IX.—INFLUENCE OF ANALOGY AS EXPLAINING
CERTAIN EXAMPLES OF UNORIGINAL *L*
AND *R*. By Dr. FREDERICK STOCK, M.A.

(Read at the Society's Meeting, on Friday, June 5, 1885.)

THIS paper is occasioned by Prof. Skeat's Notes on Etymology read before the Philological Society Nov. 7th, 1884, treating among other words of the following:—Listre, legistre, decretistre, divinistre, sophister, alchemister, barrister, chorister, roister, cartridge, partridge, treasure, philosopher, coffer, order, Londres, lavender, provender, jasper, culprit, bridegroom, hoarse, corporal; could, myrtle, manticple, participle, principle, syllable, treacle, chronicle, canticle.

Prof. Skeat somewhat incautiously stated in his paper (p. 3) that: 'To those who tell us that we cannot explain the *r* in this word (divinistre), we have merely to reply that *we are not called upon to do more than to declare it to be intrusive,*'¹ and again (p. 6), 'But in the words manticple, participle, principle, syllable, the *l* is certainly intrusive.'

There is throughout the President's paper no due recognition of the possible influence of Analogy on these words.

The school of philology, in which I have been trained, teaches me in the case of any word or inflexion, whose etymology is wanted, first to apply known phonetic laws. If this application is unsuccessful, then, and this second only in order of application, not in importance, to see if there is any evidence or probability of the influence of analogy; and only when both these processes fail to give a satisfactory result, and when there is no possibility of onomatopœia, to put aside the word or form as not explained in our present state of knowledge.

It will hardly be expected from me that I should attempt to give an exhaustive account of the influence of analogy in checking or combating or changing the results of purely

¹ The italics are my own.—F. S.

phonetic development. Analogy works in most cases, if not in all, consciously and frequently with apparent caprice, whereas organic change takes place unconsciously and regularly. Analogy attacks words generally one by one, and brings them over by degrees to the dominating or favourite form. Organic change, on the other hand, affects all examples of the same sound in a dialect at once. It represents indeed a physical change in the organs of speech.

But analogy working thus in consciousness has such a vast field of conditions or environment, that it is impossible in one short paper even to attempt to treat the subject exhaustively. The possibilities of analogy are almost as infinite as the possibilities of mental operation, and I shall be compelled to confine myself to a bare suggestion of its most important and frequent manifestations.

The influence of Analogy as affecting words and inflexions I take to be a lateral contagious influence of words and inflexions already in a dialect upon other words and inflexions either already in that dialect or introduced from without—deflecting such words and inflexions by their contagious influence from the form which would be taken, or which has been taken, in the course of organic phonetic development. It may be compared with the influence of a society in its larger or smaller groups upon the inherited character of its individual members; or with the influence of a contagious disease, if this is preferred, on hereditary tendencies.

This analogical influence manifests itself in the following among other conditions. A. There must always be mental proximity for the incidence of efficacious analogy. This proximity may be more or less close and does not admit of classification except as greater or less in degree.

a. There may be more or less resemblance in form. This resemblance again can only be classified as greater or less.

b. There may be the influence of numerical preponderance, the number of actual occurrences in usage being reckoned and not the number of words only. One common word may influence hundreds of less common words.

c. There may be the influence of some peculiar fitness or

suitability of the dominating word or words for the vocal organs of the speaking population. One form may become fashionable or popular.

d. There may be some special and perhaps fortuitous (possibly historical) influence, which determines the potency of an analogy, which would not otherwise have been dominant.

Of course these classes of influences are not mutually exclusive. Several of them may, and most frequently do, work together; the only one, which seems to be invariably present, being the first influence, viz. mental proximity—similarity of idea or of function.

This *A.* will work in conjunction with any or all of the four marked *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*. I will endeavour to illustrate my meaning by examples.

1. Mental proximity (*A*) (past tense of the same verb) works with similarity of form (*a*) and some influence of suitability (*c*) or caprice (*d*) not quite clear to me in levelling the persons of the past tense of the verb to ride: Anglo-Saxon: *ic rād*, *þu ride*, *he rād*, *wē*, *gē*, *hiē ridon*, now running in Modern English 'I rode (= *rād*), thou rodest, he rode, we, you, they rode.' I say the capricious influence is not quite clear to me, for in German the weak form of the same tense of the cognate verb is selected to oust the strong forms of the preterite tense of *reiten*, the mediæval German forms *reit*, *rite*, *reit*, *reiten*, *ritet*, *riten*, being represented in modern German by *ritt*, *rittst*, *ritt*, *ritten*, *rittet*, *ritten*. *A*, *a*, *b*.

