Jen Otto Harry Jespersen was born on July 16, 1860 in the town of Randen in Jutland, Denmark. Jespersen's father was district judge and his mother was the daughter of a clergyman who himself taught Jespersen's father Latin. Jespersen later mentions the characteristic fact that he belonged to a family of judges and how he had to take pains to shift his course of studies. Marking the future course of events to a great extent, his father died in 1870, and his mother with the children moved out to Hillerod. The sad fact was that his mother also died after a few years leaving the children partly to take care of themselves. At the time Jespersen was hardly thirteen years old. He attended the public school of Frederiksborg, and at the age of seventeen he matriculated and joined the university of Copenhagen. As an undergraduate he received scholarships and lived at the College of Regensen.

Several of Jespersen's essays and articles bear a personal character, which include biographical elements; but the best biographical introduction is his own autobiography: "En Sprogmands Levned" (1938). Jespersen's 'Farewell lecture at the University' (1933) is another account which gives several fine glimpses into his own life and his academic bent during his early years of study. Jespersen writes in the
'Farewell Lecture', 'As a boy I read with enthusiasm of Rasmus Rask and with the help of his grammars and made a certain start in Icelandic, Italian and Spanish: while I was at school I had on my own initiative read a good deal in these languages' (Jesp. 1938 : 835). At the same time Jespersen got interested in comparative philology and read several books on the subject. Another piece of good fortune he encountered was his life with his uncle whose chief interest lay in Romance literature. His collection of books was of great help to Jespersen during the later years of his university life.

Jespersen tells us 'In spite of these more or less childish studies I did not at once take to philology, but following a family tradition (my father, grand father and great grand father held legal appointments) I turned to Law (Jesp. 1962 : 836). After three years in the Law College he gave up the study of Law as he found it a useless exercise keeping in mind his deep interest in the study of languages. He says that the linguistic study came as 'a freeing of one's personality from the mere learning by heart of paragraphs and the readymade opinion of professors.' Jespersen vehemently reacted against this stereotyped study of Law.

Jespersen's intellectual freedom which even in the field of linguistics was later to be revealed most, found expression as early as during his graduate days when, he says, 'I wanted to go on my own way and not to have my opinions dictated to me from outside' (1962 : 836). For seven years
Jespersen served as a shorthand reporter in the house of parliament. During these years he had to support himself fully; as a result he acquired the courage to leave the study of Law and follow his own course of interest. His knowledge of shorthand helped him in his note-taking and later in his literary work.

After leaving Law Jespersen followed more or less a haphazard study of various languages; in 1887 he took his Master's Degree with French, English and Latin as his subjects. In his farewell lecture Jespersen greatly appreciates the teaching work done by Vilhelm Thomsen (1922) and Karl Verner (1933). It was at that time that the wide-spread interest in phonetics, the linguistic catch-word of the day, greatly attracted Jespersen's interest too. The introduction of practical phonetics into the teaching of languages was very much the fashion of the day. In 1886 Jespersen and other Scandinavian scholars and teachers founded a Scandinavian Association for a reform of the teaching of languages and named it "Quoques tandem". In collaboration with a few others Jespersen wrote a few books for use in schools chiefly in Denmark. Some of them were later adopted for use outside Denmark. Jespersen gave a theoretical discussion of the problem: Sprogundervisning (1901) and translated it into English under the title: How to Teach a Foreign Language. Later he translated the same into Spanish and Japanese.

Immediately after taking his degree, Jespersen went to Oxford with a view to gaining better 'practical facility' in
English language. In 1888, a year after, he went to Germany, especially he visited Leipzig. From there he went to France for a couple of months. Almost daily he visited Paris for academic and aesthetic purposes. Then Jespersen returned to Berlin to study Old and Middle English. Once back in Copenhagen he taught English and French in private schools. For some years Jespersen gave time to study his own native language and during this period (1890-1903) he was the joint editor of and a frequent contributor to the linguistic periodical 'Dania'. This was the time he came in collaboration with several prominent people; he writes of this saying, 'of that co-operation I have many precious memories' (Jesp. 1962: 842).

In 1891 Jespersen got his doctorate on the thesis: 'Studies Over engelske kasus, med en indledning om fremskridt: sprogot'. Subsequently in 1893 Jespersen was appointed the first 'Ordinary Professor' of English in the Copenhagen University. He writes, 'Now you see again what good luck has followed me: my post was created just as I was more or less ripe to undertake it' (1962: 842). He held this post in the University of Copenhagen until he retired in 1925. In 1920-21 he was also rector of the University.

Jespersen did considerably great travelling and visited most countries in Europe. He visited the United States twice: in 1904 to attend the Congress of Arts and Sciences held in St. Louis, and in 1909 he was a Visiting Professor at the University of California. Jespersen's first important
scientific effort was the paper: 'Til Sporsmalet om lydlove' which was at once translated into German. This paper is reprinted in his 'Linguistica' (155), an anthology of Jespersen's own main contributions in various periodicals. In this paper he attacks the main thesis of the Neogrammarians, emphasizing an intimate relation between sound and sense: the outer form and the inner content, a point of view which proved very fertile in his later works. His views on the sound sense correlation and his notions of 'language progress' are two notions fundamental to Jespersen's works.

All these years Jespersen's lingering interest lay in the study of human language; he writes, 'In my University teaching I have been chiefly a linguistic investigation laying stress both on the living language and its historic evolution' (1962: 844). He considered speech as the noblest instrument to bind man to man, and thought to thought and therefore deserves study on its own account.

