Interferenţe şi conexiuni lingvistice

An Attempt to Classify Linguistic Analogy:
Fundamental Types and Defining Traits. Applicative to Romanian

Lect. dr. Ionel Apostolatu
Universitatea "Dunărea de Jos" din Galați

Résumé: Notre travail vise à l'établissement d'une typologie fondamentale des changements / des créations analogiques dans la langue, tout en mettant en évidence leurs caractéristiques définitoires et en les illustrant avec un matériel linguistique roumain. A partir d'une bibliographie fondamentale dans la recherche du phénomène de l'analogie linguistique, on a opéré avec trois critères importants, à savoir : le critère de la régularité des créations analogiques (en fonction duquel on peut établir deux grands types d'analogie : l'analogie systématique ou régulière et l'analogie accidentelle ; le critère du niveau de la langue (qui permet le repérage de l'analogie phonétique, morphologique, syntaxique, lexico-sémantique et même graphique) ; le critère de l'homogénéité paradigmatique des formes entre lesquelles s'établit une relation de modélisation analogique (qui permet la délimitation de l'analogie intra-paradigmatique de celle inter-paradigmatique).

Mots-clés: analogie, analogie systématique, analogie accidentelle, extension analogique, nivellement analogique

0. General remarks

As a linguistic phenomenon, *analogy* is a source of innovation within language, generated by the speaker's need for symmetry, simplicity, regularity and paradigmatic order. Analogy determines changes in the shape and meaning of a language element, under the influence of another similar element that serves as a model, or creates "new" linguistic forms in accordance with a particular model.

In most cases, analogy acts in favour of regularities, the principle being that of placing a word in a well-organized system. The distinction between "regular" and "irregular" is always very important for the psychological existence of language, because the regular forms are those used by the speakers as a basis for new creations, while the irregular forms will often undergo the tendency of being replaced by new forms, created with the help of analogy.

The systematic character of language prevents regular words from being changed, and thus ensuring the stability of language itself as a means of communication. A stronger system, with well-defined structures and derivative models easily recognizable by the speaker, incorporates the weak one. The more easily isolated words, which are not engaged in any relationship, are absorbed.

> "When a word is part of a numerous group, analogy - which, in fact, is producing by itself such important changes - opposes the development without control of the energy of the two principles mentioned (i.e. *sound shifting* and *meaning shifting*; a.n., I. A.) [...]. But when the word is isolated, unsupported by any other word, sound and meaning shifting makes its own way with it" (Philippide, *Principii*, pp. 88-89).

If, as far as the content of the concept of « analogy » is concerned (including linguistic analogy), things are generally clear, most definitions (made lexicographically explicit, or involved in formulating some theories and also in the practice of some demonstrations) being reducible, in principle, to a series of common elements (involving partial similarity between two or more concepts, situations, phenomena, as well as a cognitive process based on such a similarity), specifying the sphere of this concept, with all the implication regarding the delimitation of certain types of analogy, on the basis of some rigorous taxonomic criteria, proved to be more difficult to do.

Further on, we will strictly refer to the typology of linguistic analogy specifying from the beginning that in the bibliography there is no consensus on the types of analogy, and even less on the criteria used to establish them. In fact, not many linguists have been concerned

with the setting up of one or another type of analogy, and when they did, they have not always stated these criteria clearly enough.

Such a state of things is understandable, if we think that this phenomenon has been researched by many linguists, belonging to very different movements or schools of linguistics, analogy being involved in both diachronic and synchronic linguistics; this concept has been used by both historical-comparative linguistics and structuralism, and also by both linguistic psychologism and formalism, each of them highlighting an aspect or another of the phenomenon, depending on the doctrinal principles adopted. Thus, some of them mentioned analogy only in phonetics and grammar, especially from the point of view of language change; others have also approached it in syntax, then in the domain of word formation and semantics. From one domain to another it has been noticed that analogy might have an accidental, sporadic character or, on the contrary, a rather systematic, regular one, which has made some linguists talk about the existence of some natural "tendencies" in the various manifestations of analogy. Other linguists have taken into account the effects of analogy, and then they talked about the "damages" caused by analogy in language, or on the contrary, about its "benefits". Ultimately, according to the "validity" of the model, some scholars distinguished between a "real" analogy (or simply, *analogy*) and a "false" one.

