LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, — It is possible at times for one who has to address an audience upon a subject selected either for him or by himself to approach his task with a degree of enthusiasm that makes him somewhat impatient of prefatory matters: he longs to rush at once in media res. Such is my case this evening. As a Devonshire man, and one who has for many years devoted to philological pursuits such scanty scraps of leisure as could be secured amid the duties and cares or an arduous profession, I have hoped to interest my hearers in a topic that blends and intertwines the fascinations of Devon and Philology—the Devonshire Dialect as illustrating and illustrated by other dialects and languages. And though to the splendid beacon-light which here in the West of England has bee kindled and maintained by Members of this Association and former Presidents it is but a *yaﬄe o’ ude* [laugh and Fr. *eu* nearly] that I am able to contribute, and that too without any attempt at eloquence, any endeavour to charm the ear with
periods polished and rotund, I yet claim and demand that you shall share my enthusiasm in studying the language of our forefathers. For, to judge from the analogy of the northern part of the island, it was not only the peasantry in former days who spoke the special dialect of our county, but more or less it was used by all classes. In our own time indeed even the peasantry are forgetting the local mode of speech; but if in Scotland of old learned clergymen such as William Lauder and Barbour, bishops of noble family like Gawain Douglas, heralds like Sir David Lindsay, Lyon King of Armes, wrote in "braid Scots," which we know our Scottish king James I. familiarly understood, it is at least probable in a very high degree that our ancestors, if they had bequeathed to us a

local literature for early times, would have left it arrayed in some such linguistic costume as the Exmoor Scolding and Courtship, Mrs. Gwatkin's Devonshire Dialogues, or Nathan Hogg's Poems.

Now when we read these little volumes, but especially the clever and humorous productions of the late Mr. Baird, the peculiarity that most forcibly arrests our attention is perhaps the PRONUNCIATION, so widely different from that which is current in good modern society throughout the island. Let us therefore deal first with Pronunciation. And giving precedence to the vowels, we at once notice that notwithstanding our familiarly speaking of the "broad" Devonshire Dialect, changes that have been made—corruptions, if you please—have really been in the direction, not of broadening, but of narrowing the sounds.

Take vorrid for example (=forward). The original sound of this word I take to have been foreward [store, hard]. Here the ward, which is current English has undergone a slight narrowing [cord], and in German has become wärts [care], has in Devonshire Dialect thinned off into wid, from which finally the w has disappeared.

Take the verb would, the past tense of will. This is one of the Mixed Verbs in which besides change of vowel as in the Strong Verbs the Weak Termination d was also added, and wolde [Ger. wollte], or with the u sound [bulldog], as is the usual modern sound, was the result. That the vowel was short as in the German wollte we know from
the *Ormulum* to have been the fact for at least six centuries and a half: it was not long as in *told, sold*, from *tell* and *sell*. But in the Devonshire Dialect this *wolde*, besides losing the final vowel and the *l*, has, like the second syllable of *forward*, dwindled away to *wid*; nay, it becomes thinner still sometimes—*weed*, made by Nathan Hogg to rhyme with the participle *zeed*.

In like manner the O.Fr. *juste* [*dzh, now zh*] has given us *just* [*dzh, rüst*] but is the Dev. Dial, *jist*; nonsense is *nonsins*; *can, kin; must, miss; from, vrim; that, thit*; whoever, *uiver; upon, apin; yes, yiss or iss*; curious, *kuryiss* [Fr. *queue* nearly]; purchase, the second syllable of which was the O.Fr. *chacer* [*tsh*], now *chasser*, is *purchis*. It is unnecessary to multiply examples, but it is right to add that *zich* for *such* is not one. This word preserves the true ancient vowel of the AS. and E.E. *swilc*, though every other element of the word has been modified or thrown away.

Another thin sound that is very frequent in the Devonshire
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Dialect is *u* as in *butes* and *shuz*. The true Devonshire sound of this vowel seems to me to be more nearly the French *eu* than *u*. Prince L. L. Bonaparte considers it to lie between the two. Mr. A. J. Ellis affirms that he has heard both sounds in different parts of Devonshire, and as he possesses wonderful accuracy of ear, I suspect he is right, though his observation is not confirmed by my own. Well, this sound in a large number of words is substituted for the fuller *oo* [Fr. *ou*, Ital. and Ger. *u*]. Thus, to quote a few examples only, the A.S. *bóc* (book), *dó* (do), *móna* (moon), *nón* (noon), *gós, lócian* (look), *eów* (you), which I believe to have been sounded as in modern English, except that all of them had a long vowel, have become in Devonshire *buk, du, mune, nune, guse, lük, yu*; the O.N. *tók* [cloke], which is our *took*, has become *tuk*; the Fr. *prouver, mouvoir, coussin*, have become *pruve, muve, cushin*. In words derived from earlier French forms with *u* such as *user, cruel, flûte, curieux*, the vowel in Devonshire in all probability has remained almost unchanged, as in *yuz, cruel, vlut, curyiss*; for it was at a very early period that the French changed the full Italian *u*, with which these words were doubtless sounded in the Latin originals, into the thin *u* which is now so familiar.
But it may be urged that there is certainly one large class of words in which the Devonshire Dialect gives a broader sound, as in *taich, aich, clain, baist, ait yer mait, laive, pursaive,* &c. True these are broader sounds, that is, you have to open your mouth wider in sounding them than *teach, each, eat your meat,* and so on; but it is these latter forms which are the corruptions, though fashion has set her seal upon them, and Devonshire has preserved the genuine older pronunciation. If I may be pardoned for alluding to my own investigations, I may claim to have proved this—and the proof is admitted by some who were very unwilling to accept it—in my work on *Early English Pronunciation.* It is there shown that though in Chaucer and other early English poets words may be spelt with the same termination, they may yet be sounded differently, just as even now *here* and *there* end in the same three letters, but the sound is not the same. In those poets we find *queene, kene, grene, bene* (part.), *sene* (part.), *wene, bitwene,* &c, rhyme together, all of these being spelt with *een* in modern English, while *lene, mene* (noun and verb), *bene* (noun), *clene,* &c., all of which we now spell with *ea,* also rhyme together, but as a rule refuse to rhyme with the former class. So it is with words in *eke: cheke, leke, seke, biseke* (now *beseech), weke* (noun), *meke,* are one class yielding
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a large number of rhymes, while *speke, breke, wreke* form a second; and these latter, now spelt with *ea,* retain in Devonshire their former sound, as indeed *breke* does universally. But I will not weary my hearers with further details on this point, or inflict on them the whole of my thin octavo just now.

In a few instances no doubt a vowel is broadened in the Devonshire Dialect. Thus *i* is made *ai* [Fr. haïr] in *oblaige, v(a)ine = fine, l(a)ive = life; or a [fate] becomes *ai* as in *aight = eight.* And so the negative prefix *un,* which in earlier times was apparently sounded as in German, and as the short *u* is habitually sounded now in our midland and northern counties, is broadened in Devonshire into *on,* as in *onjist, ondu, onlike;* the change being precisely the same as seems to have taken place in the Friesic *onwillich* for *unwillich,* *onwaxen* for *unwaxen,* *onriucht* for *unriucht,* &c, such forms being very common in that Low German dialect.
Still I contend that in the Devonshire Dialect vowels are much more frequently thinned than broadened. And this is nothing rare. To quote a few examples. The word for *mother* in Skt is mâtri, Zend mâtâ, Lat. mater, Grk. ματηρ in the dialect most widely spoken, but in Ionic and Attic Greek it was μητηρ [may, tare], which again in Modern Greek is attenuated into meteer. And uniformly in Modern Greek η which was e [there] is now e [here]. Again *star* is found in its true form apparently only in the oldest Skt., that of the Vedas, and in Zend, but has reverted to it in Modern English. In later Skt it has lost the initial sibilant, and become tárâ. In Greek and Latin it prefixes an a, αστηρ, astrum, or, in Latin, takes the termination -la, stella for ster-la. But the root vowel is altered from a to the thinner e both in αστηρ [there] and stella, and so also in the Goth. stairno and Ger. stern, and is thinner still in the Germ. derivative Gestirn. The root of the Latin simi-lis (=same-like) is found in the Skt. sama, Engl. same. The not unfamiliar name *Aldis* appears in the eastern counties as Aldus, and is originally Eald-hús. And the locative case plur. in Skt. regularly ends in -shu, which in Greek is represented by -σι, the Skt. naushú for example being letter for letter the Greek ναουσι. And in a very large class of words in our language the change of a [father] into a [fate] has taken place, as *name* from A.S. nama, *take* from O.N. taka, *prepare* from Fr. préparer, *landgrave* from Ger. Landgraf, *parade* from Spanish parada, *volcano* from Ital. volcano, and so on.