Examples of this kind may be multiplied almost indefinitely in English, German and French, and doubtless in all languages; the origin may have been 'sheer blundering,' but the result is great convenience, and use has established and authorized the forms as they are.

2. Mental proximity (*A*) (formation of plural) has worked in conjunction with numerical preponderance (*b*) and some peculiar suitability (*c*) in extending one form of the Anglo-Saxon plural, the ordinary inflexion for the Norman-French plural, over many of the English nouns which previously employed a different inflexion: *e.g.* instead of 'book' pl.

‘beek,’ which would be the hereditary representative of *bóc* pl. *béc*, we have ‘book’ pl. ‘books.’

Similarly the weak form of the past participle and the weak conjugation of verbs generally has extended their dominant influence over many verbs originally strong. A, b, c.

3. It seems to be a recognized fact among the authorities that four (I suppose common) Old Slavonic verbs, *jesmĭ*, *věmĭ*, *damĭ*, *jamĭ*, have dominated all the first persons singular of all the classes of conjugation in the modern representatives of Old-Slavonian, so that they now all end in *m*. A. a, b, c.

4. Delbrück in his “Einleitung in das Sprachstudium” instances the curious analogy of *duabus* as influencing the dat. and abl. plural of such words as *dea*, *filia*, *mula*. Delbrück explains this influence as a case of mental proximity with fair resemblance in form, in which the analogy of *duabus* (no numerical preponderance) only becomes potent under the influence of a fortuitous circumstance, the necessity of dissimilation from the dat. and abl. plural of *deus*, *filius*, *mulus*, etc. I can partially parallel this case with an instance from Pfälzisch, the dialect of the Rhenish Palatinate, more particularly of the villages between and in the neighbourhood of Heidelberg and Mannheim. The literary German *ü* is in this dialect *i*, so that *Fuss* pl. *Füsse* becomes *Fuss* pl. *Fiss*. The word *Fisch* would by phonetic development have the plural *Fisch*, and would not be distinguishable from the singular, but there is frequently among the fishermen of the Neckar a necessity to distinguish between the singular and plural of fish; and in looking round for an analogy they have seized upon *Füss*, *Fiss*, and its class and have made a new singular *Fusch*, so that the declension now runs—sg. *Fusch*, pl. *Fisch*.

If any one smiles at this and thinks scorn of such vulgar formation, I would remind him of Mr. Ellis’s sentence—

‘We that read history, make history, more especially in words.’

By which I understand Mr. Ellis to mean: If we get to understand the influences at work in changing language in

untutored dialects *now*, we have a fair chance of obtaining a clue to the influences at work in those good old times before Philology was known. Those who call the working of Analogy ‘sheer blundering’ or ‘vicious spelling’ or by any other abusive epithet, seem to assume that, in the formation of such words as ‘syllable’ and ‘could,’ those employing the words have a knowledge of the antecedents of these words and are, in a word, etymologists, instead of being, as they really are, in 999 cases out of 1000, absolutely ignorant of the ultimate origin of these words and only desirous of collating new words with words already in their possession, and of simplifying actual inflexions.

I now proceed to consider the examples of intrusive *r* and *l* treated of in the President’s paper, and to strive to give the explanation which the President declared to be uncalled for.

I will first of all dispose of those forms which I do not propose to attempt to explain from the point of view of analogy.

Listre. If this word is from *lector*, the *r* is not intrusive. *R* in such a position is regularly retained in French of all periods, and it seems supererogatory to suggest its theoretic removal in order immediately to reinstate the letter as intrusive.

‘pastor’	makes	<i>pâtre</i>
‘pejor’	„	<i>pire</i>
‘pictor’	„	<i>peintre</i>

The *n* probably from the analogy of *peindre*, or possibly the form *pinctor* existed already in Low Latin from the analogy of *pingere*.

‘traditor’	„	<i>traître</i>
‘cantor’	„	<i>chantre</i>

With regard to the *s*, although this does not fall within the province of this paper, it may possibly have been added to exhibit the quantity of the vowel *i*. If so, this *s* is the result of analogy.

