Sudan University of Science & Technology

College of Graduate Studies

College of Language

Development and the Changes of the Grammatical Rules Through Old and Modern English Periods

(تطور وتغيرات القواعد النحوية خلال فترتي اللغة الانجليزية القديمة والحديثة)

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Degree of M.A in English Language (linguistics)

Submitted by :

Ali Ahmed Mohammed Yahya

Supervised by :

Dr. Wigdan Yagoub M . Sherif

2019

Dedication

To my beloved: parents, sisters, brothers and my future wife.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Praise and glory be to Allah, the Most gracious, the Most Merciful. I could not achieve what I have achieved without God's guidance and help

Firstly I would like to thank Dr.Wigdan Yagoub M. Sherif , my supervisor for her wisdom, invaluable guidance, professionalism and her an invaluable asset . Also special thanks to Dr. Hillary Marino Pitia as external examiner and Dr. Batool Ibrahim Albasheer Alkabashi as internal examiner for their kind advice and guidance

I am so privileged and honored to the English Language Department at Sudan University of Science & Technology, College of Graduate Studies, and special note of thanks goes to the head of the department Dr. Negla Taha Bashrie Alnour .

My deep appreciation is also due to my professors, Dr.Tag Elsir Hassan Bashoum , Dr. Abdalla Yaseen , Dr. Mohammed Elameen Elshingetee ,Dr. Samie Bulah , Dr.Fataih Bulah and Dr. Areeg Osman , Dr. Muntasir Hassan Mubarak Alhafian for their academic guidance.

I would like to express a heartily thanks to my sincere sister Dr Ebthal Yousif Mohammed Alamin , and all relatives , brothers , colleagues and friends ,who contributed to the accomplishment of this thesis

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to trace the developments and the changes of the grammatical rules through the old and modern English periods. Nobody can argue that language does not undergo changes. The only languages that are not prone to linguistic changes are dead languages. The study adopted comparative analytical method since the study deals with the history of English thus it is documentary/historical study .The data obtained from books and references in addition to some texts from old English compared to their resembles in modern English .The thesis aims to shed some light upon the inflectional modifications of pronouns, verbs, nouns, adjectives and that the English language has undergone during the last thousand years. The results of the study show that the English language has moved from being a highly inflective, synthetic language with many endings and cases, few prepositions and no real articles, to developing into a more analytic language with fewer inflectional markers and cases, the system of grammar was so complicated than today, the study offered some recommendation that encourage more studies in the scope of the language change.

مستخلص البحث

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تتبع التطورات والتغيرات التي حدثت في القواعد النحوية فى فترتي اللغة الإنجليزية القديمة والحديثة ، مما لايدعوا مجالا للشك أن اللغة تخضع للتغير عبر التاريخ عدا اللغات المنقرضة هي التي لا تتغير. تبنت الدراسة طريقة التحليل والمقارنة ، لعلاقتها بتاريخ اللغة الإنجليزية لذلك تعتبر دراسة تاريخية وثائقية ، جمعت البيانات من الكتب والمراجع مع مقارنة بعض النصوص من اللغة الإنجليزية القديمة مع نظيرتها في الإنجليزية الحديثة . هدفت الدراسة إلي إلغاء الضوء على التغيرات والتحولات التي حدثت في الضمائر ، الأفعال ، الأسماء والصفات التي حدثت في السنوات الألف الأخيرة ،كما توضح نتائج هذة الدراسة إلي أن اللغة الإنجليزية تحولت من تركيبية تأليفية (كثيرت الكلمات المركبة) إلي لغة تحليلية قليلة التصاريف . بالإضافة إلي أن القواعد النحوية كانت أكثر تعقيدا مما هي عليه اليوم . قدمت الدراسة بعض التوصيات التى تشجع لمزيد من الدراسات في مجال تغير اللغة .

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study:

The English language has developed and changed dramatically over its history, especially in the grammatical rules, so the speakers of modern English would encounter difficulties in learning and understanding old English and would have to figure out the middle English text.

This study concerns the developments which happened in the grammatical rules during the periods of old and modern English language. The term grammar is a word that confuses considerably it has been approached by different scholars and schools of linguistics and defined differently.

Etymologically the term grammar goes back through (French and Latin) to a greek" grammatika "or grammatikatechne "which may be translated as the art of writing so they considered grammar to be a branch of philosophy that concerns with the art of writing, by the end of the old ages and the beginning of the middle ages grammar had come to be regarded as a set of rules.

1.1 Statement of the Study Problem:

As an English teacher and MA student, who is interest in the language changes. Observed the changes and the developments that happened in the grammatical rules through, the different ages of English language from old ages up to the modern English language period. Language change is unpredictable. We can be aware of our linguistic past, but no one is able to predict our linguistic future .Thus the

researcher traced the history of English language as a documentary/historical study.

1.2 Questions of the Study:

1.What are the differences between old grammatical rules and the modern ones in terms of nouns and pronouns?

2.How wide are the differences between the old English grammatical rules and the modern ones in terms of verbs and adjectives?

3.What is the necessity of so many models of modern grammar?

1.3 Hypotheses of the Study:

1.There are the differences between old grammatical rules and the modern ones in terms of nouns and pronouns .

2.There are wide differences between the old grammatical rules and the modern one in terms of verbs and adjectives .

3. The necessity of so many models of modern grammar because of the imperfect and inadequate of the traditional grammar.

1.4 The Significance of the Study:

The importance of this research is to know the developments and the changes that happened in the grammatical rules as to be aware of old and modern English grammar, so the research conductor will describe the facts which were existed in order to be known by those who had not cover this field before.

This study will be of immense help and usefulness not only to those who related to linguistics studies but also to the academicians as well as it will be beneficial for the students of English language, it will help them

in communication. As its importance grammar is called the art of putting the right word in the right place especially in communication.

Above all this is the significance for the developments of English language as reference of comparative study of old and modern English grammar.

1.5 Objectives of the Study:

1. To elaborate the learners knowledge in grammar within its different ages.

2. To identify the differences between the old grammatical rules and the modern one.

3. To distinguish between formal and notional grammar.

4. To know the necessity of so many models of modern grammar.

1.6 Methodology of the Study:

The method that will be used in this study is historical method, collected the data, from reliable and different sources, such as books, references and an encyclopedia

1.7 Delimitations of the Study:

The Delimitations of this study are as follows:

1. Place delimitation:

This study will be undertaken in Sudan University of Science & Technology College of graduate studies, Khartoum, Sudan.

2. Time delimitation:

The study is delimited to 2017_2019

3. Topic delimitation:

This study is delimited to the developments and the changes of the grammatical rules from old English period up to the modern one.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW AND PREVIOUS STUDIEIS

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND PREVIOUS STDUDIES

2.0. Introduction:

English language has undergone extensive changes and developments between the old and modern English language periods, changes in grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary have made old English no longer understandable to speakers of modern English. In the light of these developments, the English language has often been characterized as having moved from (synthetic type to an analytic types) ,the grammatical change in traditional textbooks on the history of English or historical linguistics by and large focus won change in morphology (the structure of words) and syntax (the structure of phrases, clauses and sentences).

2.1. Definitions of Grammar:

Many grammarians have defined the term grammar differently as follows: A S Hornby; (1978-271) said that, "grammar is the study or science of rules for combination of words into sentences (syntax) and the forms of words (morphology)."It is an intervening link between morphological level and the syntactic level. The morphology of words affects the syntax of the sentences involved ,therefore, both of them have great relation with the grammar.

Palmer F (1971-12) said that:"grammar is something that can be good or bad, correct or in correct " it's bad (in correct) grammar to say 'it's me ' On this interpretation it will usually be languages that are

formally taught in school or through books that are said to have any grammar ,for it is at school or in books that the criteria for what is good and what is bad grammar be found "

C.E.Eckresley, M . A and Margaret Macaulay . M. A ; (1952.5) said that : "grammar " .someone has said : "is the art of putting the right words in the right places ". Of course all words can be put according to the work they do , thus it is impossible to say for instance : We is playing chess often . If it means present simple the right form is , we play chess often or the progressive we are playing chess now .

M .Bloomfield; (2012) free online encyclopedia said that: "grammar is defined as morphotatic that is the rules of combinatility of morphemes ". This definition referred clearly that syntax and morphology are combined together to form grammar that is to say: that grammar is born as the result of combination between syntax and morphology. In another word grammar had has strong relationship with these two branches of linguistics.

2.2 Kinds of Grammar:

Rashes L . Varshney . (1995 – 202) said that: "there are various kinds of grammar, some major types of these are the old traditional and new grammar and the major differences between the two are that:

2.2.0 Traditional Grammar:

Traditional grammar means basically the Aristotelian orientation towards the nature of language as exemplified in the work of ancient Greeks and Romans . The traditional grammar has long tradition behind it , there are ideas about sentence structure deriving from Aristotle and Plato , ideas about the parts of speech deriving from Stoic grammarians ,

there are ideas about relationship between language and mind deriving from the seventeenth century philosophical controversies between rationalists and empiricists , ideas about the history of language deriving from nineteenth century emphasis on comparative philosophy.

Traditional grammar distinguishes between rational, emotional, automatic and purely conventional type of discourse, it gives fairly through and consistent analysis of declarative sentence, it is the vehicle by means of which ordinary students and scholars have mastered many languages for centuries.

