

The Cambridge History of the
English Language

剑桥英语史

第四卷

(1776—1997)

Edited by Suzanne Romaine

北京大学出版社 剑桥大学出版社

THE CAMBRIDGE
HISTORY OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE

VOLUME IV 1776-1997

EDITED BY

SUZANNE ROMAINE

*Merton Professor of English Language,
University of Oxford*

PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

GENERAL EDITOR'S PREFACE

Although it is a topic of continuing debate, there can be little doubt that English is the most widely spoken language in the world, with significant numbers of native speakers in almost every major region – only South America falling largely outside the net. In such a situation an understanding of the nature of English can be claimed unambiguously to be of world-wide importance.

Growing consciousness of such a role for English is one of the motivations behind the History. There are other motivations too. Specialist students have many major and detailed works of scholarship to which they can refer, for example Bruce Mitchell's *Old English Syntax*, or, from an earlier age, Karl Luick's *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. Similarly, those who come new to the subject have both one-volume histories such as Barbara Strang's *History of English* and introductory textbooks to a single period, for example Bruce Mitchell and Fred Robinson's *A Guide to Old English*. But what is lacking is the intermediate work which can provide a solid discussion of the full range of the history of English both to the Anglicist who does not specialise in the particular area to hand and to the general linguist who has no specialised knowledge of the history of English. This work attempts to remedy that lack. We hope that it will be of use to others too, whether they are interested in the history of English for its own sake, or for some specific purpose such as local history or the effects of colonisation.

Under the influence of the Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure, there has been, during this century, a persistent tendency to view the study of language as having two discrete parts: (i) synchronic, where a language is studied from the point of view of one moment in time; (ii) diachronic, where a language is studied from a historical perspective. It might therefore be supposed that this present work is purely diachronic. But this is not so. One crucial principle which guides *The Cambridge History of the English*

Language is that synchrony and diachrony are intertwined, and that a satisfactory understanding of English (or any other language) cannot be achieved on the basis of one of these alone.

Consider, for example, the (synchronic) fact that English, when compared with other languages, has some rather infrequent or unusual characteristics. Thus, in the area of vocabulary, English has an exceptionally high number of words borrowed from other languages (French, the Scandinavian languages, American Indian languages, Italian, the languages of northern India and so on); in syntax a common construction is the use of *do* in forming questions (e.g. *Do you like cheese?*), a type of construction not often found in other languages; in morphology English has relatively few inflexions, at least compared with the majority of other European languages; in phonology the number of diphthongs as against the number of vowels in English is notably high. In other words, synchronically, English can be seen to be in some respects rather unusual. But in order to understand such facts we need to look at the history of the language; it is often only there that an explanation can be found. And that is what this work attempts to do.

This raises another issue. A quasi-Darwinian approach to English might attempt to account for its widespread use by claiming that somehow English is more suited, better adapted, to use as an international language than others. But that is nonsense. English is no more fit than, say, Spanish or Chinese. The reasons for the spread of English are political, cultural and economic rather than linguistic. So too are the reasons for such linguistic elements within English as the high number of borrowed words. This History, therefore, is based as much upon political, cultural and economic factors as linguistic ones, and it will be noted that the major historical divisions between volumes are based upon the former type of events (the Norman Conquest, the spread of printing, the declaration of independence by the USA), rather than the latter type.

As a rough generalisation, one can say that up to about the seventeenth century the development of English tended to be centripetal, whereas since then the development has tended to be centrifugal. The settlement by the Anglo-Saxons resulted in a spread of dialect variation over the country, but by the tenth century a variety of forces were combining to promote the emergence of a standard form of the language. Such an evolution was disrupted by the Norman Conquest, but with the development of printing together with other more centralising tendencies, the emergence of a standard form became once more, from the fifteenth century on, a major characteristic of the language. But processes of emigration and colonisation

then gave rise to new regional varieties overseas, many of which have now achieved a high degree of linguistic independence, and one of which, namely American English, may even have a dominating influence on British English. The structure of this work is designed to reflect these different types of development. Whilst the first four volumes offer a reasonably straightforward chronological account, the later volumes are geographically based. This arrangement, we hope, allows scope for the proper treatment of diverse types of evolution and development. Even within the chronologically oriented volumes there are variations of structure, which are designed to reflect the changing relative importance of various linguistic features. Although all the chronological volumes have substantial chapters devoted to the central topics of semantics and vocabulary, syntax, and phonology and morphology, for other topics the space allotted in a particular volume is one which is appropriate to the importance of that topic during the relevant period, rather than some pre-defined calculation of relative importance. And within the geographically based volumes all these topics are potentially included within each geographical section, even if sometimes in a less formal way. Such a flexible and changing structure seems essential for any full treatment of the history of English.

