The English Dictionary (if with capital letters we may thus, for a moment, idealize it) is truly an amazing treasury of words! One best realizes this, of course, by turning the pages of the Oxford Dictionary. And one can scarcely realize it without doing so. At first, perhaps, the peruser hardly suspects that he is looking not so much at words as, quite often, the shadows, one may sometimes say the ghosts, of words. The present chapter is concerned, in part, with these shadows. Sometimes they are in the shape of by-forms, simply; occasionally, in spite of the "genius" of the tongue, a word dares to play another role; assimilation and analogy, always at work, often leave words and forms of words stranded; back-formations and truncated (or aphetic) and clipped terms come to be passed by, unrecognizable; hundreds of corruptions (but not all) have perished; factitious forms were marked, from the beginning, for the graveyard; words with doubtful etymologies have frequently been laid permanently aside; above all, thousands and thousands of words and forms, in one manner or another, stand isolated on the pages of our Dictionary. The vocabularies of people are continuously changing, which is to say that they are being adjusted by people to new needs and new life. It might accordingly be supposed that the work of the lexicographer, who nowadays works "on historical principles," is minimized. Yet it is not; and we have him to thank for numerous aids and innumerable facts and decisions and notes.

The restlessness of early modern English has already been commented upon. The result of this restlessness is today, in part,
apparent. Even writers and thinkers who were much taken with words between Shakespeare's time and Dryden's, saw and announced some of the perils in which the vocabulary stood. We have a way in our present enlightenment of passing judgment on writers and their words alike; but it is ever pleasant to think that whatever their judgment was and whatever our concernment or worry is, the Well of English makes no mistake in the matter.* Thus, once again in the thought of Professor George Gordon (Bib. 361,) how far men's words served and how far they were ornaments and even baubles throughout the time mentioned above, is in a measure our concern in this chapter. No conclusive examination or proof is, of course, possible. Sometimes words served a purpose, and were found indispensable in their service; sometimes, no doubt, "one tried, to see what would happen," though it is believable that such trials were infrequent; often the writer took his words seriously, because he took himself and his own little world seriously; sometimes was was utterly careless of his verbal household, and by no means kept his vocabulary in tact. The spelling out of "defilement," "increase," and "enrichment" is indeed a difficult matter if one insists on having the whole of the English Dictionary in mind!

It was inevitable, thus, that hundreds of these shadowy forms and words should live but for a day. Intrinsically they are seldom faulty. The corrupt, irregular, and erroneous forms are, in the main, few. And it should always be remembered, as suggested above, that there are still many corrupt forms in the vocabulary. As much can be said of abbreviated and back-formations, and the like. On the other

---

* P. 4 and Bib. 343.
hand, the "fault" barely lay with the user or words (especially when he grew indifferent to nice distinctions, and confused forms and meanings,) or with time bringing about changes in forms (analogy, assimilation, additions of suffixes, truncations and abbreviations, adjustments of compounds) or with both time and circumstance (fact of isolation.)[[ Dates are often interesting and sometimes important; but we shall look to their significance in the last chapter.]]

English, thus, was merely increased and not enriched in forms like abandonate, abashless, abjectedness, adapt, agricollist—a handful of 'a-' words. Each happens to illustrate a different phenomenon, a different kind of adjustment taking place. Words like abandonate we shall discuss in the next chapter. One's interest in the affix is quickened; suffixes and prefixes are a very large subject. In a slightly different way abashless and abjectedness interest us. The suffix '-less' has at least occasionally had 'un-' for a rival; and for abjectedness there are two or three cognate rivals. Analogy was, so to speak, the only friend of adapt (1704 Swift, 1733 North;) but it was not strong enough in the face of 'adapted' (1610,) and numerous synonyms ('fit' and 'fitted,' 'suited,' &c.) Agricollist, finally, was wholly isolated. It occurs only in some poetry by Dodaley, 1754, and in a line of Mrs. Piozzi's, 1794, "Those who are speaking with agricollists will observe that soil is the word in use." Had it en-

* Taken individually, see p. 264; collectively, op. Bib. 376.

[[ A kind of warning given on p. 13 may be recalled here. The classifications of this and the ensuing chapters scarcely explain why words grow obsolete. They suggest causes and possibilities. They serve as convenient names under which the better examples—or words—may occasionally explain themselves. ]] Ch. XI, p. 441, where only a complete garnering is possible.
joyed a prolonged existence, it could but doubtfully have endured against 'agriculturist' (1760, 'agriculturalist' (1812,) the less scientific 'agriculturer' (also 1812,) and 'agricitor' ('A husbandman. The word in our language is modern, but is getting into common use."—Todd, 1913.) Contrarily, 'agricole' and 'agricolus,' though living, are exceedingly rare, and 'agricolation,' like 'agricolist, is obsolete.

Form-association is responsible for what today we should call many superfluous terms. The word abbatical is a choice example. Though the form 'abbatial,' still in use, was before it (1642,) it was made independently "apparently by form association with 'sabbatical'" and used in 1655 (Fuller) and 1774 (T. West.) Here, as one may say, the form-association is on the side of the obsolete member. In alexipharmac it is the other way around. This obsoletism is ultimately from the Greek, and was "At first used only in the Greek or Latin form; after its [French] adaptation as alexipharmac it was also used adjectively, and finally by form-association made Alexipharmic (1671 ff.)" This date—1671—serves for the obsolete form. Interestingly, the form alexipharmacal was before alexipharmac in time both as adjective (1643) and as substantive (1607.) Form-association, finally, works in such mysterious and emphatic ways as to cause, or help, an erroneous form to gain ascendency over a correct one. We shall have occasion, presently, to look at some corrupt obsoletisms. In the aggregate they may tempt one to believe that all corrupt forms are obsolete, but quite a number of words in our vocabulary like 'mammology' and 'rubiferous' and 'frontignac' prove the contrary. We focus momentary attention on the last-named: it designates either wine made at Frontignan (1629 ff.) or the grape from which
the wine was made (1641 ff.;) yet the name 'frontignac' is an erroneous form for \textit{frontignan} (1756, 1769 Mrs. Raffeld,) wherein the "substitution of -ac for -an is perhaps due to a reminiscence of the many Southern French names in \textit{ignac}." One note in passing the word used by the NAD editors—'reminiscence.'

When one comes across a word like \textit{agriculist} in the dictionary, one perhaps suspects the existence of a word \textit{horticultist}, and one is not disappointed. The poet has been there with both words. The obsoletism is from medieval Latin, 'hortus,' 'colere.' The date is of course 1754; it is interesting to note that our living word, 'horticulturist' (from 'horticulture,' 1679, and comparable with modern French 'horticulteur,') is 1813. A bishop used, in 1760, the form \textit{horticultor}.

Whence a great abundance of forms is on display in a work like the Oxford Dictionary. \textit{Circumferencer} was used by Petty in 1672, but 'circumferentor' (surveying instrument) was before it: 1610 ff.; so \textit{coaraction} (1782 only) and 'coaraction' (fr. L. 'coaractation,' 1545 ff.;) \textit{delirous, -nese} (1652--1722, especially H. More; L. 'de' and 'lira') and 'delirious' (from 'delirium,' 1706, 1599;) \textit{inclinated} (fr. \textit{inclinate}, obs. r. 1571, fr. L. 'inclinatus,' ps. pple.) and 'inclined' (respectively, 1577 and 1590 ff.;) \textit{insolvent} (1668) and 'insolvent' (1591 ff.;) \textit{scansive} (obs. rare, fr. L. ppl. stem 'scans,' fr. 'scandere,' 1657 Tomlinson [L. \textit{scansilla et}] and 'scandent' (ad. L. pr. pple., 1682;) \textit{sycophancy} (fr. 'sycophant' [ad. L. and Gr. 1575 ff.] and 'ry,' 1670 Owen "... an example in the art of sycophancy") and 'sycophancy' (ad. L. 'sycophantia,' ad. Gr., 1657 ff.;) \textit{vernacularize} (a. 1802 only, fr. 'vernacul', obs. r. ad. L. 'vernaculus' [used twice by Grew in a work of 1669]) and 'vernacularize' (1821, fr.
vernacular,' 1601 OFr.;) and volatize (v., 1650, fr. 'volat-ile' a. and '-ize') and 'volatilize' (1657 ff., fr. 'volatile' [a. 1300] and same suffix, op. Fr., Sp., Pg., It.; volatization [1699 and 1818] and 'volatilization' [1661 ff.] are very similar.) Although incursation (rare, 1656 H. More "Immortality of the Soul") is from a late Latin form, 'incursionem,' our form 'incursion' (1615 ff.) has held its place. Forms like ignible, illustrable, indiscernible, and qualitated are based on types, often asterisked.* Occasionally two forms from the Greek occur. Thus 'dioptric' is a more modern adoption of the Greek 'through' and 'pertaining to vision'—1635. Dioptric was recorded by Blunt in 1656 and by Todd in 1656; its substantive use occurs in Power, 1664, and in some "Philosophical Transactions" the next year (op. 'doptrics,' 1644.) So gymnade, used by Gale in 1677; whereas 'gymnasium' had been in the vocabulary since 1573.

The Italian 'generellissimo' (1621, a superlative) has prevailed. Generalissimus was, however, used in the "London Gazette" (1683) and elsewhere (rare.) For serenissimo, in contrast, no need has permanently been felt (a. F. 1665 Sir T. Herbert in "Travels," for both it and the Italian form, serenissime ("most serene," 1624, 1391) have not been kept.[I] But late Latin 'scrinary' (1396, "keeper of archives") is our form where "S. H." in his translation of 1670 used a word or form from the Italian—scrinary. Against I-

*Ignible, obs. rare, 1678 R. R[ussell] "Gerber" "A metallick Body .. ignible (or sustaining Ignition.)" Ac. L. type 'ignibilla,' 'Ignitable' fr. v. and '-able' (1646.) Illustrable f. L. type 'illustrabilla,' fr. 'illustrare' (1650 Browne, 1669) and 'illustratable' (fr. v. [ppl. stem of 'illustrare,' 1530] 1850.

Italian 'vermicelli' (1669 ff.) a Scottish form from the French, vermicell (1724 only) could not stand. Sometimes the French form has prevailed over the Latin: 'influx' (1547) over influct (1675 only), 'inter-friction' ('friction,' a. F. 'friction,' L. 'friction-em,' 1591 ff.) over frictionation ("rubbing together," 1747 Franklin "Conjecture," friction also obsolete, ad. L. 'frictionem,' 1533--1694; 'inter-friction' used by De Quincey in 1847,) 'veridical' (1653) over verifical (a. 1660,) 'quintuple' (1635, a. F. after 'quadruple') over quincuple (1774 only, ad. L. 'quinqueplex,' ) and sometimes it has been the other way around: 'decency' (1567, fr. L. 'decentia') over decency (1673 Sprat "Sermon," 1633, 1697 Dryden "Aeneid" of Virgil, interesting intervening, or temporary, form from French, from L. word as above,) *'florilegium' ("a collection of flowers," a. 1645, elsewhere; on analogy of 'apocryphal,' "anthology"—literal rendering of Greek [1711]0) over florilege (a. Fr., 1651, 1665; florilegy, anglicized form, 1621, also obsolete,) 'indomptable' (1634 [obs.]) 1623 ff.) over inompence (a. F. 1653 only, "Emperor of the indomptable" [ad. 1663 inompatile] Forces of the Elephants of the Earth") 'obfuscous' (1922, ad. L. type) over offuse (a. F., 1849 Lytton "Caxtons" ("Blackwoods") only—"dark, dusky," ) 'perforated' (pol. a., Her. 1436 ff., &c.) over perforation (a. Her., ad. Fr., 1661 Morgan,) 'pericranium' (1590, New Latin) over perigrans (a. F. ad. med. or mod. L., 1632


* Greville in his "Diary," 1936, spoke of Taglioni's "grace and decency:" a confessedly Fr. form and use, thus. Cf. in next Ch. 'noe' and 'noy.'
D'Urfey, 1703-1804, 'podium' ([1611,] 1789 ff.) over posary (1664 only, Evelyn tr. "Freart's Architect." "They served for Podia or posaries of a leaning-height," Fr. fr. med. L.,) 'propagate' (ppl. stem of L. 'pro-pagare,' 1570 ff.) over propagate (v. obs. r. 1659 Bp. Patrick, 1695 Congreve, ad. Lat.? or Fr.?,) 'superintendent' (ab. and adj., 1592 ff.) over surintendent (1665 Gubbier, 1690 Temple, 1709 Mrs. Manley, a. 1721 Prior,) and 'unconnected' (ab. 1650) over unconnected (earlier Fr. equivalent, ab. 1500 to 1700; the L. 'connectere,' &c., was "there," and with the post-Renaissance outlook, surrendered its form to the English; also analogy of 'affection,' 'direction,' 'collection,' 'inspection' to help c. 1725-1750: 'at' / 'x' especially in the U. S.)

For the most part these obsolete forms are of rare or rarest occurrence. Their dates are always interesting, but as promised a few pages back (p. 162 and footnote,) we postpone this inspection. 'Isosceles' was English from 1551 on (or previous,) from late Latin and Greek, yet a French form (1542) appeared in English in 1715: isoscel; and isoscelar the adjective, 1711 "Brit. Apollo," is also obsolete. Iniquous was used by some writers (including Sir Thomas Browne and Shaftesbury, 1692 and 1711,) but another Latin form coming through Old French replaced it: 'iniquitous' in 1726. No need existed for both amalgamation (1753 only, but op. amalgamize, obs. rare 1599 and 1674) and 'amalgamation' (1612, fr. 'amalgamate' 1660 ff.; op. Ch. VI, '-ate' and '-ize;') for both apostating and 'apostatizing,' asserving and 'asservating,' destruct and 'destroy,' &c.*

---

* Apostating vbl. sb. fr. obs. v. (apostate, 1533 ff.) used by Hexham 1660; ppl. a. 1656 Bp. Hall. 'Apostatizing' vbl. sb. 1659, ppl. a. 1652 ff. Asserving ppl. a. 1733 North (asserver 1591 ff.)
Analogy, then, the attraction of forms and like sounds, plays a great part in the moulding and increase of our vocabulary. The wonder is (as one turns the pages of the Oxford Dictionary) that more words have not been marked "obsolete," as having passed in all probability from further use. A good word, 'adjust,' was before justen (from the adjective after [or on the analogy of] 'fasten,' 'hasten,' and the like; the respective dates being 1661 ff. and 1659 Locke, 1665 Hooke;) 'inclining' was before inclination (obs. rare, perhaps on the analogy of 'declension;' 1400 and 1751 translation, respectively,) and other forms were at least as early—'gratifying' and gratificatory ("after 'satisfactory,'" used but once, a. 1665,) 'lymphatic' and lymphaduct (formed after 'aquaductus;' used in some "Philosophical Transactions" of 1667, 1664living form, and the obsolete between 1664 and 1769,) 'nominator' and 'nominor' (1765, 1790,) obround (1663, 1683) and 'obrotund' (after L. 'oblong-us,' 1550) and then-tofore after 'theretofore,' and meaning the same: ecclesiastical writings.

Analogy is like a horn of plenty in the case of cerulean. The obsoletism signifies "made cerulean, colored blue," and was used by Sir T. Herbert in his "Travels" book of 1634, and again by another writer in 1690. 'Cerulean' is chiefly poetic, and has been in the

'Asservating: 1339 ff., is from the verb form in '-ate,' where the date is 1791 ff. Destruct, v., obs. rare (1 use) a. 1630 Mede, L., perh. on analogy of 'construct.' 'Destroy' 1297 ff., fr. ME. and OFr. and Old Popular Latin, 'destrugere.' Op. also 'destructify' (rare, prob. obs.,) used in "Fraser's Magazine" in 1941, "enough to contaminate, poison, degrade, and destructify the whole race." Disposeth obs. rare L. 'disponere,' cp. WiN. 'disposition;' 1661 Glanvill "Societis Scientifica"—"some constitutions are genially disposed to this mental seriousness." 'Dispoise,' 6 a and 8, "to incline the mind," c. 1340 fr. OFr., 'disposer' versus L. 'disposit-' pol. stem. 'Dispose' chiefly Sc. Po-
the language since 1667; **ceruleous** (1575--1717, rare) and **cerulific** (obs., rare, 1701) were other forms chosen or created by Boyle, Grew, and writers of "Philosophical Transactions" (twice.) Herbert was fond of this word. As remarked above, he used **ceruleated** in the 1634 volume; he also used in the same publication, uniquely, **ceruleal,** and in 1677, in another edition or volume of his "Travels," the established form—'cerulean.' 'Cerulean' appears not to have been a sufficiently poetical form for a few poets, and Spenser and Dyer tapered it to 'cerue' (not marked obsolete.) 'Cerulenescent, finally, is the botanist's term (1830, 1831.) Analogy, precisely speaking, is perhaps not wholly responsible here; but however they came about, these forms are plentiful enough to give pause for thought.

And so it would be possible to instance words almost without end. But a rule of rareness all but invariably holds: **hilarious** used but the once by Pell (1659,) **inquart** (1683; 'inquartation' 1231, 1392.)

---

**pal a. obs. rare (1) 1651 (popan 1339.) 'Papal' has been the accepted form since 1390. AS. and L. 'papa,' 'papacy,' &c. Schismatizing ppl. a. obs. rare (1) 1712, fr. 'schismatistic' and '-ate' and '-ing.' 'Schismatizing' is fr. OF. and Greek, 1601 fr. Sensually a. OF. obs. rare, 1700 and 1728; 'sensuality' in Fr. Hist. 1475, a. OF. Solidipede, obs. rare (1) 1661 Lovell, and solidipedous, 1712: our terms are 'solidipe' sb. 1646, ad. med. or mod. L. 'solipes,' and 'solidopedus,' 1717, respectively.

A few further examples: Digestive perhaps illustrates "too many syllables," or would illustrate as much if it had been used extensively. It was used only by Tomlinson, 1657, 'Made milde and tractable by a digestate heat'; 'Digestive' (our word) dates from 1532. Digestion is in Bailey only. Empyreum was used by Crashaw in 1647, by Butler ("Remains") 1680, by Ken 1711 (poet.,) by Priestley 1777. 'Empyrean' used substantively (1667 ff.) is our word. Ephemerid (1394, earlier f. was ephemeral, 1795 fr.) and 'ephemercal' (1639 [2] ff.) illustrates the matter of affixes. Jeremy Taylor 1660 preferred ephasiage for 'episcopacy' (1647 in this use.) Indiscriminately was used by Boyle in 1665, L. 'in' and 'discriminat.' Our word is from 'discriminate'—'indiscriminate-ly' 1652 ff. Fishly was used by Cowley in his "Voyage" (1699:) 'fishily' (1331, fr. 'fishy' and '-ly') has replaced it. Flaman
inquiet (a. 1694 Leighton "Sermon"—"Sinful liberty breeds inquiet")'inquietude,' 1440, 1597 ["restlessness"] ff., "diquest" 1581 ff.,)
potter (1661 Boyle, a. 1729 Woodward, app. after 'leathern,') min-
brand (1709—1729, 'minuend' 1706 ff., analogy with 'subtrahend' and
euphony,) mucage (1657, 'mucilage' c. 1400 ff., analogy of corres-
ponding words in other European languages—Fr. 'mucilage,' Late
Latin 'muciligo,' Span. 'mucilago,' Frg. 'muclagem,' Itel. 'mucillaggine.')*

We should not today consider the following sentence grammatical: "So
'tween Sister and this Prince, the marriage was upstriked" (1677.)

So 'chose' (1654, 1714) and well'schose (1692, 1751) and flee-bit
(1696 "London Gazette") and many other ppl. adjectives, and so perhaps
alighten (secondary form of 'alight,' 1697 and 1000 ff. respectively.)

Analogy is at work in 'hexagon' (1810 ff.) against a by-form hexagony

and flagment (1706—1730) and 'flamingo' (1565,) and flux (1693
only, s. Ger. 'flusz') and 'flux' (1704 ff., ad. Fr., It., L. &c.)
suggest lines of changes, or exchanges, between Germanic and Ro-
manic. Goldling, 1655 only, and 'golding' (1599 ff.;) hyperrti-
tize (a. 1734 only: North "Autoiblog.") and 'to act as a hypocrite,'
'hypocriac' (1630 ff., perh. ad. obs. Fr., or back-form extension
'hypocrisy;') intesater (1699 only) and 'intestate' (a word of
importance from 1655 on;) prerequisite (1651 Baxter "Infant
Baptism") and 'prerequisite' (ab. 1651 ff.;) radicity (1651 only,
Bigge) and 'radicality' (fr. the adj., 1646 ff.;) reconnaissance
(1902, 1913 Wellington, obs. r.) and 'reconnoitre' (both fr.
the French, but this latter also fr. Ofr. and L., 1707 ff.;)
sonorous (a. 1693 Urquhart "Rebelats," 1730, 'sonora' and
'ferous') and 'sonoriferous' (1713 ff.;) travestied (ps. ppl.
"An earlier formation than 'travestied' ps. ppl. of 'travesty' v.;
prob. intended as the repr. of It. 'travestito'—"dissguised;
travestied." 1656 Blount "Glossog." [def.]") .. Metaphorically ..
any thing .. translated out of one language into another;" 1697
Montague and Prior "Hind and Panther Travestied;" 1725 Bentley,
1752 Warburton "Serm. "God .. travestied to the mortal side of
local godship,") 'travestied' (1694 ff.;) each of these repres-
sents a slightly different phase of this general cause of ob-
solescence—the great superfluity of forms in our vocabulary.
Thus the suffixes in the first mentioned (golding)—dim. vs.
pres. ppl. '-ing.' Economy of effort in 'sonoriferous'&c.

* Minorand and mucage from Miss Miller (App. A.)
(1655 Bramhall "Against Hobbes" [only use;]) and the variants inter-
collonnation, prussing, typed, underline, unmerchandable, untented, may
also be mentioned here.* Analogy is—or was—at work in scorched,
which was an alteration, perhaps after 'scratched,' of 'score.'
Scott used it in 1923. So scripitor, which was perhaps an etymologi-
cal refashioning of 'scritoire'—"writing desk," 'escritoire:' 1716,
1724, 1732, 1752; and sojourney, alteration of 'sojourn' (verb) after
journey; 1657 and 1674 only. Splatterface, except for its most rare
appearance (1707 only,) might be taken for a phonetic alteration of
'platter-face;' op. splatter-footed, 1649. So gaytry, gayetry, and
rhythm, resineous(ous), tidive, trankum, tubnell, unsound, and others.[

* Intercollonation, obs. r. var. of 'intercolumelation' (1624 ff.:)
"inter-collumined or set with pillars between" (Florio; ) "A port-
tico . . tolerably just in its proportions . . save only that the
intercollonations are too large"—Jefferson "Notes Va." (1792.)
Pruss var. of 'Pruss' (spruce beer.) Typd. a. obs. r. fr. 2.
(an obs. var. of 'tipe' ab. 3, "trap" 1799) "furnished with traps,
1799 A. Young in book on agriculture, Underline obs. var. of
'underline' a. l. (e. 1722 ff.) 1750 Ellis "Country Housew." "Such
underlines small cernels" (another.) Unmerchandable obs. var. of
a. fr. 'tent' v. 2 (obs. a. F. 'tent-er,' (Sp. L. 'temptare' . . in
med. L. after Romance langs.) 'tentare') "isolated in base.
A var. of 'tempt' occasionally down to 16th c. Tweetle v. by-
formation or altered form of 'tweedle:' hence 'tweedling' vbl. ab.
"tiddling" 1749 J. Collier 'He's gone who lov'd the tweedling-
trade.' 1912.

[ Gaytry ? altered form from 'gaiety' (1647 ff.) after 'poetry,' 'co-
Rhythm v. graphic var. of 'rime' v. Often written rythm. 1650-
1660. Rosineous Fr. 'resin,' alteration of 'resin' (1393 ff.)
"yielding resin;" 'resinous' (1646 ff.) 1669 Worlidge "Syst. Agri.
Co. also 'rosil' and 'roses' and 'rosin' (1350 ff.) Tidive
a. obs. rare (1) alters. of 'tidy' a. after adj. in '-ive,' and
perh. by assoc. with 'hastive,' 'hasty,' 'hastife,' 'tardy,' &c.: 
'timely, opportune.' 'tidy' a. l. (also obs. 1750 ff.) 17.. Lord
Bennet etc. in "Child Ballada" Trankum altered f. 'trankum'
as in redup. 'trankum-trankum: perh. infl. by 'trangum' chiefly
used by Scott. "A personal ornament, trinket." 1919 "Blackwoods
—'I'd be troubled to put on my trankums;" 1922 "Nigel"—"some,
my good boy, . . never mind these trankums," 1924 "St. Ronan's," 1929
Antinomism, antiquarism, Latitudinism, Millenarism, and Tractism and their analogues are not the only ones of their kind, but do compare interestingly. All have been assimilated to (or exchanged, perhaps through analogy, for)\textsuperscript{5} forms in 'ianism.' Thus Antinomism (1653, 1672)—'Antinomianism' (1643 ff.,) antiquarism (1659 Sir Thomas Browne [only use])—'antiquarianism' (1779 ff.,) Latitudinism (1667 Locke, 1695)—'Latitudinarianism' (1676 ff.,) Millenarism (1650 Bp. Hall, "The First Paradox of Millenarism")—'Millenarianism' (1864 ff.,) and Tractism (1934 Whately [2, also 1944,] 1944 "Daily News")—'Tractarianism' (1940 ff.). Almost needless to say, an interesting array of forms and counter-forms lie behind these five terms. Behind antiquarism was the still-living 'antiquary' (1596 in this sense—"student"—ff.;) whereas it was otherwise with Antinomism and Millenarism. But there was another form, 'antiquarian' (B. sb. "an antiquary," 1610 ff.,) giving our 'antiquarianism.' It is interesting to note, in passing, the great difference in dates here: Sir Thomas Browne in 1659, and then 1779. It is the kind of word we would expect him not to have failed to use—or create. Antinomist was slightly before antiquarism in time—

"Doom Deworgoit." Tubnell obs. r. (1) app. irreg. dim. of 'tub' (sb.) or arbitrary alteration of 'tunnel'—"a small tub:" 1688 R. Holme "Arm." * * * a Tubnell that is vulgely a Turnell" Unisound obs. r. alteration (phonetic?) of 'unison,' which (3. 1706 ff.) superseded it. 1763 (2.)

\* One is often tempted to speak glibly of "assimilations," and to use, not too carefully, the terms 'analogy' and 'analogue' (and the like.) One cannot always be sure that assimilation, phonetic or otherwise, took place. English words, as illustrated in the Oxford Dictionary, are often terribly arbitrary things. It is

[1] Miss Miller (App. A) would point to the "isolation in the stem" of this term. Millener is, of course, obsolete (infra.) But 'Millenary' (sense 4) and 'Millenarian' (sb.) are living, and identical. So is 'Millenarianism' living. What more can one ask? These forms bear comparison with those on pp. 309 and 316.
1632, 1656 against 1653, 1672—and had in 'Antinomian' (1645 ff.) a successful rival. So Millegar (1654 Vilsein [2]) was closely contemporary with the obsolete form in -ism. Latitudinism and Tractism were evidently directly from the Latin ('Latitudin-') and the thing.

Certainly the forms sociation, nexure, flagrette, pravitous, pouil, and ment would look strange today. The part that affixes play will be illustrated more fully in the next chapter; but since they do seem to lend phonetic charm or semasiological strength or force to forms, sometimes, we pause over a few words here. Suffixes are not, as has been maintained, precisely added; simple words do not just acquire affixes. If one bases his opinions and judgment on the Oxford Dictionary, the most that he can usually gather from dates and etymologies therein is that two or more forms were more or less co-existent, or were wholly apart in actual use. Obsolescence is always primarily concerned with the uses of words—though there are other important or primary matters too.

Affixes do often seem to give force, directness, certainty, to words. One would say "greater certainty." Thus commodate, verb and noun, once a special sort of word in Roman Law. He "knew how to commodate his actions to his . . . genius" (1656; ) "they have not that com-

[Interesting to note, in passing, that although there are many quotations under 'assimilation' in the NED, none have to do with grammatical assimilations. 'Analogy' (NED 3. Lang.) means "Similarity of formative or constructive processes, imitation of the inflexions, derivatives, or constructions of existing words, in forming inflexions, derivatives or constructions of other words, without the intervention of the formative steps through which these first arose."

* See Miss Miller's remarks (App. A,) p.466. "Simple word lost by addition of suffix" is put under "Linguistic Causes. Phonetic," Teichert is cited (also App. A,) and, below, gent and 'gentle,' and nouns in 'm.' A cross-reference should therefore be made here to the previous chapter, especially pp. 128 ff. (esp. "Kent."
"accommodation" (1677.) But 'accommodate' has been in much use since 1593; 'accommodation' since 1644; and there was another word, a verb, accom-, in use between 1653 and 1765. Forate today (used by Tomlinson in 1657) would never seem to have the force of 'perforate' (v. 1539 ff.) Forate, moreover, is "alone." Latin 'forare' is behind it; but there are not forms in '-ed,' '-ing,' or '-ation,' as with 'perforate.' * So fuse, the adjective, used but once, in 1724 in some correspondence. "His style is fuse, and reasonings pretty magisterial." 'Diffuse' in a figurative sense was used by Milton in 1643 and after; in a sense to correspond to the obsolete word, from 1711 on. Flagrate is obsolete. In the sense "to burst into flame" (1756,) it was overtaken by 'deflagrate' (1727 ff.;) in the sense "to burn" (1705,) by 'conflagration' (1657 ff.) Flagration was used between 1669 and 1747. Fulgenoy (1659 D. Pell, 1794,) 'fulgent' (now poetical or rhetorical, 1432 ff.,) and Benlowes' 'fulgurance of minde," all stand in interesting contrast to 'refulgence' (1634 ff.) and 'refulgency' (1616 ff. —"?Obs." [NED]) Lustrate (v.2,) 'lustre' (v., now rare, 1592 ff.;) and 'illustrate' (sense 4, 1530—1734,) have all given up the sense "to part lustre to." The first is wholly obsolete, but was used in the "London Gazette" and elsewhere at the end of the seventeenth century. It was from the noun.

Visa Miller (Appendix 4) contributes maciation, "A making lean" (Bailey, 1727,) mirahility, "? Admirable quality" (a. 1691,) monstator; "a demonstrator [which word has been with us from 1611 on] an exhibitor [dates 1654 ff.]" (1852,) and muneration, "a recompensing

* The ppl. adj. is dated 1540 ff., 'perforated,' 1597 ff. (much use;) 'perforating,' 1661 ff.; 'perforation,' 1440 ff.; 'per- forative,' 1597 ff.; 'perforator,' 1739 ff.
or rewarding." She has to say of the first, second, and fourth: "Isolation in stem, few words from the same root," and of the third: "Isolation in stem—demonstrate meaning 'to prove, demonstrate' obsolete." Is this, however, quite true of any one of these words? "Emaciate" (an.) and 'emaciation' (1662 ff.,) 'admirableness' (fr. adj., 1596 ff.) and 'admirability' (1731 ff.,) 'demonstrator' (1611 ff.,) 'remuneration' (1477 ff.) and many other related forms come to mind. The present writer believes that these words, like many others, simply demonstrate the influence and value of prefixes.

We look to suffixes very briefly. Mant and pugil were mentioned above. The first is interesting in its obsolescence not only for form, but meaning. Fashion in dress will be discussed in a later place. But the words 'mantilla' (1717 ff.) and 'manteau' (1673 ff.,) either of which was a possible synonym of mant (1651—1752,) suggest that the short obsolescence perhaps was swallowed up, or became somewhat indefinite in meaning. Yet mant had cognates in French, Spanish, I-
talian, and Portuguese (and elsewhere,) and appears to have enjoyed considerable use for more than a hundred years. *Pugil* was used perhaps only twice (1646 and 1670;) the strong analogy of forms in '-ist' at once suggests itself ('pugilist' 1790 ff.) 'Touse' is now rare, and 'tousle' has in one sense superseded it ("to pull about in horse-play.") Forms like it and *lux* (1708, 1725 Pope, 1775)—'lucate' (v. 1623,) *ridicule* (a. F. ad. L. 1672-1693, see p. 166)—'ridiculous' (c. 1550 ff.) and *triture* (1773)—'triturate' (1755 ff.) may be found quite readily. *Gent,* finally, might possibly be taken as an example of "sound-insignificance" (pp. 129 ff.) Both it and 'gentle' were English since 1225, and both had the same primary significance. But finally (c. 1470) 'gentle' only remained.

Not a few forms have been affected, or affected, by past participles in 'ed.' It is, to be sure, just more of the story of analogy.

---

solate. *Rigate* v. obs. (1) "to moisten" 1657 Tomlinson. So *Rigation* (1651-1779.) 'Irrigate,' 'irrigation' (1615 ff.) are rare in the above sense. *Rupture, ruotation* (1657 Tomlinson, 1669 Simpson and 1623 respectively,) 'fruation' 1533. But the word 'belch' (O.E. 'bealcian,' 1000 ff.) is of course the familiar expression—a case of isolated word-families (see below, end of chapter.) *Rupt* v. obs. (1) fr. L. "to break, nullify" 1726 Ayliffe. 'Erupt' 1657 ff. (but with slight difference in sense.) *Equate* v. obs. r. "to consorate, dedicate" 1652 and 1660 (both Waterhouse,) 1755. 'Conserieate' 1460 ff.—L. 'conserieate'- ppl. stem of 'conserieare,' 'con-saureare.' *Sect* v. obs. fr. L. "to cut or divide." 1657 and 1697. 'Dissect' 1607 ff., "cut asunder" (stronger meaning and form?) *Socia-
tion* 1621 H. More, 1716 South "Serm." 'Association' 1535 ff., 1659 ff. *Tuberant* a. obs. (1) ad. late L. "swelling out, pro-
truding" 1653 Culpepper and Cole "Barthol. Anat." "The tuberant or rosea part of the Liver." *Protuberant* 1646 ff. *Vagil-
nated* obs. r. 1629, 1449. 'Vaginate' rare, 1349, 1456, 1559. 'Invagination' ppl. a. 1335 ff. *Versation" 'a turning over or backwards or forwards..." 1656 Blount--1337. 'Reverse' ab. 1390 ff. and 'reversing' vb. sb. 1581 ff., hardly have the same signification, but come to mind. *Decessor* L. 'decessor' "one who retires, a retiring officer" 1647 Ser. Taylor "The Popes may deny Christ as well as their chiefes [sic] and Decessor Peter" also 1651 "Serm." *Predecessor* 1375 ff. fr. agent-n. of L.
We may take as paradigm *adapt*, participial adjective from the verb. It was (says the *NED*) "on the analogy of ppl. adjs. like 'content', 'distract,' 'erect'—in form identical with verbs, though really adoptions of L. pples. in '-tus.'" It meant "fitted, suited, fit." It was used by Swift in 1704 and North in 1733—probably much-used in this period. But 'adapted' was also there, even earlier (1610 ff.) Dates in general seem to indicate that forms in '-ed' were earlier.*

Three forms were wholly or chiefly Scottish: allocate, circumstantiate, circumstantiate. No form in '-ed' apparently exists to answer to premonstrate; indeed a large family of words is here mainly disused.[[ Fading of a historical kind is evident in un-Latin and likewise un-Latinized. Unpremeditatedly is, of course, an adverb founded on an archaic form, 'unpremeditate' (1551--1325; 'unpremeditatedly' [fr. pple. form, 1776 ff.]) Many such words existed in the vocabulary (see below.) Improviso, used twice or more by Mrs. Piozzi (1796 and 1799) and her "Anecdotes" and "Journals," was perhaps with a flour-

* Some 39 examples reveal: 12 of rarest occurrence, 8 or more probably rare (improviso, e. g.;) '-ed' usually much earlier form in 21 cases; contrary, 7 cases; about the same in time, 7 or so cases; no form in '-ed' (premonstrate,) l. But see Ch. XI, p. for full statistics on forms and dates.

The roster is: adapt (above;) adorn a. r. (1) fr. It. 1667 Milton "Parad. Lost" 'adorned' 1681 ff.; allocate Sc. 1717, 'allocated' 1664 ff.; circumstantiate 1649--1805, much use, used in "Scots Mag." and "Edinb. Rev." 'circumstantiate' 1654 ff.; chagrin a. and 'chagrined;' both app. first used by Pepys in "Diary:" 1660, "My wife in a chagrin humour;" 1665, "How chagrined the Prince was;" chagrin used by De Foe (1706) and others (1708, 1711;) circumstantiate a. obs. r. (1) "adapted to circumstances" 1651 Jer. Taylor, 'circumstantial' 1654 ff.; curnute 1706 Phillips (ed. Kersey—dictionary,) Bailey, &c., 'curnuted' 1613 ff.; dementate a. ad. L. 'dementatus' pa. pple. 'dementare' "driven mad" 1640, 1675, 'demented' 1644 ff., 'dement' (v.) 1545

[[ Premonstrate ppl. a. (1) 1654 Z. Coke "Logick" "ordinative, methodical, and .. premonstrate" V. obs.: 1533--1679; no form in '-ed;' premonstration and premonstrate (abf) obs.; 'premonstrator' r.
ish doomed in the face of a more English form, 'improvised' (1837 Carlyle.)

But the versatility of English—or irregularity—is again demonstrated in contrary forms like disjuncted (c. 1650) and 'disjunct' (1590 eff., disjunctly observed 1649–1706), ovated (1752, c. 1755 [of leaves]) and 'ovate' (adj. 1775 ff.), prematured (1768 only "woman of Honor;" "its being a little prematurely was of no great moment") and 'premature' (2. 1529 ff.,) subject-matter (1697 tr.) and 'subject-matter,' subovated (1776) and 'subovate,' and unmannishly (1792 W. Roberts "Looker-on" [2]) and 'unmannishly' (op. Kipling 1894.)

We shall encroach upon the province of the next chapter so far as to glance at a few forms in '-er,' for here too analogy and assimilation are often strongly at work. In garden-roll (1794) monograph (1804 only.) mimograph (1656 only,) shop-lift (1673, 1692, 1762.)

Twaddle (3. 1902--1939) venture (9. 1702 only,) and a few others it seemed, in the course of time, to be missing, or wanting. Dates are, again, interesting: all are fairly close save in the case of iconographer and of venture.* The normal way of anglicizing a Greek word represented by Latin '-graphus' is, in English, '-grapher.' Hence 'iconographer,' 1388 ff., and 'mimographer,' 1639 ff. Twaddle is particularly interesting, for it seems for a time to have run 'twaddler' a genuine race. We speak of it in the sense "A person who talks or writes a twaddle." So Mrs. J. West in "The Infidel Father" (1902) "[He] acknowledged himself to be . . . bored by detestable twaddles." Moore in his "Post-bag" (1913: ) "He thinks . . . the imagination . . . Could only enter in the noodies Of dull and ledger-keeping twaddles." And Macaulay in an essay on Montgomery's poems (1930: ) " . . . he is something of a twaddle." 'Twaddler' has been in the language since 1797 (Duke of Rutland.) Dickens and Miss Bradden used it. Venture and 'venturer' (1530) are in contrast.

* The living forms in '-er:' garden-roller, 1792 ff., iconographer,

But again contrary examples are to be had; the 'er' (or extra 'er') is superfluous in *dragonner* (1639–1705, 'dragoon' sb. 1622 ff.,) *fellower* (1652 only, 'fellow' c. 1000 ff.,) *representative* (1676 only, 'representative' 1647 ff.,) *souller* (verb, 1691 only, 'soull' [v. 3, "convey (a person) into a skull"] 1927 ff.,) *Transalpiners* (1599 Nashe "Lenten Stuffe," "Hollanderes . . Transalpiners," 1657 Earl Monmouth tr. "That all Transalpiners might be driven out of Italy," 'Transalpine' 1617 ff.,) *twisterer* (1725 "London Gazette"—"Charles Scot, . . twisterer . . " 'twister' 1579 ff.,) and others. Most of these, it will be noted, are of rarest occurrence. Thus Marvell in "Mr. Smirke" (1676:) "I mean of the humor of this *Parlamentum Indoctum*, this single *Representative.*" 'Transalpine' (sb.—a person &c.,) though not marked "obsolete," is also of rare occurrence, and one is somewhat surprised at the dates in the NED—1617 to 1634 only. A word like 'twister,' it need hardly be observed, might have a whole chapter to itself in a history of commerce.

Rarely, simple words are found only in compounds. *Booter,* thus, from the Dutch, "spoiler, robber," is only in the combination 'free-booter,' 1716 ff.; and Miss Miller (Appendix A) instances *mongs* ('social monger,') *mongster* ('flour mongster,') *mire* ('pimire,') and *mose* (corrupted into 'mouse'—'tit-mouse.') Unquestionably a number, though probably not great, of like forms could be found. *Steermost* is mentioned below. A kind of contrary example is perhaps seen in *feather-wife* (Ch. VII, p. 376.) or in *oil of petre*, 1653–1741, and 'petroleum' (1526 ff.)

The subject of spelling is, to be sure, a large one. Ger-

1833 ff., mimographer, 1639 ff., shop-lifter, 1690 ff.
tainly no one would sigh over its simplification if by "simplification" one meant the loss of 'a,' 'e,' 'o,' 'u' vowel-variation in modern English 'appurtenance' (1377 ff.) Appartinancy occurs uniquely in Sir Thomas Browne's "Pseudodoxia Epidemica" (1646, the Preface. Before nice distinctions were drawn, there may have been confusion about 'cheagrin' and 'shagreen,' emergent (erroneous spelling, 1655 Fuller, 1792 Washington "Lett.") and 'emergent.' Variant spellings are seen in cogniscible (1654 L'Estrange "Chas. I.") and 'cognizable,' congelable (1696 Good "Celestial Bodies," "It is not by nature a Fluid congelable," 1737 Keir; ad. Fr.) and 'congealable' (1626 ff.,) convival (1650 Sir Thomas Browne, 1662, 1755 Johnson; L 'convival-is') and 'convivial' (1668 ff., ad. L 'convivial-is' and MnFr.,) Frisic (1677 Hale "Primitive Origin of Man," 1753 Johnson "Lett. to Boswell," "... books in the Frisick language;" fr. L. 'frisi') and 'Frisic!' ("of or pertaining to Friesland" [1539 ff.,] 1837 ff.; Frisialsh 1664 Webster—phonetics?,) referable (a. obs. r., a. 1661 Fuller and 1676 Towerson, only) and 'referable' (1646 ff.,) 'referrible (1656 ff.,) ruff (a. obs. r. 1651 "ruff suet" to cool a hot grid-iron, 1676 "more or less ruff or tinctured") and 'rough,' versity (1690) and 'versity;' and others. 'Typhon' (Greek name of a giant) and 'typhoon' (China sea storm, 1555 and a. 1583 ff. resp.) have been confused; so also wrasty (1697, 1702 both Vangrugh) and 'resty' the adjective (1515 ff.) Meanings in obliquangled and linger, perhaps in precourse, are put to rout because of the spelling-appearance. The first-mentioned (1630) has been made easier for the eye in 'oblique-angled,' although one notes two more forms—obliquangulous (1630 T. Lawson only) and 'obliquangular' (1636--1357.) Linger (v. obs. [1]) is—or was—from Old French 'enaiigr-ir,' "to
render sharp;" and S. Purchas in 1657 ("Pol. Flying-Ins") wrote "He is inegred (made eager) with thirsty greediness for pardon and grace." Today we have 'precursory,' 'precursor,' 'precursive' and the like, and a word like precourse would probably not look "natural" (1673 Marvell, 1736 A. Gib.) We still have the phrase 'go to wrack and ruin' or 'rack and ruin;' but racking (vbl. sb.) is obsolete (1699, some political ballads.)

Forsat, thorakial, travestere speak for themselves. The first is a foreignism (1674 Cotton "Complete Gamester," but is now spelled 'forçat.' 'Thoracic' and 'travesty' are the accepted spellings of the other two obsolete forms (both used but once.) 'Thoracic' has been in use since 1656 (against 1716 only for the obsolete word,) and 'travesty' (verb) since 1662 (against Marvel's "Who by a verse Wit and Representation might travestere the Scripture," 1672 "Reh. Transp.").

Of especial interest are critio (sb.2) and 'critique.'* A spelling-distinction began to impose itself early in the eighteenth century, and "in spite of Johnson and the Dictionaries" 'critique' gained its place in the vocabulary. In the nineteenth century it took on a quasi-French pronunciation. Still other forms and spellings were "about" in the seventeenth century and eighteenth, and no doubt some of our modern critics would have held that things were in a pretty bad way. One needs only to run his finger down five

columns of the *NED* ('critic' through 'criticule') in order to understand, or begin to understand, why Dr. Johnson sometimes felt as he did about words. Spellings--forms--words: what an abundance! But a real need was felt in the case of 'critique;' and real needs are seldom denied. Yet against the obsolete variants stand today forms like 'load stone' (or 'loadstone') and 'lodestone' (1515 ff., fig. 1577 ff.) 'Lodestone' is perhaps more common today. But strangely the lexicographers are unable to make up their mind. This is interesting because we are, as remarked at the beginning of this chapter, so much their debtors, if not their dependents. Webster has 'loadstone' at least "dialectal" if not "obsolete;" yet a writer, lately professor of physics in London, used 'loadstone' three years ago (W. Watson, "Intermediate Physics," 1929, p. 391.) Not even obsolete forms (or spellings) stay down.

In all this, English, as remarked above, was increased but hardly enriched; a superfluity of words is abundantly evident. The derivation of forms has already been touched upon (pp. 164 ff., 167, 172, &c.) but before leaving it, we shall look briefly into a kind of network of forms, as if to "play safe." No rules can be evinced; but the truth about the state of the vocabulary, at least in the written language, will be made clearer.

What has been called "apparent isolation" (Miss Miller's

1697 Bentley. 1710 Steele "Tatler" No. 45, para. 4, "That Sort of Drama is not . . . thought unworthy the Critick of learned Heads." 1755 Johnson (altered by Todd 1913 to 'critique.') "2. An essay in criticism:" 1709 Pope, 1710 Steele "Tat." 1766. 'Criticism' 1607 ff. 'Critico' 1593 ff. (the person; literary criticism: 1605 [Bacon] ff.) 'Criticiam' M.-w. Southey "Doct." 'Critiling;' 'criti- castor,' &c. See Ch. III, pp. 97 ff. and also 5, 7, and Bib. 433.
thesis, Appendix A) is evident in forms like affund and 'affuse,' agnit and 'agnize.' In the case of affund ("to pour upon," 1657 Tomlinson's "Renodeus" only,) form from the infinitive, the form from the participial stem, 'affuse' (rare, but not obsolete, 1693 ff.) has, as it were, triumphed. Attending 'affuse' are 'affused' (1676 ff.) and 'affusion' (1615 ff.) Close to affund were transfound (a. 1649 Drummond of Hawthornden, "That all bells of steeples . . . be taken down and transfound into pieces of ordnance [sic]—only use) and transfund (likewise rare: 1670 Knittobbe, "Transfundeing of blood," and a. 1677 Barrow "Sermon," "Speech, that most natural, proper and easie means of . . . conveying, and, as it were, transfunding our thoughts and our passions into each other") But against this form from the Latin infinitive ('transfundere') stood, again, a participial-stem form, 'transfuse,' going back to the early fifteenth century, and very much in use from 1601 on. Tomlinson also used, uniquely, deposing, where 'depict' would seem to have been at hand (1631 ff.,) end inconcludency was another rare form (1654 Hammond "his heap of inconcludencies," replaced in time by 'inconclusive' (1696 ff.). Indeed, there were several form-possibilities here for a time—inconcludent (1671 "True Nonconformist," 1677 Barrow, 1722 Ayliffe,) inconcluding (1644 Chillingworth "Sermon," 1659 Pearson "Creed," 1677 Barrow "Disc. Unity of Church,"") inconclusible ("endless," 1665 Fisher "Rusticks Alarm" only,) and unconcludable (1642, 1653:) all obsolete in favor of 'inconclusive' towards the end of the century. Distendible (1672, 1732; 'distensible' 1328 ff.) and indissolvable (1660-1711; 'indissoluble' 1563 ff.) appear to have put up more of a fight.

Oftener, however (so it would seem,) the form from the Latin
infinitive has endured. Almost half of the forms here, the obsolete forms, were used but once each. Thus Sir Thomas Browne's *absterge* in the "Vulgar Errors" (1646,) from Latin 'abstereus,' pse. pple. from the infinitive form, which gave modern English 'absterge' (1541—1517.) So also *delusible* (1665 Boyle, only, fr. L. 'delus-' pple. stem of 'deludere') and 'deludable' (1646; fr. the Eng. vb. with '-able;' the verb ['delude'] 1450 ff.,) *educt* (v. obs. rare [l. fr. L. 'eductime'] pple. stem of 'educere,' 1683 E. Hooker, "Educted, or brought forth out of the Womb of pure Nature";) and 'educe' (1603 ff.,) *exclusible* ("That may be or should be excluded," 1650—3 translation, "Neither seem they exclusible from Heaven:" apparently no 'excludable' [etc.] form,) *impense* ("To weigh on," fr. L. pple. stem 'impens-',) 1797—1803 Foster in "Life and Correspondence," "Make religious sentiments impense so powerfully on the mind"—only use) and 'impend' (v.² 1780 ff.; in a transf. and fig. sense, "hang threateningly," 1599 ff.; "about to happen," 1674 ff.,) *indistingtible* (1774 Wotton only) and 'undistinguishable' (1590 ff.,) *transmise* (v. obs. rare, 1647 More "POEMO," "If they shoot out, be they equally transmise Around this body?" Ib., "Neither Speech nor Language is Where their voice is not transmise;" v. obs. rare, a. 1643) and 'transmit(ted)' (1400 ff., fr. infinitive,) *unintermisable* (1610—1655) and 'unintermittent' (nineteenth century.) All of these obsolete forms were of rarest occurrence. Not so *conceptible* (1650, 1677, 1695, 1677 'conceivable' 1596 ff.,) *conclizable* (1654—1755, 'concludable,' 'concludible' 1617, 1655 ff.,) *condescensible* (a. 1677—1747, so other forms in -ly, -ness, -ional, 1652, 1927, 1657, -tious 1651; 'condescending;') *diversive* (1693, 1704; 'divertive' OF ad. L. inf, 1543 ff.,) *emissive* (16., 1746, 1737; 'emitted; "sent forth"--fr. inf. form,) *expansed*
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(1627, 1644, 1675; 'expanded,') imple (1647 J. hall, 1669 Gale "Crt. Gentiles;" 'immit' now rare or obs. oad. L. inf., "insert, in-
ject," ) inquisite (1674, 1639—1736 (the verb; the adj.: ] 1903 only;
inquisitor' 1450 ff., 'inquire' ad. inf. 1250 ff., ) and inwctor
(1654 Gayton "This is the very life of all books, . . it is their
guard and security from the mouths of scandalous invectors;" 'in-
veigher,' 1584 ff.; L. 'invehere,' 'invectum.'

The network is indeed large. In extensive (1659) and 'exten-
sive' (1605 ff.) we have rival participial stems in the backgroud
(1st Latin 'extensivus' &c.) In a number of examples the parti-
cipial form has outlived the form from the English adjective: adapt-
ness (1749 By. Newton "Milton" only) and 'adaptedness' (1695 ff.,)
antiquenness (1672 only, 'antiquatedness' 1731 ff.,) debauchness
(called "a corruption of" 'debauchedness' [1613 ff.] 1640—1659,)
deformly (fr. an archaic adj., 1382--1372 [Browning] and '-ly,' a.
1694 Leighton "Serm. Habakuk"—"A limb out of joint, which . . moves
both deformely and painfully," a. 1734 North "Lives"—"[He] often
laughed, but (as his visage was then distorted) most deformly;" 'de-
formedly' 1593 ff.,) premeditately (1649—1803, Haylin, Sarah Field-
ing &c.) 'premeditatedly' 1754 ff.,) professly (1652 Gaule, 1662 J.
Chandler, 'professedly' 1570 ff.) Occasionally one finds a con-
trary example like abjection (fr. ppl. a. and 'ness,' 1660
Boyle, 1694 Lord Delamer; 'abjection' 1410 ff., 'abjectness' 1599
ff. [adj. and 'ness.'])

