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AKE THE SPEECH I PRAY YOU, AS I PRONOUNC'D IT TO YOU.

Shakespeare, Tragedies, p. 266, fo. 1623.

LEGENDI SEMPER OCCASIO EST, AVDIENDI NON SEMPER. PRÆTEREA, MVLTOS MAGIS (VT VULGO DICITUR) VIVA VOX AFFICIT. NAM, LICET ACRIBA SINT, QVAE LEGAS, ALTIVS TAMEN IN ANIMO SEDENT, QVAE PRONUNTIAE, VVLTVS, HABITVS, GESTVS ETIAM DICENTIS AFFIGIT: NISI VERO FALSVM PVTAVMVS ILLVM AESCHINIS, QVI, CVM LEGISSET RHODIS ORATIONEM DEMOSTHENIS, ADMIRANTIBVS CVNCIS, ADIECISSE FERTVS, TI AE, EI ATTÑT TOT ΘΗΠΙΟΤ ΑΧΧΚΟΙΕΙΤΕ; ET ERAT AESCHINES, SI DEMOSTHENI CREDIMVS, ΛΑΜΠΡΟΦΟΝΟΤΑΤΟΧ: FATEBATVR TAMEN, LONGE MELIVS ZADEM ILLA PRONVENTASSE IPSVM QVI PEPPERAT.

C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi Epist. ii. 3.

VERVM ORTHOGRAPHIA QVOQVE CONSVENTUDINIS SERVIT, IDEOQVE SAEVE MVVTATA EST. NAM ILLA VETUSTISSIMA TRANSQE TEMPORA, QVISVS ET PAVIORES LITERAE, NEC SIMILES HIC NOSTRIS EARVM FORMAE PVERVNT, ET QVIS QVOQVE DIVERSA . . . . FORTASSE SVCVS SCRIBERANT, ETIAM ITA LOQVABANTVR . . . . EGO (NISI QVOD CONSVENTVDO OBSTINVERIT) SIC SCRIBENDVM QVIDQVE IVDICO, QVOMODO SONAT. HIC ENUM EST SVVS LITERAEVM, VT CVSTODIANT VOCES, ET VELVT DEPOSITVM REDDANT LEGENTIVS; ITAQVE ID EXPRIMERE DEBENT, QVOD DICTVRI SYMV.

M. Flb. Quinctiliani, Inst. Orator. i. 7.
NOTICE.

The first portion of the Chaucer Society's publications being ready for delivery to its members, it has been thought advisable to issue at the same time the first four chapters of the present work, which contain an investigation of Chaucer's pronunciation and Prof. F. J. Child's Memoir upon his language. The MS. of the remainder of the work, which will be of about the same extent as the present part, is so far advanced, that it will possibly be ready for issue before the close of the present year; but as the revision at press and the construction of the indices will be very laborious, it may have to be delayed beyond that time. A brief summary of the contents of both parts, and an outline index, is here annexed. Complete Indices will be added to make reference to the great variety of matters treated upon, ready and convenient, as the work is intended to give in a small space the greatest possible amount of information upon a subject hitherto almost untreated.

This treatise also replaces the paper on the Pronunciation of the Sixteenth Century, etc., which was read by the Author before the Philological Society, on 18 January and 1 February, 1867.

A. J. E

KENSINGTON,
1 FEB., 1869.
CORRIGENDA IN PART I.

Readers observing any misprints in Part I. are respectfully requested to communicate with the author, 25, Argyll Road, Kensington, W.

p. 5. under Grh, read A.

p. 7. l. 5, for sēa read vēa.

p. 53, l. 6, for aukseŋ read auksh.

p. 57, line 9 from bottom, for oo'w read oo'w.

p. 60, l. 17, for 1 read 2

p. 70, l. 18 for ut it read ut in.

p. 80, l. 20, for inclined suspect read inclined to suspect.

p. 85, l. 12, for that he read than he.

p. 89, n. 1, l. 2, for he a read he is a.

p. 106, l. 18, for refuse so say read refuse to say.

p. 113, l. 21, for does seem read does not seem.

ADDENDA.

p. 12. After the paragraph commencing ** add:

1 evanescent, made from [], before a single letter or combination, denotes that it is scarcely audible, although the speaker is conscious of placing his organs in the proper position for speaking it.

2 evanescent, made from [], enclose more than one evanescent element, or entire evanescent words, as (t'nt' koom t' paahs, = and it came to pass.

p. 12. After the paragraph commencing ----- add:

(') prominent, the acute accent may be placed over any element of a diphthong or triphthong, when it is considered desirable, to shew that it has the chief stress of the inter-gliding vowels, but not necessarily the chief stress in the whole word, as, for example, to distinguish the pairs of diphthongs (tu iů, ūi ū, ēa ēa).
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Y vowel, see I
Y consonant, see Z
INTRODUCTION.

PALAEOYPE, OR THE SYSTEMATIC NOTATION OF ALL SPOKEN SOUNDS BY MEANS OF THE ORDINARY PRINTING TYPES.

In order to write intelligibly on speech sounds, some systematic means of representing them must be adopted. In order to understand the mode in which speech sounds change, delicate physiological actions of the vocal organs must be indicated. In order to be generally intelligible, the letters of the Roman Alphabet in their original Latin senses, as nearly as may be, should form the nucleus of the system of symbolisation. In order to be convenient to the Printer and Writer, the old types, παλαιοι τύποι (paleii· tii·pi), should be used, and no accented letters, few turned, and still fewer mutilated letters should be employed. The system of writing here proposed to fulfil these conditions will, in consequence of the last, be termed Palaeotype (pælˈiotaɪp). It is essentially a makeshift scheme, adapted solely to scientific, not popular use, not pretending to supersedes any existing system of writing, but sufficing to explain all such systems, and to indicate the pronunciation of any language with great minuteness and much typographical convenience.¹

The reader will have no occasion to study the whole of the following list before beginning to read the book. The nature of the symbols allows by far the greater number of them to be arranged alphabetically, so that the reader can immediately discover the meaning of any symbol or usual combination, and any unusual symbol is generally explained when it first occurs in the following pages. It is only necessary to bear in mind that the Roman vowels (a, e, i, o, u,) are pronounced as in Italian, and (y, ö) as the German ü, ö, that

¹ A full account of the principles of the notation is given in the Transactions of the Philological Society for 1887, Supplement, Part I. The subsequent appearance of Mr. Melville Bell's Visible Speech, and the elaboration of the following pages, have occasioned a few modifications and improvements. As now presented, Palaeotype is believed to contain characters for all the sounds considered by Rapp, Lepsius, Brücke, Max Müller, Haldeman, Merkel, and Melville Bell, and hence to be the most complete series of phonetic symbols which has been published.
the italics and small capitals indicate certain modifications of these sounds, that (h, j, w) are always diacritical, having no meaning of their own but serving to modify the meaning of the preceding letter, and that (h, j, w, q, o, i, u) represent the sounds in (hay, yea, way, sing, but, bite, how). Long vowels are indicated by reduplication, as (aa, ee, ii); repeated vowels are separated by a comma as (a,a, e,e, i,i). The other common symbols are well known.

