UNIT TEST

# Unit test 1:

The Present-Day English noun *wasp*is derived from the Old English noun *waps*, but the two adjoining phonemes were changed via metathesis. Was this an internal or external change? What level(s) of linguistic analysis did it affect? Support your answer.

It is an internal change. It affected the phonology, and probably, this was the reasons for the change. It is easier to pronounce "wasp" that "waps". **(0’80/1)**

In the aftermath of the Norman Conquest, many French terms were introduced into English, among them castle, pork and table. Was this an internal or external change? What level(s) of linguistic analysis did it affect? Support your answer.

This is an external change. As it was because of the Norman Cosquest that the borrowings were introduced. Also, during the Norman Conquest, french was the language of pretige. It changes the vocabulary, as that words did not existed before, and then, they were introduced as new words with new meaning. **(0’60/1)**

You're right in the motivations for the external change, but it was also internal, as it has contributed to expanding the English lexicon.

This is an example of the interplay of internal and external factors triggering linguistic change. On the one hand, the Norman Conquest is a historical event which is part of the external history of English. On the other, this has resulted in a massive borrowing of French terms into English, thereby changing the configuration of the English lexicon (up to then mostly of Germanic origin). These borrowings affected the level of lexis.

The Great Vowel Shift implied a number of sound changes which affected English long vowels during the 15th to the 18th centuries. Was this an internal or external change? What level(s) of linguistic analysis did it affect? Support your answer.

It is an external change as the modifications from "The Great Vowel Shift" were, in a way, because of a social reason. People tried to imitate the pronunciation from the higher classes. It affected the phonology, as the mayor change were the length from the vowels. **(0’6/1)**

It is an external change for the reasons you mention, but it is also internal, as it affects the development of English, in particular of vowels (phonology level).

Comment on the relationship between the Proto-Indoeuropean form \*wegh /wegh/ , meaning 'move, ride' and Old English weg /weg/, meaning 'road'. **(0)**

In Old English the relationships between words and, hence, the syntactic function of the different constituents, were marked by means of inflections. For this reason, there was no need for elements to occupy a specific slot within the clause. Over time, however, these inflections were levelled and eventually lost, and the relationship between words had to be marked by other elements such as prepositions and word order became more rigid (cf. *se cyning meteð þone biscop vs. þone biscop meteð se cyning*).

**The noun aspirin was originally a proper noun which denoted a compound, acetylsalicylic acid, used especially as an analgesic. As such, it was capitalised. In Present-day English, it is no longer capitalised and it can be used to refer to a dose of acetylsalicylic acid in tablet form. What change(s) has the word aspirin undergone? Is this an internal or an external change? Support your answer.**

The word has undergone commonisation (from a proper noun into a common one).

This is a case of an interplay of internal and external type of change. It is internal because a new word is coined and the vocabulary of English is hence enlarged. On the other hand, it is an external change because a new scientific discovery (external force) has resulted in a linguistic change, with the coinage of a new word. The word was capitalised at first because it was a proper noun, but it has undergone commonisation and as such its spelling has changed.

# Unit test 2:

How would you account for the relationship between the initial /k/ sound in the Latin word cruor and the initial /x/ sound in the Old English word hrēaw, both meaning 'raw'?

Because of the Grimm's Law or the Firt Consonant Shift, there was a sound change that affected the Proto-Indo-European system of plosives. So the the intial sound from *cruor,* which is a voiceless plosive, changed into a voiceless fricative /x/, the one that it is in *hrēaw*. This also means that both words are cognates. **(1/1)**

Based on the Old English word tunge 'tongue' (nominative singular feminine noun), was Old English a synthetic or an analytic language? Support your answer.

A synthetic language is a language with inflections that have syntatic information.  If 'tongue' is nominative singular feminine noun, it means that the word has inflections that can give us that information. So English is an synthetic language. **(1/1)**

How would you account for the relationship between the Proto-Indoeuropean form \*bhar and Old English beran, both meaning 'to bear'?

