

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

**English Usage in Four of *The Hound
of the Baskervilles*' Film Adaptations
(from 1939 to 2012)**

(Bakalářská práce)

**English Usage in Four of *The Hound of the Baskervilles*' Film Adaptations
(from 1939 to 2012)**

(Bakalářská práce)

Autor: **Martina Krymláková**

Studijní obor: Anglická filologie

Vedoucí práce: **doc. PhDr. Václav Řeřicha, CSc.**

Počet stran: 72

Počet znaků: 110 618

Olomouc 2015

*Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla
úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.*

V Olomouci dne 5. 5. 2015

.....

Motto

“Language is never in a state of fixation, but is always changing; we are not looking at a lantern-slide but at a moving picture.”

Andrew Lloyd James

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor doc. PhDr. Václav Řeřicha, CSc. for his time, positive encouragement, and valuable guidance throughout the process of writing this thesis. I would also like to thank my family and friends for their support.

Abstract

This bachelor's thesis is concerned with the differences in the usage of the English language which occur in different time periods of the twentieth century and the present century. I aim to ascertain the differences in language usage by selecting several phenomena concerning the language change that were taking place throughout the twentieth century, and by exploring them in the renowned novel *The Hound of the Baskervilles* and its film adaptations. The novel which was published in 1902 together with the selected adaptations released in 1939, 1959, and 1988 cover the whole twentieth century, while the last one from 2012 mirrors the most modern period of time.

Key words

English language, differences in usage, twentieth century, twenty-first century, language change, *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, Doyle, film adaptations.

Anotace

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá rozdíly v užití anglického jazyka vyskytujících se v různých časových obdobích dvacátého a jednadvacátého století. Práce si klade za cíl odhalit tyto rozdíly pomocí zkoumání několika jevů týkajících se jazykových změn, jež se odehrávaly během dvacátého století a které s největší pravděpodobností přecházejí do století jednadvacátého. Tyto jevy jsou pozorovány v proslulém detektivním románu *Pes baskervillský* a jeho filmových adaptacích. Román vydaný v roce 1902 společně s adaptacemi z let 1939, 1959 a 1988 pokrývají dvacáté století, přičemž poslední adaptace z roku 2012 odráží současnou moderní dobu a jazyk.

Klíčová slova

Anglický jazyk, rozdíly v úzu, dvacáté století, jednadvacáté století, jazyková změna, *Pes baskervillský*, Doyle, filmové adaptace.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
1 Selected adaptations	12
2 Pragmatic frames and methodology.....	14
3 Lexical and semantic change	16
3.1 Growth of vocabulary.....	16
3.1.1 Neologisms.....	16
3.1.2 Semantic change.....	16
3.1.3 Category shift.....	18
3.1.4 Compounding, blending and derivation.....	18
3.1.5 Shortening	20
3.1.6 Borrowing	20
3.2 Words mirror their times	21
3.3 Reduction of vocabulary	22
4 The novel and adaptations: differences in lexicon.....	23
4.1 Neologisms	23
4.1.1 Shortening of existing words	25
4.1.2 From telegram to cell	25
4.2 Obsolescence	25
4.2.1 Replacing obsolescent words	27
4.3 New terms for improved inventions.....	29
5 Americanization	32
5.1 Mandative subjunctive	33
5.2 The novel and adaptations: American influence	35
5.2.1 Americanisms.....	36
5.2.2 MS construction	37

6	Sociocultural influence.....	39
6.1	Colloquialization and informalization.....	39
6.2	Democratization of discourse.....	40
6.3	The novel and adaptations: democratization.....	42
6.3.1	Words containing man.....	42
6.3.2	The singular they.....	44
6.3.3	Addressing.....	45
6.3.4	Informalization? Colloquialization?.....	51
	CONCLUSION.....	55
	RESUMÉ.....	60
	WORKS CITED.....	63
	LIST OF TABLES.....	68
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	69
	APPENDIX.....	70

INTRODUCTION

The source of inspiration for the present bachelor's thesis was a famous quotation by a Welsh linguist Andrew Lloyd James: "Language is never in a state of fixation, but is always changing; we are not looking at a lantern-slide but at a moving picture" (1935, 98).

Language as such is constantly changing in the course of the history of mankind. Every day people modify their means of communication—including language—and although they most probably do not consciously plan to change their language and may not be aware of the fact that they actually *are*, they cannot (and perhaps even do not want to) prevent or stop this process (Baugh and Cable 2002, 8). The process of language alteration proceeds gradually and only with some lapse of time can it be noticed and paid attention to (19).

From the considerable amount of literature that has been published on the topic of language change, I will be mostly referring to April McMahon's *Understanding Language Change* (1994), Leech et al.'s *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study* (2009), Baugh's and Cable's *A History of the English Language* (2002), the chapters on the twentieth century in the fourth volume of *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (1998), and last but not least Christian Mair's *The Twentieth-Century English: History, Variation and Standardization* (2006).

Those publications are concerned with the extremely extensive topic of language change. The selected scholarly literature served as a valuable source of theoretical information and enabled me to select several specific areas of this complex phenomenon that I will pursue in the present paper. The purpose of this thesis is to trace differences in the language usage in different time periods of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century.

It is, of course, possible that a number of differences that cannot be anticipated at the present time will be found during the research. Nevertheless, based on the scholarly literature, the hypothesis is that differences concerning the following issues will be detected in this research:

- 1) Changes in lexicon: neologisms; semantic changes; part of speech shifts; new words formed by compounding, blending, derivation; new loan words; shortening of existing words: increasing usage of clippings, acronyms and initialisms,
- 2) obsolescence of words (and their prospective substitution),
- 3) growing influence of American English on British English, namely an increasing usage of mandative subjunctive and an increasing number of American borrowings,
- 4) democratization of discourse.

To be able to examine those tendencies of the twentieth century which continue to affect the present century, the language of a novel which was published at the very beginning of the twentieth century will be compared with the language used in four different film adaptations—three of them made later in the same century and the last one released in 2012.

The chosen novel is *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. This crime novel was written by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and, after being published serially in magazines between the years 1901 and 1902, it was first published in 1902 as a book. Since this detective story was met with enormous success, it has served as a source of inspiration for a great number of adaptations. For the purposes of this work, I chose a 1939 adaptation produced by 20th Century Fox, a 1959 adaptation by Hammer Film Productions, a 1988 adaptation produced by Granada Television and WGBH, and one of the most recent adaptations with a slightly different title: “The Hounds of Baskerville” which is, in fact, an episode from a TV series *Sherlock*, broadcasted by BBC in 2012.

This research aims to answer the following questions: Which of the above mentioned tendencies are reflected in the adaptations? Does the data from the novel and adaptations reflect diachronic differences in the usage of the English language? What were the differences in the usage of the English language in the 1900s, 1930s, 1950s, 1980s, and 2010s?

Those issues will be explained and discussed in the following chapters and thereafter searched for in the selected excerpts from the novel and their corresponding film counterparts. In some cases, the whole novel and the whole film scripts will be scrutinised; the method will be clarified before each

constituent investigation. Finally, the incidence of those issues in the individual adaptations will be compared. The examined and compared excerpts will be (when desirable) categorized according to the pragmatic contexts in which they occur.

In spite of the fact that one might raise an objection that the scholarly literature used as groundwork for this paper analyses the written and spoken language, and that the language that is used in film is scripted, thus not spontaneous, I base my assumptions that film language is a valid source for research on Quaglio and Biber (2006, 717) who maintain the opinion that although television language has its own characteristics, “the general similarities between television dialogue and face-to-face conversation suggest that television has the potential to provide researchers and teachers with a convenient source of spoken language data.”

1 Selected adaptations

There are several reasons for choosing Sherlock Holmes's story to be the focus in the present paper. Firstly, Holmesian detective stories belong to the most widely known ones in the world and, presumably, to the most renowned works in the British literary heritage. Secondly, as a consequence of its popularity, there has been a great number of adaptations made, and not only in the print medium (novels, short stories, comic books), but also in radio, on stage, and eventually on screen. In addition to the numerous adaptations made throughout the twentieth century, new adaptations continue to emerge year after year, and the beginning of the twenty-first century is no exception. Faye (2012, 7) even claims that "the world of Sherlockiana is richer than ever" or as a headline of an article in *The Telegraph* reads: "Sherlock Holmes: we are living in a golden age of Sherlockiana."¹ Up to now, Conan Doyle's most frequently adapted detective story for film and TV is *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (Porter 2012, 9) and on that account it was chosen for this paper.²

The oldest of the selected adaptations—released in 1939 and starring Basil Rathbone as Sherlock Holmes—has been very well received by audience and highly praised by critics. It was produced by 20th Century-Fox and directed by Sidney Lanfield.

The second adaptation selected was produced by Hammer Film Productions and released twenty years later—in 1959, directed by Terence Fisher. This particular adaptation is significant, for it was the first Holmesian colour film. The next adaptation that will be compared was produced by Granada Television and WGBH, released in 1988, and directed by Brian Mills. This one was chosen for purely practical reasons—to fit the time span of 20 to 30 years between two adaptations.

¹ Spencer, Charles. 2011. "Sherlock Holmes: we are living in a golden age of Sherlockiana." *The Telegraph*, December 19. Accessed April 2, 2015. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film-blog/8966559/Sherlock-Holmes-we-are-living-in-a-golden-age-of-Sherlockiana.html>

² Porter (2012, 8–9) lists 11 adaptations of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* made in the UK between 1905 and 2012 (1932, 1939, 1959, 1968, 1972, 1978, 1982, 1983, 1988, 2002, 2012), however, she left out an adaptation directed by Maurice Elvey, released in 1921.

Though it could be said that the most recent adaptation of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* is an episode called “The Hound of the Cancer Cells” of the CBS TV series *Elementary*, that was broadcasted in March 2014, it is not considered to be a “real” adaptation of this detective story in the true sense, because apart from the word *hound* there is not much else that it would have in common with the original story (the character of Dr. John Watson is even transformed into a woman Dr. Joan Watson). Therefore, the second most recent adaptation of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* was chosen for the present research—an episode from BBC’s *Sherlock* under the name “The Hounds of Baskerville”, released in 2012, directed by Paul McGuigan. Unlike the twentieth-century remakes that are set in Victorian London, this one (written by Mark Gatiss and Steven Moffat) is in an original way set in contemporary modern London. Nevertheless, as Porter (2012, 2) aptly points out: “It surprisingly is more faithful to canon than some adaptations set in the Victorian era, and details from Conan Doyle’s stories are cleverly worked into the episodes.”

2 Pragmatic frames and methodology

A theory of speech acts will be employed as the basis for the practical parts of the present paper. Detected changes in the usage of the English language will be classified according to the pragmatic frames to which they belong.

In a simplified way, the basic principle (or belief) of this theory is that by saying something, people can actually perform an action, or affect someone else to do something. The term “speech act theory” to which I will be referring to throughout this chapter is ascribed to a British philosopher and Oxford professor J. L. Austin. A collection of his lectures containing his influential ideas was published posthumously under the name *How to Do Things with Words* (1962). Right in the first lecture Austin expresses an adverse opinion against former beliefs that statements only reflect their meaning: “It was for too long the assumption of philosophers that the business of a ‘statement’ can only be to ‘describe’ some state of affairs, or to ‘state some fact’, which it must do either truly or falsely” (1). Austin’s theories of *performative utterances* and *locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts*³ were further developed and systematized by John R. Searle, his Oxford student.⁴

Several attempts have been made to refine or amend Austin’s taxonomy of *illocutionary speech acts*. The classification proposed by Searle (1979, 12–19), however, has probably been the most influential and will be made use of in this thesis. Searle classified *illocutionary speech acts* into five basic categories named according to their functions. Those are paraphrased below, complemented with some examples of typical areas of use from *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*:

Assertives: They commit the speaker to the truth value of the uttered proposition.
e.g.: statements, assertions, conclusions, descriptions, claims, reports

³ Locutionary act is “the basic act of utterance, . . . a meaningful linguistic expression.” Illocutionary act is “an utterance with some kind of function” performed via the “illocutionary force of the utterance.” Perlocutionary act has a function of intending to have a (perlocutionary) effect, a consequence (Yule 1996, 48–9).

⁴ *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Speech Acts.”

- Directives:* The speaker attempts to get the hearer to perform some future action.
e.g.: commands, orders, requests, suggestions, advice, questions
- Commissives:* They commit the speaker to perform some future action.
e.g.: promises, pledges, threats, refusals, offers
- Expressives:* They express the speaker's psychological state (attitudes, emotions) about their proposition. The truth value of the proposition is presupposed.
e.g.: statements of joy, pain, sorrow etc., but also expressions of thanking, apologizing, blaming, welcoming, congratulating, praising
- Declarations:* If the declaration is successfully performed, the reality is changed via the propositional content.
e.g.: excommunicating, declaring war, marrying, firing from employment, nominating, (officially) opening a bridge

During this research, some of the collected data will need to be organised according to their pragmatic contexts, to ascertain whether the particular phenomenon has spread out completely or only into some pragmatic contexts. For those purposes, the above described categories of *illocutionary speech acts* will be used.

3 Lexical and semantic change

In the following sections the most important aspects which influence the English vocabulary will be described. Those differences that occur among the inventories of the English lexicon during different stages of the twentieth century are an important issue for this thesis and need to be discussed in depth.