Coffre, ordre, Londres. I do not propose to explain these words by analogy. I consider the *n* as a possible phonetic explanation, and compare *diacre* from *diaconum*.

Hoarse. Prof. Skeat himself recognized this form as "due to a misunderstanding of the vowel-sound, which led to a vicious spelling," and I was at first inclined to explain the Middle English form *hors*, now *hoarse*, as influenced by the analogy of the Middle English *hors*, the quadruped. But Mr. Sweet tells me that the form *hêrs* is to be found in Dutch; and Dr. Murray instances a form *hears* in Lowland Scotch, so that we are almost compelled to give up this explanation from analogy. As I find the form *hâss* in Old Norse and know that an original *rs* frequently appears in Old Norse as *ss*, I am now inclined to postulate the existence of the form with *rs* in the original Teutonic language, either as existing side by side with the form without the *r*, or as itself the earlier form.

The explanation of this *r* by analogy falls to the ground, and with it the explanation (falsely so called) of the *r* as 'intrusive.'

Fronde, jaspere. I have no explanation to offer here for the *r* in these words, nor for the *r* in *culprit*. It is not by any means certain that *culprit* is derived from *culpatum*. The Dictionary examples of *culprit* are, comparatively speaking, few and un instructive.

Myrtle. I believe this word to be derived from a Latin form *myrtillum*, through Old French *myrtil*.

I now proceed to consider the words in which I hold that analogy has more or less exerted its influence.

Could. Obviously influenced by the analogy of *should* and *would*. A, a, b.

Prof. Skeat in his paper (pp. 5, 6) says: "Putting aside the intrusive *l* in *could*," by which I understand him to signify that he regards the analogical influence as too obvious to need comment.

Cartridge. This word seems to have first come into English in an architectural sense connected with the curl or scroll on the capital of a pillar. It seems to have been derived from the French *cartouche* of the same meaning.

Being a word introduced and used by workmen, there is no wonder that the word should be influenced by the

analogy of known English words, and by popular etymology made into *carthouse* on the one side and into *cartridge* on the other. The introduction of the second *r* was facilitated by the analogy of *charter*, *chartre*, for which a form *cartre* had existed in English.

The 'cartrage' or 'cartridge,' in the sense of a small receptacle for gunpowder, was introduced into English later, also from the French, which had it from Italian. The *r* of 'charter' and of 'cartridge' was again efficient in introducing an *r* after the *t*, and the popular form *cartrage* was formed with a termination *rage* appreciated by the common folk. But alongside of this form a literary form seems to have been maintained from the first with the exact French spelling *cartouche*.

I do not explain the *r* of *chartre* or *cartre* by analogy (Prof. Skeat explains it now from *chartula*). The terminations *-rage*, *-ridge*, and *-house* are, however, instinct with analogies. A, a, b.

Partridge. The second *r* in this word appears in French.

In explaining *perdriz* I proceed thus: *perdicem* allows the *dr* to be transposed, and becomes *pedricem*. There is evidence of this form in French of the fourteenth century *pietris*. *Perdicem* and *Pedricem* might suffer¹ contamination and become *perdicem*. This would give in French *perdris* or *perdriz*. Or the contamination may have taken place in French; *perdis* and *pietriz* evolving *perdriz*.

I look upon the spelling *perdriz* as due to the learning of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which discovered that the Latin had an *x* in the nominative case. *Perdriz* would phonetically have become *pédrres*. The earlier English form seems to have been *partryche*, with a suffix known in O.E. *heveneriche*. The suffix was exchanged for *ridge*, to which it was sufficiently similar to invite analogical change. I imagine the form *partryche* was made from French *perdriz* at a time when the *z* was still pronounced sharp in Norman French *perdrîts*. The contamination is a result of mutual analogy. A, a.

¹ Compare *jecinoris* from *jecinis* and *jecoris* (Delbrück).

Corporal (noun). Prof. Skeat recognizes this as an analogical formation in imitation of *corporal* (adj.). Our President does not, however, approve of this analogical influence. He calls it "a misunderstanding of the vowel-sound, which led to a vicious spelling." There is some excuse, however, for us English in this matter. The adjective *corporel* was in use in French in the twelfth century, and the corresponding form *corporal* in English at any rate as early as the fourteenth century. The word *corps* (*de garde*, etc.) was frequent in French in military significations.