We will summarize several points of view expressed in the linguistic literature (especially in the works on the history of linguistics in general and on the history of the concept of *analogy* in language, in particular)[1] as a starting point in our attempt to establish a general typology of linguistic analogy. We are interested in describing the defining features of the identified types, how they function, and also, in illustrating each of these types with language material (mainly selected from Romanian).

1. The criterion of systematicity (or regularity) of the analogical phenomena

As we already have mentioned above, some linguists have tried to define the analogical processes in terms of the regularity with which they apply. According to this criterion, we may distinguish between systematic and non-systematic analogical processes (or shortly **systematic** and **non-systematic analogy**).

Such a typology is largely tributary to the parallelism existing between analogy and phonetic laws, at least from the neogrammarian perspective[2], which claims that sound changes can be devided into more or less regular subtypes. Regular sound changes (often called "phonetic laws") are highly mechanical, exceptionless forces that hurtle blindly through the grammar (as in Romanian regular transformation of *-l-* between vowels, or "rothacism", in words of Latin origin: lat. *gula* > rom. *gură*, lat. *mola* > rom *moară*, lat. *salem* > rom. *sare* etc.), while irregular sound changes are sporadic or accidental (like apheresis, metathesis, haplology, dissimilation etc.). Similarly, the analogical changes might be assessed in terms of regularity. But such a comparison between sound changes and analogy has its limits, because even "the most systematic" analogical changes are far from having a mechanical nature and their regularity had been achieved in time[3]. The reason is that, in contrast to the phonetic laws whose action is conditioned by physical and physiological factors (i.e. the specific phonetic context and, possibly, certain articulatory skills), analogy operates through complicated psychological mechanisms involving the "knowledge" and interpretation of the language system: its nature, its material, its functioning rules, all that helps the speaker to form and perform his idiomatic competence. Therefore, the distinction between a systematic and a non-systematic type of analogy is quite fragile and presupposes a rather subjective assessment of its "degree of sistematicity" (cf. Hock, *Principles*, p. 167).

However, we can talk about the existence of two types of systematic analogy which are generally recognized as being regular to a certain extent: **analogical extension** and

analogical levelling, provided that "there are few, if any, cases of absolutely regular analogy" (McMahon, *Language Change*, p. 70).

1.1. Analogical extension (often also called **proportional analogy** or **four-part analogy**) is the most common and productive type, which operates on the basis of a proportional model and consists, mainly, of the generalization of a morpheme or a morphological pattern, which already exists in language, from a form or a group of forms that function as a model, to another form / forms which previously did not exhibit this morpheme / morphological pattern and which are in paradigmatic relationship with the model: **A : A' / B : X** (X = **B'**)

As far as Romanian is concerned, we give several examples of analogical extensions, mainly from the morphological field. The first example is the (early) generalization of the *-i* inflexion to mark the 2nd person of the verb, which had as a starting point the second person singular forms of the verbs of IV conjugation of Latin origin (Lat. *audis* > Rom. *auzi* and, hence, *cânţi, vezi, faci* etc., instead of Rom. **cântă* < Lat. *cantat,* Rom. **vede* < Lat. *vides,* Rom. **face* < Lat. *faces*).

> *aud .... auzi*
> *fug .... fugi*
> *.....................*
> *laud x   x = lauzi*

We also have the same type of analogy for generalization (at a later time, which is about XIXth century) of *-u* desinence to mark the 3rd person in the plural of the imperfect indicative (the starting point is probably the *au* form of the verb *a avea – au : aveau / cântă : cântau / văd : vedeau / cred : credeau / fug : fugeau*). We can also mention analogical extension when adopting the "weak" preterite forms, instead of the "strong", etymological ones (*arséi* for *arş, merséi* for *mérşu, fãcúi* for *féciu* etc.)[4]. For example, by analogy with the numerous preterite forms in *-ui* (*avúi, bătúi, tăcúi, putúi* etc.), the verb *a face* changes its original "strong" preterite forms *féci(u), féceşi, fécerã* etc. (cf. Lat. *feci, fecisti, fecit* etc.): *fãcúi, fãcúşi, fãcú, fãcúrã* etc. The process can be described as follows:

> *tac .... tăcui*
> *fac x   x = fãcui*

Another example of proportional analogy refers to the past participle of the same Romanian verb *a face*. The etymological form is *fapt* (cf. Lat. *factus,* with the regular change of *-ct-* > *-pt-*, as in Lat. *lactem* > Rom. *lapte*; Lat. *noctem* > Rom. *noapte* etc.). However, the speakers changed this original participle into an analogical one ended in *-ut* suffix: *fãcut*, under the influence of the more numerous past participles in *-ut* of II and III conjugation (cf. *avut, bătut, tăcut, văzut* etc.)[5]:

> *bat .... bătut*
> *fac .... y   y = fãcut*

Within the nominal flexion, we often speak of the extension of plural desinences (for example, the extension of *-uri* desinence to mark the plural for the Romanian neuter nouns[6]) or of some phonetic alternations that additionally mark the category of number (such as the alternation of *a / ă* in *parte / pãrţi* which extended to a large number of feminine nouns: *carte / cărţi, hartă / hărţi, corabie / corăbii, sabie / săbii* etc.):

> *timp .... timpuri*
> *frig .... friguri*
> *...........................*

câmp x   x = câmpuri (which replaced the old etymological plural *câmpi*, preserved only in expressions: *a bate câmpii* "to beat about the bush", *a-şi lua câmpii*   "to take the road")

or
parte .... părţi
carte x   x = cărţi

In the field of word-formation, ***affixation*** provides the best example of proportional analogy, being extremely productive at the same time[7]. Thus, the Romanian speakers have long perceived the relationship between a verbal root and the *-tor* suffix (firstly identifying it in the words inherited from Latin as *vânător* < lat. *venatorem, lăudător < laudatorius*), resulting in the formation of a word that designates the agent or the author of the verb action. They have transformed this relationship into a model that was so heavily practiced that today there is no Romanian verb from which we cannot form an agent by derivation with the *-tor* suffix):

lupta : luptător
munci : muncitor
croi : croitor
dori : doritor
..........................,
vopsi : x   x = vopsitor,
juca : y   y = jucător,
plasa : z   z = plasator etc.

Although any analogical process can be described under the form of the four-part proportion (a description that might be called the "Saussurean model"), the authors that referred to the analogical extension believe that the analogical extension is the type of analogy that better fits A : A' = B : B' or $\frac{A}{A'} = \frac{B}{B'}$ scheme.

One special type of analogical extension with a well-defined proportional character, but with a less systematic character and a relatively low productivity, is represented by ***back-formation***, which is a word-formation technique defined by most specialists as the analogical process of creating new words or grammatical forms by eliminating real or false (apparent) affixes from words or inflexional forms already in use[8]. At the basis of back-formations there is always an analogy, hence the need to study any back-formation by integrating it in a system of analogical forms which explains and often causes it. Here are a few examples of Romanian back-formations.

In Romanian there are some correlative pairs (consisting of a verb and a noun belonging to the same lexical family) of Latin origin:

gust (< Lat. *gustus*) – *gusta* (< Lat. *gustare*);
joc (< Lat. *jocus*) – *juca* (< Lat. *jocare*);
luptă (< Lat. *lucta*) – *lupta* (< Lat. *luctare*) etc.

Folowing this model, Romanian speakers created a noun from a verb already found in language, by simply reducing the verb suffix:

blestem < blestema (< Vulg. Lat. *blastimare*);
cânt < cânta (< Lat. *cantare*);
câştig < câştiga (< Lat. *castigare*);
leagăn < legăna (< Lat. **liginare*);
poruncă < porunci (from Slavic *porončiti*) ;
pază < păzi (from Slavic *paziti*) etc.