In 1899 Jespersen was elected a member of 'Danish Vidiskabernes Selskab' and later he became member of several Academies and scientific associations. Three honorary Doctorate Degrees were conferred on him: in 1910 from New York; in 1925 from St. Andrews; Scotland; and in 1927 by the University of Sorbonne, Paris. He was President of the International Congress of Linguists in Copenhagen in 1936. An honorary volume 'A Grammatical Miscallany Presented to Otto Jespersen' with contributions from eminent scholars belonging to fourteen countries was published on his 70th birthday. In 1930, on his
birthday, Edward Sapir wrote the following characterization in a Danish newspaper, addressed to Jespersen himself: 'Your work has always seemed to me distinguished by its blend of exact knowledge, keenness of analysis, ease and lucidity of style and by an imaginative warmth that is certainly not common in scientific writing.' It was the spirit of scientific enquiry that guided him throughout and he never lost his grounds as an independent thinker who could make significant contributions to human knowledge.

Jespersen's was not a pure, rational concern for a knowledge of human language, he sought a broad varifiable and empirical basis for this knowledge which had most practical orientations as his biographical sketches reveal. Jespersen stresses that the most central fact to base his science of language is the activity of the individual to make himself understood what was in the mind of the first' (Jesp. 1924: 17). This is in agreement with what Noam Chomsky says later, 'The central fact to which any significant linguistic theory must address itself is this: a mature speaker can produce a new sentence of his language on the appropriate occasion, and other speakers can understand it immediately though it is equally new to them' (Chomsky, 1964a: 7). Although Chomsky has added a note of creativity here, Jespersen has essentially the same basis to begin with.

The theoretical considerations of Saussure are based on a distinction between 'the speech-act' and 'Language': the 'parole' and the 'langue'. Jespersen takes the activity of the
speaker-hearer as his essential starting point. While Saussure held the view that 'langue' alone is the 'objectum formale' of linguistic investigation, Jespersén gives adequate place both to the Saussurian langue and parole just as Chomsky's theories on generative grammar stresses both 'competence' and 'performance.' Jespersen relates the activity of the speaker-hearer with the nature of language as an objective system of structured elements which comes directly under grammar. This approach of Jespersen to view language both as competence and performance, as langue and parole or as the activity and the content of language was a significant departure from the approach of his structuralist contemporaries who often treated language as if only a system sounds and structures devoiding it of its natural dynamism as human behaviour (Jesp. 1924:17).

Language as such, the principal object of linguistics cannot be made amenable to investigation except by means of its manifestation in speech or writing, the concrete behavioural aspects of language. Language as we understand the term today is both a structural reality and a psycholinguistic reality and can be obtained in all its freshness for analysis and descrip- only from the individual human speaker's mouth. Once out, language becomes a petrified remnant of that form of human behaviour called 'human speech.' It is from this active speech which Jespersen catches from the speaker's mouth that he moves on to the analysis of the 'content' of the speech activity and this content (language) becomes his chief concern.
What is important for our consideration is the parallel stress Jespersen puts on the two aspects of language and the behavioural context in which language as an object is placed. This is the solid scientific, empirical grounds (if one wants to call it so) on which he bases the theory of language. Jespersen asserts over and again that "we shall never be able to understand what language is and how it develops if we do not continually take into consideration first and foremost the activity of speaking and hearing" (Jesp. 1924: 17).

Jespersen dealt with several problems also related to the understanding of speech-sounds. His works on phonetics and phonology of English have been thorough and elaborate. With the historical perspective and analytical bent of mind Jespersen could deal successfully with several problems in phonetics apart from the work he did in connection with sound changes as part of his historical research. His two essays 'What is the Use of Phonetics' and 'Voiced and Voiceless fricatives in English' reprinted in English in *The Selected Writings of Otto Jespersen* (1962: 545, 579) reflect his deep insight into the problems of sound analysis and description as early as 1910. The eight grades Jespersen recognizes have provided modern phonetics with a basic criterion for the division of vowels and consonants (for Jespersen's eight grades of sounds, see L.R. Palmer 1972:56).
Many consider Jespersen the end of a generation of linguists, or in the right sense of the word 'tradition', the end of a long tradition as well as the beginning of another tradition of linguists. As Harrold Hungerford puts it, when generative grammarians call him traditional they mean that he was one of the long series of Western linguists which began in pre-Christian Greece, that he did not share the ideas and methods of American Structuralism' (Hungerford 1970: 202). But what is significant here is not only that he maintained his individualism despite the wide-spread interest and acceptance of the structuralist concepts of language and linguistics which became the fashion of the day. He made active and original contributions to the study of grammar which came to be appreciated by several transformational generative grammarians including Chomsky himself.