2.2.1 Weaknesses of Traditional Grammar:

RadheyL . Varshney (1995 – 203) said that: "traditional grammar is inadequate and full of shortcomings, if it had been adequate and perfect, there would have been no necessity of so many models of modern grammar. Traditional grammar is based mainly on indo- European classical language that differ from Greek, Latin Sanskrit, etc . It does not adequately distinguishes between all the linguistic levels, it is normative and prescriptive rather than explicit and descriptive, it is rules are illogical it's inconsistent and inadequate as a description of actual language in use, it neglects not only the contemporary usage but also the functional and social varieties of language, it's approach is diachronic (historical) rather than synchronic (contemporary) . It tries to study a living language like a dead one.

In his book the structure of English (1952) Fries challenges traditional grammar by calling them 'not insightful ' pre-scientific 'prescriptive ' and having ' literary bias ' they are full of inadequacies there may be about 200 definitions of the sentences yet they are not able to differentiate between.

The dog is barking.

The dog barking

Traditional grammar said that a noun is the name of a person, place or thing, yet cannot include blue and red in the list of nouns although they are the names of colours. Traditional grammar uses meaning as the primary tool of linguistic analysis. Total meaning of a language utterance cannot be analyzed in the present stage of our knowledge.

2.3 Structural Grammar:

Radhey L. Varshney(1995 – 205) said that :" the beginning of the twentieth century was marked by the new approaches suggested by Ferdinand de Saussure and the Prague school of linguistics in Europe, this new movement which was a reaction against the traditional or universal grammar and an improvement upon the historical and comparative studies of language in the nineteenth century, is known as structural linguistics as it attempts to describe a language as it is used in terms of recurrent element and recurrent regularities (structures) . It has been called mechanical because it's procedure is mechanical, it studies a language employing certain procedures which linguists have formulated, tested and improved. Furthermore it eschews the mentalistic approach which is based intuitive analysis of data, and insists on purely objective analysis.

In the words of John Lyons, the term structuralism means that each language is registered as a system of relations (more precisely, a set of interrelated system) , the elements of which, sounds, words, etc... have no validity independently of the relation of equivalence and contrast which hold between them (introduction to theoretical linguistics, p 50)

According to structuralism, any sentence of a language may be represented as a particular arrangement of the ultimate constituents the minimal grammatical elements of which is composed. Every sentence has therefore what is known as linear surface .The structuralism or structuralist developed the system of immediate constituents, or I C analysis.

2.3.0 Weaknesses of Structural Linguistics:

RadheyL . Varshney. (1995 – 208) said that : " Chomsky criticized this school of linguistics for its being corpus – bound and neglect of meaning , structuralism ignores explanatory adequacy , meaning, linguistic universals , native speaker's intuition and his competence of generating infinite number of sentences from a finite set of items .

Structuralism analyses the data of given corpus by means of inductive methods and formulates a grammar based on discovery procedures of data. Structuralisms fail to capture all ambiguities and relations. It does not include the idea of creativity, it does not account for the degree of grammatically and acceptability.

2.4 Formal vs Notional Grammar:

The same reference (p. 209) . Formal grammar is grammar that both in theory and in method is concerned solely with the observable forms, structural functions and interrelation of the components of sentence or stretches of utterance. (Robin, op, cit, p.182) .Modern grammatical theory is frequently said to be "formal "in contrast with traditional grammar which was notional.

According to Jesperson, notional grammar starts from the assumption that there exist extralingual categories which are independent

the more or less accidental facts of existing languages ' and are universal in so far as they are applicable to all languages through rarely expressed in them in a clear and unmistakable way 'formal 'grammar puts forward no such assumption about the universality of categories as ' parts of speech ' 'tense ' 'mode ' etc and claims to describe the structure of every language on its own terms .

A grammatical description which is based entirely on the observable forms of language may be called formal grammar, whereas a description based on meaning rather than forms is called 'notional 'or philosophical grammar.

A formal definition of noun in English might be: 'a word which distinguishes between singular and plural and possibly has a possessive forms whereas a notional definition might be a 'meaning words '

The main difference between formal and notional grammar can be stated as follows:

Notional (traditional or universal) grammar ' Formal or structural grammar

1.Old declined after the 18 century   New, declined or development mainly in 20 c
2.Pre-scientific or (unscientific)   Scientific

3.Illogical, inconsistent & un methodological consistent,   Logical and methodological

4. Subjective & intuitive.   Objective and verifiable

5.Informal   Formal

6.Studies languages as if they were alike . studies a language as a mirror of culture;

Since no two cultures are alike; no two

languages are alike either

7. Gives priority to written form, especially Literary from of language.	Gives priority to the spoken from or the contemporary actual usage.
8. Lacks precision and economy.	Has prediction and economy .
9.Is a set of prescriptive or normative rules .	Is an inventory of all the linguistic units.
10.Lays due emphasis on meaning .	Since meaning is a very Complex phenomenon , ignores meaning ,
11.Based on Greek and Latin models	Based on factual study of language.
12.Fusion of all linguistic levels.	Separation of all linguistic levels .
13. Explanatory (how and why) .	Observational and descriptive .
14. Humanistic and philosophical study.	Empirical science .
15. Has along history.	Has a short history.

2.5 Transformational Generative Grammar:

The same reference (p-167) .The name 'Transformational - Generative 'suggests that there are two aspects of the theory, the grammar it provides is both transformational and generative there are two aspects are not logically dependent upon each other. Though the theory gains plausibility from the interaction of the two hence it is necessary to understand these two terms

2.5.0 Transformational:

The same reference (p-167) It is because of the shortcoming of phrase structure grammar and because of the other reasons that Noam Chomsky come to hold the view that notions of phrase structure are quite adequate for small parts of language and that the rest of the language can be derived by repeated application of grammar to cover the entire

language directly, we would lose the simplicity of the limited phrase structure grammar and of the transformational development.

2.5.1 Generative:

John Lyons, (1981) said that : "A generative grammar is set of rules which operating upon a finite vocabulary of unit , generate a set of syntagms and thereby defines each syntagm to be well-formed in the language that is characterized by the grammar. Generative grammars that are of intersrtolinguistics will also assign to each well-formed syntagm that they generate in appropriate structural description . The definition of generative grammar given here is more general in one respect than Chomsky's . It the term syntagm; where Chomsky would use the 'string ' or 'sequence' . A syntagm is a combination of grammatical units which are not necessarily ordered sequentially. Though Chomsky defines sentences and phrases as strings, it is quite reasonable and indeed it is in accord with traditional conceptions, to think of them as syntagms. Another important point to note about the definition of generative grammar given above is that it allows for the existence of many different kinds of generative grammar, what needs to be emphasized here is that one kind of generative grammar may have advantages that another kind of it does not have, so far at least ,it is undear which if any of the many different kinds of generative grammar that have now been constructed and investigated will best serve as a model for the grammatical description of natural language . Although it has been a widely held view for many years that some version of transformational grammar will best serve this purpose. Recent work has called into question the validity of the arguments that led Chomsky and others to this conclusion.

2.6 Systemic Grammar:

Radhey L .Varshney. (1995-p188) said that : "systemic grammar is a refined model of Halliday's earlier of grammar ,in which he used a set of four categories (unit ,structure, class and system) and four scales (rank ,exponence, realization and delicacy).Subject, object and complement are the categories of structure. " sentences and clauses are the instances of the category of unit, 'verb', 'noun ' etc are the categories of class. System is the range of possibilities in a closed choice e.g.; the domain of active and passive, affirmative and negative, singular and plural is the domain of system, so scale and category grammar tends to state that all languages have Structure, units, classes and systems. So, there are different numbers of units in different languages, these units are built up one inside the other, if we start with the sentence we have five units in English: sentence, clause, group, word and morpheme. Sentence according to this description is the highest unit and morpheme is the lowest these units have fixed relations between themselves, that is every clause consists of one or more than one group, and every group consists of one or more than one word, every word consists of one or more than one morpheme.

Halliday is of the opinion that the sentence is not the largest pattern carrying unit in English, it may paragraph and efforts are being made to analyse paragraph, although no significant progress has been made so far in this direction. Sentence according to Halliday is distinct from units because if the order of sentence in text is changed, the text loses its meaning, but if the units below the sentence are re-ordered, we either get an impossible sentence or the meaning of the sentence is changed e.g.; if the word order of the sentence – the boy will help the girl – is changed, we may get:

a. will the boy help the girl?

b. will the girl help the boy?

c*. The girl help the boy will

d*. The boy help the girl will

e*. The will help boy girl etc...

Since sentence is the unit with which language operates in situation, Halliday calls it the lowest non-disorderable unit, traditional grammarians treated words as the unit of main interest, and early structural linguists focused their attention on morphemes. But the recent tendency is to concentrate on sentence which is the maximum unit of language besides the paragraph.

So , in the revised version of Halliday's grammar known as systemic grammar, the basic concept is that of ' system ' which means a set of options or choices together with an entry condition is satisfied one option from the set must be selected. The grammar itself takes the form of a series of system net-work. It has therefore come to be called systemic grammar.

The aims of systemic grammar is not only to demonstrate our actual use of language but also, and importantly to predict what choices we can make and show to what extent these choices are contextually conditioned.

Systemic grammar has two components: systemic and structural, the systemic component details the choice, and in fact is the deep grammar of the underlying features and properties which tend to universal. The structural component shows how these choices are realized it is the

surface grammar of underlying choices. Any one sentence has got just one structure, but many simultaneous structures all of which are superimposed on one another as it were.