3.1 Growth of vocabulary

3.1.1 *Neologisms*

Coining completely new words happens rather less frequently when compared to other ways of creating neologisms in English—Ayto (1999, x) talks about only one per cent, the majority of which are commercial names, proprietary names, technical terms, or eccentric and clumsy inventions of the public imagination.

3.1.2 *Semantic change*

A certainly economical way of enlarging vocabulary is to give a new meaning (= sense) to an existing word, or to modify its meaning. In the majority of cases the old meaning coexists alongside the new one. Or else, the new sense replaces the old one, either partially or completely (Peprník 2006, 39). This is a never-ending process which took place during the whole history of the English language (all languages for that matter) and will go on in the future. Baugh and Cable (2002, 307) even claim that the process of employing new meanings to existing words is one of the most common phenomena that happen in any language.

McMahon (1994, 174) highlights that semantics is more amenable to change than other fields of grammar, which means that words can change their meaning altogether easily. On top of that, it might happen so quickly that it can be experienced within a person's lifetime—this leads to the assumption that those semantic changes that took place throughout the twentieth century should be traceable.

A frequently given example of the shift of meaning concerns the English word *gay* (McMahon 1994, 175; Bauer 1994, 30; Peprník 2006, 75;

Crystal 2003, 138). Originally, this word used to mean “cheerful or brightly coloured” (Bauer 1994, 30), nowadays, however, *gay* is used to denote being a homosexual. The first usage of the latter sense recorded in *OED Online* was in 1922 by Gertrude Stein.⁵

There have been four main types of semantic change distinguished. Several different terms are used among linguists:

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--|
| (1) | <i>Broadening</i> | (McMahon 1994, Bauer 1994) |
| | <i>Widening</i> | (Peprník 2006) |
| | <i>Extension</i> | (Crystal 2003, Baugh and Cable 2002, McMahon 1994) |
| | <i>Generalization</i> | (Crystal 2003, Baugh and Cable 2002, McMahon 1994) |
| (2) | <i>Narrowing</i> | (Crystal 2003, Baugh and Cable 2002, McMahon 1994, Bauer 1994, Peprník 2006) |
| | <i>Specialization</i> | (Crystal 2003, McMahon 1994) |
| | <i>Restriction</i> | (McMahon 1994) |
| (3) | <i>Amelioration</i> | (Crystal 2003, McMahon 1994, Bauer 1994, Peprník 2006) |
| | <i>Regeneration</i> | (Baugh and Cable 2002) |
| (4) | <i>Deterioration</i> | (Crystal 2003, Peprník 2006) |
| | <i>Pejoration</i> | (Crystal 2003, McMahon 1994, Bauer 1994) |
| | <i>Degeneration</i> | (Baugh and Cable 2002) |

The terms in (1) label the process of broadening the word’s sense so that the word can be used in more contexts than it used to. The terms in (2), however, stand for the exact opposite. When the sense of a word is specialized, it often denotes a more positive sense (3), or a more negative/pejorative one (4). As for the semantic shift of *gay* discussed in the previous paragraph, in Crystal’s opinion (2003, 138) it cannot be said whether this word has undergone *amelioration* or *deterioration*. The classification of some instances of semantic change depends on one’s attitude and morality.

⁵ *OED Online*, s.v. “gay, adj., adv., and n.,” accessed February 11, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/77207?rskey=HoWZpK&result=4>.

It is not an uncommon phenomenon that one word acquires more senses. Peprník (2003, 43), for example, uses the term *branching* for the process of a word becoming polysemous.

3.1.3 *Category shift*

A very economical way of expanding vocabulary is the shift of a word's category known as *conversion* (also *zero-derivation* because there is no affixation added, or *functional shift*). In his *Changing English* (1975, 168) Potter mentions that most frequently *conversion* concerns nouns and verbs. Here is an example of a noun being converted to a verb: *The letter is addressed to John*. Sometimes, a noun can be distinguished from a verb by different placement of stress, which applies to this example. Additionally, "a few verb-noun pairs exhibit vowel and voicing differences" (Aarts and McMahon 2006, 528). It is always context, however, that is crucial in telling the word categories apart.

It is important to mention that the converted form usually does not carry all the senses that has the source form. Crystal (2003, 129) gives an example of the noun *paper* being converted to a verb. As a noun, *paper* has three meanings: "newspaper", "wallpaper", and "academic article". *To paper*, however, solely means to cover walls with wallpaper, that is the verb preserved only the second meaning of the noun.

An example of *conversion* that took place in the twentieth century is the creation of a noun from a verb by adding hyphenated *-in* suffix. This was inspired by the pattern of *sit-in* protests of the previous century (Potter 1975, 172). According to *OED Online*, the *-in* suffix in the sense of "indicating any group protest or large gathering for some common purpose" was first used in the 1960s; for instance a *study-in* (1961), a *pray-in* (1963), or a *hate-in* (1967).⁶

3.1.4 *Compounding, blending and derivation*

Ayto (1999, viii) and Bauer (2006, 483) share the view that combining existing elements is the most common mechanism of creating neologisms in the modern English language. According to Ayto it amounts to almost three quarters of the new words incoming to English (viii).

⁶ *OED Online*, s.v. "-in, suffix3," accessed February 11, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/92978?rskey=8YQN3V&result=14&isAdvanced=false>.

Compounding (also *composition*) is usually described as a process of putting two words together in order to form a third one. A more precise definition can be found for example in the *Handbook of English Linguistics* (2006, 485), according to which compounds are lexemes that inflect just as well as lexemes without a complex inner structure. In addition to that, another characteristic of the internal structure of compounds is that they have at least two lexemic bases, which can be separately inflected when used as independent lexemes and are able to function as heads of the relevant phrases. Furthermore, only one of these bases forming a compound word can take inflection (most often it is the right-hand one).

An example of a compound is shown in (5). This example also demonstrates that orthography does not play a big role in forming a compound, since different spellings might be considered correct.

(5) *word formation/word-formation/wordformation*

In his *Twentieth Century Words* (1999, viii) Ayto makes an important point concerning compounding in the twentieth century: “But there is one particular sort of compound that is highly characteristic of the 20th century: *the blend*.” *Blend* is a new lexeme that is formed by combining parts of two (or more) other words, for example *chunnel* (channel + tunnel). Crystal (2003, 130) agrees that *blending* was a very popular method of lexical construction mainly in the second half of the twentieth century. Ayto (1999, ix) adds that thanks to its aptness it became particularly popular during the 1980s and 1990s.

Another way of creating new words is appending affixes (prefixes or suffixes) to existing words—a process called *derivation* (or *affixation*).⁷ This process may either preserve the word-category or create a different one. According to Potter (1975, 70) affixation is very productive and active and it is difficult to keep count of new derivatives. Among the twentieth century’s words coined by derivation belong for example *counterattack* (from World War I), *counterintelligence* (from World War II), *defrost*, *fandom*, or *racketeer* (Baugh and Cable 2002, 305).

⁷ English does not make much use of *infixes*. When so, people often use them while swearing or as a device of being emphatic, e.g. *absobloominglutely*, or *kangabloodyroo* (Crystal 2003, 128).

3.1.5 Shortening

This process involves shortening of existing lexemes (also *clipping*) while neither the meaning nor the word-class change. Most frequently the initial part of the lexeme is preserved while the end is cut off. However, there are other types, too, for example *shrink* (from *head-shrinker*) (Bauer 1994, 233).

By removing a suffix, a certain subset of shortened words can be created. This process is called *back-formation*.⁸ Bauer (1994, 230) and Ayto (1999, ix) agree that nearly all *back-formations* in the English language are verbs. Ayto further explains that the usage of *back-formation* has spread significantly in the twentieth century, especially in military and scientific jargon. A list of examples of “back-formed forms” is given in Potter (1975, 83–4). For the purposes of this work, only those examples that originated in the twentieth century were selected, see (6) below:

- (6) *liaison* (1915), *emotion* (1917), *peevish* (1918), *sculptor* (1934), *frivolous* (1940), *bulldozer* (1941), *automation* (1950), *television* (1950), *escalation* (1955), *sedative* (1956), *sightseeing* (1960), *laser* (1966)

When there are only initial letters taken from the constituent words of a phrase, it is the case of *initialisms*, for example *BMI* stands for *body mass index*. If the series of initial letters are pronounced as an ordinary word and not each letter separately, it is an *acronym*. The importance of *acronyms* needs to be emphasized for they “have been the 20th century’s great new contribution to English word-formation” (Ayto 1999, ix) and by 1990s they had proliferated into all spheres of modern society. What triggered the spread of acronyms was mainly the emergence of companies and organizations with multi-word names (a significant increase occurred during the World War II) and definitely the contemporary rushed and fast-moving times where people try to save time wherever it is possible (ix).

3.1.6 Borrowing

Since the British Isles were invaded many times by several tribes of different nationalities over its history, it is no wonder that the English language has been influenced by their languages.

⁸ Potter (1975, 83) defines *backformation* as a “regressive or negative derivation, or derivation in reverse.”

Every time there was a new cultural influence, English adopted the corresponding vocabulary. Ayto (1999, ix) gives examples of new culinary vocabulary that has found its way to English vocabulary, for instance: *ciabatta* (Italian), *doner kebab* (Turkish), *courgette* (French). Beyond all doubt, also developments in science and technology, new findings in fauna and flora, and other areas in which people occupy themselves mean the invention of new, relevant vocabulary which is either translated into other languages or borrowed from the source language. An often used term for a borrowed word is a *loanword*.⁹ Probably the most known Czech contribution to the English vocabulary is the word *robot*, which is, at the same time, a neologism of the twentieth century.¹⁰

As Crystal (2003, 126) observes, English never tried to exclude foreign loanwords from its lexicon, it has always been the other way around. According to him, the English language has altogether borrowed vocabulary from over 350 different languages from all around the world.

Concerning the twentieth century, since the end of World War II English has experienced a new influx of foreign words. English gradually became the lingua franca, thanks to which it has made contacts with a great number of languages. This inevitably caused a boom in borrowing (Crystal 2003, 126). Ayto (1999, ix) claims that “foreign borrowing . . . has provided it [the English language] with approximately 5 per cent of its new words in the 20th century.”

3.2 Words mirror their times

The cause of lexical and semantic change is the change that our society undergoes. Those changes reflect the development but also different attitudes that society takes at a given period. As Ayto (1999, iv–v) briefly summarizes it: “Words are a mirror of their times.” He shows in a table which semantic fields were the chief ones in the constituent decades of the twentieth century. Until the 1940s it has been mainly *cars*, *aviation*, *radio*, *film*, *psychology*, *transport*, and of course *war*. Since the 1950s there has been a growing

⁹ Potter (1975, 63) points out that *loanword* is itself a loanword (more precisely a *calque*) of a German word *das Lehnwort*.

¹⁰ *Robot* is an invention of a Czech author Karel Čapek. He minted this word in his famous novel *R.U.R.* (1920).

preoccupation with *the nuclear power, media, space, computers, youth culture, drugs, environment, political correctness*, and in the last decade *the Internet*.

All the above given fields meant new nomenclature. But the second half of the twentieth century also brought changes in some designations of people's occupation, race, gender, sexual orientation and other areas including people that might be perceived as disadvantaged, discriminated or even suppressed. It was the 1970s when people engaged in inventing *politically correct language* and began to coin new neutral words. An example of a way of creating non-discriminatory words taken from *Twentieth Century Words* (1999, 493) is given in (7) below.

- (7) **person** *n* (1971) Used in place of *man* in a range of compound forms in order to avoid an invidious exclusion of women. Mainly found in the titles of jobs and offices that can be held by either sex[B]y the end of the century it had been more or less comfortably absorbed into the language.

Inventing more neutral and socially acceptable appellations is actually often closely related to making *euphemisms*. *Euphemisms* are an inextricable part of the twentieth-century lexis. To give a few examples, *mentally handicapped* people became people *with learning difficulties*, unattractive people became *aesthetically challenged* (Crystal 2003, 177), and a politically correct designation of a *dustbin man* is *refuse collector* (McMahon 1994, 182). If there is a new name for some term invented, it sometimes happens that the former one becomes a *taboo*.

3.3 Reduction of vocabulary

It naturally happens in a language that a word ceases to be used. Such words slowly become *obsolescent*, then *obsolete* (also *out-of-date* or *dated*) and are in many cases substituted with a new term (Peprník 2006, 75). When a word (or expression) is no longer used and understood among people, it becomes *archaic*.

In the present paper, obsolescent words will be searched for in the novel and it will be investigated whether those terms were replaced in the constituent adaptations, or whether they were kept in order to restore the Victorian atmosphere.

4 The novel and adaptations: differences in lexicon

This chapter is devoted to the differences that occur among the constituent adaptations' lexicons. As was already emphasized, words reflect their times and it will be examined here, whether it is so in the selected adaptations. The hypothesis is that there would be words reflecting their times found. It must be taken into account, though, that the script writers might want to make their films Victorian-like, that is, to make their films faithful to the original setting of the novel. Therefore, they might have decided to avoid using neologisms and expressions atypical of that time. The question is: What are the weaknesses of the historicizing adaptations?

The differences in lexicon were examined in the following way. Approximately 4,000 words from each adaptation and approximately 8,000 words from the book (from which only dialogues were selected and taken into account) were examined. They were searched for neologisms and terms which became (or are becoming) obsolete, in order to find out how the lexicon is diachronically changing within the framework of the selected adaptations. It is not the purpose of this chapter to find and show all neologisms, or all obsolete terms. That is the reason for not examining the whole book and whole film scripts.