Because of the Grimm's Law or the Firt Consonant Shift, there was a sound change that affected the Proto-Indo-European system of plosives. This change affected the intial sound from \*bhar. This sound is a voiced aspirated plosive and it changed into a voiced plosive /b/, the one that it is in beran. This also means that both words are cognates. **(0’80/1)**

Forgot to mention that the voiced aspirated turned into a voiced unaspirated, i.e., with loss of aspiration (/bh/ > /b/)

Comment on the relationship between the Proto-Indoeuropean form \*wegh /wegh/ , meaning 'move, ride' and Old English weg /weg/, meaning 'road'.

Because of the Grimm's Law or the Firt Consonant Shift, there was a sound change that affected the Proto-Indo-European system of plosives.. This change affected the word \*wegh. This sound: /gh / is a voiced aspirated plosive and it changed into a voiced plosive /g/, the one that it is in weg. This also means that both words are cognates. **(0’80/1)**

Forgot to mention that the voiced aspirated turned into a voiced unaspirated, i.e., with loss of aspiration (/gh/ > /g/)

**How would you account for the presence of the suffixes -*ed*, -*t*, and -*d*in the participial forms *planned*(English), *geplant*(German)*,*and *gepland*(Dutch)?**

The presence of the suffixes -ed, -t, and -d are common in these 3 languages as the three of them are Germanic languages. Germanic languages have some special characteristics that differ from the other Indo-European languages They share a dental suffix, because they are all weak verbs and English, German and Dutch are Germanic languages.

**The Present-day English verbs to bear and to like form their past and participle forms differently. Explain why.**

To bear was a strong verb and forms the past and participle by ablaut or vocalic alternation, while like is a weak verb and shows a dental suffix.

# Unit test 3:

Explain the difference between a loan translation and a semantic loan. Support your answer with examples.

Loan translation is a literal translation word by word. It is taken the form and the meaning from the Latin word. In contrast, the semantic shift do not take the form from latin, but it takes the meaning. A semantic loan is a word that acquires a new meaning. **(0’40/1)**

You need to provide examples, Alba. CAREFUL: \*it is talen the form and the meaning (double subject > the form and the meaning are taken); \*the semantic shift do not > DOES not.

Loan translation: a calque or word-by-word translation (the form and the meaning of the foreign word become a model for the native construction): *mildheort* ‘mild-heart’ < Lat. *misericors*; *gōd-spell* ‘good-news’ < Lat. *euangelium*;

Semantic loan take the idea from a foreign word but contain no element that directly corresponds: *synn*, orig. ‘crime’ > ‘crime against God’; *God*, orig. neu. ‘pagan god’ > God masc. only sg. ‘God of christianity’

Which is the subject in the following Old English sentence: se cyning sl*ōh*þone biscop?

Se cyning is in the mominative case, we know it because of the 'se'. While þone biscop is in accusative. So se cyning would be the subject. **(1/1)**

The English words *schrub*and *scrub* are cognates (i.e. they derive from a common source). Indicate which one is a Scandinavian borrowing and which one a native word. Support your answer.

The Scandinavian word is scrub. Scandinavian loanwords have a lack of palatalization of velar plosives and the group /sk/. In Gmc it was /sk/, and for Old English this changed into /ʃ/, as we can see in schrub. In contrast, in *scrub* the /sk/ remains. **(1/1)**

Explain the type of word order in the following sentence:

forþam þe ('because') he his freond ('friend') is ('because he is his friend) **(0)**

This is a subordinate clause, specifically an adverbial clause of reason. It is introduced by the subordinator *forþam þe* ('because'), and subordinate clauses in OE showed verb-final word order. This is the case of the verb *to be*in this case, which appears in final position in the sentence.

