacturers, in our own time have given us terms like frontlash, pzazz, and fastback, and their counterparts in the past have given us similar terms.
Finally, let's consider the history of the individual's role in creating new words. You'll remember that when we were talking about Shakespeare and the way he borrowed words, we got the idea that people in Shakespeare's time were very willing to adopt new words or forms to suit their needs. We said that there seemed to be some evidence that this was true in the way that Shakespeare used borrowed words. If we look at the same period of time, roughly the 16th century, more closely, I think we'll find additional support for our guess.

Around 1450 Gutenberg invented the printing press and moveable type. In 1476 a man named William Caxton introduced these innovations to England.

1. What initial effect do you suppose these events had?

(The press made available in large numbers many books which had previously only been available in hand copied manuscripts. This meant that English scholars had access to thousands of titles which it would have been impossible for them to obtain previously.)

2. What language do you suppose most of the books were printed in at first?

(Latin.)

3. Now if a majority of the books being printed were printed in Latin, and English-speaking scholars tried to translate these works into English, what was likely to happen?

(A number of Latin words are likely to be adopted.)
In doing this worksheet we will be studying the history of a few English words. You will need to use the etymological entries in your dictionaries to find the histories of these words. Fill in the appropriate sections of this worksheet with the required information. Do not use abbreviations in writing out the history of the words. Use the examples which you are given as a model. Finally, write a brief explanation of the way that these six items demonstrate the generalizations we have made about the history of our scientific terminology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>HISTORY OF WORD</th>
<th>PRESENT MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phonology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astrology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suppose next that in addition to printing many books in Latin, the presses in all the countries of Europe began to turn out books printed in the various languages of Europe, and suppose that such books found their way to England, or that books written in French and Italian began to be printed in England.

4. What effect would such books have on the English language?

(As English-speaking scholars tried to translate these works words from other European languages would be borrowed.)

In other words, the invention of the printing press, by making it easier to come into contact with other languages, made it easier to borrow words from other languages. In a sense, of course, we would be greatly oversimplifying if we attributed all of the borrowings of this period to the invention of the printing press and the work of scholarly translators. As a matter of fact merchants traveling from country to country, exchanging goods with one another, probably did as much, if not more, borrowing than did scholars.

However, scholars did contribute large numbers of words to our word stock at this time. Frequently, they did not simply borrow a word; they created words using Latin or Greek roots to form English words. We have just discussed the way in which this tendency has affected
the creation of scientific terms ever since the 16th century. Let's look at an example of one scholar's contributions. Here is an example of a dedication from the first book on education written in the English language.

In this passage, Sir Thomas Elyot uses a number of words (those which are underlined) which had only recently appeared in our language. Some of them disappeared just as rapidly as they appeared. There are also two words which had never appeared in English before and which have been a part of the language ever since. Sir Thomas used the words "education" and "dedicate" for the first time. Both words come from Latin roots. In a sense one might say that these words were simply borrowed words. As a matter of fact, this would not be a completely accurate statement. These words are distinguished from most borrowings in that Elyot, following the custom of many others in his time, was consciously attempting to enrich the English word stock and therefore did not bring these words into English in the exact forms that they had in Latin. Instead he attempted to make them more like native English words. He changed the Latin word *dedicatus* to "dedicate" and added the previously borrowed French suffix *-tion* to the stem of the Latin word *educate*.

It is possible then to view these words as created as well as borrowed words. In a sense the terms used by Elyot and his
Distribute two more selections from Baugh's text: "From Wilson's Arte of Rhetorike" (pp. 262-264) and "From George Pettie's Preface to Civile Conversation" (p. 265).

Allow 10 minutes for reading. Point out that underlined terms are new. Note the irony evident in the fact that many of the terms used in derision by Thomas Wilson have become a part of the lexicon.

In summary, then, we can make two points. First, our guess that a fairly free and easy attitude toward language was prevalent in Shakespeare's time would seem to be substantiated. If we examined the period even more closely than we have, we would find additional evidence to support this notion. Secondly, in the use of "inkhorn" terms we can see the way that individuals can change the English lexicon by borrowing or creating new words. It contemporaries were to become the base for all the Graeco-Latinate words which would eventually be created by speakers of English, words which never existed in Greek or Latin, words like "astronaut" and "cosmonaut."