Interruptly (1646 J. Hall) and 'interruptedly' (1663,ff.) and
reiterately (1654—1666, 1794) and 'reiteratedly' (1792 ff.) show
past participial forms replacing verbal forms; occasionally the form
from the substantive has outlived the form from the verb: 'defence-
less' (1530 ff.) and _defendless_ (obs. rare, fr. verb, 1737 "Common Sense," "Pointing a Musket to a defendless man's breast,") 'ranterism' (1673 ff.) and _rantsim_² (1665, 1670, 1691, fr. vb., 1602 ff.; sb. 1649 ff.,) _subdividual_ (fr. 'subdivide' after 'dividual,' &c., 1716 M. Davies. "Athen Brit." "To declare . . new Articles of Faith in Popery and Arianism as subdividual Worship and individual Adoration." 'tolerationist' (1630 ff.) and _toleratist_ (obs. rare, fr. vb. and _-ist_, 1716 M. Davies) "Amongst our Nationalists and Tolerationists, High and Low, or those that are indulg'd and others that are conniv'd at;" op. also _toleratrist_, obs. rare, irreg. fr. above, 1654 E. Johnson, "There is no room in [Christ's] Army for toleratristes," 1845.) So also _nuller_ (obs. rare [l] fr. verb and '-er' 1650—1694 H. More) and 'nullifier' (1632, likewise from a verb;) and _reciprocately_ (obs. rare [l] 1666 G. Harvey) and 'reciprocally,' or _uniteness_ (1639, 1634,) _unitement_ (1631 only,) and 'unitedness' (1636 ff.) So _sentimentize_ (nonce-word, 1753 Richardson in "Correspondence") and 'sentimentalize' against _ecstatize_ (v. obs. r. fr. adj., 1654 Gayton, "He stood ecstatiz'd at that Picture") and _ecstatize_ (fr. 'ecstasy' [1392 ff.] 1335 ff.,) and _roomliness_ (fr. _roomly_, adj. obs. rare [l] 1743; 1744 "London Magazine") and 'roominess' (fr. 'roomy' [1627 ff.] 1640 ff.) And so _perplexly_ (obs. rare [l] fr. adj., also obs. 1380; 1670 Milton) and 'perplexedly' (1650; fr. ppl. adj. 1477 ff.,) or _spirituality_ (1677 Gale; fr. 'spirit'? and 'spirituality' (3. 1500 ff.,) 'spiritualism' (2c. 1855 ff.,) or _sprightness_ (1674 only, N. Fairfax) and 'sprightliness' (1650 ff.)

We shall postpone to a later chapter (X) a fuller discussion of uses and senses, but it seems relevant here, for forms' sake, to look
at words which were used in somewhat contrary ways, verbs used substantively, nouns used as verbs, and adjectives as nouns, and the like. The flexibility of English is herein displayed. As a rule, a given word is demonstrably a verb, a noun, an adjective, or an adverb in form and use—ordinary use; dates are often adjunctive proof. Still, one cannot always be sure of a writer's attitude towards his word, his feeling, his use of it. Heteroglyphied may seem to some to be an authentic verb, and really not a verb-form from a noun-form. "Thy . . well-ingrediented soups," wrote Lamb in an "Elia" essay. One might argue that the word is a verb for the nonce, and that it was a substantive before it was a verb, and therefore was a substantive used as a verb, has nothing to do with its being a verb in Lamb. However this may be, we shall look at a number of examples.

Abandon as a substantive is obsolete (especially ab. 1755 and 1776 Ld. Kames, "an abandon of all mines.") The verb dates from 1386, 'abandoning' from 1640, and 'abandonment' from 1611. So allocate, "an allowance," 1709 Strype; the verb 1640 ff.; and enjole and calculate and complicate and many others.[[ Comport, from an obsolete

* Such arguments are indeed sometimes found, and often have much to support them. What a writer or speaker is conscious of is the thing that counts. So substantives and verbs, though they share the same form, are quite distinct. Certainly mixt, obsess, or perplex below would seem to support the notion. They are almost homophones of themselves. One cannot, finally, take too careful note always of a writer's or speaker's use, his feeling concerning the character of a word as expressed in his use of it.

Apropos the ensuing paragraphs, Archbishop Trench in "English Past and Present" (Ch. III) writes: "It seems often as if an almost unaccountable caprice presided over the fortunes of words, and determined which should live and which die. Thus in instances out of number a word lives on as a verb, but has ceased to be employed as a noun;" 'embarrass,' 'revile,' 'dispose.' &c.

[[ The following roster of 36 words does not pretend to be complete, but merely representative in its information.—
French word, 'comport,' "behavior, comportment" (which latter word in English dates from 1599 on, but is rare or even chiefly obsolete according to the Oxford Dictionary,) was used by Jeremy Taylor (1660, "Our comport and conversation") and by Dryden (a. 1700, "I know them well, and mark'd their rude comport.") The verb dates from 1616. It is, of course, not unusual for a poet to use thus a word. So in 1705, "But Haughty Louis hop'd the Fate to Mock, Seems to deride her brave Denounce of War." Likewise the churchman—devote, 1659,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sb.</th>
<th>Vb.</th>
<th>Synonyme</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abandon 1755, 1776</td>
<td>1386 ff.</td>
<td>vs. in 'ing' 1640 ff. and 'ment'</td>
<td>1614 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocate 1703</td>
<td>1640 ff.</td>
<td>allowance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cajole 1716</td>
<td>1645 ff.</td>
<td>'ing'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculate 1695-1724</td>
<td>1570 ff.</td>
<td>'-tion' 1393 ff.</td>
<td>1399 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comport 1660-1700</td>
<td>1616 ff.</td>
<td>'-ment' 1599 ff.</td>
<td>Lvg. f. now rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deary 1686 only</td>
<td>1617 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1632 ff.</td>
<td>Decr., rere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denounce 1705</td>
<td>1592 ff.</td>
<td>'-ment' 1544, '-ing' 1552</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devote 1659</td>
<td>1596 ff.</td>
<td>'-ment' 1614 ff.</td>
<td>Above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappoint 1642 1656</td>
<td>1596 ff.</td>
<td>'-ment' 1614 ff.</td>
<td>Above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distil(1) 1822</td>
<td>a. 1400 ff.</td>
<td>'still' 1552 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialustre 1656, 1657</td>
<td>1638 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1694 tr.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dress 1726, 1739</td>
<td>1440 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1694 tr.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embark 1654</td>
<td>1550 ff.</td>
<td>'embarkation' 1645 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employ 3b. 1679-1745</td>
<td>1460 ff.</td>
<td>'employment' 1593 ff.</td>
<td>Cert. senses lvg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endorse 1663 only</td>
<td>1591 ff.</td>
<td>... does not mean 'endorsement'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express sb. 2 1644 ff.</td>
<td>1400 ff.</td>
<td>'expression' 1640 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloat 1645, 1654 r.</td>
<td>1575 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1593 ff.</td>
<td>'gloater' 1659 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grind 1565</td>
<td>a. 1000 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1340 ff.</td>
<td>&quot;set task of —&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gullet 1714—9</td>
<td>1654 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impede 1659 only</td>
<td>1605 ff.</td>
<td>'impediment' 1399 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impute 1649 only</td>
<td>1375 ff.</td>
<td>'-ation' 1391 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixt 1644 &amp;c.</td>
<td>1440 ff.</td>
<td>... sb. fr. L 'mixtum,' ppl.a. 1448 ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bosess 1694 only</td>
<td>1503 ff.</td>
<td>... fr. L type *obsessus?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observe 1696, 1930</td>
<td>1390 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1526, '-ation' 1355 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pare 1651 tr. only</td>
<td>1392 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1398 ff.</td>
<td>Homoph. w. 'pair'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pend 1674 only</td>
<td>1674 ff.</td>
<td>... no '-ing' vbl. sb. form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perplex 1652, 1762</td>
<td>1595 ff.</td>
<td>'-ity' 1300 ff.</td>
<td>Assum. L *perplexus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ponder 1738 only</td>
<td>1390 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1355 ff.</td>
<td>'-ment' a. 1763 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ブラージド 1659</td>
<td>1605 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1605 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relate 1. 1651-6</td>
<td>1530 ff.</td>
<td>'-ing' 1557, '-ation' 1660 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stranguulate 1702 only</td>
<td>1771 ff.</td>
<td>'strangulation' 1542 ff.</td>
<td>&quot;A strangled animal&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjugeate 1773</td>
<td>1432 ff.</td>
<td>'subject' 1340 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sully 1602-1762</td>
<td>1591 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>test 2b. 1769 only</td>
<td>1743 ff.</td>
<td>... &quot;proof, sample&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usurp a. 1647 only</td>
<td>1325 ff.</td>
<td>'-ation' 1387 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Some manifestation of a reciprocation in the devote," or Bishop Hall
"There is nothing more troublesome in human Society than the disappoin-
of trust and failing of friends," or Barrow's "Surely these expresses
are used in condescension to signify the . . expressive benignity of
God"—"&c.," as one may usually add to such writing. The anonymous
playwright of "Lady Alimony" (1659:) "To prune those wild luxurious
sprays, Which give impede unto this spreading vine"—really the poet
again. Motteux in his Rabelais shaped French 'obsidion' into ob-
sesses: "Obsesaes, Storms and Fights Sanguinolent." Observe is in-
teresting for its status in the Oxford Dictionary, for though marked
obsolete as noun there, Stevenson has Alan say to David in "Kid-
napped" (1836:) "'And that's a good observe, David.'" "But we are
at no such pend," wrote Nathaniel Fairfax in 1674 ("Bulk and Selv.;")
and again, "A pend of earnest strift forwards, which we call spring-
sonness." In their contexts, sully and ponder do somehow not seem
unnatural: "Those little Spots and Sullies in its Reputation" (Addison
in "Spectator" Numb. 256, paragr. 4, 1711,) and "He . . soon after
took his leave, not without one little flight to give me for a ponder"
(so Fanny Burney in her "Diary" in 1788.) . . . It will be
noticed, in the table given on the preceding page, that in only two
instances out of thirty-six is the verb as "late" as the noun, or
later: pend, strangle; that often the verb is a century earlier
('abandon,' 'calculate,' 'denounce,' 'devote,' 'distil,' 'dress,'
'embrace,' &c., &c.;) and that synonyms in '-ment' or '-tion,' or verbal
substantives, were usually at hand, and often much (a century or more)
earlier: however interesting such calculations may be, always more in-
teresting, the writer, believes, is a vision of the use of words—a
demonstration of the flexibibility of English.
Even more often, it would seem, "with a reversed fortune a word lives on as a noun, but has perished as a verb." So continues the statement begun in a footnote on p. 188; and the archbishop instances 'slug,' 'child,' 'rogue,' 'malice,' 'path,' &c.* We may take as the type here the particularly interesting term addition.

* Elsewhere, in the same chapter (III of "English Past and Present,"Archbishop Trench gives 'meek,' 'fool,' 'dead,' 'intricate' (with Jeremy Taylor quoted,) and 'serene' (to serene, a beautiful phrase, Trench thought.) See below.

This list, like that on p. 189 and others to follow, is only what the writer has on hand, but believes to be typical.——

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb.</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accoly 1725 only</td>
<td>1325 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addition 1662 only</td>
<td>1494 ff.</td>
<td>sb. dict.; v. arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alooran s. 1678</td>
<td>1366-1796</td>
<td>both obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atom s. 1673, 1648</td>
<td>1477 ff.</td>
<td>sb. arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bavin 1634, 1635</td>
<td>1529 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitch 1675, 1637</td>
<td>1400 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braggadocio 1643</td>
<td>1590 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calibre 1731, 1775</td>
<td>1583 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronicler 1662 only</td>
<td>1397 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colto 1733, 1740</td>
<td>1440 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critio 1607-1706</td>
<td>1583 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devil 1652</td>
<td>900 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digit 1628 &amp; 1709 r</td>
<td>1644 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissemblant 1612-1737</td>
<td>1290 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disinherit</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draper 1717</td>
<td>1362 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edit 1652 only</td>
<td>1297 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edition 1716</td>
<td>1570 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(editor 1646, 1659</td>
<td>1499 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort 1652</td>
<td>1386 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elixir 1650-1687</td>
<td>1391 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elrayde 1652</td>
<td>993 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epistle 1671, 1741</td>
<td>1470 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esunach 1653, 1632</td>
<td>1665 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence 4, 1691 ff.</td>
<td>1385 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exception 1656 &amp;c.</td>
<td>1250 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falcon 1507 only</td>
<td>1016 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow 1654, 1751</td>
<td>1613 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fetish 1723</td>
<td>1611 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flefl 1792</td>
<td>1669 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filigrane 1690</td>
<td>1586 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontal 1652</td>
<td>1652 &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glazer 1743</td>
<td>1306 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-morrow 1696</td>
<td>1501 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grain 1664 only</td>
<td>1501 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

elsewhere, in the same chapter (III of "English Past and Present," Archibald Trench gives 'meek,' 'fond,' 'dead,' 'intricate' (with Jeremy Taylor quoted,) and 'serene' (to serene, a beautiful phrase, Trench thought.) See below.

This list, like that on p. 189 and others to follow, is only what the writer has on hand, but believes to be typical.——

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wb.</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accoly 1725 only</td>
<td>1325 ff.</td>
<td>sb. dict.; v. arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addition 1662 only</td>
<td>1494 ff.</td>
<td>both obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alooran s. 1678</td>
<td>1366-1796</td>
<td>sb. arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atom s. 1673, 1648</td>
<td>1477 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bavin 1634, 1635</td>
<td>1529 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitch 1675, 1637</td>
<td>1400 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braggadocio 1643</td>
<td>1590 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calibre 1731, 1775</td>
<td>1583 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronicler 1662 only</td>
<td>1397 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colto 1733, 1740</td>
<td>1440 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critio 1607-1706</td>
<td>1583 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devil 1652</td>
<td>900 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digit 1628 &amp; 1709 r</td>
<td>1644 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissemblant 1612-1737</td>
<td>1290 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disinherit</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draper 1717</td>
<td>1362 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edit 1652 only</td>
<td>1297 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edition 1716</td>
<td>1570 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(editor 1646, 1659</td>
<td>1499 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort 1652</td>
<td>1386 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elixir 1650-1687</td>
<td>1391 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elrayde 1652</td>
<td>993 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epistle 1671, 1741</td>
<td>1470 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esunach 1653, 1632</td>
<td>1665 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence 4, 1691 ff.</td>
<td>1385 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exception 1656 &amp;c.</td>
<td>1250 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falcon 1507 only</td>
<td>1016 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow 1654, 1751</td>
<td>1613 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fetish 1723</td>
<td>1611 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flefl 1792</td>
<td>1669 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filigrane 1690</td>
<td>1586 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontal 1652</td>
<td>1652 &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glazer 1743</td>
<td>1306 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-morrow 1696</td>
<td>1501 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grain 1664 only</td>
<td>1501 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above & pp. 192-193. Other senses not obs.; see above.’digitate’ also obs. in this sense.

dictionaries
The word 'addition' is, of course, still among us; but it has, in one sense, become obsolete, namely, "something annexed to a man's name"—his rank, place of residence, occupation. And so Fuller's remark, in 1662, about a knight worthy to "be honourably additioned," and again "Bale... is pleased to Addition this worthy man, Sewaldus Magnanimus."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vb.</th>
<th>Sub.</th>
<th>Synonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>marguebus 1693</td>
<td>1574 ff.</td>
<td>'hieroglyphize' rare—obs. ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hieroglyphize 1762 only</td>
<td>1593 ff.</td>
<td>'imitation' 1502 ff. ad. Latin?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imitate 1689</td>
<td>1534 ff.</td>
<td>'insul' 1592 (not quite the same m.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingredience 1650, 1622</td>
<td>1526 ff.</td>
<td>'something annexed to a man's name'—his rank, place of residence, occupation. And so Fuller's remark, in 1662, about a knight worthy to &quot;be honourably additioned,&quot; and again &quot;Bale... is pleased to Addition this worthy man, Sewaldus Magnanimus.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insolence 1647</td>
<td>1376 ff.</td>
<td>'marble' (v.) 1693 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jasper 1799 only</td>
<td>13... ff.</td>
<td>'penal' 1439 ff. Nonsense-word(v.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levee 1725—1732</td>
<td>1672 ff.</td>
<td>'penal-law 1639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter l. 1713</td>
<td>1350 ff.</td>
<td>'marble' (v.) 1693 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nauseate 1660, 1633</td>
<td>1646 ff.</td>
<td>'nauseant' (sb.) 1446 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outlook 2. 1655</td>
<td>1607 ff.</td>
<td>'to look beyond' sb. 19th c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panegyric 1798,1732</td>
<td>1673 ff.</td>
<td>'to look beyond' sb. 19th c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penal-law 1639</td>
<td>1377 ff.</td>
<td>'percept' 1562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceive 1652</td>
<td>1377 ff.</td>
<td>'perceive' a. 1300 ff. sb.: philos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perdut 1565 &amp;c.</td>
<td>(also obs.)</td>
<td>adj. not obs. 'piaffe' 1761 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleur 1731, 1735</td>
<td>1362 ff.</td>
<td>'plittase 1647, 1650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plittas 1647, 1650</td>
<td>1225 ff.</td>
<td>'plittase 1647, 1650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plummet 1711 &amp;c.</td>
<td>1322 ff.</td>
<td>'precipito 1654 only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pome 1658—1727</td>
<td>1420 ff.</td>
<td>'precipito 1654 only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precipito 1654 only</td>
<td>1632 ff.</td>
<td>'proem(e) 1653 only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proem(e) 1653 only</td>
<td>1386 ff.</td>
<td>'projection 1703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projection 1703</td>
<td>1394 ff.</td>
<td>'precipito 1654 only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulvile 1700, 1704</td>
<td>1619 ff.</td>
<td>'quadriile 1734 only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quadrille 1734 only</td>
<td>1736 ff.</td>
<td>'cosmetic or powder for wig'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re-edition 1716 only</td>
<td>1577 ff.</td>
<td>'sycophant 1637-1704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recplet 1565 only</td>
<td>1577 ff.</td>
<td>'sycophant 1637-1704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp-shot 1725, RY</td>
<td></td>
<td>'sycophant 1637-1704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>side-glass 1699 &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>'sycophant 1637-1704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signature 1653, 1740</td>
<td>1534 ff.</td>
<td>'size 3. 1661 only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size 3. 1661 only</td>
<td>1300 ff.</td>
<td>'synonym 1761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sycophant 1637-1704</td>
<td>1579 ff.</td>
<td>'tenant 1721, 1776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synonym 1761</td>
<td>1432 ff.</td>
<td>'tenant 1721, 1776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenant 1721, 1776</td>
<td>1330 ff.</td>
<td>'term 3. 1654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term 3. 1654</td>
<td>13... ff.</td>
<td>'texture 1694—1335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>texture 1694—1335</td>
<td>1606 ff.</td>
<td>'tory 1651 &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tory 1651 &amp;c.</td>
<td>1646 ff.</td>
<td>'tractade 1657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tractate 1657</td>
<td>1474 ff.</td>
<td>'trench 6b. 1729 &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trench 6b. 1729 &amp;c.</td>
<td>1479 ff.</td>
<td>'trinket 1651—1734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trinket 1651—1734</td>
<td>1533 ff.</td>
<td>'trench 6b. 1729 &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trough 1663</td>
<td>725 ff.</td>
<td>'turtle 1701, 1754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turtle 1701, 1754</td>
<td>1009 ff.</td>
<td>'typolithography 1285—1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typolithography 1285—1911</td>
<td>1911 ff.</td>
<td>'tyrannize' 1590 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We look again to the actual uses. For their uses of 'alcoran,' 'elixir,' 'digit,' 'epicycle,' 'eunuch' and the like, the poets are interesting. Thus Marvell, before 1679, speaks of "Prophecies fit to be alcoran'd." Lovelace twice used 'elixir' as a verb—"Thou hast so spirited, elixir'd, we conceive there is a noble alchemy;" and "Then in his self the lymbeck turns And his elixir'd poison urns." Other poets make similar use. Whitlock has both element and dislike.

"How does this fifth Element [i.e. detraction] dislike all the other foure?" Davies makes use, in a similar way, of both edition and re-edition. The playwrights are present—"Have you pulvill'd the Coachman and Postilion that they may not stink of the Stable when Sir Rowland comes by?" (so a character in "The Way of the World" 1700.) "Who braggadocied still himself upon Being infallible"—Epilogue of a play by the Duke of Buckingham (1693.) Shadwell twice uses side-glass, wildish in "Bury Fair" (1699,) "So will I [go to the park,] where I will side-glass you," and again in "The Volunteers" (1693,) "My side-glassing you at the park." Fuller uses thus anti-rumour, chronicler, effort ("He efforted his spirits with the remembrance . . . of what formerly he had been"—"Worthies," 1662,) and vogue. Today we smile at stumbling upon Benlowes' "The serpent
devil'd Eve." In sermons appear *proem* and *unchristian*—"If I deny this, I must unchurch and unchristian almost all... of the churches and Christians in the world" (Baxter, 1658; so Beveridge and Bp. Talbot later.) Many nonce-words, or rather nonce-uses of nouns, such as *artifice*, *botch*, and *penal-law*, might, of course, be found. Urquhart has *frontal* ("Serving in this place to frontal a Vindication of the honour of Scotland," "Jewel," 1652—image of altar? [1391 ff.]) and *harquebus*—"to shoot as a harquebus" (Rabelais," 1693.) Evelyn's verbal *filigrane* and *pome* may be noted in the passing, the dates for the former word or use being especially interesting. How true to form is De Foe's *panegyrig*, "praise greatly," "I am not going about to panegyric upon my own work." "If your fair sister don't epistle me this post," wrote Mrs. Foley in correspondence with Mrs. Delaney (1741;) and Mrs. Griffith in a letter of 1757 complained, "You may levee him fifty times, without being admitted by his Swiss porter." Mrs. Delaney wrote to Mrs. Anne Granville, "They quadrilled after dinner till ten, and I dozed by them." Only a few words appear to be used as often as was 'trinket' as a verb, which has hardly passed from use. "Had the Popish Lords... not trinketed with the enemies of [the Crown] and themselves," wrote North about 1734. Scott spoke of "Tampering and trinketing with hellish cures" in "Ivanhoe" (1919,) and again of a "woman, who trinkets and traffics with my worst foes:" in "Kenilworth" (1921.) The use of 'turtle' as a verb is comparable. The disuse of a word like *unalohemy* is due to more than prefixes and turning nouns into verbs, to be sure. "Like the only true Philosophers stone, he can unalohy the alloy of life," wrote Feltham, 1661. "S. H." in his "Gold. Law" (1656) wrote, "He invades, and evades Law, and yet neither Usurpers nor Arbytraters it." There is an added idea
in each of these verb-forms. Usurper is not quite 'usurp.' Especially interesting in view of discussions elsewhere (pp. 97 ff. and 132-133, and Bib. 433) is critic the verb. "They do out... comment, critick, and flourish upon them," wrote Temple sometime before 1692. Again, "Those who can critick [Virgil's] poetry, can never find a Blemish in his Manners"—from Dryden; and Collier, "The playing the Pedant unreasonably to critick things" (1736,) or Pope, in an epistle, "Critick'd your wine" (1735.) 'Criticize' was there all this time (1649 ff.,) but did not seem always to be the word wished for. ... It is these interesting uses we turn to after making statistics. What is true of the list on p. 199 seems even more certainly true of that on pp. 191 ff. The substantive form was always first, and often much earlier. Synonyms abound; and were it not for the above quotations and many more like them collected by the lexicographers and their friends, we should probably be too exclusively on the "side" of "obsolescence."

Occasionally on some reasonable analogy a verb is "had" from an adjective, or adjective-form. Thus abrupt, verb, thrice or oftener in Sir Thomas Browne: "Buzzing thy praises which shall never die, Till death abrupts them" ("Religio Medici," 1643,) "The effects of whose activity are not precipitously abrupted, but gradually proceed to their cessations" ("Pseudodoxia Epidemica," 1646,) "The insecurity of their enjoyments abrupteth quiettranquilities" ("Christian Morals," 1692.) The NED implies that Sir Thomas had 'corrupt,' 'disrupt,' and the like, in mind. So staminate, "to imbue with stamina," close to which is 'invigorate' with its large family, its etymological likeness. "People... form'd and staminated, by the immediate hand of God, with peculiar Principles of Vitality," wrote Parker, 1720.—which again puts one in mind of the churchmen, and of the uses of words.
Thus Jeanes, 1656 ("Fuln. Chr.") "Will Christ then . . . suffer anything to prevail against his Church, which is his fulness? What were that but to wayme and incomplete him?" Hammond in a sermon on Ezekiel, 1660: "no means . . . to . . . overslow this furious driver."

Fuller twice has unactive: "Though bookishness may unactive," and "it unactiv'd [a man buried in speculations] to be practical" (1639 and 1665.) There is Jeremy Taylor's insecure, and Hickeringill's alamort—"One Bishop would not, of old, be pleased with a fat Bishopprick, but Chagrin and Aalmort, because not Archbishop," and Reeve: "Oh look with shame . . . upon this wofull envirating or dis-humening your selves."

To the poets belong lyric, reserverne, and thick—to name only three examples. "The Songster Lyrick'd o'er with all His Skill the

* The list of those on hand is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vb.</th>
<th>adj.</th>
<th>synonyms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abrupt 1643-1632</td>
<td>1607 ff.</td>
<td>'human'</td>
<td>1606 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alamort 1705</td>
<td>1592 ff.</td>
<td>'dissuasfleet'</td>
<td>1661 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antichristian</td>
<td>1587 ff.</td>
<td>'human' obs. v.</td>
<td>1591 only: 'inhuman'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brittle 1742</td>
<td>1382 ff.</td>
<td>'rare; afterOF. 'delicier' 12thc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumpect 1667,</td>
<td>1422 ff.</td>
<td>demure 1651 only</td>
<td>14. ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decrepit 1693</td>
<td>1450 ff.</td>
<td>determine 1647</td>
<td>1386 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deleute 1633</td>
<td>1382 ff.</td>
<td>dishuman 1657</td>
<td>'human' 1399 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demure 1651 only</td>
<td>14. ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1661 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrete 1646-1257</td>
<td>1340 ff.</td>
<td>discolute 1656 a</td>
<td>1599 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunken 1000-1697</td>
<td>1050 ff.</td>
<td>improvis 1791</td>
<td>1380 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire 1673</td>
<td>1400 ff.</td>
<td>inscruculate 1713</td>
<td>1607 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicit 1657</td>
<td>1651 ff.</td>
<td>incompete 1656</td>
<td>1380 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extravagant 1656</td>
<td>1399 ff.</td>
<td>inordinate 1646</td>
<td>1398 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improper 1791</td>
<td>1380 ff.</td>
<td>insepure 1649,</td>
<td>1654 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscure 169, 1675</td>
<td>1654 ff.</td>
<td>inside 1657 only</td>
<td>'overlarge' (v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyric 1704, 1711 r.</td>
<td>1589 ff.</td>
<td>'slow' 888 ff.; as v. 1557 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overslow 1660 only</td>
<td>1571 ff.</td>
<td>paramount 1697</td>
<td>1528 ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
following madrigal." "She thinks that this may be her wished Ruggier, and re-serenest her brow, and eyes." "The Night-Mare Life-in Death was she, who thickens men's blood with cold." The last is from "The Ancient Mariner." And so also the letter-writers, notably Horace Walpole and his Improprer: 1791 "Correspondence"—"I am too old to be improper and you are too modest to be impropered to." Temple, who had "thicks" above, had "prone" in his "Memoirs"—1683, "The Contents of this Letter were proned by the French Ambassadors at the Nimeguen among the several Ministers there." "S. H." (p. 194) again appears: "I am afraid that I have transgressed both in quantity and quality . . . so by encroaching on your Highness patience in prolixing it." For their dates and muchness of use drunken and delicate are interesting ("These Evil Demons therefore did as it were Delicate and Episcurize in them;") we understand perfectly Sir John Spelman when he writes "The West Saxon Kingdom and the Kingdom of Kent became again entired in one hand," but cannot, perhaps, grant that the word is very useful here, because it seems awkward when so used (1673;) and inarticulate and polite ("There was some uncertainty in the business of Descents, or Hereditary Successions, though it was much better polite than former ly,") and signate ("All plants . . . which have their stalks signated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>Synonyme</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>the vb. not completely obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prolix</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prone</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserve</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savage</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signate</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>ab.: 1662 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laminate</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superfine</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>'refine'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thick</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>1639-55</td>
<td>1591-1741, also obs.; 'inactive' 1725 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfortunate</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmartial</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>. . . 'martial' 1374 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with cuts and slits (as if were) are senative to scars and wounds,"
are in a similar way interesting for their use.

A somewhat contrary form is *abscond*, adjective, as used by
D'Urfey in his "Pills" (1719, the verb 1612 ff.;) and like it *castigate*
(1640, 1678, 1637; the verb in the same meaning, "chasten," is obso-
lete: 1653 to 1669,) *equilibrate* (1693; verb 1635 ff.,) *equiponderate*
(1646 Browne, 1674 Petty; verb 1661 ff.,) *exert* (1647 More, 1661
Lovell; verb 1661 ff.,) *placerate* (1662, 1675, rare; verb 1678 ff.;
'plac'd' 1626 ff.,) and *recline* (1667 Milton, "fruits which the com-
pliant boughs yielded [sic] them, side-long as they sat recline on the
soft downie Bank.") Probably not many forms would be found for this
division.

Likewise adjectives from substantives (so to speak) are rare.*

Lassels in a book of voyaging (1670) speaks of books "thrown overboard
by . . . alphabet rogues." But 'analphabetic,' on an obvious analogy,
was not called into existence until recently (1761.) *Fal-hal* was un-
questionably once more alive than it is now. "One of many reduplica-
ting formations expressing the notion of something trivial or gaudy,'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unworthy 1654 only</th>
<th>1240 ff.</th>
<th><em>Synonymes</em></th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent 1549 ff.</td>
<td>1340 ff.</td>
<td>. . . this v. form had much use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The list is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>SB.</th>
<th><em>Synonymes</em></th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging 1692-</td>
<td>1561 ff.</td>
<td>&quot;grateful;&quot; see above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analphabet 1670 only</td>
<td>. . . 'lo' 1976, 'loal' Blount only, 1691.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caftodilly 1792</td>
<td>'caftodil' 1592 ff.; 'dilley' 1579 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinant 1653</td>
<td>1620 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fal-ral 1743 ff.</td>
<td>1736 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flux 1677</td>
<td>1732 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fible 1716, 1727</td>
<td>1737 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedientiary 1700</td>
<td>1540 (obs.) 1794 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postscript 1654 only</td>
<td>1523 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refactory 1691 only</td>
<td>1483 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it is perhaps still alive as a noun (1706 ff.,) but its appearance even as an adjective in the pages of Richardson and Madame D'Arblay indicates how much more fashionable it once was, "Humoring his old fain-lil taste," "these fell lil people!" Richardson has it thus more than once; it is also in Scott ("Heart of Midlothian," 1819;) and 'fainfulness' was coined in 1781. Acknowledging as participial adjective is gone, and the sense of "grateful" has particularly faded from the word: "There are but few acknowledging persons" and "the English are acknowledging" (so Dryden, 1692 and 1700;) and likewise Mrs. Delany in a letter of 1750. Typical of magazine writing is a passage from the "Gentleman's Magazine" of 1773: "To express the Condition of an Honest Fellow, and no Flincher, under the Effects of good Fellowship, it is said that he is . . . Sherry." The expression may have been "of the town" (p. 373.)

One should take careful note of forms like postscript. As a participial adjective (1654 only, H. L'Iestrange in "Charles I") it is (or was,) like the noun, allied to Latin 'postescibere' and the English verb; and so its derivation is not directly from 'postascipt' sb., but more distinctively from the Latin. But its form is obviously at one with that of the noun, and it is with forms and causes of obsolescence—possible causes—that we are concerned.

We end our considerations here with the very endless substantives derived from adjectives, or perhaps one should say, used as adjectives. If one wished to make out some sort of case for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>Sb.</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sherry</td>
<td>1602 ff.</td>
<td>.. &quot;drunk&quot;</td>
<td>See p. 373.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spunk</td>
<td>1773 ff.</td>
<td>'spunky' 1796 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truss</td>
<td>1210 ff.</td>
<td>.. v.; 1300 ff. attrib. use of sb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verse</td>
<td>900 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"polarity" in English (see Bib. 376,) one might do well to begin with these sometimes intriguing, elliptical forms. It will be seen, from the list below, how scattered these uses are; but although they are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sb.</th>
<th>AdJ.</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>capillary 1697</td>
<td>1656 ff.</td>
<td>'caution'</td>
<td>Evelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cautionary 1655</td>
<td>1597 ff.</td>
<td>'manner' 1566 ff.</td>
<td>Gataker, R. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chromatic 1653-88</td>
<td>1627 ff.</td>
<td>'ity' 1225 ff.</td>
<td>Dryden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de bonair 1697-1743</td>
<td>1225 ff.</td>
<td>-tition</td>
<td>Evelyn, Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceptive 1652</td>
<td>1611 ff.</td>
<td>-var. meanings</td>
<td>Gaule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>declamatory 1583</td>
<td>1591 ff.</td>
<td>-remem</td>
<td>L'Estrange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>declarant 1774</td>
<td>1730 ff.</td>
<td>-tion</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decumbent 1641-99</td>
<td>1656 ff.</td>
<td>-tion</td>
<td>Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deductive 1677</td>
<td>1665 ff.</td>
<td>-var. meanings</td>
<td>Hooker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defendant 1665</td>
<td>1596 ff.</td>
<td>-var. meanings</td>
<td>(many writers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deficient 1640-179</td>
<td>1604 ff.</td>
<td>-remem</td>
<td>Aylyffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite 1726</td>
<td>1553 ff.</td>
<td>-var. meanings</td>
<td>Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dehortatory 1643</td>
<td>1576 ff.</td>
<td>-var. meanings</td>
<td>Burton, Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic 1653-31</td>
<td>1602 ff.</td>
<td>-crat 1790 ff.</td>
<td>Hobbes, others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratical 1653-1734</td>
<td>1 ff.</td>
<td>-crat</td>
<td>J. Adams &quot;Diary&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demure 1766</td>
<td>144 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Gayton, North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deprecatory 1654-1734</td>
<td>1586 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Gauden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devotional 1659</td>
<td>1648 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Browne, Moxon, Jeake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diametral 1653-74</td>
<td>1555 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Fryer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diamond-out 1691-8</td>
<td>1637 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Gauden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dietetic 1659</td>
<td>1716 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Wood &quot;Life&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult 1709</td>
<td>1400 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Jer. Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digestory 1675, 1708</td>
<td>1612 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Z. Crofton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digitate 1661</td>
<td>1661 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dire 1660</td>
<td>1567 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>M. Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrepant 1647</td>
<td>1524 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Temple &quot;Letter&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrete 1660</td>
<td>1598 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Daniel, Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discursive 1677</td>
<td>1626 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>W. Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismissory 1716</td>
<td>1647 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Glanvill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disposative 1677</td>
<td>1612 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Glanvill, trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disputable 1649-60</td>
<td>1548 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Glanvill, trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distillable 1669</td>
<td>1611 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Glanvill, trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divisible 1665</td>
<td>1552 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Glanvill, trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogmatic 1631-1702</td>
<td>1678 ff.</td>
<td>'dogmatist' 1654 ff.</td>
<td>Donne, Hobbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative 3. 1651</td>
<td>1559 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>N. Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dormant 1723</td>
<td>1623 ff.</td>
<td>-ness</td>
<td>Chambers, trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downright 1674</td>
<td>1305 ff.</td>
<td>'adj. used elliptically.'</td>
<td>N. Fairfax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dainty 1670 ff.</td>
<td>1623 ff.</td>
<td>'not wholly obs.'</td>
<td>G. H., others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic 1656</td>
<td>1592, 1335</td>
<td>'not wholly obs.'</td>
<td>Trapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elective 1701 only</td>
<td>1530 ff.</td>
<td>'not wholly obs.'</td>
<td>anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electoral 1692-1707</td>
<td>1675 ff.</td>
<td>'elector' 1675 ff.</td>
<td>&quot;Lond. Gaz.&quot; (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enclosed 1645 only</td>
<td>1607 ff.</td>
<td>'elector' 1675 ff.</td>
<td>Howell &quot;Letter&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episcopal 1708</td>
<td>1495 ff.</td>
<td>'elector' 1675 ff.</td>
<td>Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivocal 1653-1734</td>
<td>1601 ff.</td>
<td>'elector' 1675 ff.</td>
<td>Swift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
everywhere, the names Browne and Taylor, Milton, Pope, and Dryden, L'Estrange, Evelyn, Hale, and a few others, loom largest. Mrs. Behn’s plumy has already been mentioned (p. 74,) and has, at least slightly,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sb.</th>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>Synonyms</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eradicative 1654</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>...cert. lvg. senses</td>
<td>Whitlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erratic 1669, 1714</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gale, Derham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimable 1682</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>'-ical' 1504</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evangelic 1812</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excursive 1675</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Addison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanatory 1650</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>'-ation' 1610 ff</td>
<td>R. Hollingworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicative 1659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extemporary 1661-85</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuller, anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extravagan 1682 ff</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaule, many others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fantastic 1764 &amp;c</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td></td>
<td>anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feasible 1661</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glanvill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fetid 1707-48</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuller, Fuller,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreright 1784</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraddulent 1796</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td></td>
<td>anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frightful 1727</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>quasi-sb.</td>
<td>Defoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gnomic 1630</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>...sb. 3 above</td>
<td>Ogilby transla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haggard 1653</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>'a heroic poet'</td>
<td>trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardfast 1674</td>
<td></td>
<td>...other lvg. senses</td>
<td>N. Fairfax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heroic 1630</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humdrum 1757</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Griffith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hysteric 1684--</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'lament' 1563 ff</td>
<td>&quot;Let&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illuminary 1692</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luttrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imprudent 1753-67</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>medicine</td>
<td>trans., anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incident 1753, 1755</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chambers, Mayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incluse 1726</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incosiderable 1670</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indolent 1720, 1810</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td></td>
<td>magazine, anon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indulgent 1825</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhuman 1653-1755</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cogan, Mrs. Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insufficient 1654</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlocutory 1708</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>'tion' 1514 ff</td>
<td>Motteux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlocutory 1697</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. S. Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intricate 1655</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>'laments' 1535 ff</td>
<td>Gurnall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamentable 1748</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lazy 1692</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>arithmetic</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legative 1657</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pettus [Dict.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| levative 1659   | 1567 |                                              | Tomlinson & "Phy."
| linear 1654     | 1656 |                                              | T. Baker       |
| lunar 1651      | 1626 |                                              | R. Child       |
| lustral 1656    | 1533 |                                              | Usher         |
| mirable 1646-53 | 1450 | 'nocturn'                                     | Pope          |
| naked 1735      | 950  | 'number'                                      | G. Havers     |
| national 1766-8 | 1597 |                                              | Holwell       |
| natural 1665    | 1511 |                                              |                |
| nocturnal 1670  | 1435 |                                              |                |
| numerical 1766  | 1629 |                                              |                |
an air of surprize and nonchalance. So, in diaries and letters, de-
mure, "an hypocritical demure on his face," **foggrym, humdrom**, "I fear
many letters will give you the humdrums," and **posthymous** (a posthu-
mous child.) 'Heroics' are, of course, still spoken of; but Butler
put the word to another use—"Virgil . . To whom th' Heroics ever

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob.</th>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ocult 1656 only</td>
<td>1567 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>E. H. &quot;Gold. Saw&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocential 1679</td>
<td>1656 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Leamerd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operative 1672 &amp;c</td>
<td>1603 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Penn, Davies ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinionative 1659</td>
<td>1553 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orectic 1671</td>
<td>1779 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parmesan 1702-7</td>
<td>1519 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Lond. Gaz.&quot; (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peculiar 1720-13</td>
<td>1590 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kendall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pellucid 1669</td>
<td>1619 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceptive 1694</td>
<td>1656 fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Burthogge [Lyle]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| plastic 1644-1837 | 1632 fr. | | Sulver, " Car-
| plummy 1687 | 1593 fr. | | Mrs. Behn (p. 74) |
| posthumous 1649, 17R | 1629 fr. | | Ld. Herbert, Sewall |
| predetermined 1660 | 1577 fr. | | anon. |
| prediatory 1686 | 1611 fr. | | J. S. |
| preferable 1702-10 | 1648 fr. | | Pope |
| private 1716 | 1432 fr. | | Gataker |
| prognostic 1653 | 1603 fr. | | J. Davies |
| protectoral 1661 | 1657 fr. | | R. Mayhew, J. Nesse |
| prudential 1679-90 | 1641ff. | | |
| querical 1699 | 1699 (obs.) in a title; 'query' | | |
| roylet 1658, 1695 | | 'royalet' r. 1650 | Osborn, Cotton |
| satyric 1693 | 1509 fr. | | Dryden (2) |
| scorbutic 1676 &c | 1655 fr. | | Lady Fanshawe |
| signate 1662 | 1649 fr. | | J. Chandler |
| spectral 1656 | 1315 fr. | | Ussher (2) |
| subalternal 1673 | 1400 fr. | | Marvell |
| sublunar 1613-96 | 1610 fr. | | Good .. |
| subsequent 1603-5 | 1460 fr. | | Hale .. |
| subsidiary 1756 | 1543 fr. | | magazine |
| suppletary 1649 ff | 1628 fr. | | J. Taylor, others |
| supreme 1660 | 1523 fr. | | F. Brooke |
| surgent 1657 | 1592 fr. | | F. Cockin |
| tänder 1668-1742 | 1225 fr. | | Dryden, Richardson |
| tetragonal 1694 o. | 1571 fr. | | tr. |
| theological 1626 ff | 1526 fr. | | Slater, Hutton |
| thermo-electric 1823 | 1823 fr. | | Cumming, Francis |
| transitory 1649-54 | 1374 fr. | | Roberts, Whitlock |
| traumatic 1683 | 1656 fr. | | Salmon |
| trenchant 1660 | 1310 fr. | | anon. hist. |
| triumphal 1671 | 143 fr. | | Milton "P. R."
| vacant 1712 | 1290 fr. | | Blackmore (2) |
| vermicular 1690 | 1655 fr. | | 'vermacule' 1657 | R. Clark (2) |
since Have sworn Allegiance." Dryden used the word 'satyric' in the
sense "a satyrical drama." 'Satirist' dates from 1589 or before;
and 'satyric' in the sense "satiric writings" from 1600 on. So
Dogmatic, short for 'a dogmatic person,' used by Donne and Hobbes
and others between 1631 and 1702. 'Dogmatist,' analogically more
acceptable, perhaps, dates from 1654 or earlier. A few forms like
devotionary are wholly obsolete. Devotionary, however, was used
considerably in the seventeenth century. 'Devotee' in a measure
replaced it (1657 ff.). Except, nowadays, where 'domestic' is coupled
with 'economic' (&c.,) the idea of "domestic economy" is largely gone
from 'economy' (&c.)—a contributary fact to the obsoleteness of
economic, ab. in Trapp, 1656, "God is the best economic." Haggard
is interesting. In a translation of 1653 is the comment, "So chil-
dren oftentimes effascinate themselves, when their parents at-
tribute it to haggards and witches." Etheredge and others used it,
in somewhat varying senses, between 1653 and 1715. But a shorter,
well-established form (1552 ff.) was there, our term, 'hag.' And
'haggard' was perhaps best known throughout (1567 ff.) as an adjective.

It seems evident that if one wishes to discuss words "used as"
nouns and verbs, adjectives and nouns, verbs and adjectives, and the
like, one must, in putting them carefully face to face, weigh dates
and probabilities as to amount of use. Almost invariably in the
comparatively few but representative examples listed on the foregoing
pages, the dates for the living forms (or uses) are earlier, often
much earlier. The living forms, throughout the period of modern Eng-
lish, moreover, are, according to the Oxford Dictionary, much more
frequently used than the obsolete. Nevertheless, hundreds and possibly
thousands of contrary examples could be amassed—even examples like
"daffodilly' in a "Temple Bar Magazine" article of half a century ago: "a daffodilly drawing-room." Nouns will ever be subject, thus, to surprize services. So, in a lesser degree, with other parts of speech. There would be no virtue in amassing hundreds of examples, one imagines, unless it were to demonstrate amply the flexibility of words, the versatility of our vocabulary. But examples enough can probably be supplied by the mind, from experience. Inevitably hundreds of uses, sometimes strange, occasionally amusing, rarely amazing, to which nouns, adjectives, and verbs are put, become in course of time isolated and lost. This is really what we mean when we speak of "obsolete senses (or uses.)" The behavior of a word for a century or say, is singularly "correct," ordinary; then a writer delights to give it a peculiar twist, or perhaps, merely wishing for a literary short-cut, he boldly enlists the service of an adjective instead of a noun. He may be hardly conscious of what he is doing. Time passes; the book is not read; the word lurks, but is ultimately brought to light by the interested lexicographer. And this is truly one way in which words "become obsolete":

We return more strictly to the immediate subject of this chapter—the forms of words. Particularly interesting is a word like dilly, which will, perhaps, be recognized as an abbreviation (perhaps abbreviation) of a term, now half-obsolete, once important in the language of travel: 'diligence' (1749—1949.) Whether either term, dilly or 'diligence,' is now even vaguely familiar, certainly both, and especially the convenient abbreviated term, were familiar in the second half of the eighteenth century. It is really the thing, the object, that has been lost. It is interesting to note that when a writer in
1994 pictured again the old public stage-coach, the word he used was dilly (1796—1994.) Not all abbreviated or syncopated words are, however, quite like dilly, which is to say that occasionally the shortened form disappears, but the longer form remains. Why? Perhaps a number of illustrations will speak sufficiently fully for themselves.—

The word catamount is still locally (as the lexicographer says) available. Up to the end of the last century, at least, it was a popular name for the cougar or lynx. It also sometimes designated the pard or panther. But, a shortened form from 'cat o' mountain,' or of 'cat of the mountain,' it could not keep up, vaguely, varied associations. It is therefore partly obsolete, partly local.

Quite a number of words like disaffect, disunite, divest could be found. These three forms, however, in slight contrast to others offered on pp. 176 ff., are—or were—probably viewed as shortened forms of, respectively, 'disaffected,' 'disunited,' 'divested.'

Different again in character are hurtberry, 1661 Fuller's "Worthies," questionably short for 'hurtlebery' (c. 1460 ff.), integumentation (1316 "Edin. Encycl.," 1317 "Blackwood's," 1328 Webster) shortened from 'integumentation' (1809 ff.) pad-staff (Fuller, "Worthies," again) for 'paddle-staff' (1609 ff.,) fust (1832 Wheler "Journ. Greece")—"These

* Infra, Ch. VIII, p. 380.

The writer takes polite exception at the NED on dilly and 'diligence.' Modes and means of travel and travel-words have a way of living on "within" (as it is said) "the memory of man." Is not 'diligence' still used of Continental stagecoaches? The homophony of dilly with 'dilly,' from 'sapodilla' (Florida and West Indies small tree,) may present itself: if so, how clear it is that homophony, again, is no cause of obsolescence in words? One is tempted, to the contrary, to speak of "the geography of English."

[I The dates: disaffect 1632 "Lond. Gaz.," -ed,' 1632 ff.; disunite 1642 H. More "Song of Soul," "Sith the soul from them is disunite," -ed' 1650 ff.; divest a. 1679 Ed. Orrery "..of more than life —"
growth Fust also, or Yellow wood, used to dye with") short for 'fustid (ad. Fr., a kind of wood in dyeing, [1542 ff.,) grub (1717 D'Urfey "Pills" only) and 'grubby' (a. 3., 1611 ff.,) doct (1709 Motteux "Rabelais" —"Doct Verboecimtion is imib'd," only use; Lat. 'doctus," fiddlecome (1697 Vanbrugh "Relapse," 1777 Sheridan "Trip to Scarborough," short for 'fiddle-come-fadle [also obs., 1663 Cowley "Gutter of Coleman," from 'fiddle-fadle' (see p. 144,) with 'come' for 'oum'] martel, manufact, and others.

Phonetically Lawson-eve and yarrell are interesting. The first is—or was—short for 'Low Sunday evn,' the Saturday in Easter week. It occurs in writings of the years 1725 and 1941. Yarndle was dialectal, shortened from 'yarn-windle' (1342 ff.,) and was used in 1692.

Another kind of shortening is seen in dom for 'dog-dashes' and 'dog-throw' at dice, the abbreviated expression occurring in H. W.'s translation of the Colloquies of Erasmus, "That the throw Cous was a lucky one, and the dom was unfortunate" (1671.) So nick-time, 1650 A. B., "In troth not too early, for it was in the nick-time," for 'the nick of time' (only use,) and palm (1725,) short for 'palm-wine' (1708) or possibly 'palm-sack' (1342,) and point (adv., 1754 Richard-

* Martel ass Sc., shortened form of 'Martilmas,' 'martinmas' (1297.) Used 17.. Miss Miller points its homophony with 'martel' a hammer (15th c. and after,) esp. one used in war, and 'martel:' 'martin' (obs.;) also the dying out of local dialects.

Dates suggest that manufact was, if not "clipped" in its "origin," at least possibly "clipped" in after-appearances: 1690 against 1622 for 'manufacture.' Manufacturer 1649—1812 and 'manufacturer' 1752 ff. contrast nicely. As Miss Miller says (App. A) the analogy of corresponding words in other European languages helps here: Fr. 'manufacture,' Sp. and Pg. 'manufactura,' It. 'manufactura.' D'-Urfey in 1690 used the word thus: "Which would have been a wholesome [sic] Act T'encourage Woolen [sic] Manufact;" Maydman used the word twice in prose writings the next year.

A similar form-incompleteness is seen in: inconform (1659 Gauden, "A way... no way inconform to the will of God," 1663 Charle-
son "Grandison" [only use] "All the Christian doctrines . . are point against it [sc. duelling]" short for 'point-blank' (1591.) Historical interest attaches particularly to forms like bub, crit, fan, fuse, hogen (or hogan,) petre, scrib, sleezy, stitch, tid, and a few others. Bub, like hurtberry above (p. 205,) was questionably short for 'bubble'—"to bribe, to cheat." Long before D'Urfey used it in his "Pills" of 1719, it was given another meaning, "to throw up in bubbles" (1563.) But its innocence, as is well known, was lost to it in course of time. The question might be put, How innocuous is 'bubble' (the word) today? Today, of course, it depends on whether one is looking at some children with their soap-bubble pipes or is recalling a great financial disaster of the mid-eighteenth century. But bub is gone. Time has put us at a distance from the kind of cheating it once familiarly denoted. Crit is perhaps a term more readily understood. Fielding in the prologue to "The Wedding-day" (1743) wrote "Smoke the author, you laughing crits." Fan was a jocular abbreviation of 'fanatico' (1444 ff.,) perhaps a slang term of
its day. Certainly fuss (1667 Dryden, 1675, 1702 Steele in "Funeral")
short for 'fussock' ("a fat unwieldy woman," 1700 "E. E." in his
Dictionary, ffs.) was dialectal or slangy. Dr. Burney in a letter
(1795) created scribe; sleazy in Blount (1670) was from 'Silesia'
(a kind of cloth, 1674—again the obsoleteness of the thing,) and
stitch (1671—1719) was short for 'stichbeck,' a kind of strong ale
(1671 ff.) hogen, or hogan, 1672—1733, was an abbreviation of
'hogen-mogen;' and petre for 'petre-salt' and petterish were used
between 1690 and 1763. Gray (1767) in a letter wrote "Tomorrow I
go Vizzing to Gibe side to see the new married Countess;" and another
nonce-abbreviation pie J. Watts in 1657, "Yes, to Pie and Parrot
out our Tongues, Degrees, and Leavning of the University."

