

Text A and Text B differ in that one is an advice manual and the latter is an extract from a non-fiction book suggesting it may be more entertaining than Text A. Both were not only written about women or 'their place in society', but were actually written by women giving the reader an interesting perspective on attitudes at that time. Looking at the reputation of women and the changing styles of communication, I will examine how the what is that language has changed 1901 to 2012.

From looking at both texts, it is evident that the reputation of women has evolved in the last century. The narrative in 1901 women were viewed as subservient to men and were seen as the 'homemakers' in society. With this in mind, it is clear to see the contradiction in comparison with the use of the post-positive evaluative adjective 'equal' used in Text A. Due to the social context of 1901 we can infer that this adjective has been strengthened over time due to its powerful association with rights. This is further supported when women's subservience is portrayed through the noun phrase 'has mental growth'. This infers a male superiority when it comes to 'intellect' as a 'young' wife will struggle to sustain his attention or compete with him on an educational basis due to her inferiority. ~~Even~~ The very direct view of generalising women has been also through the use of the collective determiner 'every' which implies that there is no variation among the gender as they were seen as the lower being in early 20th century society. This image of a lower being is further supported by the reputation of the modal verb of obligation 'should' to suggest it is a woman's duty to care for her husband. Religion also plays a major part in portraying the reputation of women. The ~~at~~ ~~adjective~~ phrase 'behave socially' involves an abstract noun coupled with an adverb of manner which so portrays the prominence of religion in our lives. This links directly to women too as we can interpret that this has

contributes to virginity. This demonstrates a language change as our language has become less fixed on religion as time due to our growing acceptance of science moving our attitudes toward a woman's 'gift' or virginity has changed as Text B also demonstrates how we've become more accepting of ~~open to scientific language~~ which predominantly relates to females. More expresses a ~~as~~ we've also grown to accepting women as equal to men. The mockery of a lack of intellect ~~appears~~ ~~lack of intellect in text B~~. Text B completely differs from Text A here as it appears to be mocking our old attitude that women are unequal due to our ever growing shift towards equality. Women here are suggested as being strong and direct which can be shown through the use of the asyndetic list which portrays resentment to the years of suppression women have faced. This is further supported by the use of the attributive evaluative adjective 'marvellous' to suggest how patriarchy and discrimination are no longer accepted. The connotation of the ^{predicative evaluative adjective} ~~adjective~~ noun 'DRUNK' being to do with having a social life, instead of denying your husband also suggests a shift in equality. Hence the imperative phrase 'we need to reclaim the word feminism' is arguably the most valuable in expressing this change. 'Feminism' is a connotation of a noun 'ism' (which we now categorise as a suffix due to its common use) and the evaluative 'adjective'. This has been done to express the importance of the movement and the importance of women. The dynamic verb 'reclaim' has also suggested that feminism has undergone popularisation throughout the years which may be due to the extreme movements that correlate to that ~~term~~ it. Overall, the reputation of women can be seen as improved as time as a century later it appears as though we are making these active attitudes that women are subservient to men. Even in Text A the growing shift can be seen due to the colloquial noun 'imag' showing how

the view was beginning to be accepted even in the early 20th century.

The changing styles in communication have also been portrayed by both of these texts. Although in 1901 language was standardised, a lack of accessibility to an education meant this was hard to grasp for an illiterate society. Therefore, it can be implied that the grammatical density of Text A may have been too difficult for an audience to understand suggesting it was for those high up the hierarchical ladder. In Text B, a complex compound complex sentence has been used which includes a main clause, a coordinate clause, a temporal subordinate clause and two relative subordinate clauses. This entails the view that language has become more simple over time as now we prefer to appeal to an audience of a wide range of abilities rather than specifying a certain clientele. Lynne Tovey believes as language may be becoming too simplistic suggesting that we have built a collective tolerance as the years. However surely this is better as it builds the accessibility and understanding over time. The use of the hyphen in 'to-day' also denotes how language, particularly in grammar has developed. In today's hectic society, it seems to be an inconvenience to use hyphenated compounds. Recently moving we have reduced our redundancy. This grammatical density infers an informal formal tone which differs greatly from the refined register used in Text B. This relates to Shoen Goodman's theory that, as we die to a society is becoming more personable, we prefer to now bridge the gaps between the author and the reader. This colloquial tone is also expressed through the use of dysphemistic language such as the word 'ragging' instead of Text A's use of 'gift'. By applying a concrete noun rather than an abstract one, not only can infer our society is more open but we can see how redundancy

is taken into effect. As we have become more accepting of women as language relating to women has also become more accepted and her thiefie goes through a process of ~~weakening~~ the sensitive field has gone through a process of weakening. Capitalism has also been used to express anger in Text A showing how the spoken and written mode has merged over time as the written mode here has become more expensive to imitate prosodic features. The frequent use of taboos in Text B with the use of phrases of 'faking bollocks' also demonstrates a language change - in contrast to the explicit language used in Text A. Text B is very open in expressing language as we would see today as vulgar. This relates to Pinker's theory that in the early 20th century, taboos relating to bodily effluvia were the most offensive however the attitude can be interpreted as being changed as Text B's use of 'shit' and the connotations that follow from that show the little offence. Pinker now believes it's more offensive to target minority groups in behavior which is why the derogatory attitude in Text A is no longer defended in Text B unless it's been adopted in a humorous sense. This demonstrates how our methods and styles of communicating with an audience have changed over time.

The Prescriptivism vs Descriptivism debate is also key when discussing the change from Text A to Text B. Humphrey for example doesn't agree with the weakening of laws as he believes this means we are losing a part of our language. This process can be shown by Text B's use of the adjective 'knackered'. However, a descriptivist would agree that such weakening just suggests a lack of necessity in the language so that we surely keep it would be redundant. Furthermore, Humphrey would also disagree with the excessive use of 'you' in Text B. Although Fairclough believes this has become more

frequent to provide the kids and maybe apps - a parenthesis would amount it is too informal. However, we could argue that this use of the second personal pronoun 'you' is simply more functional.

Overall, Text B differs immensely from Text A due to its becoming a more ~~complex~~ society which can be reflected in our language and how it has changed the past century.

Not too perfect.