The explanation is given by keywords, the letters expressing the sounds in question being italicised, and by the symbols (* † † ‡ ‡ w 0 -) which show how some of the letters are formed from others, (*) by attempting to pronounce simultaneously the two letters between which it is placed, by taking the contact (†) nearer the mouth, or (‡) nearer the throat, (‡) by protruding, or (‡) by inverting the tongue, (‡) by clicking, (w) by 'rounding' or labial modification, (q) by 'widening' or distending the pharynx and oral passages, (0) by removing the effect of the diacritic before which it is placed, and which is inherent in the preceding letter, as (w) with opened lips, (0) with narrowed pharynx, etc. For all English sounds, numerous other examples will be found in Chapter VI, § 2. On p. 15, there is furnished a complete comparison of Palaeotype with Visible Speech, whence the exact value of the former can be determined by a reference to Mr. Melville Bell's work. Diagrams of the positions of the tongue and lips during the pronunciation of the vowels, are given on p. 14.

In the course of the following pages many explanations and discussions of phonetic subjects become necessary. See the nature of glides, diphthongs, and combined speech sounds explained in Chapter III, § 2, the principal vowels and diphthongs in the same chapter, § 3, especially under the heading U, the nature of palatisation (j) and labialisation (w) in the same chapter, § 4, under P, B; T, D; C, K, Q; CH, J, and GH, and the nature of aspiration under H. The Tables in Chapter VI, §§ 1 and 2, and the footnotes to Chapter VIII, § 1, may also be consulted.

Examples of the use of Palaeotype in continuous writing will be found in Chapter V, §§ 1, 2, 3, 4; Chapter VII; Chapter VIII, §§ 3, 4, 5, 6, 8; Chapter IX, §§ 1, 3; Chapter X, §§ 1, 2, Chapter XI, §§ 1, 2, 3. In this Chapter XI will be found examples of modern English and Scotch, forming a convenient exercise for those who wish to study the nature of this system of writing, and allowing of a direct comparison with Visible Speech.
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The mode of writing the "turned" or inverted letters is explained in each particular case. Italic letters have one horizontal line below them, as í; small capitals have either two horizontal lines, or one short oblique line, as ¡, below them, tailed letters as g, j, p, q, y, when they have to be printed as small capitals, may have a horizontal stroke above them, like i. The letter u may be also written with its stem crossed like i, and f with two cross bars.

For the purposes of alphabet arrangement, ae, oe are considered to be the same as ae, oe, and the turned letters e a u i a o w r respectively. Isolated letters, words, and phrases in palæotype occurring in the midst of ordinary spelling are enclosed in a parenthesis ( ) to prevent confusion.

KEY TO PALAEOTYPE.

Abbreviations.—A. arabic, C. chinese, E. english, F. french, G. german, I. italian, P. provincial, S. sanscrit. occ. occasional, = interchangeable with.

I. LETTERS.

A  a  = (æ0), I. matte, F. chatte, (mat-fo, shat)
A  a  = (æ0), G. mann, F. mateles, (man, matle)
: A  a  = (aae), E. want, what, august', (want, what, agost'), see (o)
A  a  Gaelic math, good, (maa); nasal twang
A a  long of (a), E. father, I. mano, (fadh-í, maa-no)
A a  long of (a), G. mañen, (maä'-nen)
:Aa  aa  long of (A), E. awen, (aañ), see (aa)
Aa  aa  long of (a,)
Aah aah  long of (ah)
Aah aah  long of (ah)
Aaa aaa  long of (aa), see (a)
Æ  æ  = (æ0), E. man, cat, sad, (men, kat, sed)
Æææ  æææ  long of (æ), P. E. Bath, (Beath)
Ææh ææh  long of (eh)
Æeh æeh  = (ææ) labially modified (æ) or widened (æh)
Ah  ah  = (ææ), occ. E. ask, staff, grant (ahsk, stahf, grahnt)
Ah  ah  = (eæ), Irish sir, Austrian man (sahr, mahn)
Ai  ai  E. aye, G. haen, (ai, haen), see (ai)
Aa  aa  F. an, temps, cent, (aa, taa, aaaa), see (a)
Au  au  G. haus, (raus), see (au)
Ay  ay  theoretical G. euch (syth)
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B  b  E. see, (bii)
B  b  sonant of (p), which see, ? = (bw)
:B  n  = (b4), lower lip against teeth, Brücke's δ
'B  b  = (b4p), flat Saxon t, Rapp's τ
Bh  bh  G. w in the middle and south, (v) without the teeth
Bj  bj  = (b+4)
Brh  brh  = (b+4), lip trill, G. brr for stopping horses, Brücke's κ
Bw  bwe  = (b+w), F. bois, (bwe)

C  c  = (st)? nearly (th), Spanish s, and e before s, t, Badajoz,
   (Badadaxoo)
C  c' = (st)? nearly (dh), Spanish d (?), ciuda (ciusac')

D  d  E. do, (duu)
D  d  = (d4g), usually accepted A. ω, Lepsius's A. ɔ
: D  n  = (d4), S. ɔ
: D  d  = (d4), tip of tongue on gums
: D  d  = (d4t), flat Saxon (d), Rapp's τ
Dh  dh  E. thee, Danish ved, (dhii, veth), Welsh dd
Dh  dh  (dh+gh), Newman's A. ω, Lepsius's A. ɔ
: Dhh  shh  Lepsius's Dravidian sound, nearly (sah)
Dj  dj  = (d4t), Hungarian gy, E. ver'sure, (v4dz)
Dw  dw  = (d4w), F. deit (dua)
Dzh  dzh  E. judyng, (dzhodzh'w')

E  e  = (s), E. met, G. fett, F. jette, (met, fett, zhet), see (x)
E  e  = (st), E. aerial, F. été (séréal, etc), L. s chiuse
:E  e  = (st-), L. s aperto, occ. E. met, G. fett, (met, fett)
:m  e  = (ah-t) turned e, written e, E. but (bet), see (x)
:M  e  = (sew) = (st-), turned e, F. que je me répente (ke
   zhe me repaste)
:M  e  = (st-), turned u, occ. E. but (but)
O  u  = (u4) = (uw-), turned a, written u, E. mention, real, (men'shen, rii-ul)
Ee  ee  long of (ε), E. mare, Mary, (meex, Meer'v)
Es  es  long of (ε), E. arling (arling), see (es, es')
:Es  es  long of (ε), like a bleat
:Es  es  long of (ε), replaces (z, ar, ox) in South E.
:Es  es  long of (ε)
:Es  es  long of (ε)
:Ep  ep  long of (ε)
:Dh  edh  long of (uh)
:Dh  edh  long of (uh)
Eci  eci  occ. E. they, (dhees), for (dhees)
Eci  eci' occ. E. fate, (fes'jt), for (feset)
Eca  eca  long of (ea), see (a)
:Eca  eca  long of (ea), see (a)
:sh  sh  = (sh-w), West E. sir, first (sohr, foehrst)
:sh  sh  = (sw), occ. F. ed
Ei  ei  Scotch time (teim), Portuguese ei
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gi</td>
<td>usual E. eye, time, (ɔi, ɔim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei</td>
<td>F. vise (vea), see (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gi</td>
<td>F. we人的, (yan-yan), see (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>I. Europa, (Euro-pa), Cockney and Yankee town (teun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G0</td>
<td>usual E. house, shout (neus, shout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>E. foe, (foo), gentle hiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fh</td>
<td>upper lip against lower teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fh</td>
<td>violently hissed (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fh</td>
<td>(f*kh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fw</td>
<td>(f*wh), the back of the tongue in the (u) position, F. fois, (fuu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>E. go, (gö)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G. go, (g), occ. E. guard, (guard), F. gueux, (go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:G</td>
<td>sonant of (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G'</td>
<td>(g*k), flat (g), Rapp's k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td>G. tage, (taagh's), Dutch g, S. घ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td>(gh) = (gh̪), G. wiege, (bhīgh̪e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td>buzz of (xh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td>violently buzzed (gh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>(j), which see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>(gh), which see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>heard in gargling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>(gh̪), A. ज, heard in gargling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>F. goitre, (gwatr')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>(g*we)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>G. ange, (au-gweh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gj</td>
<td>(gh*we)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>E. he (mi), S. घ, (bh, dh, gn), jerked utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H'</td>
<td>jerked whisper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H'</td>
<td>with no capital, diacritic, with no meaning by itself, but modifying the meaning of the preceding letter in any manner that is convenient, see (ah, th, sh, 'h), &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>A. ढ (haa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>a scarcely audible (a) as Cockney park, (paśh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>with no capital, diacritic, variety of (h), see (lhh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hw</td>
<td>a voiced whistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hw</td>
<td>an ordinary whistle, distinct from (wh, kwh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>E. seven, F. fini, fiche, (ivent', fini, fish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>F. river, finny, fish, (riv', fini', fish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>occ. G. ii, Swedish y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>long of (i), E. eve, (iiv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>long of (i), E. happy... (mpört), in singing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>long of (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iu</td>
<td>E. identity, (fiitl'iit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iu</td>
<td>American variety of (iu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuu</td>
<td>E. futility, (fiitu-til)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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J E. yet, G. ja, (ret, rae)
j with no capital, diacritic, palatal modification of preceding letter.
'j faint sound of (r, i) into which E. (ae) occasionally tapers, see (e'j)