2.7 Old English Grammar:

From Wikipedia the fee encyclopedia; "The grammar of old English is quite different from that of modern English predominantly by being much more inflected, similar to Latin.

As an old Germanic language, the morphological system of old English is similar to that of the hypothetical proto-Germanic reconstruction, retaining many of the inflections theorized to have been common in proto-indo-European and also including characteristically Germanic constructions such as the Umlaut " .

2.7.0 Features of Old English:

Albert C. Baugh &Thomas cable; (1978-50) said that: "most fundamental feature that distinguishes old English from the language of today, its grammar "In it is grammar old English resembles modern German. Theoretically the noun and adjective are inflected for four cases in singular and four in plural although the forms are not always distinctive, and in addition the adjective has separate forms are not each of the three genders . The inflection of the verb is less elaborate than that of the Latin verb, but there are distinctive endings for the different persons, numbers tenses, and moods. The nature of the old English inflections will be illustrated in the following:

2.7.1.0 The Noun

The inflection of old English noun indicate distinction of number (singular and plural) and cases . The old English noun has only four cases, the endings of these cases vary with different nouns, but they fall into certain broad categories or declensions. There is a vowel declension and a consonant declension , also called the strong and weak declensions, according to whether the stem ended in Germanic in vowel or a consonant, within each of these types there are certain subdivisions , the stem of nouns belonging to the vowel declension ended in one of four vowels a,ŏ,i,or u . And the inflection varies according .Their nature may be gathered from two examples of the strong declension and one of the weak: *stān*(stone), a masculine *a*-stem; *giefu* (gift), a feminine *ō*-and *hunta* (hunter), a masculine consonant stem. Forms are given for the four cases, nominative, genitive, dative, and accusative;

Singular	N.	stān	gief-u	hunt-a
	G.	stān-es	gief-e	hunt-an
	D.	stān-e	gief-e	hunt-an
	A.	stān	gief-e	hunt-an
Plural	N.	stān-as	gief-a	hunt-an
	G.	stān-a	gief-a	hunt-en
	D.	stān-um	gief-um	hunt-um
	A.	stān-as	gief-a	hunt-an

It is apparent from these examples that the inflection of the noun was much more elaborate in Old English than it is today. Even these few paradigms illustrate clearly the marked synthetic character of English in its earliest stage

A. Adrian. Richard A. Demers Ann. Farmer Robert M. Harnish (1988-331) said that : " New nouns could be formed in old English by adding 'ing' not only to verbs , as in modern English (sing +ing = singing) , but also to a large class of nouns e.g. the word (Viking) was formed by adding -ing to the noun (wic) "bay" . It turns out that the –ing suffix can still be added to a highly restricted class of nouns, the meaning "materials used for "as in roofing, ' carpenting , an flooring . Thus the rule for creating new nouns with the – ing suffix has changed by becoming more restricted in it's application so that a much smaller class of nouns can still have – ing attached . Albert C. Bough & Thomas Cable; (1978-57) said that: "generally the gender of old English nouns is not dependent upon considerations of sex, while nouns designating males are generally masculine and females feminine. Those indicating neuter objects are not necessarily neuter , stān (stone) is masculine mŏna (moon) is masculine , but sunne (Sun) is feminine as in German, often the gender of old English nouns is quite illogical, words like mægdan (girl) , wif (wife) , bearn and cild (child) which we should expect to be feminine or masculine , are in neuter while wifmann(woman) is masculine because the second element of the compound is masculine .

2.7.1.1 The Adjective:

Albert C. Bough and Thomas Cable; (1978-57) said that: "the old English adjective contrasts in the most striking way with the complete absence of inflection from the adjective in modern English complexity is

quite unnecessary, as the English language demonstrates everyday by getting along with it, it's elimination has resulted in a second great advantage which English processes over most other languages. Also from free encyclopedia: adjective in old English are declined using the same categories as nouns; five cases (nominative , accusative , genitive , dative and instrumental) three genders as (masculine, feminine, neuter and two numbers (singular , plural), in addition, they can be declined either strong or weak the weak forms are used in the presence of a definite or possessive determiner, while the strong ones are used in other situations, the weak forms are identical to those for nouns, while strong forms use a combination of noun and pronoun endings.

2.7.1.2 The Verb:

Albert C. Bough and Thomas Cable, (1978-59) said that : " old English distinguished only two simple tenses by inflection, a present and past ,and except for one word , it had no inflectional forms for the passive as in Latin or Greek , it recognized the indicative , subjective and imperative moods and had the usual two numbers and three persons .

A peculiar feature of old English was division of the verb into great classes , the weak and strong , often known in modern English as regular and irregular verbs ,these terms which are so commonly employed in modern grammar , are rather unfortunate since they suggest an irregularity in the strong verbs which is more apparent than real . The strong verbs like sing , sang , sung which represent the basic indo – European type are so called because they have the power of indicating change of tense by a modification of their root vowel . In the weak verbs , such as walk , walked , walked this change is affected by the addition of a " dental " sometimes of an extra syllable, the apparent irregularity of the

strong verbs is due to the fact that verbs of this type are much less numerous than weak verbs . In old English , if we exclude compounds , there were only a few over three hundred of them , and even this small number falls into several classes within these classes, however a perfectly regular sequence can be observed in the vowel changes of the root . Nowadays these verbs generally speaking, have different vowels in the present tense, the past tense and the past participle. Some verbs the vowels of the past tense and past participle are identical as in break , broke , broken and some all three forms have become alike in modern times (bid , bid , bid) . In old English the vowel of the past tense often differs in the singular and plural; or to be more accurate, the first and third person singular have one vowel while the second person singular and all persons of the plural have another, in the principal parts of old English strong verbs, therefore, we have four forms the infinitive the preterit singular (first and third person) the preterit plural and past participle. In old English strong verbs can be grouped in six general classes, to which may be added a seventh, the reduplicating verbs, while there are variations within each class they may be

I.	drifan (drive)	draf	drifen(ge)	drifen
II.	Cēosan (choose)	cēas	curon	coren
III.	helpan (help)	healp	hulpen	holpen
IV.	beran (bear)	bær	bæron	boren
V.	Sprecan(speak)	spræe	spræcon	sprecen
VI.	faran (fare , go)	fõr	fõron	faren
VII.	feallan(fall)	fēoll	fēollen	fēallen

20

Also there is important group of verb in old English that form their past tense by adding -ede , -ode , or – de to the present stem , and their past participle by adding – ed , - od , or -d . Thus fremman(to perform) has a preterit fremede and past participle gerferemed;lufian (to love) has lufede and gelufod; Libyan (to live) has lifds and gelifd. The personal endings expect in the preterit singular are similar to these of the strong verbs and need not be repeated. However the weak conjugation has come to be the dominant one in our language many strong verbs have passed over to this conjugation , and practically all new verbs added to our language are inflected in accordance with it "

2.7.1.3 The Personal Pronouns:

Albert C. Baugh. &Thomas Cable; (1978-58) said that: "from the frequency of it is use and the necessity for specific reference when used, the personal pronouns in all languages is likely to preserve a fairly complete system of inflections. Old English shows this tendency not only in having distinctive forms for practically all genders, persons and cases but also in preserving in addition to the ordinary two numbers, singular and plural a set of forms for two people or two things – the dual number. However, in old English the distinction between the dual and plural is an unnecessary complication in language and was disappearing from the pronoun in old English the dual forms are shown in the following table of the old English personal pronouns ;

Singular					
	N. Ic	ðū	hē*(he)*	hēo*(she)*	hit *(it)*
	G. mīn	ðīn	his	hiere	his
	D. mē	ðē	him	hiere	him
	A. mē(mec)	ðē(ðec)	hine	hie	hit
Dual	N. wit *(we two)*	git *(ye two)*			

	G.	uncer	incer	
	D.	unc	inc	
	A.	unc	inc	
Plural	N.	We	gē	hie
	G.	ūser (ūre)	ēower	hiera
	D.	ūs	ēow	him
	A.	ūs (ūsic)	ēow (ēowic)	hie

" From Wikipedia , the from encyclopedia ; "Many of the forms above bear strong resemblance to their contemporary English language equivalent;   for instance in genitive case ēower became "your", ūre became " our " min became "mine " .

2.7.1.4 Interrogative and Relative Pronouns:

J.Algeo; (2010-100-101) said that :" The interrogative pronoun hwā'who' was declined only in the singular and had only two gender forms:

	Masculine/ Feminine		Neuter
Nom.	Hwā		hwt
Acc.	hwone		hwǣt
Gen.	hws		hwǣs
Dat.	hwǣm, hwām		hwǣm, hwām

Ins.	hwǣm, hwām	hwȳ

Hwā is the source of our who, hwām of whom, and hwæ of what. Hwone did not survive beyond the Middle English period, its functions being taken over by the dative. Whose is from hwæs with its vowel influenced by who and whom. The distinctive neuter instrumental hwȳ is the source of our why. Other Old English interrogatives included hwǣðer' which of two' and hwilc 'which of many.' They were both declined like strong adjectives .Hwā was exclusively interrogative in Old English. The particle þe was the usual relative pronoun. Since this word had only a single form, it is a great pity that we ever lost it; it involved no choice such as that which we must make—in writing, at least—between who and whom, now that these have come to be used as relatives. Sometimes, however, þe was preceded by the appropriate form of the demonstratives sē to make a compound relative

2.8. Modern English Grammar:

From Wikipedia the free encyclopedia "English grammar has minimal inflection compared with most Indo-European languages, modern English lacks grammatical gender and adjectival agreement case marking has almost disappeared and mainly survives in pronouns the pattering of strong versus weak verbs inherited from its Germanic origins has declined in importance in modern English and remnants of inflection (such as plural marking) have become more regular. At the same time the language has become more analytic, and has developed features such as model verbs and word order as resources for conveying meaning. Auxiliary verbs mark constructions such as questions, negative polarity, the passive voice and progressive aspect.