Romanian speakers are very familiar with the pattern, inherited from Latin, according to which the name of fruit trees are masculine and the name of fruits are (mostly) feminine: *cireş-cireaşă* (cf. Lat. **ceresius, ceresia*)*, păr-pară* (cf. Lat. *pirus, pira*)*, piersic-piersică* (cf. Lat. *persicus, persica*)*, prun-prună* (cf. Lat. *prunus, pruna*). Since these names differ by the

298

presence of -*ă* inflexion in the feminine forms (which gives them a larger phonetic structure as compared to the masculine ones), some speakers interpreted the names of the fruits as being derived (by affixation) from the names of the fruit trees. Then, the speaker could create names for fruit trees whenever within the language there were only the names of fruits, by simply eliminating the -*ă* desinence: *alun < alună, cais < caisă, căpşun < căpşună, vişin < vişină, zarzăr < zarzără, smochin < smochină, portocal < portocală, banan < banană* (cf. Hristea, *Sinteze*, pp. 73-95). Here the mechanism of back-formation is a clear analogical one:

      prună .... *prun*
      alună .... *x*   *x = alun.*

1.2. Analogical levelling (or **regularization**) consists in total or partial elimination of morphophonemic alternations that appear as "anomalies" within a paradigm[9]. The main cause of analogical levelling was identified in cognitive linguistics as being the principle of iconicity, which requires a similarity between a form of language and the thing it stands for, implying an unequivocal relation: one sense – one form. Thus, irrelevant alternations are suppressed. Analogical levelling primarily affects the isolated and less commonly used forms. The general tendency is to bring "order" within conjugations and declensions, to place as many forms in a system as possible and to eliminate irregularities and confusions.

In Romanian, examples of analogical levelling are found with the irregular plural nouns inherited from Latin or with the category of irregular verbs, whose forms have undergone many analogical changes. The first case refers to the tendency to eliminate the category of the Romanian imparisyllabic noun inherited from Latin. Except for the noun *om* with the irregular plural *oameni* (< Lat. *homo, hominis*), all the other imparisyllabic nouns have been modified by analogical levelling. For example, the noun *cap* (< Lat. *caput*), with the etymological plural *capete* (< Lat. *capitis*) has remodelled both the singular and the plural form. On this type of flexion, unusual for a noun of 2nd declension, there began to exert the pressure of flexible forms with regular number flexion, in which the plural category was clearly marked by the -*i* and -*uri* desinences. Thus, the regular and analogical plural forms arose like *capi* and *capuri*. However, it is interesting to notice that, in the case of analogical levelling, the irregular form does not disappear out of necessity, but it can coexist with the analogical ones. This is made possible by either semantic specialization or by the limitation of the circulation of one of the forms to a certain register or dialect. In the case of the triplet *capete – capi – capuri* we talk of a semantic specialization. The etymological form *capete* preserved its basic meaning "the top part of the body that has the face at the front and is supported by the neck"[10], while the analogical forms have meanings derived from a metaphorical extension of the basic meaning: *cap – capi* "chief, leader", *cap – capuri* "mechanism, device". It is worth mentioning the fact that the analogical pressure exerted not only on remodelling a regular plural, but also, on building a singular form according to the etymological plural. The result was the emergence of the form *capăt* "end of a thing, an action or state", rebuilt after *capete*, through analogy with pairs such *strigăt-strigăte, ţipăt-ţipete.*

In the case of parallel forms within the paradigm of some irregular verbs, such as *mănânc – mânc* (in which the first form, with reduplication, is etymological, and the second one is analogical), we speak of a different diatopic distribution, in that the etymological form is to be found in a wider area, covering half of the southern part of the Romanian territory and Moldova, while the analogical one, without reduplication, is spread in Transylvania and the Banat-Hunedoara area. At the same time, the etymological form is literary and the analogical one has a popular character.

1.3. Out of the types of analogy that have a less systematic character or even an accidental one, we mention the most important ones: ***contamination*** (or ***blending***),

hypercorrection and ***folk etymology***. We wish to emphasize that in the linguistic literature there is no uniform point of view on the subordination of these phenomena to the general concept of *analogy*, some authors preferring to deal with them more as separate phenomena, although related to analogy (see, for example, Paul, *Prinzipien* or Philippide, *Principii*). On the other hand, neither the strict delimitation of these three phenomena was not always sufficiently clear, more confusion occurring as a result of overlapping the sphere of contamination on the one of popular etymology. We will succinctly present the mechanism of these phenomena.