Jespersen's growth towards a more rigorous and formalistic approach to the study of language is evident from his "Analytic Syntax (1969) which is recognised by many as the flowering of his methodology. This work is the best proof of Jespersen's ever continuing attempt to reach a level of theoretical comprehensiveness and methodological rigorousness with formalization of grammar as an important aim. As Samuel R. Levin recognizes in the forward to Jespersen's Analytic Syntax (1969), 'No fair-minded linguist of any philosophical persuasion could ever deny to Jespersen a profound knowledge of the structure of English, an
impressive intellectual power and a persistent theoretical orientation.' Jespersen as though having foreseen the impending need for the use of a formal apparatus for explicating and representing the underlying structural implications of language switches over his usual discursive treatment of grammar to a formalistic mode in the 'Analytic Syntax': By means of such formalistic representation Jespersen made it clear that the content of his treatment of grammar are not the grammatical 'categories' but 'grammatical relations' i.e., the recurring patterns and regularities which constitute what we call syntax. No grammarians or linguists of the nineteenth or early twentieth century preoccupied themselves so much the underlying grammatical relations as did Jespersen. Jespersen is not merely a link between the traditional and contemporary linguists; his active and significant contribution to the understanding of the grammar of English and of human language in general have indeed a value which cannot disappear by the mere passage of time.
Otto Jespersen's voluminous works on language and linguistics reveal the kind of intensity and enthusiasm with which he approached the problems of language. One must acknowledge that there is hardly any aspect of language which Jespersen has not dealt with in one way or other. By temperament, approach and profession Jespersen took deep interest in the actuality of languages, with linguistic systems and their structure and relations. With the fundamental belief that the English Language was the most advanced with its most sophisticated apparatus for expression, Jespersen was impelled to assume the task of explicating the grammar and the history of the English language with the sort of ease and lucidity which even a layman can have access to.

As Posner (1970: 312) recognizes, the validity of Jespersen's faith in the greatness of the English language is manifested in his voluminous work on English Language. Jespersen wrote in an era when the main linguistic preoccupation was with establishing the relationships between the various Indo-European language trying to arrive at an understanding of the kind of development and changes languages underwent. It is interesting and valuable to include at this juncture a comprehensive list of Otto Jespersen's works on language which will give an idea of the vastness of the area in which he worked. Again, it is worthwhile to examine some
of his most prominent works especially those which have so much figured in the present treatise. The following list is provided in chronological order and reference could be made of the details in the bibliography using the number indicated along with the year of publication of a particular work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles : Books</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bib. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How to Teach a Foreign Language</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rasmus Rask</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chapters on English</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Growth and Structure of English Language</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mankind, Nation and Individual</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An International Language</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Philosophy of Grammar</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Essentials of English Grammar</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Linguistica</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Analytic Syntax</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Noviel Lexike</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Phonetik</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The System of Grammar</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Progress in Language</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Phonetische Grundfragen</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lehrbuch der Phonetik</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Die Sprache</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Publications**

1. Vilhelm Thomson's Interpretation of the Orkhon Inscription | 1894 | 161 |
2. Punning or Allusive Phrases in English                | 1900 | 162 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Nasal in Nightingale</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A History of English in Relation to Other Subjects</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>For + Subject + Infinitive</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>What is the Use of Phonetics</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Role of the Verb</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The Classification of Languages</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Artificial Languages after the World War</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>History of our Language</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Negation in English and other Languages</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Speech in Honour of Vilhelm Thomson</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The Teaching of Grammar</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Introduction to an International Language</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Preface, Noviel Lexike</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>A Supposed Feminine Ending</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Adversative Conjunctions</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Symbolic Value of the Vowel i</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Voiced and Voiceless Fricatives in English</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Monosyllabism in English</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Notes on Metre</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>A Marginal Note on Shakespear's Language</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Nature and Art in Language</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Karl Verner</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Presidential Address</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Farewell Lecture at the University</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Congratulatory Message</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of Jespersen's foremost beliefs was that language is in a state of continuous progress. In 1894 he published one of his earliest works "Progress in Language" (1894). In fact it was this belief that led Jespersen to take a scholarly interest in English, a language which more than any other exhibits in its history the kind of pattern which Jespersen saw as progress. It was a question seriously debated by his contemporaries whether the loss of inflections added to the worth of a language or it indicated a process of gradual decay. We find Jespersen adopting an attitude diametrically opposed to that of the 19th century scholars who held that language evolution was synonymous to decay, as proved by the superiority of the classical over the modern languages. In this book he maintains that changes have always spelt progress. Jespersen also discusses the question of 'Language progress' in his 'Die Sprache' (1920). Jespersen is firm in his conviction that the further we go back in time towards the earlier phases of a language the more complicated the structure becomes. The constant simplification of the structure of the language is in line with the progress and expanding horizon of the linguistic community.

Jespersen's system of language analysis and description in terms of the structure of English language is seen well in his Essentials of English Grammar (1933). His insight into the grammatical structure of English language independently helps him make a number of significant theoretical statements on the nature of language as such. The greatness of the work on language lies not only in its adequacy to meet the descriptive requirements of that particular language, but also
in the kind of valid generalizations the linguist is capable of reaching. Jespersen's awareness of this requirement and his attempt to do so is evident in the 'Essentials', although this awareness does not so well meet the requirement Chomsky expects when he says, 'the grammar of a particular language is to be supplemented by a universal grammar that accommodates the creative aspect of language use and expresses the deep-seated regularities which, being universal, are omitted from the grammar itself.... It is only when supplemented by a universal grammar that the grammar of a language provides a full account of the speaker-hearer's competence' (Chomsky: Aspects ; 1965 - a: 6).

Jespersen's insights, learning and ability to recognize linguistic problems are well revealed in this work. In this context Harold Hungerford's comments on the work stand justified, when he says, "Among his (Jespersen's) distinguished books, The Essentials of English Grammar is only one, but there is hardly a better grammar of English, and its value is increased by the long essay which explains and justifies it. Both the The System of Grammar (1933) and the 'Essentials' are full of ideas which later scholars have made their own: 'neither the book nor the essay has been made irrelevant by the intellectual advances which some linguistics would call the scientific revolution, which they have helped to stimulate' (Hungerford 1970 : 56). The whole book is in fact a summary of his entire system.
After having published two volumes of his monumental work: *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* (1909-1949), Jespersen wrote his views on the general principles of grammar which he says (in the preface) he arrived at after years of intensive study and extensive work on English grammar. These basic views of Jespersen are presented in a coherent manner in his *Philosophy of Grammar* (1924). He confesses quite in line with the modern views and linguistic principles that the shortcomings of traditional grammatical theories are due to the fact that grammar has been chiefly studied in connection with ancient languages known only through the medium of writing, and that a correct understanding of the essential nature of language can only be had through the direct observation of living speech and only a second place should be given to written documents (Preface to the 'Philosophy of Grammar'). In fact most statements of Jespersen which help us include him among the most recognized linguistic theoreticians are found in the 'Philosophy of Grammar.'

