

Comparison and critique of two english article

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Lecturer's Comparison and Critique "There Will Always Be English" by Steven Pinker, poses a convincing argument on the nature and future of the English language, as well as its current dynamics. This is in relation to the strong sense of conviction and authority that the author uses in his wording. The command and usage of language is highly proficient for the content of the article, which creates a strong impression of knowledge of the issue at hand. This is especially with reference to conventional rules of language generated to regulate the usage of language, as a form of a manual (Pinker). This shows how well informed the author is on issues affecting the English language. It is in relation to the command that ethos are applied to make the article appealing to the audience and the reader because, projects valid arguments backed by valid references into the history of language.

On the other hand, "I h8 txt msgs: How texting is wrecking our language" by John Humphrys also bears a form of ethos by referring to everyday events that the audience and readers of the article can easily relate (Humphrys). This is concerning texting and the influence it has on the daily use of language in today's society. However, it fails to some extent to provide a strong argument for the degradation of language by texting. The above is due to the constant referral to personal opinions, albeit true, and over emphasis on a single consequence of texting. This is concerning the bias he has against violation of language rules rather than the positive side of ease in communication that texting has brought with it.

Emotionally, none of the two articles is appealing to the audience if looked at in critical level. The only emotion elicited from both is that of sympathy directed at the mutilation of language especially in the texting article by John

Humphrys. The article by Steven Pinker does little to capture the emotions of the audience except by giving hope of the language not dying, which elicits a sense of relief (Pinker). The purpose of both papers varies depending on the article; this is due to the target audience and the intended response from the audience. Pinker's article dwells more on the hope that exists for the English language, as opposed to the dangers that English as a language faces in terms of extinction due to mutilation and evolution.

In relation to the application of logic, Pinker does well by relating his ideas based on systematic thought. This occurs due to the numerous deductions that he makes based on the daily life occurrences, as opposed to unidirectional opinions of Humphrys in texting. His logic is mainly personal opinion and mostly biased against texting and not the issue at hand. For Humphrys, he makes direct observations from the society, which makes him lose points in the application of logic as an aspect of persuasion to the audience (Humphrys). However, his only, logical opinion in this case is the thought he gives to those that do not understand the shorthand mutilated language used in texting. In relation to this, he deduces that it takes many resources to make out the words applied in the intended communication.

In conclusion, the two articles have their similarities in strengths and weaknesses, as well differences in persuasions. This makes the two authors distinct parties making their cases heard in different formats and levels of communication.

Works Cited

Humphry's, John. I h8 txt msgs: How texting is wrecking our language. Mail Online. 2007. Web. 18 October 2012. < <http://www.dailymail.co>.

uk/news/article-483511/l-h8-txt-msgs-How-texting-wrecking-language. html>

Pinker, Steven. There will Always be an English. New York Times. 1999. Web.

18 Oct. 2012. < http://pinker. wjh. harvard.

edu/articles/media/1999_12_24_newyorktimes. html>