Jh oc. E. hue (huiu), occ. G. ja (jhaa), occ. F. ouf (ouh)

K k E. key, can, coal, (ki, ken, ko)
K k (k) = (k*), occ. E. cart (cart), F. cue, (ko)
:K x = (k), A. j (xaaf)
Kh kh G. daeh, Scotch loch, (dakh, loch)
Kbh k'h = (k'), G. siech (schi)
:Kb xh related to (k) as (kh) to (k)
Kh kh S. E., upper G. komm, (khom)
.Kh kh violently hissed (kh)
kJ kj = (k), which see
Kjh k'j = (kh), which see
Krh k'rh = (kh'), Swiss ch, A. (krhaa)

Kw kw = (k*w), E. queen, F. guoi, (kwim, kwa), Latin gu
Kw wh kw'wh = (kw*wh), G. auch, (aukwh), Welsh ow, Scotch gwh
:Kw wh = (kwh)

L l E. low, (loo)

L l Polish barred l
:L L = (l'), S. (上映)
L x turned r, written as l with _ below, lisped (l)

Lh lh whispered (l), breath escaping on both sides the tongue,
. E. felt = (fellht) at full, occ. F. table, (tablh)

Lh lh whisper of (l)

Lh z according to Lepsius, Dravidian l in (Tamil)

Lh zh whisper of (x)

Lhh lh'hh = (lhh), breath escaping on the right side of the tongue
only, Welsh U

Lj lj = (l*), I. ph (lji)
Ljh lj'jh whisper of (lj)

Lw lw = (l*w), F. loi (lwa), Anglosaxon wil-

Lw lw'lw = (lw)

Lwh lw'wh = (lw'wh)


M m E. me, (mii)
m no capital, diacritic, = (a), which see

Mh mh voiceless (m), E. tempt (temmht) at full
Mw mw = (m*wh), F. moi, (mwa)

N n E. nap (nep)
N n = (n*), see (d)
:N n = (n), S (上映)
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A = no capital, written η not joined to the following letter, diacritic, French nasality, the four French nasals, vin, an, on, un, are written for convenience (vea, αα, οα, εα), though perhaps more properly (αι, αλ, ελ, εα), according to Mr. Melville Bell (αι, αλ, ελ, εα).

Ν = (ντ), see (d).
Nh = voiceless (n), E. tent = (tennht) at full.
:Nh = according to Lepsius, Dravidian nasal before (ph).
Nj = (n*), F. and I. gn, Spanish ñ, Portuguese nh.
Njh = (n*), F. noix, (nsea).

O = (οω) (οο), I. o aperto, F. homme (om).
O = (οω) (οο), E. omit, American stone, whole, oim, ston, hol.
O = (οω) = αο, turned e, written o, being used for small capital ο which is not sufficiently distinct from the small o, E. on, odd, (on, od).

CE = (οω) = (οι), F. jeune, G. böcke, (zhœn, bok-e), Feline writes (zhœn, zhœem), for F. jeune, jeûne.
CE = (u-ω), Gallic laogho, (lagh).
:CE = (a-ο) = (a-ω), Rumanian or Wallachian 'a, 'e, 'i, 'o, 'u.

D = (ιο), written ω, E. first, (faist), see (a).
Ei = acc. F. aîl, (aei, æih, æilj) or (ai), occ. Dutch uy.
Eac = occ. long of (ο), F. jeûne, (zhœem).
Eac = long of (ο).
Eac = occ. long of (ο).
Ey = occ. Dutch uy.

Oh = (ahω) = (ohj), (ο) modified by raising the tongue.
Oh = (ahω) = (ahj), (ο) modified by raising the tongue.
:Oh = (ahω) = (ahj), (ο) modified by raising the tongue.
Oi = North G. neu, (noi), see (ay, oy).
Oi = P. E. boy, (bei).
:Oi = usual E. oyster, (sist-ε).
Ω = F. bon (boi), see (A).
Ω = long of (ο), I. uomo, (uomo), P. E. home, (hoom).
Ω = long of (ο), E. home, (hoom), see (οο'ω).
:Ω = long of (ο), drawled E. odd, God, (ood, Good), different from E. awed, gawed (aad, gaad).

Ooh = long of (oh).
Ooh = long of (oh).
:Ooh = long of (oh).
Ooa = long of (oa), see (A).
Ooa = occ. E. know, (noon).
Ooa = more usual E. know, (noon).
Oωw = occ. E. no, (noon), for (noo).
Ou = Dutch ou, P. E. out, (out), see (ευ).
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On ou P. E. house, (mous)
Oy oy occ. upper G. such, (oykh)

P p E. pea (pii)
P p = (p*k)? = (pw)?, Lepsius’s Peruvian or (Khetsh-)wa p
:P r = (pj), lower lip against teeth
Ph ph whisper of (bh), an old sound of ф?
Pw pw S. в, Bavarian gerd, (p nec), Schmeller Gr. p. 137.
Pj pj = (p*ju)
Prh prh = (ph4), whisper of (brh), which see
Pw pw = (p*we), F. pois, (pea)

Q q E. singer, linger, sinker, (siq’u, liq’g3, siqk-x), S ʁ
Q q = (q’), distinct from (nj), S. ʁ
:Q q = (qi)
Qh qh = voiceless (q), E. sink = (siqkhk) at full
Qj qj = (q) which see

R r E. ray (re), breath passes over the tip of the tongue
which trembles slightly, Spanish r seave.
R r uvula trill, F. r provençal or grasseyé, Paris, (Pari)
:R r = (r*), S. ʁ

ع ى turned r, written as r with ʿ above, E. vocal r when
not preceding a vowel, ear, air, are, ear, poor, (iiu, eeu, eai, ooa, powr), hearing, arising, mooring, (hiir-
riq, eer-riq, moom-riq,) pervert, murmur = (pervert; murmur) or (powr-, mar-m), or (powr-, mar-m), see (ʿ)
turned r, written as r with ʿ above, E. palatal vocal
r when not preceding a vowel, ear, air = (iiu, eeu) more accurately than (iiu, eeu), and (serf, surf) may
be distinguished as (sarf, sarf) or (sarf, sarf), this dis-
tinction is frequently neglected in speech.