Albert C. Baugh. &Thomas Cable; (1978-224) said that: "English grammar in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century is marked more by the survival of certain forms and usages that have since disappeared than by any fundamental developments. The great changes that reduced the inflections of Old English to their modern proportions had already taken place. In the few parts of speech that retain some of their original inflections, the reader of Shakespeare or the Authorized Version is conscious of minor differences of form and in the framing of sentences may not differences of syntax and idiom that, although they attract attention, are not sufficient to interfere seriously with understanding. The more important of these differences may be in the following .

2.8.0 The Noun:

Albert C. Baugh. &Thomas Cable; (1978—225-226) said that: "The only inflections retained in the noun were, as we have seen above, those marking the plural and the possessive singular. In the former the *s*-plural had become so generalized that except for a few nouns like *sheep* and *swine* with unchanged plurals, and a few others like *mice* and *feet* with mutated vowels, we are scarcely conscious of any other forms. In the sixteenth century, however, there are certain survivals of the old weak plural in *-n* Most of these had given way before the usual *s-* forms: *fon*(foes),*kneen*(knees), *fleen*(fleas). But beside the more modern forms Shakespeare occasionally has *eyen* (eyes), *shoon*(shoes), and *kine,* while the plural *hosen* is occasionally found in other writers. Today, except for the poetical *kine* and mixed plurals like *children* and *brethren,* the only plural of this type in general use is *oxen.*An interesting peculiarity of this period, and indeed later, is the *his*-genitive.

In Middle English the *–es* of the genitive, being unaccented, was frequently written and pronounced-*is, -ys*. The ending was thus often identical to the pronoun *his,* which commonly lost it s*h* when unstressed. Thus there was no difference in pronunciation between *stonis* and *ston is* (his), and as early as the thirteenth century the ending was sometimes written separately as though the possessive case were a contraction of a noun and the pronoun *his*. This notion was long prevalent, and Shakespeare writes ʼ*Gainst the count his galleys I did some service* and *In characters as red as Mars his heart*. Until well into the eighteenth century people were troubled by the illogical consequences of this usage; Dr. Johnson points out that one can hardly believe that the possessive ending is a contraction of *his* in such expressions as *a woman's beauty* or *a virgin's delicacy*. He, himself, seems to have been aware that its true source was the Old English genitive, but the error has left its trace in the apostrophe, which we still retain as a graphic convenience to mark the possessive.

One other construction affecting the noun becomes established during this period, the group possessive: *the Duke of Gloucester's niece, the King of England's nose, somebody else's hat*. The construction is perhaps illogical, since even a king may be considered to have some rights to his nose, and the earlier construction was *the Duke's niece of Gloucester,* etc. But the expressions *Duke of Gloucester, King of England,* and the like, occurred so commonly as a unit that in the fifteenth century we begin to get the sign of the possessive added to the group. Instances are not common before the sixteenth century, and the construction may be thought of properly as belonging to the modern period. Nowadays we may say *the writer of the book's ambition* or *the chief actor in the play's illness*.

Palmer F. ; (1971- 189) said that : " English has no gender . The nouns of English cannot be classified in terms of agreement with articles, adjectives or verbs. There in English pairs of words of the type; stallion, mare, ram / ewe, bear / saw, uncle / aunt, brother / sister. But this is a lexical feature. Not a grammatical one – related to sex. Not gender we ought to talk of these. Then in term of 'male' and 'female' not 'masculine' and 'feminine'. English has a suffix -ess used in , for example authoress , princess , duchess . But this too is a lexical feature . it is not regular , since we have no teacheress . doctoress , kingess etc... and it is not even regular morphologically .This is a matter of derivation , but not of grammatical gender .Within the same lexical area we have names for small creatures *-foal, lamb, piglet.* There is often a quartet - the generic name, the name of the male, the name of the female and the name of the young *(sheep, ram, ewe, lamb),* though there are fewer distinctions in some cases *(dog* is generic and male, *cow* usually generic and female, *foal* and *colt* distinguish two kinds of young horse, and there is also *filly).*Note that here too there is a very irregular kind of derivation, *piglet ,duckling, gosling.* The choice of the pronouns is almost entirely a matter of sex –*he* refers to male, *she* to female and *it* to sexless objects or optionally to animals even when their sex is known. If we divide up the words in English according to the pronouns used we find not three classes but seven since some words are referred to by two or three of the pronouns:

he   *man, boy, uncle*

she   *woman, girl, aunt*

It   *table, chair, tree*

he, she   *doctor, teacher, cousin*

he, it   *bull, ram, boar*

she, it   *ewe, sow, ship*

he, she,   *cat, dog, thrush*

There is one odd man out here - *ship,* and we could have added *car ,*to as 'she' that English has gender, since this is not a matter of sex but of the arbitrary kind of classification found in French *la porte,* etc. But, first, these are very few in number (and we should not wish to build a grammatical category on a few examples) and they belong to a clearly defined class of mechanical things. We can add to this class, and in recent years *plane* and *hovercraft* have been added .This is not then a matter of grammatical gender at all but simply that *she* is used for females and mechanical objects (a class defined semantically).Where there is co-reference with reflexives, it might seem we have agreement within the clause, and a similar point could be made with emphatic forms with *-self* since we find *The boy himself,* and *The boy hurt himself* not *"The boy herself .* or *The boy hurt herself.* But this is still determined by sex, not grammatical gender. The choice of one of the following will depend on a judgment about sex;

The dog bit himself.

The dog bit herself.

The dog bit itself.

2.8.1 The Adjective:

Albert C. Baugh. &Thomas Cable; (1978 - 225) said that: "Because the adjective had already lost all its endings, so that it no longer expressed distinctions of gender, number, and case, the chief interest of this part of

speech in the modern period is in the forms of the comparative and superlative degrees.

In the sixteenth century these were not always precisely those now in use. For example, comparatives such as *lenger, strenger* remind us that forms like our *elder* were once more common in the language. The two methods commonly used to form the comparative and superlative, with the endings *–er* and *–est* and with the adverbs *more* and *most,* had been customary since Old English times. But there was more variation in their use. Shakespearian comparisons like *honester, violente st*are now replaced by the analytical forms. A double comparative or superlative is also fairly frequent in the work of Shakespeare and his contemporaries: *more larger, most boldest,* or Mark Antony's *This was the most unkindest cut of all*. The chief development affecting the adjective in modern times has been the gradual settling down of usage so that monosyllables take *–er* and *–est* while most adjectives of two or more syllables(especially those with suffixes like those in frug*al,* learn*ed,* care*ful,* poet*ic,* act*ive* ,fam*ous*) take *more* and *most*.

2.8.2 The Pronoun:

Albert C. Baugh. &Thomas Cable; (1978 – 226 -229) said that: "The sixteenth century saw the establishment of the personal pronoun in the form that it has had ever since. In attaining this result three changes were involved: the disuse of *thou, thy, thee;* the substitution of *you* for *ye* as a nominative case; and the introduction of *its* as the possessive of *it*. In the earliest period of English the distinction between *thou* and *ye* was simply one of number; *thou* was the singular and *ye* the plural form for the second person pronoun. In time, however, a quite different distinction grew up. In the thirteenth century the singular forms *(thou, thy, thee)*

were used among familiars and in addressing children or persons of inferior rank, while the plural forms *(ye, your, you)* began to be used as a mark of respect in addressing a superior. In England the practice seems to have been suggested by French usage in court circles, but it finds a parallel in many other modern languages. In any case, the usage spread as a general concession to courtesy until *ye ,your,* and *you* became the usual pronoun of direct address irrespective of rank or intimacy.

By the sixteenth century the singular forms had all but disappeared from contexts in which the plural forms were deemed proper and were maintained into the twentieth century only among the Quakers. Originally a clear distinction was made between the nominative *ye* and the objective *you*. But because both forms are so frequently unstressed, they were often pronounced alike [jə] A tendency to confuse the nominative and the accusative forms can be observed fairly early, and in the fourteenth century *you* began to be used as a nominative. By a similar substitution *ye* appears in the following century for the objective case, and from this time on the two forms seem to have been used pretty indiscriminately until *ye* finally disappeared. It is true that in the early part of the sixteenth century some writers (Lord Berners , for example) were careful to distinguish the two forms, and in the Authorized Version of the Bible (1611) they are often nicely differentiated: *No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you* (Job).