To demonstrate to you that attempts to enrich the English vocabulary were a matter of concern at this time, let me introduce you to the battle over "inkhorn" terms (this was the name given by opponents of the movement to enrich the English word stock to the new terms used by their contemporaries). Here are pro and con arguments about the practice of using "inkhorn" terms.

In the end it was the view of Elyot and Pettie that prevailed, and the conscious borrowing of words has continued to be one of the ways that our lexicon grows.

In summary, then, we can make two points. First, our guess that a fairly free and easy attitude toward language was prevalent in Shakespeare's time would seem to be substantiated. If we examined the period even more closely than we have, we would find additional evidence to support this notion. Secondly, in the use of "inkhorn" terms we can see the way that individuals can change the English lexicon by borrowing or creating new words. It
is worth noting that the individual's contribution in this particular case, as in most cases, is a product of subgroup pressures and cultural contact, and that borrowing and creating are wound together to such an extent that it is difficult to separate them. This is to be expected in view of our earlier discussion of the complex nature of the history of our lexicon.

Before we leave our study of the history of the English lexicon we should probably try to see the entire picture at once, that is, we ought to try to treat one complex historical event from all of the viewpoints we've been using.

1. What did we say was the basic cause for lexical change?
   (Changes in the world around us.)

2. What happened in 1492?
   (Columbus discovered America.)

3. What effect did that event have on the world?
   (It opened a whole new continent for exploration, exploitation, and settlement.)

4. Did the English language have to change because of this change in the world?
   (Yes.)

5. Why did the English language have to change?
   (Because English-speaking people came to the New World.)
And English did change, didn't it? It began, as you might expect, by borrowing an Italian seaman's name as a name for the New World; the Americas, north and south, were christened with the first name of Amerigo Vespucci.

Let's consider only the first moments in the history of English in America. In those first moments we'll see all of the things we've been talking about throughout this unit happening, and will get an excellent sense of the way a historical event affects a language. Let's begin with the obvious.

6. What new cultures, what new language groups did these settlers encounter?
   (The Indians.)

7. What do you suppose happened to English because of this contact?
   (It borrowed Indian words.)

8. Which Indian words do you think were most likely to be borrowed?
   (Words which had no English equivalents.)

   This is precisely what happened and the words "wigwam," "tomahawk," "canoe," "toboggan," "machinaw," "wampum," "squaw," and "papoose" became a part of the English language.

9. What words do you think that subgroups of hunters who were a part of the colonial society got from the Indians?
   (Names of animals.)
And because of this, the Indian words moose, racoon, skunk, opossum, and chipmunk became English words.

Let's think for a moment about another kind of cultural contact taking place at this time.

10. Were the Indians and the English the only two languages groups in America at this time?
   (No.)

11. What other groups were present?
   (Dutch, German, French.)

And from the contact with the colonists who spoke these languages English got the French words portage, chowder, cache, caribou, bureau, bayou, and levee; from the Dutch cruller, coleslaw, cookie, stoop, boss, scow; from the German, bread, pretzel, smearcase (cottage cheese) and sauerkraut.

12. Do you suppose that the contact with the new culture of the Indians caused some shifts in the meanings of words?
   (Yes.)

Perhaps the most complex case of this involved the colonists' encounter with a vegetable the Indians raised. They used one of their own words "corn" to name this vegetable, but "Indian corn" was not really English "corn." They had even more trouble naming the parts of the corn plant, however. Let me read you the account of their problems.
In addition, the subgroup of the culture concerned with politics caused some shifts of meaning, and the terms "mass meeting," "state house," and "land office" were born.

Next let's consider the way in which the contact with the Indian produced new words. From this contact we get the terms "war path," "medicine man," "war paint," "pipe of peace."

And the governing subgroup had to create new words to describe the new politics. The terms "congressman," "caucus," and "selectman," became a part of the language.