In many cases (as in the Latin *similis*) the attenuation of

the vowel is due to the addition of a syllable containing a thin vowel, and to the tendency then to assimilate the former vowel to the latter (the change which in German we call *umlaut*). Thus when -kin is added to *John*, the derivative is not Johnkin, but Jenkin or even Jinkin; and as when to *Angle*, which seems to be the earliest form of our national name, is added the termination -isc, the adjective so formed is not Anglisc or Anglish, but English, or, as it has been widely pronounced for several centuries, and is now almost universally sounded, Inglish.- To add yet two examples, *firkin* stands for *fourth-kin*, as being the fourth part of a barrel or chaldron, and *kilder-kin* (of which I
cannot accept Wedgwood and Skeat's etymology) is really a diminutive of *cauldron* or *chaldron*, these being only different forms of the same word, which is derived from the Latin *caldarium* with an augmentative ending.

How the Devonshire Dialect tolerates the hiatus that occurs when the shortened form of the indefinite article is used before a vowel, as *a egg, a ail, (i.e. an eel), a angel, a evil eye*, it does not seem easy to explain; but one may remark that in Spanish and Italian, which differ from French in this particular, the same hiatus is permitted: as in Spanish *una espada, una aguja*; in Italian *una armata, una ala*.

But one phenomenon occurs in the Devonshire Dialect, as also in that of Wiltshire and Sussex, and probably other southern counties, which must not be lost sight of. It is the division of a long vowel so as to form two syllables; as in *oùr, hâre, boäns, intiër, myell*. In the *Exmoor Courtship* we find *me-al, me-an, me-at*. In *Mucksy Lane*, one of Nathan Hogg's *Po-ams*, we have the distich:

"Wull, now I think I shant be wrong
Ta zay et ez a myell long."

And again:

"Tha last now lives pin ower heel."

Why this is of interest is that the same division of a long vowel occurs every now and then in Chaucer. For example:

"Of *fiers* Mars to don his sacrifise";

"Ne how that *lych* waké was yholde."

And in later poets too at times; as:

"And what his father fifty *years* told,"

which occurs in Tourneur's *Revenger’s Tragedy*. And in Shakspere's *Tempest*, Prospero says to his daughter Miranda—

"Twelve *ye-ar* since, Miranda, twelve year since,
Thy father was the duke of Milan,"
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it being impossible to scan the former of these lines except by dividing the first "year"
into two syllables. So also in the Two Gentlemen of Verona—

"But qualify the fire's extreme rage."

In Marlowe's Edward the Second, aye must be made two syllables to scan the line—

"Aye, if words will serve, if not, I must;"

and hands in each of the consecutive lines,

"EDW. Lay ha-ands on that traitor Mortimer!
E. MORT. Lay ha-ands on that traitor Gaveston!"

It is to a similar division that we owe the curious pronunciation of the first numeral one
as wun, and in Devonshire also oats is sounded wuts. The change is this: the A.S. án
[lawn] having closed into one [Fr. aumône], and then assuming the close English o
[bone], the sound which the word still retains in the three compounds alone, atone, and
only, then dividing, like Nathan Hogg's bo-an, becomes o-on, and so wun.

Lastly as to vowels, e sometimes assumes a kindred semi-vowel to precede it, while
u absorbs its preceding semivowel. Thus here becomes yur; hearing, yurring; evening,
yevlin; heathfield, yeffel. Similar to this is the change of i [marine] in Skt. into the
semivowel in composition when another vowel follows, as when iti + ãha becomes
ityâha [Ger. Ja]. Analogous to the words in which an initial w is absorbed by an u [too]
following, as ude for wood, umman for woman, are numerous words in Icelandic. Thus
ulfj (where the r is only the nom. masculine termination) is the Gothic wulfis, A.S. wulf
Engl. wolf &c. The verbs varða, which is the A.S. wadan, Engl. wade, and vefa, which
is the A.S. wefan, Engl. weave, have as their past tenses first per. plur. óðum [loathe]
and ófum [over] respectively; and vella [wedlock] and verða in like manner, which are
the German wallen and werden, make ullum and urðum; the initial w, which in Modern
Icelandic is sounded like our v, but was probably our w at an earlier stage of the
language, has disappeared.

Next to refer briefly to the aspirate. This, as everybody knows, has almost vanished
from French, Italian, and Romonsch, and is quite unknown in Spain, Portugal, and
Greece. The true Devonian follows these excellent precedents to a great extent, very
commonly omitting the h where it ought to be sounded, while elsewhere it inserts it
when unauthorized for the sake of emphasis. It is on the distinguished
authority of Mr. Baird that I affirm, that if a friend of yours seems to *hinterveer way you*, and *tu hack* in a manner that you deem *honjist*, it is perfectly *haup'n an haisy* to you to administer a gentle and dignified rebuke by calling him a *hass* /

In the consonants we find a tendency to prefer the sonant or flat to the surd or sharp, especially in the three classes of words represented by *vlower* for *flower*, *zyder* for *cider*, and *zhure* for *sure*. This preference for the sonant letter seems to have been formerly characteristic of all the Southern dialects. It is not so with the sibilants—to judge from the spelling—in Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*, written about the close of the thirteenth century; but such forms as *vor, byvore, vayr, vorst (=first), vast (=fast), lyve (=life), wyve (=wife), your, vourty, &c.*, are found on every page. In the *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, written in the Kentish dialect in the fourteenth century, the flat sibilants also are as common as in the West of England, though Dr. Morris states that "the modern Kentish vernacular has dropped this peculiarity." But it is curious to observe that the substitution of *v* for *f* characterizes one of the old Greek dialects—the Macedonian. The Greek β [veeta] is almost identical with our *v*; and in the names Βιλιπποσ for Φιλιπποσ, and Βερνικη (the name of Herod Agrippa's queen, as given in Acts xxv.) for Φερενικη, we have just the same phenomenon as is exhibited in the Devonshire *vour* and *vive* for *four* and *five*.

The guttural or gutturals formerly existing in English, and still familiar in German, Scotch, Welsh, Spanish, Modern Greek, &c., have been variously dealt with in Devonshire as in other parts of the island. As in *laughter*, AS. hleahtor, Pl. Du. lach, Ger. Lache and Gelächter, the now recognised pronunciation substitutes an *f* for the guttural; so in Devonshire we have *auft for ought*, and *sife for sigh*. But in many instances for the guttural, and in one word (*after*) for *f*, an *r* is substituted; of course pronounced with well reverted tongue—*arter, darter, ort (aught), nort, thort, cort, "wit bort ez wit tort,"* and so on. I have only noticed one instance of an *r* simply intrusive; namely, *wisterd* for *worsted*. For *worsted*, according to both Wedgwood and Skeat, takes its name from the village *Worsted* (that is, *Worth-steed*), in Norfolk; and the
second syllable contains neither an \( r \) nor any sound that an \( r \) could replace. Of a simply intrusive \( d \) in conjunction with the kindred consonants there are several examples—
cornder, twirdlin, purdlin uv a cat, guardlin (i.e. quarrelling), and so on. Apparently also there is an intrusive \( l \) in aulburn
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as an epithet of hair; but in fact the \( l \) is radical, the word being derived (as Dr. Murray will show in Part II. of his great Dictionary) from the Lat. alburnus; so that it means originally not golden, but whitish.