It is significant to note what Jespersen writes on the correctness of language: 'the question of correctness is always settled in a practical manner by the speaking community while grammarians indulge in dispute over 'correct forms' (1924 : 338). 'The Philosophy' reveals the fact that Jespersen's concern for language was not a pure, rational and abstract one, but he has a basic which is verifiable and empirical as any structuralist would expect it to be.
Jespersen has sought a broad, verifiable basis within the realm of language itself. The central fact on which Jespersen's theory is founded is 'the activity of the speaker to make himself understood by another, and the activity of the listener to understand what was in the mind of the other' (1924 : 17). This has already been seen in another context in detail. Stressing the behavioural aspect of language Jespersen is of the view that we shall never be able to understand what language is an how it develops if we do not continually take into consideration first and foremost the activity of speaking and hearing.

It is in 'Philosophy' again that Jespersen stresses the creative aspect of linguistic activity. While expressions such as 'Thank you', 'Good Morning' or 'Beg your Pardon' etc., are considered unchanging and stereotyped forms of expressions which Jespersen calls set 'formulas' as these expressions require no on the spot creative effort on the part of the speaker, an utterance such as 'I gave you a lump of sugar' is a definite product of the speaker's manifold creative choices as a human individual involved in an activity which is most specific to his species as such. Every time when a sentence is made the speaker is at liberty to make a choice of terms and expressions from his stock of linguistic units. Jespersen writes, 'The sentence he thus creates may or may not be different in some one or more respects from anything he has ever heard or uttered before (Jesp. 1924 : 19).
If most of Jespersen's works concentrate on the history, phonology, morphology and syntax of English Language proper, there are works which reveal his primary concern with language as such and linguistics as a science. The most important contribution in this regard is his: *Language, Its Nature, Development and Origin* (1954). It is a work from which extracts and chapters are widely included in anthologies and readers in linguistics. Most of these extracts are rightly considered classics in linguistics. The opening account of the 'history of linguistic science' is considered by several as the most authentic and lucid are available on the subject. He traces the trends in language studies up to the end of the 19th century. Jespersen revises also his views on the language and the origin of language as given in his earlier work 'Progress in Language' (1894). Throughout Jespersen attempts to explicate one of the basic propositions that language is activity and that too purposeful activity, and we should never lose sight of the speaking individuals and their purpose in acting in a particular way. When Jespersen emphasizes the purposefulness of language he comes closer to the transformationalist dictum that language is a rule-governed behaviour and it was very much contrary to the 'mechanistic behaviourism' of the era.

Jespersen's classical work is indeed his seven volumes on *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* (1924). The European scholarly tradition culminates in three grammatical works produced in the first half of the century.
These are: (i) Jespersen's Modern English Grammar, (ii) Henrik Poutsma's *A Grammar of Late Modern English* (3 vols: 1931-2) and (iii) Kruisinga's *Handbook of Present-day English* (5 vols. 1944-26). Among Jespersen's other great works the seven parts of *A Modern English Grammar* occupy a unique place and these have established his place between the great men who preceded and those who have followed him. The entire seven volumes of which the Vol. VI: *Morphology* is our material for enquiry, and Vol. VII (Syntax) was completed and edited by Niels Haislund, are full of examples and illustrations, classifications and descriptions of actual spoken language on the one hand and written texts (literature) on the other. These books reveal the person of Jespersen who knew what was thought and said among the English linguists of his period. Jespersen acknowledges that these works are the result of several years' collection of material.

*A Modern English Grammar* is the first of its kind in terms of the prescriptive aims which grammar books were mainly meant for. Jespersen departs from the pedagogical aim and wrote mainly for those who wanted to enquire into the nature of language and of English grammar for the sake of scholarly interest. Jespersen's books on language are not 'textbook grammar' for pedagogical purposes. The seven volumes contain synchronic material which work him out from among his contemporaries who wrote grammar from a variety of perspectives. The reader is forced to pause and think over the essential characteristics of human language, a fact which penetrates the depth of his entire work on language:
'to understand the tendencies and possibilities of human language'.

As a form of innovative measure Jespersen discarded the usual division of grammar into the theory of forms (accidence, morphology), the theory of word-formation, and syntax. Jespersen follows a new scheme that is in conformity with the ways of the most outstanding modern grammarians. He has followed, thus, the principal categories of a grammatical order comprising both word-formation and word order. It is possible for any enlightened reader to obtain valuable insights into the structure of the English language which he has thoroughly and systematically analyzed.

The last of Jespersen's works that needs mention here are his Growth and Structure of English Language (1938) and his Analytic Syntax (1969). The Volney Prize of the 'Institute de France' was awarded to the former work, and the latter is now considered one of Jespersen's best works though it was out of print for several years. Mostly what we get in the form of the history of English are accounts of the external history of English language with not much insights of the growth and changes of the English language. In Jespersen's 'Growth and structure of English Language' we have for the first time a most satisfactory and authentic internal history of English which he traces with his own fundamental notion of 'linguistic progress.' If progress of human language meant anything to him it is because the entire structural development of the English language was transparent to him. The lucidity and comprehensiveness of the work was
appreciated by later eminent authors and the book has become a basis of later works on the history of the English language.