1.3.1. Blending or **contamination** (cf. Rom. *contaminaţie*, Germ. *Kontamination*, Fr. *contamination*) in a broad sense, represents an interesting linguistic phenomenon that consists in the development of a morphological "compromise" between two forms (usually notional words) with identical or similar meanings which are perceived as being in some kind of competition with each other. The result is a lexical hybrid that contains elements belonging to both primary units: *roată + ocol > rotocol, cocor + stârc > cocostârc, fura + lua > furlua, ghebos + cocoşat > gheboşat,* Fr. *colis „pachet" + pachet > colet, impuls + bold > imbold, ţop „rude, boor" + mârlan > ţopârlan, nătărău + fleţ > nătăfleţ, zăpăcit + năuc > zăbăuc* etc.

The phenomenon in its essence and its most typical manifestations has an unconscious and occasional character, but it may also come with intentional creations, as in the examples: *război +* Lat. *bellum > răzbel, nărav +* Lat. *mos, moris > morav* (used as a pluralia tantum, *moravuri*).

A special case of contamination consists in the voluntary blending of two words that do not have any (obvious) semantic connection, the result being a **lexical hybrid** that may take over the meaning of one of the basic words or may have a different meaning. Such intentional creations usually have a stylistic role, speakers speculating the ludic function of language, as it is proved by a number of hybrid forms registered in informal speech and slang, as well as in the belletristic writings or in the mass-media language: *nepot(el) + purcel > nepurcel, privighetoare + cioară > privighecioară, stres + sesiune > stresiune, română + engleză > romgleză* etc.

In most cases, by contamination, a single form arises, in which the beginning and the end of the expression of two distinct units are found in a mixed form. Two different forms seldom emerge and if so, some authors call it *bidirectional* or *reciprocal contamination*[11]:

merge (< Lat. *mergo, ere) + cure (<* Lat. *curro, ere)*
curge
mere (reg. „merge").

As an exception, blending may occur between two antonyms: *balaoacheş* "dark-skinned, dark-haired, blackish; an insulting epithet for gypsies" < *bălai* "blonde, fair, golden" + *oacheş* "dark-skinned, dark-haired, blackish".

1.3.2. Folk etymology is a highly complex phenomenon, closely linked to what is called the speaker's "etymological feeling" which often originates in "common-sense" assumptions rather than serious research. Folk etymology refers to popularly held (and often false) beliefs about the origins of specific words when the less known words (whether new or old), the rare or isolated ones within the language, are "explained" by a spontaneous association of words and better known forms, but genetically unrelated, the only condition being the formal similarity. Folk etymology may affect both the expression and the content of the word subjected to such connections that emerged from folk beliefs about its origins: *sănătoare (<* Lat. ** sanatoria) > sunătoare* "tutsan" (by association with the verb *a suna*), *ferăstrău > fierăstrău* "saw" (by association with *fier* "iron"); *filigran* "filigree" > *filigram*

(by association with *gram*), *vindicativ* "vindictive, avenger"> vindicativ "to heal, healer" (by association with *vindeca* "heal"); *salutar* "salutary, saviour" > *salutar* "worth welcomed" (by association with *saluta* "to welcome, to greet"), *mutual* "reciprocal, mutual" > *mutual* "silently" (by association with *mut* "silent, dumb, speechless") etc. Some folk etymologies, because of their frequency in use, come to impose on standard language (e.g. *sunătoare, fierăstrău*), but most of them belong to the informal or popular language.