One question that came up as this project began was the extent to which it might be possible or desirable to work within a single theoretical linguistic framework. It could well be argued that only a consensus within the linguistic community about preferred linguistic theories would enable a work such as this to be written. Certainly, it was immediately obvious when work for this History began, that it would be impossible to lay down a 'party line' on linguistic theory, and indeed, that such an approach would be undesirably restrictive. The solution reached was, I believe, more fruitful. Contributors have been chosen purely on the grounds of expertise and knowledge, and have been encouraged to write their contributions in the way they see most fitting, whilst at the same time taking full account of developments in linguistic theory. This has, of course, led to problems, notably with contrasting views of the same topic (and also because of the need to distinguish the ephemeral flight of theoretical fancy from genuine new insights into linguistic theory), but even in a work which is concerned to provide a unified approach (so that, for example, in most cases every contributor to a volume has read all the other contributions to that volume), such contrasts, and even contradictions, are stimulating and fruitful. Whilst this work aims to be authoritative, it is not prescriptive, and the final goal must be to stimulate interest in a subject in which much work remains to be done, both theoretically and empirically.

The task of editing this History has been, and still remains, a long and complex one. As General Editor I owe a great debt to my friends and colleagues who have devoted much time and thought to how best this work might be approached and completed. Firstly, I should thank my fellow-editors: John Algeo, Norman Blake, Bob Burchfield, Roger Lass and Suzanne Romaine. They have been concerned as much with the History as a whole as with their individual volumes. Secondly, there are those fellow linguists, some contributors, some not, who have so generously given of their time and made many valuable suggestions: John Anderson, Cecily Clark, Frans van Coetsem, Fran Colman, David Denison, Ed Finegan, Olga Fischer, Jacek Fisiak, Malcolm Godden, Angus McIntosh, Lesley Milroy, Donka Minkova, Matti Rissanen, Michael Samuels, Bob Stockwell, Tom Toon, Elizabeth Traugott, Peter Trudgill, Nigel Vincent, Anthony Warner, Simone Wyss. One occasion stands out especially: the organisers of the Fourth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, held at Amsterdam in 1985, kindly allowed us to hold a seminar on the project as it was just beginning. For their generosity, which allowed us to hear many views and exchange opinions with colleagues one rarely meets face-to-face, I must thank Roger Eaton, Olga Fischer, Willem Koopman and Federike van der Leek.

With a work so complex as this, an editor is faced with a wide variety of problems and difficulties. It has been, therefore, a continual comfort and solace to know that Penny Carter of Cambridge University Press has always been there to provide advice and solutions on every occasion. Without her knowledge and experience, encouragement and good humour, this work would have been both poorer and later. After the work for Volume I was virtually complete, Marion Smith took over as publishing editor, and I am grateful to her too, not merely for ensuring such a smooth change-over, but for her bravery when faced with the mountain of paper from which this series has emerged.

Richard M. Hogg

EDITOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Given the long time this volume was in preparation, it has passed through the hands of more than a few editors at Cambridge University Press. I would like to thank, in particular, Penny Carter, Judith Ayling and Kate Brett for their help during their respective tenures as editor in charge of the Cambridge History of the English Language project. I am grateful to Richard Hogg for comments on my introduction.

Suzanne Romaine
Oxford, 1997

CONTRIBUTORS' ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The contributors to this volume are grateful for the help and advice they have received from friends, colleagues and students, as well as from their fellow contributors and the editors of and contributors to other volumes. We wish especially to thank the following.