T l turned l, written as r with ʿ below, glottal low Ger-
man trill, nearly (g)

.R .r = (rl) strongly trilled Italian, Spanish, Scotch r
Rh rh whisper of (r)
Rh rh whisper of (r)
:Rh rh whisper of (a)
:Rhh xhh Lepsius’s Dravidian sound, nearly (r ah)
Th th whisper of (r)
Rj rj = (r*ju)
Rah rsh Polish przex, (prahez), (r) very brief, (sh) distinct
Rw rw = (r*we), F. roi, (rea), Anglosaxon, and early E. ʿer-
qw uq = (r*we), occ. E. (anu) in place of (ou) = our
Rzh rzh Polish rza, (rzhaz), (r) brief

S s E. so, (soo)
S s = (s*kh), Lepsius’s and usually received A. а
Sh sh = E. she, F. chant, G. schen, (ahii, shaz, shaim)
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Sh  sh  = (shl), S. &q;
Shj  shj = (sh*jh), occ. G. stellen, sprechen, (shjteln, shjprekh'en)
Sj  sj = (s*yh), Polish ʃ
Sw  sw = (s*wh), F. soi = (swa) or (sua), not (sea)
Swf  swf = (sh*wh), F. choix = (shwa) or (shua), not (swha)
Sz  sz = G. initial s, so, (szoo)

T  t  E. tea, (tii)
T  t  = (t*k), Newman's and usually received A. Ľ
:T  t  = (tj), S. ژ
.T  ķ  = (tj), tip of tongue on gums
Th  th  = E. thin, (thin), modern Greek θ
Th  th  = (th*kh), Newman's A. ៣
_THh  thh  Lepsius's Dravidian sound, nearly (zhh)
Tj  tj  = (t*j) whisper of (dj), occ. E. virgae, (vër-tjiu)
Tsh  tsh  E. chest, match, catching, (tahest, mutsh, kæts'h'iq)
Tw  tw  = (t*wh), F. loî, (twu)

U  u  = (sw), F. poule, E. Louisa, (pul, Lu,i-zas), see (u)
_U  u  = (sw) = (u), E. pull, cook, (pul, kük), generally confused with (u)
:U  u  = (u), Swedish ʊ short
UTh  wh  = (sw) = (u), I. o chiuso, (o) verging into (u)
.Ui  ui  F. oui = (ui), F. ouï = (ui)
Uu  uu  long of (u), E. pool, (pʊl)
_Uu  uu  long of (u)
_Uuh  wh  long of (uh)

V  v  E. veal, (viil), F. v, North G. w, see (bh)
_V  v  = (v), buzz of (f), which see
.V  v  buzz of (f), which see
Vh  vh  = (v*gh), buzz of (fh), which see
_Vw  vwh  = (v*wh), F. voix, (vwa)

W  w  E. witch, (witsh)
W  h  diacritic, labial modification of preceding letter
W  ur  turned m, written w, defective lip trill, occ. E. very true, (vœr'turu)
Wh  wh  whisper of (w), E. which, (witsh)

X  x  Spanish x, j; Quixote, Mexico, or Quijote, Me; xico, (Kixoootee, Mee-xikoo)
_X  x  buzz of (x)

Y  y  = (iwh) = (i), F. hatte, G. lücke, (yt, lyk'c)
_Y  y  = (yo), Welsh y, and final y, pump, ewyllys, (pymp, ewálth'ys), E. houses, goodness, (næuz'yz, gud'nys)
:Y  y  Polish, Bohemian, Hungarian y, Russian (yec)
INTRODUCTION.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Yi} & \quad \text{yi} \quad \text{F. lws, ennui, (lyi, aanyi)} \\
\text{YY} & \quad \text{yy} \quad \text{long of (y), F. flute, G. gemuth, (flyyt, gemytt)} \\
\text{XY} & \quad \text{xy} \quad \text{long of (y)} \\
\text{ZI} & \quad \text{zi} \quad \text{long of (z)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
Z & \quad \text{z} \quad \text{buzz of (s), E. seal, miser, (ziil, mozi-zaz)} \\
Z & \quad \text{zh} \quad \text{buzz of (sh), Newman's and usually received A. L, Lepsius's A.} \\
Z & \quad \text{zh} \quad \text{buzz of (sh), E. vision, F. gens, (vizh-un, zhaz)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
Z & \quad \text{zh} \quad \text{buzz of (sh), (shl), buzz of (sh)} \\
Z & \quad \text{zh} \quad \text{buzz of (sh), (shl), buzz of (shj)} \\
Z & \quad \text{zh} \quad \text{buzz of (s), buzz of (sj)} \\
Z & \quad \text{zs} \quad \text{final E. z, z, when fully pronounced, days, flies, buzz, (dezaz, fizaz, bezaz)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
Z & \quad \text{zw} \quad \text{zw} \quad \text{(z\textsuperscript{w}w), see (sw)} \\
Z & \quad \text{zwh} \quad \text{zwh} \quad \text{(zh\textsuperscript{w}w), see (swh)}
\end{align*}\]

2. SIGNS.

(‘) turned comma, when final, simple whisper, as E. bit, (bit’); before a vowel, diacritic, attempt to whisper the vowel, as (‘s), whispered (as); before a sonant, diacritic, semivocalise, see (‘b, ‘d, ‘g)

(’) apostrophe, simple voice, F. able, (abl’), E. little, rhythm, open = (lit’-l, rit’-m, oop’-n), often written (lit’-l, rit’-m, oop’-n), S. Ꚓ Ꚓ = (‘n, ’l)

(’’) double apostrophe, long of (’), S. Ꚓ Ꚓ = (’’n, ’’l)

(-) hyphen, read words or letters that are written apart as if they were written close, opposed to (‘), letter elided, as F. nous avons un ami, dit-il à l’homme, (nux- avoaz- anami, dit- il a l- om)

(-) minus, before a diacritic, remove its effect from the preceding letter in which it is inherent, thus (a= u- w means that the sound of a is heard, when (a) is first pronounced and then the lips opened

(1) turned 1, A. l (za’lef), Hebrew נ, Greek soft breathing (?)

(‘) comma, diaeresis, begin the following letter as if it had no connection with the preceding, E. minutie = (miniu’- shi,i), E. unerring, unowned = (en,er’iq, on,oond’)

(2) double comma, commence the following letter so gently that its commencement is difficult to determine, spiritus lenis (?)

(,) period, pronounce the following letter emphatically

(,) period and comma, commence the following letter with great abruptness, strongly marked hiatus

(;) semicolon, open the glottis suddenly, A. * (ham’za), A. ﺟ (jal xaraamu)
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(!) turned semicolon, close the glottis suddenly as in stammering, or suddenly cease any sound, as when startled, leaving a sound half uttered; (n!:) is a suddenly checked emission of breath, strongly resembling a click (†), as in Zulu (ik.x:wa), Visible Speech, p. 126.

(,) turned 3, A. ꞏ, bleat baa == (bægæc)

(“) turned comma and apostrophe, speak the following word in a subdued tone or voix voilées.

(,) turned apostrophe, nasalize the preceding letter, but not as in F. nasiliation (_PRINT_ID_)

(;) turned !, attempt to pronounce the preceding letter with inspired breath, (f_i, ph_i), calling a bird

(†) attempt to pronounce the preceding letter with the air in the mouth without inspiring or expiring, click, E. tut == (tliğini), E. cl’ck (tj§†)

(§) turned 5, Caffir dental click, Appleyard’s c, == (t‡), or (t§†), as in (iqªbha-ti), Visible Speech, p. 126.