1.3.3. Hypercorrection is a linguistic phenomenon with profound socio and psycholinguistic (and even cultural) implications where speakers claim to "solve" a conflict between the standard language / dialect norm ("a prestigious and imposing one") and his own dialect norm (imperfect, less cared, dialectal, popular). In this conflict, a form of language presumed to be "incorrect" is subjected to an inappropriate corrective process, according to what the speaker "knows how to do" with its own language in order not to be off the standard correctness (i.e. an inadequate analysis of the context for the prestige forms). We can say that linguistic hypercorrection occurs whenever a real or imagined rule of language is applied in a mistaken or non-standard context, so that the desire to be "correct" leads to an incorrect result. Faced with enough exceptions to a rule, the speaker might mistake the exception for the general rule, applying it to those situations where it was never meant to occur. However, this "extreme care" for the manner of speaking, combined with an empirical "knowledge" of language facts does not prevent the "hypercorrecting" speaker from misinterpreting the standard – non-standard relationship as far as certain language facts are concerned. We can say that, paradoxically, it is out of "fear of error" often combined with a desire to seem formal or educated that makes them push the limits of accuracy beyond the norms of standard language.

Hypercorrect forms are to be found in almost all of the language levels, which means that we can talk of several types of hypercorrection, the most representative being the phonetic and the grammatical ones.

As for Romanian, the hypercorrection phenomenon was mostly reported and interpreted in phonetics, where it deals with two major subtypes: **a) consonantal hypercorrection** (*pseudo-depalatalization*: *piftea* instead of *chiftea, patrafir* instead of *patrahir*, as a reaction against the dialectal transformation of the labials *p* and *f + i* into the palatals *k'* and *h'*, in pregnant dialectal pronunciation found in Moldavian: *k'atră* "piatră"*; g'ini* "bine", *h'eri* "fiere"; ***pseudo-deaffricatization***: *gioben* instead of *joben, cioric* instead of *şoric*, as a reaction against the dialectal mutation of the affricates *ĉ, ĝ* into the fricatives *ŝ, j*, particularly in the northern and western Daco-Romanian dialect, as in the examples: *plăcintă > plăŝintâ, sânge > sânje, frige > frije, gem > jem* etc.; ***pseudo-defricatization***: *juvaer* instead of *giuvaer*, as a reaction against the archaic phonetism *ĝ* which is still to be found in the dialects of Maramureş, Crişana and Moldavia (cf. *ĝoc, ĝos, ĝune, ĝur* etc.), while in the rest of the Daco-Romanian dialects, as well as in standard Romanian, *ĝ* corresponds to *j* (*joc, jos, june, jur* etc.); **b) vocalic hypercorrection** best illustrated by the speaker's reaction against the shifting of a medial *e* to *i* (which is almost a general popular transformation in spoken Romanian): *antelopă* instead *antilopă* (< Fr. *antilope), benoclu* instead of *binoclu* (< Fr. *binocle), ieften* instead of *ieftin* (< NGr. *efthinos), mesadă* instead of *misadă* (< NGr. *misadi), petec* instead of *petic* (Cf. Lat. *pittacium), sălbatec* instead of *sălbatic* (< Vulg. Lat. *salvaticus*) etc.

We may also find many examples of **hypercorrection in grammar** (i.e. in morphology and syntax): personal forms **trebuiesc, *trebuieşti,* etc., in the paradigm of the impersonal *trebuie*, by analogy with the inflexion of the personal verbs (that mark the category of person for each of the three person values); the compound form **nou-născuţi* instead of the correct one *nou-născuţi* (as a result of the misinterpretation of the adverb *nou*

which is taken for the adjective *nou*, and thus subjected to agreement, like any adjective); **clasa a întâia*, instead of *clasa întâi(a)*, by analogy with all the other ordinal numerals beginning with *the second* (*al doilea / a doua*), in whose structure we have the morpheme *al / a*.

2. The criterion of the language level in which analogy produces effects

Another criterion for the classification of analogy, perhaps the most comfortable one, takes into account the language compartments where analogy becomes effective. Starting from the fact that analogy is a general phenomenon in language, we can conclude that it is present at all levels of the language system organization, allowing us to distinguish the following types: *phonetic analogy*, *morphological analogy*, *syntactic analogy*, *lexical analogy* (including semantics). If we also consider the aspect of written language, governed by a set of principles and spelling rules, then we could also talk of a *graphic analogy*.