In the latter half of the twentieth century when 'linguistic formalization' and 'theoretical rigorousness' became the catch-word of the day, the significance and relevance of Jespersen's *Analytic Syntax* (1969) has been all the more on the increase. The book is the best proof of the kind of theoretical and procedural maturity Jespersen had indeed reached. The 'Analytic Syntax' is also the proof of his continuous orientation towards more and more rigorous, mathematical and formalized apparatus.

As Samuel R. Levin in his forward to Jespersen's later edition of the says, 'No fair-minded linguist of any philosophical persuasion, could ever deny to Jespersen a profound knowledge of the structure of English, an impressive, intellectual power and persistent theoretical orientation (Jesp. 1969). In Jespersen we are able to find the seeds of the central notions of transformational generative grammar. The value of 'Analytic Syntax' his in the fact that while his contemporaries too had vague notions about such things about things as competence, Jespersen did attempt to give shape to a 'formal apparatus' to reveal the underlying structures.

His concern with deeper relations rather than categories is clear. He with years of acquaintance with the structure of language reached a stage when he recognized the significance of structural relations rather than structural
categories in the study of grammar. Jespersen made use of symbols such as S, V, O and P; he attempted to bring to surface the 'deep structures' of sentences like (i) 'he found the empty cage' and 'he found the cage empty', (ii) 'he proved himself a fine fellow', and (iii) 'he washes him' and 'he washes himself'. The theoretician in Jespersen is found in all its excellence in the 'Analytic Syntax' and no one can deny him the credit of having developed a formal apparatus for the first time to explicate the structural relations of sentences.

In Mankind, Nation and Individual (1954 : 6) Jespersen exposes in a lucid manner the basic distinctions between grammatical and ungrammatical sentences with a view to driving home the idea that the competence of the linguistic community is the criterion of grammatical correctness or incorrectness. Jespersen discusses this distinction in the context of the linguistic community as the last authority in matters of correctness. In this book Jespersen also explicates his notion of 'Universal Language.' Jespersen is in constant search for 'something common behind the endless variety and differences, something that belongs to all humanity, and is one and the same everywhere' (1954 :b : 185). Jespersen is aware of the fact that when we examine languages we do indeed find many things which imply the existence of a fundamental common nature in human beings all over.
Regarding syntactic unity he says, 'although in grammar different languages follow different courses... and yet even here, if we look deep enough, there is something common to all' (154. b : 195). In all the works mentioned above we no doubt find Jespersen emerging as a theoretician of an exceptional stature, one who cherished deep concern over the fundamental problems of language: the origin, the development, the structure and the history of English in particular and of human language in general so far as the underlying principles are concerned.
I. Historic Developments of Morphemes:

1. The Third Person Singular: (1942:14): The third person singular in the present indicative of all verbs except the well-known small verbs has the same three varieties of s-ending as the genitive and plural of substantives: [he] loves, likes, kisses / laikz, laiks, kisiz /. This verbal ending -s has in Standard English ousted 'th /p/', and its history cannot be treated except in close connection with that ending. In OE -th was used in the ending of the third person singular and in all persons in the plural of the present indicative, but the vowel before it is varied, so that we have: for instance 'sprecan (infi.) - sprip (3rd sing.) - spricap (plural)'. But in the Northumbrian dialect of the tenth century -s was substituted for p (sg. bindes, pl. bindas), and as all unstressed vowels were soon after levelled, the two forms became identical (bindes). The northern s'es spread and became universal in standard English. The change is not an instance of the ordinary 'blind sound-laws', but is a purely morphological change. This is an instance of 'efficiency': 's' was in these frequent forms substituted for p because it was more easily articulated in all kinds of combinations.

2. Past Tense Suffix: (1942:28): The regular English verbs have no change in the kernel itself. The preterit (prt) and
the participle (ptc) are formed by the addition of written -ei which has three phonetic forms according to the final sound of the base. The historical development of -ed is parallel to that of the plural ending -(e)s, where e was dropped in the late ME. Similarly the ending -ed has retained its syllabic value after t and d while in other cases e is dropped. Where e is silent now, the d of the ending is unvoiced after voiceless consonants: OE locode > looked /lukt/. Contrary to the above rules the old full pronunciation /id/ is often retained in archaic language such as in 'learned, beloved, blessed, and markedly'.