The analogy was bound to be strong in French as well as in English; but stronger in English because of the foreign vowel-sound *ā* in *caporal* and because of the approximate inaudibility of the *r* in *corporal* at the close of the sixteenth century, when the noun seems to have been introduced into English (1579, Digges *Stratoticos*, p. 84. "The *corporal* is a degree in dignitie above the privat souldior").

The noun *corporal* has met with some favour in French, according to Littré, as a variant from *caporal*, which was introduced from Italian in the fifteenth century. There seems to have been another *corporal* in use in English at the close of the sixteenth century, possibly in the sense of an aide-de-camp, or *personal* attendant of the general—*corporal* of the field. A, a, b.

Bridegroom. *Bridegroom* was probably influenced by the analogy of the word *groom* in English when *goom* ceased to have an independent intelligible existence. *Grome* at any rate seems older in the language than *bridegroom*. The word *groom* may itself be an analogical formation either in Norse from which it may have been introduced into English or in English itself. A, a, b (occurrence).

Lavender and *provender* I look upon as influenced in English by the analogy of *lavender*, a washerman, and *provender* in the sense of *præbendarius*. A, a, b, c. I hardly regard this explanation as sufficient.

Philosopher. Of this word Prof. Skeat says in his Dictionary: "Here the *r* is a needless addition, as the

French word was *philosophe*, correctly answering to Lat. *philosophus* and Gk. *φιλόσοφος*." I look upon this word with its, to an English ear, meaningless termination *e*, as attracted to the numerous class of English words denoting agents in *er*, baker, fiddler, harper, etc. A (agency), *a*, *b*.

Trésor. I think this word was influenced by the great numerical preponderance of words in French with initial *tré* over those in *té* especially by the great frequency of the occurrence of compounds of *trans* = *très*, and by the possible popular etymology of *trésor* as 'beyond gold, more than gold.' A, not quite clear, probably associated with the popular etymology suggested above: *a*, *b*, *d* (or same as *or* gold).

The other examples of intrusive *r*, *legistre*, *decretistre*, *divinistre*, *sophister*, *alchemister*, *barrister*, *chorister*, *rustre*, *roister*, may be all included under one class. I proceed to attempt an explanation of them from the point of view of analogy.

Before the introduction of the termination *-iste* into French from Latinized Greek words in *-ista(m)*, such as *evangeliste*, *psalmiste*, the termination *-stre* was very common in French.

1. *Nostre*, *vostre* being in very common use were a host in themselves.

2. *Astre* from Lat. *-astrum*, *-astram* became a favourite French termination.

3. The two words *maistre* and *ministre*, being also very common, formed a point of starting to facilitate the formation of doublets in *-stre* to the nouns in *-ste*.

The words *légistre* and *sophiste* and others were then attacked laterally by the analogy of *maistre* and *ministre*, assisted by the words *nostre*, *vostre*, and by the French adjectives in *-astre*.

I am inclined to think, but I have not been able to verify this, that the termination *-istre* and *-ister* thus acquired in Eng. and Fr. the character of an understood termination expressing agency, which might be added to other words (like *-âtre* for adjectives), and that we thus get the forms *barrister*, *divinistre* and *decretistre*. Such a form would be

likely to become popular in English, because of the existence of the agent terminations in *-stere*, formerly feminine.

Prof. Skeat in his Dictionary says of *huckster*, "The A.S. distinction in gender between the terminations *er* and *ster* was lost at an early period, so that the word was readily applied to men."

The hypothesis of this analogical influence led me to suppose that some other words of obvious Greek origin might be also influenced by the same analogy. I accordingly looked up *psalmiste* and *evangeliste* in Littré, and, although I could only find the form *psalmiste* quoted by Littré, I found that *evangelistre* occurs in Rutebœuf (thirteenth century).

I am inclined here to make an excursus on the procedure in this kind of development. I do not think it has been sufficiently elucidated or corroborated by ordinary English philologists. The process is the following.