Particularly interesting are truncated or aphetic forms.
Some of those that became obsolete in early modern English are glov,
cessment, fegro, frodile, loo, perbole, squesh, tent, inative,
trail, velope, and 'you—questionably some others.* It is again

Pad-staff in Fuller, "Worthies" (1661) and 'paddle-staff' (1609
ff. 'Paddle' sb. "spade," 1407 ff.) undertake sb. prob. after
'undernmi' v., an undertaking (ff.) or enterprize; 1647,
1676. The verb 'undertake' dates from . Garle is question-
ably short for 'garland' (1363 ff.), 1677 "Lond. Gaz.," "A white
garle about her neck." Hooker was probably a kind of abbreviated
variant of 'huckle-backed'—one might perhaps say an abbreviation
of the idea. The dates respectively are 1707 E. Ward "Hud. Redly.,"
"Next to this hocky greasy Beast, Stood a young Beau, most nicely,
dress," and 1652 ff. Perpet, 1715, 1745 (De Foe) and 'perpetua
(ff.) Sustent sb. obs. r. ? shortentag of 'subtentacle'
after OF 'soustien' 1664 Evelyn tr. Freert, "the sustent, prop or
foot of a thing." So also turpin 1633 and 'turpentine' (ff.)
unfast (v. dial.) harp (homophony,) visorum (aphetic, occupation
of printing,) syéy (slang,) hop-soot (end-of-ch., a... ..) till
(dialectal,) ha (lost appellation,) harry-soph, and others. Doubt-

* E.g., canvassing as an ellipt. constr. for 's-canvasing,' 1691
Temple "Mem.;" chemy (pp. 22--23;) kimbo (a. and v., "to set a-
kimbo") 1697—1704, Dryden, Richardson, &c., 'akimbo' adv. c. 1400
ff.; laborate 1662, 'elaborate' 1611 ff.; lizary 1791, 'alizari'
1850 ff.; umbrae 1675 (clergyman) 'adumbrate' 1641 ff.; vacuative
1656, 'evacuative' 1611 ff.; avalanche 1766, 'avalanche' 1789 ff.
not always clear why such words grew obsolete. Their aphetic quality does not fully explain their obsoleteness. There are aphetic forms of words in the vocabulary today, and aphetic pronunciations of words are frequently heard. Dates, however, are again interesting. Almost always the full form was earlier, often much earlier." **Loo, squash,** and **avalanche** are somewhat contrary examples. Smollett in his book of travels (1766) spoke of mules and drivers perishing "by the avalanches". It is more than likely that the form 'avalanche' was available in 1766 and earlier; and is it possible that the definite article had something to do with the obsolete form? The closeness of dates, below, will be noticed. So with **loo,** aphetic for 'halloo.' The inter-

ful examples are seen in: **descoll,** ? synco pepated ad. fr. Fr. or L., a word which proved useful ca. 1640-1653, 'decollate' 1599 ff., disculp 1738 only, Warburton, vs. 'disculpate' 1693 ff.; **inasse** 1657, 'incession' 1599 ff.; **umbel** ad. L. Sp. Pg. It. a meaning "an umbelliferous plant" obs. r. 1702, 1713, a contraction not clear; **unguit** 1675 J. Smith "Chr. Relig." "The Gallick Druides (that most uncult Tribe of Divines)"—'uncultured' 1555 ff., 1727 ff. (see p. 179.) Somewhat different in character: **distil-house** from the stem of 'distilling-house' (1599 ff.; 'distillery' 1759 ff.) 1692 "Lond. Gaz." also 1723, —1807; **gip** a. OF. 'gip' — 1653 transla., op. 'gypsum' (— ff.); **unsily** 1640, 1653 transla. 'unskilfully' 1555 ff.; and **tid,** 'A word app. deduced by Bailey from tid-bit, but also in independent dialect use." Bailey, Johnson and later dictionari ans, and nonce-use, poets, &c.

The above list is exceedingly miscellaneous, but perhaps shows how diverse the possibilities in words are.

* **Alchemy** r. (1) 1715
  acloy 4. 1577—1669, 1711
  cloy 4. 1577—1669, 1711
  geassent 1645, 1721
  terror 1711
  frolide 1674, 1725
  kimbo 1697—1903 (much use)
  laborate 1662 only
  lizary 1791
  loo 1666—7, to 1711
  perbole 1678 Dryden
  squash 1678—1724
  tent 1799 (2 uses)
  tractive 1656
  trait 1764, 1772
  umbrate 1675

  'alchemy' 1605 ff. 1640 ff.
  'acloy,' 'acloy' obs. or arch. 14th c. ff
  'assessment' 1543 ff.
  'affeeror' 1667 ff.
  'affodill' also obs. 1420—1615; see above
  a-kimbo' 15th c. ff.
  'elaborate' 1611 ff.
  'alizar' 1540 ff.
  'hallo' 17°1 ff., see above
  'hyperbole' 1529 ff.
  'masquash' 1624 ff., see above
  'intent' 1610 ff. (doubtful example)
  'entail' 14th century ff.
  'adumbrate' 1641 ff. (doubtful example)
jection is not obsolete (1605 ff.) But 'hello' dates in writing from 1781 on (Mme. D'Arblay,) and was first used as a substantive by Dickens in 1840; the word or form 'hollo' (verb) is of 1542 ff., and 'holly' of 1599 ff. One naturally thinks, of course, of how loo was pronounced. Certainly its sense here, "to urge on by shouts," was "exceptional." Denham used it, and Shadwell and others. Finally, the word had and has other associations. Frodile was a shortened adoption of French "afrodille." But no English word 'afrodille' ever existed, nor 'afrodil,' and Affodil is obsolete (1420—1615.) The modern word is 'asphodel,' 1579—1677. Frodile may have been used but rarely; and after all there was a form in the vocabulary, well-established, before it.

Yet dates never really explain the obsoleteness or obsolescence of words. No general explanation is quite feasible. But if we look too much for particulars, we are likely soon to get lost in the multiplicity and even insignificance of them. We focus attention thus on the word squash where it is marked "sb. 3" in the New English Dictionary. It was aphetic for 'musquash' (1624 ff.) 'Musk-rat' (which animal the obsolete form designates) has been an English word since 1620. The verb 'squash' dates from 1565 on. 'Squash' the gourd was perhaps first in writing in 1643. 'Squash' the ball is recent—1836 ff., 'squash' the act of "squashing" is much older—1611 ff., 'squash' the sound dates from 1654 on, and 'squash' as college slang again is recent—1857 or so ff. Shakespeare used the word, quite attractively, in 1590. With these facts before us, it

vacuative 1656
valanche 1766
velope 1722
'veous 1674
'evacuative' 1611 ff.
'avalanche' 1739 ff.
'envelopes' (v.) 1386 ff.
'avows' 1300 (archaic if not obs.)
is not difficult to understand why *squash* as aphetic for 'musquash' became obsolete. But not all truncated forms have, like this *squash*, been surrounded by so many confusing similar forms. Some, nevertheless, like *sheny*, are doubtfully obsolete; some are colloquial or dialectal—*tent* (Scottish,) *valanche* (French dialectal,) 'vous' (colloquial reduction, probably for 'avowe,' "I make my avows;") a number were most rarely used—*fearor*, *kimbo*, *laborate*, *perbole*, *vacuitive*, *velope*; the spelling of *cassment* would possibly make for its obsolescence; and the scattered senses of *clow* probably helped contribute to its partial-obsolescence. *Unch* instead of 'muncheon' (1669) and *unneath* for 'underneath' (1654 Vilvain, "A noble Pair ... ly here unneath one stone;" 1712 Parnell and 1750 Shenstone, 1347 Halliwell—a Somerset term) may be added here: not aphetic, but reduced forms.

While it is left to a later chapter (X) to discuss the usage of words, it may prove interesting here to glimpse a few elliptical uses of words. Particularly interesting are uses like *crack* for "crack-brain, crazy fellow" (1701 Sedley in "Grumbler," 1711 Addison in "Spectator,") *crop*, "person wearing hair cropped" (1639 "Lond. Gaz.," 1700 "B. L.," 1711; so also *crop-ear*, 1596—1702,) *dodle*, "a doddling or infirm person" (1691 Otway "Soldier's Fortune," "Is your Piece of Mortality such a doting Dodle? Is he so very fond of you?") *dapper* (1709 "Tatler"—"A distant imitation of a forward Fop, and a Resolution to over-top him in his way, are the distinguishing Marks of a Dapper," Again in a later issue, and 1747,) *fair*, used absolutely or elliptically for "a person of fair complexion" (1771,) *fortune*, "a woman of fortune, an heiress" (1655—1923, Steele, Fielding, Byron, others,) *frontier*, "a settler on the frontier; a frontiersman" (1677,) *insurance*, short for 'insurance-officer'
(1722 De Foe "Colonel Jack") **negative**, "one who takes the negative side" (1649, 1673; also "heretic," 1731,) **occasionalist** (1705,) and **toupee**, "one who wears a toupee, a person of fashion, beau, spark, buck" (1727 Pope, etc., "Art of Sinking"—"Then oh! she cries, what slaves I round me see? Here a bright Redcoat, there a smart Toupee," 1747 "Gentl. Mag."—"Here swiftly move toupees, in apruce undress;" so also **toupet**, foreignism, 1729 Fielding, 1749 Richardson "Clarissa" —"A couple of brocaded or laced-waist coated toupetes... with sour screwed up half-cocked Faces.") It is, of course, not difficult to understand the obsoleteness of **crop or toupee** here, and **dapper, dodgle, fair, and fortune** illustrate the sense for style in language, and nicely bear comparison with lists given elsewhere. These elliptical expressions are indeed often flashing. Time has put us at a great distance from the thing in **pope** for "pope-day celebration" (1766 and 1769 only,) the exclusiveness of his world keeps us from understanding the angler's **turkey**, short for 'turkey-fly' (1799, 1676,) without the context of both letters and life we cannot gather the meaning of **triump** as used by Evelyn and others in the seventeenth century—"triumpah arch," "triumphe, trophies, statues," "triumphe or statues of Sugar"—, and **trade** for "trading expedition" (De Foe, 1725.) **pigtail** (monkey, 1774,) **cat** (short for 'cat-skin,' 'cat's fur' 1656, 1672,) **exuberance** ("an abundance of good things," 1675, 1751,) **fox, 'foxglove,' 1694 translation,** **try, 'trysail,' 1665, out,** "to break off acquaintancehip" (1792, 1809, Mad. D'Arblay and Southey in letters, 1825 "New Monthly Magazine,") and non for 'non placet' (Wood in "Life," 1712 Hearne) present interesting little problems.

* Cp. pp. 15, 131—132, 207 ff., 373 and 462. (popular expressions, derisive appellations, euphemism,) 145 (blob-tale,) and Bib. 380 and 376. Also dress (thrum, &c.) p. 364
In point of fact, many of these clipped forms, and especially those designating kinds of people, are either not remotely obsolete or not obsolete at all. If a predilection for the clipped word exists—and it does still exist, in English, very much—it is because of the convenience afforded, the freshness and even smartness attained. The abbreviated word may be a time-saving device or an attractive way of wearing one's speech. And so *mob* and *pop* and *prig* and *doodle* and *noodle* and *humbug* and many other such terms only enjoy less vogue than once they did. All originally were of the years 1626—1703. Something, always, besides the abbreviated character of a word is responsible, often primarily, for its obsoleteness. The predilection for the clipped word is decisively illustrated in *pundirion*, obsolete in favor of 'pun.' It is "apparently related, either as earlier form or derivative, to *pun*" (which dates from 1660 on.) It was used during the Restoration. Nothing certain is known about the cognates 'pun,' *pundirion,* *punnet,* Italian 'puntiglio.' Fashionable slang also brought in *tut,* 'mob,' 'mob,' 'snob,' and others. 'Moment' and *momentane* (1704 ff. and 1709 respectively) and 'rum' and *rumbustion* (1652) are further illustrations. Contrary examples are *hallelloo*, doubtfully obsolete extension of 'hallow' (.. ff.,) 1730 Fielding (also 1749,) and *pommelion,* "an unexplained extension of *pommel* (1639, also obsolete, "knob in a cannon," technical use?) 1769—1367. *Nanger,* a prothetic form, "to make angry," may also be singularly included here (1675 Wycherley "Country Wife," 1691; *angry,* 'angry,' obs. rare, 1631.)

The Oxford Dictionary does not define 'back-formation,' but perhaps the few obsolete examples of this language-phenomenon will explain the nature of their derivation. It is only to be wished that they explained their obsolescence as well. But again, no single reason for the obsolescence of back-formations could probably be found, unless, indeed, one were to say that, as with clipped forms, so here, form has been no aid, time has put us at a distance from forms once familiar, and the vocabulary became overcrowded. Out of fifteen examples of the periods of our study (1650 ff.,) only five back-formations were much used: effront, "free from bashfulness," "put to confusion" (1643, 1649,) ganger (back-formation of 'gangrene,' influenced by 'canker,' 1635, 1696, 1725,) owl (apparently a back-formation from 'owler,' 'owing'—smuggling of wool and sheep out of England; figurative speech in which the smuggler was likened to an owl; obsolete and historic, 1696—1792,) permix (permixt, —d also obsolete, 1420 ff.; 1679, 1693,) and throwst (irregular back-formation from 'throuster'—silk-weaving; 1691, 1725, 1744.) The others chiefly illustrate the versatility of English. Had, e. g., selvairise lived (a back-formation of the popular eighteenth century term 'eclaircissement,' and meaning "to clear up," 1754 only, Newton, "Till Time shall accomplish and eclaircise all the particulars,";) then we could wonder at it. The reasonable thing for this rare term, and several others like it—finick from 'finical,' "a finical person," 1706 only, hypocritize, "to act as a hypocrite, to hypocritise" (1690,) back-formation from 'hypocrisy'? pown, erroneous back-formation from 'pannage' (1374 ff.) 1664 Spelman, predecess, nonce-word, back-formation from 'predecessor,' "to precede," 1747 H. Walpole in "Letter"—"Lord John Sackville predeceased me here," ravel, kind of bread (obscure)
Strangely, the Oxford Dictionary does not define "back-formation"

But the few obsolete...
1674, *rendling*, on 'rendles' (obs. ex. dial. 1440 ff.) "sourling, setting" 1724, *septuagene*, back-formation from 'septuagenarian';

1656, *ubiquit*, from 'ubiquitous' or 'ubiquity,' 1676 Marvell, "This being done, then the Exposen ubiqutis himself, peeping at the Keyholes, or picking the Locks of the Bed-chambers of all the Great Ministers," and *verd*, back-formation from 'verdage,' "to sow for verdage," 1779 (*verdage* also obs., introduced by W. H. Marshall in the same year, 1779)—to do, they did: they became obsolete. Back-formations, one is tempted to conclude, are rare, and are not precisely needed.

Many corrupt forms have, to be sure, survived in English. But hundreds have perished. Sometimes, no doubt, correct forms were learned. But quite as often—indeed, oftener, it would seem—no correct forms were forthcoming; irregular and erroneous and assumed and factitious forms were simply stranded. One must look, always, to dates. Then it is frequently less easy to say that correct forms replaced erroneous ones—correct forms "were learned." Nevertheless, words are ever full of paradoxes, and dates are not always reliable. What one can be sure of is this, that here as elsewhere our vocabulary became unreasonably large and confused.

* See p. 163, where the living erroneous form 'frontignac' is contrasted with a more regular but obsolete form frontipnan. Likewise 'rubiferous' (rare, but not obs. 1696) and 'rubiloud.' 'Disposis' (medicine, irreg., 1951 ff.) and 'tele-graphem' (really obs., "A word suggested instead of telegram, as being more correctly formed; but never generally adopted, 1957 ff.) are but two out of many such examples.

[[ Miss Florence Miller's thesis, Appendix A. This writer lists under "Corruptions" some seven words, and says of their forms that they "probably arose out of misunderstanding of the spoken...".]}

---
Strangely, the Oxford Dictionary does not define "back-compatibility".
Dates, usage, and other particulars, thus, seem on the one hand to indicate the co-existence of forms correct and incorrect: abnoxious (1649 Bp. Hall) and 'obnoxious' (1597 ff.,) anagotetical (1731 and 1794 only) and 'anagological' (1528 ff.,) adminiculary (1652 [typographical error?], 1817) and 'adminiculor' (1676 ff.,) anotherguese ("plausible but erroneous 'emendation'" by Arbuthnot, 1727 of) 'anotheguese' (arch. 1625 ff.,) attractive (on incorrect analogies, cf. 'tactical,' 1691 only) and 'attractional' (never used; 'attracting' [ppl. a.] 1661 ff., 'attractive' [sense 4] 1603 ff.,) deglutition (from an obsolete French word; 1657) and 'deglutition' (from French and Latin —1650 ff.,) dilatory ("A bad formation for dilatory" [living, surgery, 1611 ff.,] 1691 only,) dileriate (error for 'deliriate; 1689) and 'delirious' (1706 or before, ff.,) disingenuous (frequent error in seventeenth century for correct form; 1655—1707) and 'disingenuous' ( ff.,) futilitous (irregular, from 'futility' and 'ous,' 1765 Sterne "Tristram Shandy"—"Love is . . one of the most Agitating, Bewitching, . . Futilitous . . of all human passions") and 'futil' (1555 ff.,) frigiferous (badly from the Latin, 1604 Evelyn "Sylva" only: "Not exposed to Sulphurous exhalations or Frigiferous winds,"') 'frigid' (1622 ff.,) gallanture (irregularly from sb. and '-ure' 1633 only, Oldham, "Gallants . . Known only by their Gallanture and Vice") and 'gallantry' (1632 ff.,) heterogenous ("A less correct form of heter-
homous" [1624 ff., 1695—1912,) hvmenal (erroneous, 1674, 1792) and
'hiemal' (1560 ff., but now rare,) immoretta ("A corruption of in-
'amorata" [1651 ff.] probably from confusion with 'amoretta,' &c.,
1709 Mrs. Manley, "There are others... that lavish vast Sums upon
their Immoretta's," 1767 [2]) industric (irregularly from 'induction'
after 'electric,' 1355 [2]) and 'inductional' (1329 ff.) or 'inductive'
(1499 ff.; no form 'industral,') investation, ipseand, obeliskine,
obitel, opposive, oxygenity, palmaul, panacœm, papillous, percur-
ration, phæole, poplité, potential, principe, retrogradation, salis-
potent, sarden, sceptism, simutal, simulty, stupenduous, testes,
thornie, tolerism, torpulent, transmigra, vernacular, vulgario, and
many others."

---

dine,' Egyptian coin (1533 ff.,) corrupt obs. f. dated 1674;) mand-
gloryse (1493, 1499; 'mandragora' dates from 1000 &c;) martilose
(13. — 1548; see above;) millensiale (1542, 1593, corruption of
'milium solis;' 'milium' 1b. 1645 ff., &c;) modwall (1572—1736,
variation or corruption for 'woodwall' 1250 ff., or 'witwall'
1669—1844, the woodpecker [1530 ff.]) moyce (doubtfully corrupt
variant of 'morse' sb. 1 [1404—1226], clasp of cope; the variant
used in 1550 and 1592; and musser (probably a malprint, 1601, for
'musset,' 'muset.' ) Dates of once again, here indicate the co-
existence of correct and incorrect forms, but hardly anything more.
Nor is there really anything to suggest that correct forms were, in
course of time, "learned." As suggested below, they may have been.

* Investation, bad formation of 'investition' (not given) or 'inves-
tion' (1575, 1632—also obs. rare,) 1665. 'Aperand,' corrupt. of
'a per se, and,' 'an old way of naming the character & at the end of
the alphabet'—'& by itself: and.' 'Amerand' 1377 ff. 'Ipsand
1547. 'A per se' 1475. 'O per se.' Obeliskine, n.w. irreg. fr.
obellax,' used by Shelley, 1819; 'obellaxal' 1763 ff. Obital
1690—1715. The ety. f. of L. 'obitus' is 'obital' (1705 ff.
rare.) Opposite, 1676 only; irreg. f. 'opose' v. and -ive.'
'Oppositive' 2. 1622 ff. Oxygenity, irreg. n. d., 'oxygeny'
-n.w., quality of being oxygen, or oxygenous, 1594. Palmaul 1572,
'pall-mall' 1593 ff. Panacœm 1694, tr. 'error f. of 'panacea'
1548 ff.; also panœy 1690 only. Papilloms 1735, irreg., 'papill-
onaceous' 1668 ff. Percuration 1785 'Gentl. Mag.' erroneously
from 'percurs' v. and 'ation': percussion (hypothetical form,
not given in N.E.). Phæole 1649, erron. f. of 'range' 1543 ff.
Also phalaeque 1635 'Lond. Gaz.' obs. f. of 'palax' (foreignism,
1691, 1853.) Poplite 1758 only, irreg. ad. mod. L.: 'poplitale'
1736 ff. Potential 1651, "Then the earth... did specifie those that
potentail salt" (fc., only use:) error for 'potential' 1485 ff.
It is possible, of course, that correct forms were ascertained or "learned" and were substituted for incorrect forms. Dates and use may seem to indicate this possibility in absorption, an irregular formation, by Sir Thomas Browne (1680), as if from Latin 'absorbutus' instead of 'absorputus'—whence regular 'absorption' (1741 ff.).

Achromic (1761) had the same derivation as 'achromatic' (1766—probably the later form), yet was improperly formed. 'Anthropotomy' (1855 ff.) is a more accurate denomination than androotomy (1691 and dictionaries after Johnson, 1755, only.) A distinction came to be drawn between

Principle 1650, 1677 only, erroneous variant of 'principiate' (also obs. 1613—1697.) Retraction 1646, 1703 "Brit. Apollo"—erron. f. of 'retrogradation' (1554 ff.) Salaipton 1575, 1656 Blowat, false reading for 'salaiptanen'. Sardan ad. L. "? with supposed correction of form after Gr." 1649 only; 'sardoln' epithet of herb supposed to produce 'sardonla' laughter; also obs. rare—1633 only. Sceptism, 1653: badly formed on 'scepticism' (1646 ff.) Simultal 1654 only, irreg. fr. L. 'simul' —'simultaneous' (ad. L. type, 1660 ff.) Similaty 1677 Gale, irreg. fr. L., homophony—except obs. rare—1, with other obs. fr. Simility; 'simultaneity' fr. French, Spanish, &c. 1902 ff. Stupendous 1736—1794, after adj. in 'ous,' op. 'tremendous,' vulgar form of 'tremendous' &c.: 'stupendous' dates from 1666. Testee 1654 Vivain and 1682 only (obs. r.,) irreg. forms from L. 'testis': —'witness'; op. 'trustee': 'testa' 1654 ff. Thornia, chem. ad. Fr. 'thorine' 1517, a bad representa. of Berzelius's name 'thorjord'; Eng. chemists long used 'thorina' and 'thorium' for 'thorla' and 'thorium'; dates for obs. f. 1517, 1526, 1531 &c. Tolerism 1551 Borrow 'Laenger' "Thou wouldst be badly out of place in these days of... universal tolerism." "Fraser's Magazine" in the same year says "How can this master of words [Borrow] justify such a barbarous bit of patchwork as 'tolerism'?" 'Tolerationism' dates from 1593. Torpulent well illustrates the part that analogy plays throughout our vocabulary: 1657 Reeve 'God's Flea' —"Lay aside neglect, awake from torpulence, and again, "Our prayers do show, what an esclant and torpulent people we are." Irreg. fr. 'torpor,' after 'corpulent.' 'Torpid' 1613 ff., 1656 ff. So torpency, obs. rare—1, 'torpidity' 1614 ff., 'torpor' 1626 ff., &c. Tractory 1709 only, 'tractatory' 1725 ff. Trangdillio, 1704: mistake for 'twangdillio'? Transmigrate 1657 only, perversion of 'transmigrare' after 'transfigurat' or Fr. 'transmiger.' Trigen app. error of some kind for 'triger,' 1659 ff. Unaccustomed 1701 'Lond. Gaz.' 'Liable to be... seized in like manner as Prohibited and Unaccustomed Goods:' 1715 Ib., for 'ungusted' (1393 ff.) a case of getting hold of the wrong word? Unconcernness
Dauphin' and 'delphm.' Many tries like fidipèd (1661 only, Lovell, badly from the Latin) and 'fissiped' ("having toes separate," 1646 ff. and 1656 ff.) were made. Writers have occasionally been taken to task for creating "barbarous bits of patchwork" (see tosrigia in the footnote to the previous page.) Popular corruptions and perversions of words, it would seem, have not so much been "corrected" as simply lost in the vast stream of English words. Amusing, they served their day. Perhaps they became trite even in their appropriate sphere. Out of it, they were probably not recognizable—or, if recognizable, were frowned upon. Thus, pot-carrier, a perversion of 'potiocary,'


Other improper, irregular, erroneous forms and uses do not so much seem to say that correct forms were ultimately arrived at, and incorrect forms therefore lost to the language, as that the vocabulary from time to time came to possess unneeded forms. The following are all improper (ed.) most are of rarest occurrence (see statistics below,) some show the effect of pseudo-learning, not a few are unrecognizable (i.e., the form does not aid one in getting a meaning,) some are hopelessly awkward, a number illustrate the operation of etymology, and all show the endless resourcefulness of the mind of man, and capability of English.—Agnoscere 1652 only, improp. fr. L., 'scent' 1530 ff. Aeroamare 1657 only, improp. fr. L., no replacement. Adivirza 1657 only; also adimoplate. Adjustly 1681, irreg. fr. 'adjust' by form-sans. w. 'just'—'justly'—no replacement. Admirez 1702 only, improp. fr. 'admire' or? Fr. 'admirer' and 'ize,' op. 'accomplish' and 'accomplish;' 'admi-
ure' 1590 ff. Angelence 1658 only, irreg. fr. 'angel.' Argento 1657 only, improp. fr. L., isolated term. Argumentive 1667 Dryden, only use, irreg. fr. 'argument;' 'argumentative' 1642 ff. Atheth-
ize 1701 Beverley only, irreg. fr. Gr., 'isola.' in rt. Badiner 1697 Vangrugh, irreg. adpt. 'banter;' 'badinage' 1659 ff., 'badin-
eur' obs. 1734 Pope to Swift. Boundant 1649, 1654 Fuller, erron.
form of 'bounden' ff. Calumnier 1614—1675, irreg. fr. 'calum-
"pothecary," 1683, and potter-carrier, vulgar or provincial variant of the same word (1764,) otherwise, a corruption of 'otherguise' (now only colloquial, 1632 fr.) by folk-etymology after 'guise; 1653—

ny,' op. 'astronomer;' 'calumnier' (1586 ff.), 'calumnior' (fr.) Cathedral and 1676 only, irreg. fr. 'cathedral;' 'cathedra' (1297 ff.) Chrysant 1647 (astral.) ? irreg. fr. 'crisis' De- orspitigate, -tany 1670 G. H. "Hist. Cardinals"—"Of his goodness and despotitgate [bonta e deospitata]"—irreg. formations; 'despotitude' 1603 fr. Delemitate 1627, 1657 only, irreg. fr. L. "soften" So delenittical, dictionary word. Demologue, 1627-77, 1717 n-w. irreg. fr. L.; demulce, v., likewise obs. (1530--1931.) Interesting uses by Feltham ("These soft and smooth demouelations that insensibily" &c.) and two centuries later, in "Blackwood's." Demulc- itive 1756 "The oil is opening and demulcitive," 'demolent' 1732 fr. Dentar 1831 (2 times) only use, irreg. ad. Fr. 'dentaire,' fr. a Lat. wd.; 'dental' 1599 fr. Dermaology and 'dermatology,' both 1719; op. compounds. Devote 1729 Fielding, 1724: erroneous form of 'devote' or of 'devotee'—pseudo-Fr. spelling. Diduot (1676) 'didoe' (also obs. 1579--1696,) and 'dido: confusion of forms. Disgustation 1659 only, irreg. fr. 'dugust' (1619 fr.) Disgustability 1660 H. More, 1672 Mede's Works, 1711 Ken; irreg. fr. 'disgustious' as if 'disputacious: 'disputatiousness' (1601 fr.) Disseit 1674 irreg. f. 'a' and 'seat' Disfrange 1778 only, L. opd. was 'dif- fringeres; this opd. irreg. fr. L. 'Frangeres'. Dispensatory for 'dispensitive' (1528 fr.:) 1635--1679, churchmen. Dispositate 1650 Howell, error form for 'depositate,' thru confusion with 'dispese; 'deposite' (1624 fr.) 'depositate' (1619 fr. [includ- ing a use by Howell.]) Dissid 1657, ad. L. 'dissidium,' now held to be an error for 'disidium;' see 'disidence' (1656 fr.) Divast 1677 only, incorrect form for 'devast;' Divinitize 1649 only, translation, irreg. fr. 'divinity' and '-ize;' 'divinize' 1656 ff. Dulceus 1639 only, irreg.; no word quite similar. Dulciscate 1657 only, irreg. Freud 1656 only, corruptly fr. Fr. 'obfuscate' (trena). Efrorntous 1734, much used by North only, irreg. fr. 'effronted' after words like 'affectuous,' 'fatu- ous. 'Ellicitate 1651 only; so also elicitate 1647 More "Poems;" 'elicct' 1641 ff. Emoloe 1555 only Diggles "These things... should be and emolled and emolled in their Parlements," corruptly fr. Lat. 'emolageres vs. 'homologare,' to confirm—a word from French parliamentary system. Andermont 1603 E. Pegge "Aneod. Eng. Lang." (see above for quot.) Antecessor 1719 only, shows confusion with 'antepeze;' (Fox-hunting.) Abstant 1697 and 1699 Damper and Wafer in resp. Voyages; app. a confusion of Sp. 'estacion' and 'estacion,' a cattle-Farm. The quotations relate to Central America and Mexico. Also 1707 Funnell, "Voyages." Excretionis 1633 "New Monthly Mag." only, badly fr. 'exres- cent' and '-tious' after 'adventitious' Exsauriate 1683 only, irreg. fr. L. Flandkerin, Flandkerin (a comic perversio, 1663) and flandrian (1800) all obs. Flandrakin 1694--1821; 'Fleming' 1430 fr. Form-socket (above). Fossology 1776--1830, no re- placement; our word simply is 'paleontology' 1838 fr. Impress
1755, in Bunyan and Smollett, *form-speckle* in a number of the "London Gazette" for 1702, possibly a perversion of 'fernticle' or the dialectal 'fanfreckle," Long Oyster, 1674, "Locusta' (sea fish,) Solomon-

1665, erron. for 'imprest' v.l. Imprest 1652, 1659 only, erron. for 'impress'—confusion both ways. Incumbition 1759 Sterne "Tr. Shand." "The souls of connoisseurs themselves by long friction and incubation;" Irreg. fr. L. Incrustate 1657, Irreg. fr. L. In-
goruous 1679 only. Insoluble 1676, Irreg. fr. 'inquisite' ("If the body cannot be seen, then it is insoluble before the justness of over and terminer") Insignificant 1676 only, Irreg.
Insolant 1803 only, fr. assumed L. (see below) Insolvent 1658 Irreg. fr. Fr.; so also Integrant, Integrative, 1734. Inter-
median 1716 only, ? corruptly of 'Intermediate' Intersensor 1675 only, form-confusion? (see below) Intersensory 1653 only, Irreg.: 'irreprehensible' also obs. r. 1546. Juvenile 1703 only, Irreg.
fr. L. Juvenility 1657 only, Irreg. fr. L. —'youth'. Necessitated erron. for 'necesitated'; 1707—1741. Nesteral 1644 Herrick "Hesperides. To his Mistress"—"For your breaths too, let them smell Ambrosia-like, or Nectarine;" 'nesterous' 1708 ff. No-
yuggal 1716 Davies only, Irreg. fr. L. Oblique 1790, corruption from 'arbelest' Observational 1703 only, Irreg. fr. L., 'observ-
vational' 1654 fr. Olympionicest 1656 Jasher, Irreg. fr. L. and Gr. "a victor at the Olympic games" Out-door 1646, 1766, 1812, and 'outer door' Pantarch 1694 Motteux "Reb." erron. fr. 'pan-
carte' Patiate 1653 only, Irreg. fr. L., "to suffer" Pejora-
tion 1650 only. Pychon 1639, ? corruption of 'pelloon'—surgery.
Polytiore 1661 only, app. an error for 'polyphone' Fortres-
s Sir T. Herbert in "Trav." ? corrupt. of obs. f. 'portice' with ending perhaps influenced by 'fortress' Furtide one use only, app. a corrupt. of obs. f. 'podride'; 'olla podride' 1599 ff.
Propositorship 1762 transl. "Busching's Syst. Geog." an in-
correct rendering of med. L. fr. Ger., Fr. Predacian 1553, 1795 only erron. fr. of 'predacous' Previation 1560 only, Irreg.
'pre' and L. 'vivere'—"the fact of living before another; senio-
rity" Profligate 1657 only, Irreg. fr. L., "to flow forth" Pro-
vasion 1655 Fuller, only, obs. erron. form of 'prevention'
Purification, 1652 and 1673 only, Irreg. fr. 'purify'; 'purifica-
tion' 1566 ff. Quiescens 1692 Holme, Irreg. fr. 'quiesc' v. and 'ous' Habitable 1716 only, M. Davies; 'habitabil' 1622 ff. Ra-
tactory 1720 only, Sterpes; Irreg.: "confirmatory" Recopper 1652 only, app. Irreg. fr. L. 'recovery' Regality 1672 "London Gazette" Irreg. fr. L. 'regale': '"regelement' (1700 ff.) homonym with 'regality'; "regal" 1672 ff. Replication 1665 only, Sir T. Her-
bart "Trav." "Two or three Trees being pierced, in an hours space [they] repliated the greediest appetite" Irreg. fr. 'replie-
t' Repulate 1657 Tomlinson only, Irreg. fr. obs. Fr. or L. Reviv-
tion 1464 Sir T. Browne, 1652 Sparks, only, Irreg. fr. L., 're-
viviscence' 1626 ff. Rubatude 1657 Toml. only Irreg. fr. L., ap.
'nigriude;' 'redness' Sculpited 1553 only, Irreg. fr. f. 'sculp-
tor;' 'sculptured' Sourvetical 1653 only, Irreg. fr. 'scurvy;
'scorbutic' 1655 ff., 'scurvical,' 'scurvied' Semenacy 1714, corrut
gundy, 1764, 1769, 1896 & co. (perhaps not so obsolete!,) perversion of 'salmagundi' (1674 ff.,) leatherdown, 1702 only, corruption of 'L'édredon'—'elderdown,' and many others. Many such malformations still are amongst us, and probably always will be. "Our Cockney has analogy to warrant him in his compounds when he talks of the endmost house in a street"—so a writer, in 1903, of anecdotes about English (footnote p. 220.)

Not always can we be sure that popular perversions are genuine. Some of those above may hardly seem so; and while princum, "nicety of dress," may indeed be colloquial in both character and actual source, we can have our doubts about boreme, burn-grace, abamnde, and wakegoose. * Slightly different, again, and sometimes showing sophistica-

of mod. L. 'samen daui' Slaven 1692 Holmes only, irreg. fr. 'slave' v.—"split" Giffiss 1664 Power only, error for 'slude'? 'mice' ? (see below) Stonern 1753, 1722, corrupt form of 'stonen' 900 ff. Subinate 1657, irreg. fr. L., "to kneet, work up" Subside 1653, Irreg. fr. L.; so subside, "to cause to sink in" 1655. Swarf-money, -penny, local, 16., 1730; perch. a corruption of 'worth-money,' -penny': 'ward-money'—a due paid in commutation of the service of Castle-guard, ward. Symphyn 1655 H. More, "The Daemon .. rather seems by temporary constitution to keep the parts together, then to join them by any permanent symphony." Ib. Irreg. ad. mod. L., isol. in rt. Thesial 1654 Wilcox only, "One hundred Thesial Verses are here rendered"—irreg. fr. 'these' Tragediae, anomalous formation. Triansation 1646 only, Browne "Not only Mankind .. may suffer this triansation; Ib. Irreg. fr. 'sexus' after 'connexion' &c., "change of sex," meaning fr. form would be difficult, also homophony with 'transation'? Treger 1642 "Rates of Merchandizes," 1721; corrupt. of 'Trezuiter,' name of place in Brittany; cf. 'Dowlas,' 'Lockran,' 'Boldavy'; linen fabric, kind of Lookram; p. Tridegenernary 1733 only, an irreg. forms, fr. L. 'tredew.' and intended to mean 'of or pert. to the number 13' Tritarchy, 1647 only, "rule or govt. by three persons:" irreg. used for 'triarchy'. Vegetats irreg. n-w. 1773 Venterious 1640, 1707, irreg. fr. 'venture' Vernaculate 1557 irreg. fr. 'vernacular;' slang. Wistless, poetic and irreg., 'wistly,' 'wistful,' -less; 1747, 1795 Southey, 19th Cary.

Portmentesu? Witxen 1654, n-w. Geayton, "Such arts those gamesters have. Their Wittals to their wittses to enslave" (with note in margin:) Irreg. fr. 'wittol.' Writitation 1773 Mark Carter "Lett. "What writing, as somebody used to say, what writitation it all is" 1797 only, irreg. "poor or insipid writing".

* Princum ? mock-latini fr. 'prink' 1690 D'Urfey .. "An awkward
tion are formations like *propensation*, 1650, for 'propension;' 1530 ff., *fulsemick*, 1694 (Congreve in his "Double-Dealer," "O filthy Mr. Sneer, he 's a nauseous figure, a most fulsemick Pop,"') for 'fulsome;' 1250 ff., *adragant*, 1725 and 1775, a popular corruption of 'tragacenthe,' 'tragacanth' (1573 ff.), *baisemain*, 1654 Flecknoe, "Travels," for 'baisemain,' foreignism, 1655 ff., *alanto*, 1696, 1721, perhaps a Scottish corruption of French 'à lointain,' cutzooks (and many such oaths; see p. 373,) *turtie* (sb.²) apparently a corruption, by English sailors, of 'tortue,' 'tortoise' (1775 ff.,) and others. The sophistication in *stellescope* and *sorangene* especially speaks for itself. The first was probably a nonce-word and intentional perversion of 'telescope,' in 1661; and the second, used in 1792, 1911, 1913 (etc.) is quasi-Latin.

Occasionally one finds, in our vocabulary, factitious forms, and these, like the rest, come and go. Ablemost, of somewhat earlier date than most of the words of this study (1614,) *hoblin*, a factitious nonce-variant of 'goblin' (1524 ff.; 'hobgoblin' 1530 ff.) 1755 T. Amory in "Memoir," "Be they . . . hoblins or goblins, fairies or genii," and perspicuus, framed by Fielding in "Amelia," 1752, are clear examples; *lentuler, quantative, and secrement* (and quite a number of others) were formed "as if" on Latin words; and *ophylization, insinant, legiformal.*

* Fear . . That my behaviour may not yoke With nice Prinoms of that Folk" Boromes, corrupted form of 'bouts-rimes,' 1637 Mrs. Behn, "Emp. Moon" "I'll make some Boremes on Love," (another use.)
* Burn-grace, corrupt. of 'bongrace' in 1654 Gayton "Fest. Notes," "Burn-graces in Summer to save Children's Faces" Shammas 1665 only, So., app. a blundering adptn. of Fr. 'chemarces,' "to ornament with lace," *Wake-goose* 1759 only, ? corrupt. of 'wayzgoose' 1731 ff.
* Lentular 1761 only, "lens-ished." Quantative for 'quantitative' (1591 ff.; op. 'quantitive' 1656 ff.) as if fr. L. 'quant-us', 1644 and 1661 Glanvll. Secrement 1664 only, 'secretion' 1646 ff.
molass, prurituation, and schistic were similarly from assumed Latin terms. Through misunderstanding and false analogy prowessed, favaginous, and opicular were coined. [Bawze (possibly onomatopoetic,) alifty, folier, golly (sb.) mekin, qually, raddled, rumbullion, aliffe (p. 222,) solutist, tramble, twaddling, urle, and wark—to name by no means all—are words of obscure or doubtful origin, or (as Carlyle might say) no-origin at all, or are doubtfully genuine (folier.) Only three, alifty, rumbullion, and wark, were used more than once.] Quite a number of words could

* Chylification 1731 only, fr. assumed Latin; 'chylification' 1651 ff. ('chlyfity' and '-ation,' and French 'chylification'). Insulant 1803, fr. assumed Latin 'insulare' and 'ant;' 'insulating' 1797 ff. Legiformal 1693 only, Urquhart "Rab." "There are Heaps of these Legiformal Papers"—fr. assumed L., "?of a legal form or character" Molasse So., assumed singular, 1773—1913; "dying out of local dialects"—Miss Miller (Appendix A.) Pruritation 1654 Z. Coke "Logick"—"A pruritation and itch after knowledge" only use; again fr. assumed Latin. Schistic 1742 Fielding in "Philos. Trans." only use, ad. assumed Greek. So also electrical as if fr. L. 'electricus'—1673 Grew, 1703 in "Phil. Trans." 1763 Shenstone, "And what electrical fire Shall solve the frosty gripes, and bid it flow?" 'electrical' 1635 ff.

II Prowessed 1717 E. Fenton "Odys." and 1726 Pope "Odys." only uses; app. through misunderstanding of the superlative prowest' in Spenser and Milton; "endowed with prowess; valiant." Favaginous 1658 Sir Thomas Browne "Garden of Cyrus," 1636 Plot "Staffordshire," 1634 "Syd. Soc." and many others. Fr. Lat. 'favus,' "honeycomb;" perh. on false analogy of 'farraginous,' or of L. 'fabaginus,' 'oleaginus.' Opicular 1761 Sterne "Tr. Sh." "Pref." "To free it from any little motes, or specks of opicular matter." Fr. L. 'opacus' on some mistaken analogy (NED.) So also grandio, grandio 1650 Trapp, "A Magnifico, a Grandio, such a one as sought to make himself great even to a proverb"—pseudo-Span. from notion that Sp. masc. abs. end in '-o.' So pedegorize 1665 Sir T. Herbert "Trav." "Abuzvez Deilameshaw, . . . the hundredth in descent from Adam as they pedegorize;" only use; app. rudely fr. 'pedegre,' 'pedigree' and '-ize.' Phonetically awkward and "no call" for such a term.

II Bawze 1677 only, "to shout." "Of doubtful origin." So: alifty 1646, 1696, "Of uncertain origin and meaning"—'olive,' 'sleave,' "fleete"? 'Lively.' Folier 1671 only, "Of doubtful genuineness; author a German" golly 1656 only, transla. Sp. 'goli; hand freq. in 17th c. dramatista. Obsc. orig. Mekin, herb used for
thus be found: *seceril*., *centry*, *Chalsee* (v.), *caterquibbles*, cognize (a non-etymological formation, 1633 only), *discumbitory* (another), *discumbiture* (another), *fire-night*, *fitcheew*, *fridge*, *frump*, *funky*, *furifuff*, and others.* Most of these, again, occur but once; but their occurrence is often interesting. *Frump*, for example, has been variously used and interpreted: "to suilk," "be in a bad temper," "snub," "mock," "vex," "jeer," "jest." "hoax." It is words like *ragnetical* in Fielding and Smollett, *simagre* in Dryden, *enattok* in Gayton, and *sprash*, *suggill*, *luskard*, and *night-book* that arrest us, and, in the thought of Dr. Johnson (p. 49), "draw that attention

* The origin of *seceril* is not quite clear; the ending of *centry* is not explained; *Chalsee* (v.) is "Presumed to be f. Chaldee or Chaldees, with the notion of 'cheat as an astrologer'; but evidence is lacking"—Butler in *Hudibras* twice, 1664 and 1680, also Dennis, 1697; *Fable* 1649 G. Daniel, fr. Ger. dial. form?; *Jargole* "to confuse." 1692 Locke in letter, no derive.; *deceptible* wholly obscure in ety., but 'deceptibility' not; *flaber* 1697 Mrs. Behn "Lucky Chance," "There's no other way of quenching the fire in her flaber chops." fr. or for 'flaberkin'? (also obs. rare—1, 1592 Nashe, "puffy"); *floating* 1743 only, "a Floating of small Goals, then Stones; "thin stratum"; *fridge* 1676, "jerk or scrape" app. onoma; *garabees* 1692 Hickeyringill (2) and 1702 C. Mather only; ? f. 'gad-bee'.

Under the others in the *NED* are given only quotations: *caterquibbles*, 1691 only, "Long Vacation," "Thou... hadst such Magnificent Puns, such Exalter Clinches, such Caterquilblies, and Conundrums." *Fire-night*: 1653 "Notus Hiberna," "Some have learned more of their Teacher." on a fire-night, than sitting at the
on themselves which they should transmit to things."

In chapter IV (p. 120 ff.) words and forms lacking euphony were particularized. Unquestionably a second factor attaches to such words growing obsolete: lack of relationship between form and meaning. This is seen, for example, in awkward forms—the vocabulary abounds in them—like *alwaysness* (1674 N. Fairfax "Bulk and Selvidge," see pp. 11 and 84 and Bib. 249,) *angryable* (1662 J. Chandler [2,1]) *appearable* (1651 only, for 'visible,') *becomeness* (1656 only, for 'becomingness' 1657 ff.), *biggerness* (1674 only,) *boatman-

---

desk all the day." *Fitches; v. obs. (1) a. 1650 May "Satir. Puppy" (1657) 95 "Yet this is she .. whom Pride did become as a full Oath doth a desperate Gallant: that fitchew'd with a degenerate posture of the Chines." *Fugger* (2) obs. (1) 1631 Mrs. Behn "Rover" II Spil. "Right Worshipful and Squires: who laugh, and cry Ads, Nigs, 'tis wondry good, When the fugers all the Jest that's understood." *Funky* s. a. 1734 Twamley "Dairying" [Faults in cheese] Sweet or Funky Cheese" Ib. 30. *Furifuff; obs. r. (1) 1699 T. Plunket "Char. Gd. Commander." "Timon Misanthropos (though shuri enough;) I think, was better then this Furifuffi";

---

* Ragmatisch a. obs. r. ? 'rag' sb. ? "wild, ill-behaved," "riotous," 1742 Fielding "Joseph Andrews" i. vii, "I think him the ragmaticslest fellow in the family." 1771 Smollett "Humphrey Clinker" 19 May 11, "I want be Rogered .. by any ragmatical fellow." *Snattock* obs., "of obscure origin"—"a scrap, fragment" 1654 Gayton "Pleasant Notes"—"From rag, Snattooks, Snapes, irreconcilable and super-annuated Smocks and Shirts". Ib. "The Letter . . crumbled into such miserable Snattooks, that the Divell could not plese it together." *Simagre, foreignism, obs. rare. ad. Fr. (of unknown origin)—"an affected air or look"—Dryden, 1676, "Kind Keeper" "By these languishing Eyes, and those Simagrea of yours, we are given to understand, Sir, you have a Mistress in this Company." Again in "Ovid's Meta." (1700.) *Sprash obs.--l. meaning obscure. 1775 S. J. Pratt, A damned Sprash, indeed, cries Nabel, wiping his face, but the man is gone the world over." *Sugill, sugill v. obs.r. ad. L., doubtful sty. "to beat black and blue, bruise"—1653 Butler "Hud." "... Though we with blacks and blues are suggill'd." *Luskard obs. rare--l. of obs. forma. f. "folard" (obs.) "A kind of grapes which uses a looseness of the bowels" 1653 Urquhart "Rabelais"—"The muscadine, the verjucie grape and the luskard for those that are costive." *Night-book 1809 "Sporting Mag." "Suffering his name to remain upon the debtor side of a night-book for years."
age, bodysome (Fairfax, above,) book-answerer, disflourish, disquiet-ful, heretobefore (1667, 'heretofore' 1550 ff.,) immethoded, library-keeper, overbound, transchangeative (irregular form, perhaps after 'talkative,') wouldiness (nonce-word.) Not more than three or four of these words were used more than once. Context, and context alone, makes most of them intelligible. Alwayness, bodysome, and wouldiness today seem especially awkward for expressing the ideas they are meant to express. This is, one might object, simply because we are used to other terms—'everlastiness' or 'empiternity,' 'corporeal' (1663 ff.,) and 'desire,' 'inclination.' But we have long been so used to these words from the Latin that alwayness and bodysome, at least, must seem to be as Glanvill thought of them (p. 94)—"far more unintelligible than the Latin which custom of

* Fairfax, thus, spoke in one place of "The alwayness of the soul," in another of "The alwayness of him who is unbounded;" and again, of "All bodysome Beings." Hammond, a. 1660, "Pract. Catech.," wrote, "And 2. Whatevery you do, you do, first against one velleity (or wouldiness) or other; and secondly, with some mixture of the contrary." It is interesting to note whence these terms emanate; may like terms could be found (stop-go-me, fall-away, outwalk, questword, questrymen, sword-wrack, thing-ship, op. p. . . .) So Barrow in a sermon, a. 1677, "Love and pity of our selves should persuade us to forbear (reviling); as disquietfull, incommodious, and mischievous to us." So disflourish where we should say 'wither,' 'wilt.' 1640 Sedgwick, "His hand may shrivell and disflourish"—"Christa Counsell." Waterhouse in his "Appl. Learn." 1653 spoke of "immethoded discourses,...slovenly sermocinations. 'Immethodic'—'-Local'—'-Locally'—'-Localness'—'immethodize' &c., are all alive.

N. Morton, 1669, in his "New England Memoirs," spoke of a "greater ship towing the lesser at her stern all the way overbound"—"bound over or across (the sea.) It is a reasonable but unique word. We have 'outward-' and 'inward-bound' today (the play "Outward-Bound," and "trans-Atlantic" (&c.) Out of context, such a word might mean two or more things. J. Chandler was apparently fond of 'transchangeative'—"The objects of taste sitting immediately in some body, cannot by reason of their corporeal thickness, from a transchangeative Image;" and "The transchangeative virtue of the Archews."

To these may be here added: dehaust (1654 only, Codrington tr. "Hist. Justine," "He being the cause of the great Dehaust of moneys
speech hath made easie and familiar... a vanity... reprehensible in a Preacher." The thing, to be sure, is gone in the word boatmanage; "Any boatman... that taketh more for Boatmanage... than is ordained" (Stow, 1720; but wore the word to come back into use, and rival 'boatmanship' (1912 ff.—not quite the same meaning as Stow's,) we might have difficulty over 'boatman,' 'age,' and 'manage.' It is interesting, in passing, to think of the difference between the suffix '-age' and the suffix '-ship.'

Finally, library-keeper must seem long and awkward in comparison with 'librarian.' Trapp, in 1647, spoke of the Jews as "God's library-keepers;" and Dr. Thomas Barlow was (Birch, 1734) "chief library-keeper of the Bodleian Library." 'Librarian' was first used early in the eighteenth century (1713 Steele.) How, except for context, should we guess the identity of Goldsmith's book-answerer (1760 "Citizen of the World,"... he may buy reputation from your book-answerers;" op. 'critic' pp. 5, 7, 97 ff., and Bib. 433; also pp. 191 and 207.)

in the Exchequer." This is from L. 'dehast-um,' pa. pple. of 'dehaurire,' and is an example, once again, edw what can come of words. 'Exhaustion' in '-tion' is a more likely noun-formation, surely (1661 ff.) Aganimaedversion (1676 Marvell: 'in-animaedversion' also obs. 1656; 'inadverence' 1563 fr., 'ooy' 1650 ff.) invalensariaeag (1762 "Lond. Mag." So others obs., e. g., 'invaludinary' 1661 "Papers" and R. L'Estrange; 'invalid' 1642 ff. [the adj.,] 1709 fr. (the sb.) liquability (1662 only, 'That softness should signify liquability, answered just to humidity signifying buoyancy," 1731 Bailey. 'Liquableness?') mopedness (1660-1669; 'mopingness,' 'melancholiness' 1523 fr., 'melancholia' 1693 fr.) movingness (1661-1669; 'moving,' 'touchiness,' &c. Miss Miller classifies these two words in 'm' under "wider associations.") pendilatory (1653 Urquhart "Rabelais"—"In his dangling and pendilatory swagging [Fr.: en pendillent]"") pendulosity dates from 1656 or before.) Sacrificalist (1652 Gaule "Magastromancer," a sacrificing priest.)

Untoward, again, are—or were—certain adjectives in '-ly:'

faintly (1712 W. Rogers "Voyage," "It being but a faintly food," "1771 J. Foot "Penelope," "Hence the spring Emits a faintly blush") where 'faint' in its various senses was already in the vocabulary (1350 ff.)

wagerly (1674, Bailey, and 1793 W. Jones "Letter," "... a plain wagerly man") where 'wager' was used attributively, and 'wagering' (1392, but a word with a different shade of meaning) and 'wagerish' (1393 ff.)

came in, hopely (1653 only, churchman) where 'hopeful' was in use (1568 ff.; 'hopefully,' adv., 1639 ff.)

idiotly (1662 only, J. Bargrafe "Pope Alex. VII," "This silly, idiotly, coxcombly, Cardinal Maldachino") where we have 'idiotic' (1713 ff.)

limberly (1782 only) where 'limber' was the accepted form (1565 ff.)

plasterly, plaisterly (1655 only, Fuller "Hist. Camb.," "Others looked for [the cause of sweating-sickness] from the earth, as arising from an exhalation in moist weather out of Gipsans or plaisterly [ed. 1340 plasterly] ground") where 'plastery' was the ordinary word (1533 ff.; or 'plaster' used attributively [1722 ff.], but no attributive sense would do here;) seedyly (1699) where we use 'seedy' (1574) and 'seed' attributively (1500 ff.)

sycophantly (1630 only) and 'sycophantic' (1676 ff.) or 'sycophantish' (1340 ff.; 'sychphantical' obs.—1566 ff.) and tatterly (1739 only, "Impudently sending them in such a tatterly rap a begging to your worship") and 'tattered' (1394, 1596 ff.; of garments, 1340 ff.) or Carlyle's 'tattery' (1843, 1867.) The suffix is singularly adverbial. And although the

Sanguificative (1662 J. Chandler.) Sanguincolency (1664 H. More.)
Seponariness (1669 only.) Scholasticistated (1772 only.) Servitudinosa (1647 only.) Solitariety (1678 Gudworth, p. 2.) Spectacle-telescope ('binocular-telescope,' 1722; change in terminology of science.) The rareness of these terms will be noted.