But one instance of the addition of a consonant must not be passed over. It is found in the phrase "vor enny keendest tbeng" (Exmoor Courtship). This keendest, which has assumed an illicit final \( t \) (such as we find in amidst, amongst, whilst), was in its earlier form kynnes, the genitive of kin; i.e. kind or sort. The literal meaning of "vor enny keendest theng" is therefore "for a thing of any kind." Many such phrases are to be found in our Early English writers, the word kin being spelt either with a \( y \) (the earliest form), or a \( u \), or an \( i \), and not infrequently the adjective preceding was also in the genitive to agree with its noun. Thus in Layamon we have "a summes kinnes wisen;" that is, "in a fashion of some kind," or, as we should now say, "in some kind of fashion;" "nones kunnes assaylyng" (Castle of Love)—"assault of no kind," or, in the modern idiom, "no kind of assault."*

More common however than either the addition or the insertion of consonants is their omission. Thus \( v \) is dropped in zar for serve, \( l \) in unny for only; thus also \( r \) is dropped in foce, scace, heace (=hearse), pass'n, weth a wile, Thesday and cus, [Fr. curieux, nearly] as standing both for course and coarse, the two words being confounded. The omission of \( r \) in all these words is before the sharp sibilant, and differs in that particular from the use in the Langue d' Oc of nost' home for notre homme, that is, mon mari; and from such forms in the dialect of Gascony, as aute for autre, rënde for rendre, live for livre, poute for potere, late Latin for posse. But in hoce (=hoarse) it is current English that is corrupt, as shown by A.S. hæs [howl], O.N. háss [Ital. au], O.H.G. heis, Swed. hes, Da. hæs [face], Dutch, heesch. Similarly, where there is apparently a \( b \) lost in rammle for
**The Salamanca Corpus: "President’s Address ["The Devonshire dialect: a study in comparative grammar"]" (1885)**

**ramble,** as in various English dialects, the *b* does not originally belong to the word, but is, as Prof. Skeat shows, a euphonic insertion like the *β* in *αββροτος.* † **Ramble** is in fact derived from *roam* by

* This idiom is pretty fully discussed in a note in my edition of the *Castle of Love,* on 1. 855.
† It is now just thirty years—so the years fly away—since I wrote a paper for the Philological Society, explanatory of such insertions, to show how there is almost a physiological necessity for them. Dr. Richard Morris has justly remarked that "the seat of euphony is in the vocal, not in the acoustic organs;" and it requires but little study of these vocal organs to discover that the breath is stopped from passing through the nose by the elevation of the *velum palati* in sounding all letters, both vowels and consonants, except only the three nasal liquids *m, ng, n,* which differ only in this particular from *b, g* (hard), and *d.* If therefore we are passing from one of these consonants to another, as in going from *m* to *l* or from *n* to *r,* among other changes we have to close the passage through the nostrils. This at once changes *m* into *b,* and when for *rammle* we say *ramble,* we have in reality effected the transition from *m* to *l* more easily when we have made it in two steps instead of one. So *αν-ρος* becomes *ανδρος,* and the Fr. *épin* (for *épine*) with the diminutive -*le* added becomes *épingle.*
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the addition of an *l,* which conveys at once a diminutive and a frequentative sense—to keep on roaming a little. The same termination is found in *sprinkle* from A.S. *sprencan,* *justle* or *jostle* from *joust,* *trample* from the Germ. and Platt-Deutsch *trampen,* *hustle* from the Old Dutch *husten,* *gruntle* (a word found in Villiers's *Rehearsal*) from *grunt.* And as to the intrusive *b* we find it also in *mumble* from *mum,* *shambles* from A.S. *scamel* = stool, and in *tremble,* Fr. *trembler* from late Latin *tremulare.*

The Devonshire Dialect drops a *t* occasionally, as in *ack, jack, nex, bess, ackshly,* *ginelvoks,* *kurrek,* but much more frequently a *d,* as in *behine,* *vine* (=*find*), *roun’,*
poun', han', lan', harly, hannel, &c. Just so the Fr. pronoun en had in early times a final t, ent, which t represents the d of the Latin inde, from which the word is derived.

Numerous other instances of euphonic change are furnished by our native dialect—lebn, zebn, lebner for eleven, seven, levener (= luncheon), bumbye for bye and bye, hapmy for halfpenny, dree happerd a nits for three ha'p'orth of nuts, dripmy bit for threepenny bit, wiss'n for wouldst not, kiss bring for canst brin—but time will not admit of my dwelling on these. But the forms id'd'n for is not, and wadd'n for was not must be alluded to as closely analogous to certain changes of letter in Greek, where Homer, Pindar, and Herodotus give us οδη, κεκαδενον, and ιδεν for οση, κεκασενον, and ισεν; only here it is the δ that is radical, and the change has been in the other direction.

There is, however, one curious metathesis that must detain us a little longer. It is where r changes places with an adjacent vowel. Examples are urch, urd, curst, burches for rich, red, crust, breeches; firnt, pirnt, pirnce for front, print, prince; urgment for regiment; burd and cheese; burnstoan, purty, apurn, girt (i.e. great), purtect, pursayve, purmote; and so on. But in Greek in like manner we have side by side κρατερος, θρασος and θαρσος, ημβροτον (with the euphonic β) and ημαρτον, κραδια and καρδια. Nor is it very easy to determine which is the older form. Take the last pair. The form καρδια is supported by the Latin cor, cordis, Goth. hairto, O.H.G. herza, A.S. heorte, Icel. hjarta, [42]

Pl. Du. kart, Engl. heart. But the Skt. is hrid, and in Old Irish Dr. Whiteley Stokes gives us the two forms cride and cradion. One thing only is clear, that not Devonians alone, but the Indo-European races generally (for I believe r is found in all Indo-European alphabets), have found it somewhat easy to mix up this letter with its vowel. But it is specially notable that in Sanskrit, and in Bengali also, this transposition is fully recognised. In that part of Sanskrit grammar which treats of Sandhi (that is, Euphonic Combination) rules are given on the subject. I will not trouble you with the rules, but here are a few examples. Rī, to go, gives richchhati, he goes, but ârchchhat, he went. Kri, to do or make, jri, to grow old, give us the futures kartā, he will do, and jaritā, he
will grow old. *Kri*, to make, and *krî*, to scatter, both form the causal *kārayati*, he causes to make, or he causes to scatter. So *drish* forms a verbal adjective *darshaniyah, chrit chartyah, krît kîryah, vrish vrishyah* or *varshyah*. And *pîtri*, father, *mâtri*, mother, *nri*, man, form the plurals *pîtara, mâtara, narah*, or in the older form with *s, pita, mûta, nara*, identical with the Greek *πατερες, ματερες (Æol.), ανερες*. But the resemblance of the Devonshire Dialect to these Indian languages is all the more striking if the opinion is correct, which is held by modern philologers, that the phenomenon is to be ascribed to the peculiar sound of the Sanskrit *r* in this class of words. It was not, according to this view, the trilled *dental r*, as in *ride, rapid*, or the guttural *r*, as in French and the Northumbrian *burr*, but just the same reverted *r* as is so familiar in our county, the tongue being curled back towards the back of the palate, as in their, lord, Dartmoor.

But it is time to leave Pronunciation, though the subject is far from exhausted, and proceed to the Accidence of Devonian grammar.

Here turning first to the pronouns, *zum aumin*, especially that last syllable, present a considerable difficulty. My old friend, Mr. Elworthy, has it in his very competent hands, and *zoce* I am strongly tempted to leave it there, and yet may summon courage to deal with it *vurder aun*.

Now Nathan Hogg has left it on record that *wan awm com'd to ware I zot*. The history is interesting, but it is the form of expression *awm*, that needs one brief remark. It is of course equivalent to *of them*, but it does not stand for *of them*. The final *m* stands for *hem*, the dative plural of *he*, which came to be used indifferently as dative or accusative.
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And if we read—

"A vigger jump'd, ha zeed'n dun't,
An naw'd'n"—

what is this *n* that occurs twice? The question admits of a brief answer. It was originally a word of four letters, *hine [linnet]*, the accus. masc. sing. of *he*, for which in ordinary
English the dative him is now substituted. This hine lost the final e, lost the aspirate, lost its first vowel (these two constituting the root in a modified form), and ’n alone remained, a fragment of the termination. This tempts one to a brief digression. We have one word in the language of five letters, of which, as some philologers have supposed, only one is radical—the word drake. The Latin anas, of which the stem is anat, claims kindred with drake as to the first letter d only; the -rake, Ger. -rich, as in Täuberich, indicates the male bird. So Latham and others have anatomized drake, not satisfactorily; but it remained for an ingenious Frenchman, Pellissier, to point out in a work on the French language a French noun, in which not a single letter of the root remains—the word oncle. But this is an absurd mistake. The word is derived from the Latin avunculus, itself a diminutivo from avus. In avunculus, if the v was sounded like our w, its disappearance before the kindred u is just similar to the formation of our Devonshire ude and umman already discussed. If it was sounded like our v, we again find analogies in head (Devonshire haid) for Middle English heved, from A.S. heafod, and lord (Devonshire loard), from M.E. loverd, A.S. hláford. At all events the v slips out, and avunculus remains. Then the change that takes place is just the same as when Claudius assumed the form of Clodius, plaustrum that of plostrum, or when the Latin cauda became the Italian coda, and the Latin causa, the Italian cosa, and the French chose. And so when we compare the standard French of the present day with that which is still called the Langue d'Oc and spoken in the South of France, we find the dative of the article au is in Langue d'Oc aou, gauche is gaucho, and so on. In fact the o in oncle is the root, all three letters of the root compressed into one. Now it is familiarly known that a variety of terminations consisting of or beginning with vowels, that were in constant use in AS. (as in steorr-a star, tung-e tongue, wud-u wood, lufi-an to love), all, like hine which we have just dealt with, in M.E. became a simple e, and finally this also was lost at least in the spoken language, as in these very words, star,
tongue, wood, love. But in Devonshire we find one word, a demonstrative adjective, which to this day preserves the M.E. ending, the word thicky. This was in A.S. the def. art. followed by ilca for the mase, ilce [caper] for the fem. and neuter. Hence thilke [caper], which losing the l and thinning, as so commonly, the final vowel, becomes thicky. There is, we all know, existing by the side of this, another form in which the final vowel is abraded, thic (or thek, as it appears in the Exmoor Courtship).