On the other hand Ascham and Sir Thomas Elyot appear to make no distinction in the nominative, while Shakespeare says *A southwest wind blow on ye And blister you all over*! In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* occurs the line *Stand, sirs, and throw us that you have about ye,* where the two pronouns represent the exact reverse of their historical use. Although in the latter instance, *ye* may owe something to its un emphatic

position, as in similar cases it does in Milton, it is evident that there was very little feeling any more for the different functions of the two words, and in the course of the seventeenth century *you* becomes the regular form for both cases. In some ways the most interesting development in the pronoun at this time was the formation of a new possessive neuter, *its*. As we have seen above, the neuter pronoun in Old English was declined *hit, his, him, hit,* which by the merging of the dative and accusative under *hit* in Middle English became *hit, his, hit.* In unstressed positions *hit* weakened to *it,* and at the beginning of the modern period *it* was the usual form for the subject and object. *His ,*however, remained the proper form of the possessive. Although it was thus identical with the possessive case of *he,* its occurrence where we should now use *its* is very common in written English down to the middle of the seventeenth century .Thus Portia's words *How far that little candle throws his beams* are quite natural, as is the Biblical *if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted* ? If grammatical gender had survived in English the continued use of *his* when referring to neuter nouns would probably never have seemed strange. But when, with the substitution of natural gender, meaning came to be the determining factor in the gender of nouns, and all lifeless objects were thought of as neuter, the situation was somewhat different. The personal pronouns of the third person singular, *he, she, it,* had a distinctive form for each gender in the nominative and objective cases, and a need seems to have been felt for some distinctive form in the possessive case as well.

Various substitutes were tried, clearly indicating a desire, conscious or unconscious, to avoid the use of *his* in the neuter. Thus, we find frequently in the Bible expressions like *Two cubits and a half was the length of it* and *nine cubits was the length thereof.* Not infrequently the

simple form *it* was used as a possessive, as when Horatio, describing the ghost in *Hamlet ,*says *It lifted up it head,* or when the Fool in *Lear* says:

The hedge-sparrow fed the cuckoo so long,

That it had it head bit off by it young.

The same use of the pronoun *it* is seen in the combination *it own: We enjoin thee…that there thou leave It, Without more mercy, to it own protection (Winter's Tale)*. Similarly, *the* was used in place of the pronoun: *growing of the own accord* (Holland's *Pliny,* 1601).Both of these makeshifts are as old as the fourteenth century. It was perhaps inevitable that the possessive of nouns *(stone's, horse's)* should eventually suggest the analogical form *it's* for the possessive of *it*. (The word was spelled with an apostrophe , down to about 1800) The first recorded instance of this form is in *The Second Book of Madrigals,* published by Nicholas Yonge in 1597,50 but, like most novelties of this kind in language, it had probably been in colloquial use for a time before it appeared in print. Nevertheless, it is not likely to have been common even at the end of the sixteenth century, considering the large amount of fairly colloquial English that has come down to us from this period with no trace of such a form. At the beginning of the seventeenth century it was clearly felt as a neologism not yet admitted to good use. There is no instance of it in the Bible (1611) or in any of the plays of Shakespeare printed during his lifetime. In the First Folio of 1623 there are only ten instances, and seven of these were in plays written near the end of the dramatist's career. Milton, although living until 1674, seems to have admitted it but grudgingly to his writings; there are only three occurrences of the word in all his poetry and not many in his prose. Yet so useful, a word could hardly fail to win a place for itself among the rank

and file of speakers. Toward the close of the seventeenth century its acceptance seems to have gained momentum rapidly, so that to Dryden (1631–1700) the older use of *his* as a neuter seemed an archaism worthy of comment.

Finally, mention should be made of one other noteworthy development of the pronoun in the sixteenth century. This is the use of *who* as a relative. Refinements in the use of subordinate clauses are a mark of maturity in style. As the loose association of clauses (parataxis) gives way to more precise indications of logical relationship and subordination (hypotaxis) there is need for a greater variety of words effecting the union .Old English had no relative pronoun proper. It made use of the definite article *(sē, sēo, þæf),* which, however it was felt in Old English times, strikes us as having more demonstrative force than relative. Sometimes the indeclinable particle *þe* was added (*sē, þe,* which that) and sometimes *þe* was used alone.

At the end of the Old English period the particle *þe* had become the most usual relative pronoun, but it did not long retain its popularity. Early in the Middle English period its place was taken by *þæt* (that), and this was the almost universal relative pronoun, used for all genders, throughout the Middle English period. In the fifteenth century *which* begins to alternate fairly frequently with *that*. At first it referred mostly to neuter antecedents, although occasionally it was used for persons, a use that survives in *Our Father, which art in heaven*. But the tendency to employ *that* as a universal relative has never been lost in the language, and was so marked in the eighteenth century as to provoke Steele to address to the *Spectator* (No. 78) his well-known "Humble Petition of *Who and Which*" in protest. It was not until the sixteenth century that the pronoun *who* as a relative came into use. Occasional instances of such a

use occur earlier, but they are quite exceptional. There is no example of the nominative case in Chaucer. Chaucer , however, does use the oblique cases *whose* and *whom* (infrequently) as relative pronouns ,and it is clear that the use of *who* as a pure relative began with these forms. Two earlier uses of *who* are the sources of the new construction: *who* as an indefinite pronoun (*Who hath ears to hear, let him hear; Who steals my purse steals trash*) and as an interrogative in indirect questions. The latter appears to have been the more important. The sequence *Whom do you want*? (direct question), *They asked whom you wanted* (indirect question), *I know the man whom you wanted* (relative) is not a difficult one to assume. In any case, our present-day widespread use of *who* as a relative pronoun is primarily a contribution of the sixteenth century to the language.

2.8.3 The Verb:

Albert C. Baugh. &Thomas Cable ; (1978 – 229-232) said that :"Even the casual reader of Elizabethan English is aware of certain differences of usage in the verb that distinguish this part of speech from its form in later times. These differences are sometimes so slight as to give only a mildly un familiartinge to the construction .When Lennox asks in *Macbeth, Goes the King hence today*? we have merely an instance of the more common interrogative form without an auxiliary, where we should say *Does the king go*? or *Is the king leaving today*? Where we should say *has been* Shakespeare often says *is: Is execution done on Cawdor*? and *'Tis unnatural, Even like the deed that's done;* or *Arthur, whom* [who] *they say is killed tonight*. A very noticeable difference is the scarcity of progressive forms. Polonius asks, *What do you read, my Lord?—that* is, *What are you reading*? The large increase in the use of the progressive is one of the important developments of later times. Likewise the compound participle, having *spoken thus, having decided to*

make the attempt, etc., is conspicuous by its infrequency. There are only three instances in Shakespeare and less than three score in the Bible. The construction arose in the sixteenth century. On the other hand, impersonal uses of the verb were much more common than they are today. *It yearns me not, it dislikes me, so please him come* are Shakespearian expressions which in more recent English have been replaced by personal constructions. In addition to such features of Elizabethan verbal usage, certain differences in inflection are more noticeable ,particularly the ending of the third person singular of the present indicative, an occasional-*s* in the third person plural, and many forms of the past tense and past participle ,especially of strong verbs .The regular ending of the third person singular in the whole south and southeastern part of England—that is, the district most influential in the formation of the standard speech—was -*eth* all through the Middle English period. It is universal in Chaucer: *telleth, giveth, saith, doth,* etc. In the fifteenth century, forms with -*s* occasionally appear. These are difficult to account for, since it is not easy to see how the Northern dialect, where they were normal, could have exerted so important an influence upon the language of London and the south. But in the course of the sixteenth century their number increases, especially in writings that seem to reflect the colloquial usage. By the end of this century forms like *tells, gives, says* predominate, though in some words, such as *doth* and *hath,* the older usage may have been the more common. One was free to use either. In the famous play for mercy in the *Merchant of Venice* Portia says:

> The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
>
> It dropp*eth* as the gentle rain from heaven
>
> Upon the place beneath: it is twice bless'd;

<div align="center">It bless*eth* him that giv*es* and him that tak*es:…*</div>

It is worth noting, however, that in the trial scene as a whole, forms in *-s* outnumber those in *-eth* two to one. Certainly, during the first half of the next century *-s* had become universal in the spoken language. This is beyond doubt, even though *-eth* continued to be quite commonly written. A writer toward the middle of the century observes that "howsoever we use to Write thus, *leadeth*it, *maketh*it, *noteth*it, *raketh*it, per-*fumeth*it, & c. Yet in our ordinary speech (which is best to be understood) wee say, *leads* it, *makes* it, *notes* it, *rakes* it, per-*fumes* it."54 It is altogether probable that during Shake- speare's lifetime *-s* became the usual ending for this part of the verb in the spoken language. Another feature of the English verb in the sixteenth century, more noticeable at the close than at the opening, is the occurrence of this *-s* as an ending also of the third person plural.

Normally at this time the plural had no ending in the language of literature and the court, a circumstance resulting from the disappearance of the East Midland *-en, -e,* the characteristic endings of the plural in Chaucer. But alongside this predominant plural without ending, we find occasionally expressions like *troubled minds that wakes* in Shakespeare's *Lucrece,* or *Whose own hard dealings teaches them suspect the deeds of others* in the *Merchant of Venice*. These are not solecisms or misprints, as the reader might suppose. They represent forms in actual, if infrequent, use. Their occurrence is also often attributed to the influence of the Northern dialect, but this explanation has been quite justly questioned, and it is suggested that they are due to analogy with the singular. While we are in some danger here of explaining *ignotum per ignotius,* we must admit that no better way of accounting for this peculiarity has been offered. And when we remember that a certain number of Southern

plurals in -*eth* continued apparently in colloquial use, the alternation of -*s* with this -*eth* would be quite like the alternation of these endings in the singular. Only they were much less common. Plural forms in -*s* are occasionally found as late as the eighteenth century .We have already seen that during the Middle English period extensive inroads were made in the ranks of the Old English strong verbs. Many of these verbs were lost , and many became weak.