The purpose is also to ascertain whether the obsolescent words that were being used in the original story were replaced with their more modern counterparts. While searching for the substitutive words, the whole scripts of the adaptations were examined. The apparent reason for this is that each film is different and the given word that is looked for in the scripts might appear in a different part of each film.

4.1 Neologisms

A table of neologisms that were detected in the book and the scripts is provided below. The rows in **Table 1** are divided according to the way the words were formed. The columns stand for the years in which the adaptations were released.

Only a few neologisms occurred in the examined part of the novel (besides, it can be only speculated how "old" can a word be to be still counted

as a neologism). Nonetheless, **Table 1** demonstrates an interesting finding. The first three adaptations truly managed to adhere to the vocabulary used in the Victorian times, since there were no neologisms used in their scripts, save for one departure from the rule. That is, in the 1959 adaptation, Doctor Mortimer talks about a *horse-bus* which had not been invented until 1905 (this is an important incongruity and is further discussed in chapter 4.3). However, this does not hold true for the last adaptation which transports Sherlock Holmes to the twenty-first century.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
new coinage		1. toff (1851)			
semantic change					1. twitter (2006) 2. clone (n.) (1982)
compounding, blending, derivation	1. breaking point (1899) 2. telegram (1852) 3. dolichocephalic (1849–52)		1. stop press (1881) 2. arteriosclerosis (1860) 3. boot-boy (1860) 4. horse-bus (1905) 5. telegram	1. dolichocephalic	1. website (1993) 2. hush-hush (1916) 3. cuppa (colloq. 1925) 4. documentary (1935) 5. top-secret (1944) 6. e-mail (1979)
shortening, initialism, acronym					1. blog (1999) 2. TV (1948) 3. NATO (1949) 4. MOD (1965) 5. I. D. (1955) 6. WHO (1946) 7. cell (1988)
phrase	1. catch a glimpse (1872)				

Table 1: Neologisms¹¹

On the whole, the majority of the detected neologisms were created either by compounding, blending, or derivation. This proves the claim by Ayto (1999, viii) and Bauer (2006, 483) that the prevalent way of creating neologisms in English is by combining existing elements.

¹¹ In case of multiple incidence of some terms in the table, the subsidiary information that is given in the parentheses is not provided alongside the repeated term. This rule applies to all the subsequent tables.

4.1.1 *Shortening of existing words*

What also proved to be true is the increasing popularity of coining neologisms by creating clippings, acronyms and initialisms, which has, according to Ayto (1999, ix), rapidly increased in all areas of modern society by the end of the twentieth century.¹²

There were no instances of clippings, initialisms or acronyms detected in the novel. Neither were in the 1939, 1959, and 1988 adaptations which endeavour to imitate the English of the Victorian Age.

The most recent adaptation presents a significant change. There were seven instances detected. Three of them were created by clipping: *blog* was shortened from *weblog*, *cell* was shortened from *cellphone* (which is a blend of *cellular* and *phone*), and although it might seem that *I.D.* is an initialism, it is not, because it was not created from the initial letters of two words, it was shortened from *identification* or *identity*. *NATO*, which stands for *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, is an acronym since it is pronounced as one word. The remaining ones are initialisms: *TV* (from a compound: *tele+vision*), *MOD* (*Ministry of Defence*), *WHO* (*World Health Organization*).

4.1.2 *From telegram to cell*

The last column shows significant progress in technology and Sherlock Holmes keeping up with it. The modern Sherlock using *twitter* and *e-mail*, writing a *website*, watching *documentaries* on *TV*, reading John's *blog* and calling with his *cell* clearly demonstrates the reason why the recent Sherlock is called a "millennial technowizard" (Stein and Busse, 10). This shift from receiving *telegrams* (or *wires*) and letters written with ink to text messages which Sherlock reads on his smart phone, is only one of the many manifestations of adjusting the original Victorian story to twenty-first-century audiences. Therefore, the perception of Sherlock Holmes being up-to-date and using the latest technology for solving crimes has not changed.

4.2 Obsolescence

Far more instances of terms becoming obsolete or old-fashioned were detected than instances of neologisms in the novel. **Table 2** shows those

¹² For more information, see 3.1.4 Compounding, blending and derivation and 3.1.5 Shortening.

obsolescent terms, many of which were reused in the first three adaptations, clearly to create Victorian atmosphere. The artificial language which is created for those purposes, however, does not always correspond to it and this will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

The last adaptation is not trying to maintain the atmosphere of past times, but on the contrary. This is reflected in not using any of the old-fashioned or obsolete terms from the novel—that is the reason for the rightmost column being blank. While searching for obsolescent terms in the novel, there were a number of terms found that are nowadays perceived (and therefore labelled in dictionaries) as formal. This will be discussed in chapter 6.3.4 in greater depth.

More importantly, in case the obsolescent words were not used in an adaptation, the crucial questions are: Are those outdated words being replaced with modern ones? Are they replaced with completely new terms or are they substituted by already existing terms that have only become more commonly used? Those questions are discussed in the following sub-chapter.

novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
1. kin (old-fash. or form.) 2. kinsman (old-fash. or lit.) 3. ere (old use or lit.) 4. lad (= a boy or a young man) (old-fash., BrE) 5. dwelling (obsolete/form.) 6. why (interjection) (old-fash. or NAmE) 7. pray (adv.) (old use or ironic) 8. whence (old use) 9. chap (BrE, inf., becoming old-fash.) 10. by Jove (old- fash., inf., esp. BrE) 11. fellow (referring to a man/boy) (becoming old-fash., inf.)	1. gentleman (becoming old-fash.) 2. Yes, rather . (old-fash., BrE) 3. by the by (old-fash.) 4. gent (old-fash. or hum.) 5. look here (= to protest) (old-fash.) 6. splendid (old-fash., esp. BrE) 7. fellow	1. why 2. pray 3. confounded (old-fash.) 4. gentlemen 5. why 6. scoundrel (old-fash.) 7. rigmarole (now rare) 8. retainer (= servant) (old-fash.) 9. fellow	1. why 2. no mistake (old-fash., esp. BrE/colloq.) 3. chaff (v.) (old-fash. or form.) 4. infernal (old-fash.) 5. fellow	

Table 2: Obsolescence

4.2.1 *Replacing obsolescent words*

So far, it has been proved that the English lexicon is changing, that some words from the beginning of the twentieth century are becoming obsolete, and that it is observable in the film adaptations of *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. The focus of this sub-chapter is to find out whether (and by which words) those words are being substituted for. The sentences from the novel where the obsolescent words have been used were grouped according to the category of *illocutionary speech acts* to which they belong. Afterwards, the film scripts were searched for words that have been used in the same category to replace those obsolete or old-fashioned terms.¹³

It is important to bear in mind that each adaptation differs from the original story to a greater or lesser degree and that some scenes might be omitted. Therefore it is not always possible to find the relevant words that would replace the dated ones.

The greatest number of obsolescent words were detected in sentences that were classified as *Assertives*. This category contains sentences, where the following obsolescent/obsolete/old-fashioned words were used: *lad*, *chap*, *fellow*, *kin*, *kinsman*, *ere*, *dwelling*, and *whence*.

The words *lad* and *fellow* have very similar meanings (both referring to a boy or a man). In the 1959 adaptation, the word *man* is used instead, and the 2012 adaptation also uses *guy*. *Chap* (referring to a man in a friendly way) is substituted with *bloke* in the 2012 film. The word *kin* is simply replaced by *family* in the 1959 and 1988 adaptations, but no substitution for *kinsman* was found. The conjunction *ere* was not used anymore, not even in the first adaptation which replaces it with *soon*. The obsolete word *dwelling* was substituted with *house* in all the adaptations. And finally, the no-longer-used adverb *whence* is replaced by *from where*, and the example sentences were found both in the first and in the last adaptations.

Moving towards the category of *Directives*, those words were used in sentences categorized as attempting to get the audience to perform some future action: *lad*, *fellow*, *pray*, *whence*. No new substitutions were found for *lad* and *whence* in the category of *Directives*. The word *fellow* was replaced by *man*

¹³ The relevant data was put into tables provided in Appendix.

in the 1959 and 1988 adaptations. The adverb *pray* has found its substitution in the 1939, 1988, and 2012 adaptations—*please*.

In the category of *Commissives* the word *fellow* was replaced by *man* in the 2012 adaptation, just as well as in the category of *Assertives* and *Directives*.

In the category of *Expressives*, the word *fellow* is reused in the first three adaptations. The most recent one replaces it with *boy*. The interjection *why* was not replaced by anything in the first three films. There was no usage of *why* found in the 2012 adaptation and it is difficult to state which interjection has replaced it because it can be used for many different occasions (to express surprise, indignation, shock, etc., or it can be used to intensify one's approval of something). Nowadays, expressions like *Oh, God!* or *Oh God!* would be used instead. Similarly, the expression *By Jove!* which would be used for instance to emphasize the utterance or to express the speaker's surprise, would be nowadays substituted with *God!*, *Oh my god!*, *Jesus!* or for example *Jeez!*

4.2.1.1 Fellow

It was discovered that *fellow* is a very commonly used word both in the novel and in the adaptations (except for the most recent one), and for that reason a closer attention will be paid to it in this sub-chapter.

OED Online lists 10 main senses of the “*fellow n.*” entry.¹⁴ Over the course of history, the original sense has altered. Originally, this word designated *a partner, colleague, co-worker* or *an ally*. Together with the second listed sense *a companion, associate, comrade*, their last recorded usage was in the 17th century. Most of the remaining senses were last used in the 19th century. The only senses which endured to the 20th century are phrases such as: *good/jolly fellow, what a fellow, poor fellow, stout fellow, my dear fellow, my good fellow, old fellow*, compounds like *fellow-worker*, and another sense that has not much in common with the sense of employee rating.¹⁵ The original sense has narrowed to a specific one which has been used

¹⁴ *OED Online*, s.v. “fellow, n.” accessed April 15, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/69094?rkey=0Z7GLy&result=1&isAdvanced=false>.

¹⁵ One other sense has endured to the 20th century, but is marked as colloquial or dialectal: “Of a person: The consort, spouse, husband or wife. Also of animals.”

until today: “the term *fellow* [is] applied to the Senior Scholars, who have graduated, or otherwise passed out of the stage of tutelage.”¹⁶

More to the point, Sherlock Holmes is known for his familiar addressing phrase “*my dear fellow*” and so it is not surprising that this phrase is repeated by the film *Sherlock*.¹⁷ Even though the word *fellow* is used in phrases throughout the novel (*a young fellow, an excellent fellow, my good fellow, poor fellow, etc.*), more importantly, a number of times it is also used independently, without a modifying adjective. The last recorded sense in *OED Online* which was “used without adj. as the ordinary equivalent for ‘man’” was in the late nineteenth century. Therefore, the usage of *fellow* (not being a part of a phrase) in the novel, at the very beginning of the twentieth century, is completely acceptable. The film adaptations, however, use archaizing language in order to restore the semblance of Victorian atmosphere.

To sum up, the word *fellow* has preserved the meaning of a *man* in phrases (adj+*fellow*) up to the twentieth century (there are no recordings of their usage in the twenty-first century in *OED Online*). Those phrases occur repeatedly in the adaptations (except for the last one) and it can be considered perfectly acceptable for their language. However, as they try to simulate Victorian language, they deliberately archaize the language of their characters by the usage of an independent *fellow*.

Since *fellow* has been narrowed to a specific sense that is understood in the contemporary society, and since the 2012 adaptation does not try to simulate archaic language, the word *fellow* is not used at all there.

4.3 New terms for improved inventions

One more matter needs to be taken into account. As a consequence of human inventions being constantly developed, a new term is often coined for the improved invention to replace the old term. The reason for it might be that the newly invented/developed/up-graded thing does not have much in common with the original one anymore, and it is therefore more convenient to differentiate between the two things. The old term might become obsolete (or even archaic),

¹⁶ *OED Online*, s.v. “fellow, n.” accessed April 15, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/69094?rkey=0Z7GLy&result=1&isAdvanced=false>.

¹⁷ The modes of addressing are discussed in chapter 7.4.3 Addressing.

or simply continue to exist and be perceived as an outdated invention. There are no special time markers attached to such terms in dictionary entries. Instead of a time marker, it is usually written in the definition that the given term used to be used in the past.

Such cases also occur in the novel and its adaptations. Among the most rapidly changing areas of human involvement surely belong long-distance communication system and transportation. The progress in the long-distance communication has already been mentioned in chapter 4.1—to remind an example: *telegrams* were replaced by *cell phones*. As far as the latter is concerned, Doyle's Sherlock Holmes could take a ride in a *hansom cab* whereas the modern Sherlock could take a *taxi*.