In the adjectives it is notable that we have a few double comparatives and double superlatives. To students of language it is of course a familiar fact that near is really the comparative of the A.S. neáh or nêh, which we now pronounce nigh; so that nearer is a double comparative. More obviously still biggerer is such. And forma in A.S. and O.Friesie is a superlative meaning first, the m having the force of a superlative exactly as in the equivalent Latin primus. But to this forma a second superlative termination -ost is added, and so fore-m-ost is formed, a double superlative. We have in standard English several such forms; and Devonshire can boast one of its own—leastest.

This doubling of a termination to convey the same force twice over is happily named by Dr. Latham "excess of expression." We find it not only in double comparatives and double superlatives, and in forms more complicated still, like innermost, nethermost; we have also double feminines like song-str-ess; participles with a double termination in vulgar English, as drownded, and the newfangled abomination sod-dened; double diminutives, like the Scotch lassiekin, which is exactly the Latin puellula; and double plurals. For example, analogous to mouse mice, cow changes its vowel, and forms the plural ky (A.S. cý). To this an n is added as in ox oxen, and the double plural kine appears. Analogous to goose geese, and foot feet, was brôðor [brew], brêðer which in A.S. was a dative sing., but in E.E. was used as a nom. plur.; but it seems to have been forgotten in course of time that brêther was plural, so "to make assurance doubly sure" an n was added, and the double plural brêtheren or brethren was the result. But what is curious is that in one of the commonest of these words Devonshire claims to possess a keener insight into language, and commonly rejects the superfluous letter. For the noun child, like a large class of words in German and in Icelandic, forms the plural by adding -er. In ordinary English -en is superadded, as in numerous forms in Dutch, and in M.E. there existed lambren,
calveren, eyren (eggs); but Devonshire, like the Northern Dialect of English, which it very rarely follows, usually prefers the simple plural childer, though children is also used.

This plural termination -en, which was much used in M.E., as unclen, sustren [Ger. süß] (sisters), hosen, fon (foes), been (bees), &c., has almost died out in Devonshire. Yet there is one such in Mrs. Gwatkin's Devonshire Dialogues, and with the termination added not to a word originally English, but to one of French origin, rosen: a tetty o' rosen (a bunch of roses), and pots o' rosen.

But we have not yet done with "excess of expression." In A.S. were certain genitives of pronouns which in Modern English have become her, our, your, their. To all of these we add, when we use them (as the French grammarians would say) disjunctively, another genitive termination, s. The final r was already a sign of the genitive, as often in German, and to a small extent in Dutch and Icelandic; but we have made double genitives, hers, ours, yours, theirs.

Now let us return to min. The ground is sufficiently cleared; it will be enough that I simply state the conclusion at which I have arrived. The word is equivalent to them, or to the hem which, as we have seen, is often represented only by 'm, as in aul aw 'm. Then, as we now know that pronouns may take a double inflexión, such as the double genitives just dealt with, and that nouns may form double plurals, like children, my theory is that in min we have a double plural, though it is termination only. The word probably never existed in its full form, which would be hemen or hemin; but the last two letters were added after the first two had already disappeared.

(Several days after the last paragraph was written I made a discovery, and in the course of writing this paper I have made more than one such, with mingled surprise, amusement, and vexation. What to the writer seemed original has after all not been original. Experience shows that it is very easy to have ideas lodged in the mind, the source of which we have utterly forgotten, and in course of time the thoughts themselves are lost sight of, overlaid—as though by Darwin's earthworms—with a layer
of other matter; and then some day when we are digging we come upon some substance a little beneath the surface which we fancy we have never seen before, and we plume ourselves, it may be, on the happy result of our ingenious and painstaking search; when after all it is only a mineral that is already known and described in the books. Four years ago Mr. Elworthy read a paper
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before this Association, in which he maintained—on the basis of facts furnished by my learned friend and late colleague, Dr. Murray—the very view for which I have just been contending. He was so kind as to send me a copy, and, with a greater or less degree of attention, I read it, and in course of time utterly forgot it! Ought then the last few paragraphs to have been entirely struck out? I think not; for to the very best of my consciousness and belief I was exploring on wholly untrodden ground, and any argument becomes the more cogent when it is thoroughly re-examined and remodelled, with old facts marshalled in a new array, and fresh facts introduced. But this must be clearly avowed, that whatever merit there may be in this little discovery belongs to Mr. Elworthy and Dr. Murray, to be divided between them in whatever proportions are just. I disclaim it altogether. Besides, in the paper referred to it is shown by several quotations from the old poem of Sir Ferumbras that the form *hemen*, or *hymen*, that seemed so necessary as an earlier form of *min*, actually did exist; nay, in one passage the very word *men* itself; and this old poem too is in the Devonshire dialect. So the argument is clenched, and the origin of this curious form remains in the region of conjecture no longer.

Passing on now to the verbs, we notice first, in the verb *to be*, how pure the Devonshire dialect has remained from northern admixture. In A. S., as in German and Latin, two defective verbs, partly overlapping, unite to form the verb substantive (not to mention a third *was*, *wes*, or *wis*, which supplies some of the past tenses). The root of one of these two appears in Skt. in the form *as*, in Grk. *εἷ* (as in *εστι*, *εσμέν*), in Latin as *es* (as in *est*, *estis*, *esse*), in Gothic as *is*, in A. S. as *is*, and so on. The root of the other is in Skt. *bhū*, Grk. *φῶ*, Latin *fu*, and so on. The former of these often loses the initial
vowel, as in Lat. *sum* for *esum*, *sim* for *esim*; and it is from this root that the pres. ind. in A. S. forms the plur. *we synd* or *syndon*, *ge synd* or *syndon*, *hi synd* or *syndon*. From the other root the plur. *we*, *ge*, *hi*, *beó*, or *beó*, is derived, which in M. E. became *we*, *ye*, *they*, *been*, or *be*. But the former root *es* often, under certain circumstances dependent on the place of the accent in the Old Teutonic, changes its final sibilant into an *r*, as in the Latin *eram*, and, pray observe, in the pres. ind. in Icelandic, which runs thus: *em* (or *er*), *ert*, *er*; plur. *erum*, *eruð*, *eru*. Now the Icelandic, which when we speak of times long ago we usually call Old Norse (though the changes in the language during nearly a thousand years have been so slight as hardly to justify the use of a distinct name), was the native tongue of those invaders who, under the name of Northmen or Danes, carried on so long and bitter a conflict with our Saxon and Anglian forefathers. The Angles, at least those who occupied the district north of the Humber, probably already spoke a dialect not very remote from the O. N.; and when a large body of Scandinavian invaders came and settled in their midst, these could not but impress a marked character on the Northern English dialect as a whole—the dialect, that is, which was spoken from the Humber to the Forth—confirming it in its resemblance to the Norse. Hence, to specify only a single detail, the Northern English has for the plur. of the pres. ind. of the verb *to be*, *aron*, or *aren*, or *arn*, or *are*. Devonshire is loyal to the Southern mode of speech, and says always *es be*, *yu be*, *they be*.

Again, in the A. S. verb the plur. of the pres. ind. regularly ended in *-að*. As the centuries rolled on, they brought changes, which I need not weary you with, except to say that in the Southern English this simply changed into *-eth*, or lost the vowel, still retaining the *-th*. In Robert of Gloucester, of the thirteenth century, and in the Kentish *Ayenbite of Inwit*, of the fourteenth, this is the regular termination. In Chaucer this does not occur; for he wrote in the Midland dialect, in which the *-að* was overpowered and expelled by the *-on* of the imperf. and of both tenses of the subj. Chaucer's plur. was *we*, *ye*, *they*, *tellen*, or *tellè*, or *telle* with the final e mute. But in the Devonshire dialect the
ancient ending has not wholly vanished, and thus we can account for the apparent solecism in "like giants ait 'th."