Similar terms are cited throughout this study. They are always in the vocabulary—always "with us."
suffix '-like' is always at hand—historically possible and common—,
it would be interesting to detail some of the above examples, faintly
or formerly for instance, and others to be had. 'Faint-like' would
hardly be poetic in the 1771 quotation, and faintly imparts what
'faint' could not impart. It is not difficult to see how these
words served a purpose, and then were used no more. There is nothing
especially awkward about most of them; but it may be questioned whether:
in each word the meaning is perceptible, the adjectival quality is felt

For various reasons certain adverbs have been lost to our vo-
cabulary. It must be allowed, again, that most of the examples are
of rarest occurrence: breachily, contemptedly, excusedly, encounter,
largely, lostly, nextly, questionatively, resultatively, solarly,
volunteerly, and probably a few others among eighteen. The idea in
the first word, breachily, is exceptional and apparently unneeded.
In capiturally we have, possibly, an example of "later isolation"
(see below, pp. ff.)—"In the form of, or as, a chapter" (italics
mine; 1702, 1711 Swift in "Letter," 1761 Sterne in "Tristram Shandy.")
Entirely, like the foreignism ene (p. 129, ) on which it is based, had
a restricted appearance in philosophical writings. Encounter as ad-
verb would always have the substantive and verb against it. Without
context, the meaning of lostly (1660) would not be clear (: "hope-
lessly;" 'hopelessly' 1616 ff.)* No suffix is wanted in nextly
(1674, 1754, and at other times; 'next' is very old, 1300 ff.)
Solorly, irregularly from Latin 'sol-us,' is given the meaning "By
itself" in Tomlinson (1657, only use; op. 'solar' today.) In one

* So also lashly, under which the NED submits only a quotation—
1694 Sir. W. Hope "Sword-man's Vade-mecum"—"That he may not by
being advised to play calmly, fall into the other extreme of
playing too carelessly, lashly, and perhaps timerously."
way or another large;most (1666 only, for 'most,' ) latewardly (1720 and 1721,) questionatively (1657 Reeve "God's Plea"—"These words are put questionatively," ) resultively (1657 only,) suppibly (1632, 1748 Richardson in "Clarissa," 1795,) volunteerly (1715) seem awkward. Adverbs commonly are derived from adjectives; hence (perhaps) the obsolescence and obsoleteness of contentedly (1653 only) and excusably (1654 only) formed upon past participles, and paragraphly (1673 [2]) upon the substantive ('contemptuously' 1591 ff. [much use,] 'excusably' 1619 ff., 'paragraphically' 1713 ff.) Complimentally is a particularly interesting example here. It appears to have been much used in the Restoration Period (1679, 1680, 1691, 1748 [Richardson, ] &c.) 'Complimental' is obsolete in two senses, but is unimpaired in its best-known sense (1745 ff.) 'Complimentary,' 'complimentaryness' and 'complimentarily' are all later—1716 ff., 1830 ff., and 1947 ff. Then there is 'complimenter'—one who pays a compliment. Is 'complimentary' phonetically more graceful than 'complimental'? One—complimentally—simply appears to have served its day, and then been superseded. The adverbial forms appear not to have been rivals, although, as the ensuing chapter will show, '-al' and '-ary' were often rivals. Other adverbs have disappeared, but more than half scarcely were even in the language.*

* Those collected for this study are: accommodately (1691 Glanvill, 1687 H. More,) adaptly (1709 Prior, only use, "For horsemanship adaptly fit;" 'adaptively' 1854 ff.,) adjointedly (1721 Strype "Ecol. Mem.," ) affectionately, argu;itively, belovedly (1667 Waterhouse "Fire Lond.," "My Worthy .. Father, who hath lived long, creditably and belovedly in it;" only use; "no call?" ) boundedly (meaning from form,) chapterly (Scottish,) deceptiously (form from a rare form,) funeraly (1659 Sir T. Browne, ".. even crows were funerally burnt," ) Greekly (1654 Vilvaín, ": the books of the old Testament Greecos be transfer'd;" 'Greeksesque' 1799, 'Greekish' 1300, 'Greekery' 1682, 'Greekize' 1796, 'Greek-liky' 1847, 'Greekishly' 1831 in "Blackwood's," ) hindlongs (1669 only,) insculpatedly (1691
As remarked a few pages back (p. 211,) usage will be the subject of a later chapter; but we may look, in passing, at a few adjectives used as adverbs, for here too form is much concerned. So damnable, "she's damnable handsome!," in Davenant and elsewhere, and divers in poetry (J. Philips and Pope, 1703, 1729) for 'diversely,' familiar (1703,) hideous (Milton and elsewhere,) lonely (1664 only) where we should have 'alone,' unsightly (1726, "No Building . . . can be placed more unsightly or inconveniently, than in a Valley," and violent (1709 Lady Montagu in a letter, 1712, 1719.)

At least a few compounds have been changed around. The image is not very satisfactory, for instance, in belly-mountèned (1656 Gatsker.) While 'mountain-bellied' is not given in the NED, this is the form one would expect. Today we commonly speak of 'gold-dust' (1703,) not of dust-gold (1665.) The two words are wholly independent, it would seem; and there is no way of particularizing the obsoletenesse of dust-gold except to say that we became familiar with the imagery and order of 'gold-dust.' It is queer, however, that Whitlock in a work "Zootomia" (1654) should have written, "She doth not set Business back by unquiet branglings, and finde faulting Quarrells." This is the only appearance of find-faulting. 'Fault-finding'—surely a more logical form—was in use since 1626; and 'fault finder' since 1561. Queer, too, Fox's translation of Wurtz (surgery, 1653:) "If a party hath received a Wound in the Eye Apple." 'Apple of the eye'

H. More, "The Son of man is a Title which Christ so insculpatedly assumes to himself," observentially (1652 Gauls "Magnetromancer," "with careful observanse, only use,) eapply (1654,) scrubby (1732,) slightily (1679, 1740,) squintly (1655, 1677,) thiknwayes (1644 Digby "Nat. Bodies"—twouses, "the air not to be divided thickwayes," "broadways and thickways," and wontly (1654 only, Wilvain, fr. 'wont' ppl. a., "according to custom.")
is centuries old—385 ff. So 'silver-plate' was before plate-silver (1610 ff. and 1756,) 'stringhalt' before haltstring (1523 ff. and 1673 only, "London Gazette," "A dark brown Mare . . . having the halt-string in both the hinder legs when she is cold," ) 'herefrom( before hence-from (1596 ff., but now rare, and 1666 only.) In place of meet-help (1641, 1696) we have 'helpmeet' (1673 ff.) and 'helpmate' (1715.) Perhaps, as Miss Miller suggests (Appendix A,) biblical association has strengthened the living form (Genesis 11, 13, 20.)

Palmacoco did not prove likely in the course of time (1631 ff.,) and our form is simply 'coco-tree' (1613 ff.) or 'coco-palm' (1955 ff.; 'coco(a) 1555 ff.) So many others, the nonce-word raise-devil where we would say 'devil-raising,' self-law, fair-like, eye-cast, over-floaty, single-fold, sheepy-solvey, &c.*

This lack of relationship mentioned a few pages back (p. 226) is still more evident in other words to be discussed in Chapter VII.

* Self-law, "a law of one's own making or to suit one's self," 1654, a. 1650. Fair-like a. obs. r.--l, fr. 'fair' and 'like,' "In good condition; well-looking," 1662 Hickeylingill, "Naboth .. was too fat and Mr-like to avoid the shambles of these bloody Butchers." Eye-cast 1672 J. Howard "Mad Couple," "There's two of them that make their love together, by languishing eyes-casts." Over-floaty 1706 only, Phillips s. v. keen "When a Ship is over-floaty, and rolls too much." Single-fold 1651 only, Biggs "The single-fold doctrine .. . 'Simple' Sheepy-solvey "A non-sense-compd. based on 'Linsey-Woolsey,' "1657 J. Watts.

So also much-making a. 1656--1929 ("Wider association"—Miss Miller,) pleni-power (1700 only, prob. rendering of a foreign expression, Lat. 'plenipotentia,') sculpto-fusile (1816, taken as comb. form of L.,) sensitivo-rational (1769 ff. only, Tucker,) ship-private (1799; our 'privateer' is sufficient [1646 ff.]) thereaway-abouts (1929, The martyrs had been buried thereaway-abouts; "thereabouts" 1600 ff.; redundant and awkward, cp. here-to before above, p. 227,) trade-language (1662 Owen, "Latin is the trade-language of religion among learned men," associations of 'trade'? 'learned' or 'universal'?), woman-actor (1739 Cibber, "Alexander Gore, the woman-actor at Blackfriars;" also meant "actress;" divided-meaning here, 'actress' 1666 ff.) Under 'able' cp. old-fashionable; under "word more suggestive of the thing" (Ch. VIII, p. 388) op. counter-crosse and dark-closets.
Confusion would probably result today if indeed the vocabulary had forms like ingorgeous and 'gorgeous,' headman and 'headman,' counsellary and 'counsellary,' and voracious, 'vorageous,' and 'voragineous.'

The truth would seem to be that most of the above forms (pp. 215 ff.) were of rarest occurrence. Some 174 corrupt, irregular, or erroneous forms were collected for this study, and of them not less than 199 are marked, in the Oxford Dictionary, "Obs. rare—1." and many of the others, perhaps 40, were likewise used only once or twice. Seldom indeed does one come across an example like disingenuous (p. 216) or complimentially (p. 231.) Nevertheless the rarer sort of word or form has been included (perhaps too abundantly,) first, because so little else offered in its place, and second, because it sometimes suggested a point, or demonstrated as only the word itself can, the versatility of English."

Probably no single cause—or fact—works more widely for the obsolescence of words than isolation. We are here still primarily

Reference may be made here to pp. 120 ff. in the previous chapter (euphony.) Examples like acidolous (1674, 1676, both Crew, "An oily liquid of acid character as vitriol,) aqua-bleous (1674 only, Crew, ) aqua-vitriola (1672 "Philos. Trans.,") arom-a-olent (1657 only, Tomlinson, ) beneplacit (1673 Gale "Grt. Gentiles" only ref., so sb., 1643 Sir T. Browne, 1656 Blount, 1658, and bene-placitum 1662 Glanvill, only ref.; 'pleased' 1392, 'satisfaction' 1316, 'contented' 1526, 'satisfaction' 1400, 'satisfactory' 1547, 'satisfy' 1430, &c.,) novantique (1638 only, Gadworth, "new-old,"
over-bias (1659 Bauden, "I find some men of worth .. over-awed by the vulgar, or over-biased by their own private interests;" 1711 Shaftesbury,) retro-infinitia (1678 only, Gadworth,) sapientipotent (1656 Blount, 1675 J. Smith,) savy-stake (1654, 1799,) abound. They are, again, mostly rare in appearance.

Interesting if personal in character are the suggestions of Trench in his "English Past and Present," ch. III. "'Rootfast' and

* Cf. pp. 119—120: "having discovered .. obsoletisms where they may be found" (&c.) and rare words suggesting points and possibilities
concerned with form. There is nothing exceptional in the idea or expression 'drive away,' but there is something exceptional about abiglate. The obsolete form is irregularly and singularly from the Latin. It is isolated. Abiglate and many hundreds of other words like abiglate do indeed in a negative way prove that connecting and related words "help."* Cognates may indeed be a kind of capital.

These isolated words and forms choically demonstrate one phase of "rareness." The rare appearance and rare use of words have several times been spoken of in this study. But if all the rare words were brought together, it would soon be seen how learned and literary they almost without exception are; how they came, often in translations, from chiefly the Latin and French; and how most were used but once, and are not likely to be used again. Occasionally there is a nonce-term or "dictionary" word. While a number of these isolated words

'rootfastness' were ill lost, being worthy to have lived;" so too Lord Booke's bookhunger, Baxter's word-warriors; maligener (familiar enough to military men--'malin gre;' soldier who shirs from evil will,) againbuying for 'redemption,' afterthink for 'repent,' &c., &c.: a long list of OE. compounds chiefly replaced by Latin words. It is interesting here to recall or compare Glanvill and Fairfax (pp. 11, 84, and 227--228, and Bib. 249,) and remarks on pp. 2 (Wardale,) 62 (Marison,) and elsewhere, and in Bib. 340, 591. For studies of compound words, see A. G. Kennedy (Bib. 19:) numbs. 3270 to 3329 inclusive (pp. 327--328.)

* See p. 13 and Appendix A, pp. 465 and 477--488. The four kinds of isolation which Teichert detects in words are, again: isolation in which no other word or words, or but very few, are "connected;" apparent isolation; later isolation; and isolation in affixes.

Miss Miller states: "Sometimes a word is a member of a family as large as many existing families, but the fact that it has be- come synonynous with a family of words which has a larger association results in the survival of the word from the larger family." She submits (besides others beginning with 'm-' below:) ON. makede replaced by 'comfort,' 'ease;' malisant--'shanderer;' mige--'loaf (of bread);' molson--'measure (of muscle);' muerel--'nose-band' or 'bridge;' others, chiefly from the French. Again, as ilustrating families pitted against one-another: malurted (OF., 'meilheur,' 'maleured,' 'maleurous') vs. 'misfortune' ('fortune,' '-ate,' 'un-fortunate,' 'ill-fortune,' 'fortunately,' 'fortune-teller,' 'hun- ter,' &c. &c.); meuvaste (OF., 'mavite') vs. 'malice;' mirability
have been mentioned (agricolists, p. 162, is a fair example, or negation or benefaction, footnotes pp. 221 and 234,) and others will be presented in later chapters, practically all of the 515 collected for this study, and separately classified, help in one way or another to show why words are rare—why they are not useful. Not less than 431 of these isolated words are marked "Obs. rare" or "Obs. rare—1" in the New English Dictionary, and dates suggest that at least a few more are also—or were—of rarest occurrence. More than 300 seem to be wholly isolated, without connecting words and often rare in appearance; some 219 belonged to "families," though often small; a very few belong to families which are now obsolete."

('mirabilist,' 'ility,' 'able,' 'iliarism,' 'mirebundous') vs. 'wonder' (&c.) For "Later Isolation," see below.

* Isolation in root, "only word ifoothtbiroot" . . . . 329
Rare, nonce, and dictionary words . . . 244
Isolation in root, "families" . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 236
Rare, nonce, and dictionary words . . . 187

As explained in a prefatory note ("Acknowledgements,") it has seemed best to include examples of minor importance in footnotes rather than in an appendix. Not all of the 515 examples of isolation are given below, but some interesting words will perhaps be found. The first list is only of "Obs. rare—1" words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsolentism</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Synonym(s) and Notes</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abigate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;drive away&quot;</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablapse (Lat.)</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>'blindness'</td>
<td>Urquhart Jml.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abression (Lat.)</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>contrast 'abression'</td>
<td>Hallywell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aditance (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;gird up one's loins&quot;</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adauge (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;augment&quot;</td>
<td>Quares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aenean (Lat.)</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>'brazen'</td>
<td>Tryon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agonous (Lat.)</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>&quot;struggling&quot;</td>
<td>Bulwer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aition (Lat.)</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>'alimentation' 1656 ff.</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allation (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;importation, introduction&quot;</td>
<td>Lovell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aliaud (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;to bepraise&quot;</td>
<td>Waterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alliate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>&quot;composed of garlic&quot;</td>
<td>Bigge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altess (Fr.)</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>'highness,' 'nobility'</td>
<td>J. B[rian]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amaricate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'embitter,' 'irritate'</td>
<td>Le Strange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amiantal (Gr.)</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>'unrefined'</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annosity (Lat.)</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'agedness' 822 (Bailey)</td>
<td>Hacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anualy (Lat.)</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>&quot;of or pert. to handle&quot;</td>
<td>Urquhart Jml.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apocha (Lat., Gr.)</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>&quot;an acquittance&quot;</td>
<td>Bit, Toml.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apparate (Fr.)</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>&quot;to make equal, match&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprique (Lat.)</td>
<td>1656, 1657</td>
<td>&quot;sunny&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A few things may be noted. Practically all of the words are learnedly from the Latin or Greek. Often, a simpler word, more or less "native," existed: effode and effossion for 'dig,' emike for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsolletism</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Synonym(s) and Notes</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attex (Lat.)</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>&quot;add, weave on&quot;</td>
<td>Keck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autum (Lat.)</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>&quot;to affirm&quot;</td>
<td>Hickering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedilt</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>'hidden'</td>
<td>Hickering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biphylous (Gr.)</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>'bifoliate' 1936 ff.</td>
<td>F. Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boethetic (Gr.)</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>&quot;helpful, creative&quot;</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bouffage (Offr.)</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>&quot;a satisfying meal&quot;</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bouleveration</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;an overturning, upsetting&quot;</td>
<td>Chamberlayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bouleverse</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>1674 &quot;upset&quot;</td>
<td>J. Keckering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brevashing (Fr.)</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>'boasting' 1552 ff.</td>
<td>P. Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullient (Lat.)</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>'swaggering' 1596 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oseheationtation (Lat.)</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>'bubbling'</td>
<td>J. Sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defol (Lat.)</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>&quot;honoring with one's co.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delabiate (Fr.)</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>&quot;dilepate&quot; 1570 ff.</td>
<td>Forsyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deration</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>(see above)</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devenenate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>&quot;to scrape away&quot;</td>
<td>Derham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diffode (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;to deprive of beauty&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effossion (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;digging out&quot;</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emike (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>&quot;to spring forth&quot;</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiment (Offr.)</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>&quot;Breaking up&quot;</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empsé</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>'deserted, uninhabited'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>episitically (Gr.)</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>'intensively'</td>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eruicate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'to weed out'</td>
<td>J. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esse (Offr.)</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>'to confound, confuse'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eventriqueness</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'corulence'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efsofiate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>&quot;dig out&quot;</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extient (Lat.)</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>'preceded by a numeral'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gamical (Gr.)</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>'martial'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illable</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>'insalible'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immation (Lat.)</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>'ingling'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impote (Lat.)</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>'to drink heavily'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incerntole (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'sieve'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incolurable (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'that cannot be tamed'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineffagnate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'unfashioned'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infoedation (Lat.)</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'defilement'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infruntite (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'tasteless'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingannation (it.)</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>'deceiving'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingravitate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'loaded'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integent (Lat.)</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'that covers'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intertrigation</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>&quot;mutual friction&quot;</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inwoning (Gr.)</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>&quot;inhabiting&quot;</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lagenerious (Lat.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'flagon-shaped'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laniarious</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'butcher-like'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lassate (Lat.)</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>'tired,' 'weary'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libence (Lat.)</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>'willingness'</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'spring forth,' noutheticai for 'warning,' repertor for 'discoverer,' restancy for 'remainder' ("the little restancy of his life," writes Waterhouse in "The Fire of London," 1667,) are but a few examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsolctism</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Synonym(s) and Notes</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>linous (Lat.)</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td><em>of the nature of flax</em></td>
<td>Evelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechaton</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>'saliary' 1566 fr.</td>
<td>M. Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modenature</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>'decoration of cornice'</td>
<td>H. More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nociferous (L. type)</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>'harmful'</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nathal (Gr.)</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>'spurious'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nugality (Lat.)</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>'frivolity'</td>
<td>Urquhart Jwl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtite (Lat.) s. v.</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'obscure' 'to daub'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiment (Lat.)</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>1656 &quot;a covering&quot;</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paleous (Lat.)</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1652 'of nature of parsnip'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pestilaceous (L.?)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>1652 'very pleasant'</td>
<td>Gadworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penitissim (L.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'comprehensive'</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pereme ne (L.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'perforate'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perileptic (Gr.)</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>'perileptic'</td>
<td>E. G. Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertund (L.)</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>'plaisted, 'woven'</td>
<td>Cudworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plestic</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>'to promise'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollicitate (L.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'to entice, induce'</td>
<td>Holme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populese (L.)</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1661 'aadvantageous' 'profitable'</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postillary (L.)</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>1660 'drawing or calling forth'</td>
<td>Evelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purititr (Fr.)</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1669, 1677 'fighting'</td>
<td>Holieyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prslation</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>1700 'that which presses'</td>
<td>Rust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prement (L.)</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>1669 'to touch upon, refer to'</td>
<td>Evelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestringes (L.)</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>1660 'advantageous' 'profitable'</td>
<td>H. D. Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profiscious (L.?)</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>1661 'drawing or calling forth'</td>
<td>Evelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prolicict (L.)</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1662 'to entice, induce'</td>
<td>H. D. Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressoid (L.)</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>1661 'drawn, 'tare'</td>
<td>Urquhart Jwl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prostasy (L.)</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1671 'rend, 'tare'</td>
<td>Rycart tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proterial (Gr.)</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>1659, 1677 'precedence,' 'pre-eminence'</td>
<td>Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pumpil (L.)</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>'early-bearing'</td>
<td>J. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psymatic (Gr.)</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>'dwarfish,' 'eminutive'</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebullieny (L.)</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>'interrogatory'</td>
<td>G. Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinct</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>(see 'bullent' above)</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>release (L.)</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>1671 'rend, 'tare'</td>
<td>Bulwer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renite (L.)</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>1699 'a backward effort'</td>
<td>Urquhart Jwl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renix(e (L. type)</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>1671 'ndward effort'</td>
<td>Goad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repertor (L.)</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>'a discoverer'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retroction</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>1671 're-erurance'</td>
<td>Lovell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revinct (L.)</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>'bound up'</td>
<td>&quot;Phil. Tr.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ridibundal (L.)</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>'inclined to laughter'</td>
<td>Bulwer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rorant (L.)</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>'falling as dead'</td>
<td>Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rudicle (L.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'spatula' (wooden spoon)</td>
<td>Ashwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scoloeolotic (Gr.)</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>'vermifuge'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scrupees (L.)</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>'rough'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seious (L.)</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>'of the nature of suet'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simity (L.)</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>'to offer resistance'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spondence (L.)</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>1679 &quot;a backward effort&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successrent (L.)</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>'a discoverer'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first two, and others to go with them, particularly illustrate ways, perhaps deservedly obsolete, of saying one thing—e.g., **effro», effro-**
oon, **exfodi», and **diffro**. In *deservation*, *relolisaesan*, *simity*,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsolescence</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Synonym(s) and Notes</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suillary (L.)</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>&quot;of swine&quot;</td>
<td>transla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talarian (L.)</td>
<td>1761, 1693</td>
<td>&quot;pert. to ankles&quot;</td>
<td>transla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vividality (L.)</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>&quot;fact of being fordable&quot;</td>
<td>Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vargeous (L.)</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>&quot;rod-like&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ph. Tr.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy or more words collected for this study are, like the above, completely or almost completely isolated; but though they have few if any connecting forms, they have been used, some of them, several times, and in years far apart. A few are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arterisc (L.)</td>
<td>1661--1699</td>
<td>(two senses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boation (L.)</td>
<td>1646--1713</td>
<td>'bellowing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cespitation (L.)</td>
<td>1653--1669</td>
<td>'stumbling'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deburpate (L.)</td>
<td>1623--1833</td>
<td>'defile' &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executed (L.)</td>
<td>1632--1894</td>
<td>'sharpen'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exdo (L.)</td>
<td>1669--1754</td>
<td>(isola. in affix?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fractid (L.)</td>
<td>1665--1866</td>
<td>'over-ripe' 1671 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fristion (L.)</td>
<td>1656--1743</td>
<td>'crumbling' 1655 ff. (O.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulciment (L.)</td>
<td>1648--1759</td>
<td>'support' (arithmetical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconcinnamon (L.)</td>
<td>1662; 1677 ff.</td>
<td>(music:) 'inharmony'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lepidity (L.)</td>
<td>1647--1694</td>
<td>'fasciousness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manation</td>
<td>1656--1714</td>
<td>'flowering out'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manation</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>'malting' 1400 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mastigadour</td>
<td>1729--1727</td>
<td>'slabbabag-bit' 1753 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medleance</td>
<td>1656--1664</td>
<td>'evil speaking'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mication</td>
<td>1645--1725</td>
<td>(two senses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microscychy</td>
<td>1651--1674</td>
<td>'purification' 1390 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mochlic</td>
<td>1657--1753</td>
<td>'purge' 1563 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penintime (L.)</td>
<td>1626--1712</td>
<td>&quot;innermost but one&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipegaceous</td>
<td>1674--1693</td>
<td>&quot;pepey&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proxenele</td>
<td>1659--1718</td>
<td>&quot;agent&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarcastic (L.)</td>
<td>1656--1694</td>
<td>(e. and ab.) 'inscrivat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedasiam (Gr.)</td>
<td>1656--1797</td>
<td>'jotting'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sepissiary (L.)</td>
<td>1650--1658</td>
<td>'perfumer'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unquestionably isolation is not the only element at work among these words; moreover, if the words are closely studied, it will probably be discovered that "isolation" but poorly explains the obsolescence of some. It is for this reason that the present writer does not make extensive use of Telcher's classification.

Just what is sometimes meant by "isolation in affix" is something, and the discussion of affixes has mostly been left to Ch. VI.
versipellus, and a few others, complex ideas reside. No one, of course, is willing to carry around in his mind a single word to express "a marking or groove, such as is produced by a string tied around [something]"—even if he is the kind of person who has to have a string tied around his finger to cause him to remember a thing. Occasionally, the isolated word or form is used humorously—incession, indect. It would be futile to try to amassed isolated forms and terms emanating from the pulpit—deposition, immolation, repARATION, thyals-stery, &c. Not only isolated in appearance, but also foreign, is esseme in a title of 1660, "Mahometane Juglinga, to assume their Spectators in this lower world;" but perhaps it made its mark. Occasionally an unusual word or form is felt to be necessary in a translation, and ineffigilate, lassate (Motteux in his "Rabelais," "You...thence your Lassate Corps realimeate," Linous (1715 translation of "Fancirolius' Rerum Mem.," "Pliny mentions another Sort of Linous Substances (orig. alerius quaque lini ausuam, l) saxous ("other saxous and dry places (orig. allique saxous & aridie loxue")—Tomlinson, 1657; 'rocky,') statitic, auxillary, and talarian (1671 H. M. tr. "Erasmus Colloquies," Prelates did ordain that Clergy men should wear Talarian coats, that is, coats hanging down to their ankles; also 1693 Urquhart "Rabelais") are but a few examples. In notiometer and tuett, things have possibly disappeared; in tache, a process (pp. 376-ff.) In ampe the meaning is somewhat indefinite; and in exercice, and others it is specialized beyond recognition. Sometimes an author surrounds his word with helpful context—devenanestate ("To see what yet remains of beauty and order devenanestate, and exposed to shame and dishonour," Waterhouse, 1653.) Caprich illustrates how one form can become isolated and lost because of a later-comer. Caprich was in Blount (1656,) and Butler in "Hudi-
bras" (1664, "like witches . . forthwith cur'd of their Caprices,"
) and others used it; but French 'caprice' replaced it (1667 ff.)
Insensation, bravishing, secaturated, squassation, and insansion like-
wise afford interesting contrasts, and, in a different sort of way,
biphyllous (1756 only, 'bifoliate' 1836—more familiar connecting
forms?) So also boulevseration (1667) and bouleverse (1673, 1674,)
and bouffage, ossats, cohonestation, &c., for which no real need,
with more familiar words at hand, existed. Analogy is apparent
in anagrpis (1669, analogy of 'synopsis;' 'anagrammatism' 1605 ff.,)
anatrical (op. 'identical,' 'enmeatical,' &c.; imitative 't,') erummy
(supposed analogy of 'calumny,') surgation (after 'purgation'?,
tesserae (after 'mosaic;' 1711, 1773,) tradit (1657; op. 'credit,')
volvulous ('pendulous,') and a number of others. The use, by
Evelyn, of ingeniary and nociferous is interesting as showing how
words travel in pairs, how one word possibly suggests another.
"Architects (I mean the Manuary as well as the Ingeniary) have been
. . . rewarded with Knighthood" ("Freart's Architecture," 1664;)
"Not that there are no nociferous tress as well as Saniferous" ("Sylva,
1702.) Dinetic (though marked "Obs. rare" in the OED) enjoyed
a little vogue in books by Glanvill, Browne, and Ray (1663, 1641, 1691.)
Oversupply from the Latin is particularly apparent in depriment
(1713, 1721, also 1624 [ab.,] and 'depressing' 1739 ff.,) disnote
(1657, dignose 1639—1671, 1641—1676; 'discern' 1430 ff., 'dis-
tinguish' 1561 ff.,) dissep (1657, 'dissspire,' 'separate,') and
edule (1699, edulious 1682 [2] besides 'dible' 1611 ff.,) Indivul-
sively (1673 only) and inseparably (1890 ff.) show the effect of
long establishment.

Quite a number of terms, though in fact wholly isolated, cannot
be said to be isolated because of their roots. There is some-
thing recognizable in assate, degubation, desoratory, duddie ['bud,' ]
emportment, exorininate, indoct, obstipate, obduce, delirible, sub-
sect. So a peculiarly compounded forms: pestifugous, vicestoxic, 
verlcoerdious, verlloous: And repation and succeditor may be add-
ed.

If we seek further, we find many words like adjutorious, am-
hagitory, lactase, socalical.* Each of these words represents a

*This third list is of "Obs. rare—l" words which, like adjutorious 
above, have become obsolete along with whole families of words. 
Only a number of the choicer examples are offered. —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amoletismesa Dates</th>
<th>Synonym and Notes</th>
<th>Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoxal ... 1652</td>
<td>'absurd' 1557 ff.</td>
<td>Fuller, &amp;c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afflating ... 1671</td>
<td>'inspired' 1586 ff.</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albic ... 1657</td>
<td>'whitish'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albification,</td>
<td>to be subservient</td>
<td>D'Esses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alligated ...</td>
<td>'bound,' 'united'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alligate, app. &amp; v.</td>
<td>alligated, alligation (r.) alligator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancillie 1365</td>
<td>'ancillary' and fngsm. ancillia 1599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anhelant 1674</td>
<td>'breathing,' 'inhaling'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anhele v., anheled</td>
<td>'toothless'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anhelose 1632</td>
<td>obs. 1731, 1803; anhelation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arilote v. 1652</td>
<td>'divine,' 'fortell'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ariolater (x) 1652</td>
<td>'soothsayer' &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ariolation 1646</td>
<td>'soothsaying' &amp;c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ariole 1399 ff.</td>
<td>(obs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ariolist 1652</td>
<td>Gauls, &amp;c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assete 1657</td>
<td>'roast'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assetion</td>
<td>'pleased' 1312 ff., satisfied 1516 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asseture</td>
<td>obs. 1552, 1562, 1566, 1568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assecuuration ...</td>
<td>'satisfaction' 1586 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stramentaceous ...</td>
<td>'inky'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--terious 1717</td>
<td>(but two 16th forms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---tery 1613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---titious 1650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beation 1652</td>
<td>'blessing'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beatizing 1652</td>
<td>'satisfied' 1332 ff., 'satisfied' 1616 ff.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'beatitude' of course not obs.: Caxton, Bradford, Prynne, Mil-
| ton, Coleridge; Catechism and Bible tradition to keep it alive? |
| benefacit 1674 &c. | 'touched' 1322 ff., 'satisfied' 1516 ff. |
| boselive (Fr.) 1652| 'crooked' 1322 ff. |
| bosament 1541 only | (f.-likeness w. 'boss' Du. wd.) |

---
family of words which has become obsolete. Thus there were the forms
adjutate, the verb (1524, 1633), adjutator (1531—1642), adjutary (adj. and
sb., 1612 ff. and 1505 ff.), adjunctice (1609), adjunctix (dictionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observatious</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Synonyms and Notes</th>
<th>Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>debellate</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>&quot;overthrowing by war&quot;</td>
<td>Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debellate</td>
<td>1611, '26</td>
<td>(many synonyms—&quot;warlike,&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debel v.</td>
<td>1555—1925</td>
<td>'conquering,' 'subjugating,'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debellation</td>
<td>1526—1930</td>
<td>'vanquishing' &amp;c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debellator</td>
<td>1713 only</td>
<td>'subduer,' 'vanquisher'</td>
<td>Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debellish</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulcorous</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>'sweet'</td>
<td>Evelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulse, dulsen</td>
<td>1606 only</td>
<td>(1606 only), dulcous (1608 only), dulcassate (1675 only,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duloid</td>
<td>1657—1698</td>
<td>dulcologny (1623, 1646 rare),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulcitonant</td>
<td>(dict.)</td>
<td>dulcity (1623—1657), dulcoacid (1657 [2,])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulcorate</td>
<td>(1501 only,); and two lvg. forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effestar</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>'fierce' &amp;c.</td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eff. v.</td>
<td>1652, 1653</td>
<td>efferation 1694 tr. Bonet; effere v. obs. R., sb. Sc. obs.; efferase obs. in sense of &quot;general heat&quot;; ef-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effereuse obs. r.</td>
<td>1614 and 1657</td>
<td>tomlinson; effervency 1670—1691.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effusive</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'overflowing'</td>
<td>Loveday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effusive</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effusenous</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effrenate</td>
<td>1651, 1657</td>
<td>(except 'esapse' 1644 ff., a whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elapsive</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>family of words is here obs.; again, affix?)</td>
<td>Sparks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embolismm</td>
<td>1677, 1726</td>
<td>1796 'intercalary.' 1614 ff.</td>
<td>Cary, tr., Hutton, Whiston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---ary</td>
<td>1696 only</td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;c., Hearne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---man</td>
<td>1704 only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emicant</td>
<td>1712 only</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emicite</td>
<td>1657, 1709</td>
<td>(dictionaries)</td>
<td>Toml., Motteux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td></td>
<td>Broene, Ash &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engastrilous</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engastrimyth</td>
<td>1593—1709</td>
<td>'ventrilogist' 1566 ff.</td>
<td>Motteux, others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engastric</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>(rather grotesque conception in these words?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esure</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'eating'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esurance, esuriate,</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'eating'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esurience, -oy, -ou</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>(Motteux' translation of Rabelais, under asurial, interesting.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esurality</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>'heathendom'</td>
<td>Nugent tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic &amp;c.</td>
<td>1613 &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnolizhe</td>
<td>1653 only</td>
<td>(&quot;Whereas both Taditya and Josephus relate these sudden opening of the doors of the Temple, etc....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they appear to me very much to ethnolize in all these stories&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      |         | ---J. Spencer, "Prodigies."
grassate               | 1652    | 'of a disease; to rage'                                 | Saulo              |
| grassant, grassation, |         |                                                          |                    |
| grasator: all obs.    |         |                                                          |                    |
| incendiate            | 1653, 1701| 'burn!'                                                  | Sedley             |
| incendiation, incendator, incend, | 1653, 1658, -ly, 1657, 1658, -ly, incendence —all obs. and often rare; but we still need the word 'incen- |                    |
|                      |         | diary' (1611 ff.)                                      |                    |
| mesocroyant           | 1711 only| 'misbeliever' 1470 ff.                                  |                    |
| mesocroyant           |         | "Few words of the same root"—Miss Miller (App. A.)     |                    |
only,) adjiuavé (1599,) adjuvate (1599--1709;) yet the well-known word 'adjiutancy' is still with us, together with three others. The point it is desirable to make is that against adjiuturious (öc.) stood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsoletisms</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Synonyms and Notes</th>
<th>Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>message</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>'economy' 1651 ff., 'management' 1598 ff.</td>
<td>Miss Miller (App. A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messanger</td>
<td>1667-1739; obs. and rare.</td>
<td>'cottage,' 'husbandman,' etc.,</td>
<td>Miss Miller (App. A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rotation</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>'rrequent movement'</td>
<td>Miss Miller, True?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munification</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>'defence' 1297 ff., 'protection' 1375 ff.</td>
<td>(as above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neslrose</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>'able to swim'</td>
<td>Bailey (Interesting to contrast this small family with 'swim' etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naufragate</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>'wreck'</td>
<td>Glanche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naufrageous</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>'danger of shipwreck'</td>
<td>Motteaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naufrage</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>'shipwrecked person'</td>
<td>Rycnon tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nolese, -ency</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>'unwillingness'</td>
<td>Gale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solition</td>
<td>1653, 1673</td>
<td>'braven'</td>
<td>Waterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfrixt &amp;.</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>'perforate,' 'penetrate'</td>
<td>Többinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perflete</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'of nature of reward'</td>
<td>Corbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenial &amp;.</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>'to hasten unduly'</td>
<td>Ward, Rocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preproperate</td>
<td>1647, 1651</td>
<td>'taking the side of a king'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regius</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regнстin</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reglan &amp;c.</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>'regression,' 'return'</td>
<td>Herrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regredience</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>'repercussive' 1400 ff., 'recover' 1377 ff.</td>
<td>Cotton tr., Bonet tr., Bp. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remigable</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repercuent</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revict</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revision</td>
<td>1677, 1679</td>
<td>'sleeping,' 'springing'</td>
<td>Gayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saltitante</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>'a female dancer' (fr. Ital.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saltatrese</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few words of this root</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esapony &amp;.</td>
<td>1661, 1699</td>
<td>'soapy'</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seruous</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>'saw-like' (few wds.)</td>
<td>Hobbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sextiplicate</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>'sixfold'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--cation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--triplex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--tuply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asposed</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>'dry'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alacious, aligeate, aligation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alapize</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>'to sprinkle after the manner of</td>
<td>Urq. Rab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alapize</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>mustard powder;' few words of this root, several obs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alapize</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>'to sprinkle after the manner of</td>
<td>Urq. Rab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alapize</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>mustard powder;' few words of this root, several obs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alapize</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>'to sprinkle after the manner of</td>
<td>Urq. Rab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alapize</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>mustard powder;' few words of this root, several obs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sollevate</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>'to raise in tumult'</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sollevation</td>
<td>1641, 1697</td>
<td>'insurrection'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somandric</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>'relating to human body'</td>
<td>Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aomastism</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>'materialism'</td>
<td>De Foe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somatist</td>
<td>1670, 1694</td>
<td>'materialist'</td>
<td>Clanvill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later specialization of this word in physics.
a powerful rival—'helpful' (1340 ff.) 'Help' is even earlier—
397; and likewise 'helping' 1205 and 'helpfulness' 1643 ff. (&c.)
The family which *ambigitory* represents is likewise largely obsolete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obsoleteis</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Synonyms and Notes</th>
<th>Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stibial</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>'antimonial'</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stibism, stibiarian, stibiate, &amp;c., mostly rare or obs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stiliicidious</td>
<td>1646, 1656</td>
<td>'produced by falling in drops'</td>
<td>Browne, Blount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three words obs. here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superblate</td>
<td>1622, 1745</td>
<td>'luxuriant growth'</td>
<td>Grew, N. Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superblance</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>'thanatolact'</td>
<td>Blount, Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superblisht</td>
<td>1641, 1651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superbical</td>
<td>1656, 1658</td>
<td>'attract'</td>
<td>Waterhouse, Bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicerate</td>
<td>1692, 1750</td>
<td>'widowed'</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viceration</td>
<td>1657, 1656</td>
<td>'widowhood'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vildiscency</td>
<td>1653, 1670</td>
<td>'disparagement' 'contempt'</td>
<td>Waterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vildiscence</td>
<td>1646, 1656</td>
<td>'villainy'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vitriiscious</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>'glassy'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others of this root obs.

Others, showing more use, are:

- *scutating* &c. 1753 ff. 'sharpening'
- *sliciency* 1666, 1665, 1755 &c.
- *sliciace, sliciency, sliciant, slicict* (mostly rare):
  vs. 'enticce' 'attract'
- *arenous* 1664, 1759 'sandy' 'gritty'
- *arenacea* 1731, 1749
- *arenaceous, arenery, aremate, arenose, arenosity, arenous, arenulous*:
  many obs. forms.
- *australize, australian, australine* &c.
- *conspisgate* 1647 &c. &c. 'thicken'
- *deferate* &c. 1669 &c. 'defile' 1530 ff.
- *Simpson, 'Bonet,' Bentley, Greisinger, D'Israel, &c.
- *enodate* &c. 1656 &c. 'tree from knots'
- *enode, enodate v. and a., enodous, &c.
- *equiurrate* &c. 1654 &c. 'equivalent'
- *esurine* 1651--1687

*Words from this root chiefly obs.; but 'esurine,' 'esuriency'*
- *exolent* &c. 1669--1741 'active' 'repturous'
- *exorrect* &c. 1649--1697
- *extubrert* 1703 &c. 'swelling'
  Seven obs. and one lv.:
  - *extuberance, exuberancy, extuberat, exuberation, extuberal, exuberous, exuberatness, &c.*
  - *extuberent* now rare.
- *exas &c.* 1657--1723 'burn'
- *fasciment* 1657, 1681 &c. 'stuffing'
- *faetucity* 1656 &c. 'hautness' 'ostentation'
- *maggoty* &c. 1723 &c. 'folly' 1225 ff. 'absurdity' 1523 ff.
  "Isola. in stem, maggot in sense of 'fancifulness' obs."—Miss Miller (App. A.) Also homophony with 'maggot' the worm."
For while "ambiguous" (1656 ff.), "ambiguously," and "ambiguousness" are still in the vocabulary, ambiguous (1652 only), ambigious (dictionary only), adjectivity (by form association with 'dilatory,' 'transitory,' and used twice or more by Scott, 1714, 1826) are obsolete; and the whole family here has that of 'circuits' and that of (winding' (&c.) against it. Laetecce, laetecesse, lestivative, leatification, and leatiform are all not only obsolete, but of rarest occurrence; 'milky' (&c.) were there long before—1324 ff.

And like laetecce and 'milky' are most of these isolated forms.

One may indeed question whether the types called "apparent" and 'later' isolation explain with greater sureness still the obsolescence of these lonesome words and forms of words. The student of phonology naturally takes delight in ferreting out forms like

---

* "... In the second place there is apparent isolation. Because of a change of vowel, a word may not be recognized in its family." (Miss Miller, App. A, p. 465; much later on in her thesis she gives examples: ) "This [apparent isolation] ... is due to some change in the word which causes it not to be recognized in the family to which it belongs." The six examples given are: melillor ('cursing'; ad. from Lat. 'meileist;' made to represent Irish 'máilicst,' and so suffering from apparent isolation; ) mengubalist ('one versed in the Jewish tradition,' 'melquabal;' &c., not recognizable in the same family as 'cabbala,' 'caballio,' 'caballism,' 'caballist;' 'caballistio[el],;' &c.,) milice ('militia;' ad. from a French adaptation of Latin: 'militia' is a direct Latin adoption, and has closer kinship with 'militant,' 'military,' and the like;) Mormorism; morsuce (do not show true relation to 'moricide,' 'mordicant;' mormorism is badly formed on 'morsuce;' perfect of 'morders;' "to bite," after 'morsute;' both lack 'd,' and seem thus to be strangers to their own family.

The above statement from Miss Miller continues: "... or by certain words becoming obsolete in some particular meaning, thus causing compounds formed on these meanings to become obsolete." She submits: magnility, "great or wonderful thing," obsolete because of 'magnila' being obsolete in the sense of 'great or wonderful works, wonders;' meliorate, drink of honey and water—mellitism, honey and wine—melliturgy, action of making honey; all obsolete because of the loss to our vocabulary of "honey" as a sense (or meaning) of 'mell;' meckledom, "size, magnitude," &c., is obsolete because of the loss of mickle; mischievance; misalleping; misgovernail; misleve: the isolation here is always in the
appear to be especially of interest. Lovell apparently was the only writer ever to use it: "Others are lingible, as lohocks, syrups, and sublinguale troches" ("Hist. Anim. & Min.," 1661.) It is a kind of lonely descendant from Latin 'lingere,' and as such would not be, in the layman's eye, related in a network of forms (see NED under 'lick,' verb) to 'lick.' OE. 'lician' and Lat. 'lingere' at once suggest Grimm's Law. We have no Mss. 'lickable;' indeed, the nearest we can come to such an idea is via 'lickerishness'—perhaps. Of course any one is free to coin 'lickable' to suit a purpose. Al- coronal illustrates rather the effect of spelling and affixes (see the next chapter, '-al,' '-ic,' '-ish;') draconist is interesting

stem. Examples which illustrate complete obsolescence growing out of partial are: melalent, 'ill-will,' 'malevolence,' from the obsolescence of 'talent' in the sense of "disposition," "temper." Manurate, "occupation or cultivation of land," from the obsolescence of 'manuer' in the sense of "to cultivate:" so also manuere. Many-what, muchwhat—what in the sense of "things" obsolete. Meatboard, meatgiver, meeting, meeteill, metaseel: all obsolete because of 'meet' being obsolete in the general sense of "food" (wider association an ultimate cause here?) Missew—'saw' obsolete in sense of "saying, discourse." Misloving, "dispraise, depreciation" from 'loving' being obsolete in the sense of 'praise, laudation." Mismeaning, "wrong inten-
tion:" 'meaning' obs. in sense of "intention." These are interesting examples, but "apparent isolation" is too comprehensive an explanation to be entirely valuable. Classi-
fications and headings are useful, but are apt to entrap one. Every word, finally, must be taken by itself. If this is always done, it will be seen that often there are "reasons within reasons" reasons behind others. Thus Miss Miller elsewhere suggests that meil, "honey," 1575 to 1664, became obsolete because it was "ins-
significant in sound." This is farfar as her explanation goes.
The 'meil-' words are numerous, often obsolete (mellenn, melled, melleous; &c., &c.), occasional "dial." or "o.,, and do not constitute a family of words that bears much comparison with the family of 'honey-' words (almost 11 columns, and amazing!) The possible homophony with 'meil,' 'hammer,' and 'meil,' "last sheaf of corn cut by harvester," is not mentioned by Miss Miller—although as remarked in Ch. IV, pp. 146 ff. and 156, the "danger" here is
for its association with Draco of Athens, as well as its etymological associations with 'dragon' and 'drake.' Mecubalist is offered by Miss Miller (Appendix A and footnote, p. 246;) remordancy may be compared with examples submitted on pp. 183 ff.; and nutritor and nutrication, by no means wholly unrecognizable, are interesting for their relationship to other forms from Latin 'natrix,' 'nutrire,' and for their dates (1623, 1646, 1657, 1677; 'nourisher' 1413 ff., 'nourishment' 1413 ff.)

So undercraft, in which the obsolescence lies chiefly in 'craft,' sanitude ("healthy condition,") familiar, familiar(a,) &c. Where we have 'domestic,' 'family' (1602 against 1643, 1660, 1676,) preponderer, angersome (1650, 1656; 'anger:' "pain" 1250—1475,) appoise ("to weigh or estimate by comparison," 1670 only,) circumact ("to drive round or about, 1667 only, but circumaction also used Here and elsewhere; 'action' in a similar sense obsolete: 1475—1749,) de-err ("to go astray," 1657 only; specialization of 'err,') and many others: examples of "later isolation." But "later" does not ex-

more apparent than real. These are matters that must always be considered. Finally, a careful comparison of dates shows not only how much earlier 'honey' &c. was (325 ff.,) but how much more used 'honey' and its compound forms were, in all periods and places. And priority and usage are most important of all if one is seeking for real reasons—not scholarly. So with magnallity, 1646—1682, and magnalia, foreignism, 1645—1691: more Latinism than we needed. 'Wonders' is as old as "Beowulf," and a powerful rival. Miss Miller does not discuss mickle, which with its compounds "went out" in the Middle English period, yet is by no means unrecognizable today. Dates, wideness of association, form-likeness, primary senses, figurative meanings: all and more perpetually lie behind words, isolated or not.

* Unquestionably some of the following are doubtful examples: de-pester v. a. OFr. "To disentangle or rid oneself (from.)" 1695 Cotton tr. "Montaigne." "One vice . . . so deeply rooted in us, that I dare not determine whether any one ever clearly depestered himself from it or now." 'Pester' in senses of "clog, entangle, embarrass" &c., of "overt owd" and "huddle," obs.; aphetic for
plain why, nor does it tell how: it merely comprehensively suggests when. An inquiry into the why is ever apt to lead from form to meaning. Thus an interesting but puzzling compound, book-pad, verb, "to plagiarize," and formed after 'foot-pad.' "He book-padded the ancient pæegyricks of the noblest thoughts that suited with his subject." So F. Spence in 1695, "House Medici." And book-padding occurs in 1723. Perhaps, says the NED, there was a confusion with other senses of 'padding.' 'Pad' in one of its verbal senses early meant "going along a path;" but it came, no doubt through ever-new associations—the common behavior of people who 'padded'—, to mean "rob on the highway, be a footpad." The quotations in the NED are interesting as showing this development, this specialization, in meaning: "'pad the road' in search for work," "footsteps heard padding," &c.—padding and padders or paddists. But 'pad' in its other verbal sense doubtlessly is present here, as the Oxford Dictionary suggests—"to stuff or fill out (a book.)." 'Pad' is recent in the exact sense of "fill out . . . a sentence, story, by means of unnecessary words or matter" (1831 Macaulay fr.) Surrounded by all

'empester,' and influenced in its latter senses by 'pest' ("plague.") Discost v., "withdraw from coast or side" (1599), "withdraw" (fig. sense, 1677 Barrow in "Sermon." "Do we not sometimes grievously re-proach them . . . for discosting from our practice: " so also ppl. (1610—1677 [Barrow again.]) The obsolete is in the simple v. Disobeservative a. obs. r. 1672 W. de Britaine, "A great part of the people became diseservative to the Laws." The sense here is "dis-obedient," not as in 'unobeservative' (1661; i.e., no isolation in prefix 'dis-' [see next chapter.]) 'Obeservative' in sense of "o-bedient" (sense 2 nearest possible case: obs. 1604—1743. Enervous a. obs. r. "bereft of nerve or strenght," used several times by North; 1677, 1734; 'nervous:' "strength" now rare 1415—1442. Erroneous 1731 Arbuthnot, "An erroneous Circulation (that is, when the Blood strays into the Vessels destin'd to carry Serum or Lymph.) See de-err p. 248. Exauscate v. obs. r. 1657 only Reeve "God's Ples;", "Your distemper, your exauscating [not obs.], and your exauscating yourselves." "To suck dry." OE, gives 'suck,' corresponding to Lat. 'sugere.' Sucate (sb.) obs. and likewise succation (obs. rare—l 1697 "Ph. Tr.") Exauctor-
these associations, the word is still attractive. But the associations
have either changed or completely disappeared; we are no longer
familiar with the imagery involved; and another word, much used and carrying
forceful associations, has come into our midst — 'plagiarize' (1716 ff.;
'plagiarism' 1621 ff., 'plagiar' 1646 ff., 'plagiarist' 1674 ff.)

It would be hard, without context, to know what one meant by
bosom-mischief. 'Bosom' is magnificently ramified with meanings
and associations: not less than 26 usual, figurative, transferred,
and exceptional. The NED is itself sceptical here. One might
divine Warburton's meaning for 'journalary' (1740; also 1762)—'of or
belonging to each day;' but puttish, again, 'of the character of
a bumpkin or sot' (1738 "Gentleman's Magazine;" put 1699 ff.) offers
difficulty.

Occasionally, one looks in vain for the "main" word. So with
dismystery, 1649, "No man ... hath published any thing ... to dis-

ate pa. pple. and pple. s.; auctor obs. in favor of 'author:'
1630—1911 (Scott.) V.: 1629 (Cockeram)—Bailey (dictionaries.)
Exauctorion 1625—1934 (Goleridge.) Exhient 1658 only,
'one who administers (a rite.)' Based on early use of v. 1:
ob. 1490—1657. Factoresse, "female agent" 1651, 1663; so also factrix.
Flot (1677 tr.,) flutly (same,) facter (1665 Sir T. Herbert, 1677 Gale:) 'feigner' (&c.) Flagrable, "tending to blaze," 1669, flagrant. Incultured 1660 only; ill-educated, 'nurture' usually connected with food, &c. But G. P. Krapp in
his "Knowledge of English" speaks of "Nature and Nurture."
Reinfund 1704 only Swift. "To pour in again." Refund, 'to
pour back or in or out again,' now rare or obs. 1596—1913.
Unfurniture 1640 (2,) 'furniture' in this sense of "intellectual
equipment" obs. exc. arch. 1569—1946. Case of specialization
in another direction? Match-wright 1674 N. Fairfax, "maker of
watches."

To these may be added: amid 1657 only; v., ab. and ppl.
antegredent 1696 only, antegression, dictionary only. aperitic
1656, 1656, and aperitical 1687 only. asisident 1656 only,
assident 1753. depastion 1659 only, 'consumption;' depastor
n.w. 1593. disceptatious (fr. form now arch.) 1692 only; Dis-
putations' 1660 ff., 'controversial' 1583 ff. Also disceptator
&c. Diesnorm, fr. norm (obs. 1662, 1612) 1644 only. dingitating
experience, extange, extremite, hession &c.,) mackerel 1692
only ('broker' 1550 ff.,) prepoll, splendidus, unsauteulous; &c., &c.
mystery the same." Gladment, 'garment,' 1647 only, is another such term. And occasionally, it may seem that the isolation lies not in the stem of the word but in an affix: excriminate, obstipate, oppressable, expostion, or durous ('dure,') dazzle, maisterel ('master' with diminutive ending and specialized sense,) grizzlish. But as remarked in a footnote (p. 239,) the discussion of affixes, their characteristics, rivalry, and commonness or raresness, has been left to the next chapter.