(☎) turned 2, Caffir cerebral (Lepsius) or palatal (Appleyard) click, Appleyard’s g == (t§†), as in (zguzalse-n”), Visible Speech, p. 126.

(ℓ) turned 7, Caffir (uni-) lateral click, Appleyards x, == (tj§†) with prolonged suction, as in (gac½ran-ji), Visible Speech, p. 126.

(∀) turned 4, Hottentot palatal click, Boyce’s qe, == (tj†) probably, Lepsius’s Standard Alphabet, 2nd ed., p. 79.

(≠) turned 8, Waco click == (x†), Haldeman, Analytic Orthography, p. 120.

(≠) turned 0, distend the pharynx and cheeks, ‘widens’ the sound.

(+) made from †, take the preceding letter nearer the throat and further from the lips, inner position.

(+) made from †, take the preceding letter further from the throat and nearer to the lips, outer position.

(†) turned †, invert the tongue so that the under part strikes the palate, when pronouncing the preceding letter, see (b, l, n, x, sh, t)

(†) protrude the tongue when pronouncing the preceding letter.

§ bi-lateral, allow the breath to escape on both sides of the tongue or mouth, but not over the tip of the tongue or through the middle of the mouth.

§ made from §, uni-lateral, allow the breath to escape on one side of the tongue or mouth only.

§ turned ‡, trill any free part during the utterance of the preceding consonant.

* link, form a new position by attempting to pronounce the two letters between which it is placed, at the same instant, but giving prominence to the first letter named, see (ij) == (1^e)
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** governor, placed between two letters at the beginning of a phrase, shews that the first is to be pronounced like the second throughout, indicating a defect of utterance, as (1**1), (1 pronounced with a nasal twang; when no letter precedes, it indicates that the effect of the following letter is heard in all letters, (**)p close lips, (**t) protruded tongue, (**) general nasal quality, (**') strained voice, etc., Visible Speech, p. 81.

(•) turned period, before a word, speak the word emphatically as ('niu did s't, niu 'did s't); after a letter, (') shews that it occurs in an accented syllable, as (hi•'iq, meek•'iq, ripooz•)

(:) colon, before a capital letter, (in which case it is written below it, as g,) shews that it is the capital of a small capital letter, see (:E) capital of (x); after a letter, shews that it occurs in a secondarily accented syllable, as (sinkom•'primen•'a•bel•'it, na•'woen•men:

~ written under a word indicates spaced letters, used to give prominence to a word in palaeotype, answering to italics in ordinary printing.

Following a Word.

(..) low level tone, C. high (phiq)
(••) high level tone, C. low (phiq)
(••) rising tone, C. high (shaq)
(••) tone rising from low pitch, C. low (shaq)
(••) rise and fall, circumflex, C. (fu•kjen shaq)
(••) falling tone, C. high (knuoe, knu, kni)
(••) falling tone to low pitch, C. low (knuoe)
(••) fall and rise, inverted circumflex
(••) stop voice in high pitch, C. high (shut•, zhi•, njip•)
(••) stop voice in low pitch, C. low (shut•, zhi•, njip•)

Preceding a Word.

(•••) speak in a high key
(•••) speak in low key

PALAEOTYPE AND VISIBLE SPEECH COMPARED.

The diagrams on p. 14, transferred by Mr. Melville Bell's permission from p. 8 of his English Visible Speech, will be the best guide to the pronunciation of the vowels. Each of the first nine diagrams represents the position of the tongue for the four vowels written below it. For the first and third vowels in each diagram, the passages behind the narrowest part of the channel formed by the tongue are in the usual condition, but for the second and fourth vowel in each diagram, they are distended, making the vowels 'wide.' For the first and second vowel in each diagram, the lips are open. For the third and fourth vowel in each diagram, the lips are more or less rounded,—namely, for Nos. 1, 2, 3, as in No. 10, for
Nos. 4, 5, 6, as in No. 11, and for Nos. 7, 8, 9 as in No. 12. As the
principal interest in the following investigation attaches to changes
in the vowel system, a careful study of these diagrams will be of
material assistance. If any reader pronounce the key words with a
vowel requiring a different position from that here pointed out, his
pronunciation differs from the author's, and the value of the symbol
is to be determined from the diagram in preference to the key word.

In order to fix the value of the palaeotypic letters, they are on
p. 15 compared with those of Mr. Melville Bell's Visible Speech, by
means of his "Cosmopolitan Telegraphic Table," which has been
here reprinted by his permission. The figures indicate the columns
and the letters the lines. The following is Mr. Bell's classification,
which will be frequently alluded to.

Columns 1, 2, 3, 4 contain consonants, lines a, b, c, d, e, f are
voiceless, lines g, h, i, k, l, m, are voiced; lines a, g are primary,
lines b, h are mixed, lines c, i are divided, lines d, k, are mixed
divided, lines e, l are shut, lines f, m are nasal.

Column 5 consists of glides, which are represented in palaeotype
on a different principle, see below, Chapter III, § 2. The letter
(x), (x), is considered as the true English aspirate in palaeotype, but
Mr. M. Bell considered (x'), or 9a, to be the more correct form.

Columns 6, 7, 8 are vowels, column 6 back vowels, column 7
mixed vowels, column 8 front vowels, and in each column lines a, b,
c, are primary, lines d, e, f are wide, lines g, h, i are round, lines
k, l, m are wide round, lines a, d, g, k are high, lines b, e, h, l are
mid, and lines c, f, i, m are low vowels.

Columns 9, 10 contain the aspirates and modifiers.

Glossotype.

An investigation of historical English spelling in Chapter VI, § 3,
suggested the possibility of enlarging the alphabet required for
writing the theoretically received pronunciation of literary English,
so as to meet the requirements of writers of our provincial dialects,
who endeavour to preserve the analogies of ordinary spelling. It
was found necessary to deviate from these slightly for the represen-
tation of our complicated diphthongal system, and some foreign
sounds, which occur provincially, but are unrecognized in our
orthography. The use of the short mark (') to indicate the pro-
cvincial shortening of vowels generally long in the literary dialect, and
of the long mark (') for the lengthening of vowels generally short, is
hardly a deviation from ordinary usage. The principles of this
scheme are explained in Chapter VI, § 3, where the exact value of
the letters is explained, and its use is exemplified in Chapter XI.
But for convenience, a very brief key is given on p. 16. The name
Glossotype refers to the chief use for which it was intended—the
writing of provincial Glossaries. It is hoped, however, that such
a scheme, although designedly incomplete, may be found useful to
all who may occasionally wish to indicate pronunciation with some
degree of exactness, but do not care to enter upon general phonetic
investigations.
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LINGUAL POSITIONS OF THE VOWELS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 1.</th>
<th>No. 2.</th>
<th>No. 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ι, ι,</td>
<td>ι, ι,</td>
<td>ι, y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɛ, e,</td>
<td>y, ɛ,</td>
<td>U, ah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u, u,</td>
<td>U, uh;</td>
<td>I, y.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 4.</th>
<th>No. 5.</th>
<th>No. 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ι, e,</td>
<td>ι, ah,</td>
<td>ι, ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, o,</td>
<td>ah, ch.</td>
<td>e, e,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o, o.</td>
<td>ι, ch.</td>
<td>ι, e.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 7.</th>
<th>No. 8.</th>
<th>No. 9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ι, e,</td>
<td>ah, oh,</td>
<td>ah, ah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, o,</td>
<td>ah, ch.</td>
<td>e, e,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, ɛ.</td>
<td>ι, ch.</td>
<td>ι, e.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LABIAL POSITIONS OF THE VOWELS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 10.</th>
<th>No. 11.</th>
<th>No. 12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u, u;</td>
<td>ι, o;</td>
<td>a, ae;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U, uh;</td>
<td>oh, oh;</td>
<td>ah, ch;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ms. Melville Bell's Visible Speech Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Palaeotypic Equivalents of Visible Speech Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>rh</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>h'</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>keh</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>wh</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>lh</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>i, j</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>lwh</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>tj</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>qh</td>
<td>nh</td>
<td>nh</td>
<td>nh</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>uh</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>gwh</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>oh</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>lj</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>lw</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>uh</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>u, w</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>oh</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>nj</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key to Glossotype