Now when some of us went to school, we were taught to divide verbs into Regular, such as love loved; and Irregular, such as run ran, shine shone. It is the fashion now to call those that form the past tense by a change of vowel Strong Verbs, and those that add d or ed Weak Verbs. Just so in Greek there was a strong and a weak past tense, the strong called the Second Aorist, the weak the First Aorist. In both ancient Greek and modern English we find all newly-formed verbs follow the weak inflexión—φιλοσοφεω, εφιλοσοφηρα, and electrify electrified. And in many instances in Greek a verb in the early writers used the strong aorist, and in later the weak. The same tendency is found in the Devonshire dialect. Instead of knew, threw, drew, ran, sang, stuck, shook, fell, &c, we find naw'd, draw'd, drade, rin'd, zing'd, stik'd, shak'd, vall'd [Fr. pâle], and so on.

[48]

In Dutch, Flemish, and High Germ. there was and is to most past participles a prefix ge-, which is not found in the Scandinavian languages. In like manner it appears never to have existed in Northumbrian English; while it was commonly, not always, used in Midland and Southern Early English. Now the vulgar pronunciation of this prefix at Berlin is not ge-, but ye-, and doubtless at some period the English ge- underwent a like change, after which it was further simplified into y- or i- (as constantly in Chaucer and his contemporaries), and next into a mere a- [America] before it finally vanishes. This as a participial prefix has entirely disappeared from the now current English; but in Devonshire there are innumerable such forms—a-com'd, a-got, a-told, a-vound, a-skalded [Fr. pâle], and so on. But I need not enlarge the list. Your Committee on Devonshire Verbal Provincialisms is diligently collecting examples.

It was remarked just now that the old infinitive ended in -n, which in Chaucer's time was obsolescent. In like manner ago is the later form of agone; and so in many instances a final n is lost in Devonshire. Thus we find a-be for been, a-lade for laden, I'm mistake, ef I'd a-like, where can they be go to? n being omitted. Similar to these are in Early English writers y-do for done, i-falle for fallen, unknowe for unknown, he
hadde be for he had been, to have take for to have taken, i-schreve for shriven, and so on. But while we notice this peculiarity in a few Devonianisms or in a fourteenth century poet like Chaucer or prose writer like the author of Merlin, we perhaps fail to notice that there are in current English many instances of the very same apocopate. This may be accompanied by a change of vowel, or the past indicative may be used as a participle; but the -n is thrown away, as in let, hung, run (Chaucer's i-ronne), sung, swum, burst, shone, for leeten or gelaten, hangen or gehangen, &c.

But there is another participial form that claims attention, which is commonly denounced as a vulgarism in whatever part of England it is met with, and nevertheless is by no means so corrupt a form as that which fashion has long sanctioned: I mean -in for -ing in the pres. participle. In Skt. the pres. and fut. participles active form their Anga base—you will forgive my not stopping to define the term—in -ant, as tudant striking, adant eating. In Greek the pres. act. part. and certain others form their stem in ντ, pronounced nd, as—I quote the genitive—τυττοντος, pronounced by the Modern Greeks teept'ondos, δεικνυντος pronounced dheeknee'ndos. In Latin we find nt in the pres. part. act., and nd in what

some grammarians, I think justly, regard as the pres. part. pass., as amans amantis, amandus amanda amandum. In Germ. the termination is -end, in A.S. -ende; while in Icel. it was and is -andi (as kallandi [paddling] calling, brenandì burning); and hence in the Northern dialect of Early English we find -ande, while in the Southern -inde became a common form, of which, as in all other words ending in an unaccented e, that e became mute. But notice that in all these forms the n is followed by a d. At this point therefore the verbs give, bear, love [loop] have for their participles givind, bearind, lovin'd [loop]; and obviously it is a smaller change merely to omit the d and so get givin', bearin', lovin', than both to omit the d and also change the nasal liquid nâ (to adopt the Skt. method of naming the letter) into ngâ [sing]. Yet the ngâ form, giving, bearing, loving, is now deemed correct, and is authorized and alone tolerated by that

"usus
The Salamanca Corpus: “President’s Address [“The Devonshire dialect: a study in comparative grammar”]” (1885)

Quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi."

The dialect of our county has gallantly fought for five centuries or more for the less corrupt form, but has fought in vain. One cause which has favoured the change of -ind into -ing is no doubt the fact that there existed at the same time two considerable classes of nouns, chiefly verbal nouns, ending one in -ung (which is also so common a termination in German) and the other in -ing, and a confusión of the three terminations was the result; just as in Devonshire we find write used not only for the verb write and the noun fright, but also for the adjective right.

Before taking leave of this class of words—meetin, veelin, warmin [hard], tinkrin, hammerin, walkin [Fr. pâle], axin, watchin [father], drappin, larnin, and so on through all the verbs in the language—it may be permitted to observe how easy it is for anyone who attempts to write in a local dialect to adopt erroneously the customary mode of spelling, either from mere force of habit, or from failing to observe some of the local peculiarities. Mrs. Gwatkin always writes these words with -ing; Mr. Baird does so occasionally, but much less frequently in his Second Series (1864) than in the earlier Letters and Poems (1860). I suspect his later observation was the more correct. In like manner Mrs. Gwatkin writes why, when, where, etc.: Mr. Baird never does, and I venture to think he is right. The wh which is so distinctly sounded by the Irishman or the Scotchman, but for which the majority of Englishmen now substitute the simple w, is, I believe,
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never pronounced by the class of whom Nathan Hogg is so brilliant a representative.

From Accidence we pass on to Syntax. And here the first point to be noted is that the familiar rule which demands a nominative case for the subject of a verb seems to be in Devonshire honoured almost as much in the breach as in the observance. The accusative seems actually to be preferred, but not those forms now used as accusatives, but which were originally datives, him, them, whom; nor has me ousted I, that modest uniliteral pronoun, which is always conscious of standing for number one, and can assert its individuality under the most inauspicious circumstances. For we Devonshire uses us or
es; for example, "Well, thort I, us shall ha 't bam-bye, and zo es had, with a sissarary."

And again, Rab is telling Bett of some of his domestic wealth that may serve ere long to promote their nuptial bliss: "I 've a gude doust bed-tye, and a tester-bed, and a banging brass kittle that es may swap for what gudes es may lack." But we is also used, as in the same connexion, "Well than, we 'll zee to raise the wind to buy a pig." She, as a nominative, gives place to hur: "Her squat down upon the bank, and her put back her head, and made fast her eyes: 'How delightsome,' her zaid, 'is the soft wind that blows 'pon my vace.'" Thee is substituted for thou: " 'Sweet lamb,' her zaid, 'art thee dead? Wilt thee never open thee eyes again?'" But in Nathan Hogg's Sairyiss Poems we find thou also.

"Wat dist thow yer, thow litt'l vlow'rr?
   Why zich a spot dist crave?"

And again-

"Iss! litt'l vlow'r, I'll iver think,
   As thow rayturn'st aych yur,
   Thit thow beest zent ta bare ta mee
   A zmile uv luv vrim hur."

But, as in current English and in French, the plural pronoun is more commonly used than the singular, even when addressed to a single person, being sometimes yu [nearly Fr. yeux], sometimes ee. Here is you as a nominative—

"Yu'l vine et tha gurtist misteak yu've a-meade,
   Ef yu git hinteverein way wan tuther's treade."