3. The criterion of the paradigmatic homogeneity of the forms subjected to analogical modelling

As analogical pressure is exercised from within or outside the paradigm of a word, we can speak of two types of analogy, designated as **intraparadigmatic analogy**, which occurs within one and the same paradigm and **interparadigmatic analogy**, as a result of the influences which may occur between different paradigms. This distinction is more efficacious in the case of morphological analogy, namely the inflexional paradigms. An example of intraparadigmatic analogy is present in the case of verbal forms *mânc, mânci, mâncă*, and *usc, uşti, uscă* (for the etymological ones: *mănânc, mănânci, mănâncă; usuc, usuci, usucă*) in the paradigm of the Romanian irregular verbs *a mânca* "to eat" and *a usca* "to dry". The analogical forms (current in the northern Daco-Romanian dialects) came into being due to the numerous inflexional forms within the paradigm of these verbs which present the radical **mânc**-, respectivelly **usc**-, without reduplication (**mânc***ăm*, **mânc***aţi*, **mânc***ând*; **usc***ăm*, **usc***aţi*, **usc***ând*, etc.).

As far as the interparadigmatic analogy is concerned, it can be generally found in the case of proportional analogies, for example when dealing with the influence of the plural upon the singular in noun inflexions:

draci .... drac

copaci x   x = *copac* (a new, analogical singular form, for the etymological one, *copaci*, which was identical to the singular and hence ambiguous; this new singular form has been accepted as the standard one);

şoareci .... y   y = *şoarec* (a new singular form, instead of the standard and etymological one, *şoarece*).

4. Conclusions

Being closely connected with the systematic character of language as a whole and of each compartment within it, analogy acts as a way of expressing the general tendency to adjust and organize the linguistic material as coherently and economically as possible within the language system. With analogy, words are placed within a well-organized paradigm, in which the functional oppositions are clear and unambiguous. Analogy represents a language universal, one of the main forces generating change and progress in language, referring both to the tradition surpassing and creativity. Analogy is the most important factor of lexical-grammatical (re)organization. It is a mechanism and an instrument used

by the speaker in the act of speech, which helps him to continuously shape and reshape language, permanently "renewing" and "rebuilding" it in order to best adapt the language material to new individual intuitions. Understanding language as an "activity" (cf. Gr. *energeia*) and not as a "finite product" (cf. Gr. *ergon*) helps us to explain any changes or innovations in language. The existence of linguistic traditions, which are in fact patterns of expression, causes the speaker to analogically go on creating new language forms. Each speaker holds some knowledge of language, a ***saber idiomatico*** which is the starting point for any future and potential new expression (cf. Coşeriu, *Sincronie*, pp. 42, 96). But such new and original expressions are, in fact, just a matter of superseding the traditional pattern (cf. Gr. *dynamis*). Any innovation in language presupposes, on the one hand, the superseding of the *dynamis*, and, on the other hand, as far as a linguistic innovation is accepted as a model for future creations, it can become *dynamis* in its turn. Such an interpretation allows us to argue that analogy is a matter of *dynamis*, which gives it a special significance in the processes of linguistic change.

