24 Historical Linguistics

24.1 Language Change

(1) Articulatory Simplification
   a. These are comparable to Articulatory Processes.

(2) Analogy
   a. Causes irregularities in a language to become more regular.
   b. compare: ox → oxen; child → children
   c. swing → swung, winged
   d. swimed ~ swam

(3) Reanalysis
   a. hamburger → burger
   b. fish burger, veggie burger, tofu burger
   c. Sir Sandwich → sandwich
   d. email, e-commerce, e-money, I-pod, I-tunes, podcast, etc.

(4) Language Contact
   a. borrowings: chinook, rouge, beef, poultry, etc.
   b. hypercorrection: pro[t]igy ~ pro[d]igy

24.2 Reconstruction

(5) Genetic relationship:
   a. proto-language with proto-forms
   b. daughter languages share cognate forms
   c. a protoform *A > B
   d. B is a cognate form in one of the daughter languages.
   e. e.g. *ped (PIE) > foot (Eng)

(6) Rules for reconstruction
   a. Phonetic Plausability
   b. Majority Rules

24.3 Sound Shifts

(7) Grimm’s Law "Jacob Grimm (1822) and Proto Indo-European"

\[
\begin{align*}
& b^h \rightarrow b, p \rightarrow f \\
& d^h \rightarrow d, t \rightarrow \emptyset \\
& g^h \rightarrow g, k \rightarrow x(h)
\end{align*}
\]

(8) Examples English ~ Latin
   a. foot ~ pied
   b. thin ~ tenuous
   c. hundred ~ centum
   d. acre ~ ager
   e. Words borrowed after Grimm’s Law took place (i.e. Latin and French borrowings) are not affected by the sound change.
(9) Grimm’s Law and other Indo-European

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhrātā</td>
<td>phrater</td>
<td>frater</td>
<td>brother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10) Modifications to Grimm’s Law: Verner’s Law

a. if a sibilant precedes /t/ then Grimm’s Law doesn’t apply.

b. stāre (Lat.) > stand (Eng)

c. \( \theta \rightarrow \delta /V_\_V \)

d. pitā (Sans) > faðar (Goth), faðaʀ (Eng)