Despite *hansom-cab* (shortly *hansom*) being quite a novelty in the Victorian times (1852), the book characters take a ride in it only twice in the story, see (8). Although *cab* (1826) is a predecessor to *hansom*, it is much commonly used as a means of transport in the novel (20 times), see example (9). Once Dr. Mortimer made use of a *gig* (1791) which was a small one-horse carriage having only two wheels (10). *Carriage* (1741), which is understood to have four wheels and being driven by one or more horses, was made use of four times in the original story (11), and a small carriage called *trap* (1807) was driven four times, as well (12).¹⁸

- (8) *An instant afterwards he gave a little cry of satisfaction, and, following the direction of his eager eyes, I saw that a hansom cab with a man inside which had halted on the other side of the street was now proceeding slowly onward again.*

Setting aside the whole grim story of Sir Charles's death, we had a line of inexplicable incidents all within the limits of two days, which included the receipt of the printed letter, the black-bearded spy in the hansom, the loss of the new brown boot, the loss of the old black boot, and now the return of the new brown boot.

- (9) H: "Shall I have a cab called?"
- (10) M: "I had descended from my gig and was standing in front of him, when I saw his eyes fix themselves over my shoulder, and stare past me with an expression of the most dreadful horror."
- (11) H: "Send back your trap, however, and let them know that you intend to walk home."

¹⁸ For terms "hansom cab", "hansom", "cab", "gig", "trap", "carriage", and further "horse-bus" and "taxi" from the following paragraphs, *OED Online* was consulted, accessed April 8, 2015.

- (12) *Our friends had already secured a first-class carriage and were waiting for us upon the platform.*

The 1939, 1959, and 1988 films try to adhere to the Victorian times as much as possible by their historicizing approach. On that account, the mentioned terms for horse-driven vehicles had to be used, obviously because the actors make use of those vehicles, and so they actually appear on the screen.

As much as those adaptations deliberately attempted to historicize the language, there is one incongruity in the 1959 adaptation. Conan Doyle's Doctor Mortimer could not have said: "*I'm a few minutes late, I'm afraid. Those confounded horse-buses,*" because according to *OED Online*, the term *horse-bus* has been first used in 1905, and the novel was published in 1902, so the word did not exist then. This imperfection could be regarded as an "ornament", a deliberate (although wrongly chosen) archaism used in order to create a popular impression of Victorian England.

With their artistic production the film makers pander to their contemporary audience by creating an artificial language of the beginning of the twentieth century. They, however, select only certain aspects, and apart from making common mistakes, their negligence is also apparent elsewhere, for example by not using as much formal expressions as the novel does.¹⁹

The 2012 adaptation is put into the contemporary world, so it follows that there are no horse-driven vehicles. It would suggest itself that the term *taxi* (of British origin, shortened from *taxi-cab*, invented in 1907) would be used instead. However, the viewers of "The Hounds of Baskerville" will only hear Holmes say: "*None of the cabs would take me.*" This is a case of semantic change. The term *cab* acquired a new sense when the horse-driven vehicle developed into a motor vehicle. A British person talking of a *cab* instead of a *taxi* is an example of American influence on British English. According to a dictionary of Americanisms the term *cab* is attributed to American origin and is no longer perceived by the British people to be an Americanism.²⁰

¹⁹ For more information on this subject, see chapter 6.3.4 Informalization? Colloquialization?

²⁰ *Slovník amerikanismů*, 3rd ed., s.v. "cab."

5 Americanization

The reason for devoting a whole chapter to American English (henceforth AmE) as an influence on British English (henceforth BrE) is simple:

British and American English still occupy a unique position in that they still are the only two standard varieties with a truly global reach, and hence more likely to influence the future shape of the language than standards with a regional or national scope. (Leech et al. 2009, 11)

The influence of AmE was not uniform. The United States achieved their global domination after the Second World War. At this exact time period, speakers of BrE became aware of and consequently afraid of excessive *Americanization* of their language (Leech et al. 2009, 21). Therefore, it is not anticipated to come across numerous instances of American influence neither in the book, nor in the 1939 adaptation. The hypothesis is, however, that some occurrence will be found in the later adaptations.

Although Mair (2006, 193) asserts that the “world English” will not be as much assimilated to American norms as it might seem, he nonetheless acknowledges the indisputable American influence on other varieties and even designates the twentieth century as an “American Century”.

In their chapter “Current Changes in English Syntax” Leech and Mair (2006, 336) claim that *Americanization* intertwines with *grammaticalization* and *colloquialization*, meaning that one process does not necessarily mean ruling out the other. An example of *Americanization* intermingling with *colloquialization* is the growing usage of semi-modals or the diminishing usage of *be* passives.

Americanization is predominantly realized in the lexicon. American twentieth-century neologisms have penetrated not only into other English-language varieties but into foreign languages, too.²¹ Grammar, in comparison with the lexicon, was only moderately influenced, and pronunciation almost not at all (Mair 2006, 193–4).

As far as grammar is concerned, a frequently debated influence of AmE on BrE grammar is the unexpected increase in the usage of once abandoned

²¹ BrE has been borrowing words from AmE since the early nineteenth century (Leech et al. 2009, 21).

mandative subjunctive (Mair 2006, 193; Mair and Leech 2006, 336; Leech et al. 2009, 11). The following section is dedicated to this grammatical construction because “the subjunctive is one of the few areas of grammar where there are differences between standard British and American English” (Johansson and Norheim 1988, 27).

5.1 Mandative subjunctive

Gerd Overgaard ascertained in her diachronic study *The mandative subjunctive in American and British English in the 20th century* (1995) (cited in Peters 2006, 771) that until the end of the Second World War the usage of *mandative subjunctive* (henceforth MS) in BrE had been rather low (and lower than in AmE). With the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century, however, Overgaard’s data show a steep ascent in the British usage of MS (particularly from the 1960s).²²

According to Quirk et al. (1985, 157), it is less typical for BrE to use this construction, and is mostly used in formal or even legalistic style, but they also admit that it is probably due to American influence that the use of MS was revived. Their definition of MS is the following:

[MS] occurs in subordinate *that*-clauses, and consists of the base form of the verb only. Thus there is a lack of the regular concord of the indicative mood between subject and finite verb, and there is no backshifting of tense . . . ie the present and past variants are formally indistinguishable . . . [T]he *that*-clause [is] introduced by an expression of demand, recommendation, proposal, resolution, intention, etc. This expression takes the form of a verb, an adjective, or a noun.

There are three types of mandative patterns distinguished. In *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (2002, 995) they call them “subjunctive mandates” (13), “should-mandatives” (14), and “covert mandates” (15).²³

(13) *Her friends recommend(ed) that she go to see that exposition.*

(14) *Her friends recommend(ed) that she should go to see that exposition.*

²² The corpus of literary texts which Overgaard uses for her study ranges between 1900 and 1990.

²³ Quirk et al. (1985) and some other linguists refer to the “should-mandative” construction as a “putative *should*” and to the “covert mandative” simply as an “indicative verb.” It was this very book that used the term “mandative subjunctive” for the first time.

(15) *Her friends recommend that she goes to see that exposition.*

Her friends recommended that she went to see that exposition.

There is no agreement in the MS construction between the subject and predicate in the subordinate *that*-clause and there is no backshifting of the tense in the proposition. The two latter constructions are favoured in BrE, whereas in AmE they occur only marginally. In case of the covert mandatives, the verbs in indicative mood act in accordance with the regular concord, and in case of past tense, there is regular backshifting.

Quirk et al. (1985, 157) make an interesting point that “there is a tendency in BrE to choose the subjunctive more especially when the finite verb is BE (eg in the passive voice),” as in (16) below.

(16) *We demand that the case be investigated immediately.*

What is very important for the present paper, is an observation by Pam Peters (2009, 128) who claims (after having examined several corpus-based researches) that MS actually appears more frequently in the spoken discourse in BrE than in written texts. This notion disputes the claim by Quirk et al. (1985, 157) that it is mostly formal written contexts where the usage of MS in BrE occur. This finding increases the possibility that MS was/is used also in relatively neutral contexts that might relate to the situations selected from the adaptations of *The Hound of the Baskervilles*.

The etymology of the word “mandative” mirrors its use. The noun was derived from the verb “mandate” which in Latin means *to enjoin, command*. MS are constructions that express a “demand, request, intention, proposal, suggestion, recommendation, etc” (Serpellet 2001, 532). Quirk et al. (1985, 1182) give a list of so called “suasive verbs” which can be followed by *that*-clause either with a “*should*-mandative”, with an indicative verb, or with a MS (see **Table 3**).

As this is probably the most discussed and studied influence of AmE, it will be searched for in the selected adaptations. It will not be surprising if no examples of MS are found in the novel or in the adaptation from 1939, but in the post-war adaptations there is a greater possibility that some instances of the usage of MS will be found.

agree	demand	intend	recommend
allow	desire	move	request
arrange	determine	ordain	require
ask	enjoin	order	resolve
beg	ensure	pledge	rule
command	entreat	pray	stipulate
concede	grant	prefer	suggest
decide	insist	pronounce	urge
decree	instruct	propose	vote

Table 3. Suasive verbs. (Quirk et al. 1985, 1182)

5.2 The novel and adaptations: American influence

The purpose of this chapter is to find out to what extent is the American influence observable in *The Hound of the Baskervilles* and its adaptations. Were there any American words used? Did BrE adopt the MS construction to that extent that it would be used in the adaptations' scripts?

The influence of AmE on the English lexicon will be pursued first. The amount of examined words was the same as for detecting changes in lexicon, that is approximately 4,000 words from each film script and approximately 8,000 words from the novel (from which narrative parts were omitted).

Thereafter, the usage of MS will be discussed. The whole text of the novel and whole scripts were examined. Both the novel and each constituent adaptation were searched for the "suasive verbs" (listed in **Table 3**) which would be followed by a subordinate *that*-clause.

It is important to emphasize that the American influence was immensely increased after the second half of the twentieth century. On that account, the hypothesis is that there would be more instances of *Americanisms* in the three later adaptations than in the first one, or in the novel. Moreover, the MS usage in BrE is said to ascent significantly after 1960s, therefore the hypothesis is that the MS construction will be found primarily in the two most recent adaptations.

5.2.1 Americanisms

As **Table 4** clearly demonstrates, the hypothesis proved to be right. The terms in the table are considered to be of American origin or (in case of some terms in the rightmost column) are used especially in North America.²⁴ The extent of American influence on the language of the twenty-first century is evident from the table.

novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
1. wire (inf.)	1. Keep me posted . 2. clipping (n.)	1. man (in addressing) (inf.) 2. cartridge (= a case containing bullets) 3. watch out	1. haven't gotten 2. dammit (inf.)	1. pay off 2. TV 3. I guess (esp. NAmE, inf.) 4. nights (= at night) (esp. NAmE) 5. gonna (colloq., esp. U.S./inf., non- standard) 6. wanna (inf., non-standard) 7. spot-check 8. cell (inf., esp. NAmE)

Table 4: Americanisms

The only odd thing is that there were only two *Americanisms* found in the 1988 adaptation. One possible explanation for this unexpected incongruity could be that the script writers intended to assimilate the language of their characters to the language used in the book as much as possible, so that there truly is no other American term. Alternatively, it is also possible that some *Americanisms* were overlooked during the examination, by mistake.

5.2.1.1 There is an Americanism and an “Americanism”

The verb *damn* is listed as an *Americanism* just as well as phrases like *I’ll be damned* or *I don’t give a damn*.²⁵ It is used in “imprecations and exclamations . . . or sometimes [expressing] merely an outburst of irritation

²⁴ For classifying those terms, Peprník’s *Slovník amerikanismů*, *OED Online*, and *OALD* were consulted.

²⁵ *Slovník amerikanismů*, 3rd ed., s.v. “damn.”

or impatience.”²⁶ The expression *dammit* used in the 1988 adaptation stands for *damn it* and expresses Sir Henry’s irritation for he was twice stolen a boot.

This is the second sentence that Sir Henry utters in the film: “*And I’ll have an answer dammit!*” In a short while (still the same scene), he explains his annoyance to Dr. Mortimer: “*I’m sorry Mortimer, I’m sorry to trouble you with this nonsense but this is a first class hotel, dammit!*”

Those two sentences are among the first ones that the viewer of the 1988 adaptation hears from Sir Henry. His saying *dammit* twice in his introductory scene is probably not coincidental. Sir Henry Baskerville, as the last of the Baskervilles, came to England to take over the Baskervilles’ heritage, and what is important, he came to England from America where he had spent nearly all his life. Therefore, the film makers deliberately and literally “put American words into Sir Henry’s mouth” thanks to which they create an unmistakably American character.

This is the very scene that introduces Sir Henry Baskerville to this particular film (some man from the boat, by which they came to England, says goodbye to Sir Henry):

(17) a man: “*Been a pleasure having you aboard, Sir Henry.*”

He: “*Sir Henry. I still haven’t gotten used to that title.*”

The usage of *gotten*, which is an American form of the past participle of the verb *get*, was obviously intentional, as well. On that account, *dammit* and *gotten* are not *Americanisms* in the sense that they would affect the BrE usage. Those expressions were, in all likelihood, used deliberately to differentiate Sir Henry’s speech from Victorian English.

5.2.2 *MS construction*

The novel and the adaptations were searched for the “suasive verbs” (which can be followed by MS) followed by a subordinate *that*-clause. Those were further examined whether they could be counted among MS constructions.

²⁶ OED Online, s.v. “damn, v.” accessed April 15, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/47064?rskey=HPzYOt&result=8&isAdvanced=false>.

As far as the novel is concerned, there were only instances of “should-mandative” and “covert mandatives” found.²⁷

The 1939, 1959, and 2012 adaptations did not employ the MS construction either. One example of employing MS was detected, after all—in the 1988 adaptation, see example (18) below.