Notes

[1] In our approach, we mainly relied on Sturtevant, *Introduction*, pp. 96-122; Itkonen, *Analogy*, pp. 67-125; Hock, *Principles*, pp. 167-209; Hock, *Analogical Change*, pp. 441-457; Mc. Mahon, *Language Change*, pp. 70-96; Bybee; *Diachronic Linguistics*, pp. 958-964; Engelberg, *Analogical Change*, pp. 46-48; Sihler, *Language History*, pp. 73-93.
[2] In neogrammarian theory, analogy and phonological change are two major forces of language change.
[3] "Even the most systematic analogical changes ordinarily come close to being regular only after centuries or even millennia" (Hock, *Principles*, p. 167).
[4] The distinction between "strong" and "weak" preterite forms in Romanian refers to the position of the accent, which falls on the radical (in the case of strong preterite: Old Rom. *féciu, adúşu*) or on the inflexion (in the case of weak preterite: Modern Rom. *făcúi, aduséi*).
[5] The old participle *fapt* (current in texts of XVI-XVII c.) remained to be used exclusively as a noun.
[6] This desinence extended from nouns such as *timp – timpuri, frig – friguri* (cf. Lat. *tempus – tempora*, *frigus – frigora*, where the ending *-ora*, which became Rom. *-ură > -ure > -uri*, was interpreted as a desinence and then isolated and analogically attached to a wide number of neuter nouns: *câmpuri, vânturi* etc.). In Contemporary Romanian, this pattern is very prolific and affects even nouns compatible with other desinence to express de plural, which results in breaking the standard language rules (cf. **succesuri*, instead of *succese*; **exempluri*, instead of *exemple*; **serviciuri*, instead of *servicii*; **permisuri*, instead of *permise*, **stâlpuri*, instead of *stâlpi*).
[7] Analogy is active in all types of word-building processes. In fact, "analogy plays in word-formation an important role as well in morphology, it is the very principle which underlies the vitality of derivative elements" (prefixes, suffixes etc.)" (Puşcariu, *Derivarea*, p. 265).
[8] Some linguists consider back-formation a subtype of sporadic or non-systematic analogy (cf. McMahon, *Language Change*, p. 75).
[9] If analogical extension involves patterns, the second systematic type of analogy, levelling, involves paradigms, which are a set of inflexional forms with the same stem morpheme.
[10] Besides that there are other meanings, mainly derived from the "top part" feature.
[11] This term is not very appropriate, because blending is by definition a matter of reciprocity. We consider that it would be more suitable to name this type *double contamination*.

Bibliographical abbreviations

Bybee, *Diachronic Linguistics* = Joan Bybee, *Diachronic Linguistics*, in Geeraerts & Cuyckens, eds., *Cognitive Linguistics*, pp. 945-987.

Coşeriu, *Sincronie* = Eugeniu Coşeriu, *Sincronie, diacronie şi istorie*, Editura Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1997.

Engelberg, *Analogical Change* = Stefan Engelberg *Analogical Change*, in Strazny (ed.), *Encyclopedia*, I, pp. 46-48.

Geeraerts & Cuyckens, eds.,
Cognitive Linguistics = Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2007.

Hock, *Principles*	= Hans Henrik Hock, *Principles of Historical Linguistics*, second edition, Berlin; New York; Amsterdam, Mouton de Gruyter, 1986.
Hock, *Analogical Change*	= Hans Henrik Hock, *Analogical Change*, in Joseph & Janda (ed.), *Historical Linguistics*, pp. 441-460.
Hristea, *Sinteze*	= Theodor Hristea (coord.), *Sinteze de limba română*, ediţia a treia, revăzută şi din nou îmbogăţită, Editura Albatros, Bucureşti, 1984.
Itkonen, *Analogy*	= Esa Itkonen, *Analogy as Structure and Process*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 2005.
Joseph & Janda (ed.), *Historical Linguistics*	= Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda (editors), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2003.
Mc.Mahon, *Language Change*	= April M.S. Mc.Mahon, *Understanding Language Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
Paul, *Prinzipien*	= Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte,* Dritte Auflage, Max Niemeyer, Halle, 1898 (online version available on www.archive.org).
Philippide, *Principii*	= Alexandru Philippide, *Istoria limbii române*, volumul întâi *Principii de istoria limbii*, Tipografia Naţională, Iaşi, 1894.
Puşcariu, *Derivarea*	= Sextil Puşcariu, *Derivarea cu sufixe de la tulpina pluralică*, extras din „Homenaje a Menendez Pidal", vol. III, Madrid, 1925, pp. 265-268.
Sihler, *Language History*	= Andrew L. Sihler, *Language History. An Introduction*, John Benjamins Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2000.
Strazny (ed.), *Encyclopedia*	= Philip Strazny editor, *Encyclopedia of Linguistics,* vol. I, A – L, Taylor & Francis Group, New York, 2005.
Sturtevant, *Introduction*	= Edgar H. Sturtevant, *An Introduction to Linguistic Science*, fifth edition, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1956.