Not greatly different is the isolation of obsolete foreignisms. This kind of word has already been spoken of (Ch. IV, pp. 134—139 inclusive.) Form is especially telling here. It is not always possible to say just why. Not a few foreignisms, often picturesque, have been found indispensable to English. Nevertheless, there have been times when the vocabulary was noticeably overloaded with terms especially from the Latin, but also the French." It was all, as Urquhart says in "Jewel," a kind of explosion. Most of the words here are, again, learned; three-fourths or more are of rarest occurrence; and obviously no real need existed for any. All might, therefore, be dismissed with a gesture. Yet it is interesting to look at a few examples and dates, and to take note that often the rival synonym is of Old English or Scandinavian (&) origin.

* See p. 646 (Bib. 390, footnote: "Of a thousand English words borrowed from the French," &c.) Also Bib. 246 and 592 (Dryden;) and Ch. III pp. 57, 63 (Dryden's "Marriage a la Mode,") 72, &c.

[[NED s. v. albedinety. While the Latinism of (especially) Milton as exhibited in divine (7. in NED,) divulge (3. transf.,) instrument, &c., and of others in labor (7., Dryden—"the various Labours of the Moon [L. defectus solis varios, luneque labores,]"") spaciousness (4., Fuller,) &c., is not dealt with here, these examples are apropos.}}
For abstraction, thus, we had a sufficient expression in
'loosening' or 'unbinding' (1382 ff.; obsolete term 1650 only;)
for approquage (1663 only,) 'approach' (v. 1374 ff.;) for debite
(1679 only,) 'debt' (1300 ff.;) for degussant (1635 only,) 'de-
gussating' (1339 ff.,) 'intersecting' (1656 ff.,) or 'crossing'
(1591 ff.;) for demess (1657 only,) 'mow down' (900 ff.,) 'cut'
(1300 ff.;) for dement (1651 only,) 'teething' (1832 ff., but 'teethe'
much older—1410 ff.;) for discumb (1693 only, J. Evans: "At the
beginning of the Paschal Feast the Jews did not put themselves into
this Discuming or Leaning posture;" also 1694; op. resumb, discu-
bitory,) 'recline' (1420 ff.;) for felection (1646 Browne speaking
of the locust, later dictionaries,) 'hook' (900 ff.;) for fiation
(1703 only,) 'blowing' (1175 ff.; op. flat v. 3 1675 only, 'blow'
1000 ff.;) for fiation (1716 only, M. Davies, "The different degrees
of Penitential Fiation, Audition, Subtration, and Consistence,"
)'weeping' (1200 ff.;) for frizory (1657, )'frying pan' (1392 ff.;)
for frustraneous (1643—1790, Milton, Gauden, Harvey, Ken, &c.,)
'vain' (1300 ff.,) 'useless' (1593 ff.,) 'ineffectual' (1425 ff.;)
for incolist and incolary (two "tries," 1657 Tomlinson and 1652
Urquhart; op. incoler, incolant, incolent,) 'inhabitant' (1462 ff.;)
for infide and infidous (1663 and 1656, 1657,) 'faithless' (1300 ff.,
'dishonest' (1611 ff.,) 'trescherous' (1330 ff.)—and so on, through
the alphabet." Occasionally a word appears to have been a favorite

* Inspeculate (1659 only, inspeculation 1650--1660,) 'behold' (v.
971 ff.,) introsum (1657) and 'consume'; intaecular (1721, 1811,)
'breakfast' (allusive, 1842 ff.; but 'breakfast' [ab.] 1463 ff.;)
luotation (1651, 1660 tr., 1698,) 'struggling' (1380 ff.;) luco-
tiferous (1656 Blount, 1924 Miss Ferrier "Inher.," "An equipage
and attendants of—of—the most luciferous description,"
)'sorrowful' (in "Beowulf,") 'mournful' (1542 ff.,) 'gloomy' (1593
ff.;) ludibund (1664 and 1669 H. More, only,) 'playful' (1240 ff.;)
—fructaneous, ludibund, ludiferous, incolary (and incolist,) super-adventient, temebrize; introsume and ultimum show adjustment of af-fixes; cambium (1703 &c.) and urbicary, urbicarian (1654—1723) are Latin in imagery as well as in form; especially peculiar is deodate ("given by god") as used by Gayton in his "Pleasant Notes"—"I gather'd up the Deodate good Gold" (1654;) likewise aspectabund (op. Lat. 'laorimabundus,' 'osculabundus:' question of the suffix?) while rarely a Latinism has humorous possibilities—aibe, ceberrimus, and numerous nonce-creations.

What is true of these forms from the Latin is true of others from the French—acier (1666, 'steelt c. 725 ff.,) badot (1653, 'silly' 1547 ff.,) bouvrage (1915, 'beverage' 1325 ff.,) disinterese-ment (1662, 1713, 'disinterestedness' 1692 ff. fr. vb. [1612 ff.,]) effroyable (1689 only, 'frightful' 1607 ff.,) enmuntery (1655 only, Fuller, 'emunitory' 1547 ff.,) fourb(e (1669—1761, fourbery 1642—1737 [Fielding,] 'cheat' [person] 1559 ff., 'cheater' 1607 ff.,) gymnasse (1652, anglicized from French 'gymnase,' 'gymnasium' 1598 ff.,) reprimant (1652 only, 'reprimand' 1636 ff.,) scaliere (1652, 1653, 'staircase' 1624 ff.,) supercelestial (1654 only, 'supercelestial' 1559 ff.,) verðe (1695, 1656, 'verdea' 1625 ff.,) vertice (1665 only, 'vertex' ["zenith"] 1646 ff.,) vivace (1721 only, 'vivacious' 1645 ff.)* Somewhat exceptional are a few forms: sub-bois, law-word,
1677, 1706, 1709 &c., 'underwood' 1325 ff.; paraphrase 1676 only; recommand 1673—1756 (Dryden, Walpole, Mrs. Brooke in "Old Maid," "I . . . deranged the right wing a little, but Betty has recomimded it passablement bien;") intitule (1664—1671;) lecration (1693—1855, 'wagging,' "tremulous move;") and Coleridge's intortillage (1809 "The Friend," " . . . an intortillage or intertwisting both of thoughts and sentences.") "To make state (to do something)"

the New English Dictionary calls "a mere Gallicism." Internune (1647 Hammond, "He was call'd . . . Apostolus also, an intercessor or internune betwixt them;" 1661 Evelyn, "The internunce and interpreter;" 'internuncio' from the Italian, 1641 ff.,) nastroe (1693, 1706, 1707, 'nasturtium' 1629 ff.,) and principe (1649, 1669, 'principle' [sense 3 in NEP] 1413 ff.) will perhaps recall similar forms offered early in this chapter (pp. 162 ff. and 165—166.) Faux-prudes are perhaps still among us, but the name interestingly has gone (op. p. 213 and footnote, and p. 469—App. A.)

Time shows that other languages, notably Italian, have also made temporary loans to the English vocabulary. Only a few, a very few, of these words (perhaps a tenth) enjoyed any vogue (op. p. 13, footnote.) Nevertheless, attorraine and atteration from the Italian

1829 "Gentl. Mag.," 'pupil' 1563 ff.,) espous (1682 Browne, 'millet' 1400 ff., 'spelt' 1000 ff.,) estesp (1755 only [2,] 'ration' 1407 ff.,) fanfreluche (1653, 1693 Urquhart "Rab.," 'trifle' [v.,] 1400 ff., 'wanton' 1582 ff.,) fleblie (1734, 'doleful' 1275 ff.,) fusee (1710 C. Fiennes Diary, "Peppe both in Suffolk and Norfolk knitt much and spin, some with ye Rock and fusee as the French does, others at their Wheeles;" 'spindle' 1425 ff.,) goinfre (1443, 'gourmand' 1491 ff. [obs. sense,]) interbastate (1657, 1666, 'quilt' 1555 ff.,) intermede (1791, 1794, 1796, 'intermedium' 1660 ff., 'medium' 1593 ff.,) laschetty (1673, 1702 only, 'laxity' 1528 ff., 'carelessness' 1000 ff.,) lascive (1647 only, 'lascivious' 1425 ff.,) monion (military, 1652—1302, 'stump' 1375 ff.,) mot (1645 [sense 2.,] 'motto' 1589 ff., 'word insignificant in sound'—Miss Miller,'
Ch. V

(1673, 1696, 1713, 1757, &c.) and busto (1662—1693) caricature (1712—1750), festino (1741—1765), and romanza (1641—1661), and lemonade (1640—1676) from the Spanish and velt-marshall (1709—1319) from the German and Dutch, enjoyed some vogue. Synonyms, though not always satisfactory (not always etymologically related or even semantically close,) are usually of earlier date.* The truth would again seem to be that as most of these forms were of rarest occurrence, so were synonymous words not only before them in time, but well established—much in use; that through analogy or otherwise these synonyms often appear to be more distinctly English—nativism and the Englishing of words; and that rarely do we find a term which probably belonged in the vocabulary of men talking.

The part that form plays in the story of words is thus seen to be large. Yet 'adjustment' and 'analogy' and 'form-association,'

App. A: one is tempted to ask, What about the French? is mot insignificant in sound there? Miss Miller probably implies that mot as compared with 'motto' is insignificant, &c.; mouche (1676—1725, 'beauty spot' 1579—1735 [but not obs.,] "isolation in stem, few words from the same root"—Miss Miller,) parlier (1666 only,) poile (1746 only, 'fine hair, 'down,) primilipy (1693 only, 'first-class,' regoit (1733 only, 'harvest, 'crop,) relaxsh (1663 only, 'relaxed, 'careless,) remerciment (1654, 1777 only, 'thanks,) reponse (1704, 1719 only, 'ramplon' 1573 ff.,) repugnatory (1737, 'defensive,) ridder (1694 only, 'rider, 'knight,) souffler (1674 only, book of travel, 'blower, 'whale,) ubiquitair (1645 only, poetry, 'ubiquitary' 1597 ff.,) others.

* Thus 'bust' 1691 ff., 'caricature' 1746 ff., 'feast' 1200 ff., 'romance' 1330 ff., 'lemonade' 1663 ff., and 'field-marshall' 1614 ff.

To these may be added: caprich (see p. 240, 1656—1693 against later Fr. 'caprice' 1677 ff., chîrme, chîrme (1655—92—1734, Fr. or Ital. [&c.], 'crew' 1570 ff., 'gang' 1340 ff.,) disgraciately 1734 only, North: "All this he would most disgraciately obtrude by his quaint Touch of 'confirming all.'") entrata (1670 only, 'revenue' 1433 ff.,) faciata, faciata (1644, 1654 only, 'facade,'
and 'aphetic forms' and 'back formations' and 'isolation in stem' are but names and phrases, and do not really explain how it is that words grow obsolete. They scarcely always suggest and imply; and perhaps it is the word that always best for itself. And so we have looked at many examples like aggress, ship-agent, well-woven,* like nauseate, impulser, sprightliness, extempore, and interpole, applauding, extent, perfusion, like manger, remune, primitivist, like manufact, actuose, accumb, unleasable ([and like ambige and assassine, or gowe and empiric.] ) "One tried"—indeed—and some-


foration' 1440 ff.

[ PP. 204 ff. Manger v. 1675 Wyckerley, 1681 Hicherlingull; so hangry 1691: 'agnost forms,' 'to make angry' &c. Fremune obs. coll. 2, contrast of 'pressunire' 1753. Primitivist n.w. 1513, contract. for 'primitivist' (1660 ff.) .


[ PP. 165 ff. and 251 ff. French, Latin, and Greek foreignism.
times it was to see what would happen.* Particularly interesting is opinionator (q.v.) "Such ... are to be called Philosophers not opinionators or lovers of opinions," wrote Gale in 1677; and South in a sermon in 1710 spoke of "The Pharisaes, and Opinionators of their own holiness." Laud, Mountagu, Blair, and Lordamer all used opinator (1626—1696.) Opinionator was used, between 1523 and 1714, by Coverdale, Mayne, Stubbe, and Savage—perhaps others, and opinatiae, from the French and Italian, was used between 1603 and 1634 and 1677 and 1716 by BBarrow, Gauden, South, and others. Opinionist, outside of church history, is obsolete, having been used between 1623 and 1760; opinionatist was a form chosen by Sir T. Herbert in his "Travels" (1634,) Baxter in his "Infant Baptism" (1651,) and Fenton in a sermon of 1720. But 'theorist' (1594 ff.) seems to have sufficed. It is, in contrast to the above obsoleteisms, fixed, decisive. It would be hard to derive from 'theory' such an array as has been derived from 'opinion.'

(1930 only, 'avalanche' and It. 'velene'; 'avalanche' 1766 ff. [op. pp. 209--210, footnote,]) zingbo (1743 Walpole in letter to Mann; ? for It. 'zino;' 'zino' 1651 ff.) The above forms are all from the Italian.

From the Spanish: ensay (1740 tr., prob. ad. Sp 'ensayar,' 'essay' v. 1440 ff.), JInspirado (1654 H. More [2],) "a person who imagines himself to be inspired," lemonado (1640, 1663, 1676, 'lemonade' 1663 ff.,) patroona (1704, 'a mistress of slaves in the Levant," Sp or obs. It. [2 refs.]) rebarricado (1655 tr., 'bar- ride' v. 1592 ff.,) roomery (1655 Sir T. Herbert 'In his Roomey in the way to Medina ... he was wounded to death,' 'pilgrimage' 1250 ff.,) segara (1735, quasi-Spanish, 'cigar' 1735 ff.,) stentrel (1755 only, ad. Sp., 'the centre gangway of a galley," &c.

From the Portuguese: escrivan (1726 Shelvocke 'Voy.' Eng. 'super-cargo' [clerk] 1697 ff.,) fagong (1772 [2],) "a fire-place used on shipboard,") sippo (1657 Purchas "Pol. Flying-Ins," 'lians' 1796 ff.)

From German and Dutch: garsopper (1799,) schiffer (1633, 'slette' 1455 ff.,) slenker (1659, 'dangle' 1590, 'sway' 1545,) loren- driver (1649, 'smuggler' 1661 ff.,) overschiffer (1759, 'trans- ship' 1792 ff.,) serio-schoe (1659, 'sate' 1838, &c.) slinger, spouting, sprunk, &c. Interesting too are locomen (Negro-Eng.,) and raree-fly (Fielding in 1736, 'raree-show' 1631, 1704 ff.)

* Bbl. 361. Professor Gordon instances turgidus from Jonson, 1601:

"Barmy froth, puffy, inflate, turgidus ..." 'turgid' 1620 ff.
But regardless of explanations that may be agreed upon, one cannot escape from a feeling that especially in the seventeenth century there was an oversupply of words. It is interesting to note what kind of words our dictionary today records for the periods between Queen Elizabeth and Dr. Johnson. If today in the general (colloquial) vocabulary we have still more words, undoubtedly it is partly if not chiefly because we have more things, more concepts, to be named; and our oversupply that is in danger of obsolescence lies afield—slang, e.g. True enrichment almost always stands off clearly against mere increase.

Finally, it should not be supposed, once again, that the words and forms cited in this chapter became obsolete because of some peculiarity or untowardness in form. How form and meaning are inseparable a later chapter (VII) will try to show. Yet so large a part have affixes played in the shaping and adjustments of English words, that it is first left to the ensuing chapter to tell something of their story.
CH. VI

Although the present chapter seeks to discuss obsolescence in words from the viewpoint of affixes, approaches are not always clearly or decisively marked, and no perfect conclusion is easily attainable. One may reasonably ask, at the outset, if obsolete prefixes and suffixes exist? At least one describer of English, Richard Morris, listed, many years ago, some "living" and "dead" affixes; he contrasted '-craft,' '-hood,' '-kind,' and '-ship;' for example, with -head, -lock, -red, -ric(k). Others have instanced the more common affixes and their significations, or have discussed their origin and history. Unquestionably a number of suffixes and prefixes have fallen into disuse; we have lost words like manded and forfight and botanographer (ac.;) and it will be suitable to our purpose to see, presently, how and in what degree affixes like -red and for- and botano- bring about obsolescence in English words.

Not many affixes, however, are obsolete in the way in which -red and for- and ge- are obsolete. These affixes, and a few others, are not only disused, but unrecognizable. Not so with botano-, which

*Bib. 385. A list submitted on pp. 4—6 gives dates and very brief titles, and another classified list is given under section VI of the bibliography. The writer regrets that he has not been able to see all of the studies mentioned. A few, however, notably those by Gadde, Pound, and Key, will be cited or used in this chapter. With Morris may be compared Brown, Chapin, Haldemann, and possibly Schmidt.

[Bib. 437 (Brown, lists most common prefixes and their significations,) 440 (Chapin, origin and meaning of Eng. affixes,) 457 (Draat, 'ge-' in MnE. vb.,) 666 (Gadde, 'age,' 'ery,' 'ment;' see pp. 332—334 below,) 302 (Haldemann, origin, meaning, and application of affixes,) 525 (Pound, "Stunts" and "Vogue," cp. 534, Schmeding on Carlyle's use of '-dom,') 535 (Schmidt, trans-
had something like a vogue in the seventeenth century,* and -aster, which, though it occurs in obsolete terms like Gramaster, logicoaster, militaster, diceaster, parasitaster, and philosophers, is kept somewhat alive in 'philosophaster' (1611—1894 in NED) and 'poetaster' (1599 ff.) and the like. In short, there are quite a number of affixes which are used no longer in forming new words, but which are entirely familiar and, as it were, at home in the vocabulary. Thus, -acy can no longer be as freely used as once it was, nor -ard, -ose, -ster, nor be-(especially interesting,) bis-, øv-, die-, proto-, supra-, and others. The possible reasons why these affixes fell into disuse we shall presently try to arrange. Particularly engaging in their disuse are the diminutive suffixes -ette, -ello, -allo, -ing, -kin, -let, -ling, and -ook; and some disuse of feminine distinctions in a partial loss of -trix and

formation of affixes in Middle and New English in verbs, substantives, and adjectives,) 536 (Skeat, a- in its various senses and forms: ad-, ab-, ex-, an-, at-, ge-,) 543 (Strachan, -al in 'disallowal'—'disallowance;' protest against 'disallowal';)

On diminutives: Bib. 441 (Coleridge, '-let' and '-et,' whence they came, their meanings; op. Röy,) 458 (Eckhart, Anglo-Saxon dims.,) 488 (Key '-let,' '-ock;' meanings and functions,) 496 (Lewis, function of diminutives in general, ideas of "tenderness" and "size;" '-ling,' '-kin,')

* "Hence in the 17th century were formed many short-lived compounds in imitation of those of astro-"—NED. Thus, botanographer (1692,) botanographer (1692 Fuller,) botanography (1731,) botanologist (1654 Sir Thomas Browne,) botanical, 'botanology' (lvg.,) 'botanomancy' (lvg,)

[This affix from the Latin expresses incomplete resemblance and consequently is generally pejorative. It illustrates rather nicely a difference between written and spoken English: 'grammaticaster,' 'politaster,' and the two living forms cited above—if not also the obsolete words astrologaster, Gramaster, &c.—, as written English are quite recognizable; but a word in aster would hardly be found in spoken English. Miss Miller (App. A) says, in consequence: "Not a living suffix" under her militaster. Dates are:
-trice (-drice,) if not also of -(tr)mes, is visible. One ought, perhaps, to speak of the loss or isolation of words and forms having these and similar affixes; yet when a fairly impressive number of obsoletisms possessing one affix can be brought together, the fate of that affix becomes more evident.

The fate is not always complete obliteration or partial isolation, the quality of being unrecognizable or only partly familiar and reasonable. Most commonly, affixes have rivals. Sometimes there seems to be a kind of general plurality of forms and affixes, as in 'absorbency,' 'absorptiveness,' 'absorption,' and Sir Thomas Browne's irregular absorption,* or 'agatáed,' 'agate-like,' 'agatine,' 'agaty,' and agated,|| or 'cerulean' (ac.) cited in the last chapter (pp. 168—169.) Of such, English has undeniably had a superabundance. Definite adjustments in our language seldom take place here. They do not always take place where the rivalry is more pronounced; yet it is perhaps possible to see something like definite competition in words in -al versus

| 'living'    | Obsolete
|-------------|-------------
| 'criticaster' 1694 ff. | astrologaster 1622, 1636 |
| 'grammaticaster' 1601 ff. | grammaraster 1716 only |
| 'oleaster' 1598 | logaster 1683 only |
| 'poetaster' 1599 ff. | millaster 1640—s. 1652 |
| 'politicaster' 1641 ff. rare | parasitaster 1606 only |
| 'surdaster' ? | ploeaster 1707 |
| 'theologaster' 1621 ff. | philosophaster 1797 obs. n-w. |

Ben Jonson appears to have introduced or popularized 'grammaticaster' and 'poetaster.' The latter is in works by Butler, Walpole, and Macaulay. Burton had 'theologaster;'

Milton, 'politicaster.' 'Philosophaster' will be found in Kingsley's "Hypatia" (ch. 3.) 'Criticaster' and the nonce-forms in '-ism' and '-ry' are also interesting; they occur in the writings of Southey, Swinburne, others. See also p. 98.

* Dates: 1762 for obs. sense, 1859 ff. lvg.; n.d date; 1741 ff.; obs. form 1680. A verbal substantive 'absorbing' is not cited, nor is the "proper" form 'absorbence.'

|| Dates: 1847 ff.; no date; 1847 ff.; 1695 ff.; 1665.
words in (particularly) '-ous' or '-ic,' or compounded with
'-like,' in -ary versus others in '-al,' '-er,' '-ous,' in
dis- versus those in 'un-,' or 'in-,' or 'de-' (etc.) forms
in -er going down before similar forms in -ist,' -ator,' and
a few other personal suffixes. A kind of battle is reached
when we come to -ian and '-ial,' '-ic,' to -ic and '-ical,'
'-al,' '-ian,' '-ous' (etc.) and "vice versa," to -ish, -ist,
to -ment and '-ation' (etc.) or -now and '-ancy,' '-ancy'-and
again, "vice versa," to -ose against '-ous,' to -ous against
'-ical,' '-al,' '-ive,' and a host of others, to -ure and
'-ion' or '-ment.' All this rivalry is, even when arranged
in some order, confusing. Unquestionably, in the course of time,
these affixes draw to themselves certain functions, meanings and
shades of meanings, vogues; they do not always successfully or
gracefully hybridize; an affix whose character—or characteristic—
is not firmly established, may not easily usurp the place of an
affix whose idiomatic quality is familiar to all; occasionally,
dates, again, are a determining factor; and no doubt phonetic
relationships* play a part, perhaps a large part, in the story
of these interesting elements of our language.

Not infrequently affixes, notably suffixes, are super-
fluous. It is seldom possible to say whether they are innocently
so, or affectedly. -Al (and -ial) -ary, -(I)fy, -ive, -ize, -ment,
and -ous seem to have offended much; and among the prefixes, dis-,
in-, re-, and trans-. A term which Henry More possibly got from

* Ch. IV and Bib. 419 (Mrs. Aiken.) Interesting as Mrs. Aiken's
"accord" theories are, they will not be extensively tested out
or used in this discussion of English affixes. The part that
sound plays will in a general way and brief be touched upon
towards the close of the chapter (pp. 343—344.)
Cockeram (1623) or Blount (1656) may be applied to a few of the words having these affixes—*inexsuperable*:* Quite a number of prefixes show weakening: *a-, be-, de-, di(s)-, im-, in-, per-, re-, super-, trans*, and particularly *pro-. Weakening among the suffixes does not seem to be so common. What makes for this weakening? One thing, notably: affixes seem no longer able to carry the idea or burden of emphasis as once they did. *Be-* is particularly interesting—*bestented, bestowage, bestraughted, betine, betrench, betrust, betwit, bewrite*. Another: *aphesis* (see pp. 203 ff.;) and here the prefix *a-* stands forth: *eaclearment, accompla, adhortatory, adnascent, agg generate, annumber (&c.,) aspare, others.* Occasionally, isolation lies not so much in the affix as in the fact or thing, the disappearance of objects and ideas. This possibility is always lurking. If one seeks far enough, one more often than not finds that the causes of obsolescence are divided between "form" and "meaning." So with *Grubean, rubster;* so with *disartuate, disramation, fallish, flaggish, and frippish, liquorous for 'liquid,' pullious, rosinaceous, and two or three interesting forms in -wick.*

No single aspect is so prominent, finally, as that of number. English has picked up her affixes everywhere, and not a few of them have enjoyed great vogue. Sometimes the vogue is so general as to be hardly discernible—*ade, be- (fig. 6 in NED,), de- and di- and dia-, -ize and -ness and -ship;* but sometimes it becomes so emphasized in the newspapers and elsewhere as to be inescapable—*ge, -eria! (see p. 17,) -ish, -ism, -ist.* We may not, out of politeness, say that affixes were an obsession with Carlyle (Bib. 525 and

* Obs. rare, ad. L. 1659 "Immortality of the Soul," 1. ix (1662) 137, "[His] inexsuperable confidence of the truth."
534,) but we may, with impunity, hold that he and Southey and Coleridge and others were sometimes affix-minded. The vogues of affixes is a subject as entertaining as it is large, and will be touched upon again at the close of this chapter. But vogue ever makes for increasing numbers, and perhaps for ultimate confusion, not alone from the viewpoint of numbers, but from something more subtle—words drawing "that attention on themselves which they should transmit to things" (p. 49.) One need only contrast the plain, service-worthy monosyllables of our language, enduring etymons, with ephemeral, voguish creations.

The part that affixes play in the waxing and waning of our vocabulary is best illustrated, however, not by programmes or theories, but by examples themselves.—

It is interesting to think that if this study were being written a century ago—1832—one more "obsolete" affix, -dom, would probably be added to those mentioned above (for-, -red, botan-.) Miss Pound (Bib. 525) draws attention to how it lay dormant for a long time, and then was revived by Carlyle and others. In long course of time its Old Saxon attachments were loosened and lost to it. It grew out, indeed, of an independent substantive—"statute, judgment, jurisdiction,"—a point of importance. It is amusing to think of how the seventeenth century (or, more honestly, of how certain writers in the Restoration) could speak seriously of protectordom and at least half-seriously of peopledom (1657 Earl of Monmouth in a translation, 1659 Harrington in "Oceana," 1660, 1711 &c.;) but of how some writers in the eighteenth century might have viewed words in -dom. Very likely, for all its use in the next century, especially early, the suffix lost in force
and sobriety. It gained a different kind of acuteness. How long it will endure, we cannot say.

If this study were of the old and middle periods of the English language, many time-worn and obsolete affixes would probably come to view. For-, as has been remarked, is now entirely obsolete. Bishop Gauden in a sermon (1659) perhaps esoterically spoke of "one scared and forehared" ("harried exceedingly.") Under forfight, Scottish, intensive for "to exhaust (oneself) with fighting," occurs but one quotation in the NED, anonymous, 1661. Probably not many other words in for- existed so late as the mid-seventeenth century. Like for- is the prefix um- and the suffixes -red and -rie, and (in the degree in which it is obsolete) -ock. These affixes have scarcely been replaced. Most of the um- words disappeared about 1300—um, "edge, circumference." One exception was the rare umstroke of which Fuller appears to have been fond: 1650, "Pisgah," "Such Towns stand (as one may say) on tiptoes, on the very umstroke," and again, "Places situate on the Umstroke ... are not in their exact position." Similarly, only a few words having -red (OE. 'raden') remained even in Middle English—possipred, e. g. True, Modern English has, indispensably, 'hatred' and 'kindred.' Behind -rie was riche, rike (sb.,) all obsolete now. The substantive signified "kingdom, realm" (397—1390,) also "sovereignty" (900—1440 or later;) while 'bishopric' happens still to be in demand ("province, diocese" [&c.,] 890 ff., "office or position" 1394 ff, two obsolete senses,) abbotrie (1120—1711,) schoolrie (1739, 1797,) and perhaps a few others, are disused.*

* Schoolrie is marked "U. S." and reference is made to Pelham, Mass, with the query, "after bishopric?" Offsetting the others were or are: bishopry obs. Sc. 1535—1665; 'bishophood' 1000 ff;
The suffix -ock is exceptionally interesting, and still invites investigation.* It cannot be called obsolete, but it is geographically isolated, and apparently not a living formative.

Of the thirty-one examples submitted below, only six are obsolete or partly obsolete ("Arch.," "Obs. exc. hist. and dial.," "Obs. exc. So.,") but practically all are Scottish or dialectal—contrast, how-

* Morris (Bib. 395) calls this a "dead" suffix. Miss Miller (App. A) submits: madock, "earworm," 1240—1694 (with comment: "Isolation in stem as well as in dim. suffix;") millocke, "a little mill," 1570 ("no actual use known;") mamock, "scrap or shred, broken or torn piece," 1529—1970, archaic only.

Sir G. Cornwall Lewis (Bib. 496, article written in 1932) and T. Hewitt Key (Bib. 498, art. dated 1936) supplement Grimm and others with lists; and their examples, together with a few other examples, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>So.?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baddock</td>
<td>1944 ff.</td>
<td>fry of coal fish</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not in NED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bannock</td>
<td>1425 ff.</td>
<td>oot or barley cake</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Wright, Jamison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bittock</td>
<td>1382 ff.</td>
<td>a little bit</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>north dia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bladrock</td>
<td>1714 ff.</td>
<td>talkative silly</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brannock</td>
<td>1700 ff.</td>
<td>small fish</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Lewis, Key, NED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullock</td>
<td>1000 ff.</td>
<td>a young bull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buttock</td>
<td>1300 ff.</td>
<td>bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabock</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>see kebbuck below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caemock</td>
<td>1425 ff.</td>
<td>crooked stick</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Obs. exc. So.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caetock</td>
<td>1399 ff.</td>
<td>cob of cabbage stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charlock</td>
<td>1000 ff.</td>
<td>weed</td>
<td></td>
<td>proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crovock</td>
<td>1725 ff.</td>
<td>crooked head</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devilock</td>
<td>1991 ?</td>
<td>little devil</td>
<td></td>
<td>not in NED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eamock</td>
<td>1000 ff.</td>
<td>emmet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gavelock</td>
<td>150- 1823</td>
<td>spear, iron croobar</td>
<td></td>
<td>dial. Obs. exc. hist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hattock</td>
<td>1674 ff.</td>
<td>a little hat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hillock</td>
<td>1382 ff.</td>
<td>shock of sheaf of com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hummock</td>
<td>1356 ff.</td>
<td>little hill, &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humlock</td>
<td>1519 ff.</td>
<td>knoll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kebbuck</td>
<td>1470 ff.</td>
<td>cheese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knublock</td>
<td>1790 ff.</td>
<td>small knot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lassock</td>
<td>1816 ff.</td>
<td>little girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maddock</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"abbotcy" rare 1344 ff.; 'abbotship' 1495 ff.; 'abbacy' (in the sense "dignity, estate") 1425 ff., (in the sense "period") 1794 ff. Abbotscote was mostly 13—15th centuries.

Notes

The examples in -ock and -uck in W. and Jam.

* Re. Eng. Not in NED.

Examples in -ick and -ock in W. and Jam.

See above...
ever, 'hillock,' 'hummock,' and 'paddock,' which seem to have gained
general currency—so perhaps also a few others. One might say, in-
deed, that this affix enjoys a kind of splendid isolation. We shall
return to diminutives later.

Somewhat different in character are the affixes -head, -loser,
-logian, -logue, and vi-. For-, ge-, um-, -red, and -ric upon dis-
appearing, were wholly lost. Not so -head, which was swallowed up
in '-hood.' Middle English *hed* was originally attached only to
adjectives; but when it came to be attached to nouns, it became
synonymous with '-hood.' Thus it was lost; and by a kind of reverse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>So.?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mammock</td>
<td>... see above ...</td>
<td>dial.</td>
<td>arch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millock</td>
<td>... see above ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paddock</td>
<td>1622 ff.</td>
<td>small enclosure &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pillock</td>
<td>1570 only</td>
<td>small pill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pillock</td>
<td>1425 ff.</td>
<td>coal fish yr. old</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playlock</td>
<td>1694 only</td>
<td>a small pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pottock</td>
<td>1675 ff.</td>
<td>var. of 'rowlock'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rullock</td>
<td>11125</td>
<td>plaything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warlock</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>wizard, dwarf &amp;c.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>obs. senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whilock</td>
<td>1397 ff.</td>
<td>a little while</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not in NED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key especially details this suffix, and points out that in
Scotland diminutives are particularly a living principle.
He used in his search the work of Lewis, Grimm (grammar,)
Jameison's Dictionary, together with various provincial
glossaries—Jennings' Somersetshire Glossary, Grose's
Glossary, Wilbraham's Cheshire Gloss., Moor's Suffolk Words.
He lists some 25 words with "Simple dim. suffixes" (all
included in the above list,) and then appends: Guttural
softened to final w or ow, as:

-ock: 69; -om: 27 sb., 3 adj., 9 vbs. -ock weakened to -ick
in lassick, laddick, whence again by softening of guttural to
'lassie,' 'laddie,' 'rummie.' -ock : -ick : -ch, 'scratch'
fr. 'scar,' &c. See below, pp. 280.
Oh.

VI

"falsehood," 'like-

lihood.' Actually,

then, there was an exchange, an adjustment; and

although 'hood' and '-ness' play the larger parts in the story of

-hed, -head, in a concentrated study of this suffix per se other

affixes would be found to enter in—'dom,' 'right,' 'ship,' &c.

But it will be seen from the dates below* that -head belongs to a

period antedating the era of our interests.

So with -loger, -logian, and -logue, all more or less super-

seded by 'logist.' There are, states the New English Dictionary,

only a few words, actual or assumable, like 'astrologer,' geolo-

ger, theologer; and the suffix is simply no longer a living formative.

Miss Miller lists meteorologer (1683—1686) and 'meteorologer' 

(1621 ff.), martyrloger (1643) and 'martyrologist' (1676 ff.)

There was also meteorologian, another "try" (1614—1635.) The af-

* The early rivalry of -head and 'hood' is illustrated in the

following words (from Miss Miller's thesis, App. A:)

maphead,

"state of being human; human nature; human shape or form" and

several other meanings and uses, o. 1220—1593, a. 1300 ff.,

&c.; isolation in stem and native word versus foreign; 'man-

hood' 1377 ff. ('virility' 1536 ff., 'courage' 1375 ff., 'valour'

1581 ff.; masterhead 1429, 'masterhood' 1454 ff. Of -head and

'-ness:' madhead o. 1375—a. 1450, 'madness' 1393 ff.; menlihead,

"condition of being human" o. 1250—1415, 'virility, bravery,

courage' 1422—1594, 'manliness' 1375 ff. (native word driven

out by French terms; isolation in suffix;)

manynhed a. 1300—

a. 1400, 'manynness' 1609 ff., 'multitude' 1325 ff.; meekhead

1297—1672, 'meekness' o. 1200 ff.; micklehead a. 1300—o. 1400,

mickleness is obs. exc. dial, a. 1300 ff.; mightyhead, mildhede,

milsthede; much-head and Murrumehead were each used but once,

13., and o. 1475 respectively.

Miss Miller concludes in her thesis, p. 309: 'This rather

limited number of cases seems to point to a conclusion that

in the case of the suffix 'head' appended to nouns it was

replaced by 'hood,' and in the case of the suffix appended to

adjectives it was generally replaced by '-ness.' It is

true that a few instances still exist as mentioned above of

this suffix used with adjectives to form nouns, but they seem

to be rather in the minority.'

For further examples, see pp. 292 & 310 below.
fix -logue is now little used as a personal ending. Astrologue, geologue, and theologue* are wholly obsolete, and 'philologue' is rare. Others are of more recent origin—Assyriologue, ideologue, and 'sinologue,' e. g. —and would certainly be familiar to those who are acquainted with 'Assyriologist,' 'sinologist,' &c. Elsewhere -logue has rivals (chronologue 1653 only, and 'chronology' 1593 ff.) or is given a nonce-use (annealogue, after the analogy of 'decologue,' 1655 Fuller, "When this [commandment] was wanting, the Decologue was but an annealogue.")

VI-, finally, is largely obsolete because of 'vice-.' Occasionally no form in 'vice-' is to be had: vi-curate 1617 only, vi-politic 1632 B. Jonson ("vi-polétique,") &c. But the norm would seem to be 'vice-' indeed; and vi-president (1663 Davenant in a "Masque") and vi-queen (1642 Marryat) are altogether exceptional ('vice-president' 1574 ff., 'vice-queen' 1578 ff.,) and forms in 'vice-' abound.

It is perhaps obvious from the above brief discussion that much time is required to make an affix completely obsolete. Meaning in affixes is apt to be not too fixed, too clear. Thus -red from OE. 'ræðen'—"rule, condition." But the words 'rule' (OF. fr. L.) and 'condition' (Fr. fr. L.,) which, together with other words of similar meaning, have usurped the place of OE. 'ræðen,' are dissimilar in meaning, show the effect of conquest, and demonstrate the compulsion

in language, or perhaps one may say, in people speaking, to grow and change. "New terms," it has been said, "for new ideas." If one may change "for" to "with," one may possibly be nearer the truth. The small philological gulf between -red and 'radden' was, in the course of much time, widened. From the facts of conquest and phonetic change, the Old English word was lost, and the life of -red thereby shortened. New affixes, more meaningful, came in. They took on new functions. They replaced old affixes, and will in time be replaced themselves. When form relationships cease to be clear, meaning perishes, and we have obsolete words on our hands.

In the period of our interest, however, most of the affixes show only a kind of partial isolation, and are only partly responsible for the obsolescence of words. So it is, for example, with -ard. Archbishop Trench wrote: "More than half of the words formed in 'ard have dropped out" ("Past and Present" pp. 215–217,) and cited blinkard, bosard, disgard, drivelard, musard, and so on; but a statement in the NED (under -ard) would seem to contradict or at least modify this: "'ard' appeared in Middle English in words taken from Old French as 'bastard', 'coward', 'mallard', 'wizard', also in names of things as 'placard', 'standard' (flag), and became at length a living formative of English derivatives, as in 'buzzard', 'drunkard', 'laggard', 'slugard'... [Moreover] In some words it has taken the place of an earlier '-ar', '-er' of the simple agent as in 'bragger', 'bragger', 'braggerd', 'standard', 'standard' (tree)." In these latter terms, the Oxford Dictionary adds, -ard gave an intensive, augmentative, or pejorative sense—"one who does to excess, or who does what is discreditable." Most of the terms cited by
the archbishop are, again, of early date," and probably only a few obsolete items with -ard exist for the period 1650 ff.: babelard after French 'batillard,' 1679 Mrs. Behn ('babbler' 1530 ff.) wipard, nonce-word, "article for whipping," in Urquhart's "Rebeilaiz" (1653.)

It is a clearer case and, as mentioned above (p. 263,) a very interesting affix. Few affixes illustrate so well the vicissitudes of affixes. This prefix has several associations or senses: originally, "about;" then "around externally," "thoroughly," "off, away," "to make (something something)," "call or style (somebody something,"") "surround, cover," &c. The meaning "thoroughly" passed into a more intense meaning of "to excess, ridiculously." In the privative meaning of "off, away," as in "An ancient application . . . to express the sense of 'bereave of,'" be- is largely obsolete: bedwil, benim, bereave, belim. 'Behead' (1000 ff.) is still a living word for obvious reasons; and no doubt there are a few others. This use of be-, very common in OE. and ME., probably originated in words like 'be-shear,' "to cut all around."

* The passage in Ch. III of "English Past and Present" reads as follows: "Neither can I esteem it a mere accident that of a group of depreciatory and contemptuous words ending in 'ard,' at least one half should have dropped out of use; I refer to that group of which 'dotard,' 'laggard,' 'braggard,' now spelt 'braggart,' 'sluggard,' 'buzzard,' 'bastard,' 'wizard,' may be taken as the surviving specimens; 'blinkard' (Hymilies), 'dizzard' (Burton), 'dullard' (Udal), 'musard' (Chaucer), 'trichard' (Political Songs), 'shreward' (Robert of Gloucester), 'ballard' (a bald-headed man, Wyclif), 'pluggard,' 'stinkard' (Ben Jonson), 'haggard,' a worthless hawk, as extinct."

For her seven words in 'M,' Miss Miller found other good reasons than "Isolation in affix:" mafflard (stammering or blundering fool, 1450, Isola. in stem, maffl meaning 'to stammer, mumble,' obs.) mastard (stallion, 1592, Isola. in stem, no other word from same root [derivation not given,]) mobar (clown, bear [term of contempt,] c. 1440, again Isola. in stem, no other word &c., derivation not given; folown 1563 ff., 'boar' 1297 ff.,) mokerard (mokerer' [1303-1755,] miser' [c. 1560 ff.], no other word from the same root, date 1303,) mollart (a kind of pear, 1600;
Quite a number of be- words, then, are obsolete;* and while one finds a number of terms like bedeal and benimb, one also finds obsoleteisms like beguilty, belag, besparkling, betine, in which the sense of be- is "to render or make," "to make to," or is merely intensive. II Negro is doubtfully obsolete, and was used in two different ways— "to make Negro" and "to blacken" (1646 Sir Thomas Browne, 1650, 1659.) In both of these senses the be- is intensive. No verb 'negro' exists; and 'negrocy' (1799 ff.) is sufficient and definite. Of the terms bestentened, bestowne, besteatured, &c., showing prefix-rivalries, we shall speak later.]]

obsolete thing [thing or term for thing?,] mooldtard (a bird that is shedding its plumage, c. 1440-1650, Isola. in stem moult intr. "of feathers: to be shed in the process of change of plumage" obs., 'mouler' c. 1440 ff.,) musard (dreamer, foolish trifler, 13.-1489; economy of effort; 'dreamer' 1300 ff.) Morris (Bib. 335) lists -ard among his "romanic dead suffixes."

* Ref. In NED Living Obsolete Examples of obsoleteisms becurry, bedowse, behale bedrowse, betrench, bethrust beddeal, belus, bereave beberk, bechirn, bechirp befoul, beglad, begrilly, behyporks belimb beolsaked, bedaughtered

Especially interesting are the dates under be- 2, "thoroughly, intensely, soundly, much" &c., even "ridiculously." The forms here, both living and obsolete, belong chiefly to the 16th and 17th centuries.

Dates are: beguilty, "to render guilty," a. 1653 only, Bp. Sanderson in a sermon. Belag, "to make to lag," 1721. Another obs. vb. belag has the meaning "? to clog or wet with mud," and is of much earlier date (1300 ff.) For besparkling, betine, see below.

Fairfax (op. p. 11, 34, 226 and Bib. 91 and 249) in his "Balk and Selvidge," "to the Reader" wrote: "I had . . lost and benothing'd myself;" and again: "the world benothing'd." We should, of course, use 'annihilate' (1590 ff.)


The obsolescence is not always due to the prefix, however. It would be easy to find numerous examples like *bebass*, "cover with kisses," *becense*, *becrompoun*, *becurry*, "belabour, curry one's hide," *besperple*, *besquatter*. If anything, the prefix contributed in these and other like examples to keeping the terms alive. As much might be said, not without reason and safety, for all obsoletisms beginning with be-. Yet the truth would seem to be that this prefix has been overworked, has been assigned to too many tasks, and tasks too opposite in character—be- functioning as a particle meaning here "about," "externally," there "off, away," "bereave of," and again, "ridiculously." No wonder our continental cousins are puzzled.

A great many nonce-words and rare terms show a kind of uncertainty about de- and dis-. This is, in a general way, about all the explanation one can give—a statement of fact. If one looks closer, one sees that phonetics plays little if any part here, and meaning a great part. It suited a purpose with Burton to speak of *decoznizing* (instead of 'recognizing') his king (see pp. 66 and 101,) with Foote in 1762 ("Orators") to write, "The culture of our lands will sustain an infinite injury, if such a number of peasants were to deparochiate," with Urquhart in his "Rabelais" (1653) to mention *decrottinG* dirt from clothes and shoes, with Ward in his "Simple Cobbler" (1647) to picture fears of "dehominations . . . dis-common-wealthings," with Hobbes talk of "Dedoctors of morality." This last example is especially interesting, for it is rare (says the Oxford Dictionary) that de- is coupled with adjectives and (as here) substantives. Into the mouth of Baron Bradwardine in "Waverley," 1814, Scott put *debind*—"A prisoner of war is on no account to be coerced with fetters, or debinded in ergastulo." Peculiar (to us) is the
use by a writer in 1676 of *depersonate*—"A Bond-man, a Slave . . . being wholly decapitated and *depersonate* . . . from the common condition of a humane person." Although a verb, 'personate,' possesses some twelve senses, a few living and several obsolete, "to be or give the status of personal rights" is not among them. 'Dispersonate' is not a synonym of *depersonate*, as might be expected. Form here simply does not betray meaning. Sir Thomas Browne is much at home in a word like *detenebrate*, "To detenebrate and clearse this truth" ('Pseudodoxia Epidemica," 1646.) So *detumefy* in a translation of a medical work (1684, Bonet,) and *devaporate* after, and opposite to, 'evaporate' (the obsoletism was used in both a transitive sense, "to condense," and an intransitive, "to become condensed," ) and *deample*—" . . . things . . dampled and dismanaged amongst [people]" (Reeve: "God's Plea," 1657.)

Words and forms beginning with *dis*- are even more numerous, and are sometimes awkward. Thus *disunanimous*, 1723, *disaccept*, 1647 ("It had formerly made many fair proffers of service to this Island, but it was disaccepted," ) *disacceptable*, 1697 only, *disacceptance*, 1642—1720, and *disaffectionate* (1796 only) and 'unaffectionate' (1915 ff.) or *discapitation* (1787 only) and 'decapitation' (1650 ff.; but contrast the phonetic situations in *disangelical*, 1687, 1736, and 'unangelical,' 1711 only, yet not marked obsolete; cp. footnote p. 262.) To the modern ear, *undispunged* (1670) may seem inharmonious in comparison with 'unexpunged' (a century later; *dispunge*, verb, obs., 1606 ff. and 1622 ff., 'expunge,' verb, 1602 ff.) Yet *undispunged* did not become obsolete because of 'unexpunged,' or any question of harmony. It is—or was—like the others—a lonesome sojourner in the vocabulary. Unquestionably the possibilities in *dis-* have been much mined: *dis-*
commonwealth (see p. 273,) discompensate (1704 Fuller,) discribe (1647 Ward again, "to undo by writing"—"circumscribe .. proscribe or discribe,) disdesire ("disësire and un-wish." N. Badon, 1651,) diadetermine (ib.,) disghibelline ("dis-Ghibelline themselves from the Puritans," Marvell 1672,) disgospel (1642 Milton,) disobstetriciate (1652 Urquhart in "Jewel," disaccident ("to throw out of his reckoning as to the west," 1672 Marvell, "and so disaccidented our Geographer,"), dispersussion (1649 Senderson in a sermon, "to call such his dis-persawesion by the name of despair," dissimilies (1659 O. Walker, "dissimiles [sic.] and Contraries," disublection (ib.,) disthatch (1654 Gayton,) distime, and disuniversitz ("Cambridge .. almost dis-universitied," 1665.) All of the above are nonce-words.*

Indeed, it would be possible to find quite a number of words showing how limited the use of some affixes must, in the nature of things, be. -Aster has already been mentioned, and -maney will be. Bis-, something of a foreignism, finds occasional use in English—'bisalternative,' bisannual (1725, 'biennial' 1621 ff.) So -by as used

* To these may be added terms, all of rarest occurrence, in which dis-, di-, dif- show:

(1) living force—reversing of the action of the simple verb (NED, sub prefix II. 6) disaffright (free from alarm, 1676 Hobbes; 'unaffrighted' 1586 ff.,) disapparel (1530—1652; 1655 Vaughan, "I'le disapparell and to buy But one half glaunce most gladly dye;" 'disrobe,' 'undress,') disartuate (1660, book on vegetables; the simple v. is likewise obs. and indeed only a dict. term [Bailey,]) disassertor (1651, agent-n. fr. hypothetical vb., 'contradictor' 1599 ff.,) disassist (1669, 'hinder,' 'obstruct,') disconfide (to put no confidence or trust in, 1669; so disconfidence 1621, 1799 tr. only, and disconfidently 1666 only,) disconform (dis-agree in practice, 1670 Hacket, 1678 Norris, "Pardon my sweet Saint I implore, My soul ne're disconform'd from thine before,") discovenant (to dissolve covenant with; this term, full of religious associations and allusions, contrarily shows considerable use [is not "of rarest occurrence:"]) 1650 Trapp, "God will own them no longer; they are now dis-covenanted;" so 1667 Flavel, 1702 C. Mather; 1861; op. 'covenant' v. 1392 ff., loss of idea?,)
in idleby or Idleby (1539–1703, 1611–1691; Cotgrave, Motteux; "Idle" 1534 ff., owleble (1653 E. G. in Bulwer's "Anthropometaemorphosis" "Men were swine and turn'd to Owlebles,") sureby or sureby (appellation for a person—and hence a thing—that, being "sure," may be depended upon; [1553]–1643, attrib. 1612, 1675; much use,) and wigsby (so popular in the late eighteenth century, 1735–1742; jocular for

discreditor (1654, one who discredits confidence in anything; after Fr.? 'credit' 1559 ff.) disembay (1651 Sherburne "Poems," "The fair inamorata who from far Had spiz'd the ship . . now quite disembay'd, Her cables coiled, and her anchors weigh'd,")
disembangle (1726 Berkeley [2 times,] 'disentangle,') disem-brute (1677 H. Brooke "Fool of Quality," "Of a numerous people [Peter the Great] disembrated every one except himself;" 'de-brutalize' 1891 ff. "Chicago Advance,") disespose (1667 Milton in "Paradise Lost,") disfit (1669, "His Age disfitting him for service," a. 1714 "It disfits you for communion with God," "By . . intemperance [they] disfit themselves for the service of God," 'unfit' 1611 ff.,) disfrequent (1646 Gaule, 1666; dis-frequenter 1646 ff.; 'unfrequent' v. 1593, 1703 ff.), diffidelity (after 'infidelity,' unbelief, 1659 Fuller, "Parol-Diffidelity in matters of such nature,") disimpark (to turn out of a park, 1609–1711,) disimpin (1609–1711, "inanimate," "The Optick Nerve being . . disimprinted and relaxed," 'deobstruct' 1653 ff.,) disoxidate (1801 ff., 'deoxidate' 1799 ff.,) disquatter (1654,) disreport (to give evil report of, 1653 Baillé, "Their forwardness to misreport, disreport, discovers much evil affec-
tion in their spirits;" ab. used 1640 by Fuller,) dissenter (1652 W. Hartley "Inf. Baptism," "The Lord . . dis-resented such performances as were tainted with wickedness;" 'resent' 1628 ff.,) dissettle (1635, 1659, 1692 [again an exception to the "rarest occurrence" clause above],) 'unsettle' 1593 ff. &c.

(2) living force—negating of adjectives (NED sub affix II. 10;)
disanglitical (above,) disanimate (1691, "They saw . . many dis-
animate Bodies;" 'inanimate,') disadcoutive (1919; v. disadcoutue
16.—1626; 'unadcoutive,') disadcongrous (1673; "inconcrous,")
disacconsolatory (1654 Warren, 1659 D. Pell; 'disacconsolate' 1737 M.,
"inconsonant") disacconsanony (1654, 1690; so disacconsant adj. 1630–1906;
'unacconsanony' 1665 ff., 'unacconsanant' 1535–1843, 'inacconsanant,')
disaccorrespondent (1654; 'uncorrespondent' 1631–1944, 'oy' 1659 ff.,) disinhabitable (1660 F. Brooke tr. "Le Blaino's Trav.," "There was reason to believe these parts disinhabitable;" 1660 N. Ingelo "Bentivolio & Urania" [op. pp. 91—92] "Will you make this place
"a person who wears a wig.") This suffix would appear to be living on chiefly in family- and place-names—Crosby, Spilsby, &c. It is supposed to add a playful or derisive touch, and may possibly be iden-tified with `-boy.' Likewise circum-, which Richard Morris (Bib. 335) calls "dead," but which, upon close inspection, shows itself to be very much alive—except that it has been compounded with other


(3) living force—negating of substantives ("lack or absence of thing in question," NED II. 9 under dis-:) dishumour (1712 Sætle "Spect." "Anything that betrays Inattention or Dishumour," 1795,)
disin-vitation (1654 Ld. Orrery "Parthenissa" "why do you... give me so great a dis-invitation to obey you.") dispractice (1673 Penn, "Well satisfied with any Member's Dispractice of an orderly Per-formance," 'discontinuance,') disreport (see above.)