And ee is familiar in "du ee" and "doan't ee." And as an accusative we have you in, "Gaffer, did I iver tell you that measter was drunk lass Vriday, and vall'd into the mud-pool,
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and that Dame and I lugg'd en out?" But the pronoun here is emphatic, otherwise ee—which of course stands for ye—would be preferred, at least after a verb, as in "I zeed ee du 't."
But you is originally accusative and dative: ye alone is the nominative. We have therefore in the sentences just quoted a complete confusión of cases, which, I need hardly observe, obtains very generally in standard English, as well as in the Devonshire Dialect. Is any such confusión to be found in other languages? The French je, in Old Fr. *jeo* or *jo*, is simply another form of *ego*; but when the pronoun is separated from the verb, it is not *je* that is used (except in the solitary phrase *je soussigné*), but *moi*, derived from the Latin accusative *me*. The change of vowel is the same as when the Latin *regem*, after being cut down to *re*, as in Italian and Spanish, then, like a large class of similar words, admits the sound of *o* or *ou* [*Fr. sou*], and becomes *rouè* [*were*], and afterwards *roi*, as now pronounced. *Moi* then is clearly accusative, and yet used as a nominative, disjunctively, as the grammarians call it. The reverse of this is found in Languedoc, where *iéou* (which is the Latin *ego*, Portuguese *eu*, Italian *io*, Spanish *yo*, and French *je*) is regularly used for *moi*, and not as *je*. In like manner in O.Fr. *que*, and in Italian *che*, though derived from the accusative *quem*, are often used as nominatives; and in Portuguese *quem* [*Fr. quintuple*] may be a nominative, as, *Quem era eu?* Who was I? So the Latin *med* for *me*, which the analogy of the Sanskrit ablatives *mat*, "from me," and *twat*, "from thee," shows to be originally an ablative, is used in Plautus more commonly as an accusative than as an ablative. A like confusión, not of cases but of genders, is found in the French *leur*. The Latin genitive plural, *illorum illarum illorum*, is the origin of the O.Fr. *lor*, which became *leur*. The feminine form is lost, and *leur*, like the Italian *loro* also, is used for both genders. When *eus* [*It. Europa*] is used in O.Fr. as a feminine, this is only an apparent confusión of genders, the modern *eus* being masculine; for, as Orelli has well shown in his *Altfranzösische Grammatik*, the Latin feminine singular *illa* becomes *ele* (later *elle*); this *ele* loses the final *e*, then assumes an *s* to form the plural, and the *els* that results becomes *eus* [*It. Europa*], as the liquid *l* becomes *u* in innumerable instances.

But from the language of Ville-Hardouin, and the *Roman de la Rose*, let us come back to our Devonian forms of speech. And before leaving the pronouns, it is worth while to observe that in many other cases besides the one expresion
already quoted emphasis decides the form to be used. *Him*, when unemphatic, is *en* or 'n, as we have already seen: "Why, the mother and darter rag *en* and scan *en* whenever they come atwart *en". But if emphasis is needed, Devonshire uses *he*: "I wish zumbody wid mawl *he*;" "Hur drade sheep's eyes *ta he*;" "Hur defied *he* and his law;" "Jist ax a *he*." So for the feminine: Betty describes old Mall, who was a terrible termagant, as "trimming up my Measter," and then describes him in turn as "wringing up his vist to *her*, and swearing he ’d have *her* before her betters, and trounce *her*"—the pronoun *her* three times. But if emphatic—

"I'll wurk a charm to tackle *she*." Now just as there is confusion in the use of pronouns, so we find when we turn to the verbs. From the Sanskrit verbal root *as* = *be*, which I have already had occasion to mention, is formed the present indicative 1st singular *asmi* = *I am*, where the additional syllable is obviously connected with the oblique cases of the 1st personal pronoun, *my*, *me* in English, *mâ*, *me*, *mat*, etc. in Sanskrit. The same root *as* assumes the forms *es* in Greek and Latin; and in Greek we might therefore expect *esmi* = Sanskrit *asmi*; but instead of this—just as in Icelandic *vaðmál* is pronounced *vammál*—we have *ε`μμι* = *I am* in the Doric dialect, which, undergoing a slight additional change, became *ειμι* [*Amy*] in other parts of Greece. In Latin the same *es*, with the same consonant *m* added, becomes *esum*, and then (as above remarked) loses the initial vowel. In Icelandic we get the same biliteral root; but in the 1st person singular of the present indicative, where Latin drops the *e* and keeps the *s*, Icelandic drops the *s* and keeps the *e*. Hence we get *Icel. ek emi=Lat. sum*. Similarly in Meeso-Gothic we have *ik im*, and in A.S. *ic eom*, which in modern times has become modified into *I am*. The analogy then of these other languages makes it plain that of the two letters of the word *am*, the first is the modified root of the verb, the second is the modified pronoun of the first person. Apart from such analogy the word would be incapable of explanation, there being no other instance in English of this termination *m*, familiar as it is in the Latin verb. But what of the Devonshire Dialect? As above pointed out, it prefers to use *be* in the present tense, and it is doubtless because *am* was less familiar that its exact significance was forgotten, and
so it came to be used with other pronouns besides I, as thou'm, we'm, yu'm, they'm. I suspect that an entirely different explanation would have to be given of such French provincialisms as j'avons for j'ai in Le Médecin Malgré Lui and elsewhere.

A different account must be given of the addition of the final s in verbs, not only in the third person singular, but in other parts also of the present tense, as I writes for I write; Zais I; In es gose; Yu bares et up wull both in body an min'; Tha drums wis a bating; They lukes in my veace; How they laffs to be zure. Now in A.S. four parts out of the six of the present tense end in ð (th). Thus the tense I love in A.S. is in full as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ic lufige} & \text{we lufiað} \\
\text{ðú lufast} & \text{ge lufiað} \\
\text{he lufað} & \text{hi lufiað} \\
\end{array}
\]

This ð (th) very readily changes into s (precisely the process which is reversed by persons who lisp), and thus we have the three persons of the plural ending in the same s as the third person singular. Every one remembers how Shakspere uses this old form in the beautiful song—

"Hark, hark, the lark at heaven's gate sings,
And Phoebua gins arise
His steeds to water at those springs,
On chalic'd flowers that lies."

This use is not rare in the Folio Shakspere, though commonly altered by modern editors. Numerous examples are quoted in Dr. Abbott's Shakespearian Grammar, and it is common in Devonshire also.

Various IDIOMS, some of which hover on the borders of Syntax, next claim attention. One of these is the use of the conjunction that to strengthen and confirm another conjunction. It is usually thinned off to thit, and in the use referred to it forms the phrases how thit, wen thit, ware thit, ef thit, in case thit (like the Fr. en cas que or dans
le cas que), thin thit. Our friend Nathan Hogg will furnish an example or two. "I ax'd 'n ware thit he wiz gwayn." And Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, who I am in a position to assure you does not habitually employ our western mode of speech, when enquiring of Nathan in what village or town he could hear the broad Devonshire Dialect for himself, puts his question thus: " Bit cud yu tul ma wur thit I cud yer et spauk? Again—

"Tiz strange wat vules there bee in live,
Now thic thare vulis h zex'n's wive,
Zed Roger'd drink'd a cupple quart
A zyder moar thin thit ha ort."

Again, Nathan went to see "The Wile Baists," and among them observed some pelicans swallowing fish—

"An the man zed as how thit aufl'n they can,
Wen they veels vury hungary, zwaller a man."

And elsewhere, "Aiv'n if thit I cude." Now exactly the same usage is found in Early English. The very first line, for example, of the prologue to the Canterbury Tales begins with such a reduplicate conjunction—

"Whan that Aprille with hise shoures soote
The droghte of March hath perced to the roote" *

The Schipman is described, who had a large spice of the pirate in his composition, and we are told how he made his unfortunate prisoners "walk the plank"—

"If ðat he faught and hadde the hyer hond
By water he sente hem hoom to euery lond"

In the description of the Pardoner we read—

"Ne was ther swich another Pardoner
For in his male he hadde a pilwe beer†
Which ðat he seyde wasoure lady veyl
He seyde he hadde a gobet of the seyl
That seint Peter hadde whan ðat he wente
Up on the see til Ihesu crist hym hente"

Elsewhere in Chaucer we find how that, what that, though that, why that, er that, &c. It would be easy to multiply examples of a form of expression that was common 500 years ago.

But indeed we find how that even in the English Bible of 1611, as in 1 Cor. i. 26, "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh... are called;" and the Revised Version retains this archaism. The Devonshire Dialect however goes a step further than how thit, for we also find as how thit, and sometimes thit as how, a form that Nathan Hogg uses.