A termination is developed in strict accordance with phonetic rules in the case of one or more words. It is then found to be a convenient and useful termination, and is applied to other words or roots, which in and of themselves would never have developed such a termination. I take as an illustrative example the words in *-δαπός* quoted by Dr. Weymouth in his paper this evening (Accent in Sanskrit and Greek, June 5th, 1885), and explained by him as all derived from ablatives in *-δ* followed by the preposition *ἀπό*, and taking on adjective terminations. The real explanation is probably the following:

The termination *-δαπός* was formed originally in *ποδ-από-ς* and *αλλο-δ-από-ς*, in the case of which there is some evidence or probability of the ablative forms *ποδ*, *αλλοδ*. There is, however, no such probability in the case of *ήμεδαπός*, *ύμεδαπός*, *παντοδαπός* or *τηλεδαπός*. The probability is that the words *τηλεδαπός*, *παντοδαπός*, *ήμεδαπός*, *ύμεδαπός* were formed on the analogy of the forms in common use, *ποδαπός*, *αλλοδαπός*. (I do not claim credit for this as an original explanation. I cannot find in my notes and papers my authority, or I would quote it.) Similarly *Wildner* in German is formed on the

analogy of *Gärtner*, *Bogener* (Behaghel), the termination *-ner* being felt as the suffix. Every one recognizes the influence of analogy in cases in which the influence has been very widespread, as for instance in the growth of the termination *-issimo* in Italian, and in the spread of the plural in *s* in English, and of the weak conjugation of verbs. It is just, however, in cases like these of the less widely-spread terminations *-ister*, *-δανος*, *-ner*, that the initial working of analogy is most characteristic and instructive, and least frequently recognized.

I now proceed to the cases of intrusive *l*.

Syllable. I look upon this *l* as the result of the influence of the common Romance adj. suffix *-able*, *cuvenable*, *reasonable*. The termination was also well known in nouns, e.g. *table*, *stable*. A, *a*, *b*.

Manciple, *participle*, *principle*, are formed on the analogy of *disciple*, *people*, and helped by such words as *temple*, *example*, and by the moderate frequency of the termination *el* and *le* in Old English, as well as in many Romance suffixes. A (nouns), *a*, *b*, *c*.

Treacle (*triale* found in O. Fr.), *chronicle*, *canticle*, are formed on the analogy of *article*, *miracle*, *tabernacle*, etc. A (nouns), *a*, *b*.

I believe I have now gone through Prof. Skeat's examples of intrusive *r* and *l*. It is quite¹ possible that our President accepts the position that these intrusions were caused by analogy; and I am quite certain that he could furnish very much stronger arguments and examples to corroborate this position than I can. It is indeed most probable that I, working only with very ordinary means of reference at my command, and not acquainted with the bibliography of the discussion of the words, have missed in many cases the actually efficient cause of the analogical influence. I feel confident, however, that there has been analogical influence. I accept no exceptions to phonetic laws except such as are caused either, firstly, by the lateral influence of analogy, or rather by the influence of the language or dialect as a whole

¹ Prof. Skeat does accept this position.—F. S.

or in its grouped parts, upon individual words or forms, or, secondly, by the influence of onomatopœia.

I must apologize to the Society for having presumed to attack its President's language. I cannot adequately express my gratitude as a student to Professor Skeat for his Dictionary. No one can over-estimate the gratitude I felt to Prof. Skeat for bringing out a Dictionary which reached the end of the alphabet in my student period. There are so many lexicographical efforts, which have reached the middle of the letter A or the end of C, or perhaps have arrived in different parts at the middle of the letters G, M, and O respectively, that it was an almost unheard-of privilege to read what a great modern scholar had to say about a word with initial *x*, *y*, or *z*.

I must however contend that in our President's Dictionary the operations of Analogy have met with scant respect, and that in the paper which I have attempted to criticize this evening the operations of Analogy have been thrust aside when they might at any rate have been investigated, whether they furnished a clue to the explanation of intrusive *r* and *l* or not.

X. — SOUND - CHANGES IN MELANESIAN LANGUAGES. By the Rev. R. H. CODRINGTON, D.D., of the Melanesian Mission, Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

(Read at the Society's Meeting on Friday, 19 June, 1885.)

1. It is necessary at the outset to define the field occupied by those Melanesian languages concerning the sound-changes in which I am about to speak. I do not undertake to survey all the languages in Melanesia, nor indeed all which are spoken in the part of Melanesia with which I am acquainted. Those which I am to consider occupy the north part of the New Hebrides, the Banks' Islands, the Santa Cruz Group, and the Solomon Islands so far as Ysabel. To these must be added Nengone, one of the Loyalty Islands (commonly called Mare), Fiji, and Duke of York Island, between New Britain