Moreover, those that remained were subject to considerable fluctuation and alteration in the past tense and past participle. Since all of these tendencies were still operative in the beginning of the modern period, we may expect to find them reflected in the language of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Among verbs that developed weak forms in this period were *bide, crow, crowd, flay, mow, dread, sprout,* and *wade,* and we accordingly find corresponding strong forms that have since disappeared, still in common use. Strong forms also alternate with weak in verbs that had begun to change earlier. Some of these are mentioned in . Others were *waxen,* more frequent in the Bible than *waxed, sew* beside *sowed, gnew* beside *gnawed, holp* beside *helped*. A number of weak forms like *blowed, growed, shined, shrinked, swinged* were infairly common use, although these verbs ultimately remained strong. In certain common verbs the form of the past tense differed from that of today. Such preterits as *brake* and *spake, drave* and *clave, tare, bare,* and *sware* are familiar to us from the Bible. *Bote* as the past tense of *bite* (like *write—wrote*) was still in occasional use. The participle *baken* is more frequent in the Bible than *baked*. *Brent* and *brast* were common forms for *burnt* and *burst,* while *wesh* and *washen* were prevalent as the past tense and past participle of *wash* until the close of the sixteenth century. Because in all these cases the forms current today were also in

use, it is apparent that in Shakespeare's day there was much more latitude in the inflection of the verb than is permitted today.

Wardhaugh R .; (1995 – 16) said that :" Atypical regularly inflected verb eg ; bake, or play is marked inflectionally for third person singular present tense subject agreement(-s) as in he bakes and she plays , the present participle (-ing) as in we are baking and they are playing .the past tens (-ed) as in we baked and they played and the past participle(-ed) as in she has baked and they had played , other verbs showing such regular inflections are ; treat , wish , save etc ... . Irregular inflection may occur in past tense and past participle form of some verbs in a few verbs there is also an additional change in the third person singular form of the verb and (be) has its own special peculiarities. the change from (go) to (went) is called a suppletive change because there is no phonological resemblance between the two forms .

Crabtree M . & Powers J ; (1981 – 317) said that :" the early modern English past tense of the verb climb was clomb , thus over the course of past few centuries climbed has replaced clomb as the past of the verb climb .

2.8.3.0 Auxiliary Verbs versus Main Verbs:

A. Adrian, Richard A , Demers Ann , Farmer , Robert M and Harnish ; (1988 – 331) said that :"contemporary English makes a distinction reflected in questions (only auxiliary verbs can be fronted in questions as in can you leave?) . Negative sentences (only auxiliary verbs can take the contracted negative, n't , as in you can't leave) , and tag questions (only auxiliary verbs can appear in tags as in you can leave can't you ?). Focusing only on model verbs (can , must) it is interesting to note that prior to the sixteenth century these syntactic distinctions

between main verbs & auxiliary verbs did not exist , at the time it was possible for main verbs to take not and examples such as the following can be found in Shakespeare's writing .

a. I deny it not . ("I don't deny it ")
b. Forbid him not. (" Do not forbid him ")

Similarly, main verbs could be fronted informing questions;

a. Revolt our subjects ? ("Do our subjects revolt ? ")
b. Gives not the hawthorn _ Bush a sweeter shade ?")
c. Does the hawthorn -Bush not give a sweeter shads ?")

After the sixteenth century the grammar of English had changed so that auxiliary verbs and never main verbs – had to be used in negation question and other patterns.

2.9 The Previous Studies:

In this section the research conductor is going to spot a lights on the previous studies and scientific papers which that relevant to the research topic;

2.9.0 Scientific Papers:

Paper One:

This study was carried in (2015) by Eduard C . Hanganu .B . A , M . A linguistics lecturer in English U . E , under the title : " the English Grammar A Historical Perspective " . This paper has pursued the history of the English grammar from its Greek and Latin roots (with a short excursus into the Sanskrit grammar) all through the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and the present times, and has shown how perspectives and theories on grammar have progressed and changed with the times. The

English grammar seems to have a strong basis in the Greek tradition of language and structure. This Greek grammar tradition has been transferred to the Romans, and then to the English language through the influence which the Latin language has had on English. While English is a Germanic language, the Latin influence on English cannot be ignored or made to appear irrelevant or insignificant, and we need to acknowledge and accept this linguistic truth. "

Paper Two:

This paper was carried out in (2012), under the title " Language Variation and Grammatical Change " by Snizhana Holyk Associate Professor , Candidate of Philological Sciences, English Philology Department, Institute of Foreign Philology, Uzhhorod National University, This paper discusses the problems of language variation and grammatical changes in English. Language change has been the object of numerous researches and it is often applied for studying the nature of systematic variability. The author attempts to prove that the interest in language variation focuses mostly on differences that have some social significance.

A key term in the study of linguistic variation is the notion of linguistic variable. The paper gives insight into the methodology of eliciting, analyzing and evaluating the data for the analysis of language variation and change. Also some preliminary results are suggested explaining grammatical variation within the forms of nominal number. The findings of this paper are rather general and quantitative analysis is needed to verify their systemic properties. Further research is suggested with the application of both the methodological collection of data and a corpus analysis. "

2.9.1 International Studies:

1/ First Study:

This study was undertaken in (2011) by Katerina Tuvung under the title of " The Language Change " at the University of Gothenburg . " The objective of this paper is to investigate some of the inflectional changes (conjugations and declensions) that the English language has undergone during the last thousand years. The principal intention of this limited study is to investigate aspects of morphological modifications in the English language from Old English to Modern English , such an investigation would give the reader a more complete picture of how the English language has evolved in the course of history. After all, phonology is not only closely related to the pronunciation of words: it is also linked to the spelling of words. Old English for instance, was a purely phonetic language. The research finding is that; the researcher said that : " Through the process of writing this paper, I have learnt a great deal about the history of English, and it has made me aware that language change is happening at this very moment. It also makes me wonder what the language will look like in several hundred years from now. "

2/ Second Study:

This study was carried out in (2008) by Jon S .Stevens , B.A , Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in the Graduate School of the Ohio State University under the title of "Semantic Change and the Old English Demonstrative" This thesis provides formalizations of the semantic changes undergone by the Old English *se* paradigm, the demonstrative determiner which yielded the Modern English definite article *the* and the Modern English demonstrative *that*. The researcher concludes that these changes

exemplify the bidirectionality of semantic change. In the case of the masculine form *se*, its development into a definite article reflects a tendency toward 'semantic bleaching'; a tendency often purported to be part of a unidirectional 'grammaticalization' process.

The researcher review the literature on grammaticalization and its criticisms, and conclude that the development of *the* from *se*, rather than being part of a unidirectional process, reflects a 'semantically natural' change. Furthermore, I show that the development of the Modern English demonstrative *that* from its ancestor form *þæt* is a counterexample to unidirectionality. Upon examining the details of this development, The researcher have provided a formal account of how the definite article in English developed from a demonstrative, and of why this change is a natural one .

3/Third Study:

This study was carried out in (2014) by Zuzana Rehakova , at the university of Jihoceska faculty of education .This thesis focuses on the patterns of the word structures in Old English and Present Day English. It is based on an analysis of two different texts. The theoretical part of this study concentrates on the evolution of the language itself, which, is vital for understanding all the changes that have occurred during the evolution of English language. Different sentence structures and word order patterns are analyzed in the practical part.

The researcher chose the poem *Beowulf*, because it is the best preserved work from the Old English period. Samples were selected from both written texts, and analyzed with a focus on the word order patterns of different types of sentences (simple sentences, subordinate clauses of time, purpose, manner, conditional, etc.). The researcher used

comparative analytical method .The results coming from the analysis confirmed that the EL has undergone a big change during last centuries and probably the process of changes in the language will continue in the future.

4/Fourth Study:

This study was carried out in (2012) by David Weber, at Masaryk University Faculty of Arts , under the title of " English Prepositions; A Historical Survey " The methodology employed for the empirical investigation is essentially quantitative and is based on the diachronic part of the Helsinki Corpus. The diachronic part of the corpus includes texts

from Old English, Middle English and Early Modern English, covering period of more than thousand years. The results are that in the Old English period, prepositional system was entirely Indo-European or Germanic in its origin. Morphologically, it consisted of simple and compound prepositions. No complex prepositions occurred during the Old English period.

The corpus has shown that the number of prepositions was constantly increasing. It was increasing already during the Old English period due to word-formative processes. This trend continued in the Middle English period. The prepositions increased as both tokens and types. The increase in preposition tokens was part of the movement of the language from a more synthetic to a more analytic state: as the old case-systems decayed, their function was often taken over by prepositions.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction:

In this chapter the research conductor will discuss the followings : the tools which help in data collection, the validity and reliability of the research and data analysis procedures , and the method that adopts in this study is comparative analytical method ,it is clear above in literature review that help the researcher to compare between the old English grammatical rules and the modern one and find out the changes that happened through the different ages of English language , especially between the old period English and modern period

3.1 Method of the Study:

The researcher adopted comparative analytical method since this research is documentary/historical study , so the research conductor compared some texts and analyzed them so as to help to find out the changes and developments between the old English grammatical rules and the modern English grammar .