3. Irregular Verbs: (1942:31): In class 1 verbs the irregularity consists in the addition of t after a voiced sound, a nasal or l: burn-burnt. The form has come down from the OE 'beornan and byrnan', and the present u owes its origin to the influence of the lip-consonant b. In -l we have dwell - dwelt. The present meaning is due to scandinavian influence. The t is of later date than OE. The phenomenon is said to have arisen due to the analogy of 'keep-kept' and similar words, which owe their 't' to the voiceless final consonant of the stem. It is remarkable that the type of preterit in question in most cases has the vowel /e/, frequently corresponding to a present tense with /i/; other vowels such as /i/ and /o/ are rare. In the 'send-sent' group the OE suppressed the d of the stem before the ending: sendan - senda - gesend (ed).
4. Irregular Verbs (1942:24): In OE the so-called strong
verbs were characterized by changes in their vowels due to
apocophony ('gradation') which in the main goes back to the
primitive Aryan and may be to a great extent explained by
old accentual rules as is found in classes like 'inf. writan
-prt. sg. wrat -prt. pl. writon -ptc. written'. In
course of time several intricate phonetic and analogical
changes took place to modify the scheme which governed the
OE verbs. Thus the short :ı and u were lengthened before -nd,
and these long vowels were later diphthongized and thus
we have the present-day forms like 'bind - bound'. This is
in line with the ordinary laws of sound-change. Similarly
the Mod E 'write - wrote' are the normal representatives of
the OE 'writan - wrat'. On the other hand the influence of
analogy is responsible for the loss of the distribution
between prt. sg. and prt. pl. discarded every were except
in 'was-were'. This process has reduced the parts of the
verbs are reduced from four to three, and in some cases
further into two and in others into one: (i) eat - ate -
eaten, (ii) sit - sat, and (iii) put. Partial and total
transitions from one OE verb class into another became a
regular feature; nothing is left thus in Mod E. except
scattered clusters of words which still cling together
forming some apparent regularities amidst the wholesale
irregularity.
5. **Participles in -n** (1942:76): OrdinarilY the second participle of all strong and reduplicative verbs ended in -n. While in the infinitive the -n has disappeared, the participle has in many cases preserved the form. This set is the remnant of the ME -(e) ne, used after the definite article and in the plural. The -n ending is very often appended to originally weak participles e.g., 'hearn, putten, setten, shutten'. The form 'proven' is seen as a result of this tendency. There are several categories of Mod E participles ending in -en. 'Been, seen, gone' etc., are the result of the stem ending in a vowel. A series of verbs such as 'gnawn, sawn, shown' have -n forms besides regular forms in -ed. These -n forms are chiefly used as adjuncts.

6. **Verbs from Substantives** (1942:86): In OE there were a certain number of verbs and nouns of the same root, but distinguished by the endings. Thus 'I love' through the three persons 'sg. ran lufic - lufast - lufap, pl. lufiap. The substantive 'love' was 'lufu'. The two word-classes are still kept apart by the endings. Similarly the form 'Stoep and Sloepe' (sleep) may be both noun and verb, the other forms may be distinct. In the subsequent centuries we witness a gradual simplification ... with mutual approximation of the verbal and nominal forms. The -m was changed into -n; all the vowels of the weak syllables were levelled to one uniform e /ə/; the plural forms of the verbs in p gave way to forms in -n ... forms in -s becoming the only
general forms. These changes have brought about the perfect formal identity of the two parts of speech as found in (iv) love - loves (v) love - loves.

7. **Compound Forms** (1942: 141): The elements of a composite word may in the course of time undergo more or less radical phonetical changes which may make them quite unrecognizable: 'lammas (OE htaf-moesse : loaf-mass), goshawk (goshafock: goose-hawk), cupboard /kʌp'baːd/, channel (chainwale), gunnel (gunwale) and so on. Sometimes a word dies out in free use while it continues to be part of a compound as in 'lay' from 'loaf-kneader' or 'gospel' from 'god-spell'. Very often a reaction sets in and compounds are revived or renovated from a feeling of the composing elements. An extreme example is OE 'huswif' which as a unit has become 'hussy /hazi/ meaning 'a bad woman'. But the compound is re-formed as 'housewife'. In many cases the obscurati on of the sound has not been accompanied by an obscuration of the composition as found in -man in 'postman, policeman, statesman and fireman'. Bahuvrihi compounds go back to Indo-European times. A modern English example: is 'red-coat' or 'blockhead'. Such compounds consist of 'an adjective and a noun'. Bahuvrihi-compounds exhibit the same features as ordinary final-determinative compounds such as 'horse-race or book-case'.

II. **Sound-Alternations in Morphology:**

1. The plural is formed by mutation of the stem-vowel in the following Mod B substantives (the vowel pairs
having undergone various changes since OE times) (p.183);
/ u* : i'/ (OE ɔ - ɔ): foot, goose, tooth. /æ : e/
(OE ɔ - e): man.

2. The vowel in 'man' is weakened to [ə] both in the sg.
and pl. when a compound is formed in singular or plural:
Englishman - Englishmen. 'Woman' is a compound of 'man'
(OE wifman). The pronunciation has become sg. (wumən),
pl /wimin/. The vowel of the first syllable is due to
the influence of the labials w and m. The i has been
preserved in the plural due to the front vowel in the
second syllable. The plural is now spelt 'women' with
'o' from the singular. The change of kernal found in
'child - children' goes back to an original difference
in vowel-length /i - i/. -n is added to 'childre' (OE
cildru).

3. In the formation of the third person singular the vowel
is shortened and altered in 'says /sez/' and 'does /dəz/'
and in compounds 'outdoes and overdoes'. In some cases
the final consonant of the kernal disappears in rapid
pronunciation before the -s: Thus /d/ between /n/ and
/z/ as in hands, friends, thousands;
/ d / disappears between /l/ and /2/ as in fields,
shields, yields and moulds.
'th' disappears between a consonant and -s, as in mouths,
sevenths, sixths, and other fractions.
The vowel sound is changed before the -s in two verbs as mentioned above: says, does.

4. As a spirant became voiceless at the end of a word, while in the interior the voiced sound was retained, we have many words with /-f, θ, -s/ in the singular and /-vz, þz - ziz/ in the plural.

-/f becomes /vz/ as found in belief - believes, calf-calves, half-halves, knife-knives, leaf-leaves, life-lives, loaf-loaves, self-selves, sheaf-sheaves, shelf-shelves. But the alternation is not followed by forms such as *roof - roofs, hoof - hoofs*.