See p. 13. Isolated letters and words in glossotype should be inclosed in ( ). (E) is never mute; all vowels and combinations having (') or (") over them, except (\( \hat{\text{a}} \)), are the short or long sounds of the vowels and combinations without these marks, which should not be used for any other letters, thus: (\( \hat{\text{a}} \)) is the long sound of (a); (\( \hat{\text{e}} \)) the short sound of (e); (\( \hat{\text{o}} \)) to be used whenever it is thought that the proper form (ou) might create confusion.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
<th>Consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a gnat</td>
<td>i knit</td>
<td>aiy may aiw C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a P.</td>
<td>i S.</td>
<td>ay S. C. aw C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa ask</td>
<td>ih, ih P. G. u</td>
<td>aay high aaw how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āa ask</td>
<td>o not</td>
<td>aey S. aew C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae ware</td>
<td>ɔ S. P.</td>
<td>āhy G. ai āhw G. au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae S. e</td>
<td>oe, oe I. o</td>
<td>ahy aye ahh P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ah father</td>
<td>oe, oe G. o</td>
<td>any P. auw P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āh F. G. S. a</td>
<td>oh rose</td>
<td>ey S. tide ew I. eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai wait</td>
<td>āh S.</td>
<td>........ eew I. iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āi S. ai</td>
<td>on F. on</td>
<td>........ iw mw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an F. an</td>
<td>oo pool</td>
<td>oy boy ow P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ao S.</td>
<td>õ o S. book</td>
<td>õy P. õw P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āo S. man</td>
<td>ou, ŭ could</td>
<td>ohy P. ohw know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au all</td>
<td>ū P.</td>
<td>ooy I.F. P. ......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āu want</td>
<td>u nut</td>
<td>uy high uw how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e not</td>
<td>į P.</td>
<td>ūy F. ui ..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū S.</td>
<td>ūe, ūe Sw. u</td>
<td>euy F. oui euw D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee meet</td>
<td>uh worth</td>
<td>In all these diphthongs the first element has the sound assigned in the preceding column, which is run on quickly, with a glide, to a following (ee) or (oo) written (( \hat{\text{e}} )) or (( \hat{\text{o}} )).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ēe S.I.F.</td>
<td>ūh P.</td>
<td>ūe, ūe F. u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en F. in</td>
<td>u, ŭ F. u</td>
<td>u n F. un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eu F. eu</td>
<td>(') marmur</td>
<td>Diphthongs are also formed P. by affixing ('') as (roh'd) almost (roh-hud) = road, and by affixing (ui), which should then be written (ūi), as D.(hemis) = huiu, theoretical G. (froutind) = fremd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When more than two vowels come together and the first two form one of the preceding combinations, read them as such, as (resent-er (\( =\) re-enter) = re-enter.

b bee n-g ingrain
ch chest nk think
dh the p pea
f see r ray
g go 'r air
gh D.G. r I.S. r
h he rh P.F. r
(j written \( \hat{h} \)) s see
j jay sh she
k koo t tin
kh G. C. ch th thin
l lo v vale
l' little w wait, or
lh W. U. -w (after vowels)
m mo 'm rhythm wh why
n no y yet, or
'n open -y (after vowels)
x F. n (written \( \hat{n} \)) z zeal
ng thing zh vision

Foreign and Oriental sounds represented by Italicics and small capitals, by special convention.

Accent the first syllable, unless (') or ('') is written after some other syllable, as: August, august', august'.
CHAPTER I.

ON PRONUNCIATION AND ITS CHANGES.

Thought may be conveyed from mind to mind by various systems of symbols, each of which may be termed language. A real, living, growing language, however, has always been a collection of spoken sounds, and it is only in so far as they indicate these sounds that other symbols can be dignified with the name of language. But a spoken sound once written ceases to grow. Even when an orthography is chosen which varies with the sounds from day to day, each written word is, as it were, but an instantaneous photograph of a living thing, fixing a momentary phase, while the organism proceeds to grow and change till all resemblance to the old form may in course of time be obliterated. The systems of writing which have been generally adopted, far from acknowledging this fact, force us, as it were, to recognize mature or ancient men from the portraits of youths or children, and ignore the ever-active irrepressible vitality of language. We speak of the “dead” languages of Rome and Athens, unconscious that our own English of a few years back has become as dead to us, who can neither think in the idiom nor speak with the sounds of our forefathers.

Spoken language is born of any two or more associated human beings. It grows, matures, assimilates, changes, incorporates, excludes, develops, languishes, decays, dies utterly, with the societies to which it owes its being. It is difficult to seize its chameleon form at any moment. Each speaker as thought inspires him, each listener as the thought reaches him with the sound, creates some new turn of expression, some fresh alliance of thought with sound, some useful modification of former custom, some instantaneous innovation which either perishes at the instant of birth, or becomes part of the common stock, a progenitor of future language. The different sensations of each speaker, the different appreciations of each hearer, their intellectual growth, their environment, their aptitude for conveying or receiving impressions, their very passions, originate, change, and create language.
Without entering on the complex investigation of the idiomatic alterations of language, a slight consideration will shew that the audible forms in which these idioms are clothed will also undergo great and important changes. The habit of producing certain series of spoken sounds is acquired generally by a laborious and painful process, beginning with the first dawn of intelligence, continued through long stages of imperfect powers of appreciation and imitation, and becoming at last so fixed that the speaker in most cases either does not hear or does not duly weigh any but great deviations from his own customary mode of speech, and is rendered incapable of any but a rude travesty of strange sounds into the nearest of his own familiar utterances.

We may apparently distinguish three laws according to which the sounds of a language change.

First, the chronological law. Changes in spoken sounds take place in time, not by insensible degrees, but per saltum, from generation to generation.

Second, the individual law. A series of spoken sounds acquired during childhood and youth remains fixed in the individual during the rest of his life.

Third, the geographical law. A series of spoken sounds adopted as the expression of thought by persons living in one locality, when wholly or partly adopted by another community, are also changed, not by insensible degrees, but per saltum, in passing from individual to individual.

At any one instant of time there are generally three generations living. Each middle generation has commenced at a different time, and has modified the speech of its preceding generation in a somewhat different manner, after which it retains the modified form, while the subsequent generation proceeds to change that form once more. Consequently there will not be any approach to uniformity of speech sounds in any one place at any one time, but there will be a kind of mean, the general utterance of the more thoughtful or more respected persons of mature age, round which the other sounds seem to hover, and which, like the averages of the mathematician, not agreeing precisely with any, may for the purposes of science be assumed to represent all, and be called the language of the district at the epoch assigned. Concrete reality is always too complex for science to grasp, and hence she has to content herself with certain abstractions, and to leave practice to apply the necessary corrections in individual cases. Thus, if we descended into every minute
shade of spoken sound, the variety would be so interminable, each individual presenting some fresh peculiarities, that all definite character would be lost. In actual life this necessary abstraction is replaced by the second law which gives fixedness of utterance to the individual, regardless of surrounding change. Indeed, few persons of mature years, even in the most civilized communities, think of the sounds they utter. They speak to communicate thought, not to examine the instrument which they employ for that purpose, and they would be constantly checked, and irritated by thinking of how they speak, rather than of what they speak.