3.2 Tools of Data Collection:

The tools which help in data collection in literature review are the primary tools ; such as references and books some previous studies and scientific papers as well as the internet Wikipedia the free encyclopedia

3.3 Procedures of the Study:

The procedures that followed by the research conductor are tracing the history of English language through different ages

and comparing some documents and texts from old English and modern one to find out the changes and developments in the grammatical rules ,

3.4 Validity and Reliability of the Study;

The validity and reliability of this study is quite obvious from the data collected by the research conductor, that there are great changes and developments have happened in the grammatical rules through the different ages, The goals that the researcher wish to achieve are conistent because the research conductor is dealing with facts, and that is what is related to the validity and reliability of the researh .

3.5 Data Analysis :

3.5.0 The table below shows the changes of nouns in old English to their resembles in modern English.

Table: No.1

Old English nouns	Modern English nouns
Singular: stān	Stone
gief-u	Gift
hunt-a	Hunter
Plural: stānas	Stones
gief-a	Giefts
hunt-an	Hunters

3.5.1 The table below shows the changes of verbs in old English to their resembles in modern English.

Table : No.2

Old English verbs	Modern English verbs
I. drīfan	Drive
II. cēosan	Choose
III. helpan	Help
IV. beran	Bear
V. sprecan	Speak
VI. faran	fare, go
VII. feallan	Fall

3.5.2. The table below shows the changes of adjectives in old English to their resembles in modern English.

Table : No.3

Adjectives in old English	Adjectives in modern English
ʒōd mann (strong)	a good man
sē ʒōda mann (weak)	the good man
lonʒ	Long
Eald	Old
Lytel	Little

3.5.3 The table below shows the changes of the personal pronouns in old English to their resembles in modern English.

Table : No.4

Old English pronouns	Modern English pronouns
Ic	I
Wē	We
Đū	You
Hē	He
Hēo	She
Hit	It

3.6 Summary :

This chapter has discussed the research methodology , which was the historical comparative method since this study is historical / documentary and the research tools which is the primary tools that adopted for data collection , the chapter has provided the steps and procedures followed , that is to say the data tabulated and treated comparatively to show the grammatical changes and developments in old english up to modern one .

CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

4.0 Introduction

This chapter contains the analysis and discussion of data which collected through the text (documents/text analysis).More specifically, in this chapter the researcher will present the characteristics and features of old   and modern English , since this study is historical study / documentary , the results will provide the answer to the research questions

4.1 Old English texts :

4.1 0 Bēōwulf (/ˈbeɪəwʊlf/; Old English: [ˈbeːo̯wulf])

Is an Old English epic story consisting of 3,182 alliterative lines. It may be the oldest surviving long story in Old English and is commonly cited as one of the most important works of Old English literature. The date of composition is a matter of contention among scholars; the only certain dating pertains to the manuscript, which was produced between 975 and 1025. The author was an anonymous Anglo- Saxon poet, referred to by scholars as the "*Beowulf* author".

HWÆT WE GARDE

na ingear dagum. þeod cyninga
þrym ge frunon huda æþelingas elle
fremedon. oft scyld scefing sceaþe
þreatum monegū mægþum meodo setla
of teah egsode eorl syððan ærest peas
fea sceaft funden he þæs frofre geba
peox under polcnum peorð myndum þah
oð þ him æghpylc þara ymb sittendra
ofer hron rade hyran scolde gomban
gyldan þþæs god cyning. ðæm eafera pæs
æfter cenned geong ingeardum þone god
sende folce tofrofre fyren ðearfe on
geat þhie ær drugon aldor ase. lange
hpile him þæs lif frea puldres pealdend
porold are forgeaf beapulf pæs bren e
blæd pide sprang scyldes eafera scede
landum in. Spa sceal ... ... nna gode
ge pyrcean fromum feoh giftum ... onpæder

The first page of Beowulf (Nowell Codex)

4.1.1 Original text with standard typographical modifications and a Modern English glosses

Hwæt, wē ȝārDena in ȝēārdaȝum

Indeed, we of-Spear-Danes in former-times

þēōdcyninȝa þrym ȝefrūnon,

of-kings-of-a-people glory [acc.] have-heard

hū ðā æþelinȝas ellen fremedon.

how the princes courageous-deeds performed!

Oft Scyld Scēfinȝ sceaþena þrēātum,

Often Scyld Scefing [to] enemy's troops [dat.],

moneȝum mǣȝþum meodosetla oftēāh,

[to] many tribes [dat.] mead-benches [acc.] took-away,

eȝsode eorlas, syððan ǣrest wearð

terrified warriors after first was

fēasceaft funden; hē þæs frōfre ȝebād,

helpless found; he for-that consolation received,

wēox under wolcnum, weorðmyndum þāh,

thrived under sky, in-honours prospered

oð þæt him æȝhwylc þāra ymbsittendra

until to-him each-one [of] the around-sitting [gen.]

ofer hronrāde hȳran scolde,

across whale-road obey had-to,

ȝomban ȝyldan; þæt wæs ȝōd cyninȝ!

ribute[acc.]to-pay;that wasgreatking

Ðǣm eafera wæs æfter cenned

To-him son was later brought-forth

ȝeonȝ in ȝeardum, þone ȝod sende

young in dwelling, whom God sent

folce tō frōfre; fyrenðearfe onʒeat,

to-people as comfort; great-distress [acc.] he-perceived,

þe hīē ǣr druʒon aldorlēāse

which [acc.] they earlier suffered lord-less

lanʒe hwīle; him þæs Līffrēā,

long time; to-him because-of-that Lord-of-life,

wuldres Wealdend, woroldāre forʒeaf,

glory's Ruler, worldly-honour gave,

Bēōwulf wæs brēme – blǣd wīde spranʒ –

Beowulf was renowned – glory widely spread –

Scyldes eafera Scedelandum in.

Scyld's son [in] Danish-lands [dat.pl.] in.

Source:
Hladký, Josef (2003). *A Guide to Pre-Modern English. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, p. 103*

4.1.2 Summary of Changes:

There are many endings both nominal and verbal, the main verb ȝefrūnon and its -on ending marks as an indicative plural past and the -un on ȝēārdaȝum marks it as a plural dative noun that goes with the preposition –in ; and the two genitive nouns ending in –a marks that they go with þrym as possessor æþelinȝas marks a nominative or accusative plural there is one demonstrative ðā that marked for nominative or accusative . As well as change in letters like þ represents th as in þæt which means that, ƿ represents w as in ƿone which means whom . And ȝ represents y [j] as in ȝeonȝ that means young and g as in lanȝe which means long.

4.1.3 The Lord's Prayer:

Below is the text of the Lord's Prayer in the standardized West Saxon literary dialect (end of 10th century) and its Modern English equivalent from the *Anglican Book of Common Prayer* (1928). The doxology "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever", which concludes the Lord's Prayer in the *Anglican Book of Common Prayer*, has been omitted. The Old English text contains standard typographical modifications.

Fæder ūre þū þe eart on heofonum,   Our Father who art in heaven,

Sī þīn nama ġehālgod,   hallowed be thy name .

Tõ becume þīn rīċe,   Thy kingdom come.

ġewurþe øīn willa,   Thy will be done,

on eorøan swā swā on heofonum.   On earth as it is in heaven,

and forġyf ūs ūre ġyltas,		and forgive us our trespasses,	

swā swā wē forġyfað ūrum gyltendum   as we forgive those who trespass against us,

And ne gelæd þūon costnung,   and lead us not into temptation,

ac ālýs ūs of yfele.   but deliver us from evil,

Sõþlīće.   Amen.

Sources

Anglican Book of Common Prayer (1928) Old English. Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia [online] 4. 10. 2014. [accessed 2014-10-06]. Available at: http://en.wiki pedia.org/wiki/Old_English

4.1.3.0 Summary of Changes:

The researcher notice that there are great changes, morphologically that is to say the words structure like uren become our . eart/art (are) and nama become name and on . On the other hand for the syntactical change that is to say sentence structure noticed that the first line start with *father our who are on heaven* while in modern one begins with *our father who are in the heaven* .The system of grammar was much more complicated as old English was rather a synthetic language and over a course of time changed to analytic.

4.1.3.1 The Lord's Prayer – Vocabulary:

fæder	father	dæġhwāmlic	Daily
ūre	our	hlāf	*bread* (Masc.A-steam)
þū	*Thou*	sellan	to give (class 1c)
þe	relative	particle ūs	Us

eart	are (end Person Sg .of *be*)	tõdæg	*today*
on	on,in	and	*and*
heofon	*heaven* (Masc.A-stem)	forġiefan	*to forgive* (class V)
sī	*be* (Present Subj.)	gylt	guilt (Masc.1-stem)
þin	*Thine*	gyltend	*offender,debtor(Masc.A-stem)*
nama	name (Masc.N-stem)	ne	*not*
hālgian	to hallow (class 2)	lædan	to lead (class 1b)
becuman	to come (class 1V)	costnung	*temptation (Fem.Õ-stem)*
rīċe	*kingdom* (N. Ja-stem)	ac	*but*
weoróan	*to become* (class III)	ālýsan	*to deliver from* (class 1b)
willa	*will* (Masc.N-stem)	of	*from*
eorDe	*earth*(Fem.N-stem)	yfel	*evil* (Neuter A-stem)
swā swā	so as	Sõþlīċe	*truly,amen*
ūrne	*our* (Acc.Sg.Masc.)		