/θ/ becomes /z/. The examples of this alternation are: usually found after a long vowel or diphthong:

- bath - baths
- oath - oaths
- sheath - sheaths
- youth - youths
- cloth - clothes

/mouth - mouths
/path - paths
/wreath - wreaths
/moth - moths
/hearth - hearths.

/-s/ becomes /-ziz/: In present-day English this alternation is now found in house /haus/ - houses /hausiz/; but the plural of glass remains glasses /glasiz/. It is significant to note that the genitive of 'house' remains /hausiz/ without the alternation of /s/ into /z/ (p. 258).
5. There is the use of an irregular /s/ instead of the usual /z/ after a vowel or a voiced consonant is due to the fact that the late ME change of /s/ — /z/ took place only after a weak syllable as in the case of the regular ending -s. But no change took place when the -s followed a strong syllable. The instances of this are found in forms like: 'hence, else, once, twice, thrice and since' (p. 266).

6. In present-day English the genitive plural is distinct from the genitive singular in words such as 'men's, women's, children's and oxen's. But in a great majority of the words the forms are now identical; and that leads to the disuse of the genitive plural which is now comparatively rare (the ladies' maids).

7. In the class of irregular verbs there is a set in which the preterit is formed by the addition of *t* and the vowel base remains unchanged as in 'deal-dealt or feel-felt'. But some stems in ending in v or s / z/, besides vowel change undergo unvoicing of the final consonant:

- cleave - cleft (cleaved) leave - left.
- bereave - bereft (bereaved) lose - lost.

8. The addition of 't' causes the 'd' to disappear as found in 'bend-bent, send-sent, blend-blent, lend-lent, rend-rent' and so on. Vowel change alone often yields the preterit form as in 'bled - bled, feed - fed, lead - led.
and speed - sped.' The form 'shoot' in 'shoot-shot' arose through shifting of the stress in the diphthong eo from the first to the second element, the unstressed element being absorbed into the palatal consonant.

9. The verb 'abound' undergoes a vowel shift as it receives the suffix '-ance' from / au / into / /: abound - abundance. The same is true of 'pronguce and pronunciation' / an / — / /, 'announce and anunciation / au / — / / and so on (p. 119).

10. The derivative forms of 'family - familiar' etc., show the shortening of the vowel in the first syllable and the preservation of 'u' in the penultimate position in some cases as in 'oracle - oracular, spectacle - spectacular, triangle - triangular and muscle - muscular'. Because of special developments of the radical in French or in Earlier Eng. there is in some cases a marked difference between the radical and the derivative: 'joke : jocular, muscle : muscular, people : popular, rule : regular table : tabular, title : titular. In all the above the derivative contains an additional / ju / element apart from the shortening of the vowel of the first syllable.
III. 1. Irregular Verbs : Class 1.

(a) The Kernal is kept unchanged; t added:
   burn - burnt learn - learnt
(b) The kernal is kept unchanged; l added:
   dwell - dwelt smell - smelt
   spill - spilt spoil - spoilt
(c) The vowel changes; t added:
   deal - dealt bring - brought

Class 2

(a) unchanged in prt. and ptc. :
   rid - rid shed - shed
   spread - spread bet - bet
   cost - cost cut - cut
   cast - cast hurt - hurt
   knit - knit let - let
   put - put quit - quit
   roast - roast set - set
   shut - shut slit - slit
   split - split sweat - sweat
   thrust - thrust wet - wet

Class 3

(a) t is added; the vowel of the base is changed:
   kneel - knelt deal - dealt
   feel - felt dream - dreamt
   lean - leant mean - meant
   creep - crept keep - kept
   leap - leapt sleep - slept
   sweep - swept weep - wept
(b) Besides vowel change final consonant is unvoiced:

cleave - cleft leave - left
bereave - bereft lose - lost

**Class 4**

(a) t is added and d is lost before it:

bend - bent blend - blent
lend - lent rend - rent
send - sent spend - spent
build - built gild - gilt
gird - girt

**Class 5** : d is added and the vowel changed:

say - said flee - fled
hear - heard sell - sold

**Class 6** : d added and final consonant omitted:

have - had make - made
will - would shall - should
can - could

**Class 7** : t added after change in the base:

bring - brought think - thought
seek - sought beseech - besought
teach - taught buy - bought

**Class 8** : No addition, but vowel change:

abide - abode shine - shone
drive - drove write - wrote
choose - chose break - broke
speak - spoke Bleed - bled
breed - bred feed - fed
lead - led  speed - sped
read - read  meet - met
slide - slid  ride - rode
light - lit  stand - stood
sit - sat  spit - spat
shoot - shot  get - got
fight - fought  cling - clung
fling - flung  sling - slung
sting - stung  swing - swung
wring - wrung  hang - hung
bind - bound  wind - wound

Class 9: No addition, vowel difference between prs and prt, and between prt and ptc:

swim - swam - swum  sing - sang - sung
begin - began - begun  spring - sprang - sprung
ring - rang - rung  drink - drank - drunk
run - ran - run  stink - stank - stunk
come - came - come