(18) *“I pray nightly that it remove itself from us whatever it is and that we all may sleep the more soundly.”*

Having found only one instance of the MS usage, there can be no generalizations done. It cannot be said that the hypothesis proved to be right. Even though there was only one instance found, it is in accordance with what has been claimed about the ascent of the usage in BrE, that is, that this construction has been used mainly since 1960s, and the detected usage is from the 1988 adaptation. The lack of the MS usage rather corresponds to the opinion of Quirk et al. (1985, 157) that the MS construction is predominantly used in formal or legalistic contexts, which have not been herein examined.

²⁷ It is impossible to determine whether it is or it is not the case of MS when the subject of the subordinate clause is not a noun in the third person singular because in that case there is no visible agreement with the verb in English. See for example the following sentence taken from the novel:

“I suggest that we put it in one of the huts until we can communicate with the police.”

6 Sociocultural influence

The focus of this chapter is on shaping the English language as an inevitable consequence of social and cultural influences in the twentieth century.

6.1 Colloquialization and informalization

A phenomenon that became very spread in the course of the twentieth century and has vastly impacted the norms of written English is *colloquialization*—“a tendency for written norms to become more informal and move closer to speech” (Leech et al. 2009, 20). According to Mair (2006, 183), the increasing level of informality can be considered as a characteristic feature of the preceding century. Thanks to that, the differences between spoken and written style are slowly fading away.

Colloquialization manifests itself for example in the decreasing usage of passive verbs, *wh*- relative clauses in favour of *that*-clauses or clauses with no relative pronoun, complex noun phrases, and no-negation in favour of not-negation; while on the other hand, in the increasing usage of contracted forms (both negatives and verbs), questions in general, semi-modals, get-passives, and progressives, (Leech et al. 2009, 239–44; Farrelly and Soane 2012, 395).

Colloquialization is closely related to another trend of the twentieth century, that is *informalization*. *Informalization* means shortening the distance between the addresser and the addressee with the intention to make the text more accessible to the readership. Unlike *colloquialization*, *informalization* has impact not only on non-expository writings, but also on academic writings and journalistic and scientific registers. This might include “interactional features” (questions, imperatives) or avoidance of complex sentences and passive constructions (Farrelly and Soane 2012, 394–95).

It would be very interesting to investigate those tendencies in the written reworkings of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (and there is a great number of them). This paper, however, does not deal with comparing different stages of the written language, and what is more, it was mainly the second part of the twentieth century that has witnessed the growth in colloquial and informal

writing (Leech et al. 2009, 22) and *The Hound of the Baskervilles* was published in 1902.

This does not mean, though, that no attention will be paid to *colloquialization* or *informalization* in this research. It is still possible that some indications of colloquial or somewhat informal usage will be detected in the dialogues of the novel because they are both long-term phenomena which have not occurred only during the twentieth century, but in the preceding centuries as well: “this swift toward more oral styles has been at work in the written language for the last four centuries” (Farrelly and Soane 2012, 394). What is more, as will be shown in the following chapter, the terminology for the “moving-closer-to-speech” phenomena considerably overlap.

6.2 Democratization of discourse

Leech et al. (2009, 259) describe *democratization* as a “reflection, through language, of changing norms in personal relations.” This trend has affected the way people interact with each other mainly during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The intent of its adoption was to ameliorate the perception of the speakers’ unequal positions, to eliminate overt power markers and asymmetries, and to induce an impression of greater familiarity (Fairclough 1992, 203; Leech et al. 2009, 259; Farrelly and Soane 2012, 393).

Fairclough (1992, 98) claims that *democratization* of discourse is closely related to the “conversational discourse” typical for private conversations which is increasingly expanding into “institutional domains” and public spheres. The terminology of some authors overlap. Fairclough does not make a clear distinction between *democratization* and *colloquialization*, and his definition of *democratization* includes, in fact, *colloquialization*. In their chapter on *democratization*, Farrelly and Soane (2012, 393) also include *colloquialization* as an “area of discursive democratization”, just as well as *informalization*. They maintain the opinion that those phenomena are interconnected to such an extent that it is necessary to relate one to another.

A concrete case of *democratization* is the decline of *must* in favor of *need to* and *have to*—which according to Leech et al. (2009, 259) might be a manifestation of the evasion of an authoritarian position. This particular trend has been taking place mainly in the later decades of the twentieth century (88).

Another example is connected with the tendency of the second half of the twentieth century (mainly from the 1970s on)—to suppress sexist and gender-biased language. The gender-neutral *he* (including *him*, *his*, and *himself*) as in (19) has been increasingly replaced by the singular *they* (*them*, *their*, *themselves*)²⁸ as is demonstrated in (20) (Leech et al. 2009, 261; Farrelly and Soane 2012, 394).²⁹

(19) *Everyone cleaned his own room.*

(20) *Everyone cleaned their own room.*

Fairclough (1992, 205) points out that if the masculine pronoun *he* was truly “generic”, it would be used in all contexts and for all groups of people uniformly. Nevertheless, there are some cases where the pronoun *she* instead of *he* is preferred: “‘She’ is used in this way when the stereotypical member of the set of people at issue is a woman: the typical secretary, or nurse, is a woman” (206).

There are other alternatives to the gender-neutral (or “generic”) use of *he*. The first is the *he or she/she or he* pattern. This pattern has also increased in usage during the late twentieth century but it did not manage to evoke gender neutrality, since the pattern predominantly begins with the pronoun *he* (Leech et al. 2009, 263). Moreover, such a long pattern becomes tedious after some repetitions. Orthographic solution like *s/he* is, of course, inapplicable in spoken discourse (Ayto 1999, 456).

The second manifestation of *democratization* triggered by the interest in gender relations is the decreasing usage of words containing *man*.³⁰ The *man* morpheme is either replaced by another one (*humankind* instead of *mankind*), is simply left out (*chair* instead of *chairman*), or a whole new term is coined (*artificial* instead of *man-made*) (Ayto 1999, 456; Farrelly and Soane 2012, 394).

Another instance of *democratization* of discourse is the way people address one another. The usage of titles with proper names (*Mr.*, *Mrs.*, *Miss*, *Ms.*)

²⁸ The singular *they* is no novelty, it has been used “particularly in the environment of indefinite pronouns such as *somebody* and *anyone*, since at least the 16th century” (Ayto 1999, 456).

²⁹ The reflexive pronoun *themselves* has a non-standard alternative in this context, i.e. *themsel*. This form is considered to be a logical singular counterpart to *themselves*, but it has not been fully established in formal written contexts, yet.

Oxford Dictionaries. 2015. "'Themselves' or 'themsel'?" Accessed March 23. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/words/themselves-or-themsel.html>.

³⁰ *Man* being replaced by neutral (politically correct) *person* has been already discussed in chapter 3.2, example (7).

has decreased in frequency. Farrelly and Soane (2012, 394) and Leech et al. (2009, 259–261) agree that the reason for omitting titular nouns is to avoid social and gender-related distinctions. Besides, there is nothing that would replace them. People more and more address one another only by their first name, or by both first name and surname, instead (Leech et al. 2009, 261).

6.3 The novel and adaptations: democratization

The first manifestation of a discourse being democratized that will be examined in this chapter is the decreasing usage of words that contain the morpheme *man*, as a demonstration of the society’s negative attitude towards gender-biased language. Secondly, it will be investigated whether there is some usage of the singular *they* (mainly in those adaptations which were released after 1970s, that is 1989 and 2012) in order to avoid the masculine pronoun *he*. If so, the question is: Has the usage of the singular *they* penetrated into all five categories of *illocutionary speech acts*? The next issue examined in this chapter are the more familiar modes of addressing, specifically the ways Sherlock Holmes addresses John Watson and vice versa. Do they gradually become more familiar?

6.3.1 Words containing *man*

Words containing the *man* morpheme were searched for in the whole texts via the “full reader search” tool in Adobe Reader. “Whole words only” button being off, the program searched for all words that had *man* incorporated in them. Then, after excluding the irrelevant words (such as *manuscript*, *demand*, *many*, and other), the applicable data were put into **Table 5** below.

novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
1. cabman 2. clergyman 3. countryman 4. foeman 5. chairman 6. kinsman 7. madman 8. manservant 9. policeman	1. coachman 2. Englishman			1. fisherman

Table 5: Decreasing usage of words containing *man*

The data in **Table 5** seems to confirm the tendency towards avoiding words that contain the *man* morpheme.

As far as the novel is concerned, in 6 cases out of 9, the term was related to someone of male sex and instead of using a neutral one, a “*man* term” was chosen. In the remaining 3 cases, it was not referred to a specific sex. The 3 non-gender-specific words are: *kinsman*, *policeman*, and *cabman*. Although words *kinswoman* and *policewoman* have already existed, the author decided to choose the male counterpart. Nowadays, the preferred terms would be *relative* and *police officer*. There was no entry for *cabwoman* in *OED Online* found, probably because this profession was not commonly practised by women. There is a neutral term *cab/taxi driver* that would be preferred now.

Although it was referred to men in the other 6 cases, there are corresponding equivalents used in the present century: *priest* for *clergyman*, *villager* for *countryman*, *adversary/enemy* for *foeman* (or the clipped *foe* could be used), *chair* for *chairman*, *lunatic* for *madman*, and eventually (*male/female*) *servant* for *manservant*.

In the 1939 adaptation, *coachman* could have had a female counterpart—*coachwoman*, but the presently preferred term would be *coach driver*. Similarly, there are, of course *Englishwomen*, and the neutral term embracing the people of England is *the English*.

There were no *man*-containing words detected in the 1959 and 1988 adaptations, and only one such word was found in the latest adaptation.³¹ By a quick look at **Table 5**, it might be said that the table proves the decreasing frequency of their usage.

Having said that, when closer attention to the individual words is paid, other explanations for their usage emerge. The decreasing usage of words containing *man* found in *The Hound of the Baskervilles* and its adaptations cannot be attributed only to the avoidance of gender-biased language. Other reasons must be taken into consideration. Firstly, some of the words that were detected in the novel are simply no longer used, or are not so common anymore. The word

³¹ Although there is a female counterpart *fisherwoman*, in this particular case it is talked about a man, so the term is used correctly. There is a neutral term *fisher* but it is used especially in North America.

kinsman, for example, is nowadays considered old-fashioned and literary,³² and *foeman* even archaic or poetic.³³ Secondly, as far as the words that stand for professions are concerned (*cabman*, *clergyman*, *chairman*, *policeman*), it must be taken into account that such professions were probably not commonly practised by women at the beginning of the twentieth century—that is certainly a possible explanation for not using gender-neutral words in the novel.

6.3.2 *The singular they*

The usage of the singular *they* was searched for in the same way as were the words containing *man*. The original intent was to further divide the detected usages of the singular *they* according to the pragmatic frames. Unfortunately, there were too few cases detected to find out whether the usage of the singular *they* has spread into all five categories of *illocutionary speech acts*.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
Assertives	1. H: And also that someone is not ill-disposed towards you, since they warn you of danger. 2. He: Or it may be that they wish, for their own purposes, to scare me away.		He: They 've gone. Whoever they are, they must have heard us.		Ms S: Listen, if you can imagine it, someone is probably doing it somewhere. Of course they are.
Directives				W: Well, how did you know someone 's been following Baskerville? H: How else did they know so immediately where he was staying?	

Table 6: The usage of the singular *they*

The collected data were put into **Table 6**. Despite the fact that the usage of the singular *they* occurs only in two categories of *illocutionary speech acts*, the table reveals another interesting fact: despite the singular *they* being a trend

³² *OED Online*, s.v. “kinsman, n.” accessed April 15, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/103587?redirectedFrom=kinsman>.

³³ *OED Online*, s.v. “foeman, n.” accessed April 15, 2015, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/72379?redirectedFrom=foeman>.

of the latter part of the twentieth century (mainly since 1970s), it was already being used in 1902 and in the 1959 adaptation as well. This indicates that the singular *they* was already a grammaticalized phrase at the very beginning of the twentieth century.

6.3.3 Addressing

The aim of this subchapter is to trace the modes of addressing between the protagonists Sherlock Holmes and John Watson. The hypothesis is, based on the claims of Farrelly and Soane (2012) and Leech et al. (2009) (6.2 Democratization of discourse), that there will be an observable shift towards more familiar ways of addressing which are, besides the decreasing usage of titular names, also manifested by the increasing popularity of addressing by the first name only. Taking into account that Holmes and Watson do not address each other by titles, the focus will be therefore narrowed to the latter tendency.

Sherlock Holmes became an archetypal sleuth and his phrase “*Elementary, my dear Watson*” became extremely memorable in British literature. In spite of the fact that this exact line was not uttered by the original Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes, but was an invention of some later adaptation, something must have led the authors of this phrase to originate it. The inspiration is quite evident even from only one of Conan Doyle’s stories. The ways of addressing between Sherlock Holmes and his companion John Watson in the original *The Hound of the Baskervilles* and its adaptations will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

For the modes of addressing, the whole novel and film scripts were searched. The results were put in tables to provide illustration of the different ways of addressing in the constituent adaptations. To ascertain to what extent those ways change, the tables are classified according to the taxonomy of *illocutionary speech acts*. Having mentioned Holmes addressing Watson, Holmes’s methods of addressing will be examined first.

Most frequently, Holmes addressed Watson in the context of *Assertives*. **Table 7** lists some example sentences that were uttered by Holmes in the novel and adaptations.