James Adamson, Adele S. Algeo, Dwight Atkinson, Syd Bauman, Linda van Bergen, Douglas Biber, Norman Blake, Joe Bray, R. W. Burchfield, Colin T. Clarkson, Teresa Fanego, Anne Finell, Olga Fischer, Susan Fitzmaurice, Julia Flanders, Nik Gisborne, Sarah Hawkins, Jane Hodson, Dick Hudson, Merja Kytö, Sidney Landau, Roger Lass, Grevel Lindop, Peter Matthews, Terry Moore, Fujio Nakamura, Terttu Nevalainen, Francis Nolan, John Payne, Jackie Pearson, Allen Renear, Matti Rissanen, Alan Shelston, Barry Symonds, Mary Syner, Ingrid Tiekens-Boon van Ostade, Elizabeth Traugott, Graeme Trousdale, Nigel Vincent, Anthony Warner, E. S. C. Weiner, Marcus Wood, John Woolford, students at Manchester 1994–5.

ABBREVIATIONS

~	contrasts with/ corresponds to	ME	Middle English
ø	zero form or site of gap	ModE	Modern English
AmerE	American English	NP	noun phrase
AP	adjective phrase	OE	Old English
ARCHER	A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers	<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
BrE	British English	p.c.	personal communication
<i>CHEL</i>	<i>Cambridge History of the English Language</i>	PDE	Present-Day English
CV	Cardinal Vowel	PL	plural
e	early	PP	prepositional phrase
<i>EPD</i>	<i>English Pronouncing Dictionary</i>	ppl	participle
Gen.Am.	General American	PRES	present tense
IPA	International Phonetic Alphabet	SAI	subject-auxiliary inversion
l	late	SG	singular
Lat.	Latin	1, 2, 3	first, second third person
<i>LPD</i>	<i>Longman Pronunciation Dictionary</i>	s.v.	<i>sub voce, sub verbo</i> 'under the/ that word'
		VP	verb phrase
		WWP	Women Writers Project, Brown University

这是迄今为止最为恢弘、最为野心勃勃的英语史，其成就将为所有关注她的人士感到无比骄傲。

—— Randolph Quirk, *London Review of Books*

这是一支非常值得尊敬的杰出的作者队伍，这部精美的著作将成为一部必备的工具书。

—— John Honey, *Times Higher Education Supplement*

《剑桥英语史》是第一部详尽地叙述英语历史的多卷本巨著，无论是其恢弘的气度还是内容的权威性，都远远超过了以往任何一部英语史著作。她不仅仅是为专业人士撰写的，也是为所有对英语的历史有兴趣的一般读者献上的厚礼。其精彩的论述从语言的核心内容（语音学、形态学、语义学、句法学）一直延伸到人名和地名的专名学领域，除了渊博的学识之外，也显示了其独到的视角和多样的分析方法。

我们在此特别想要说明的是：这部英语史决不仅仅是某一种语言的历史，更是一部语言学的百科全书。我们相信，任何一位语言学工作者，无论他是从事语言学的哪一个领域的研究，都将从中受到知识和方法的双重教益。

更有甚者。北欧的海盗与Alfred大帝签订了协议，他们得以在东部一片狭长的地带居住下来，许多以 -by 结尾的地名见证了这一段历史，这是丹麦语“定居地”之意；像 they 和 are 这样的基本词汇来源于斯堪的那维亚语，这对语言接触的研究应当是一个不小的挑战；还有奥古斯丁莅临英伦，拉丁语再次施加影响；伴随诺曼底公爵的登陆，法语词汇大量涌入；海外殖民的拓展，新的英语变体形成……在流淌的文字中间，是民族斗争和交融的声音；这部英语史同时也是一部民族史，语言的历史中蕴涵着民族的精神历史。什么时候，我们能够有一部汉语史，能让世界人民从中理解我们民族精神的历史呢？“他山之石，可以攻玉”，这正是我们引进这部皇皇巨著的最终目的。