It is this individual fixity of habit, and powerlessness of adaptation that operates in producing the per saltum geographical changes, in which must be included, not only the changes made in foreign words, but also those resulting from any society within a society,—schools, colleges, cliques, coteries, professions, trades, emigrations,—in short any means of isolating some companies of speakers from others. Slang is only a form of dialect.

One marked result of the third law is that a uniform system of spoken sounds cannot extend over a very large district. All the speakers must have frequent opportunities of hearing the sounds from youth up, or they will be unable to appreciate and imitate them. Education, which sends teachers as missionaries into remote districts to convey the required sounds more or less correctly, but, more safely and certainly, rapid communication of individuals, such as railroads now effect, does much to produce uniformity of speech. How far, however, even in small, educated and locomotive England we are yet removed from uniformity of speech, may be learned by a very slight attention to the sounds heard in different districts, each of which has its own characteristic burr or brogue, less marked perhaps than it was in Higden’s and Caxton’s time, but still unmistakable.¹

The results of emigration and immigration are curious and important. By emigration is here specially meant the separation of a considerable body of the inhabitants of a country

¹ Trevisa in his translation of Higden’s Polychronicon, 1386, says “alle þe langages of þe norþumbres & specialich at zorks is so scharp slittinge & frotyngc & vnschape; þat we souþeren men may þat langage vnneþe vnder- stonde.” And Caxton (Prologue to Everyman) complains that “comyn Englyshe that is spoken in one-shyre varyth from a nother,” and goes on to relate how “certaym merchauste . . . taryd atte forfond . . . and axed for mete, and specyally . . . axyd after eggys . . . the good wyf answerseth that she coude speke no frenehe . . . and themne at last a nother sayd that he wolde haue eyren, then the good wyf sayd that she vnder- stode hym.” See Chapter XI for existing varieties of pronunciation.
from the main mass, without incorporating itself with another nation. Thus the English in America have not mixed with the natives, and the Norse in Iceland had no natives to mix with. In this case there is a kind of arrest of development, the language of the emigrants remains for a long time in the stage at which it was when emigration took place, and alters more slowly than the mother tongue, and in a different direction. Practically the speech of the American English is archaic with respect to that of the British English, and while the Icelandic scarcely differs from the old Norse, the latter has, since the colonization of Iceland, split up on the mainland into two distinct literary tongues, the Danish and Swedish. Nay, even the Irish English exhibits in many points the peculiarities of the pronunciation of the xvii th century.

By immigration, on the other hand, is meant the introduction of a comparatively small body into a large mass of people, with whom they mix and associate. This may be commercially (as when German emigrants settle in the United States), or by conquest (as when the Norsemen settled first in the north of France, and secondly in England, or when the Goths ruled in Italy). In these cases the immigrant language is more or less lost and absorbed, especially if it is not so developed as the language among which it enters, and into which it introduces comparatively little change. The French element of our language, for example, is only indirectly traceable to the Norman Conquest, for we find it very slightly marked, even in the xiii th century. The Roman occupation of England and the English domination in India have produced very little effect upon either the immigrant or receiving language, principally from the want of association. The languages have remained practically unmixed. The Roman language in France and Spain de facto ousted the Celtic of the inhabitants, and, after natural changes, altered by the absorption of the Frankish and Moorish immigrations.

The alterations thus introduced into a language produce but little effect on the idioms (that is, the expression of the relations of conceptions), but principally affect the words employed. Thus English has remained a Low German dialect through all the introductions of French, Latin, and Greek elements, and French, Spanish, and Italian remain Latin notwithstanding the Frankish, Moorish, and Gothic additions which they have received. But in all these languages great changes have fallen upon the forms of the
words used. We are apt to regard (bish'op, bish'of, bis'po, ves'kovo, sveezk, obhiis'po, epiis'kop, epis'kopus, epis'kopos) as entirely different words, and to call (breeik briik, keez kiiz, oblidid'zhi obliidzh') etc., different pronunciations of the same words. But the latter are really only less marked examples of the same phenomenon as is exhibited in the former. If the latter pairs of words are to be regarded as the same, the former nine must also be classed as one. In the latter we have chiefly chronological, in the former we have chiefly geographical changes. In both cases we have examples of the variation of one sound as it passes through various mouths—colitat vivu' per ora virum.

Even without reference to written forms, the conception of altered forms of one original sound (that is, of various pronunciations of the same word), naturally arises in men's minds, but when languages come to be written as well as spoken, this is more strongly forced upon them—at least in those cases which the writing notices. Writing, that wonderful method of arresting sound which has made human memory independent of life, and has thus perpetuated knowledge, was necessarily at first confined to the learned alone, the priest and the philosopher. These fixed, as nearly as they could appreciate, or their method of symbolisation, which was necessarily insufficient, would allow, the sounds of their own language as they heard them in their own day. Their successors venerating the invention, or despairing of introducing improvements, trod servilely in their steps and mostly used the old symbols while the sounds changed around them. Within the limits of the powers of the old symbols some changes were made from time to time, but very slowly. Then in quite recent days, the innovation of diacritical signs arose as in French and German, whereby a modern modification of an ancient usage was more or less indicated. Occasionally, whole groups of letters formerly correctly used to indicate certain sounds came to be considered as groups indicating new sounds,—not in all cases, but in many perhaps, where the sounds had changed by regular derivation. Before the invention of printing, writers, become more numerous, had become also less controlled by the example of their ancestors, and endeavoured as well as they could, with numerous conventions, inconsistencies, imperfections, and shortcomings, rendered inevitable by the inadequacy of their instrument, to express on paper the sounds they heard. When we are fortunate enough to find the real handywork of a thoughtful writer, as Orrmin, we see
how much might have been done to clear our mode of writing from inconsistencies. But with the invention of printing, came a belief in the necessity of a fixed orthography to facilitate the work of the compositor and reader. The regulation of spelling was taken from the intellectual and given to a mechanical class. Uniformity at all hazards was the aim. And uniformity has been gained to a great extent in late years, but at a sacrifice which uniformity is far from being worth—loss of a knowledge of how our ancestors spoke, concealment of how we speak at present, innumerable difficulties to both reader and writer, and hence great impediments to the acquisition of knowledge. The numerous societies for printing old English books which are now at work, and especially the Early English Text Society, have, by conscientiously printing manuscripts literally, done much to restore our knowledge of ancient sounds as well as ancient sense. But the veil of our modern spelling lies over our eyes, and it is not easy to gain the key to the mystery which these texts are calculated to display.

"Nobody," says Archdeacon C. J. Hare,¹ "who has a due reverence for his ancestors or even for his own spiritual being, which has been mainly trained and fashioned by his native language,—nobody who rightly appreciates what a momentous thing it is to keep the unity of a people entire and unbroken, to preserve and foster all its national recollections, what a glorious and inestimable blessing it is to 'speak the tongue that Shakspere spake,' will ever wish to trim that tongue according to any arbitrary theory." But the English of to-day do not know 'the tongue that Shakspere spake.' They may be familiar with the words of his plays according to their own fashion of speech, but they know no more how Shakspere would have uttered them than they know how to write a play in his idiom. The language of Shakspere has departed from us, and has to be acquired as a new tongue, without the aid of a living teacher. What this means can only be justly appreciated by observing how foreigners, after most laborious study of our own modern language from books and grammars, proceed to write and speak it. You will read and hear whole sentences in which every phrase shall be in accordance with grammar, and yet perhaps not a single sentence so composed as an Englishman would have penned it, or so uttered as an Englishman would have spoken it. A language can only be learned by ear.