Conan Doyle made it typical for Sherlock Holmes to address his companion by “*my dear Watson*” or “*my dear fellow*” in all Sherlockian stories, not only in *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. As the film adaptations try to adhere to Conan Doyle’s canon, **Table 7** shows that the film Sherlock (1939, 1959, 1988) also (but not always) uses those phrases.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
My dear Watson	H: My dear Watson , you were born to be a man of action.	H: Murder, my dear Watson , refined, cold-blooded murder.	H: Elementary, my dear Watson .		
My dear fellow	H: I confess, my dear fellow , that I am very much in your debt.	W: Does anything escape me? H: Almost everything, my dear fellow .		H: I confess, my dear fellow , that I am very much in your debt.	
Watson	H: It’s an ugly business, Watson , an ugly dangerous business, and the more I see of it the less I like it.	H: I have an idea, Watson , that young Sir Henry isn’t destined for a very long existence in this world.	H: All right, Watson , we’re all down quite safely.	H: It’s an ugly, dangerous business, Watson .	
John					H: I saw it too, John .

Table 7: Holmes addresses Watson—*Assertives*

It is usually easy to find utterances that would belong to the context of *Assertives*, as they include statements, assertions, conclusions, descriptions, claims, reports, and the like, which are very common. Therefore it is surprising not to have detected any “*my dear fellow*” phrases in the 1959 adaptation.

The 1988 adaptation is particularly similar to the original, as some sentences are copied from the book (especially in the opening scene where the two speculate about the owner of the walking stick, and then in Dr. Mortimer’s introduction of the problem). However, Holmes only addresses Watson by “*my dear Watson*” while writing him a letter: “*My dear Watson, I will not bias your mind by suggesting theories or suspicions.*” Therefore it cannot be accounted as a direct way of addressing.

The 2012 adaptation noticeably stands out from the table and it will be discussed later in the subsequent sub-chapter. The remaining contexts of addressing need to be examined first, the next being *Directives*.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
My dear Watson	H: My dear Watson , clumsy as I have been, you surely do not seriously imagine that I neglected to get the number?				
My dear fellow	H: My dear fellow , you must trust me implicitly and do exactly what I tell you.	H: How are you, my dear fellow ?			
Watson	H: Come, Watson , come! Great heavens, if we are too late!	H: Keep me posted, Watson , write me daily reports.	H: What do you say, Watson ?	H: When the crisis comes Watson , and it will, report to me.	
John					H: John , I need some, get me some.

Table 8: Holmes addresses Watson—*Directives*

The usage of typical “*my dear Watson*” and “*my dear fellow*” almost disappears from the adaptations in the context of *Directives* as is indicated by **Table 8**. The prevalent way of addressing John Watson is by his last name. Again, the 2012 adaptation makes an exception that will prove to be vital in the subsequent chapter.

The remaining example sentences all fall into the category of *illocutionary speech acts* named *Expressives*. There were no instances found which could be categorized as *Commissives* or *Declarations*.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
My dear Watson	H: It is a lovely evening, my dear Watson .				
My dear fellow	H: My dear fellow , you have been invaluable to me in this as in many other cases, and I beg that you will forgive me if I have seemed to play a trick upon you.			H: Brilliant my dear fellow , brilliant.	
Watson	H: Really, Watson , you excel yourself.	H: Really, Watson , you've excelled yourself.	H: That's just it, Watson . Well done, my boy.	H: Oh bravo, bravo, Watson .	
John					H: Oh, John , I envy you so much.

Table 9: Holmes addresses Watson—*Expressives*

Table 9 is composed of sentences where Holmes expresses his emotions and attitudes while talking to Watson. As far as the novel is concerned, the phrases “*my dear Watson*” and “*my dear fellow*” were both uttered by Holmes, just as well as they had been in other contexts (**Table 7** and **Table 8**). Speaking of adaptations, again, the preferred way of addressing Watson in the context of *Expressives* is addressing him only by his last name. For the third time, the 2012 adaptation continues to be an exception and Holmes addresses his companion by his first name.

Having explored Holmes’s ways of addressing Watson, Watson’s modes of addressing Holmes will be examined now.

The category of *Assertives* will be discussed as first—**Table 10** demonstrates some example sentences. Unlike Sherlock, not a single time does Watson address Holmes by “*my dear Holmes*”. It is true that Watson addresses him this way a number of times in the novel, but only when writing his reports to Holmes, and as was already remarked, addressing someone in the letterhead cannot be counted as a direct addressing. In the context of “assertive” situations, Watson does not address Holmes by “*my dear fellow*”, not even in the novel. Watson predominantly addresses him only by his last name, both in the book,

and in the film adaptations—with the exception of the most recent one where Watson addresses the detective by his first name.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
My dear Holmes					
My dear fellow					
Holmes	W: I think that I have deserved better at your hands, Holmes .	H: Keep me posted, Watson, write me daily reports. W: To the smallest detail, Holmes .	W: I must say, you never cease to surprise me, Holmes .	W: I believe you got eyes in the back of your head, Holmes .	
Sherlock					W: Well, I've not been idle, Sherlock .

Table 10: Watson addresses Holmes—*Assertives*

Only once in the whole novel does Watson address Holmes by “*my dear fellow*”, that is when asking him a question (see **Table 11**). Once again, the film Watson prefers to address the detective by his last name only. The 2012 adaptation does not cease to be an exception.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
My dear Holmes					
My dear fellow	W: My dear fellow , how can you possibly be so sure of that?				
Holmes	W: But are you sure of this, Holmes ?	W: Well, Holmes , what do you make of it?	W: Watch out, Holmes !		
Sherlock					W: Get me out, Sherlock , you've got to get me out!

Table 11: Watson addresses Holmes—*Directives*

Concerning the category of *Commissives*, it was only the novel where an example of Watson addressing Holmes was found. In this case, Watson calls Sherlock Holmes again only by his last name: “*Oh **Holmes**, I shall never forgive myself for having left him to his fate.*”

There were no instances of Watson addressing Holmes in the context of *Declarations* detected, which means that there is only one last category left—that is *Expressives*. While expressing his emotional states, as is demonstrated by the example sentences in **Table 12**, Watson addresses the sleuth in the novel only by his last name. Once more, the three first adaptations do not deviate from the ways of addressing in the original story, whereas the most recent adaptation prefers the more familiar way.

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
My dear Holmes					
My dear fellow					
Holmes	W: Good heavens, Holmes!	W: Rubbish, Holmes , rubbish.	W: I don't like that, Holmes.	W: Thank you, Holmes.	
Sherlock					W: I was terrified, Sherlock , I was scared to death!

Table 12: Watson addresses Holmes—*Expressives*

As there were all the ways of addressing between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson examined, it would be desirable to summarize the findings and finally comment on the most recent adaptation which has markedly deviated from the other three adaptations.

6.3.3.1 Addressing—summary

The purpose of creating all the tables in the preceding chapter was to find out whether there is some manifestation of *democratization* in the ways the two protagonists address one another. The ways of addressing that Conan Doyle invented for Sherlock Holmes and John Watson were compared to those that were uttered by actors who have played their parts in the constituent film adaptations.

The 1939, 1959, and 1988 adaptations altogether adhered to Holmes's archetypal phrases “*my dear Watson*” and “*my dear fellow*”, predominantly

in the context of *Assertives*. There is a visible tendency, though, of addressing John Watson by his last name only (**Table 7**, **Table 7**, **Table 8**, and **Table 9**). Similarly, **Table 10**, **Table 11**, and **Table 12** demonstrate that Conan Doyle's Watson preferred to address Sherlock Holmes by his last name. The film Watsons tended to address the detective likewise, so the "*my dear fellow*" phrase remained Sherlock's peculiarity. So far, the first three adaptations do not indicate any signs of *democratization*.

What proved to be much more interesting and crucial throughout this investigation was the most recent adaptation from 2012. Finally, some signs of *democratization* of discourse manifested by the changing ways of addressing were detected. Not even a single time do the protagonists address each other by their last names, let alone preceded by "*my dear*". Instead, the way of addressing changes to a more familiar one—addressing by their first names.

This shift towards the casual way of addressing did not remain unnoticed. Elizabeth Jane Evans, for example, in her chapter "Shaping Sherlock: Institutional Practice and the Adaptation of Character" (2012, 102–17) remarks that putting Sherlock Holmes into the modern world of the twenty-first century somewhat entails the shift towards the more informal way of addressing. She also points out the name of the BBC series—*Sherlock*—the first name only.

6.3.4 Informalization? Colloquialization?

It was discussed in chapter 6.1 that *informalization* together with *colloquialization* are tendencies attributed to written texts. It was later argued, though, that different authors use different terminology for the same phenomena. While searching for obsolescent terms in chapter 4.2, not only were there obsolete and old-fashioned terms found in the novel, but also a number of words that acquired formal status in the course of the twentieth century. On the other hand, there were a number of words marked as "colloquial" or "informal" detected in the most recent adaptation.

The words in **Table 13** belong to the formal register at the present time (according to *OALD*). Although some of the formal terms from the first column—that is from the novel—are furthermore marked as literary, and spoken registers are commonly known to be less formal than written registers, there is still a far greater number of formal words in the novel than in the adaptations.

Moreover, only direct speech was examined in the novel, so it is supposed that Conan Doyle attempted to create plausible dialogues of plausible Victorian people.

novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
1. scion (or lit.) 2. bewail (or hum.) 3. lest (or lit.) 4. abode (or hum., somewhat lit.) 5. surmise (n.) 6. crazed with (fear) 7. inclement 8. allow (= accept, admit) 9. mislay (esp. BrE) 10. indebted 11. upon (= on) (esp. BrE) 12. availed himself of (a cab) 13. neglected to (= forgot) 14. recollection 15. hitherto 16. be obliged to (sb)	1. mislaid 2. upon 3. I beg your pardon (esp. BrE)	1. I beg of you. 2. admirably 3. considerable 4. exalted 5. Would you care to...? 6. ..., I understand (= think/believe)	1. breakfast (v.) 2. determine 3. incur 4. considerable 5. deem 6. lest (or lit.) 7. chaff (v.) (or old-fash.) 8. litigious	

Table 13: Formal status

What is definitely worth attention is that there was not even one formal word found in the 2012 adaptation. If the novel was to be compared only with the most recent adaptation, it could be claimed that there is an evident shift towards a less formal language. The collected data in the other three adaptations, however, do not confirm that.

While the occurrence of formal words in **Table 13** did not unequivocally reflect *informalization* of discourse, **Table 14** lists the informal and colloquial terms that were found in the novel and adaptations and it seems that there truly is some tendency towards a more informal and colloquial style. There are 16 instances of informal or colloquial terms in the 2012 adaptation which is three times more than was found in the novel. Putting the novel aside, there is a clearly increasing frequency of the usage of informal/colloquial words and expressions in the adaptations.

novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
1. by Jove (colloq./inf., old-fash., esp. BrE) 2. what/why in thunder, by thunder (slang or colloq.) 3. chap (BrE, inf., becoming old-fash.) 4. wire (inf., esp. NAmE) 5. fellow (inf., becoming old-fash.)	1. toff (inf., BrE) 2. fellow	1. man (in addressing) (esp. NAmE, inf.) 2. shan't (colloq.)	1. by thunder 2. no mistake (colloq./ old-fash., esp. BrE) 3. dammit (inf.) 4. ain't (= have not) (non-standard, or hum.) 5. sort of (inf.) 6. folk (inf.) 7. fellow	1. cuppa (colloq.) 2. I guess (inf., esp. NAmE) 3. wee (inf., esp. ScotE) 4. bugger up (taboo, slang, BrE) 5. handy (adj.) (inf.) 6. ruddy (inf., BrE) 7. quid (inf., BrE) 8. mate (= addressing sb) (colloq./inf., BrE, AustralE) 9. gonna (colloq., esp. U.S./inf., non-standard) 10. sort of 11. I reckon (inf., esp. BrE) 12. show up (inf.) 13. wanna (inf., non-standard, esp. U.S.) 14. bloody (BrE, taboo, slang) 15. cheers (= thank you) (inf., BrE) 16. cell (phone) (inf., esp. NAmE)

Table 14: Informal or colloquial status

The historicizing approach to the topic that was adopted by the 1939, 1959, and 1988 adaptations led their producers to attempt to illustrate Victorian England. Victorian England is characterized by its stuffiness and it is presented in the absence of taboo and slang words in those adaptations. In addition to that, the central characters that occur in the story are a private highly regarded detective, Dr. Watson, and Dr. Mortimer who could not use the language of the dregs of society. Henry Baskerville never acted as a member of nobility and only when he comes to England is he addressed by the title “*Sir*”.

All this enables the film producers to characterize Sir Henry Baskerville with a more democratic/colloquial/informal language which, presumably, would be expected from an American. That is the reason for employing such expressions as *dammit* (and on the top of that twice) in his introductory scene (as was discussed above in chapter 5.2.1.1).

On the other hand, the 2012 adaptation does not attempt to mirror the morals of Victorian England, at all. Therefore, there were slang expressions like *bugger up* (also a taboo), non-standard verb forms like *gonna*, *wanna*, and a swear word *bloody* used in this film, and they perfectly reflect the contemporary modern English language.