—— 编辑

CONTENTS

<i>List of figures</i>	page x
<i>List of tables</i>	xi
<i>List of contributors</i>	xii
<i>General Editor's preface</i>	xiii
<i>Editor's acknowledgements</i>	xvii
<i>Contributors' acknowledgements</i>	xviii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xix
1 INTRODUCTION <i>Suzanne Romaine</i>	1
1.1 From Old English to New Englishes: unity in diversity?	1
1.2 1776 and after: an age of revolutions and empires	6
1.3 Shifting centres of gravity and the notion of a common core	22
1.4 Language, nation, and identity: staking a claim on the past and future	48
1.5 Conclusion: a remarkable success story?	54
Further reading	56
2 VOCABULARY <i>John Algeo</i>	57
2.1 The study of the English vocabulary	57
2.2 The growth of the vocabulary	61
2.3 Creating as a source of new words	66
2.4 Shifting as a source of new words	66
2.5 Shortening as a source of new words	71
2.6 Composing as a source of new words	74
2.7 Blending as a source of new words	76
2.8 Borrowing as a source of new words	76

2.9	Recent neologisms	82
2.10	Vocabulary change as a mirror of cultural change	88
	Further reading	91
3	SYNTAX <i>David Denison</i>	92
3.1	Introduction	92
3.2	The noun phrase	96
3.3	The verbal group	130
3.4	Elements of the clause	212
3.5	Structure of the clause	235
3.6	Composite sentences	255
	Notes	312
	Textual sources	323
	Further reading	326
4	ONOMASTICS <i>Richard Coates</i>	330
	Preamble	330
4.1	Sources for British names	332
4.2	Scholarship	336
4.3	Personal names	339
4.4	Surnames	348
4.5	Place-names	350
4.6	Street-names	365
4.7	Other categories of nameables	370
4.8	Academic writings on names	371
	Further Reading	371
5	PHONOLOGY <i>Michael K. C. MacMahon</i>	373
5.1	The soundscapes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries	373
5.2	The historical sources and their interpretation	375
5.3	Methods of phonetic/phonological analysis	381
5.4	Standards and styles of pronunciation	382
5.5	Vowel systems	403
5.6	Vowel phonotactics (structural)	418
5.7	Vowel phonotactics (lexical-incidental)	438
5.8	Vowel realisations	448
5.9	Consonant systems	467
5.10	Consonant phonotactics (structural)	469
5.11	Consonant phonotactics (lexical-incidental)	483

5.12	Consonant realisations	486
5.13	Lexical stress	492
5.14	Intonation and rhythm	517
5.15	Voice qualities	519
5.16	Conclusions	520
	Notes	522
	Further reading	535
6	ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND USAGE	
	<i>Edward Finegan</i>	536
6.1	Introduction	536
6.2	First period: mid-eighteenth century–1830	540
6.3	Second period: 1830–1930	557
6.4	Third period: 1930–present	579
6.5	Conclusions and prospects	585
	Further reading	587
7	LITERARY LANGUAGE <i>Sylvia Adamson</i>	589
7.1	Introduction	589
7.2	Breaking the standard	598
7.3	Breaking the pentameter	614
7.4	The breaking of hypotaxis	630
7.5	The problem of metaphor	646
7.6	Self-expression and self-representation	661
7.7	CODA: the two revolutions and the literary common core	679
	Further reading	681
	Key to the numbered examples	684
	Key to the cited authors	689
	<i>Glossary of linguistic terms</i>	693
	<i>Bibliography</i>	708
	<i>Index</i>	762

FIGURES

1.1	Pronunciation differences among varieties of English (from Trudgill & Hannah 1982: 5)	<i>page</i> 40
5.1	The International Phonetic Alphabet	423
5.2	Intonation and rhythm	518
7.1	Level of context-dependent reference in three genres across three centuries (adapted from Biber & Finegan 1989: 502)	593

TABLES

3.1	<i>Acquaintance</i> in nineteenth-century quotations in the <i>OED</i>	page 97
3.2	Singular and plural <i>none</i> + <i>of</i> + NP _{PL}	123
3.3	First occurrences of progressive of HAVE	149
3.4	Normal versus passival progressive in the eighteenth century	149
3.5	Finite inflections of BE	161
3.6	Reciprocals in ARCHER corpus	217
3.7	Group-verbs in PDE	222
3.8	Spread of phrasal-prepositional verb (class 4)	224
3.9	Predicative NPs versus objects	229
3.10	Some intensifiers with participial adjectives in ARCHER	230
3.11	Inverted protases and <i>if</i> -clauses in ARCHER	300
5.1	Lexical stress pattern 1	494
5.2	Lexical stress pattern 2	496
5.3	Lexical stress pattern 3	498
5.4	Lexical stress pattern 4	502
5.5	Lexical stress pattern 5	506
5.6	Lexical stress pattern 6	508
7.1	Linguistic features associated with literate and oral styles	591