The that in all these cases seems redundant, but words habitually omitted are also to be met with. A pronoun is occasionally dropped, as in " Iss, did," for "Yes, he did;" but most commonly it is it whose services are dispensed with. At the beginning of a letter expressed in the elegant simplicity for which our friend Nathan is so celebrated we read:

* The quotations are made from the Ellesmere MS.
† That is, "in his trunk he had a pillow-case." The word occurs also in the Devonshire Dialogues, where Robin is boasting of his possessions—"A tester bed, peel, and peel-bears, a pair of canvas sheets, bran new," and so on. But in Chaucer's time the word rhymed with here, not with there.
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"This com'th haupin et 'll vind 'ee in gud hulth, ez layves mee at presint," that is, as it leaves me. In Mucksy Lane—

"Pin tap the hadges hud's a-graw'd
Za thick thit hang'th acrass tha rawd;"

that is, "so thick that it hangs across the road." And akin to Mucksy Lane I may quote the famous definition once given in court to enlighten the Bench and the Bar as to the nature of pilm: "Mucks a-drowed and zo vleeth," that is, "mud dried, and so it flies about"—not a bad definition of pilm, which everybody here knows means dust. Again in the little poem Gwayn Hom we read—
"Bit wat thic hom turn' th out yu zee
Uv cus 'tis hard ta tul; Tho wan thing's saf ez saf kin be—
Depend' th apin yerzul:"
that is, "it depends." So zimmith is used for it seems, yer go' th for here it goes. And it happens that this again is an ancient idiom. It is found in Icelandic, as mik ðyrstir, it thirsts me, i.e. I thirst, mèr [Fr. manière] ofbýdr, it is horrible to me, mèr heyrist [they] it is audible to me, i.e. I hear. It is found in English as early as King Alfred, in whose translation of Orosius (Sweet's edition, Part i. p. 42) we read, "On ðæm dagum wæs ðætte," "in those days it was that," &c. And it is not infrequent in Chaucer, at least with impersonal verbs. We now say it happened, like Fr. il arriva, the Ger. es geschah, the Old Saxon it shag; but Chaucer writes—
"Bifil that in that seson on a day."
So him was lever means "it was more agreeable to him;" or as King Alfred phrases it, "ðæt him leofre wære." (Sweet's Oros., Part i. p. 44.) "Love if the list," is "love if it pleases thee." 'Foyne if hym list,' "let him fence if it pleases him." So in the Morte Arth., wonder thought me, "it seemed a marvel to me." Methinks is the only word in Modern English in which the same idiom appears, the exact meaning being "it seems to me." Those of my hearers who are versed in this branch of linguistic study will, I am sure, pardon my explaining for the sake of those who are less familiar with the subject, that there were in A.S. two verbs ðincan and ðencan, of which ðincan means to appear, ðencan to think; the latter (which is identical with the German and Dutch denken) having changed its vowel from e to i, while

the former has undergone no vowel-change in the solitary expression in which it still survives, namely, methinks. These impersonals are now largely obsolete, being superseded by some other form of expression, or by the personal use of the verb. Thus Chaucer's "What nedeth wordes mo?" would now be, "What need is there for more words?" The nedeth, or later nedes, being transmuted from the verb need with the termination -es into the noun need with the verb is, and two previoualy superfluous
words being inserted. Spenser's sentence, "It would pity any living eye," would now be, "Any living eye would pity." It repents me has quite given way to "I repent" " It likes me," "it dislikes me," are now "I like," " I dislike." "If it please you"—an expression which is the literal translation both of the French "s'il vous plaît" and (as the position of the ist shows) of the German "ge-fallist"—is now only used in formal speech: the familiar use makes the you nominative instead of accusative, and the verb personal instead of impersonal—"If you please." This change was already beginning in Shakspere's time, for (as Dr. Abbott has pointed out) both forms exist—"So please him come," and "If they please;" and while the common phrase was "Woe is me," we find in the Tempest, "I am woe for 't." Where a noun is used instead of a pronoun, as in "So please your highness," there is no inflexion of the noun to guide us, but from the antiquated form of the expression one cannot but infer an antiquated syntax also, and that "highness" is meant to be the dative case.

But we have not yet done with this zimmith, or the verb sim, or (as I myself have more commonly heard it pronounced) sim; that is, seem. This verb is used not only in the sense of to appear, but also to think. Can this be explained? Yes; the change of "It sim to me" into "I sim" is precisely of the same character as the change of "It pleasures me" into "I please," only this latter is fashionable in modern times, the other is provincial and unfashionable. But there is one point more. In Greek (as every Greek scholar knows) there is one verb that bears exactly this same double meaning, and signifies both I think and I seem; but in this case we cannot be sure that the history of the meaning is the same as in the Devonian I sim, for both senses of δοκεω are found in the earliest literature of Greece; namely, in Homer's Iliad. In ἀρκεω however, as used by Ἀeschylus in Prom. Vinct., 639 for ἀρκει—"I suffice" for "It suffices that I"—we have a clear case of the personal use of the verb substituted for the impersonal, such as one cannot but suspect in
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δοκεω, and find unquestionably in many of the expressions cited just above.
Let us next turn to a certain expression of time. We all remember how in the Gospels our Lord says, "I have compassion on the multitude because they have continued"—I take the liberty of translating with the true English idiom here, rather than follow the Greek idiom in using the present tense "they continu"—"with me now three days." This word "days" is of course the accus. in English, as indicating duration of time; the rule is the same also in Latin and Greek. But, strange to say, in both Matt xv. 32 and Mark viii. 2, where these words of our Lord are recorded, the majority of the most ancient MSS. give the "days" in the nom. ημέραι; not, as in later MSS., ημέρας. About the meaning there can be no question; simply the phrase is elliptical. We need to supply some part of the verb to be and a relative pronoun: "There are three days during which they have continued with me." Can then our western dialect exhibit any usage at all analogous to this? Yes, imperfectly analogous; that is to say, with a partial ellipsis, the ellipsis being partly supplied. It is a form of expression I have often heard; but I prefer as usual to fall back on the authority of printed books. Nathan Hogg writes—

"Last Thesday wiz week, as you naws, brither Jan, The yung squire ta Tor Abbey becom'd twenty wan;"

that is, "Last Thursday was a week since the day on which the young squire," &c. Both here and in the Greek in the Gospels a phrase of the nature of a relative adverb needs to be supplied.

One remark leads to another. "Tha yung squire ta Tor Abbey," for "at Tor Abbey." Here we have a genuine Devonianism. "Ur 'th a-been stayin ta Plympton;" "ta lass" for "at last;" "aul ta wance;"

"Thin thare wid turn up zich a rattle, As ef whole urgmints waz ta battle."

Of this use of to—or in Devonshire ta* [Henrietta]—for at, we have just the converse in Icelandic and the other Scandinavian languages, as compared with A.S. and English, in the use of at instead of to with the infinitive mood of verbs; as to make, or as the Scotch say to gar, is in Icel. at gera, Dan. atgjöre, Swed. at göra [g = Engl. y; ö as in German].

* With the change of vowel here, and in the Dutch and Flemish te, we may compare se for so in Hali Meidenhad.
But in other Teutonic languages to is in many instances employed where we use at, no motion being implied. Thus in German, zu Hofe dienen, to serve at court; das Waisenhaus zu Halle, the Orphans' Home at Halle; and corresponding to the Devonshire ta lass we have zuletzt. So also zu Hause, at home, which in Old Saxon is to hûs, in Du. te huis, and in Old Flemish te huus [goose].

The mention of this Dutch huis compels me to return for a few moments to Pronunciation. For who of us does not know the peculiar Devonshire mode of sounding how, now, cow? The recognized pronunciation of these words is with a sound which it is very difficult to analyse, but it seems to begin with ō [hot] and glide into oo [boot]. The same diphthong (as it is commonly but inaccurately called) in Essex, and commonly in London, begins with ee [there] and finishes with oo. But in London another mode of sounding it is with ā [hat] to start with, gliding as before into oo. Similar is the Dutch sound in beginning with ā, but it finishes with u [Fr. tu]. But what of our Devonshire ow? As well as I can analyse it, it begins with œu [Fr. sœur] and glides into the Devonshire u. It is the most remarkable sound in our dialect.

And in several of these expressions there is yet another point of resemblance to Devonshire—the omission of the article. In current English we say "to court" when we mean "to the king's court," and so in German and the kindred dialects, as in the Old Saxon of Reineke de Fos—

"Ok kwemen to hove fele stolten gesellen;"
that is, "Also there came to court many proud people," and in Old Flemish te hove in exactly the same sense. But in Devonshire, if a man speaks of going out of a house into the court adjoining, he will say "ta kuart: "Ha went ta kuart ta vetch tha hood." So also inta howze, into the house; "hom ta vawr dore," home to the fore door; "hur went and kimmited tha wier ta vlame."

Again, in current English we use the verb tell always as a transitive verb with the thing told (that is to say, the information communicated) as its direct object, expressed or understood (very often in the form of a noun sentence), and with the person to whom
the thing is told as the indirect object, expressed or understood. But in Devonshire *tell* is often intransitive, as, "Go owt an yer min tul;" *i.e.* talk. And in the *Devonshire Dialogue*, "Her used to *tell* to her flowers." Precisely analogous to this is the use of *λέγω* for *λαλω* in late Greek; as for example in the Gospel of John, c. xiv. 10, in
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the best MSS. *λέγω* is so used, accompanied indeed by a cognate accusative, but intransitive. So also in the forensic use of the word, as in Soph. *O. T.* 545, and Acts xxvi. 1.