(4) living force—of abs., "to strip or free of, bereave, de-prise of," 'deprive of the character, rank, or dignity of,' "to turn out, expel, dislodge" (NED 7. a, b, and c:) discabinet (to divulge or disclose, as the secrets of a cabinet, 1658 Milton [title] "The Cabinet-Council, containing the chief Arts of Empire, and Mysteries of State, discabined in Political... Aphorisms;"
 'cabinet' v. 1642 ff.,) discale (to deprive of scales or the shells, 1651 Lovell; 'unscale' 1510 ff.,) discount (1611, 1743 Richardson,) dissale (to deprive of its pales or enclosing fence, 1653 poetry,) dispower (1656 S. H. "Gold Law" "How could they do less having power, than desert and dispower him," 'unempower' 1731 ff.;) disgoal (to divest of the character of a goal, 1647 Digges "Unleaf. Taking Arms." "He will contribute His utmost en-deavours, that His own Castles... may be disgoaled,"") disjudge ("to deprive of or remove from the office of judge," 1649 Prynne, 1658 "State Trials;" 'unjudge' 1653 ff.,) disquarter (see above.)

(5) etymological attachment—"with verbs already having sense of division, isolation, separation, or undoing;" whence dis- is naturally intensive here (NED sub dis- I. 5:) disailment (1557 Reeve "God's Plea," "...disailment or disstermer," ) disdoubt (a. 1656 Sp. Hall, "The stamp is too well known to be disdoubted;" 'doubt,' 'distrust, 'mistrust, 'misdoubt,') disshrivalled (1771 "Muse in Miniature," "The languid nature's cold dishravell'd veins,"
"shrivalled up,") disinsanity (1625; used ostensively or in intensive-ly,) dislaughter (see below,) dismangle (1659 D. Pell "Impr. See" "Chips... in which lye murdering Guns, mortal engines, and dis-mangling bullets;" 'mangle' 1400; meaning here is "to cut in pieces,") disneglect (1300 "True Briton," 'neglect;') others.

(6) complete disuse—i.e., the prefix di- in disjudicant (one who judges, determines—'judge' in a loose sense; 1661 Glanvill
terms than people care to remember. It is a rather susceptible sort of prefix; and the reader will perhaps recall Herrick’s use of it."

Proto-, -ship, -some, supra-, and sur- (and others) also show, in one way or another, limited use, a tendency to be isolated. Proto-occurs largely in nonce-words or rare—proto-devil in Motteux’ "Rabelais," protho-forester 1631, proto-natural 1557, proto-notator, first or principal recorder at court, 1726 Strype, protogenericus (suggested by ‘homogeneous’) 1660. -Ship was often compounded with adjectives and past participles in OE., and many of its compounds survived (or were re-coined) in ME., but the only surviving forms are ‘hardship’ and worship." Miss Miller (App. A) submits madship, meskship, mildsh sap.

To our period belong almightyship (1663 only, ‘almightiness’ 1520 ff.,) bankruptship, holyship, and others which imply the rivalry of -ship with ‘-ness,’ ‘-cy,’ rather than disuse. Archbishop Trench (‘English Past and Present,” Ch. III) writes: "It is sometimes easy enough, but indeed oftener hard, and not seldom quite impossible, to trace the causes which have been at work to bring about that certain words, little by little, drop out. . . That . . . there is a law here at work, however hidden it may be, . . is plain from the fact that certain families of words, words formed on certain patterns, have a tendency thus to fall into desuetude." He then instances (of the vast number

"Scapssas Sc1. "If great Philosophers doubt of many things, which popular judicants hold;" 1691 Wood; "dijudicate" now rare 1607—1676, and 'dijudication,' 'ive' 1549—1704, 1659, di-
junction (1769—74 Tucker,) diislaughter (1661; 'slaughter' 1633 ff.,) diliucid (1650, 1640—1671; 'bright;' diliucidate vb. oba 1539—
1764, also abs. Lation, -idity, &c,) dimensionsable (1660, 1675; so also fa. in -ed, -or,) diprismatic (1521, miner.,) diradiate (1651; but not sb.,) diramation (1778, 'ramification')
(7) uncertain meaning—dischurch.

* Pp. 110—111. Circumfloribus is a humorous nonce-word used by Mrs. Granville 1739; circumaspect 1667, 1703, op. 'inspect'.
surviving) 'gladsome,' 'handsome,' 'weirsome,' 'buxom' ('bucksome;') but contrasts lovesome, hatesum, gilesum ('guilesome,') mealsum, heavysum, lightsum, delightsum, mightsome, brightsome, wieldsome, unwieldsome, &c. Cleavesome, 1674 N. Fairfax, and 1674 Grew, and toysome, 1632—1754 (Ford, Hoole, D'Urfey, Richardson;?) may be added, although these, like needsome and liquorsome perhaps show rivalry: 'cleavable' 1946 ff., 'toyish' 1574 ff. (toyes 1591—1592,) liquorsome 1656 nd 1664 H. More, 'liquorish' 1500 ff., likerous 1275 ff., needsome 1650 only, 'needful' 1675 ff. The Oxford Dictionary notes that supra- occurs "in a few compounds in classical and late Latin; in medieval and modern Latin it is mainly restricted to technical terms," and "its meanings in English are for the most part parallel to, but in much less vogue than, those of super-; but it is more prevalent than the latter in certain uses, e.g. the scientific." Obsolete are supranominated and supra-creatarian, and forms with 'super-' are parallel to supercargo, 1667—1944 (considerable use) and supra-vise, -vision, -visor (1606, 1566—1694.) Sur-, finally, helps to make nonce-words like surburdened and surgirdle (op. 'surcharged' and 'surcingle') and legal terms now obsolete; it conveyed the sense of 'super' in savvyne (1666—1716,) and in living use has the ideas of "excessively" ('surcharge') and "additional" ('surname.') In surrect it shows, perhaps, rivalry with 'srecct' (1692 and 1736 ff.) In this way most affixes show some isolation.

* Namely, -ee (ephemeral in character, little call for such an abundance of fanciful or half-serious forms,) -ery (same,) hemi-words from Latin have 'semi-'—"but" (adds the NAD) "there are instances of hybridism in the use of both prefixes,") -inter a number of disused rare words—"no call"—interflux 1657 tr., "A very straight yet exceeding pleasant valley, enriched by the Interflux of the same River Gappell," interludication 1652 Benlowes poetry, internuptials 1654 [op. 'intermarriage' 1579 ff.]
Perhaps those affixes which show greatest isolation are certain suffixes of diminution and feminine distinctions. One, -ook, has already been somewhat elaborated upon (pp. 266—267.) It is perhaps true "That there has been a general drifting away from the use of diminutive suffixes in favor of a noun with suitable modifiers to express the idea of diminution;" and no one will deny that diminutive terms of endearment and even of abuse must be looked for in sequestered places, including the home. The isolation here is, then, somewhat geographic. One leaves thoroughfares where general colloquial English is spoken, and seeks for nooks and crannies, cottages and nurseries, The reward then is (from Key, op. p. 266) "sic a bonnie little wea bit lassie."* As is well known, diminutives denote or connote (as suggested above) endearment or fancy, derision or abuse, or merely littleness of size. We look at them in this order.

L'Estrange "Chas. I"—"I have heard some... passionately ascribe England's calamities to those interpellations, and fetch that irrele stroke of divine Justice... from his marrying a Lady of mis-belief," interpollavit 1673 R. Russell."-ose (chiefly, e.g., from rivalry, but also forms like actuose [-see here a kind of intensive for which app. there was no further call after the 17th c.; its use by Gale and More may be especially noted,) animose [dist. only] anthropo-morphose [a wrong use] striose [obs. as adj. meaning "megrine, sapless," 1703, 1710,] out- (outchange, obs. n.w. "outward or foreign exchange, 1695,) outlouse, obs. n.w. "a means of escape (from duty &c.)" a. 1654 Selden "Table-Talk," over- (overdated, over-inspection 1655 Fuller ['over-looking,'] overmoney 1661 Fuller "worthies," "Some suspect his Officers Trust was undermined (or over-moneied rather)," oversey, "say too much," 1655 Sanderson in sermon, "How hard... it is... not... to over-say, or over-do," over-toise, n.w. 1640, overvislor [see under rivalry,] over-witted, over-word n.w. 1656 Heales "Gold Rem.," "Describ[ing a] small fly, [he] extremely over-worded, and over-spoke himself in his expression of it,") pan- (panharmony 1651 also has "panocracy," pantophile 1693,) para- (parapoint 1647 Ward "Simp. Cob." "The
Ch. VI

Swainling and amuzle are typical of the first (endearment and fancy,) of which not many obsolete examples may certainly be had. Swainling may refer to either a young rustic or a female sweetheart, and was much used between 1615 and 1672. Amuzle is—or was—possibly a fanciful diminutive of 'amuse' in some correspondence by Horace Walpole in 1795, "I thought I could amuse or amuzle myself better by sitting and thinking of you than by going out." So dripplekie, "A very small drop, a driblet," 1669 Culpepper & Cole, "If you squeeze the substance thereof, many little Dripplekies of blood do sweat out," and possibly fibling, floscule, freaking, and godikin, notekin, slimkin. Smilet is possibly not obsolete (1592–1906.) Treasonette is nonce, and dirgy and zonulet, poetic.

In buckling, manling, and miting may show fancy and endearment or contempt. Context decides. The element of contempt does not lie in the suffix of groveling (op. 'groveller') more than in the stem. But it does in ministello 1659, "a petty minister;" and so also punkete and aourling and wasteling and perhaps others. Somewhat like ministello in its formation, but showing little if any spirit of derision, is idolillo, "if the confluence could have been persuaded . . . that those enshrined Idolillos of Diana . . . were no Gods" (1646 J. Gregory in "Notes and Observations.") A more na-

crazile world will crack, in all the middle joynte, If all the ends it hath, have not their parapoynte,") per- (in sense of "very"—perdiligent 1694 Motteux "Rab." "...sedulous Perdiligence," perfidently 1650 B. "Diasollimium," pergrateful 1657, perplacid, perstanize 1357, pertingency 1656, 1708, perlingent [dicta.,] pertransible, -transient, -transition [dicta and mre,] pervene 1692,] pre- (predognit 1654, prefulgency 1660, 1687, pregage 1655 ["pregage' 1649 fr.,] preregrand 1657, preaguation, -tor, -pre-

rution, pre-say, pre-solution, pretlude, prevalid,) re- (in-
teresting to note how Florio and Cotgrave "ushered in" this pre-

fix, and how it was in vogue in 13th than in 17th and 19th

centuries; most of the forms here of rarest occurrence—recon-
tive form, *idolet*, is also obsolete.

And like *idolet* are most of these diminutive forms: *basil*, a little stick, 1657, *baggie*, So., *bolly*, dial., 1724, *closet* 1713 (but 'closet' 1925), *flecket* 1634, *journel* 1776, *molinet* (two senses—'little mill' and 'stick for whipping chocolate' 1643—1723), *moppet*, *sulet*, *shrimpet*, *slippet*, *springlet*, *strappet*, *vallet* (irreg. dimin. of 'valley,' 1647; ) *fortin*, *leafit* 1737 ff., compare 'leaflet' 1737 ff.), *pisicle* (little fish), *shrubble*, *spaddie*, *vorticle*; *cord-lett*, *flosculet* (Herrick, 1643, in "Hesperides," "...in a virgin flosculet,'") *imaglet*, *niplet* (Herrick again), *quarrelet* (Herrick), *ramelet*, *rubelet* (Herrick), 'shiplet' (1552 only, not marked obs.), *stacklet*, *trammelet* (Herrick;) many in -line.* Unquestionably the element of fancy or endearment enters into a few of these.

One does not mean to imply that diminutives will drop out of the language. Diminutive endings like those cited, with examples, above, will always be in demand. Their use may be rare (as is all but
proven in the above forms,) they may enjoy a popularity that waxes and wanes (-ette) or may, as it were, be concentrated in the hands of a few (-ling,) but they are, when really needed, indispensable. Manlet (1637 Ben Jonson—17..,) menny (1630 Jonson only,) 'mankin' (1601 Shakespeare, ff.,) 'mankin' (Byron in 1820, Carlyle in 1831, ff.,) and 'mannie' (Scottish, 1923 ff.) prove nothing unless it is that we have no permanent need for so many forms showing diminution and its secondary associations, and that the use of diminutives is in part a matter of circumstance and mood. Not only the fact speaks out in the diminutive expression, but the speaker's heart.

Not less interesting than diminutives are feminine distinctions. -ette above is one of these, and likewise -ine.* It is

* Miss Louise Pound (see Bib. 525) in an article written for the "English Journal"—"Stunts in Language"—notes how dress and speech have followed the same lines: the formal social appearance of the Victorians versus the sport wear of today, the diction of dignity and the language "with a punch" and picturesque idiom of today. Thus: farmarette, yeomanette, huskerette, officerette, sherifette, chauffarette, Tammanette, alaskerette, white-elephantette, hoboette, kaiserette, sorcerettes and devillettes (describing a stage scene)—all following 'suffragette.' So -ine: actarine, doctorine, knitterine, soldierine.

\[\text{See footnote to previous page and the NED under this affix:}
\text{"In the formation of diminutives expressing merely smallness of size, -ling has never been extensively used; a few writers of the 19th c. have so employed it in nonce-words." Lamb ('javelin-linge') and Gilchrist (philosophling [which perhaps would have had a powerful rival in 'philosophaster' 1611 ff., and pp. 260, 261, footnote,] thinking, metaphysoling) are cited. Carlyle and -kin (Bib. 534) and other affixes come to mind. The services rendered by this type of affix furnish material for further interesting study, especially in the psychology of language. Eva Notzoli's study (Kennedy item 3917) I have not seen.}

-ly (meaning "somewhat") may be mentioned here: Brittly, clutterly (1654 Gayton on Don Quixote,) glory (1670 Lessels "Voy.") "This fire...appear'd to me...to be...of the same glorious colour," 'glowing' 1600 fr.,) lazy, romancy, sauntry, shory, splendy, stumpy, stary, etc.
sarcely possible to think that in sherifess (op. 'sheriffette' on the previous page; 1659, 1661 Fuller, 1919,) triumphress, heroioke (see App. G.) autocratress (1762,) devotress (1624—1699,) and indeed nothing short of a small army of such forms, we have no "proof that feminine distinctions are rapidly giving way to the use of the same term for both the feminine and the masculine."* The simple truth is that dozens and even hundreds of forms in -ess (including -trée, -trice, -drioe, and -trix and -ster, have been coined; many are nonce-formations, many more, of recent occurrence—"to suit a purpose;" occupations have changed hands, and a few of these feminine forms have in consequence disappeared (-ster is here particularly interesting;) few supplied for any real or permanent need.

* Miss Miller, App. A. Elsewhere Miss Miller submits martyrress (1471—1673; 'martyr' a. 900 ff.,) moderatress (1602—1666; 'moderator' a. 1560 ff.,) manifestress (1662 only; 'manifestor' 1612 ff.,) merietress (nonce word 1617; 'meriter' 1607—1651 [app. also obs.,]) messaress (n-w. 1635; 'messiah' 13., ff.,) mourneress (1596 only; 'mourner' 1339 ff.,) For forms in -trix, see below.

The NED is substantially in agreement, showing how this Romantic suffix came to be appended to Eng. agent-nouns in -er in the 14th c. In the next century -er plus -ess gradually superseded the older Eng. fem. agent-na. In -ster which lost the feminine sense. But op. 'spinster.' In the 16th c. -ess was very freely used—so freely, indeed, that "the tendency of mod. usage [is] to treat the agent-nouns in -er, and the abs. indicating profession or occupation, as of common gender, unless there be some special reason to the contrary."

It is interesting to compare the first ed. of R. G. Trench's "English: Past and Present" (1855) with the much later ed. (1839) "revised and in part rewritten" by A. L. Mayhew. The list of -ess words given by Trench in 1855 (Lect. III, pp. 110—111) is much augmented by Mayhew (pp. 258—262.) Verification of the 144 terms in -ess (including -trez) given by Mayhew, for the purpose of possibly sifting out reasons and facts, as to obsolescence, did not seem worth while. The long list is impressive, however, for two things: names of coiners, Willett to Carlyle (or "beyond,";) and the unneededness of most of the terms submitted: poisonress, knightess, saintess, admirales, archeress, fellowess, dogress, intrudress, &c., &c., &c. The truth would
Perhaps we can understand how it is with people and words still more clearly if we pause over a few very scattered matters. First, most interestingly, is Wiclif and his Bible. Trench and Mayhew have sought out some 19 terms—tetheress, friendess, sinneress, purpureess, thralless, weileress, &c.—but leperess is perchance the most interesting. Even in the first attempt, Wiclif provided a synonym—"leperess, or tumbler" (1382;) and six years after he paraphrased it "daunseress." The Vulgate reads "saltatricis," the nearest to which English appears to have come was in 1734, saltatress (only reference.) It seems obvious that Wiclif's task was not less linguistic than literary. Then there is Spenser and metre—and possibly imagery—in pedleress, championess, avengeress, creatress, Britoness, and several others. The eighteenth and twentieth centuries seem to stand in contrast to the other periods of English life and expression. Not that the earlier century seems to be devoid of -ess words, but in the list by Trench-Mayhew they are fewer: so in the twentieth century—our own times. Why? An expert in literature, language, and psychology might have a hard time telling. Certainly it is not just because "things change." Occupations have been mentioned. Equally important is the change that takes place in people—especially respecting sex. In a contemporary court of law (in America) Miss Edna St. Vincent Millay felt it accordingly seem to lie between the above statements from Miss Miller and the N.D., and (p. 260) "English Past and Present:" "Tennyson's 'ostleress' is a proof that the power of forming words on this scheme has not wholly gone from us . . . " As the authors remark, the newspapers have given -ess, from time to time, much vogue. See Bib. 486 and 602, and 550 and 534.

* See Bib. 373—G. P. Krapp's "Rise of English Literary Prose," and Bib. 91 and 249 (Fairfax-Glanvill,) and pp. 11, 84, 226, &c.
her duty to correct a magistrate: "Not 'poetress,' your honor, but poet." It is more than probable that women have given death-blows to some of the feminine distinctions.* Finally, the lexicographer has apparently puzzled over many of these -ess and -tress (also -trice and -trix) forms. For while he labels buildress (1566, 1650 Fuller, 1822) "Obs. (or nonce-word,)" and many others obsolete —destroyeress (from a translation in 1662,) devotess (1658,) entertainess (1709,) razbalesse (1743 Richardson)—, he seems to hesitate over 'whipstress' (1707 translation,) 'promtress' (1793,) 'administrateress' (1775,) 'oratress' (1586—1843,) 'architecturess' (1601—1860.) Dates may influence him, and the notion that regardless of what disposition he makes of his words, the amazing little prefix will still somewhere always be in evidence. Advocateess (1641, 1647,) advocateesse (1334, 1495, 1531—Chaucer, Caxton, Elyot,) and advocratress (1631, 1749 Wesley,) or autoocratress (1762,) autoocratric (1767 Chesterfield in a letter,) and possibly 'autocratrix" (1762, 1844) may all, indeed, be obsolete; but immediately 'aviatrix' comes straight to view!

What is true of -ess and -tress seems to be true of French -trice and Latin -trix. Indeed, -trice is particularly obsolete.

* "We do not call a female author an authress; and, if a lady writes poems, she is, now-a-days, called a poet, rather than a poetress, which is almost obsolete."—Dr. Priestley in 1761. (quoted by Hall, pp. 122—123.) Johnson defined: "a she poet." See Leonard's Univ. of Wis. study, sect. 17.3. It is interesting to compare the remarks on 'female' by Lougborough in an article (see Bib. 507.) The NID notes further that formations like professioness, entertainess, instructress came in in the 17th century (vbs. and -ess,) "but none of these obtained general currency." The form poetress was used between 1560 and 1756 ('poetress' 1530 ff.)

For a few statistics, see the end of this section, p. 239 below.
It was formerly used, states the Oxford Dictionary, in many words—
corruptrice, directrice, genetrice, imperatrice, mediatrix, or-
trice, &c.—but "Modern English prefers the form -trix from the Lat.
nom., especially in legal and learned words . . . in others . . . the
compound suffix -tress." Hence, benefactrice (1711 only, Shaftes-
bury) and benefactrix (1713 only, "London Gazette") where time has
shown 'benefactress' (1711–1934) sufficient; likewise coadjuratrice
(1649–1756) and 'coadjutress' and even 'coadjutrix,' and directrice
(1631, 1730) and 'directress' (1591 ff.,) or electrice (1695, 1710,
both the "London Gazette") and electrix (1665 "Lond. Gaz.") and
'electress' (1613 ff.)—an ever-varying pattern of forms. But here
we encroach upon the ensuing section of our study—adjustments and
rivalry. Without much trouble, many forms like bablatrice (nonce,)
bellairice (dictionary,) and correctricse (1541, 1711 Shaftesbury;
-trix 1615, 1645, -tress 1611–1765—"no permanent need") could be
brought together. The forms ambassadrice (1693 Temple, 1697 "Lond.
Gaz.") ambassadrix, ambassadrice (1641 only,) and ambassatrix (1639
only) are also interesting for their dates.

-Trix seems especially to show rivalry with -tress, and ap-
ppears not only as a feminine suffix, but occasionally emerges in
words like formatrix and 'creatrix' ("Imagination Creatrix"—J. L.
Lowes in "The Road to Xanadu.") -Trix is phonetically interesting.
One is almost tempted to psycho-analyze 'aviatrix' and observatrix
and sequestretrix (&c., &c.)—or perhaps one should say, the users
of these forms. Thus Nugent in 1772: "Why should it not be said,
she was not a common woman, but a geniusess, and an elegant writrix?"
Does -trix sometimes possibly "accord" more neatly, or artfully, or
"smartly," than -trice and -tress?
About the only generalization that can be made is that, ever in need of names and distinctions in names for things, and ever susceptible, orally and otherwise, to the possibility of harmonies in language, we shall probably continue to use these affixes. The adjustments that have taken place among them, the story of -ster, the difficulty of a plural for -trix, times and places of entry into English, nonce-uses, and other matters would make an instructive and entertaining chapter in the history of our vocabulary. *

So amazingly numerous are forms with two or more affixes each, in our vocabulary, that we shall consider only such affixes as show considerable and definite rivalry or differences, and only such examples as are possibly more interesting or characteristic.

* Such a chapter is obviously outside the field of this study; notwithstanding, a few brief, detached comments will indicate what is of interest or importance.—
On the plural of -trix (shift in pronunciation to keep pure,) see H. W. Fowler, "Modern English Usage," pp. 563--664. 'Proseautrix,' 'proseautrices;' but 'matrix,' 'matrices,' &c.

When occupations, such as baking, tailoring, weaving, changed hands (women to men,) forms in -ster became either masc. or neut., became indiscriminately, synonyms of forms in -er. Thus 'deemster,' 'deemer.' From the 16th c. on, -ster : masc. In Mn. the affix goes always with substantives. Rubaster, 1697 only, is anomalous. Occasionally -ster lends disparagement: 'rhymester,' 'rhymer,' 'joker;' but usually its function is in the way of trade-distinctions: drugster, dabster, punster, tipster; obs.: knitster (1648, 'knitter' 1515 ff.,) prigster (1633, 1714, 1307 [var. senses,] 'prig,' 'thief' &c.,) quackster (1709 "Brit. Apol." 'quack' 1659 ff., 'quackalver' 1797 ff.,) roomster (1674 Fairfax; "an occupant of space,") shamster (1716, n.w.? 'shammer' obs. 1677—1696, lv. 136.—,) throwster (1332, dice-throw,) timbester, whorster (1544, 'whorer' 1640 [obs.] 'whoremonger' 1526 ff.)

Miss Miller adds (misc.:) mongster (female trader; only as the second element in combinations: flourmongster 1251; mongster a. 975 ff.,) motild (a female disputant a. 1225—a. 1240,
relegating to a footnote* a few notes on minor rivalries and adjustments. For convenience' sake, we take all in alphabetical order.—

-Able and -ible illustrate rather nicely the fact that people do have linguistic feelings. The NED notes that "-able is the universal form of the adj. suffix as a living element; -ible being only a fossil survival in words from Lat. like horrible, possible, visible.

'mooter' 1000–1327, is obs. in this sense, mulatta (a female mulatto, 1622–1829; 'mulatto' 1585 ff.)

It would be interesting, with the New English Dictionary now at hand, to take the 144 terms (see footnote on p. 294) submitted by Trench and Mayhew and compare their dates with the dates of corresponding masculine forms. The writer has done this for more than half—77 or 125—of the words collected for this study, rare or obs. forms with feminine suffixes. Want of space prevents giving the examples here (see App. B) but a careful count shows that most of the masculine forms were between one and three centuries earlier than the corresponding feminine forms: practically contemporary—10 (sinneress, alaverna)

mas. form 1/2 century earlier—9 ('architect' 1563 ff., architecturesse 1601 ff., 'babbler' 1530 ff., babblatrice 1595 only;)

mas. form earlier by one century—13 ('attendant' 1555 ff., attendress 1662; 'compurgator' 1533 ff., compurgatrix 1663, 'tráms' 1591 only;)

mas. form two or more centuries earlier—43 ('baker,' 'chancellor,' 'devil,' 'fellow,' 'player,' &c., &c.)

Beyond dates, to be sure, numbers of uses (times used) might reveal much, and most certainly the ways in which feminine forms were used, attitudes taken, &c., would furnish much material for thought. There is no doubt in the writer's mind that masculine forms intrinsically and otherwise show much more stability than feminine; they seem to show plain serviceability and sometimes a kind of practical modesty.

* The term 'rivalry' is indeed open to abstraction, and is used in this study only very indifferently. Words and affixes possess no consciousness, of course, and so at most could be but passive rivals. Moreover, any rivalry they may seem to us to display, in the New English Dictionary or out of it—from any "Pisgah sight," as Professor Saintebury was fond of saying—is always conditioned by proximity of dates, by definite use, and, if possible, by people's attitudes (see -al below.) It seems more reasonable, accordingly, to speak simply of an accumulation and superfluity of forms and affixes in a long course of time.

Some of the more prominent oppositions among affixes were mentioned earlier in the chapter (pp. 261–262,) and these are detailed in the discussion above; a number of lesser adjustments may be listed as follows:
But in Eng. there is a prevalent feeling for retaining -ible wherever there was or might be a L. -iblis: while -able is used for words of distinctly Fr. or Eng. origin, as conceivable, movable, speakable. Hence, where there is a verb in French and English, as well as in Latin, English usage is distracted by conflicting and irreconcilable analogies" (NED under 'ble'; see also Fowler "Mn. Eng. Usage"

A.: 'fore-', 'un-', 'non-', 'con-', 'il-', &c. Aboding 1710, 'boding' 1297 ff., 'foreboding' 1337 ff. 1536 ff. Agoncal 1753, 'unoconical' 1632 ff. Ageometrical 1669, 'un-' 1570 ff. 'non'-? Aggelation 1691 only, Sir T. Browne, 'congelation' 1536 ff. 'congealing' 1471 ff., 'congealment' 400 ff. Algebraical 1709 only, objectum 1679; 'illogical' 1558 ff. Amelet 1761, 1775; 'omele' 12605 ff. &c. See below, weakening, pp. So abeciod 1650 Bulwer, only ref.; also abecedent, abegession &c.; 'recede' 1480 ff. Absumption 1651, 1661, absone 1560-1756; 'consume' 1563 ff. So ascorinate 1655 only, 'in-' 1730 ff. So affuated 1649 Milton, 'in-' 1642 ff. So assequent 1657 only, 'sub-' 1460 ff. Assinate 1742 Fielding, 'in-' 1647 ff. Astrictive 1656 only, 'con-' ff. Assimil 1657, 'consem' 1536 ff. All of these Morris calls "dead." ac.: '-io' (4) '-al,' '-an.' Harmoniac n-w. 1771, 'harmonic' 1570 ff. Hagemoniac 1656 (3) 1678; 'hagemonic' 1656 ff. Pulmoniac 1657 only, '-io' 1694 ff. Tragediac anomalous forma. for 'tragetho' (3) 1732 only Eliz. Blower (2.) Precordial, prae-, ab. obs. irreg. perh. after 'cordiac,' 1671, 'precordial' 1530 ff. Sothiac 1794, 'Sothian' 1567 ff. This suffix from the Gr. "of the heart, "of the sun") occurs in learned words, sometimes formerly as -aque, -a(a(e, -aak. an.: '-al,' 'an.' '-al, '-al, '-eous' (3), '-eral,' '-io' (5), (8), 'ian.' Orchestran 1765 only, '-al' 1811. Adamantean 1671 Milton only, 'adamatile' 1392 ff. Augusteian 1678 only, Cudworth; 'Augustan' 1704 ff. Constantinian 1652 Urc., only, 'eous' 1765 ff. Plumbeian 1656 Blount, 1683 Cudw. 1733 Pott; "leaden, lead-coloured." 'plumeous' 1823 Cockram, ff. Whitrean 1656 Blount, 1773; 'vitreous' 1646, 'vitreous' 1667, 'glassy.' Ephemerian 1904 only, 'Miniature" 'Celestial Peacock...whose consol plumes diffuse a herd of ephemeral dyes!' 'ereal' (sense 2.) 1639 ff. Druidic 1678 only, 'druidic' 1773 ff. Letherian 1659 only, Lethargle 1398, 1612 ff., Tartarcan 1759, 1804; 'Tartaran 1590 ff. Singularitan 1647 and 1653, and singularist 1593 ff., seem both to be obs. from sense rather than from form. ane (chiefly obs.).: 'aneous' Antecedean 1655, so the adv. 1663, 1693; 'aneous' 1530 ff. This was also the arbitr. ending proposed by Davey for names of monochlorides now obs. at.: '-ary' (4) '-alous,' '-al,' '-io.' Anomalar 1709 only, 'anomalous' 1646 ff. Antiphoner 1765 Burns, '-ary' 1681 ff.
'Uncontrovertible' (1664 ff.) and 'uncontroverbibly' (1755 ff.) over uncontrovertably (a. 1659; 'controvertible' 1614 ff., 'controvertibly' in modern dictionaries; forms in -able and -ably not recorded) is possibly an example of the effect of this "prevalent feeling," as is also undiscernable (1596—1794; undiscernable-ness 1645, 1654) against the common seventeenth century 'undis-

Lapidar 1767 only, 'lapidary' not quite the same meaning, 1931 (sb. 1324 ff.,) 'stony,' &c. Intermaxillar 1301 (anat.) 'ary' 1926 ff. Unexemplar 1635, exemplar as adj. obs. 1570—1739; 'exemplary' 1623 or 1614 ff. Globar 1699; 'globular' 1676 ff. 'globular' 1656 ff. Parabol 1655, parabolary, -ar 1652 Uq.; 'parabolic' 1702 ff., 'parabolical' 1574 ff., but now rare. and :: 'er.' Babelard 1678 Mrs. Behn; 'babbler' 1530 ff. See pp. 270—272 above.

at :: 'con-.' Attingence 1673, -ency, 1642—1675, -ent and v. also obs. 'contingent' does not have quite the same meaning. See a-., ad- above.

be :: 'dis-' (2,) 'a-, 'en.' Bestented 1649 Herrick, only ref., be here is intensive; 'distended' 1537 ff. Bestraughted 1650 only; bestraught, -ing, astraught, 1564, 1593, bestract 1591, all obs. Bestraught is an assumed pres.; analogically it should be 'bestraukt,' but this word was not found by readers for the NBD. 'Distracted' 1632 ff. 'Distrat' 1723 ff. Bestride prep. 1913 only, v. living, for 'astride' 1664 ff. Bestride 1661 only, 'entwine' 1616 ff.

bis :: 'bi-' Bisannual 1725; 'biennial' 1621 ff.

cir: :: 'in-' or superfl. Circumspect 1667, 1709, -tious 1649, 1656; adj. 1422 ff. 'Inspect' was

cor :: 'ex-' Cohortation 1642—1707, abhort 1481, 1572 only; 'exhortation' 1362 ff. Corrode 20. 1652, so corrosion loc. 1781 'eroding,' 'erosion,' &c.

cum :: 'ex-' Composition 1644—1729, 'explosion' 1744 ff.

du :: 'bi-' L. 'dus,' 'two.' Sometimes improperly used to form other mod. cpds. than 'two,' where 'bi-' is the proper formation (or 'di-') So ducameral, 'bicameral,' duoglott, 'di-glott,' dualiteral, 'biliteral,' duo-pedal, 'bipedal' (all 19th c.) Duparted 1583, 'biparted' 1586 ff.; 'bipartite' 1754 ff. ed :: (many suffixes) Asated (p. 261,) unfashioned, uneased where sense calls for forms in -able; 'posthumus' 1651 only, 'posthumous,' equangled 1660—1695, 'equilateral' 1660 ff.

es :: 'at,' 'atum.' Despotes 1656, 'despotat' 1666 ff. Muscat 1660 only, 'museum' 1615.

et :: 'lat.' Canon, cannoner humorously fr. 'Canon' after 'canonneer' 1641, 1659, 1691, esp. as in Baxter, turning "this Canon against his Cannoners." 'Canonist' 1542 ff.
cernible.' Indefendable 1671 is a somewhat contrary example, since the positive form is 'defendable' and there is no 'defensible' — but there is an 'indefensible' (1569 ff.) The Latin type 'dispensrabile' is behind dispensable and indispensable (1661—1766, 1662—1792,) but our form is 'dispensable' (1533 ff., 'indispensable' 1696 ff.) Other contrary forms are rejectible (1702, 1743, 'rejectable' 1611 ff.)


equv...' -an' It. L. Fr. OGH 'iso,' Chiefly nonce-words, jocular. Someaque 1696 tr.—1706 tr. 'Somasician' 1392 ff.

eur...' -ity.' Profundeur 1653 Sir T. B., 1661; 'profundity' ex...' -ob-', 'dis-', 'in-' or 'con-.' Exolete 1611—1705, 'obsolate' 1579. Exolusion 1486 (also 1574—1774,) 'dissolution' 1522 ff. Extraction 1652—1665, 'instruction,' 'construction'.

faction...'faction' Mollification 1222—1374 (but only one actual use; 'Isola. in suffix, 'faction' properly added to vbs. in 'fy' representing Lat. 'facere;' 'faction' is proper suffix where 'fy' represents 'ficere'—"mollification" c. 1396 ff.—from Miss Miller.)

factory 16. 'læg' Apifactory 1677, 'apairy' 1654—1236.

ferous...' -ative.' Luciferous 1648, 1669, 1707, 'lucrative' 14. ff.


fy...' -ize' (2.), '-ste' (3)... Angelify 1653 only, 'angelize' (arch.) 1633 ff., 'angelicize' 1852 only. Individuality 1661 Fuller (only ref.) "The Statute of Additions, was made in the first of King Henry the Fifth, to Individualie (as I may say) and separate persons from those of the same name;' 'individualize' 1637 ff. Fecundify 1730, 1763 only, 'fecundate' 1631 ff.,
and untractible, untractibility (1670, 1676; 'untractable' 1538—1924, tractible not recorded; Latin 'tractabils'.) Elsewhere -able has been displaced by -ous (effluviale 1691 only, effluvious 1669 ff., iniquitable 1734 only, 'iniquitous' 1726 ff.,) -ful (painable 1649 Evelyn, only reference, 'painful' 1340 ff.,) -ive (sportable 1767,) and the like.


id: 'old' Id not a uniq. formative in Eng. Lymphoid 1674, 'lymphoid' 1667 ff.

il: 'un-' (assimila. of in-before L.) Illiable 1649, ill-lapsable 1662, illigentiate 1659, 'unlicensed,' illineal 1647, illuxurious 1751. Question of accord of sounds?

ile: 'ine,' 'e,' 'ible.' Feminile 1650 only, 'feminine' 1499 ff., erratile 1652 only (of a star,) 'erratic' 1647 ff., refrangible 1797, 'refrangible' 1673 ff.

ine: 'eous' (2,) 'ic' (2,) 'al' (2,) 'esa,' 'ar,' 'ish.' Gypseous 1695 only, 'gypseous' 1661 ff., Tartarine 1731, Tartareous 1655 ff., electrine 1657, vitrioline 1652—1703, vitriolic 1670 ff., gutturine 1692 only, 'guttural' palatine 1656, 1711, 1773 &c., 'palatal' 1923 (distinctions in meaning—phonetics,) negrine 1703, 'negress' 1746 ff., circulaire 1647, 'circular' 1430 ff., aspine 1644, 'aspish' 1609 ff.

inter: 'con-' 'sub-' Interclusion 1623, 1671, 1793, 'conclusion' 1521 ff. Intercutaneous 1651, 'sub-' 1660 ff.


ion: '-ing,' '-eave,' '-ure.' 'Ation' is esp. frequent, and has become a living formative; see -tion. -ion and -tion are not living formatives. Fowler, "Mn. Eng. Usage" p. 294, states
-acy, which usually goes with substantives of quality, state, or condition, is—or has been—sometimes irregularly attached to nouns of action. Analogy and phonological "laws" in part explain, then, the obsolescence of co-ordinacy, disconsolation, immoderacy (and moderacy,) inconconsideracy, and originaacy and perhaps others;* for properly and regularly the Latin (participles in '-at-us' of verbs in

"The philologist sometimes knows why one form exists & the other does not—why e. g. we say infliction & not infraction but punishment & not punition. ... The conclusion is that usage should be respected, & words that have been rarely used or may easily be coined, such as abolishment, admonishment [&c.], should not be lightly resorted to when abolition, admonition [&c.] are at hand." Both -ion and -ment have equal claims to represent verbal ideas of action; but there is no such line or relationship between -ion and -ness ('abjectness' e.g. is fr. adj. and implies a state of quality; 'abjection' is fr. vbl. stem and indicates a process or action.) It should be noted that the 'punishment' (1425 ff.) is rare now, 'punitive,' '-ly,' '-ness,' '-tory' (1727-1909) are exceedingly common; and Mr. Fowler's statement about the philologist might be clarified. But -ion and -ment, as Mr. Fowler says, easily pass from the idea of process or action to that of product: -ion thus usurps too often the function and very place of -ness. -Ing is, as it were, a "way out."

Flutteration 1754, 1771, 1905, 'fluttering.' Permanence 1646 Sir T. Browne, 1659; two words only of this kind; 'permanence' 1432 ff. Superstructure 1624—1693, 1612, 1637, 1644

Superstructure' 1645 ff; ir(re) ... 'unre-' 'dis-' 'non-' &c. Irreconcilation 1650—

example of "accord.") Irresemble 1769 only, "an incomplete re-
resolve;" app. no 'unresolve.' Irresignation 1657, 1752, 'un-
resignedness,' 'unresignation' & Irresistant a. 1653; 'non-
Irreputable 1709, 1749; 'dis-' 1772 ff. Irrespective 1677 Gale,
only ref., 'unrespectful,'
'sirespectful' 1677 ff. Irresinible 1746 Only, 'invincible' 1412 ff.

Later:.. '..or' Summonister 1311, 1335, 'summonitor' also obs.

lie:..: '1st,' '1-an;'. . . Buddhist 1803—1916, early syn. of
'Buddhist' 1801 ff. Pythagorite 1652, 1746, '1st' ?Obs. 1576...
'Pythagorean' 1550 ff. Galilee v. 1735, 1791. 'coalesce' 1639 ff.

like: ..: 'ful.' Powerlike 1657 only, 'powerful' 1400 ff.

This element is much used today, however—'godlike,' &c.

less: ..: 'un-. . Abashless r. 1369, 'unabashed' 1571. Devote-
less 1650, 1739, 'undevout.' Paintless 1729 (also vsg. 1599 ff.)
'unpaintable' Reclaimless 1652. Poguilleless 1657 only.

Sublimbless 1650 Fuller. Successless 1657 only.

mis: ..: 'dis-' 'ill-. Miss Miller (App. A) gives these two
'antagonists,' and cites the Oxford Dictionary saying that mis-
expressing negation of something good or desirable is equivalent
to dis—; discomfort, miscontenting, misfavor, mistake, mis-
non, misowning, misregard, misservice. It is somewhat op-
posed to 'ill-' in misentreating, misusing, misuse.

('Abusement') Miss Miller submits: misaction 1693, misactor
1659 (she classifies these, and others below, under "Isolation
in stem"—"actor" meaning 'doer': fig. in later usage;)
miscounciler 1684 only; misappellant 1657 only; misfavor
1660, 'dis-' 1570 ff.; misowning 1661, 'dis-' 1654 ff.

Further investigation shows—but inconclusively—that 'mis-
forms were probably earlier than 'dis' (5 out of 8; 2 'dis-
early than 'mis' [but one by only a few years]; and 1 'dis-
and 'mis' both a. 1300.

most: ..: .. Thinnest 1644, 'thinnest,' 900 ('thin')
no ..: 'un' No-certain 1659, 'uncertain' 1400
non ..: 'in-' (5), 'un-' (5), 'dis-' Non-attendance 1677, also
adv., 'inattention' So: Non-concurrency 1696 (2.) Non-
efficiency 1643. Non-sincere 1656 only, Harrington "Ocean" Non-
supportive 1668. Non-feelingless 1650, 'un-' Non-script
1657, 'unwritten.' Non-consenter 1661, 'in' 1680, 'dis-
ob ..: 'con-' (5), 'ab-', 'ad-' L. "in the direction of" &c. &c.

Sometimes pleonastic. Obsorb 1684 only, 'absorb' 1553 ff.
Obstinate 1653 only, 'constipate' 1550-dx. Obstortion 1656 only,
"contortion" 1601 ff. Obene 1654 only, 'advene' 1603 ff. 'convene"
Ch. VI

The suffix -al shows true rivalry. Of the 107 examples in -al, -enal, -enal, and -ual (including spectabundal) collected for this study, 97 adjectives help to show the rivalry of forms in '-ous, '-ic(al)', and others, or compounded with '-like,' while the 10 re-

1429 ff. Obviscate 1634 tr., 1710; "smear over."

al: : 'all.' Omnipresent 1673 (Greek.), omniscient 1622 only, Donne, omniscient 1543-1670.
on: : 'on,' On-forced 1656 only, Don. Mon. tr. "It would be sufficient to obstruct that on-forced" (so Add. 1669, 1674] Donative."

or: : 'our,' 'our.' See NED under these suffixes, and 'mis-'

demeanour' as a noun meaning "a person guilty of misdemeanor"

andresponsor and sailor (the ship, 1642-1775), 'sailor,' &c.

* In 16 of these, the suffix -(i)al is superfluous (see p. ;)

dates for the others are not as helpful as one might wish: lvg.
form earlier than obs. in -al (2c.) 39 (5 very much earlier;)
-al (obs.) form earlier, 25; -al (obs.) and lvg. forms both of
about the same date, 24. The following lists are not quite com-
plete.--

-al and '-ic'

alcoloreal 1592, 1637
anachoretal 1656, 1651
amnounachial 1710, 1660
autometal 1692, 1612
astrophelial 1709, 1733
cryptographial 1691, 1824

-al, 1634-

diastereal 1735, 1940
embolismal 1691, 1796
forensial 1650, 1599
geometrical 1697, 1630
herosical 1682, 1600
Jeusal 1672, 1640, 1700
philanthropial 1646, 1777
romancial 1653, 1659
sapeoral 1651, 1704
theogonial 1727, 1940
tyranical 1651, 1691
-i and '-ious'

amigious 1693, 1658
amblygial 1705, 1831
delayrial 1652, 1643

drigynial 1637, 1654
dysnial 1676, 1636

frumental 1670
fumentaceous 1633
fumenterious 1670
igneal 1682, 1664
'flery' 1257 ff.
infential 1658, 1646
nitral 1642, 1661
ophrnal 1650, 1647
ominal 1652, 1692
pulsnal 1660, 1673
pulverial 1657, 1673
semoticonal 1723, 1634
saporial 1651, 1670
terminial 1754, 1644
vitpanic 1660, 1646

American, 1651, 1679
castratal 1657, 1657
chreomatal 1592, 1659
epitonal 1774, 1652
homoeotnal 1635, 1674
replical 1655, 1672
subental 1656, 1681
subterreal 1652, 1650
subterreal 1652, 1670

amical 1658, 1659
amical 1657, 1657
amious 1675, 1675
'mimeable' 1749 ff.
mortal -ous, -eous, -ine, -ish, -ous; temporial, &c.

Interesting too are alpestral, lectural, notarial, rentual, ro-

manceealist, sacrammonial, sortal (p. 67), vipeontal, wanal, &c.
remaining examples—substantives—seem to indicate some sort of uncertainty. Still other words in -al indicate that this suffix is itself a powerful rival of 'noe' and possibly other affixes, that it is very much alive today; and where there is so much genuine activity, there is bound to be (and to have been) some disuse.

osity Compound suffix; see under -lay below.
over: 'out-', 'super-' ... Overdated 1641 (2) 1649, over-money 1661 Fuller, 1655, oversay 1655 Sanderson in sermon, "How hard a thing it is to do or say all that is needful in weighty business, and not in some thing or other to over-say, or over-do." Over-sob 1664 Evelyn "Sylva." Over-toise 1440, Browning. Overvisor 1653 tr.; 'supervisor.' Over-willed, overwit 1647, 1671, 1745 ('outwit' 1652 ff.), over-witted, over-word 1656; over-inspection 1655 Fuller.

* The substantives are: avoidal 1695 only, 'avoiding' 1494 ff., 'avoidance' 1610 ff. Deportal 1323 Galt, "When my father took his deportal to a better world;" 1336 the same author in "Tait's Mag." "...my deportal from Glasgow." After 'arrival;' 'departure' 1533 ff., departange also obs., 1579, 1592. 'Disguisal' rare only: 1652, 1834 "Tait's Mag." Disquietal 1642 only, H. More; 'disquieting' 1535 ff. Entral 1647 only, H. More; 'entry' 1330 ff., 'entrance' 1601 ff. Imposeal 1641, 1651 only; 'imposing' 1610 ff., 'imposition' 1597 ff. Observal 1734, 1765; 'observing,' 'observation' 1390 ff. Renewal 1646 only, Earl Monm. tr.; 'renewal,' 'renunciation' 1494 ff. Returnal 1657; 'return' 1390 ff. (redundant?) surprisal 1660, 1799; 'surprise' 1591 ff. (redundant?)

H. W. Fowler in his "Dictionary" (p. 14 ff.)) speaks of examples like 're visal,' 'refutable' &c. failing to become familiar; of need in isolated occasions for forms with distinct shades of meaning—"the acquittal of a murderer, the accusation of a murderer;" and makes a plea for the use of the gerund over unfamiliar -al words (nouns) or invention of new -al words.

L. R. M. Strachen in "Notes and Queries" (11 S. VII. Apr. 5, 1913 and May 24, 1913) investigates this suffix and discovers that it does not especially go with Scottish, legal, or commercial terms. He records (from the MEP) 110 words and forms, fairly representative lists of 6 words for the 14th c., 7 for the 15th, 16 for the 16th, 41 for the 17th, 8 for the 18th, and 32 for the 19th. The 17th c. was thus 'an age of experiment;' the 18th, "cautious;" the 19th, "adventurous." 'Disallowal' will perhaps supplant 'disallowance' just as 'approval' (rare bef. 1800) supplanted 'approvance' &c. A careful checking of the 17th c. words ('comittal' misplaced) shows only a few obsoletisms, but much rareness of use for -al forms, and earlier dates for '-ing,' '-ation' and the like.
So too the suffixes -ant and -ary terminating adjectives, participial or pure, had rivals in '-ing', '(i)al', '-our', '-ar', 'io', '-ous,' and quite a number of others. It will be seen in the lists below* that often the living form was earlier (compare -al, footnote page 296,) and that more than half the obsoletisms were of rarest occurrence. Nevertheless, the fact (possibly) that Sir Thomas Browne

 transtitant, posthumary, '1761, 1764, 1765. Posthumary 1769, posthumous 1752, posthumous 1767. Posthumous 1664 only (while others have not quite the same meaning, they may be compared—forms, that is, with 'de-', 'con-', 'e-' (ex,) 'sub-'.)

* Of the 20 forms with -ant, 13 are rare; of the 49 with -ary, 27 are rare. Of the 17 with -ant: -ant earlier: 2; living rivals earlier: 9; obs. and lvg. fe. approx. same dates: 7. Of 37 with -ary: -ary form earlier: 7; living form earlier: 23 (at least 9 of these much [i.e., more than a century] earlier; ) same date: 7.

-Ant and '-ing' 9 examples; and 'ate(d):' 2; and '-ive:' 2; and '-er:' 2; and '-ist:' 1; and '-ar,' '-ary,' '-or,' 1 each. E. g.: detestant 1648, 1670; 'destest' 1650, 'destester.' So edifying, emaciant, extenuant (1756, 'ing' 1607 ff.,) funambulant, glutinant (1634; so glutinatory 1657 only; 'ive' 1578 ff..) incrassant, intestant (1673 only, 'intestate' 1737 ff.,) intestant. Languishant, naturalizant, numerant, obilgant, prassiant, prassiant, protentant (1670, 'ive' 1259 ff.,) thelogant, ubigant, vermaculant. -ary and '(i)al' 14; and '-er:' 5; and '-ous:' 7; '-ing:' 3; '-io:' 3; '-ry,' 'airy,' '-or,' '-ist,' '-ant,' '-ive,' '-y:' 1 each. E. g.: athletant 1660, 'io' 1636 ff.; atrabilant 1672-1751, 'ious' 1761, 'iary' 1331 ff.; automant 1666, 1653, 'io' 1743 ff.; bolant, conditionant 1665, 1679, 'al' 1390 ff.; consumptionant, digerant 1769, 'al' 1656 ff.; insidant 1670 only (3 Uses by Hacket,) 'al' 1644; indigemant 1651, 1653, Biggs, Urq., 'ous' 1646 ff.; influentant 1659 H. More, 'er' 1664 ff.; intermasulant 1650, 'er' 1822 ff.; muddiness and 'mundial' both 1656 Blount; occasionaly 1702 Farghier, 'al' 1631 ff.; ornamental 1715 only, 'al' 1646 ff.; ovary, posthumous 1652, 1654, 'ous' 1619 ff.; professionont, sermony, tubular, usury (esp. interesting;) vaporant, ventillant, others.
was the first to use in writing both *additionary* (1692 only) and "addition" (1646 ff.) has its significance. Before 'undulous' (1723 ff.) or even 'undulating' (1711 ff.; 'undulate' the verb 1664 ff.)
suggested themselves, Sir Thomas conceived, after the Latin type 'undularius,' an adjective *undulary* in the "Pseudodoxia Epidemica"—
"The blasts and undulary breaths thereof maintain no certainty in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re ... 'in-,' 'con-,' 'de-,' ...</th>
<th>Redented 1753, 'dented,' 'indent-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ed.' Regredation 1650 only and Phillips (1673,) 'con-.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter (ad. Fr.) 1654, 1699 only, 'encounter.' Reportation</td>
<td>1647 Lilly, only ref. &quot;The fact of being carried back.&quot; A huge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and useful prefix, but having many rare-obs. and nonce-obs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RY:** reduced form of *-ery* (see below.)

- **semi** ... 'sub,' 'half.' Semi-carbonate, semi-casette.
- **ship** ... '-ness' (2,) '-cy' (2,) '-hood.' Almightyship 1663 only, '-ness' 1520 ff. Polyship 1639, '-ness' 1619 (Lat.), 1450 ff. Bankruptcy 1656 only, '-cy' 1700 ff. Insignship 1745 only, '-hood' 1649 ff. (See p. 279.)
- **some:** '-able,' '-ish,' '-ous,' '-ful.' Cleavesome 1674 Fairfax, Grew (only 2 refs.) 'fissile' 1661, 'disposable' 1646 ff. So Liquoreome, needsome, toyeome. See pp. 279—279.
- **sopher:** ... '-mancer' Chirospheber 1643 (title.), '-mancer' 1566 ff.
- **sub** ... 'under,' '-in,' '-a,' '-de.' Sub-bailiff, -bailly 14._1757. Subservant 1661, "A poor apothecary's subservant, whose work is to look to the stills, and sweep the shop." Subscription 1671, 1652 Sir T. Browne, 1703, 1714 "Genti. Mag." 'inscription' 1661 ff. Subsume 5. gen. 1643 Hammond, 1674, 1694 Johnson; 6. 1677 Barrow, 1673 Starkey (2,) — 2 uses. 'Assume.' So also suppression in sense of 'depression,' 1709, 1753. Suspend 9b. 'depend' 1678, 1797.
- **super:** 59 obs. wds. and uses here. Webster's 1923 Collegiate Ed.: 91 main words. Words having *super-* but no permanent status in vocab. such as our meaning does not require (a test shows.) See p. 279. Some rivalry with 'pre-?' superposit, superlinary.
- **supra:** 'super.' Supercargo 1667 Denham, 1674, 1719 De Foc, 1914, 1924, 1944. 'Supercargo' 1697 ff. Supra-vise, -visian, -visor, 1566—1694 (Gassigne, Taylor, Barrow; esp. Taylor [4,]) 'super-' 1606 ff. "In much less vogue than 'super'" — NED under supra.