I INTRODUCTION

Suzanne Romaine

1.1 From Old English to new Englishes: unity in diversity?

The final decades of the eighteenth century provide the starting point for this volume – a time when arguably less was happening to shape the **structure** of the English language than to shape **attitudes** towards it in a social climate that became increasingly prescriptive. Baugh and Cable (1993) appropriately entitle their chapter on the period from 1650 to 1800 'The Appeal to Authority', characterising the intellectual spirit of the age as one seeking order and stability, both political and linguistic. This so-called Augustan Age was one of refinement. After two centuries of effort to remedy the perceived inadequacies of English to enable it to meet a continually expanding range of functions, the eighteenth century was a time for putting the final touches on it, to fix things once and for all. In the nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth the success of England as an imperial nation combined with romantic ideas about language being the expression of a people's genius would engender a triumphalist and patriotic attitude to English. The language was now not so much to be improved but preserved as a great national monument and defended from threat in a battle over whose norms would prevail. As the demographic shift in the English-speaking population moved away from Britain, the twentieth would be declared the American century, and the Empire would strike back.

The most radical changes to English grammar had already taken place over the roughly one thousand years preceding the starting year of this volume. Certainly MacMahon's chapter makes clear how in our own period the phonology of English underwent nothing like the series of changes called the Great Vowel Shift (see Lass, volume III). It is noteworthy too that changes affecting morphology are insignificant by comparison with those of previous periods. Hence, there is no separate chapter devoted to them

here. English is currently undergoing the final stages of changes begun centuries earlier, e.g. the loss of case marking in *wh*-pronouns. The use of *who* in the objective case occurs sporadically even as early as the sixteenth century among writers such as Marlowe. Even though *who* has become increasingly accepted in written English and Sapir (1921: 167) predicted the demise of *whom* within a couple of hundred years, it is still with us.

The immediately preceding period dealt with in Volume III (1476–1776) of this series, the Early Modern Period, has often been described as the formative period in the history of Modern Standard English. By the end of the seventeenth century what we might call the present-day ‘core’ grammar of Standard English was already firmly established. As pointed out by Denison in his chapter on syntax, relatively few categorical innovations or losses occurred. The syntactic changes during the period covered in this volume have been mainly statistical in nature, with certain construction types becoming more frequent. The continuing expansion of the progressive, in particular, its use in passives such as *the house is being built*, is a product of the late eighteenth century. By the time it appeared, the prescriptive spirit was so well established that it was condemned as an inelegant neologism and consciously avoided by many writers. As Baugh and Cable (1993: 287–8) note, the origin of the construction can be traced back to the latter part of the eighteenth century, but its establishment and ultimate acceptance required the better part of a century. The so-called *get* passive, e.g. *the vase got broken*, is also largely a nineteenth-century development.

Other changes such as the spread and regularization of *do* support began in the thirteenth century and were more or less complete in the nineteenth. Although *do* coexisted with the simple verb forms in negative statements from the early ninth century, obligatoriness was not complete until the nineteenth. The increasing use of *do* periphrasis coincides with the fixing of SVO word order. Not surprisingly, *do* is first widely used in interrogatives, where the word order is disrupted, and then later spread to negatives.

The part of the language probably most affected by change in our period is its vocabulary. Baugh & Cable (1993: 292) draw our attention, in particular, to the great increase in scientific vocabulary and the large number of new terms in common use among modern English speakers, e.g. *bronchitis*, *cholesterol*, *relativity*, *quark*, etc. Under James Murray’s editorship of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), scientific and technical vocabulary fell outside the range of ‘common words’ to which the dictionary was committed (see 1.3.1). Murray, for instance, rejected *appendicitis* as too technical only to have it quickly become part of common usage after the coronation