Class 10: -en (n) added:

drive - drove - driven  thrive - throw - thriven
strive - strove - striven  ride - rode - ridden
smite - smote - smitten  write - wrote - written
stride - strode - stridden  hide - hid - hidden
bite - bit - bitten  bear - bore - born
swear - swore - sworn  tear - tore - torn
tread - tred - trodden  break - broke - broken
forget - forgot - forgotten  speak - spoke - spoken
wake - woke - waken steal - stole - stollen
freeze - froze - frozen choose - chose - chosen
forsake - forsook - forsaken blow - blew - blown
fly - flew - flown draw - draw - drawn
give - gave - given eat - ate - eaten
see - saw - seen beat - beat - beaten

**Class 11 : Mixed verbs:**
go - went - gone
be ... - was ... - been
hew - hewed - hewn, hewed
show - showed - showed, shown
sow - sowed - sowed, sown
sew - sewed - sewed, sewn
gnaw - gnawed - gnawed, gnawn
saw - sawed - sawed, sawn
lade - laded - laded, ladden
shear - sheared - sheared, shorn
swell - swelled - swelled, swollen

2. **Identical Nouns and Verbs:** The following list consists of terms which function both as substantive (adj) and verbs some of which had their origin as substantives (adj) while others had their origin as verbs in OE, or ME.

love sleep answer bed
book busy care drink
empty end. fear fight
fish free harm heap
help hire hold hope
light mark mind name
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>own</th>
<th>plough</th>
<th>rest</th>
<th>right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ship</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>sin</td>
<td>smoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spell</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>step</td>
<td>thank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>wash</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>weed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blossom</td>
<td>dry</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie</td>
<td>need</td>
<td>shame</td>
<td>thunder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whirl</td>
<td>whistle</td>
<td>wound</td>
<td>wonder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>yoke</td>
<td>accord</td>
<td>account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arch</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td>array</td>
<td>bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame</td>
<td>cause</td>
<td>centre</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charge</td>
<td>chase</td>
<td>check</td>
<td>claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coin</td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>combat</td>
<td>copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost</td>
<td>couch</td>
<td>counsel</td>
<td>count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cover</td>
<td>dance</td>
<td>despair</td>
<td>doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>escape</td>
<td>flame</td>
<td>form</td>
<td>guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injury</td>
<td>lodge</td>
<td>merit</td>
<td>offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>plant</td>
<td>reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruin</td>
<td>touch</td>
<td>triumph</td>
<td>trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn</td>
<td>vow</td>
<td>birth</td>
<td>bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>cook</td>
<td>finger</td>
<td>husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fight</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>camouflage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capture</td>
<td>chance</td>
<td>cross</td>
<td>dart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face</td>
<td>faint</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notice</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>pity</td>
<td>progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabotage</td>
<td>service</td>
<td>sugar</td>
<td>powder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>knight</td>
<td>place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axe</td>
<td>bomb</td>
<td>cane</td>
<td>chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chalk</td>
<td>hammer</td>
<td>hook</td>
<td>key</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
knife  ransom  toy  wire
elbow  sense  pickpocket  nurse
mention  caution  mission  commission
condition  motion  partition  pension
petition  proportion  requisition  sanction
station  capture  feature  approach
beat  bend  bid  blemish
blow  blush  bow  build
burn  bustle  call  climb
command  concern  crave  crowd
cry  dawn  dig  dip
dislike  dismay  dispute  dissent
distemper  dive  divide  drain
dread  dress  embrace  fawn
fetch  find  flutter  frown
gather  gaze  glance  go
harass  hatch  haul  haunt
hunt  incline  insult  keep
kill  laugh  lead  lean
lend  lift  look  meat
mistake  nap  pinch  reach
rebuke  reply  run  say
search  see the  split  stare
strain  slumber  smile  tread
walk  whisper  wish  worry
3. **Compounds:**

1. **Substantive Compounds:** maid-servant, gas-light, 
servant-girl, flower-garden, sunrise, sunset, daybreak, 
nightfall, earthquake, handshake, shoe-maker.

2. **Bahuvrihi Compounds:** red-coat, feather-brain, 
blockhead, hunchback, pot-helly, butter-fingers, 
blue-jacket, bald-head, cut-throat, madcap, pale-face, 
tender-foot, lazy-bone.

3. **String Compounds:** 'debtor and creditor fashion', 
'a cat and dog life', 'flesh and blood reality', 
'boy and girl days', 'street and house' foulness, 
'tooth-and-nail system'.

4. **Clipped Compounds:** the first part alone used:  
copper, return (return ticket), canary (canary bird), 
extcursion (excursion train), head (headache), 
hunter (hunter watch).

5. **Adjective + Substantive:** blackbird, blackboard, 
blackmail, bluebell, easy-chair, freeman, gentleman, 
grandfather, halfpenny, highway, holiday, nobleman, 
 shorthand.

6. **Pronoun + Substantive:** he-rabbit, she-buffalo, 
she-cat, she-society, he-man.

7. **Verb + Substantive:** cry-baby, drawbridge, throwhik, 
cut-throat, gridstone, wash-basin, wash-house, work-day, 
guess-work, show-piece, plaything, pay-day, 
wash-day.
8. **Particle + Substantive**: afternoon, out-patient, outpost, outline, outgoing, inside, overload, overcoat, under-pants, under-current, afterthought, outbreak, onset.


12. **Particle + Verb**: Overbrim, overcome, overflow, overlap, intake, overstep, overlook, underlie, undervalue, uplift, uprise, offset, uproot, outdo, out-drink, outgo, underpaid.

13. **Reduplicative Compounds**: again and again, more and more, little by little, chit-chat, dilly-dally, dingle-dangle, jibber-jabber, snip-snap, humdrum, zig-zag, clish-clash, hurley-burley, hotch-potch, hanky-panky.