4.2 Early Modern English texts:

4.2.0 A Letter of John Dee to Elizabeth I (1588)

Most Gratious Soueraine Lady, The God of heaven and earth, (Who hath mightilie, and evidently, given vnto your most excellent Royall Maiestie, this wunderfull Triumphant Victorie, against your mortall enemies) be allwaies, thanked, praysed, and glorified; And the

same God Almightie, euermore direct and defend your most Royall Highnes from all evill and encumbrance: and finish and confirme in your most excellent Maiestie Royall, the blessings, long since, both decreed and offred: yea, euen into your most gratious Royall bosom, and Lap. Happy are they, that can perceyue, and so obey the pleasant call, of the mightie Ladie, OPPORTUNITIE. And, Therfore, finding our dueties concurrent with a most secret beck, of the said Gratious Princess. Ladie OPPORTUNITIE, NOW to embrace, and enioye, your most excellent Royall Maiesties high favor, and gratious great Clemencie, of CALLING me, Mr. Kelley, and our families, hoame, into your Brytish Earthly Paradise, and Monarchie incomparable: (and, that, abowt an yere since: by Master Customer Yong, his letters,) I, and myne, (by God his fauor and help, and after the most convenient manner, we can, will, from hencefurth, endeuour our selues, faithfully, loyally, carefully, warily, and diligently, to ryd and vntangle our selues from hence: And so, very devowtely, and Sowndlie, at your Sacred Maiesties feet, to offer our selues, and all, wherein, we are, or may be hable, to serve God, and your most Excellent Royall MaiestieThe Lord of Hoasts, be our help, and gwyde, therein: and graunt vnto your most excellent Royall Maiestie, the Incomparablest Triumphant Raigne, and Monarchie, that euer was, since mans creation. Amen.

Trebon in the kingdome of Boemia,

the 10th of Nouebre: A.Dm: 1588

Your Sacred and most excellent Royall Maiesties

most humble and dutifull Subject, and Servant,

John Dee

Source:

Hladký, Josef (2003). *A Guide to Pre-Modern English*. Brno:
Masarykova univerzita, pp. 301–302

4.2.1 Elizabeth I - Translation of Boethius

What is it, therefore, O man, that hath throwne the down to wo and wayle? Thou hast seene, I beleue, som new vnwonted thing.Thou, yf thou thinkest that toward the fortune be changed , art deceaud. This was euer her manner, this was her nature. She hath euer kept toward the rather her own constancy in her mutabilitie. Such one was she, whan she beguild the, and did deceauve with allurementes of false felicitie. Thou hast vnderstode now, the doutfull face of the blynde Goddesse, which though she hyde her self to others, hath made her self to the manifest. Yf thou allow her vse her fashon, complayne not therof; yf thou hatest her treason, skorne her and cast her of, that so falsely beguilde the; for she that now is cause of thy woe, the self same ought be of thy quyett. She hath left the, whom no man can be sure that will not leave him.

The verbal forms include *hath, hast, art, thinkest,* and *hatest*, with third and second person singular endings. The second person singular pronouns *thou, the (=thee),* and *thy* are still present, and the reflexive *her self* is written as two separate words.

4.3 Analysis and Discussion:

From the texts mentioned above the researcher noticed that , there are great changes and developments in the grammatical rules from old English period up to modern one , old English language relies on marking its nouns , adjectives and verbs , but that has relatively free word order ,

such language is called synthetic , over time it becomes a language that relies more on prepositions , auxiliaries and articles , and on word order than on case markings on nouns and verbs . this kind of language is called analytic .

The first feature as probably noticed is the presence of obsolete letters. Old English used two ways to write Gg: the Gg that we know even be written. Where the same applied to Þ Þ (called "thorn") and Ðð (called " eth") which are the archaic variants of the digraph TH , for Ww the letter Ƿƿ (called "wynn") was often used . The letter S sometimes had two lower-case variants: s, used in final position, and ſ, used elsewhere. The only obsolete vowel is Ææ. Long vowels are marked with macrons, however, marking lengths was not common.

The system of grammar was so complicated than today, as old English was rather a synthetic language, nouns used declensions as there were both strong and weak nouns, this is the reason why some nouns have got irregular plurals (eg. Foot – feet) . Adjectives were also flexive, used conjugations and were both weak and strong giving birth to present-day irregular verbs, the old English vocabulary consisted of much more germanic words than today.

CHAPTER FIVE

MAIN FINDINGS ,CONCLUSIONS ,

RECOMMENDATIONS

AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER

STUDIES

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS, MAIN FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS

AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

5.0 Introduction:

In this chapter the researcher is going to present the followings; the conclusions, the results and the findings of the study. Moreover, a brief recommendations and suggestions for farther studies that will be given at the end of the chapter

5.1 Conclusions:

This study pointed out that, there are great changes and developments in the grammatical rules through the old English age and the modern one . Therefore, old English no longer understandable to the speakers of modern English. The system of grammar was much more complicated, than today, old English was rather a synthetic language, while the modern English is analytic language.

The changes that took place between old English and modern one are typical of the kind of changes that all human languages undergo over time and after enough years have passed , the descendant language or (languages) can be very different from its (their) ancestor language.

Moreover, language change offers important indirect evidence about the nature of human languages, namely, that its rules governed. As we have seen that the major changes that the English undergone between

the old and modern English periods are best viewed as changes in the sets of rules character, grammatical rules can be added, lost, or changed, so language has always changed and indeed given the complexity of language and the way that human use it creatively change is a part of the nature of human language .

5.2 Main Findings:

1/ From the information of the study the researcher realized that there are changes in the grammatical rules .

2/In old English the system of grammar was much more complicated than today

3/ Old English relies on marking its nouns, adjectives, and verbs but that

has relatively free word order, therefore it is called synthetic language .

4/Modern English relies more on prepositions, auxiliaries, and articles, also known as grammatical words, and on word order than on case markings on nouns and agreement on verb , therefore , is called analytic language

5.3 Recommendations:

According to the results and findings of the study the followings should recommended**:**

1/ The old English grammar should be taught to those who study English as major specialization.

2/The developments and changes that happened through English periods have to be borne in mind so as to elaborate the skills and the components

of English language .

3/English grammar faced great changes and these changes should be linked from first to last change to enable the knowledge to take place smoothly.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies:

Nobody can argue that language does not undergo changes . The only languages that are not prone to linguistics changes are dead languages.

Since the change of language concerns with historical linguistics (diachronic) that concerns tracing the changes and the developments of language within different stages of time . so this area still vivid thus , the researcher would like to suggest some further studies in this scope :

1/ The phonetical changes in old and modern English (pronunciation) .

2/ The change of language.

3/ The changes of the grammatical rules through old English period and middle English

REFERENCES

Akmajian , A. & Demers , A .& Hornish , R (1988) *Linguistics An Introduction to Language and Communication* . 4th Ed . The MIT Press.

Algeo , J . (2010) *The Origins and Development of English Language* . 8th Ed . Printed in the United State of America : Michael Rosenberg .

Alkhuli , A . M . (1998) *An Introduction to Linguistics* . Alfalah House for Publication and Distribution .

Baugh , A . C . & Cable , T . (1978) *A History of English Language* . Third Ed . London and Boston : Routlarlage and Kegan Paul .

Chamoniolasova , J . (2014) *A Concise History of English* . Compiled Text Book at Faculty of Arts . Brno . Masaryk University .

Crabtree , M , C . & Power , J . (1981) *Language Files* . Department of Education and Science . Welsh office . The School Curriculum . London : English Publication .

Eckersky , C , E , M , A . & Macauly . M , A . (1952) *Brighter Grammar* . Great Britain : Lowe and Brydon Printer Limited .

Eduard , C . Hananu . (2015) *The English Grammar;A Historical Perspective Published Paper* . at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275968545 . B.A., M.A., Linguistics Lecturer in English, UE .

Gelderen , V , E .(2016) *Old , Middle and Early Modern Syntax Through Text*

Holyk , S . (2012) *Language Variation and Grammatical Change* . Published Paper . English Philology Department . Institute of Foreign Philology . Uzhhorod National University .

Hornby , A , S . (1978) *Oxford Students Dictionary of Current English* . Oxford . Oxford University Press .

Jon , S . Stevens . (2008) *Semantic Change and Old English Demonstrative* . Unpublished Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Arts . The Ohio State University .

Lyons , J . (1981) *Language and Linguistics An Introduction* . *Cambridge . Cambridge University Press.*

Palmer , F , R . (1971) *Grammar* . Made and Printed in Great Britain : Hasell Watson and Viney Ltd .

Rehakova , Z . (2014) *Word Order Pattern in Old English and Modern English* . Unpublished Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Education . University of Jihoceska .

Tuvung , K . (2011) *The language Change* . Unpublished Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Arts . University of Gothenburg .

Varshney , L , R . (1995) *An Introductory Text Book of Linguistics and Phonetics* . Suneet Printers .

Ward haugh , R . (1995) *Understanding English Grammar A Linguistics Approach* . 2nd Ed , 350 Main Street Malden . M A 02148. 5018 . USA .

Weber , D . (2012) *English Preposition A Historical Survey* . Unpublished Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Arts . University of Masaryk .

www.google.com

www.wikipedia .The free encyclopedia