**Phonetic accord?** See again p. 279.

- **tion:** ... '-ing' (3,) ' -ingue ' (3,) '-ment' (2,) others. See -ion.

their course" (1646;) and although a word, 'oval,' existed (1577 ff.) for his need, the knight wrote somewhat strangely, "Their honorary Crowns triumphal, ovary, civilis, obsidional, had little of Flowers in them" ("Tracts," a. 1632.) Both -ant and -ary signify—or help to signify—"a man (or male) belonging to or engaged in" ('informant,' 'Protestant,' 'adherent,' &c., and 'antiquary,' 'apothecary,' 'secretary;') but glossary as used by Hickeringill in "Priest-craft" (1705) is obsolete: "The Glosaries have the confidence to say... that the Pope can change the nature of things;" and so also influentialy used by More in his "Immortality of the Soul," and metallary, which en-

Fugitation 1656 Blount, 1713 Ozell. 'Fugilism' 1791 ff., 'boxing.'

Colligation 5. 1697, 1713, 1725; 'solicitude.'

tory. See -ory below.

trang... 'per-', 'ex-', 'in-', 'super-', 'pre-', 're-.' Transolate,

-loc. 1661 Lovell, "The kidneys... are to draw, separate, and trans-

colate whatever is serous and aqueous in the vessels." 1624 tr.

Bonet."'Percolate' 1624 ff. Trascurcion 1624—1665, Watton,

Bacon, More, Fuller, Hooke, L'estrange. "Excurson'? Transemi-

ment 1642, 1660; 'prevéminent,' 'super-minent.' Transvolv-

1644 Howell (also 1651.)

tude... 'ity,' '-ty,' '-ence.' Delicatude 1727 Bailey (Ask, &c.)

'-ness.' Acrude 1675, 1691 Crew; 1753 Chamb., 1773 Johnson.

'Acrude' 1769 ff. 'Acrity' 1547 ff. So Acrity 1619, 1721

only. It is interesting to note that the form without a prototype

'acridity'—has enjoyed widest use, perhaps has superseded the

more reg. 'acridus and acritus.' Deblitude 1669, 1696, Simpson,

Goad. 'Deblity' 1494 ff. Penitude 1657 only, 'penitence,' 1200

Serenitude 1612 only; 'serenity' 1538 ff.

ty... '-ness, '-ence, '-ry.' Brittlety 1652—3 "ill of Sir T.

Pelham," 'Considering the brittlety and uncertanttie of this

present life." After 'brytytle,' 'frailtly; &c. 'Brtillness' 1493 ff.

Luxurity 1679 Sterne in a sermon; n.w. 'Luxuriance'

1727 ff. Rivalty 1644, 1662 only; 'rivalry' 1593 ff.

under... 'sub-', Underscriber, undersubscriber (reund.) Under-

celestial 1640 Bp. Reynolds "Passions," "Creeping always like

those under celestial Orbes into another motion." "Sub-celestial

1651 ff.

ury... '-ure.' Prefecture 1696 Plot, onlyref. 'Prefecture' 1600 ff.

way(s)... '-wise.' Scarfways 1653 Urq. only ref. 'Scarf-wise'

1591 ff. Paleway 1705, palesways? Obs. 1610—1769; heraldry;

'Palewise' 1721—1767.

X... '-ward;' '-al,' '-ium,' '-ing,' '-ous,' '-ism,' '-ed' (3,)

'io' (2), 'form,' '-like' (4.) Awk 1655 Gurnail. From 'awk

in its substantive use? 'Awkward' 1340 ff. Britly 1693 "Ph. Tr."
joyed somewhat wider use for a time (1641—1686,)* and possibly presidential (as substantive, 1655 ff.) and registry (1716 only, 'register' 1377 ff. or 'registry' 1622.) Farquhar used, in a title, occasional, although 'occasional' apparently was in circulation (1631 ff.) "Love and Business: In a Collection of Occasionary Verse and Epistolary Prose." Context again explains. Hacket was fond of incidentary (which he used three times or more in 1670;) yet 'incidental' was "there" (1644 ff.) Interesting indeed are the forms indigenary, umbilicary, and vaporary. Although Biggs had the first in 1651, Urquhart intent upon his "Rabelais" two years later probably came independently by indigenary—"The primeval origin of my aves and staves was indigenary of the Lemovick regions" (the French says "indigène des régions Lemoviques.") And again, the same writer and the same work, "Umbilicary Parts" (F. "parties umbilicares;" 1693.) "R. G.," translating Bécon's "History of Winds," wrote: "Let us see what may be said concerning Vaporary windes (we mean such as are engendred by vapours)." Translator though he was, however, "R. G." need not have resorted to coinage—'vapory' 1593 ff., 'vaporish' 1647 ff., 'vaporatory,' 1593 ff., and other forms on their way ('vaporatory,' 'vaporific,' and

"somewhat brittle or friable;"'brittle' well-established 1332 ff. Calvary 1766; 'calcareous,' 167. Delir 1669 Gale, 'delirious or dreams,' again 'delirious or sick dreams.' 'Delirium' 1599 ff.

Dragony 1690, '-al' 1571 ff. Nitry 1714 (poet.) 'nitrous' 1601 ff.

Paradoxy 1646 Browne, 'paradox' 1540 ff. Paralogy 1646 Browne,

'isam' 1691 ff. Parny 1746 (poet.) 'parched' 1440 ff.


Sheldy 1691, '-like' 1552 ff. Slevy 1724 tr. '-like' 1591 ff. Op. 'dery' (poet.) and forms on p. 283 (footnote.)

* 'Miner' 1275 ff., 'metallist' 1646 ff., 'metallurgist' 1670 ff., 'metal-worker' 1860 ff. Miss Miller says, "Economy of effort." It is interesting, though of little real value, to contrast metallurgy and 'metallist' respecting syllables and phonetic accord. To
The point is that he did resort to coinage, and so made for an ultimate plurality of forms. This plurality has been much emphasized in this study, and perhaps even labored; so consumptionary, cottonary, and sermonary, in conclusion, will just be mentioned.*

The suffix -ate is a remarkably vast sort of suffix. We shall have occasion, towards the close of the present chapter, to see how -ate possibly more than any other affix has proven superfluous. It would seem, moreover, to belong especially to the Restoration—and after. Analogy played a large part in what, somewhat loosely and unphilologically, may be called the interplay of -ate and -ated; but it is the occasional loss of -ate in favor of some entirely different suffix that concerns us here. Dates and use combine to show how little chance there was, e.g., for forms like epitomate, italicate, scruti-

these may be added funambulant and theologant. The first speaks for a whole family of words (see pp. 238 ff.) funambulant, -ate, -ion, -ator, -ory, funambule (Evelyn, 1697, in "Numism.") the verb (also obs.) -er; all obsolete, though used widely (most interestingly) between 1606 and the end of the century, and, indeed, almost into the present (1930 last date.) Today we have the remnant 'funambulist' (1793 ff. "Looker-On.") But 'rope-walker' for common purposes is much easier, of course. In theologant the rivalry, were dates closer together, would be between -ant and '-ist' ('theologer' 1593; obs. form, 1673 Marvell.)

* Concerning translation, see pp. 113 ff. (Ch. III.) Consumptionary 1653, 1660 Gauden (both,) -ish 1655 and 1661 Fuller (both,) 'consumational' 1662 ff., 'live' 1664 ff. Cottonary 1653 Browne, -ous Evelyn in 1654; 'cottony' 1573 ff. Sermonary 1657, 1666; 'sermoniacal' 1761 ff., '-ish' 1547 ff., '-old' 1549 ff. Hurd, Poe, Bagshot, "Bookman" have '-ic'; Webster, "Acad.," "Advance" have '-ish'; Poe and "Tinsley's Mag." have '-old.'

nate, tranquillitate, vaporate, and etherated. Forms in '-ize' were, for all of these, from about a half a century to two centuries earlier.* One finds occasionally pairs like fructuate (1663 "Flagellum"—ill qualities fluctuating in Cromwell) and 'fructify' 1325 ff., alacritate (1657) and 'alacrify' 1364 only, aduncate and expediate (1661, 1659; forms in '-ous' somewhat earlier,) embryonate and vitriolate (embryonate, -y, -ive, embryonous; all obsolete in favor of 'embryonic' 1349 ff.; so vitriolate 1646—1672 [several uses,] 'vitriolic.') Again, professionately (1660) and 'professionally' (1734 ff.) There is an adjective 'peculate' (1749 ff.) but the substantive of the same form (1649—1753, but chiefly seventeenth century—Drummond of Hawthorndon, Harrington, Burnet) is obsolete in favor (perhaps) of 'peculation' 1653 ff.: so also pruratate 1724 only and 'pratorship' 1641 ff. and collogiate 1613—1696 where we speak of a 'colleague' 1565 ff. or of a 'collegian' 1462 ff. (distinctions in meaning required.)

Organizate 1647 only; -ed 1590x ff. Transmutate 1668 Baxter, "As if the fiery part of the candle were annihilated or transmutate...when the candle goeth out." 'Transmutate' 1432 ff. -ed; or ... -ate. 'Conglobate' 1665 ff. and 'conglobated 1678, L6. 'Declinate' 1810 ff. and declinated 1757. 'Indeliberated' 1655 ff. and indeliberated 1663. 'Interminated' now rare, 1535 ff. and interminated 1734, 1739, 1746. Akenside, "O'er the peopled earth and o'er The interminated ocean." 'Triennial' and trienniated 1661 only.

Asimilat in abomine v. 1693, 1745 (Swift in his rime, "By Topics which though I abomine 'em May serve as arguments ad hominem;') abominate' 1644 ff. Deterior v. fr. L. 'deteriorare' 1646 Bp. Maxwell; 'deteriorate' 1572 ff. (Seepp. 162 ff. of previous ch.)

The disuse of de- and die- has been commented upon at length (see pp. 273—278.) These two prefixes occasionally rivalled each other. "Fanatik people, who think to honour their nature by denaturing themselves." So Cotton translated Montaigne in 1685.

But a form with 'dis-' both preceded and succeeded it—its doublet 'disnure' (1450 ff.) Whether further investigation would show earlier dates for dis- over de- or not, as intimated in the examples at hand,* cannot be said here. Both affixes also had rivals in 'un-' 'in-' and a few other prefixes. [Secede may be taken as an interesting example here. Fuller wrote in his "Church History" (1655:] "To justifie the English Reformation, from the scandal of Schisme, to shew, that they had I. Just cause for which, 2. True authority by which they deceded from Rome." So Webb in a translation in 1685, and Sergeant in 1697, and possibly others. Cede, however, is likewise obsolete in the sense of "yield, give place to" (1633-1756.) 'Scede,' hardly a perfect sort of synonym, dates from 1702.

* De-arrest 1791 only; disarrest also obs., 1529, 1643. De-arrest 1727 only and 'disawaren' 1727 ff. (see p. 69.) De-bursetent 1639, 1639, 'disabusement' 1596 ff. Demark 1654 and 'dismark' 1633 ff. but now rare. Demit 1672 Browne, "de-mitted and sent from hence;" 'dismiss' 1582 ff. For de-port 1691 nonce-word, "to deprive of the character of a port, no corresponding form in 'dis-' apparently exists. Doublets like 'de-afforest' 1640 ff. and 'dis-afforest' 1593 ff. will, of course, be found.


[Interesting is deprehend &c.: Jer. Taylor twice, H. More twice (deprehendable, -ible) and others ca. 1660. More also has —or had—deprehensibly (1664,) and Gayton the shortened forms
Like de- and dis- in character and function are im- and in-.*

Here again the line of variation is between in- and un-, though not quite exclusively so. Though more than one hundred examples are at hand, only two or three generalizations seem possible, namely, that (as the New English Dictionary states) "the practice of the 16th and 17th c. was to prefer the form with in...", but the modern tendency is to restrict in- to words obviously answering to Latin types, and to prefer un- in other cases;" that, where there is obsolescence, the un- forms were very often earlier, indeed, in a ratio of 1: 4, and occasionally were much earlier; and that the in- forms are mostly rare in appearance. Further investigation might show interesting phonetic developments in these two prefixes—their according with other sounds. In-, finally, is a prefix having at least three or four semasiological possibilities—"into," "on," "towards," &c., "no, not" (negation,) and "very" (intensive; ) contrast un-.


* Although an alphabetical order was promised at the beginning of this section (p. 237,) it seems best to group the negatives de-, dis-, in- (im-), and un--; and reference should be made to 11-,
But this last-named prefix, as intimated in the above quotation from the Oxford Dictionary, has also had its ups and downs. Trench (especially as supplemented by Mayhew, 1899, pp. 210–214) shows rather elaborately how time has dealt with words like un-buxom and unrightful, or (conversely) south and mannerly, and mainly.

ir-, mis-, &c., on pp. 239–295 (footnotes.) Im- is, of course, like il- and ir-, a phonetic assimilation of in.

Incessional 1654 un- 1596
Inaccommodate 1657 un- 1605
Inadulterate 1649 un- 1664
Inagreeable 1657 un- 1550
Impenible 1693 un- 1490
Inangular 1646 un- 1756
Inflating 1755 un- 1697
Inappealable 1651 un- 1635

Incorrected 1646 un- 1397
Incorporated 1794 un- 1775
Incredibility 1668 un- 1775
Ingression 1753 un- 1334
Uncreatedness' 1643
Increditable 1695- un- 1643
die 1640
Inculture 1627- un- 1624
Indebted 1654 tr. un- 1902
Indiscerned 1652 un- 1529
Indigenerat 1660 un- 1593
Indigenerat 1660 un- 1542
Indigenerat 1647 un- 1536
Indigenerat 1694 un- 1626
Indigenerat 1643 un- 1625
Indigenerat 1660- un- 1610
Indivis 1677 un- 1412
Indifying 1659- un- 1641
Inequilvocal 1779 un- 1794
Inenergetic 1307- un- 1305
Inerring 1645- un- 1651
Inexanget 1693 un- 1654
Inexperimenit 1746 un- 1594
Infelthulien 1693 un- 1493
Inflaged 1661 un- 1611
Infrequent 1675- un- 1586
Infraga 1694- un- 1629
Ingenerat 1646 un- 1614
Ingenerat' 1528 ff.
Ingeniune 1675 un- 1665
Ingrammatical 1672 un- 1654
Injustifiable 1646- un- 1641
Immalicious 1662 un- 1649
Immechanical 1715- un- 1674
Immensurate 1654- un- 1599
Immeritorious 1642- un- 1775
Imminute 1581 un- 1775
Immodish 1649- un- 1665
Immanarchiz 1679 un- 1944
Innegable 1772 un-
Inorthodox 1657- un- 1657
Impacifc 1653 un- 1774
Imparallel 1641- un- 1652
But it is the opposition of un- and 'in-' words that asks for attention here. The Oxford Dictionary (under the prefix un-, section 5b) states: "From the 14th century onwards there was considerable variation, when the base was of Latin origin, between the Latin in-, im-, etc., and the native un-... Similar formations continued to mul-

impenetrative 1694 un- 1400
impopular 1721 un 1647
immigrant 1659 un 1602
imprudishulate 1646 un 1613
impremeditate 1677 un 1591
imprevalency 1636 un 1690
imprimitive 1726 un 1703
improduced 1662 un 1674
improprietor 1661 un 1676
imprompt 1759 un 1659
improvisation 1646 un 1636
impossurable 1691 un 1775
imputrid 1694 un 1657
imrefracted 1691 un 1676
impressed 1665 un 1603
inseasory 1665 un 1449
inse aspira 1665 un 1449

(If it should, perhaps, be remarked, that the 'un-' form does not quite always correspond exactly to the in- obsolescence; e. g., indispersion—'undispersed' [there is no word 'undispersion;', indivise—'undivided,' immemurate—'unmeasured,' insapory—'unsavoury,' ineavangelic—'unavengeliac,' &c. Sometimes [though rarely, on the whole] the 'un-' form is also obsolete: inoccasional, inaccessorial, invaluc, unvalue; for the first pair, 'unapproachable' 1591 ff. exists, and similar synonyms might be found. Rare indeed are the arresting forms instead and inattired, and forms like them.) To the above may be added:

intractation 1677 'af' 1615
incavity 1730 'con' 1578
innocent 1661 'con' 1691
inunction 1712 'com' 1340
insane 1675 'con' 1382
insinuate 1669 'die' 1530
incomposure 1644 'die' 1641

* (Italics are omitted; unless otherwise stated, it is to be understood that the un- words are obsolete, the 'in-', living.—)
unaccessible 1596-1774 in- 1555
unacquired 1702 in 1757
unactual 1699 tr in 1707
unactive 1639-1729 in- 1725
unappraisable 1583-1795 in- 1656
unadequate 1644-1709 in- 1675
unadversity 1655 in 1592
unapplicable 1647-1765 in 1660
unaudible 1611-1784 in 1601

inaccessibility 1646 un- 1657
inaccessible 1680 un 1579
inappraisable 1660 un 1564
insimilar 1801 un 1769
insimony 1653 un 1622
insordid 1660 un 1597
instead 1723 un 1200
instirred 1677 un 13
insubstantial 1651 tr. un 1642
insuccessful 1646 un 1617
insessive 1650 un 1646
inteminated 1695 un 1611
intastable 1711 un 1656
invalue 1673 un 1580
invital 1650 un 1661
tiply during the following centuries, so that a large proportion of
the words beginning with **ul-**, **im-**, **in-**, **ir-**, had corresponding forms
in **un-**... The culminating period of the double forms lies in the
17th century; since that time the tendency has been to differentiate,

unconsiderable 1643-69 in- 1577
unconsiderate 1570-1595 in- 1460
unconsistent 1638 in- 1651
unconstancy 1548-1699 in- 1526
uncorrectly 1705- in- 1611
uncorrectness 1669- in- 1672
uncurable 1392-1775 in- 1740
-ness 1425-1651 in- 1612
-ly 1425- in- 1529
undecent (arch., dial.) also
adv. 1546-1861 in- 1538-
and 1539-
undecidable 1530-1775 in- 1530
undecidability 1630- in- 1586
undeterminable 1531- in- 1611
-ate, ability, in- 1529
undiscernible 1624- in- 1635
undispensably 1676 in- 1645
individual 1603- in-1425
undoorle 1553- in- 1603
undivisible 1495 in- 1390
undooable 1553- in- (obs.)
1555-1768 [1625]
undubbable 1643-1316 in-
undubitably in- 1624
uneffectual 1548-1668 in-
efficient 1750, -ly 1653;
-ness 1749, uneffectu-
ous 1425
unelegant 1570-1763 in-1570
-ly 1603-1553 in- 1667
unelegible 1690-1775 in- 1770
unequality 1541-1770 in- 1531
(but contrast 'unequal')
unerrable 1616-1715 in- 1613
-ness 1645-1657 in- 1620
unestimable 1542-1628 in-1374
unevitble 1530-1711 in-1430
unevatibly 1623 in- 1447
unexceuable 1524- in- 1526
unexpeditious 1449-1768 in-1603
unexperienced 1111-1755 in-1893
unexpert 1425-1699 in- 1597
unexpertly 1533-1611 in- 1522
unexpeted 1631-1373 (not obs)
in- 1536 in-able 1570
unexplicable 1532-1915 in- 1555
-ness 1713 in- 1652
unexpreisable 1621-1326 in- 1625
-nness 1634 &c. in- 1727
unexpreasive 1600- in- 1755-1561
-in 1652 (arch.,) 1744 [(obs.)]
unexpreasive 1632, 1727 in- 1577
unexpresable 1332-1331 in- 1338
unextensible 1651-77 in- 1555
unfeasible 1542-1642 in- 1502
unfailed 1624 in- 1635, 1639 (obs.)
unfamous 1370-1296 in- 1439
unfastigable 1550-1629 in- 1510
unfrequency 1611-1344 in- 1600
unfrequent 2, 1619 in- 1681 (an.)
ungratitude 1547-1635 in- 1340
unjustice 1532-1871 in- 1390
unilimate 1655 in- 1536
unmoderate 1593-1617 in- 1393
unoffensive 1612-1769 in- 1593
unoperative 1641-1313 in- 1631
unpartisanship 1579, 1635 in- 1611
unpolarity 1589-1749 in- 1608
unpopuloness 1664 in- 1630
unpossibility 1561-1659 in- 1447
-bly 1659 in- 1579
unprudent 1392-1611 in- 1396
unpure 1375-1742 in- 1536
unreproachable 1603-1768 irre-
1634
unresistable 1551-1675 ir- 1597
unreverence 1385-1820 in- 1340
unstability 1540-1665 in- 1422
unseemle 1370-1391 in- 1509
unincere -ity 1664- in- 1699
unsolvable 1696 in- 1693 (meaning
of un- form is "insolvent")
unsubordimate &c. 1641- in- 1449
unsufficient 1395-1646 in- 1436
-ly, -ness 1396 in- 1526
untemperate 1525-1614 in- 1526
-ly 1392-1622 in- 1576
-un 1392-1621 in- 1555
unvaluable 1569-1712 in- 1576
unvollable 1565-1718 in- 1532
unvisable 1353-1593 in- 1340
and to discard one or other of the doublets, the forms in in-, etc., being very commonly preferred when the whole word has a distinctively Latin character, as inadequate, inadvertence, inarticulate, etc. Even with such forms there is no absolute rule, and doublets are still numerous." The forms submitted in the foregoing footnote seem to bear out this statement. For the most part, the un- and 'in-' doublets are close in time and use, both. 54 un- forms of 100 are (as a rule slightly) earlier than corresponding 'in-' forms; 43 'in-' forms are earlier (though usually only by a decade or two) than correlative un- forms; and in three cases the dates are the same for both. Sometimes meaning accounts for the obsolescence or obscenity in part of a word—both unpollite and impolite in certain senses; sometimes both forms are obsolete—unmodish and immodish (1665—1716 and 1649—1690, "unfashionable;") pronunciation possibly had something to do with the obsolescence of a form like unpossibilities; injustice is still Scottish; and uncurable, unindividual, unexpressable changing to -ible, unexpungable, and unfrequency will be found variously interesting.

-er, -ian, -ist, and a few other suffixes considered as personal endings—formers of agent-nouns,—show more of this multiplicity. As might be expected, the rivalry lies not quiet exclusively between these three affixes; -ist is perhaps the most frequent and perhaps somewhat more recent and vulgar than -er or -ian; the rivalry is seldom marked or conscious, however, and not infrequently the cause of obsolescence probably lies not in the suffix

* Although an alphabetical order was promised at the beginning of this section (p. 287,) it seems best to group here the above affixes; and cross-reference should be made to affixes on pp. 290 ff.— -an (singularian, &c.), -ard, -ee, -eer, -ester, -osopher, &c., and to -el (p. 296—7) and -ant and -ary (pp. 293 ff.,) &c.
but in the idea expressed—op. especially the nonce-forms.

The rivalry between -er and -ist is particularly marked. Usually, the -er form is earlier. Bishop Warburton in a letter (1759) spoke of some "Cherbourg expeditioners;" and although his word apparently was not used elsewhere, English a century later, and from then till now, needed and procured such a word—'expeditionist' (1841 ff.) So *lithologist* 1659 (H. More) and 'lithologist' 1746 ff., *meteorologist* 1633--1636 and 'meteorologist' 1621 ff., and *phrenologist* 1746--1749 and 'phrenologist' 1815 ff. The suffix in these three words is really -[log]er, which, like -logian, is no longer a living formative; both affixes (see the NED under each) were superseded by '-logist.' *Martyrologer* 1643, 'martyrologist' 1676 ff., and *meteorologist* 1614--1635, 'meteorologist,' may be added. 'Metallist' (1646 ff.) for *metaller* (1659) is now rare, and we prefer to speak of a 'metal-worker' (1760 ff.) A distinction has been made between 'pensionary' (1587, one who receives a pension, now more or less abhistorical sort of word) and *pensioner*, which had other things to take care of (cf. section 4, dates 1652, 1669, 1673, &c., &c.) Both *traducter,* -or (1602 H. More) and its modern equivalent 'traducti*onist' (1839 ff.) are specialized. Like *expeditioner,* above, were *subtillizer* and *suffragist*; English needed such words. Answering to the first, to be found in Cotgrave (1611) and in North (1734, "A Slave to Prejudices, a Subtillizer, and Inventor of unheard of Distinctions,") are 'subtilist' (1840 ff.) and 'suffragist' (1667, 1729 ff. but rare;) to the second (1673 and 1701,) is 'suffragist' (1822.).

* Forms in -er also contrast with a few in '-or,' '-ary,' '-ian,' &c.: *illuminer* 1661 Fuller, 1724 J. Johnson, 'illuminator' 1699 or earlier, ff.; *insurrectioner* 1734 only, North, "What had the people got if the Parliament...had colleague with Venner and other insurrectioners?" 'Insurrectionary' 1796 ff.; *post-officer* 1669--1743
Fewer are the forms—obsolete—in -ist which contrast with living 'er' forms: censurist 1627, 1641, 1670 and 'censurer' 1596 ff., discursist 1671 only and 'disputer' 1434 (no form 'discorser' exists,) epistolist 1743 Miss Carter, 1919 Southey, 1953 and 'epistler' 1610 ff., exceptionist 1639 only and 'exceptioner' 1641 ff., inquirist 1748 only, Richardson in "Clarissa," "The inquirist keeping himself on the reserve as to his employers" (again in 1750, correspondence,) and 'inquirer' 1570 ff., and sigillarist 1893 (rare only, irregular, 'sigillographer' 1892 ff.) To these may be added a few in -or: annotationist 1672 only, 'annotator' 1663 ff., contemplatist 1669—1856, 'contemplator' 1611 ff., lucubratist 1759, 'lucubrator' 1775 ff., operatist 1651 only, 'operator' 1597 ff., originist 1675 and 1694 R. Burthogge ('originator' 1913 ff. is different in idea,) punctuist 1836, 1853 only, 'punctator' 1466 ff., and sculpturist 1639 only, 'sculptor' 1634 ff.

-Ist has a few other much lesser rivalries, and seems, like -ism, to stand somewhat alone. Thus, orangist, looked at in Ch. III (pp. 77—78.) "Mr. Meadows... since he commenced insensibilist, has never once dared to be pleased, nor ventured for a moment to look

and 'official' (of the post) 1555 ff.; regulater 1654, 'regulator' 1655 ff.; Siama 1693 Dampier "Voy.," "The Siamese were now at wars with the English;" 1727; 'Siamese' (native of Siam) 1693 ff. Ukrainer 1815 "Gentl. Mag.," "That by the Malo-russians and Ukrainers is meant the same people, none are ignorant;" so in 1815 same mag. 'Ukranian' (sb., native &c.) 1916 ff.

in good humour." Thus Miss Burney in "Cecilia" (1782.) And like these nonce-forms are others: effronterist ("He was now become a perfect effronterist," 1776 pamphlet,) omnist ("I am an Omnist, and believe in all religions," Bailey 1839,) pronounist (1625 and 1899,) and a number of rare obsoletisms—dactylist, enigmatist, familiarist, guilist, inadvertist, institutionist, inveteratist, pomarist, scandalist, sentientiolist, and supremist." Here is indeed an interesting suffix—useful and yet full of display of its own.

What is true of -er and -dat seems also to be true of -ian. Here again the rivalry is chiefly, but not exclusively, between -ian and '-ist;' and we have a few illustrations in Jansenian 1653, 1657 Baxter (both, only references)—'Jansenist' 1664 ff., Orientalian 1691 Wood—'Orientalist' 1779 ff., pharmacian 1720—'pharmacist' 1801 ff., regian 1653—1670 (Wilson, Fuller, Hacket)—'royalist' 1643 ff. (wherein the philologist will at once see 'rex,' 'reg-, 'regalis' 'regale,' Old French 'roial,' &c.) and Singularitan 1647 Trapp, 1653 Bp. Webbe (only references)—'Singularist' 1593 ff.

J. Johnson, 1675 Ogilby, 'devotee' 1645 ff.

* Dactylist 1751 Warton "Pref. Milton's Min. Poems"—op. remarks on pp. 97 ff.; also op. enigmatist and sentientiolist below.) Enigmatist 1710 Addison "Whig-Ex." "I shall deal more ingenuously with my Readers than the above-mentioned Enigmatist has done."
Familiarist 1726 De Foe "Hist. Devil" "That learned Familiarist Mother Hazel."
Guiltist 1693 W. Freke "Art War," "Only the Principal Guiltists among your Enemy." Inadvertist 1679 Herby "Key Script." "The insedulity of sleepy Inadvertists that mind nothing"
Institutionist 1662 H. Stubbe, institutionist 1666 Harvey.
The form meteorologian has already been mentioned (pp. 263 and 310.) There was also an earlier form, meteorologician (1580—1583; the 'ist' form dates from the early seventeenth century [1612 ff.] )

To these may be added (from Miss Miller, Appendix A:) monopolian (1599—1641), 'monopolist' (1601 ff.;) mortalian (1647, 'mortalist' (1647—1757;) Methodian (1612 only,) 'Methodist' (1593 ff.) The word Picnickian once had a special signification (a member of the Picnic Society—certain Londoners of fashion about 1800;) but as a rival (lower case 'p') of 'pionicker' (1351 ff.,) this obsolete was shortlived (1853 or so.) Mrs. Grant twice in letters (1773 and 1786) spoke of garrisonians—her own nonce-term, therefore. Although diocesan is a more regular form than 'diocesan;' it 'perished' (1686 J. Sergeant and 1715 W. Davies, and 1440 ff., respectively.) In Chinesian, finally, (1674 only; cf. pp. 339 ff.) the suffix is superfluous ('Chinese' in this sense 1606 ff.)

In all of which, it must appear, is a superabundance of words. We have no need of doublets like Episcoparian (1649—1721) and 'Episcopalian' (1764 ff.;) 'lexicographer' (1659 ff.) adequately superseded the now remote dictionarianist (1617) and less remote but equally obsolete dictionarian (1846 Worcester;) we have no need of two forms like Muscovian (1577—1691) and 'Muscovite' (1555 ff.,) or like monopolier ('-ist,') mountaineer ('-eer' [French influence,]) musicker ('-ian;') meter (1387—1627, 'metrist' 1535 ff., 'versifier' 1340 ff.—classic '-ist' against native -er;) and where meaning gives way, or is not clear, as in miraculist and minerist, the vocabulary hardly sustains a serious loss.

* These 'm' forms are from Miss Miller (App. A,) who adds that verbs in '-ize' usually have nouns in '-ist.' Monopolier is particularly interesting—monopolian, monopolitan, and monopolite having as well become obs. in favor of 'monopolist' (all ca. 1589—1601.)
The above three affixes do not always terminate agent nouns, but are sometimes adjectival in function. This is especially true of -ian, of which the most noticeable rival is -ial. A number of these adjectival suffixes have already been considered; [but perhaps the most interesting one of all is -io (-ical.)]

"... (T)hus it is, by slow steps of casual increase, that our knowledge physical, metaphysical, physiological, polemical, nautical, mathematical, enigmatical, technical, biographical, no-mantical, chemical, and obstetrical, with fifty other branches of it, (most of 'em ending as these do in -ical) have for these two centuries and more, gradually been creeping upwards towards that akhp of their perfections..." Thus, roundly, Uncle Toby and this affix.]

Today, we make -ical (or more properly the adjectives which it terminates) secondary in character, and restrict forms in -io, reserving

* Allodian 1672, '-ial' 1656 ff.; so: amatorian 1779 Johnson in "Lives of Poets," '-ial' 1603, '-ory' 1599; (but the unquestionably obs. form in -ian is not in J's. Dict.;) colossian 1626—1794, 'colossal'; decennial 1794, 'decennial' Obs. 1648, 1703, 'decennial' 1656 ff.; Episcopalian 1649—1721, 'Episcopal' 1651; dictatorial 1642, 'dictatorial' 1701; gladitorian 1647—1732, 'gladiatorial' 1751; pontifician 1645—1709 (Hall, More, Atkyns;)' pontifical' 1440; primordial 1731, 1755, 'primordial'; quinquennial 1692 only, 'quinquennial' 1610 ff.; secretarian 1734, 1801, '-ial' 1801; septennial 1716, '-ial' 1656; others.

Hereesian 1675, 'heretic' 1330 ff.; numismarian 1716, 'numismatic' 1792 ff.; Pentelician, -ian 1741, 1597 (of or near Mt. Pentellous, near Athens—white marbles quarried there,) '-io' 1579 ff.; intercalarian 1690 only, '-ary' 1614 ff.; Levantian 1660 F. Brooke tr. Le Blanc, "I saw an Indian truck pearles with a Levantian (so they term it.)" 'Levantine' 1649 ff., 'Levanter' 1669 rare, also -ian. Vulturian 1659, '-ine' 1647; quinquilian 1716, 'ious' 1302; sterguillian 1772 '-ious' 1656; suburban; umbrellian 1721, '-iform' 1357, '-like' 1796; &c.

-able (p. 293), -al (-eal, -ial, p. 296) -an (-ean, p. 290) -ant, -ary (pp. 293—302) -ate (p. 302.)

[Lawrence Sterne: "Tristram Shandy," Bk. i, Ch. XXI; also Bk. iii, Ch. VIII—"As Obadiah's was a mixed case" &c. Bib. 259 and Ch. II of this dissertation, p. 32—33.]
to them the senses of "of," "of the nature of (the subject in question.)" That is, we make, restrict, and reserve, if we are careful. But there are still quite a number of Uncle Tobeys amongst us, and, as has been pointed out, the choice is often indifferent.

It is interesting to note, however, that more -ical forms have dropped out than -ic, and that the -ical forms are earlier, often much earlier, than the -ic forms. Of 66 words having these two suffixes, 45 in -ical (6 living and 39 obsolete) are earlier than the corresponding -ic forms; 15 in -ic (4 obsolete and 11 living) are earlier than the related -ical words; and 6 are of similar date—draconic(al), emplastic(al), hydraulical, pancreatic(al), &c.

* Fowler, "Modern English Usage," p. 250. For those who have time to think, one of two courses seems desirable: (1) differentiation and meanings of "politic," "political," "politically," "economic," "economical," "economically;" "comical(al)," (2) ousting of unneeded forms: "it is clear gain that one should be got rid of." Sometimes, states Fowler, the determining cause is apparent; 'hysteric' and 'hysterical,' 'cynic(al),' and 'fanatic(al) have acquired new functions as nouns; sometimes the reasons are obscure: 'electric,' 'dynamic' superseding the longer forms; but contrast 'hypothetical' and 'botanical.' "Botanic" (s. v.) is used only of institutions founded long ago. 'Comical' and 'comical' distinguished between, and 'cubic(al),' 'cynic(al),' 'diabolic(al),' 'dynamic(al),' 'geographic(al),' &c. discussed. 'Hysterical' Mr. Fowler thinks sometimes "more euphonic" than 'hysteric'—"a hysterical laugh," "a hysterical person"! But the Oxford Dictionary is a rock when it is necessary to show how little feeling for such nice distinctions counts here. 'Hysteric' and 'hysterical' up to now, and probably now as heretofore, are one in actual use; and while Mr. Fowler's remarks on 'cynic(al)' (e.g.) are excellent, no distinction between 'fanatic' adj. and 'fanatical' adj. seems to have been made. The NED distinguishes between "an economic science" and "an economical wife," "comic song," "comical student," &c., &c., &c.

In the following the -ic form is obsolete:
- dropsic 1651 only -ical 1633
- economic 3. 1755 -ical 1780
- erratic 2. 1656 -ical 1620
- farico 1763 -ical 1716
- implic 1696 only -ical 1673
In the following the -ical form is obsolete:
- agnatical 1660 -ic 1747
- aldermanical 1653 -ic 1770
While many of the obsoletisms are of rare occurrence, they tend nevertheless to show how an affix may have a vogue. The multiplicity of forms with -ical is not without its point. We have no need of hydropsia (1649 only, Jeremy Taylor,) hydropia (1631 ff.—but "arch." because of a line in Browning: "Soul hydropia with a sacred thirst,")

hydroptical (1640, 1657) in the presence of 'hydropic' (1483 ff.,) 'hydropical' (1550 ff., but now rare,) and 'dropsical' (after 'hydropical' 1688 ff.) Dropsia, 1651 only (a translation,) likewise is obsolete. Pathetical is not quite obsolete. Despite evidence in the New English Dictionary, the writer believes from experience that economic in the sense of "thifty, careful, saving" &c. ('economical') and systematical for 'systematic' are not as obsolete as some people might desire. Even systemically (obs. and rare) was used as lately as 1999. Sir Thomas Browne twice, and many others, both in their own comings and in translating, used sympathetical. The form was more

-ical 1657 -io 1353
aloetical 1734 -io 1701
amphibical 1652 -io 1373
anomalistical 1727 -ic 1767
antarctical 1693 -io 1366
(adv. 1711 only, obs.)
antroposophical 1678 -ic 1961
[1755, antiparalytical 1679 -io]
antipathetical 1719 -io 1583
antipodalistical 1676 -io 1722
acrostical 1750 -io 1846
beothical 1657 -io 1673
calisthenical 1837 -io 1847
cromatical 1644 -io 1627
choristical 1660 -io 1846 (r.)
chronistical 1701 -io 1520
cognatical 1660 -io 1752
dialectical 1638 -io 1228
diaistical 1656 -io 1381
dilemmatical 1659 -io 1377
diaphantical 1688 -io 1397
dreamical 1690 -io 1690
domestical 1660 -io 1744
demytical 1657 1687 1657
depidermical 1693 -io 1330
epithymetical 1646 -io 1631
etherical 1655 -io 1373
eulogical 1654 -io 1753
hematitical 1905 -io 1796
honorific 1656 -io 1650
hydraulical 1664 -io 1661
impolitical 1749 -io 1600
operatical 1730 -io 1749
panceratical 1670 -io 1665
parallastical 1671 -io 1630
parergorical 1694 tr. -io 1657
pathetical 4. 1631 tr. -io 1598
phosphorical 1753 -io 1794
physiocratical 1792 tr. -io 1304
scolical 1656 -io 1596
scorbutical 1656 -io 1655
seminifical 1646 -io (rare)
spermatical 1471 -io 1539
stentorophonic 1676 -io 1671
supernagical 1674 -io 1504
symptomatical 1646 -io 1693
sympathetical 1639 -io 1644
tynamical 1724 -systematic 1790
theandrical 1659 -io 1612
thoracical 1664 -io 1656
titanical 1642 -io 1709
or less bowing its way out in "Blackwood's" eighty years ago—"Their varnished boots even have a dull lustreless look that is ... sympathetic with the general gloom." It is interesting to note the time-gaps between dialectical and 'delictic,' disstatical and 'disstatic,' &c. They seem to suggest that we could not do without these words, but that we prefer the shorter forms.

Choristical and disharmonical had somewhat opposed forms other than those in '-ic.' 'Choral' and chorical, like choristical, were of the seventeenth century; and with 'choric' (1830 ff.) we have four available forms for this meaning today. So disharmonical and 'disharmonic' (1937 ff.,) 'disharmonious' (1659 ff.,) and 'anharmonic' (1863 ff.) Like choristical and disharmonical are, then, quite a number of other words;* but it is perhaps sufficient to remark that the rivalry was chiefly between -ic, -ical and '-ous, '-al, and '-ial,' and that it nowhere touches, in importance, that between -ic and -ical.

* In the following the -ic form is obsolete:  
alkalio 1733 -ine 1677  
-ious 1770, -ilious also obs.  
antifebrific 1661- -ile 1661  
apostematik 1666 -ous 1634  
asteristic 1652 -al 1840 &c.  
chaldic 1623, -ay 1673; -acio 1662  
digestio 1797- -ive 1532  
euphonic 1314 Scott- -ous 1774  
forestio 1650 -ical 1659;  
-ial 1696  
horizonic 1651- -al 1555  
hungarico 1661- -ian 1600;  
-ish also obs. 1606  
hypochondriatic 1657 -iac 1615  
insectio 1767- -an 1988  
idololatric 1711 -ous 1550  
leonic 1659 -ine 1396 (but diff. in deacst?)  
libellatic 1715 -ist 1794,  
-er 1599  
odorific 1796 -ous 1425  
In the following the -ical form is obsolete:  
aerial 1660 (after 'atmospherical') -ial 1664  

orytothognothic 1796- -y 1304  
pagantico 1695- -ical 1573 or  
'pagan' adj. 1596 (superfl.)  
pharmacopolic 1775- -itan 1657  
-ist 1651  
presentific(al) (aly) 1642- 
-ing  
profanatic 1699 weakening of 
suffix.  
Babelico 1763 Sterne -ian 1577  
Ramico 1653 -ian 1710 tr.  
robustio 1683-1719 -ous 1543  
or just 'robust.' See note below.  
Russico 1670 -ian 1539  
Scandico 1709- -ian 1734  
schistic 1906- old \^1852  
scoftico 1653- -ing \^1852 \[1400  
serpentinio 1677 -ile 1586, -ine  
thetico 4. 1625- -ist', -ian  
whimsico 1694, -y 1684  
wormatic 1665- -y 1430, -like &c.  

antiphonical 1710 -al 1719, -k 1347  
apooryphical 1719 -ous 1677, -al 1590
Forms in \textit{-ish} likewise have sometimes had rival forms against
them, forms, that is, in '-io,' '-like' (compound rather than af-
fix,) '-y,' '-al,' '-an,' &c.; but there is also dispute here which
suggests that people occasionally prefer saying "somewhat \textit{---}.
Thus, \textit{animalish} 1673 and 'animalio' 1677 ff. (though perhaps rare,)
'animal-like,' or \textit{bulkish} 1674 and 'bulksome' (1674—but also ob-
solate,) 'bulky' 1672 ff., illustrate the opposition of suffixes;* 
while \textit{burntish}, \textit{downish}, \textit{dustish}, \textit{fellish}, \textit{honeyish}, and quite a
number of others stand alone and indicate that after all \textit{-ish} is

\begin{itemize}
  \item archetypal 1739 -ous 1693
  \item ad 1642
  \item baptistical 1659 ab, quasi-
    \item adj. 1717 -ic 1724
  \item epistolical 1655--ary 1656
  \item to 1777 (obs.)
  \item harmonicalness 1691 -ous 1679
  \item hexagonalness 1657 -al 1671
  \item palisical 1716 -ied 1550
  \item prolectical 1659 -ary 1669
  \item -arious 1663
\end{itemize}

To these may be appended seven forms in \textit{-icly}.
Adverbs in
'-ic' plus '-ly' are, to be sure, by no means commonly obsolete.
But the following examples unanimously indicate a strong rival-
ry between '-icly' and '-ically:'
diabolically 1683 only, -ically 1599; adj. in -io 1399, -ical 1503
domestically 1632, 1755, -ically 1576; adj in -io 1542, -ical 1459
evangelically 1679, -ically 1642; adj. in -io 1504 ff., -ical 1531
plastically 1679, -ically 1449; adj. in -io 1632, -ical 1615--1681
prospectively 1658--ically 1577; adj. in -io 1604; -ical 1456 [now r]
spicifically 1659 only, -ically 1624; adj. in -io 1631; -ical 1432
symbolically 1669 only, -ically 1603; adj. in -io 1630; -ical 1620

* The others:
  \textit{catarrhish} 1699 -ous 1651--1919
  \textit{-al} 1651--1849
  \textit{chalkish} 1695, -y 1400
  \textit{dowish} 1677,-y 1575
  \textit{dustish} 1646,-y 1225
  \textit{elementish} 1671 -al
  \textit{epithathish} 1777
  \textit{frontish} 1707, front- 1312
  \textit{flagish} 1669--y 1576 (dial.)
  \textit{fogish} 1696 -y 1635
  \textit{giftishness} 1654 -edness 1660
  \textit{giggish} 1671 -y 1666
  \textit{glutlish} 1555--
  \textit{Hobbish} 1694 -ian 1697 -ian 1776
  -ian 1691
  \textit{honeyish} 1657--like 1106
  \textit{Islamish} 1799 -io 1346
  \textit{lontish} 1653,-ly 1607,-ful 1565,
    1244 (obs. exc. dial.)
  \textit{lushish} 1661 -lush 1440 (see p. 123)
  \textit{Norish} 1639, \textit{Norwegian} 1607
  pyritish 1756 -io 1302 -y 1757 (obs.)
  \textit{rebish} 1652 -ical 1662
  \textit{ricketish} 1661 only -y 1720
  \textit{robustish} -ic in 18th a; "now, only in low
  language," &c.—Johnson; much revived in 19th c.
limited in its vogue." Only rarely is one able—or "allowed"—to see how or why the -ish form came into being. A sentence, or rather phrase, in Gaule's "Magnetromancer" (1659, Bib. 103) is apropos: "Errors of paganish, rabbinish, and other magicians and astrologers" (see p. 66, "One word" &c.)

So with the adjectival endings -ive, -ory, -ose, and -ous.H It is interesting to note that considerable rivalry lies between these suffixes themselves. Forms in -ory have largely been supplemented or replaced by similar forms in '-ive;' and while many forms in -ose have given way to the '-ous' forms, doublets still exist (see the form in '-ose' occasionally outlasts the form with -ous, and 'ose' sometimes has a scientific application, or possibly is felt to be especially close to nouns of state ending in '-osity.'

pricklish 1693 -y 1578
sandish 1661 -y 1000
tartarish 1670 Tarter 1396
showish 1675-1678 -y 1712
treasonish 1672- -able 1375
springish 1663 -y 1641
tawnish 1675 -y 1377
ultrimarinish 1667 -ine 1636
-ling 13.

It will be noted that in a very few of the above, elementalish, frontish, ultramarinish, tartarish, the affix is superfluous.

* Forms like downish and dustish were included in the preceding footnote because of forms like 'downy,' 'dusty,' &c. But of course the sense is "somewhat dusty." Downish and 'downy' do not pair off, semasiologically speaking, the obsolete form evidently having been intended to mean "somewhat dejected" &c. A kind of diminutive, therefore?

Burthish 1662, 1674; Chamaish 1813 (of or pert. to the great Khan;) fellish 1650 only ("Never was wild boar more fellish;" fall sh. obs. r. 1570; 'fell' adj. chiefly poet. today;) flaggish 1669, 1635 both "Lond. Gaz.," see above; flappish 1665 only; frippish 1787 only ("the frippish grandeur of modern architecture;" 'Frippery' 1568—much use;.) greenish 1653; humourish 1667 only; operish 1742 n.w.; pothish 1725 only; routish 1734 only; shambish 1734; timish 1674, 1676, "temporary, fashionable.

[ Grouped here (again) for convenience sake (vide footnote p. 309 &c.)]
Of -ive the New English Dictionary says: "... having a tendency to, having the nature, character, or quality of, given to (some action.)" It adds, "The meaning differs from that of ppl. adjs. in -ing, -ant, -ent, in implying a permanent or habitual quality or tendency: of acting, active, attracting, attractive, coherent, cohesive. From their derivation, the great majority end in -ive, -tive and -ative."

Yet, so far as there is any rivalry, the chief opposing suffix is '-ing,' 'ful,' '-able,' '-ible,' and '-ant' forms also occurring. Thus, delegative where we should say 'delegating.' "Hither also we may referre his power Juridicall or Legislative in Parliament ... And ... his power Delegative." R. Brooke in 1641: so Locke in 1690.

Or obscurative 1664 only (H. More) and our 'obscurring' 1602 ff.; ornative (1660 only,) prefactive (1650 only, tormentive, -ative, vomitive, and others. Tardative has been supplanted largely by forms with 're-:' tardative 1665, 'retarding' 1793 ff., 'retardant' 1642, '-ent' 1900, '-ive' 1799, 'retardatory' 1953 (retardate obs. rare 1597.) Interesting also are boastive 1763 (Shenstone, "How must his fellow streams Deride the tinklings of the boastive rill,"

'boastful' 1325 ff., resentive 1662-1735 (More, Mrs. Manley, Thomson) 'resentful' 1656 ff., and wastive 1753 only, 'wasteful' 1300 ff. (though here the meaning is not quite the same in each.)

*To these may be added: co-ordinative 1642 and 1639 for 'co-ordinate' 1641 ff. ('involving co-ordination;') delegative (above;) dissipative 1740. A. Hill in letter, "A heavy dissipative insipidness," 'disguising' 1754 ff., 'disguastful' 1616 ff., and very common in the 17th and 18th cs.; implicutive 1744 Akeside ("Round her brow to twine the wreath of implicutive praise") 'ible' 1340; liquidative 1657 only Tomlinson; officiative 1653 Gauden (only ref.;) opulative 1674 only, 'opiate' 1543 ff.; perceptive 2. 1754, 1913, '-ible;' resulative 1655 Fuller, '-ant' 1815 ff.; salivative 1657, 'salivant' 1346 ff., 'salivary' 1646 ff., 'salivary' 1709 ff.

It should perhaps be observed that in the first, co-ordinative, and in oplicative, as in imperfective and ornative, the suffix is superfluous (see p.339.)
The suffix -ory is chiefly opposed by the suffix -ive, and examples are abundant—additory, concessory, collusory, exemplatory, detersory, dissolutory, &c., &c.* Dates possibly indicate the priority of -ive, and usage almost everywhere supports -ive over -ory in the examples. -ous' and a few others are also rivals, and not a few of the examples indicate that the -ory forms were wholly casual.

Behind both English -ose and -ous is, ultimately, Latin '-osus.' Both mean "abounding in, full of," of "characterized by, of the nature of." The -ous' forms, almost without exception, are earlier, often considerably earlier, than the -ose forms. "But from the 15th century onward," states the Oxford Dictionary (under -ose,) "there was a tendency to alter -ous words to -ose after Latin, as seen in such forms as ambitiose, gloriosse, malitiose, pompose, virtuosse, zelose. None of these displaced the earlier forms in -ous; but a few words formed directly from L. from the 15th c. onward have taken their place in the language, as ballicose, gloose (15th c.), loose, morose, verbose (17th c.), otiose (13th c.), grandiose, pilose (19th.)... Nouns of state from these sejs., as from those in -ous, end in -osity: globosity, verbosity."

* Additory 1659 Fuller, 1727 Swift, -ive (slightly diff. m.) 1699 M; concessory 1656, 1660 Trapp and Taylor -ive 1736; collusory 1706, 1755, -ive 1673; detersory 1657 only, Tomlinson, -ive 1596 ff.; dissolutory 1757 tr., -ive 1400; electory 1660 only, -ive 1530; exemplatory 1693 only, -ive 1531; exadatory 1752, 1654, -ive 1595; persectory 1693, -ive 1500; prejudicators 1652, -ive 1647, 1716 only, -ing 1666 ff.; putrefactory 1650 only, -ive 1545; representatory 1674 only, Owen "Holy Spirit," "They were Representatory, or... Introductory of Christ and the Gospel;" retrospectory 1912, -ive 1664; tractory 1694, -ive 1531 Elsewhere: desportatory 1783, 1796, -ing 1694 ff.; osentatory 1657 only, -ous 1650, 1701ff.; presumptorily 1681, -ously 1562; aproboratory 1835, -ious 1387; fusory 1673 only, -ible 1386; visitatory 1651, -al 1683; ancestor 1650, -al 1579; evacuatory 1704, 1789 only, -ant 1800; sen-latory 1741 only, -ory 1653; tripartitory, adlaphory 1660, -ism 166
In the rivalries of -ose and -ous, and especially in the
rivalry between them, we have, relatively speaking, discarded but
few -ous forms because of '-ose' forms, but contrarily quite a
number of -ose forms because of the presence of '-ous forms. One
wishes that one might go beyond so general a statement, and assign
or assemble reasons; but the plain fact is that forms like nervous
(1663-1776) and 'nervose' (1753) in botany are exceedingly few
('-ose' in its scientific implications—technical application,)
and that a close study of dates, usage, and etymological relation-
ships would probably not reveal why forms in -ose (or -ous) became
obsolete. At least, no such close study has been made here; and in
lieu of one, a query is made, namely, whether or not "Nouns of state
from these adjectives... end[ing] in -osity." are not always
closer to -ose forms? There is by no means always a form in -osity
lurking behind an adjective in -ose or -ous, or even a hypothetical
or remote form. Nevertheless, when there is an English noun in '-osity,' it possibly lends support to the adjective in '-ose'—perhaps
even over an obsolete -ous form.*

* The NED is, as usual, right in stating: "from these adjectives." One naturally takes "from" here to imply that the adjective ante-
dates the noun; and so, at least in the examples offered under
-ose in the NED, it does: 'bellicosity' 1884, 'bellicose' 1432;
'globosity' 1657, 'globose' 1475; 'jocosity' 1646, 'jocosse' 1673;
'morosity' 1534, 'morose' 1565; 'verbosity' 1542, 'verbose' 1672
(verbous 1657 only, verbaeious 1676 only; ) 'otiosity' 1483 ('e-
tiousness' 1667 ff., 'otiose' 1350 (apparently an exception; al-
so an obs. otiosis 1614, 1656;) 'pilosity' 1695, 'pilose' 1753;
'grandiosity' 1539, 'grandiose' 1533, others.
The writer has not chosen to deal with -ose and -ous in
chemistry (though see Ch. IX) and the like, although rigorous'
1547 (dicta.) and 'acerose,' 'more technical' 1721 ff. (dicta.,
botany, ) and 'adinosous 1872 ff. and 'adinous,' 'more technical'
1733 ff. may be added to 'nervose' above.
In the following list, the -ose form is obsolete:

biliose 1710 -ous 1541
bituminose 1691 -ous 1620
-iferous 1799 -oid 1873
brigose 1679 -ous 1387-1519
carcinomatose 1740 -ous 1700
cariose 1762 -ous 1676
Particular attention may be drawn to a few forms. Both clangose and clangous are obsolete (1661, 1710—Lovell and Fuller—, and 1646 Sir T. Browne, respectively.) The former was upon the Latin type—perhaps medieval Latin; the latter, questionably an adoption from the French. 'Clang' is, of course, a noun as well as a verb, today; but our form is 'clangorous' from 'clangor' (1712 ff.) There is also the participial form 'clanging' 1842, and there is 'ringing.' 'Defective' has been sufficient for our needs since 1472 or earlier; and both defectuous (1678 Gale "Grt. Gentiles," "The same act which is defectuous and sinful in regard of the will of God") and defectuous (1553—1726 [also the adv. and the noun in -ness, 1604—1830]) are obsolete. So copperose and copperous, and others, below.