Apart from the one particular usage of an informal expression (*dammit*), the first three adaptations quite successfully manage to avoid an extensive usage of informal, colloquial, and slang words in their attempt to resemble Victorian stiff language. The interesting thing, however, lies in what the film makers failed to notice. While attempting to avoid informal words, they neglected, to some degree, the usage of those words from the novel that are formal. The reasons for not incorporating a greater quantity of formal words to create an impression of a reserved language can be only speculated about. The data in **Table 13** thus point out the negligence of the script writers.

CONCLUSION

The motto of this thesis which was also the inspiration for this work has been validated a number of times throughout the research—it was demonstrated that the English language has changed significantly over the short period of a century, and that the differences in the language usage are observable in the film adaptations of Conan Doyle’s memorable detective novel *The Hound of the Baskervilles*.

Several specific phenomena concerning language change were selected from the scholarly literature with the focus on the twentieth and possibly the twenty-first century. The main hypothesis of this work was that some differences in the usage of the English language would be detected among different time periods—namely 1900s, 1930s, 1950s, 1980s, and 2010s—and those differences would concern *changes in lexicon, obsolescence of words, growing influence of American English, and democratization of discourse*.

There were three principal research questions posed at the beginning of this thesis: Which of the above mentioned tendencies are reflected in the adaptations? Does the data from the novel and adaptations reflect diachronic differences in the usage of the English language? What were the differences in the usage of the English language in the 1900s, 1930s, 1950s, 1980s, and 2010s?

Those questions were repeatedly examined and discussed in the constituent chapters in detail and some minor questions were often raised while examining a given phenomenon. The findings are summarized in the paragraphs below.

The methods that were employed for the systematic exploration of those issues were the following: in some cases it was not essential to examine the whole novel and the whole film scripts to prove that the given phenomenon has manifested itself there. For this reason, approximately 4,000 words from each film (which was always roughly half of the film script) and approximately 8,000 words from the book (from which only dialogues were selected) were used for the research. This method was applied to the *changes in lexicon*,

the increasing usage of shortened words, obsolescence of words, the increasing usage of American words in English, and democratization of discourse.

While searching for the *substitutive terms for the obsolete ones*, for the usage of *mandative subjunctive*, and instances of *democratization of discourse*, the whole texts were examined.

In order to determine to what extent those tendencies have penetrated into the English language, the collected data was organised according to the corresponding pragmatic contexts. Searle's taxonomy of *illocutionary speech acts* was employed for those purposes.

The apparent risk of studying the differences of language usage among the film adaptations of a novel is the potentially intentional archaizing approach of the film makers. This proved to be the problem of the 1939, 1959, and 1988 adaptations which apparently intended to remain faithful to the original and this might be considered a weakness of the whole thesis. However, several interesting matters have arisen during the research that were connected with the deliberate archaizing of the language and those will be discussed below. The most interesting results were found in the most recent adaptation which was produced in 2012. This film was not intended to imitate neither the prudish Victorian Age, nor the proper Victorian language, which enabled it to be much better compared with the novel and differentiated from the archaizing adaptations.

First of all, the results of the research concerning changes and differences in lexicon will be summarized. The hypothesis, which was formulated before the actual research, was that the lexicons of the constituent adaptations would somehow reflect their times. However, as was already pointed out, some adaptations preferred to imitate the Victorian England from the times of Sherlock Holmes and close attention was paid to their weaknesses.

Despite the determined effort to simulate Victorian English, an incongruity was detected (as is illustrated in **Table 1**). In the 1959 adaptation, Doctor Mortimer makes reference to a *horse-bus*. As was discovered, this word had not been used until 1905, which means that this was a deliberate archaism used with the intent to create the atmosphere of past times. The exaggerated effort to archaize the language caused the script writers to make such a careless mistake. Other than that, no error concerning neologisms was found. **Table 1** also supports the assertion of Ayto (1999, viii) and Bauer (2006, 483) to be right—the majority

of neologisms that were used in the novel and adaptations were created by combining already existing elements (that is by *compounding*, *blending*, or *derivation*).

As far as the lexicon of the last adaptation is concerned, it truly reflects the modern age. A great number of neologisms were found, and what is more, the hypothesis that there would be many more shortened words used at the end of the twentieth century, proved to be right. This tendency has continued to the present century, as is demonstrated by the 2012 adaptation where several instances of *clippings*, *initialisms*, and *acronyms* were detected.

Table 2 has demonstrated that a number of words from the beginning of the twentieth century that were used in the novel are nowadays perceived as old-fashioned, or obsolete. The incidence of such words in the adaptations is more essential, though. Overall, the adaptations have evidently used a lesser number of obsolescent words than appeared in the novel. It must be acknowledged though, that all the three archaizing adaptations paid attention to the word *fellow* which is rather typical for Conan Doyle's style. Not only do they use it in phrases (which have maintained their sense until the present day) but also independently without a premodifying adjective, which ceased to be used. As the last adaptation is set in contemporary England, no obsolescent words in the characters' dialogues were detected.

Another important issue concerning obsolescence, which was discussed in chapter 4, is the replacement of such terms. It was discovered that (except for the most recent adaptation) although the adaptations attempt to evoke the impression of Victorian old-fashioned language, they often substitute obsolescent words by more modern ones which, in reality, contradicts their purpose.

Chapter 5 dealt with the American influence on British English. The hypothesis was that British English would be far more influenced by American English in the three later adaptations, due to the ascent of American influence after the Second World War. The *mandative subjunctive* construction, as an often debated American construction increasingly used in British English, was supposed to be employed after the 1960s—notably in the 1988 and 2012 adaptations. The first hypothesis proved to be right—**Table 4** has clearly demonstrated the increasing usage of *Americanisms*. Additionally, a deliberate

employment of *Americanisms* was discovered. The second hypothesis was only partially right. Although the whole novel and the whole film scripts were searched for the *mandative subjunctive* usage, only one instance was detected. Therefore, no generalizations can be made. It is true, however, that the usage occurred after the 1960s which was presupposed.

Initially, the only sociocultural influence of the twentieth century with an impact on language that was intended to be pursued in this thesis was *democratization of discourse*. Nevertheless, it was found out that *colloquialization* and *informalization* do not always have to concern only the written language, since the terminology of some authors overlap, and what one author describes as *democratization* means, in fact, *colloquialization* for another one. Other authors include *colloquialization* and *informalization* as manifestations of *democratization*. Moreover, while searching for obsolescent words in the novel and adaptations, many instances of colloquial or informal words were detected. Therefore, those tendencies were pursued as well.

As far as *democratization* is concerned, it was supposed that this tendency would be manifested in the decreasing usage of the morpheme *man* in compound words, in the preference in usage of the singular *they* instead of masculine *he* (both in order to avoid gender-biased language), and eventually in the preference of addressing by the first name only (in order to create more familiar atmosphere) between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson.

The collected data in **Table 5** implies the decreasing tendency towards using compounds that include the *man* morpheme. The avoidance of gender-biased language is only one causation, however, as other causes for this inclination were pointed out. An interesting finding was revealed during searching for the usage of the singular *they*—although it was expected to detect its usage mainly after the 1970s (when people started to actively occupy themselves with gender equality); it was already used in the novel dialogues, which means that it was already grammaticalized at the beginning of the twentieth century. A significant manifestation of *democratization* was observed in the most recent adaptation. The tendency towards a more familiar way of addressing is manifested by the shift from addressing one another by the last name to addressing by the first name only. This is clearly a step towards the more casual language of the twenty-first century.

The last tendencies to be discussed are *informalization* and *colloquialization* of discourse. The detected words that have acquired formal status were grouped into **Table 13**. This data does not unambiguously confirm *informalization*, although the formal words in the novel vastly outnumber those that were detected in all the adaptations. On the other hand, **Table 14** demonstrates an increase in the usage of informal and colloquial words and expressions in the adaptations, especially in the most recent one which reflects the casual informal language of the twenty-first century.

In spite of the fact that the 1939, 1959, and 1988 adaptations did not enable this work to trace the differences in the usage of English language, they were compared with the novel they aimed to resemble as much as possible, and also with the 2012 adaptation which reflected the changes in the language usage perfectly. In the majority of cases, those three adaptations managed to imitate the Victorian language quite accurately, however, some incongruities were detected. Not only has the negligence of the script writers manifested itself in the exaggerated attempt to archaize the language (the usage of *horse-bus*), but particularly in what is missing in the adaptations.

Why do those three adaptations that aim to simulate Victorian English use such a small number of formal words? Why, instead of reusing the obsolescent words typical for the prudish Victorian English, do the script writers decide to replace them with modern ones? Is it only caused by their negligence? Those questions are undoubtedly interesting and would deserve more attention.

Likewise, the modern 2012 adaptation has proved to be a noteworthy reworking of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* and most certainly offers many more themes concerning the language usage than I was herein able to examine.

RESUMÉ

Jazyk se neustále mění a vyvíjí, třebaže si toho lidé nejsou vědomi. Nejspíše právě z tohoto důvodu nemohou tomuto procesu zabránit. Jazyková změna je velmi složitý a pozvolný proces, který je možné náležitě pozorovat jedině s odstupem času.

Cílem této bakalářské práce bylo sledovat a popsat rozdíly v užití anglického jazyka v různých časových obdobích dvacátého a začátku jednadvacátého století. Na základě odborné literatury byly vybrány následující jevy týkající se změny jazyka během dvacátého století, jež byly předmětem zkoumání:

- 1) Změny v lexiku: neologismy; sémantické změny; konverze; kompozice, derivace, univerbizace; přejímání slov z cizího jazyka; abreviace: rostoucí užití zkratkových slov včetně akronymů a iniciálových zkratků,
- 2) zastarávání slov (a jejich případné nahrazování),
- 3) rostoucí vliv americké angličtiny na britskou angličtinu, konkrétně zvyšující se užití tzv. „mandativního“ konjunktivu („*mandative subjunctive*“) a amerikanismů,
- 4) demokratizace diskurzu.

Tyto tendence a jejich projevy v anglickém jazyce byly zkoumány v románu publikovaném hned na počátku dvacátého století (1902), a dále porovnávány se třemi jeho filmovými adaptacemi natočenými v průběhu dvacátého století (1939, 1959, 1988) a jednou ze současné doby (2012). Pro tyto účely byl zvolen nesčetněkrát adaptovaný detektivní román *Pes baskervillský* (*The Hound of the Baskervilles*).

Cílem výzkumu bylo najít odpovědi na následující výzkumné otázky: Dá se diachronní změna v užití jazyka pozorovat na románových adaptacích? Které z výše uvedených tendencí se v nich projevují a jak? Jaké byly rozdíly v užití anglického jazyka v letech 1902, 1939, 1959, 1988 a 2012?

Práce je rozdělena do několika kapitol, ve kterých jsou popsány a zkoumány jednotlivé jevy. K prokázání některých tendencí stačilo ke zkoumání přibližně 4 000 slov z každého filmu (což tvořilo vždy zhruba polovinu scénáře) a přibližně 8 000 slov z knižní předlohy, ze které byly vyňaty pouze dialogy postav. Jiné jevy vyžadovaly prozkoumání celých textů. Aby bylo možné zjistit, do jaké míry pronikly tyto tendence do úzu jazyka dané doby, byla shromážděná data rozdělena podle pragmatických situací, do kterých spadala.

V průběhu výzkumu bylo zjištěno, že tři ze čtyř filmových adaptací (z roku 1939, 1959 a 1988) nezasazují příběh do kontextu své doby, ale naopak se snaží vytvořit co nejpřesnější imitaci knižní předlohy. Usilují tedy o věrné napodobení jak viktoriánské doby, tak viktoriánského jazyka. Nicméně se ukázalo, že toto záměrné archaizující zpracování je velmi zajímavé nejen z hlediska archaizace jazyka a je častokrát porovnáváno s moderním zpracováním z roku 2012. Nejnovější zpracování se nesnaží napodobit viktoriánskou Anglii, nýbrž zobrazuje Sherlocka Holmese a doktora Watsona v pokrokové Anglii dvacátého prvního století.

Hypotézy týkající se problematiky lexika se potvrdily pouze částečně. Je zřejmé, že adaptace simulující dobu Sherlocka Holmese budou používat slovní zásobu viktoriánské doby. Proto namísto porovnávání rozdílů v užití jazyka mezi těmito třemi zpracováními byly často tyto tři adaptace porovnávány s užitím jazyka v poslední adaptaci, která se pouze inspirovala příběhem Conana Doylea a ve které se hovoří soudobým moderním jazykem.

Přes veškerou snahu scénáristů o co nejdokladnější napodobení viktoriánské doby bylo objeveno několik nesrovnalostí týkajících se nejen užití neologismu, jenž v roce 1902 ještě neexistoval, ale zejména toho, co v adaptacích oproti románu chybí.

Během výzkumu bylo zjištěno, že románové postavy používají mnohem více výrazů, které jsou dnes vnímány jako již zastaralé nebo zastarávající, než používají postavy filmové. Navíc jsou některé zastaralé výrazy z románu nahrazovány novějšími, namísto jejich opětovného užití v adaptacích. To by následně vedlo k věrohodnějšímu napodobení někdejší atmosféry. Podobný nedostatek se objevil u používání formálních výrazů. Při celkovém porovnání užití formálních výrazů (které jsou typické pro zdvořilý jazyk prudérní viktoriánské Anglie) bylo zjištěno, že se hypotéza ohledně „*informalizace*“ jazyka

(posun k méně formálnímu až hovorovému vyjadřování) potvrdila ve všech čtyřech adaptacích.