Finally, in all of these cases, we can see the individual at work. Captain John Smith borrows the word "moccasin" from the Indians, Davy Crockett shifts the meaning of the term "logroll in" to a political context and Thomas Jefferson creates the word "monocrat" to refer to a person who supports monarchy as a governmental system.

In a word, in this moment, at this point in history, radical changes in the English language took place because radical changes in the world in which the speaker of English found himself necessitated changes in his language. We have mentioned only a few of the new words that the Scandinavian and Norman invasions, or the great revival of learning caused by the invention of the press, brought.
to the language, or the Second World War, or the Space Age. If we were to consider the way that the various events we have been discussing affected the sound system, or the sentence structure of English we would find equally startling changes. The reason that we studied the lexicon of our language rather than its phonology or its syntax, is that in studying the lexicon it is easiest to see the complexity of the factors that make a language what it is. The point of all of this is that the history of a language is intimately tied to the history of the people who speak that language.
WORKSHEET #5

On the basis of what you know about what happened when the English moved to America, write a brief essay explaining the way that the terms listed below became a part of our lexicon. Use this form to help you gather information for your essay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>HISTORY</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kangaroo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wombat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boomerang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swag (meaning shoulder pack)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billabong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billy can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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True or False and Why in one sentence: 30 minutes.

1. Borrowing is exclusively a result of cultural contact.
2. The fundamental cause of all changes in our lexicon is change in the world to which our lexicon refers.
3. Individuals are seldom responsible for the acceptance of new terms.
4. The Scandinavian invasion had a smaller effect on the lexicon of our language than did the Norman invasion.
5. There was no Latin influence on English before the monks brought Christianity to England.
6. Over the years war has had a continuing effect on our lexicon.
7. Scientists have made up most of their specialized words from Greek and Latin roots.
8. American English has borrowed a number of words from Spanish.
9. "Front lash" is a term recently borrowed because of cultural contact.
10. The word Edsel might eventually drop out of our lexicon.
Essay Questions: 20 Minutes

Write on Question 1 and on 2 or 3.

1. How do the words cow, beef, calf, veal, sheep, mutton, deer, venison, demonstrate the complexity involved in lexical change?

2. When we started our study of the history of English words, we decided to start with changes that are happening now. Why did we do this and what fundamental characteristics of the way people use language made it possible for us to do this?

3. Discuss the way that the invention of the motion picture camera has affected our lexicon.
1. **F** Pressure groups and individuals play an important part in the borrowing of words.

2. **T** Changes in the world around us put pressure on our language and cause lexical change because we need to communicate with one another about new things and experiences.

3. **F** If an individual's prestige is great his use of a term may well be enough to cause the adoption of a new term.

4. **T** The long duration of the rule of the Norman French nobility and their eventual use of English as a second language caused the adoption of a larger number and broader range of French words.

5. **F** The Jutes, Angles, Saxons, and Frisians borrowed Latin words while still on the European continent.

6. **T** New words have become a part of our lexicon as a result of the Scandinavian invasions, the Norman invasion, the Crusades, the Spanish-American War, the First World War, the Second World War, etc.

7. **T** This tendency on the part of scientists is a result of the classical (Greek and Latin) nature of the educational system prevalent in England at the time modern science had its beginnings.

8. **T** The contact with the Spanish-speaking settlers who colonized South America and made Spanish the predominant language of that continent is responsible for many of these Spanish loan words.

9. **F** The term was recently coined by one of our political subgroups.

10. **T** The thing named by the word is no longer being made, and if all the Edsels that exist disappear the word might also disappear.

The essay questions which form the second part of the examination can be answered in a number of ways. In answering Questions 1, students should touch on the notion of the interplay between borrowing, shifts in meaning, and the operation of subgroup pressures evident in the history of these pairs of words. In answering Question 2, students should mention the fundamental similarity between the situations which confront human beings, whenever they communicate. Changes currently taking place are inspired by the same kinds of deficiencies in or pressures on our linguistic code that caused earlier changes. Question 3 provides the widest range of possible answers. Students who do a good job answering it will need to discuss the many side effects of the movie-making business, as well as the technical terminology of movie making.