**Explain the relationship between the Old English word *Hālig Gāst* and Latin *Spiritus Sanctus*.**

This is a case of loan translation

# Unit test 4:

**1.Explain why modals became increasingly important in Middle English.**

The decay of verbal inflections in Late Old English and Middle English triggered an increasing use of modals in cases in which the subjunctive was formerly used (for uncertain facts, wishes, suggestions, demands, etc.): since the subjunctive inflections were lost, English now resorted to modal periphrases instead to express these meanings.

**2. Comment on the origin of the following pair of French borrowings: *cattle – chattel*, both of which meant ‘property, article of property’ in Middle English.**

These two words are borrowings from French, however, they were introduced in English in different periods. We can notice that the first one 'cattle'  has a clear characteristic of the Anglo-French, that is /k/ + /a/. These loanwords were introduced in English between the 11-12 centuries, that is, after the Norman Conquest. By contrast, the second word 'chattel', present the /tS/, which is a characteristic of Central French, so it was introduced between the 13-15 centuries.

**3. Comment on the relationship between the following pair of words: *house* – *mansion*.**

These words show a contrast between native word vs. loanword. *House*is a native Old English word, with cognates in other Germanic languages. In turn, *mansion*was borrowed in Middle English to refer originally to ‘the chief residence of a lord’, i.e., it was not any type of house and not anyone would live in a mansion. This example is in line with other pairs of words which illustrate societal differences of the time, as is also the case of *cow-beef, sheep-mutton, pig-pork*(animal raised by farmers/lower classes vs. meat eaten by the French/the upper classes).

4. Identify and comment on the use of the second person pronouns in the following Middle English example: Ryght welbelouyd son, I grete you well and send you Cristes blissyng and myne, desyringe to know how ye faire (‘right beloved son, I greet you well and send you Christ’s blessing and mine, desiring to know how you go’)

The forms used to designate the second person in this text are: 'you' and 'ye'. The use of these forms tells us that the person who writes the text and the person who received it belong to the high class in society, as these are respectful forms, formal forms. The use of other forms such as 'thou', if you are treating with a high class in this Epoque, would be offensive.

Note also that 'ye' is the nominative form and 'you' the objective form.

# Unit test 5:

How do we distinguish between older and more recent borrowings from French?

French is the source of many borrowings. The difference between is that the older borrowings got adapted to the English language. There is a palatalization /tꭍ/, in many words like for example in "choir". While the recent borrowing did not have time to get adapted, so they mantain the /ꭍ/, like in "champagne".

Also, the recent borrowings tend to retain the French pronunciation and the accents as well. **(0’9/1)**

Please note that choir does not show palatalisation (it is pronounced /kwaɪə/.

Comment on the use of the relative pronoun in the following Early Modern English example: The mistress which I serue.

In Early Modern English the relative "which" could resume both animate and inanimate antecendents. **(0’9/1)**

You could have added that this is no longer grammatical in Present-day English, and that this restriction was fixed later on, in Late Modern English.

Identify and describe the relative clause in the following Early Modern English example: *I know there is noe Man can doe more than your selfe*(‘I know there is no man who can do more than yourself’)

In Early Modern English there is not a relativizer, so its is called "zero". This would appear in subject and object function as in the example.

Also, we can obverse the analythic comparative with "more than". The comparatives varied freely. **(0’8/1)**

Indeed, this is a zero relativiser. However, what is the function of that relativiser in the sentence? It can't be both subject and object, and you seem to indicate that. What differs from Present-day English usage is the use of a zero relative in subject function. This is actually the case of the example, and what would differ from PDE.

In the light of the following EModE example, comment on the changes in negation from EModE to PDE: *I not doubt He came aliue to Land*.

In this examples we can also observe that there is not an auxiliary verb, as nowadays it would be compulsory. This is because is was not yet obligatory, but it was gaining ground. Also in Early Modern English it is avoid the double negatives. The order is: subject + not particle  + verb. **(0’7/1)**

CAREFUL: \*it is avoid the double negatives > double negatives are avoided (you can't have a double subject in PDE; 'it' and 'double negatives' would be subjects). Please note that in EModE double negatives were possible, unlike in PDE.