Nejnovější adaptace potvrdila hypotézu, podle které se na konci dvacátého století začalo používat více zkratkových výrazů než kdy dříve. Dále se také potvrdil předpoklad, že slovní zásoba by měla odrážet svou dobu. Sherlock Holmes z jednadvacátého století už neposílá telegramy a nejedí bryčkou taženou koňmi – to vše se samozřejmě odráží v užívaném lexiku.

Hypotéza týkající se rostoucího počtu amerikanismů v britské angličtině se potvrdila. Kromě toho bylo objeveno i vědomé použití amerických výrazů se záměrem vytvořit typicky americkou postavu Henryho Baskervilla. Hypotéza, podle které se rozmohlo užití tzv. „mandativního“ konjunktivu („*mandative subjunctive*“) v britské angličtině jako projev amerikanizace, se však z důvodu nedostatečného výskytu nepodařilo potvrdit.

Dále byly zkoumány tři projevy demokratizace diskurzu. První dva jsou spojeny se sklonem vyhýbat se sexismu v jazyce – klesající tendence užívání složených slov, která obsahují morfém *man*; a preference v užití zájmena *they* namísto zájmena mužského rodu *he* při odkazování jak na muže, tak ženy. Třetím zkoumaným projevem demokratizace bylo upřednostnění oslovení křestním jménem namísto příjmením.

První tendence byla při výzkumu potvrzena, naskytl se pro ni však i jiná možná odůvodnění. Druhá tendence nebyla jednoznačně prokázána, nicméně bylo zjištěno, že tzv. „singular *they*“ bylo gramatikalizované už na začátku dvacátého století, jelikož se jeho užití objevuje již v románu. Co se týče familiárnějšího způsobu oslovení, tento sklon se projevil až v posledním filmovém zpracování – tedy až v jednadvacátém století.

Během sledování projevů demokratizace jazyka došlo k objevení dalších dvou jevů: zvyšujícího se užití mluvených prostředků anglického jazyka (tzv. „*colloquialization*“) a tíhnutí k neformálnímu vyjadřování (tzv. „*informalization*“). Ty však mnoho autorů odborné literatury zahrnuje do definice demokratizace, a proto je nepovažují za její samostatné projevy. Tyto tendence byly do značné míry potvrzeny neformálním a nenuceným jazykem v nejmodernější adaptaci.

WORKS CITED

- Austin, J. L. 1962. "Lecture I." In *How to Do Things with Words*, 1–11. London: Oxford UP.
- Ayto, John. 1999. *Twentieth Century Words*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Bauer, Laurie 1994. *Watching English Change: An Introduction to the Study of Linguistic Change in Standard Englishes in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Longman.
- Baugh, Albert C., and Thomas Cable. 2002. 5th ed. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge.
- Crystal, David. 2003. 2nd ed. *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Evans, Elizabeth Jane. 2012. "Shaping Sherlock: Institutional Practice and the Adaptation of Character." In *Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom: Essays on the BBC Series*, edited by Louisa Ellen Stein and Kristina Busse, 102–17. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. "Discourse and Social Change in Contemporary Society." In *Discourse and Social Change*, 200–24. Cambridge: Polity.
- . "A Social Theory of Discourse." In *Discourse and Social Change*, 62–100. Cambridge: Polity.
- Farrelly, Michael and Elena Soane. 2012. "Democratization." In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*, edited by Terttu Nevalainen and Elizabeth Closs Traugott, 392–401. New York: Oxford UP.
- Faye, Lyndsay. 2012. Prologue to *Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom: Essays on the BBC Series*, edited by Louisa Ellen Stein and Kristina Busse, 1–7. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Huang, Y. 2006. "Speech Acts." In *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, Jacob L. Mey, ed., 2nd ed., 1000–1009. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

- Huddleston, Rodney. 2002. "Content Clauses and Reported Speech." In Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, 947–1030. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- James, Andrew Lloyd. 1935. *The Broadcast Word*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Johansson, Stig and Else Helene Norheim. 1988. "The Subjunctive in British and American English." *ICAME Journal* 12:27–36.
- Mair, Christian. 2006. *Twentieth-century English: History, Variation and Standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- McMahon, April M. S. 1994. *Understanding Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Peprník, Jaroslav. 1994. 3rd ed. *Slovník Amerikanismů*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- . 2006. 3rd ed. *English Lexicology*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Peters, Pam. 2009. "The Mandative Subjunctive in Spoken English." In *Comparative Studies in Australian and New Zealand English: Grammar and Beyond*, edited by Pam Peters, Peter Collins, and Adam Smith, 125–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Porter, Lynnette, ed. 2012. Introduction to *Sherlock Holmes for the 21st Century: Essays on New Adaptations*, 1–12. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Potter, Simeon. 1975. 2nd ed. *Changing English*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. "Verbs and Auxiliaries." In *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, 93–171. New York: Longman.
- . 1985. "Complementation of Verbs and Adjectives." In *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, 1147–1233. New York: Longman.
- Romaine, Suzanne, ed. 1998. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. IV 1776–1997. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Searle, John R. 1979. "A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts." In *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, 1–29. New York: Cambridge UP.

- Searle, John R. 1979. "Indirect Speech Acts." In *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, 30–57. New York: Cambridge UP.
- Serpollet, Noëlle. 2001. "The mandative subjunctive in British English seems to be alive and kicking . . . Is it due to American influence?" In Paul Rayson, Andrew Wilson, Tony McEnery, Andrew Hardie and Shereen Khoja (eds.). *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2001 Conference*. Lancaster University: UCREL Technical Papers 13, 531–42.
- Stein, Louisa Ellen and Kristina Busse, eds. 2012. Introduction to *Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom: Essays on the BBC Series*, 9–24. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Yule, George. 1996. "Speech Acts and Events." In *Pragmatics*, 47–58. Oxford UP.

ELECTRONIC SOURCES

- Bauer, Laurie. 2006. "Compounds and Minor Word-formation Types." In Bas Aarts and April MacMahon (eds.). *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, 483–506. Blackwell Publishing.
http://www.data.ulis.vnu.edu.vn/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2897/1/10_eng_ling.pdf.
- Leech, Geoffrey, Marianne Hundt, Christian Mair, and Nicholas Smith. 2009. *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. New York: Cambridge UP. www.cambridge.org/9780521867221.
- Mair, Christian and Geoffrey Leech. 2006. "Current Change in English Syntax." In *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, edited by Bas Aarts and April MacMahon, 332–56. Blackwell Publishing.
http://www.data.ulis.vnu.edu.vn/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2897/1/10_eng_ling.pdf.
- Peters, Pam. 2006. "English Usage: Prescription and Description." In *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, edited by Bas Aarts and April MacMahon, 759–80. Blackwell Publishing.
http://www.data.ulis.vnu.edu.vn/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2897/1/10_eng_ling.pdf.
- Quaglio, Paulo. 2006. "The Grammar of Conversation." In *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, edited by Bas Aarts and April MacMahon, 692–723. Blackwell Publishing.
http://www.data.ulis.vnu.edu.vn/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2897/1/10_eng_ling.pdf.

FILMS CITED

Bowen, Trevor R. *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. 1988. Directed by Brian Mills. United Kingdom: Granada Television and WGBH, 2003. DVD.

Bryan, Peter. *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. 1959. Directed by Terence Fisher. United Kingdom: Hammer Film Productions, 2003. DVD.

Gatiss, Mark co-created with Steven Moffat. "The Hounds of Baskerville." 2012. *Sherlock*, season 2, episode 2. Directed by Paul McGuigan. United Kingdom: Hartwood West for BBC Cymru Wales in co-production with Masterpiece, 2012. DVD.

Pascal, Ernest. *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. 1939. Directed by Sidney Lanfield. United States: 20th Century Fox, 2004. DVD.

Throughout this thesis I was making use of the film scripts. Prior to the research itself, I attempted to communicate with the British Film Institute (BFI), the Cinema And Television History (CATH) Research Centre, The Internet Movie Script Database (IMSDb), and BBC's "Script Library". However, I have received no response to my request for the film scripts. For this reason, I was forced to search for the scripts on the Internet. The scripts that were made use of in the present thesis were downloaded from a movie script database whose web page is provided below. They were searched for errors which were subsequently corrected.

http://www.springfieldspringfield.co.uk/movie_scripts.php

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Neologisms.....	24
Table 2: Obsolescence.....	26
Table 3: Suasive verbs. (Quirk et al. 1985, 1182).....	35
Table 4: Americanisms.....	36
Table 5: Decreasing usage of words containing <i>man</i>	42
Table 6: The usage of the singular <i>they</i>	44
Table 7: Holmes addresses Watson— <i>Assertives</i>	46
Table 8: Holmes addresses Watson— <i>Directives</i>	47
Table 9: Holmes addresses Watson— <i>Expressives</i>	48
Table 10: Watson addresses Holmes— <i>Assertives</i>	49
Table 11: Watson addresses Holmes— <i>Directives</i>	49
Table 12: Watson addresses Holmes— <i>Expressives</i>	50
Table 13: Formal status.....	52
Table 14: Informal or colloquial status.....	53

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

F	Frankland
H	Sherlock Holmes
He	Sir Henry Baskerville
M	Dr. Mortimer
Ms S	Miss Stapleton
W	Dr. John Watson
adv.	adverb
colloq.	colloquial
form.	formal
hum.	humorous
inf.	informal
lit.	literary
old-fash.	old-fashioned
AmE	American English
AustralE	Australian English
BrE	British English
MS	mandative subjunctive
NAmE	North American English
OALD	Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
ScotE	Scottish English

APPENDIX

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
lad = a boy or a young man	M: The second brother, who died young, is the father of this lad Henry.				
chap = to talk about a man in a friendly way	He: I could get no sense out of the chap who cleans them.	He: Watson? W: Yes, old chap .	H: A man after my own heart.	H: Cartwright, the little chap from the express office, I brought him down with me to look after my simple wants.	He: Well, I mean, he's a pretty straightforward bloke and you . . .
fellow = referring to a man/boy	M: From the accounts which have reached us he is an excellent fellow in every way.	W: The fellow came to see you.	F: Yes, I knew a Watson in Caprina. Yes, a notorious white slaver. Nice fellow , though.	He: . . . but if you're right and this fellow's afraid, then he's afraid not only for his own skin but what might happen to me.	W: Yeah, the guys in the pub said you could. H: I'm putting my best man onto it.
kin = family or relatives	It is understood that the next of kin is Mr. Henry Baskerville, if he be still alive, . . .	He: He was my kin , my own kin , even though he wasn't never any good.	B: A curse upon the family , unhappiness and death to his descendants.	M: The hound is supposed to have haunted the family since then to the general misfortune of the line.	
kinsman = a relative	M: The only other kinsman whom we have been able to trace was Rodger Baskerville, . . .				
ere = before; long ere = soon	H: That gravel page upon which I might have read so much has been long ere this smudged by the rain . . .	H: You'll see soon enough.			
dwelling = a house, flat, etc.	H: Within a radius of five miles there are, as you see, only a very few scattered dwellings .	H: It might interest you to know, however, that you were shadowed from my house .	W: Someone out there is signaling to the house .	H: Grimpen, just a clutter of cottages, two moorland houses , farmhouses, Lafter Hall, Merripit House, and that is all.	W: Where are you? M: His house .
whence = from where	W: It was hard to say whence it came.	M: About 50 yards from where Sir Charles fell dead were footprints.			H: Tiny little hairs all over her leg from where it gets a little bit too friendly.

Replacing obsolescent words—*Assertives*

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
lad = a boy or a young man		F: May I offer you a lift, my lad ?			
fellow = referring to a man or a boy	S: I would suggest carrying this poor fellow to my house, but it would give my sister such a fright that I do not feel justified in doing it.	H: We better put this poor fellow in one of the huts till the morning.	M: What are you talking about, man ?	W: Who was that man ?	
pray (adv.) = please	H: Pray , take a seat, Sir Henry.	H: Yes, please , go on.	H: Pray , continue.	He: Of course, I understand, please go on.	H: Sit down, Mr Knight, and do, please , smoke.
whence = from where	H: Don't you see now whence these words have been taken?				

Replacing obsolescent words—*Directives*

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
fellow = referring to a man/boy	H: But, by heavens, cunning as he is, the fellow shall be in my power before another day is past!				H: Got to see a man about a dog.

Replacing obsolescent words—*Commissives*

	novel 1902	1939	1959	1988	2012
fellow = referring to a man or a boy	H: What a nerve the fellow has!	W: I'm blasted if I know why on earth you want all these clippings about this Baskerville fellow .	F: What a splendid fellow he was.	He: By thunder, if that fellow can't find my old black boot.	Bartender: Sorry we couldn't do a double room for you, boys .
why (interjection) = to express surprise, lack of patience, etc.	He: Why , of course, that would explain it.	H: Why , in this way, only you and Sir Henry have been watched, and I've been free to work.	H: Now, sir, would you be prepared to give us the relevant facts? M: Why , yes.	H: My God. Have you got a cold Watson? W: Why , it's this poisonous atmosphere.	
by Jove = excl. of surprise or used for emphasis	H: It may have been—yes, by Jove , it is a curly-haired spaniel.		F: Found one? Have you, by Jove ?		

Replacing obsolescent words—*Expressives*