In discose 1696, discous 1706 ff., 'disk' 1730 ff. 'diskoidal' 1706 ff., 'diskal' 1940, 'disk' and 'discus' (attributive uses, 1733 ff.) is more of that untoward plurality of words which troubles, oft-

chylose 1693—-ous 1666
clangose see above
copperose 1646—-ous 1646
 -y 1791
damusse 1727 (dict.) -ous 1750, -ific 1727
defectuous see above [-1656, -ous 1540-]
discose see above
fabulous 1677—-ous 1546
ichorose 1710—-ous 1651
impearose 1740—-ous 1646
also (other rivalries, &c.):
animose (dict. only)
anthropomorphe (wrong use)
granitose see above
religiose see above

Also in the following list, the -ous form is obsolete:
articulous 1634 tr. -ose 1731
caebethescalius -ose 1755
fibribrous 1737—65 -ose 1829
globosous 1691 —ose 1475
add: calculose 1646 Browne; 'calculous' 1605 ff. (medicine.)
litigiose 1677 —ous 1382
miderose 1707—-ous 1626; so -osity 1696 only
numerose 1704 only —ous 1589 (1741)
petrose 1661 only —ous 1400 —oseal
pituitose 1710—1751 r. —ous 1607
resinosous 1712 only —ous 1846
sorofulose 1753 —ous 1612
tetrapetosoae 1694 —ous 1697
urinose 1692 only —ous 1644
verminose 1747 tr. —ous 1666
vitaerose 1690 —ous 1657—1728
spirituose 1677 —al 1303
strigose 1703—
uevous 1691—1710 —al 1658
ventriose 1707 —triose 1756; &c.
intrinsous 1695 —ose 1696
nervous see above
verbous 1657, 59 —ose 1672
vestiulous 1697—1712 —ose 1817

Add: calculus Browne; 'calculous' rare, Blount &c.
times, our vocabulary. So ventriose, &c.* It may be questioned whether or not, "in the real language of men," forms like 'granitic' and 'piscine' and 'petrous' or 'petrosal' are preferred to 'granite' or 'rocky,' and 'fishy' and 'stony.' The array of terms and triles is interesting.

Even more impressive is the obsolescence of -ous forms and the survival of forms with '-al,' '-ic,' '-ive,' '-ar(y), and others.

* Ventriose 1707 only, 'ventriose' (io plus ose) 1756 ff.; 'ventric' 1689, 'ventrical,' 'ventriculose' 1702 ff. (rare,) 'ventricular' 1322, 'ventriculous' 1802 and 'ventriculose' 1727, "somewhat ventriose;" 'bellied,' 'convex,' &c.


-ous and '-(al)al'

annous 1694 only -al 1836
centrifugal 1709 -al 1837
corporess 1669 -al 1610
detrimentous 1648 -al 1656
equineus 1653 -al 1601
equivocous 1701 -al 1601
excrementitiousness 1660
-trae 1645 -ious 1636-

obs. r. -al 1574
febrifugous 1683 -al 1663
fermentous 1662 -al 1650
-1694 (obs. tative 1665
figmentous 1660 only -al 1655
fuminous 1653 -al 1604
inimicious 1641 1671 -al 1678
natailous 1646 -ial 1611
natal 1420
nitro-eous 1692 -al 1674
parodious 1704 only -al 1507
pentagonal 1661 -al 1571
phenomenous 1754 only -al 1950
practicous 1693 only -ical 1871
purgatorious 1653 -al 1650
radious 1667 only (2) -ical
remedially 1659 -ially 1796
rostrous 1651 only -al 1867
(ed 1705, -ate 1819, -al 1709

senatorious 1664 -al 1790
transitious 1652 (adv.,) -al
vermifugous 1726 only -al 1930
vermifuge 1697
-ous and '-al'
apoplexies 1734 only -al 1611
(app. 'acrimonious')
cacochymous 1676-1702 -ic 1541
dysenterious 1654 -ic 1822
demensive 1694 tr. only -ic 1759
(s. in -ic 1662) -ical 1575
hemorrhagious 1753 only -ic 1904
nitrosulphurous 1693 only -ous 1656, 1719 only, -eous 1671-
1703 (much use, ) -ic 1936
bстetrichious 1645-1693, -ic 1742
pelagious 1661, 1575 -ic 1656
polythious 1648 only -ic 1770
selenious 1794 -ic 1756
spathaceous 1794 -ic 1935 -ous 1776
thoracious 1681 -ic 1656
asymmetrical 1661 only -ical 1690
r. 1578 -al 1550 (obs.)
symmetrical 1656 -ical 1571
(See others under '-al.')
-ous and '-ive'
appetitious 1653 -ive 1577 (but not quite the same meaning)
distractive 1667 -ive 1633
evasorous 1687 only -ive 1725
While dates do not help one way or another (i. e. to establish the priority of obsolete -ous forms or of living rivals, ) it will be noticed in the lists below that usually the obsolescence is rare. Indeed, the obsolete word is more often rare than not; yet particularly in this survey of affixes it helps illustrate the versatility of English—the endless effects of analogy, and the linguistic consciousness that works in men.

Perhaps most interesting of all are those suffixes which make (or help make) nouns—substantives, as it is said, of state, condition, dignity, office, behavior, place, action, system, privilege, and the like. A few of these have been looked at— -any p. 294 and -ion p. 299 (footnote, ) e. g. But others in -ism, -ity, -ous, -ness, and -ure contrast interestingly with living forms in what, again, may

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-alous</td>
<td>tabernaculous</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eous</td>
<td>alimentous</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>legendarious</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>sanguinarius</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>salutarius</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>valetudinarius</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>audacious</td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>cochlearis</td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>gemelliform</td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>finibrinous</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>intermedium</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>legitimately</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>obdurate</td>
<td>1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>proximate</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>rejectaneous</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>ignitable</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>thievously</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>vagabondous</td>
<td>1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>discursive</td>
<td>1706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>protuberous</td>
<td>1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>dormitory</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>ileous</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>lascivious</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>flatulent</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>utilitarian</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>posterior</td>
<td>1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>expiatorious</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>awous</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>exsanguinous</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>incommodiuous</td>
<td>1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>resinaeous</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>lustrious</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>ubiquitous</td>
<td>1782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ous</td>
<td>unctuous</td>
<td>1477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dates in italics indicate obsolescence.
broadly be called rival affixes. Dates are often interesting, but they indicate nothing definite except, possibly, in the case of '-nce' and -nity.

-ism is so interesting a suffix as to deserve a study by itself (-ism and possibly -ist.) It is, as Morris (Bib. 335) indicates, still a living affix. We shall perhaps have occasion to look at forms in -ism in later chapters (VII and IX—Religion, &c.,) which possibly indicates (if indication is necessary) that -ism is interesting not so much for its form—its phonological and etymological state of being—as for its attachments, its associations and semasiological identity. It is indeed an explosive little suffix.

-ism is chiefly indispensable. Where forms having it have been lost to English, it is usually because (it would seem) of some obscurity in meaning, or possibility of obscurity.* Scarcely a handful of rival forms exists. One might expect, at the outset, that '-ity' would give -ism competition; but this seems not to have been so; and we barely have bigotism 1691, ahool1705 (both Hickeringill,) 'bigotry' 1674 ff.; botanism 1633—1727, 'botany' 1696 ff., frivolism 1778 ('a frivolous occupation;' also dictionaries assigning the same meaning as in:) 'frivolity' 1796 ff.; impostorism 1652 only, 'im-posture' 1537 ff., and Independentism ('Congregationalism') 1653—1827 (several uses,) 'Independency' 1642 ff.]*

* So creolism, epilogism, femalism, &c., see Ch. VII, p.
Idiomatism, Ignatism (irreg.,) mulism, saintism, 'subtilism,' toler-antism, logism, and querism are perhaps clear enough, but are all rare, and show how affixes have vogues (cp. p.

[ "Many adjectives have each ending [-ism and -ity] appended & give two words of different meaning. Occasionally choice between the two is doubtful. Roughly, the word in -ity usually means the quality of being what the adjective describes, or concretely an instance of the quality, or collectively all the instances; & the
The suffix -ity, on the other hand, shows considerable tendency to obsolescence because of form-adjustments—fadings and survivals. Unlike -ism, it is not so lively an affix as it once was—Horace Walpole's 'betweenity' and 'youthfullity' (twice,) 'guppety' and 'tableity' from Plato, Aubrey's 'coxcomby,' and the likes." In the way of rivalry, it is chiefly, but not exclusively, opposed by '-ness.' Suffixes like '-hood' and '-ism,' '-ion' and '-ness,' '-noy' and '-ity,' are nicely balanced. Both 'elemental' and 'elementary' gave rise to forms in -ity, it is interesting to note; but we had (about the same time, and ever since have had) the sufficient word 'elementariness.' 'Hospitality' is, of course, not lost to us; but we distinguish between it and 'hospitableness.' That is true of internity is undoubtedly true of hundreds of like forms, marked obsolete, in the New English Dictionary. 'Externity' was possibly the suggestor. Both words are reasonable in form; but the one was simply never taken up.]

---

word in -ism means the disposition to be what the adjective describes, or concretely an act resulting from that disposition, or collectively all those who feel it. "Barbarity" is contrasted with 'barbarism,' 'catholicity' with 'catholicism,' 'deity' with 'deism,' 'formality' with 'formalism,' 'humanity' with 'Humanism,' 'latinity' with 'Latinism,' 'modernity' with 'modernism,' &c., &c.

* 'Betweenity' 1760 Walpole, 1836 Southey in a letter. 'Coxcomity' rare 1690, 1834, 'coxcomby' 1774 ff. 'Guppety' and 'tableity' both in 1542 Udall and 1655 Stanley "Hist. of Philos.," Latter in Locke (1702.) 'Threadbarity' 1692, '-ness' 1530 ff. 'Womanity' (after 'humanity') 1843—96, '-ship' 1609 (n-w.,) '-kin' 1200. 'Youthfullity' 1763, 1764 Walpole.

[ Henry Brooke in "The Fool of Quality" (1760—72:) "The internity of his ever-living light kindled up an externity of corporal ir-ridation." 'Externity' dates from 1713. 'Internality' is our fuller form, but 'internalness' is at least given in Bailey (1727; Bailey also gives 'inestimableness'—app. only use or appearance, though Cudworth in his "Intellectual System" of 1679 had inestimability.) 'Elementariness' dates from 1669; elementality occurs in Whitlock, 1654—"By this I hope the Elementality (that is the
In a general way, the story of -*nec* and -*nay* (-*ance*, -*ancy*) is like that of -*ic* and -*ical* (pp. 314 ff.) and especially that of -*ose* and -*ous* (pp. 322 ff.). This is to say that -*nay* has suffered somewhat at the hands of -*nec*. Both have had (so to speak) other rivals, notably -*ing*,' -*ion*,' -*ess*,' and -*ment*; but forms in -*ance*, almost without exception, are not only most numerous, and have not only outlived obsOLEtisms with -*ancy*, but antedated them.*

Universality) of Detraction... is out of Dispute;" and *elementarity* occurs only in Sir Thomas Browne—1650 ed. of the "Pseudodoxia Epidemica:" "Creatures farre above the condition of Elementarity."

Forms showing the rivalry of -*ity* and -*ness* are: falsicity 1644, 1773, form in -*ness* 1691 ff.; *hospitality* obs. in sense (2 of N&D) of "hospitalable quality or character" 1706, 1711, 'hospitalableness' 1612 ff.; *probity* 1751 only, 'opprobriousness' 1540 ff.; *primacy*, *primacy* 1756, 1796, *primorvus* 1656--1775, 'primitive' 1526 ff. and 'primiveness' 1693 ff.; *supinity* 1725, 1725, 'supineness' 1616 ff.; *voluntary* 1794--1819, 'voluntariness' 1612 ff.

-*ity* and -*ism*; Antichristianity 1555--1661, '*ism* 1533 ff.; *organity* irreg. form, 1647, More, 'organism' 1664 (but now rare in this sense); -*ity* and -*ion*; *deflexity* 1797 Brougham in "Phil. Trans."—"...refrangiity, reflexity, and flexity...inflexity and deflexity" (rays of light,)' *deflexion* 1674 ff.; *dimensity* (after 'immensity') 1645 only, Howell in a letter, rime? 'If of the smallest stars in sky We know not the dimensity," 'dimension' 1529 ff.; *seminality* 1646--1655, 'semination' ff. Others; *delinquency* 1692 'Christ Exalted" *Delinquency* or *Malignity*, 'delinquinity' 1648 ff. *Incompetibility* 1664 Hammond, 1677 Hall, 'incompetency' 1611 ff., *versimilitude* 1603 ff. *Angelity* (after 'humanity') 1652, 'angelhood' 1739 and 1750 ff.

Forms in -*osity* (see p. 297, footnote) are: *fatuosity* 1631 only, 'fatuity' 1648, 1539 ff.; *imperiosity* 1654 H. L'Estrange, 'imperiosness' 1574 ff.; *morboiosity* 1646--1699, 'morbidness' 1693 ff., *morbidity* 1721 ff., *morbous* adj. 1651--1694 but 'morbous' 1691 ff., *morbid* 1656 ff.; *negatiosity* 1675 only, 'negotiation' 1614 ff.; *primosity* 1539 humorous n.w., *primeness* 1611 ff.; *penetruosity* 1733 only, 'punctuality' 1620 ff.

Sonderity and *uniopacity* are discussed in Ch. VII.

*In the following list, the -*nec* (-*ance*, -*nace*) form is obsolete: delinquonce 1692-1332 -*nay* 1532 frequency 2b. 1743 -*nay* 1831 impecconance 1677 -*nay* 1614 inefficence 1797 -*nay* 1749 discoverance 1664 -ery 1553 ensuance 1652 tr. -*ing* 1561
The same statement holds for '-ence' forms over '-ency', except that occasionally the -ency (obsolete) form was earlier.

The suffix -ness had for its chief rival the affix '-ity' (including the compound suffix '-ality'). The interesting word alamodeness (1669 only) was touched upon many pages back (Ch. IV, p. 121) and was contrasted with a later, possibly more musical form, 'a-
lamodality' (1753 ff.) Both, however, somewhat illustrate the effect of isolation (Ch. V, pp. 234 ff.,) for 'fashion' (and) is our word to-day; and both have against them those people who dislike foreignism in our tongue. It is in forms like circumstantialness and 'circumstantiality' that the rivalry of -ness and '-ity' is better illustrated; and '-nee,' '-ney,' '-scy,' '-ude' may also be mentioned.* The phonetic awkwardness in forms like criminalness as against 'crim-
inall)' or like noveltiness (suffix superfluous,) will be commented on towards the end of the chapter.

* Circumstantialness 1731—1811, Bailey, Gibbon, others, 'circum-
stantiality' 1731 ff. (Bailey.) So: cordialness 1611—1691,
'cordiality' 1611 ff. Disableness 1614, 1666, 'disability' 1580
ff. disable 14., ff. obs. 'unable.' Externalness 1667—1775,
'externality' 1673 ff. Inferiorness 1674, 'inferiority' 1599 ff.
Instrumentalness 1655, 1660, 'instrumentality' 1651 ff. Min-
eriness 1661, 'minerness' (same idea?) Reciprocalness 1667 only,
Similariness 1669 only; so also simillarness 1670; 'similarity'
1664 ff. Bastardliness 1656, 1660, Bastardism 1599; 'bastardy'
1486 ff. Buoyantness 1668, 1716; 'bauty' 1713 ff.; complicateness
1656—1794, '-scoy' 1827 ff.; decrepiteness 1601—1703, decrepity
1766—1605; 'decrepitude' 1603 ff. Inconsistentness 1647, 1727
'-noy' 1699 ff., or earlier. Violentness 1692—1743; 'violence'
1790 ff.

Dissu of -ness is seen in naseness 1720 only ('low tide,')
petiteness 1677 Hale, "in respect of the smalliness and petiteness
of these Little Animals" ('petit' largely obsolete,) placeness
1674 Fairfax (mentioned many times in this study) only ref.
(ap. Coleridge's 'whereeness' in marginals to H. Brooke's 'Fool
of Quality;' idea involved here,.) Popeness 1634 n.w., diseaseness
1674, and self-nothingness, wherein (1647 More, 1677 Gale) the
idea of action is perhaps not so pronounced as in the form 'self-
annihilation' (-ness and '-tion.')

The Oxford Dictionary further says: "In Old English -nes is the
suffix most usually attached to adjectives and past participles to
form substantives expressing a state or condition... A large number
of these survive in middle and modern English, and new formations
of the same type have been continually made in all periods of
the language, it being possible to add the suffix to any adjective or
participle, whatever its form of origin may be. Formations from the
compound adjectives are also common...and even from adjectival
phrases; few of the latter, however, are in established or serious
use, and most of them are of recent introduction. This is also
the case with formations on pronouns, adverbs, etc."
-Shep and -hood replaced by -ness with adj.-Further emphasis
of the above statement. See pp. 278 and 299 (-ship,;) 267, 293
(-hood.)
The suffix -ure has been widely developed in English. Behind it is French 'ure,' and Italian (etc.) 'ura'—and the Latin. In Latin, it chiefly denoted an action or a process; in French it underwent further development, and came to signify some result or product of process: so in English, "function, state, rank, dignity," "collective body," "that by which an action is effected." Its possibilities are many. It has been active in English since the thirteenth century.

Nevertheless, where there have been rivals, there has been some obsolescence; and investigation shows that forms in '-ion' (including '-tion,' '-ation') have given forms in -ure some competition, and so have forms in '-ing,' '-ship,' '-ness,' and '-ment.' -ure and '-ation' may especially be looked at, for here again something like a phonological law is at work. Normally, verbs in '-ate' have nouns of function or state in '-ation.' Thus 'filtration' 1664 ff. and filtrature 1670 only, and 'imitation,' 'moderation,' 'obliteration,' 'predication.' Three or four others have only the Latin verb in 'are,' '-atus,' behind them—'application,' 'declaration,' 'incubation,' and 'reposition.' It is interesting to note that the form in '-ion' (the more regular form) is almost always earlier.*

* Imitature 1652 only, '-ion' 1579 ff. Moderature 1574 only, 'moderation' 1593 ff. 'temperance' 1340 ff. Obliteration 1711 (will be found in Add. and Emenda. of vol. containing 'O'—not marked obs. but obviously so,) 'obliteration' 1656 ff. Predication 1652 only, 'predication' 1300 ff.

So also: applicature 1652 only, 'application' 4. 1538 ff. Beclarature 1729, '-ion' 1340 ff. 'ing' 1374 ff. Incubature 1653-1743, '-ation' 1646. Repositure 1657, 1661, '-ion' 1617.

Other rivalries are: boisture 1667 only, 'boisterousness' 1599; boundure 1654, 'boundary' 1626 (the NED somewhat strangely uses bounding, obs. 1552, 1543, to define boundure;) 'bound' 1397; complexure 1648, 1675, 'ion' 1340 ff.; debasure 1683 only, '-ment' 1602; depressure 1699, 1621 ff., '-ion' 1533 ff.; detainure 1641, 1710, '-er' 1619 ff.; direture 1677 only, '-ion' 1509; disembozure 1790, '-ment' 1344 (r.) disembozure 1653; embasure 1656
We come finally to three interesting noun-suffixes: -ery, -age, -ment. They are especially interesting because they have been closely studied by Fredrik Gadde in a Lund dissertation (1910, see Bib. 467.) Of the three, only -ment shows itself to have suffered much from affix-rivalries and adjustments; but so interesting are certain points in Mr. Gadde's study, and so helpful are his lists, that we shall study, briefly, each affix in turn.

Before the fifteenth century, -age was not a living suffix. Its development thereafter, however, was rapid; and where it originally signified "that which belongs to," "tax, charge," it came in the midst of much use to signify other things, "place, where," "action of" or "system," "privilege," and the like. It developed (if one may be pardoned for saying so) a kind of personality. Very naturally, however, it became limited semasiologically. Its application in the seventeenth century particularly (Mr. Gadde's excellent lists show) was possibly too facile or artless, and a number of forms in -age became obsolete. Forms in which -age carries the idea of "tax, charge" will be discussed in a later chapter (VIII,) for here it is the thing itself that has disappeared; forms in which -age has the notion of "result of action," of "place," or of "things (s.c.) taken together" (collectivity,) are still frequently found, although at

Jeanes (2.) "This composition will be a great imbase to the world;" 'embase ment obs. 1575--1692, 'abse ment' 1561; engraure 1654, 1655, '-ing;' engravure 1715; expressure 1656--1713 '-ion' fruite 1653 only, '-ion' 1413; gladature 1654, '-ship' 1830; impressure 1680, '-ment' 1796; legature 1674, 'legateship' 1556; legislature obs in sense "exercise of fution or power of legis- lation," 1715--1765, '-ing;' phosphure 1792--1301, '-ide' 1349 (chem.) pondure 1661; proposure 1655, '-in;' quadrant 1673 'quar tership' 1570 ff.; refracture 1659, 'refraction;' tracure 1658 Manton, 'The angels being created pure, they had no lust within to incline them;...there was no evil tracure, no temper; how could they sin?' 'Traction' 1656 ff.
least a few obsoletisms with these meanings will be discussed; but forms in which -age denotes simple action were (as Mr. Gadde says) "many and short lived." The thought that it is desirable to stress is that these latter forms—forms, that is, like bestowage (see p. 272,) disburseage, seasonage, stuffage, usherage—became obsolete not only because of rival forms and rival suffixes—'bestowing' and 'bestowment' and 'bestowal,' 'disbursement,' 'seasoning,' 'stuffing,' 'ushering'—but also because of limitations developing within -age itself." This is not to say that -age is not now vigorously alive, even in nouns of simple action. Certain indications, more purely suggestive than scientifically absolute, are that -age most frequently denotes some simple "act" or "action"—action in general; much less frequently does it denote "procees," "practice," or "function," and still less frequently does it convey the concept of "occupation," "business" or "trade," "office," "work of." [I

---

* Bestowage 1656, 'stowage' 1390, '-ing' 1532, '-ment' 1754, '-al' 1773; disburseage 1721 only Strype, "disburseage and discharge," '-ment' 1596; seasonage 1716 '-ing' 1580; stuffage 1659, 1695 More; usherage 1651 and 1662 Hickenphill, also usherage 1711 Shaftesbury, '-ing' 1589 ff.

The following terms from Gadde have not been verified: affinage "refining of metals" 1656; alliage 'alliance' 1656; alloyage "art and process of allying metals" 1790; alnage 1660, 1736; agistage '-ing' 1691, 1751; ansverage '-ing' 1642; authorage (see below;) boatmanage 1720; careenage 1794; copeage 'copying' 1654; curtage (office) 1759; deckage 1642; fraughtage 1833; freightage 1836; &c. until the pattern really becomes a network in which it is impossible strictly to disintangle meanings!

These general indications are based on a careful count of the -age words in Gadde's concluding lists: -age: "act, action"—(the writer counted up to 74, and then desisted, for obviously this category far outnumbers the others;) -age: "procees"—9; "practice"—3; "function"—4; "occupation"—3; "work of"—3; "office"—2; "business or trade"—1. These statistics, however, count for very little as far as obsolescence is concerned: they merely indicate that an obsoletism in -age, signifying some particular occupation, became obsolete not because of the disappearance of the occupation itself, but because of a general ineptitude in -age.
-Age, like a number of other suffixes discussed in this chapter has had a rather amazing faculty for going places and accomplishing its end. Its disuse, and the disuse of nouns to which it is attached, is dependent, in any final analysis, on meanings. As long as ships sail, 'anchorage,' 'steerage,' and 'stowage' will be in our vocabulary—and especially the seaman's;* but groundage, 'right of occupying ground,' a term in the field of political privileges and systems of state, affords a rather nice contrast. So far as form (more or less strictly) is concerned, we may conclude with the remark that -age has a considerable rival in '-ing,' and lesser rivals in '-ment,' '-ness,' '-ship,' '-y' and a few others.[[6]

Almost needless to say the suffix -ery likewise, both in native formations and in adopted (from across the channel,) has had a remarkable development. It carries with it much the same associations or significations as -age does, but differs in one respect—it helps create nonce-forms, often with "bad" (or unpleasant) associations. But as Mr. Gadde points out, -ery is not like (e. g.) -ish here ('queanry,' 'bitchery;') the pejorative is 'bitch,' not 'bitchery;' and perhaps the most that one can say is that -ery has become tainted.

* Meyer-Lübke says of its use in France "that it is especially added to those verbs 'in deren Begriffe schon die Betätigung mehrerer Personen oder eine komplizierte Handlung liegt.'"

[[ Thus, authorage 1652, 'authorship' 1710 ff. Carpentage 1660, 'carpentry' 1377 ff. Imposturage 1654 and 1656 only, 'imposture' 1537; 'impostery,' 'imposterial,' 'impostage.' Loppage 1633 only, 'lopping' 1589 (loppings from trees,) 'lop' 1420. Manufacturage 1655—1691, 'manufacture' 1622 ff. Pastorage "function of a pastor" 1622 only; in 1583 this word was used to signify "penance;" 'pastorage.' Pelitage 1692 only, 'mats collectively,' 'peltry' 1436 ff. Ravenage 1673 only, 'ravenousness' 1570 ff., 'ravenous' 1412 ff. Sainage obs. n.w. 'honor (done) as to a saint' 1657. Trimmage 1693 only, 'trimming' 1625 ff. Wainsopage 1677 tr. only use, 'wainscot-work' 1585 ff., '-ing' 1580 ff. Imposturage and manufacture show superfluity of affix (see p. 359.)
In this way -ery from the fourteenth century to the seventeenth had a great and relatively innocent sort of development; in the eighteenth century it fell into some neglect and vulgar abuse; in the nineteenth century it fairly well regained good-standing.

It would be especially convenient in this study to find that -ery has drawn to itself one particularly strong sense or association; but Mr. Gadde's dissertation shows, conveniently and disappointingly, that it has not. An attempted classification of the obsoletisms in -ery at hand shows little; most are nouns of "quality" or "behavior." Thus filthy 1656 only (physical filth,) 'filthiness' 1500 ff.,

harlequinery 1741 Richardson, 1794 Mrs. Fiozzi, 'harlequinade' 1790 ff. (in Mr. Gadde's lists under "Quality, Behavior,")

impostery 1656 only, 'imposture,' nickery 1923 only, 'nickname,' perhaps others.

"Action or practice of" is seen in preachery 1654 only, Gayton, "The letter, (being base Pechery)" &c. (contrast 'peachery' a place where peaches are grown, 1811 ff.,)

preachery 1913 (n-w.) prowlery 1670 only, Hackett, "Before the month of March expir'd, thirty-seven monopolies, with other sharking prowleries, were decried," and rail-wifery 1695, "abusive scolding." The idea of occupations is obviously in two of these. "Place where" is in coughery (n-w.) and in spittery ('spitoon' 1840 ff.), both in Urquhart's "Rabelais." The notion of "rank" is in priestery, again a nonce-word, 1649 (contemptuous, in Milton.) Priestery also has the idea of "collectivity," as does viscountry 1661 only, Fuller, 'viscountship' 1611 ff. Alexiteric and deleterie are special or technical terms,* and despite the appearance (so to

---

* Obsoletisms: 1795, 1694 and 1576—1634 resp. 'Alexiteria' sb. 1657—1671, adj. 1728 ff. To these may be added (unverified) from Gadde: raillery (var of 'raillery') 1651—1754; basery, bewitchery 1664—1863; bibbery 1653; bombastery "bombastic composition" 1704; chattery 1798, 1913; dodgery 1670, 1865; dullery
speak) of "collectivity" in sluttbery and wrappery (1652 ff. and 1662 only—"The hand or arm of the Young is cut off . . . ; neither is it found among the wrapperies [L. involucra], even as the head is,") these are but examples in which the suffix is superfluous. There is, then, no startling evidence as to obsOLESCENCE in this affix, unless indeed its faculty for attaching itself to all kinds of simple nouns and adjectives be accounted exceptional.

Considerably greater is the rivalry of -ment with -(at)ion and -(ing) and a few other suffixes. It originally occurred (states the NED) "in adopted French words in -ment, either representing Latin substantives, in -mentum, or formed in French on the analogy of these by the addition of the suffix to verb-stems." The Latin sometimes meant "result or product of the action of the verb," and sometimes "the means or instrument of action"—'fragment' and 'ailment,' respectively. In English, it came to go with verbs &c. to produce both nouns of action and nouns with concrete senses, but especially (as time went on) nouns of action. Hence, as Godde points out, there is much parallelism between -ment, -ery, and -ing.* French loan-

n-w. 1653, 1941; dupery 1791--1330; fantasty 1656--1710; fawmery 1661 (beavings or tricks of a fawn;) fobbery 1698; poetastery 1333--1394; helps to show how this ending is alive today, cp. p. 260;) pothookery 1795; quakery 1671--1629; rovery 1553; sainter- rantry 1688--1326; swindlery; tattilery; &c. Others denoting "occupation, rank" &c.: pastrry "business of a pastry cook" 1710--
1752; bishopry 1655; charlotry 1686; chislaintry 1773; cop- partnery 1777--1362; distillery 1677--1307; furriery; gardenery; glassery "glassier's work" 1663--1667; grazier "business of a grazier" 1760--1343; grocer "trade of a grocer" 1693, 1835; higgler "a higgler's business" 1769; hoaier "trade of a hoaier" 1789; ironmongery 1731; joinery 1673; kodakery 1393; linguistry 1794, 1953; limnery 1331; pagery 1536--1341; piloting 1744, 1842; platerery 1654; wrightery 1515 c. &c.; and many others. Compare Ch. VIII, occupations &c.

* Kr. Nyrop (Bib. 389) also comments in his Gram. Hist. (III p. 211) on the richness and productivity of this suffix.
words of abstract quality were less frequently introduced after the sixteenth century, and seventeenth century formations on verbs, often with the prefixes 'dis-', 'pre-', and 're-', came and went quickly. Occasionally, at least, a rival suffix and rival form were already on hand."

Mr. Gadde points to a rather interesting distinction between -ery and -ment. The first "expresses simply action without any subordinate sense and is consequently equivalent to '-ing." -ery has, thus, an "iterative sense in formations like . . . harassery, devilry, which undoubtedly express the idea of the verb more intensively than the corresponding formations with -ment; nor have the formations with -ment the complex meaning found in many derivations with -age" (see p. 334, first footnote—Meyer-Lübke.) The idea of action is particularly strong and inseparable in -ment.

It even puts into formations not originally having this idea, the notion of action. Few in comparison are nouns with -ment denoting "state, condition," "means," "result"—quasi-concretes, 'feoffment' (fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, ) 'amendment' ("clause, paragraph," 1696,) 'ejection' ("writ of ejection," 1697.)

But the obsoletisms at hand again do not illustrate the above distinction. On the other hand, so pronounced is the rivalry of words with -ment and words with -(at)ion, 'that one is grateful for the somewhat helpful comment of Fowler (see p. 293, footnote, *

* Mr. Gadde points out in each section of his dissertation (-ery, -age, and -ment, pp. 34, 62, and 78 respectively) a number of rival-forms—Rivalries. Here, under -ment, he lists:

annoyment 1460 — annoyance 1336 ff.
performent 1527—1641 — performance 1494 ff.
oppressament 1537—92 — oppression 1340 ff.
guidement 1573—92 — guidance 1538 ff.
inspiriment 1610 — inspiration 1303 ff. &c., &c., &c.
The rivalry of '-ion' and -ment, as Mr. Fowler shows, is (especially if compared with that of -ion and '-ness') an easy sort of rivalry; there are not hard and fast lines, and the two affixes give and take comfortably. Examples are dehortment ("Pantalone was too proud to hearken to dehortments.") vouchment ("The Peers... lay not their Hand upon the Book, but upon their Breast, which is a Sign that their vouchment by their Honour in that Tryal is not an Oath.") dilatement ("As if there were not enough of the leaven of disquietude in our natures, without inoculating it with this diluament—this vaccine vivus of envy"—Southey,) watchment ("... if there be an end to your Watchments, as you call them?"—Richardson in "Pamela;") and dates everywhere show that the living forms in 'ion,' '-nce,' '-ing,' '-ure,' and '-al' were earlier than the obsoletisms in -ment.

*Abjurement 1646 -ing, -ation 1514
abscondment 1653 -nce 1390
-ing 1634 [abuse 1533]
abusement 1319 -ing 1530
accommodemt 1676 -ation 1644
accommodation 1652 -ing 1603
accommodation 1654
adaptment 1739 -ation 1610
adherence 1646 -ation 1543
advancement 1730 -ing
affixment 1654 -ture 1793
-ing 1664, -ion 1633-1675
avoidment 1673 -ion 1617
bedewment 1679 -ing 1611
dealment 1646 -ion 1340
declinement 1680 -ture 1637
defraudment 1645 -ing 1546
dehortment 1656 -ation 1529
dejectment 1656 - ion [1533]
depravement 1644-1703 -ation
dilument 1807 -ion 1646
delatement 1746-99 -ion 1386
demazure 1734 -ing 1631
evisement 1655 -ing 1641
exaltment 1660 -ing 1496
exertment 1696 -ion 1677

Grievement 1703 grief 13
insertment 1671-1914 -ion 1624
lancement 1658 -ion 1470
likemen 1649 liking 1225
liquamen, liquidation, liquid 1322
oxidizement 1902 -ation 1792
-dization 1717-
pertinent 1663 due 1533
promotentment 1670 -ion 1493
ravage 1723-66 ravage 1611,
-ing 1611
rectlement 1646-1766 -al 1530
rejoicement 1653, 1681
reprovement 1675 reproff 1350,
-al 1346
resultment 1693 result 1647
retortment 1649 -ion 1591
retraitment 1721 retreat
sequestermnt 1779, 1335 -tra-
tion 1565
sternument 1677 -ation 1545
surceasement 1641 surcease 1566
undertakement 1678 -ing 1425
vouchment 1670 -ing 1573
Watchment 1740 -ing, 1345

Some of the above show superfluous affixes; see p. 339.
The only generalization that can, possibly, be made is that many, if not most, of the terms and forms in this section on rivalry were of rare or rarest occurrence, and belong not quite exclusively to the realm of books and "literature;" that these opposed forms and affixes do not anywhere especially illustrate the obsolescence of words because of particular developments or noteworthy meanings and shades of meanings in affixes; that in the midst of much writing—including use of affix-words, necessarily—there was also much casualness and indifference (though probably little conscious "carelessness,"), so that, in the seventeenth century, a superabundance (as we now see it) came about. It was, as has been said, an age of linguistic experimenting, adventuring; and it seems to have been an age in which almost anything was possible and in which men, not too much hampered by literary conscience, acted accordingly.

Affixes have been the bane of words in yet another important way. We shall have occasion in the last chapter but one to speak of use and abuse, and it would be interesting to know whether the conscience of a certain divine, now in another world, at length pricks him for having written, "The supportance of the flesh in, and union with the person of the word" (Jeanes, 1656.) Probably not. The word 'support' (sb.) had modestly been at hand since the fourteenth century (1390 ff.,) but did not seem to satisfy the taste either of Jeanes or his age, or of others and their times. For supportation, now obsolete, was used by an array of authors in a number of senses—Chaucer and Lydgate, Barclay and Henryson, Bacon, Hammond, Cavendish, Bishop Hall, Donne, and even H. J. Coleridge (in 1875.) So also a third word, supportment, of which the seventeenth century was not quite exclusively fond (Powell, Wotton, De Foe, &c.)
There is little that can be said of these redundant and awkward forms. The list submitted below* is not complete, but is perhaps formidable enough. We should, perhaps, be equally glad to be rid of them and yet to have them, historically, on hand. For, as Professor Wyld remarks somewhere, they speak for the taste and feeling of their age. They are one of the ways in which modern English is

* A-, Ab-, Af- &c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>embellishment</td>
<td>pristinarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breviserist</td>
<td>quotidianary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acustomerily</td>
<td>tabulairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articulation</td>
<td>umbilloary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affabulation</td>
<td>verisimilary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effamishing</td>
<td>-ate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affraction</td>
<td>abandonete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appert</td>
<td>acclamate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sttolerance</td>
<td>accreditate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ase</td>
<td>adoptate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imposturage</td>
<td>ambitionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loppage</td>
<td>appendicicisate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-al (-ial, &amp;c.)</td>
<td>attestate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantival</td>
<td>coerocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asphordisiacal</td>
<td>discommodiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attical</td>
<td>disinheritate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>augustal</td>
<td>experimentate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bondal</td>
<td>exudate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distantial</td>
<td>implantate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigidal</td>
<td>incommodiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decoratorial</td>
<td>lmviperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependental</td>
<td>nervate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterodoxal</td>
<td>nudate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impotental</td>
<td>oppugnate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imprudential</td>
<td>overponderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iliacal</td>
<td>pronunciare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclemental</td>
<td>purgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lectural</td>
<td>recognize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omnipresential</td>
<td>religionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicatorial</td>
<td>reposeitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providential</td>
<td>repurgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requistorial</td>
<td>resignate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retournal</td>
<td>superstitiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scaphoidal</td>
<td>temperaturate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tosissantial</td>
<td>tillerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typhodial</td>
<td>transfretate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ventosal</td>
<td>transsudate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
<td>transcriptate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sesquisalteran</td>
<td>transmutate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ary</td>
<td>unaccommodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hortulanary</td>
<td>unneristrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gossellary</td>
<td>unprejudicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palmary</td>
<td>vigilate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patentry</td>
<td>de-, dis-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decontrast</td>
<td>disaffect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaliment</td>
<td>dissartuate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissalique</td>
<td>dilaughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dilucid</td>
<td>dismangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismeasurable</td>
<td>disneglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disresent</td>
<td>diradicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissoluble</td>
<td>-ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-er</td>
<td>complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cirquiter (v.)</td>
<td>pilotier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sportier</td>
<td>-er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allegorister</td>
<td>encomister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ex-</td>
<td>extimulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fy</td>
<td>sluttery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrappery</td>
<td>-ful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ful</td>
<td>saudful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fy</td>
<td>bodify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diseaseify</td>
<td>honestify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lordify</td>
<td>studify (illit.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfrockify</td>
<td>-ian (see -an)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinesian</td>
<td>decretorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ic</td>
<td>almodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animastic(al)</td>
<td>osterastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paganio</td>
<td>-ic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appendice (v.)</td>
<td>im-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imbastardize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ystylistic. Their way was to speak of "vigilating"—vigilate; we say "to vigil," or, more commonly, "to keep vigil." Compare "to pilgrim," and any number of like uses. 'Denud,' 'nude' (v.,) and nudate are interesting. Redundancy is especially flagrant in allegorister 1941 ('allegorister' 1684 ff.) Most of the obsoletisms

- immodelize
- impillor
- in-
- Infractinate
- incation
- imputation
- instigate
- intransige
- intupeying
- intinat
- -ine
- Paulistine
- -ing
- hanging dog
- renneting
- saddling
- -ion
- Assention
- disciplination
- portation
- -ish
- frontish
- Tartarish
- ultramarinish
- -iam
- Creolism
- -ist
- architectist
- democratist
- droolist (also droler)
- droller
- idiotist
- -ists
- corlile
- -ity
- nausea
- -ive
- coodinative
- imperfective
- oplicative
- ornative
- -ize
- cipherize
- dethronize
- duelize
- formize
- garrisonize
- husbandize
- lithographize
- new-modelize
- orcallize
- reavene
- severize
- -ment
- accostment
- grievement
- navigation
- resultment
- retreatment
- suocenament
- -ous
- reposance
- -ness
- manness
- medall
- mounteness
- musloness
- novelness
- neapness
- understandingness
- -see, -see
- granitose
- Augustious
- alimentarious
- circumpectious
- clementious
- clyperformous
- infreaudous
- insinious
- repandous
- retrogradous
- salinious
- sativous
- savagious
- politicous
- savious
- submontaneous
- timidous
- vague
- vagabondious
- nephroideous
- sanguineous
- pro-
- profuency
- re-
- readvertency
- re-
- recontual
- regadig
- remigitate
- remcontre, &c. (limited use)
- -ster
- prigister
- quackster
- sub-
- subpenal
- un-
- untimeless
- unaudtless
- underthomember
- unmatchless
- under-
- undersubscriber
- -ure
- bondure
- -V
- peradox
- prestig
- dirgy (poet.)

Add:
- quarterth
- usefulish
- abstrusive
- diffusive (5. Bot.)
- Attican (op. Attical)
- discreetfully (op. sadful)
- futurality
- Homerian
- impertransible
- impervestigable
- largifol
- lunctness
- and many more.
were rare in occurrence, and a comparison of dates of 266 forms shows that in only 15 instances were the obsoletisms earlier, often only slightly earlier, than the living form. A few of the 15 redundant forms are: rependous, Homeric or, olyperforous, otearctic, aphor-
disical, appendicate, submontaneous, nervate, and discommodiate. It is interesting to note that 'prig' and prigster are close in time (1633 ff. and 1679 respectively; so 'coerce' and coercate (1659 ff. and 1657 only—an irregular form), decretorian, prestily, salinose, augustuous and 'august,' democratist. With prigster, however, may be contrasted idiotist (1715, 'idiot' 1377 ff.), architectist (1650, 'architect' 1563 ff.), and quackster (1709, 'quack' 1659 ff., 'quack-
'alver' 1579 ff.) and allegorister (1341 only, 'allegorist' 1684 ff.,) and encomisaster (1676, 'encomiast' 1610 ff.) It seems needless to observe that analogy is often at work here. Appart, e. g., is in imi-
tation of 'apportion' (1574 ff.; obs. word 1793 only; 'part' v. 1275 ff.) Especially interesting are the dates of 'frock' (1323 ff.,) 'unfrock' (1644 ff.,) and unfrockify (1694 Motteux.) So also af-
fabulation (&c.) and 'fable' (1649 ff. and 1300 ff.) Finally, the Oxford Dictionary under un- draws attention to forms like unfathomless (1673) and 'fathomless' (1633 ff.) and undauntless (1654 Earl of Mon-
mouth in a translation—"Death will come the more welcome, when sought . . . with undauntless valour;" 'dauntless' 1593 ff.; due to a "con-
fusion of thought, especially in 16th and 17th centuries, where a pos-
itive term is really intended.")

* 133 pairs of words, redundant obsoletisms and simpler living forms, were compared for dates, with these totals: obs. form earlier, 15 times; living form earlier, 119 times; both of practically the same date; 7 times. To the above agent-nouns may be added: piloteer 1645 and 'pilot' 1530 ff.; legatarian; abbreviariest 1679 only, ex-
panded into 'breviariest' (?Obs. 1621, 1679) after 'abreviate;' undersubscriber 1565 ff., 'subscriber' 1599 ff.; Chinesian 1674 only, 'Chinese' 1606 ff.; droller, -list 1676 &c., 'droll' 1645 ff
Affixes also occasionally show weakening. The weakening of a- through aphesis has already been mentioned; and to this may be briefly added: be- in sense 2 in the New English Dictionary (be-sparkling in Herrick, betine in Fuller [time a late form of tind, 'kindle,'] betrench "to cut up, carve"—intensive, betreut in "E. H.," betwit in Pepys' "Diary"—emphatic for 'twit' [1530 ff.,] and bewrite [1660; intensive of 'write' 931 ff.;] de- in many words;" demi-(demi-corpsed, demi-dameel, and demi-cadence &c. in music, demi-hill, -globe (geometry), demi-groat (monies; also demi-sovereign,] demi-coster [dress,] &c.;) dis- (dishrivvled;) -ic (profanatic;) im- (imbastardize;)] in- (instringle;) -ish (downish;) Channish;) re- (refront, reincensee, relolt, releave, remigable;) super (super-abound, super-edify;) trans- (trans-dignify;) &c., &c.

As promised earlier in this chapter, we turn momentarily to the phonetics of these obsoleteties. Ash said of 'criminality,' "not much used (1775,) but the NED shows it to have been in the ascendant from 1611 on. Today, the word which Ash proposed, and which was used..."
Hammond and Fergusson more than a century earlier, possibly would seem awkward in comparison—criminaliness—, although it is to be confessed, quickly, that we have many such words in which the sounds do not "accord" especially well. Novelteness may be held up for inspection (1690 only, 'newness' 900 ff. and 'novelty' 1382 ff.;) likewise un-sub-presbytery, disencamo ('decamp,') disencourage ('discourage,' 1626—1910 Steele, Mad. D'Arblay, and 1491 ff. resp.,) disendamage (1655, 'endamage' 1374 ff.,) disenrichm disencage (1654, 'disage' 1649 ff., 'encage' 1593 ff.,) disreccommend (1691, 'dis- commend' 1494 ff.,) reassure, reinhearten, romancesliat, opinionous, and others. No impressive or scientific statement seems possible, however, in the face of facts—what we know—and uncertainties.

Affixes will always be with us. They are not merely useful; they are indispensable. Because they were so numerous from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries on, because people became more and more conscious of their possibilities, so that by the seventeenth century (especially) writers ventured all sorts of forms and hybridisms we have on record a great many words which are obsolete because, partly or chiefly, of these interesting little particles in our language. Yet a careful estimation shows that in all this seventeenth century experimentation and freedom, relatively only a few of the forms survived even for a few years, a few decades at most, in books and literature. For the spoken language, it seems almost impossible to speak. Words like prigster are few. The proportion stands: nonce, .1, "Obs. rare —1", .29, probably rare, but not so marked in the NEB, .7, used several (three or more) times, .13.

The use of affixes, as illustrated in this chapter, was (and is) usually serious in vein. Occasionally, however, affixes have evagues
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(pp. 263--264, 294 [footnote] &c.,) and when they do, the multiplicity is sometimes amazing. In the course of his reading at the Huntington Library, the writer came upon many words in -mancy in Urquhart and Gaule, and especially one list in the latter writer with which this chapter may be closed."

John Gaule pictures himself, somewhat quaintly, shrowded "in some kind of twilight" from the "Magastromancer's" sun, and lighting his own candle to expose the awful tribe. "First, [no one] . . . ought to stumble at the new coined name I have prefixed; since the thing itself is so old," &c.; and although it is not his intention to "flourish in a wild circuit of words, but [come] close to the matter at hand," he seems to be forced, from time to time, into a number of long catechisms. Wishing to warn his reader against Divination, hydra-headed, he asks, in Chapter XIX of his book:

"What difference betwixt Astromancy, Magomancy, or Magastromancy . . . and all the after-named? viz. Stareomancy, or divining by the Elements; Aeromancy, or divining by the ayr; Pyromancy, by fire; Hydromancy, by water; Geomancy, by earth; Theomancy, pretending to divine by the revelation of the Spirit, and by the Scriptures, or word of God; Demonomancy, by the suggestions of evil Demons or Devills; Idolomancy, by Idol's, Images, Figures; Psychomancy, by mens souls, affections, wills, religious or morall dispositions; Antinomancy, by the entrails of men, women, and children; Theriomancy, by Beasts; Orni-thomancy, by Birds; Ichthyomancy, by Fishes; Botanomancy, by herbs; Lithomancy, by stones; Cleromancy, by latts; Oniromancy, by dreams; On-

* Bib. 103. This book and this passage are possibly fairly well known. Roget's "Thesaurus" (see note under Bib. 605) and Balthazar Bekker on "Spirits," 1695, pp. 23—31, and other like books were also consulted; and the writer hopes to publish soon a short article on "A Dictionary of Divination."
omato-mancy, by names; Arith-mancy, by numbers; Logarith-mancy, by Loga-
rithe-s; Ster-nomancy, from the breast to the belly; Gastronomancy, by the
the sound of, or signes upon the belly; Omphalomancy, by the navell; Chi-
romancy, by the hands; Pedomancy, by the feet; Onychomancy, by the
nayles; Cepheleonomancy, by the Brayling of an Asses head; Tuphrumancy,
by ashes; Capnomancy, by smock; Livenomancy, by burning of Frankincense;
Carromancy, by melting of wax; Lecanomancy, by a basin of water; Catox-
romancy, by looking glasses; Chartomancy, by writing in papers; Mach-
romancy, by knives or swords; Christalromancy, by glasses; Dactylo-
omancy, by rings; Coceinomancy, by selves; Axinomancy, by sawes; Gatabo-
man-cy, by vessels of brass, or other metall; Roadomancy, by starres;
Spatalomancy, by skins, bones, excrements; Solomancy, by shadowes;
Astragalomancy, by dice; Cinomancy, by wine; Scyomancy, by figges; Ty-
pomancy, by the coagulation of cheese; Alphitomancy, by meal, flower,
or branne; Crithomancy, by grain, or corn; Alectromancy, by Cookes or
Pullen; Gyromancy, by rounds or circles; Lampadomancy, by candes and
lamps; And in one word for all, Nagomancy or Necromancy .. ."

Such, it might be thought, is the complete Dictionary of Divina-
tion; but it is not! The New English Dictionary shows that Lydgate
and others were before Gaule in interest in words having -mancy, while
after him, notably, (or about the same time) was Urquhart; many of the
terms in Gaule, and a few not in his writing, will be found in Browne,
in Saffron and Blount (and later dictionaries,) and in Chambers "Cy-
clopedia" of 1727 ff. (e. g. 'rhapeodomancy.') Gaule's livenomancy,
pedomancy, and typomancy are somewhat awry in their spelling; and some
five forms or terms of Gaule's do not appear in the pages of the NED.*

* Antinomancy, caseinomancy ("seives"—but what about "cheese"?)
gattabomancy ("vessels of brass"—but what of Greek "down," "away,
"entirely"?) nagomancy (not listed under 'necromancy,') roado-
It has been the endeavor of the chapters (VI—VI) of Section II to state, informally rather than categorically or positively, some of the reasons why words become obsolete, and to submit a variety of illustrations. These chapters have dealt chiefly with Form—phonetic and etymological. We turn, in the next section, to Meaning, a perhaps even deeper subject, and certainly no less interesting. But we shall be, at least in chapters VIII and IX, somewhat more remote from Linguistics proper—the scientific vein. It is replaced by historic and semasiological considerations, and the feeling perhaps will be that we are concerned not so much with the history of words as of actual things and concepts. Chapter VII is, in consequence, a link—Form and Meaning; while Chapter IX endeavors to treat of a rather difficult subject, and one that has unquestionably been mishandled—Use.

But as stated several times in this study, words do not pass from use because of one reason only. While the chapters of Sections II and III try to arrange some of the reasons or causes of obsolescence and possibly to indicate which are more far-reaching or consequential, the concluding chapter will, as promised (p. 119,) attempt a synthesis.

maney ("stars,") and stereomancy ("or divining by the elements," cp. the Gr. element 'stereō,' "solid"—chiefly in technical or scientific use as illustrated in the NEP.) The first word may be a misprint for 'anthropomancy.' Of some 75 words in -maney, according to the Oxford Dictionary, 19 are obsolete, 54 living (though a few are of rare or rarest occurrence,) and 4 are singular proposals or nonce-words—collimancy, frontimancy, fusenancy, natimancy. Gaule elsewhere than in the above list has 'aleuromancy' and pantomancers and perhaps a few others; Urquhart and the lexicographers have 'aleuromancy,' 'anthropomancy,' (Gaule has anthropomantic and anthropomantist—only uses,) 'astronomancy,' 'belomancy,' 'bibliomancy,' 'chaomancy,' 'coscinomancy' (cp. Gaule's gaseinomancy, 'fusenancy' (Lydgate—also 'adryomancy,') &c., &c. Cp. Ch. 1x, p. 403, unomaney and urinomaney, &c.