There remain yet a few points that ought not to be passed over in silence. The origin of prepositions is one of the most difficult problems the philologer has to deal with. In seeking to trace their earliest history the investigator soon finds himself involved in a thick mist, where it is impossible to see any object clearly and well defined. In such a mist it avails little to throw the reins on the neck of imagination, and gallop madly along the path of wild conjecture. The species of legerdemain practised by some etymologists really justifies Voltaire's sarcasm when he wrote that Ki and Atoës were names of an ancient emperor of China, or rather they were different forms of one and the same name; for a philologer would simply change the *K* into *A*, and the *i* into *toës*, and the transmutation is complete. Now suppose a reader of the *Ayenbite of Inwyt* meets with the sentence, "ðis we bezechið toppe allæ díng," he may see clearly that the meaning is, "This we pray above all things," but how can *toppe* come to mean above? He may go to Donaldson's *New Cratylus*, and learn the force and significance of every letter of every preposition in Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit, and may perhaps believe what he reads; and he may plod through the chapter in which the use of certain nouns as prepositions is discussed, where he will find it proved to demonstration that *δικη* and *χαρις* are only different forms of the same word, like Voltaire's Ki and Atoës, and much truly will he have learnt about the Old Kentish phrase "toppe alle thing." Suppose now, when he has recovered from his bewilderment, he betakes himself to Nathan Hogg by way of *distraction* (as the French say) after his Donaldsonian toils, he will find on the first page, "Tha Daysy *tap* tha Grave," and will recognize the word at once. Elsewhere he
will find "pin tap the hedges," and again "pin tap uv tha vier," the phrases tap, pin tap, and pin tap uv being evidently equivalent to one another and to the thrice-recurring toppe of the Ayenbite of Inwyt. But moreover he finds pin used without tap, as "pin me wurd;" "pin axin tha vally;" and he also notices apin similarly used, as in "apin crassin tha strayt." He now has no difficulty in discerning that apin is the Devonian form of upon, that the definite article is understood, and that tap or toppe when used as a preposition is really the familiar noun top with an ellipse—upon the top of being the full and complete phrase.
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Another elliptical expression is outel dores. Here, as with tap, of is understood, as it is also in out doors and indel doors. But what does outel mean? It means "the out deal of;" that is to say, "on the outer side of." In outel the d has disappeared, absorbed in the final t of out,, while in indel it remains. Deal, from A.S. délan, to divide, signifies primarily a part, and from this radical notion all the other senses of the word can be easily traced. In this case a part of the door comes to signify one side of the door as opposed to the other, and then the portion of space which is on the one side or the other side of the door.

Certain verbal forms are worth a brief notice. From the French ho-là we have derived the verb to holla, which is sometimes confounded with the adj. hollow on the one hand and with the interjection and verb halloo, A.S. ealá, on the other. Such is Professor Skeat's view. But in Devonshire holla is cut down to holl. From the adj. stiff we have the verb to stiffen. In Scotch the adj. has the form steeve, as in the lines—

"A fiery ettercop,  
A fractious chiel,  
As het as pepper,  
An as steeve as steel;"

and this very form steeve is used in Devonshire as a verb, the verbal termination being dropped. So in Scotch in the adj. and verb deave = deaf and deafen. We have all heard how the notorious Viscount Dundee found time one day amidst his cruel persecution of
the Covenanters to call, as a matter of curiosity, upon an old lady whose age far exceeded the ordinary limits of human longevity. His name Claverhouse was commonly contracted in the Scottish mode of speech into Claver'se, and clavers means noise or din. So when he asked the old lady, who seems to have entertained as little affection for Presbyterian zeal as she had respect for persecuting fury, what difference she observed between the days of her childhood and those of her age, she replied, "Then there was ane Knox that deaved us a' wi' his clavers, an noo there is ane Claver'se that deaves us a' wi' his knocks." But we can find an analogue to this steeve for stiffen without travelling north of the Tweed. For do not our poets familiarly cut off the termination of open and use ope as a verb? In two other instances indeed a termination is dropped by which we change a noun into a verb, and the Dev. Dial. uses the noun itself as a verb. Thus hap is used for happen, and carr for carry. But while we now think these vulgarisms, they are more defensible than ope for open; for ope has no separate existence either as adjective or noun. And when again naw (i.e. know) is used for knowledge, the verb for the abstract noun, as when we read of Tom Chidley in Mucky Lane—

"Tam's naw et wadd'n quite za smal
Ez nat ta tul a bite vrim scal,"

may we not adduce most respectable authority in favour of such a form? In French, le manger et le boire; in German, das Lesen und das Schreiben, who does not know the idiom? and what Greek scholar is not familiar with the use of an infinitive as a noun? The ladies present know how unnecessary it is to quote examples. They are to be found in Thucydides and Demosthenes passim: ergo let Nathan Hogg be bracketed with Thucydides and Demosthenes henceforth and for evermore!

A few words about tother. The pronoun that is originally the neuter of the definite article. It ceased to be confined to the neuter long before its use simply as the article was discontinued. For instance, in the Authorized Versión of the New Testament we find "that Christ" and "that prophet" (John i. 21, 25) for "the Christ" and "the prophet." It is
obvious therefore that "that other" is merely an old form for "the other;" and the "that" in this phrase, when its meaning as a mere article became obsolete, simply transferred its final t to the next word, and so we have "the tother." But occasionally we have "tother" with no "the" preceding it, as "wan go'th yer, and tother go'th there," and "they zeed wan tother." In this case we have the "other" retaining as an initial the solitary letter which was the neuter termination of "that." Just so in the Old Flemish of Reinaert de Vos— that is, Reynard the Fox—we find such forms as by twater for by the water, and int water for in the water, the t written sometimes with the former word, sometimes with the latter, but being in any case just the final letter still surviving out of the neuter article dat.

Before concluding this Address, it seems desirable to say a few words on an objection that may have arisen in some minds to the proposition, so ably defended by my learned friend Mr. Elworthy, that numerous peculiarities of our dialect are of high antiquity, relics of the ancient mode of speech, rather than mere corruptions of standard English. The notion that they are all corruptions certainly has the charm of simplicity; it cuts through every difficulty, like

the sword of Alexander through the famed Gordian knot. And then do not eminent philologers affirm the great rapidity with which language changes, unless stability is imparted to it by a literature and a somewhat advanced civilization?

In Max Müller's Lectures on Language we read: "The historical changes of language . . . have transformed the language of Virgil into that of Dante, the language of Ulfilas into that of Charlemagne, the language of Charlemagne into that of Goethe. We have reason to believe that the same changes take place with even greater violence and rapidity in the dialects of savage tribes. . . . In the few instances where careful observations have been made, it has been found that among the wild and illiterate tribes of Siberia, África, and Siam two or three generations are sufficient to change the whole aspect of their dialects."
But is not this statement somewhat highly coloured? "The whole aspect of their dialects" is obviously a vague expression, and it is a perfectly ascertained fact that there are great families of languages in África, the members of each of which, though it may be many centuries since their forefathers formed little communities living side by side and speaking the same language, yet retain the same general characteristics, with strong resemblances of grammar and vocabulary. Nay, as to one such characteristic, namely, syllabation, the Professor himself says, "In South África all the members of the great family of speech, called by Dr. Bleek the Bâ-ntu family, agree in general with regard to the simplicity of their syllables. Their syllables can only begin with one consonant," &c. I learn also from one of the missionaries of the Baptist Congo Mission, that in all these languages, extending as far north as Cameroons, and eastward as far as the Indian Ocean, "there are certain family marks" in inflection and construction. One of these languages, the Kishikongo, is spoken over an area of some 50,000 square miles, and yet continues one and the same language for generations, and that too without the aid of any literature. It by no means illustrates the "violence and rapidity" of change of which Max Müller speaks.

And then the southern dialect of English was spoken over a much smaller area than 50,000 miles—less than half that extent of country—and had in its favour the antiseptic force of both civilization and literature from the time of King Alfred downwards. There was also the powerful influence of the witenagemót (or parliament in later times), the scír-gemót, and the weekly market; for whenever people periodically

assemble, they must of necessity maintain the use of the same language in order to be mutually intelligible. In one word—for time forbids me to enlarge—I believe the changes which our language has undergone have been very slow, and nothing is more certain than that the local speech of our country preserves a large number of genuine archaisms. And these are well worth recording. The English Dialect Society is doing good work in trying to embalm these linguistic curiosities before the spread of national education has utterly blotted them out; and I congratulate this Society on the ability as
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well as zeal with which several of its members are labouring in the same direction. They will assuredly get their meed of praise from future generations.