But how did our glorious old writers speak? What

sounds did Goldsmith, Pope, Dryden, Milton, Shakspere, Spenser, Chaucer, Langland, call the English language? Or if we cannot discover their own individual peculiarities, what was the style of pronunciation prevalent at and about their time among the readers of their works? The inquiry is beset with difficulties. It would be almost impossible to determine the pronunciation of our contemporary laureate, but surely with our heap of pronouncing dictionaries, it would seem easy to determine that of his readers. Yet this is far from being the case. It is difficult even for a person to determine with accuracy what is his own pronunciation. He can at best only give an approximation to that of others.

In the present day we may, however, recognize a received pronunciation all over the country, not widely differing in any particular locality, and admitting a certain degree of variety. It may be especially considered as the educated pronunciation of the metropolis, of the court, the pulpit, and the bar. But in as much as all these localities and professions are recruited from the provinces, there will be a varied thread of provincial utterance running through the whole. In former times this was necessarily more marked, and the simultaneous varieties of pronunciation prevalent and acknowledged much greater. In the xiii th, xiv th, and xv th centuries it is almost a straining of the meaning of words to talk of a general English pronunciation. There was then only a court dialect of the south, and the various "upland," northern, eastern, and western modes of speech. And hence we can only seek to discover the court dialect, and then, having partly ascertained the value of the letters, endeavour to ascertain the pronunciations meant to be indicated by such writers as Dan Michel and Orrmin.

But how are we to arrive at a knowledge of the court dialect? Molière ridicules the notion of having a master to teach pronunciation, and certainly the analysis of speech sounds, was at no time, and is not even at the present day, notwithstanding the appearance of so many treatises in quite recent times, down to that of Mr. Melville Bell, 1867, a favorite subject of investigation. It is voted tiresome or unnecessary, and the greater number of even those who

1 The pronunciation of the stage is inclined to be archaic, except in the modernest imitations of every day life.
2 Thus in 1440 the author of the Promptorium Parvulorum says, "Comitatvs Northfocia" or, according to another reading, "Orientalium Anglorum modum loquendi solum sum secutus, quem solum ab infancia didici, et solotenus plenius perfectiusque cognovit."
3 The subject of a standard pronunciation is specially considered below, Chap. VI, § 6.
touch upon it incidentally, in grammars and orthoepical treatises, are profoundly ignorant of the nature and mechanism of speech, and the inter-relations of the sounds which constitute language. The consequence is that writers being unaware of the mechanism by which the results are produced, were constrained to use a variety of metaphorical expressions which it is extremely difficult to comprehend, and which naturally have different meanings in the works of different authors. Thus sounds are termed thick, thin, fat, full, empty, round, flat, hard, soft, rough, smooth, sharp, clear, obscure, coarse, delicate, broad, fine, attenuated, mincing, finical, affected, open, close, and so on, till the reader is in despair. For example, in English, German, Italian, Spanish, 'hard c' is (k), but 'soft c' is (s) in English, (ts) in German, (th) in Italian, (c), that is, nearly (th), in Spanish. The Germans call (g) the 'soft' of (k), and (gh) the 'soft' of (g). But the English call (g) 'hard g,' and (dzh) 'soft g,' and 'soft g' is (x), or nearly (kh), in Spanish. Most writers term (s, th) hard sounds, and (z, dh) soft, but Dyche finds (s, th) soft, and (z, dh) hard. One writer calls o obscure when it sounds as (a) or (uu), no matter which, but y final obscure when (i), and sharp and clear when (si).

Some writers, again, content themselves with using key words. This is indeed the easiest method for the writer, and conveys very fair notions to contemporary readers. It has been adopted in the description of Palaeotype to avoid prolix explanations. But the publication of Mr. Melville Bell's Visible Speech has enabled me by referring to his symbols to fix the sounds with accuracy, for Visible Speech contains an exact account of the disposition of the organs for producing the sounds, and hence by carefully studying that work at any time—centuries hence—the exact sound could probably be recovered. Not so with key words, for they involve the

1 The beautiful phonetic short-hand invented by Mr. I. Pitman, under the name of Phonography, and developed by the assistance of many co-workers, gave rise to a desire to print phonetically, in consequence of which a phonetic English alphabet was invented by Mr. I. Pitman and myself, which, with various subsequent modifications, has been extensively used in England and America. From the first I endeavoured (in my treatises on the Alphabet of Nature, 1845, and Essentials of Phonetics, 1848,) to make this alphabet a means of extending a knowledge of the inter-relations of speech sounds, but with very small success, even among those who were most earnest in the use of phonetic types as an educational appliance. The subject was not sufficiently attractive. At present Mr. Melville Bell's recent treatise on Visible Speech, renders a study of the whole subject comparatively easy. And he has supplemented it by a system of shorthand writing which will be applicable with almost equal facility to all languages in the world, rendering his system extremely easy to write even at full.

2 Guide to the English Tongue, 1710.
very riddle which we have to solve. Only those who, like
the present writer, have spent hours in endeavouring to dis-
cover what was meant by a simple reference to a key word
given three hundred years ago, can fully appreciate the ad-
vantage of an exact description like that furnished by Visible
Speech. ¹ There is some relief when many key-words are
given, or when contemporary languages are cited. But
here the imperfect appreciation of the citer is painfully con-
nspicuous, and allowances have always to be made on that
account. Many writers, too, content themselves with re-
ferences to the Latin, Greek, or Hebrew sounds, apparently
forgetting that the older pronunciation of these languages is a
matter of dispute, and that the modern pronunciation varies
from country to country and century to century. Let any
one begin by studying Sir T. Smith, Hart, Bullokar, Gill,
and Butler, in order to determine the pronunciation of
Shakspere from these sources alone,—or even with the as-
sistance of Palsgrave,—and he will soon either find himself
in the same slough of despond in which I struggled, or will
get out of his difficulties only by a freer use of hypoth-
sis and theory than I considered justifiable, when I endeavoured
to discover, not to invent,—to establish by evidence, not to
propound theoretically,—the English pronunciation of the
xvi th century.

The first ray of light came to me from a corner which had
hitherto been very dark. While searching for information,
some book or other led me to consult William Salesbury's
Welsh and English Dictionary, 1547. The introduction
contains a very short and incomplete introduction to English
pronunciation, written in quaint old Welsh. My imperfect
knowledge of the language was sufficient for me to perceive
the value of this essay, which mainly consisted in the
transcription of about 150 typical English words into Welsh
letters. Now the Welsh alphabet of the present day is re-
markably phonetic, having only one ambiguous letter, y,
which is sometimes (ə), or (a), and at others (y). Did Salesbury
pronounce these letters as they are now pronounced in North

¹ At the latter end of his treatise
Mr. Melville Bell has given in to the
practice of key words, and assigned
them to his symbols. Let the reader
be careful not to take the value of the
symbol from his own pronunciation of
the key words, or from any other per-
son's. Let him first determine the value
of the symbol from the exact
description and diagram of the position
of the speech organs,—or if possible
also from the living voice of some one
thoroughly acquainted with the system
—and then determine Mr. Bell's own
pronunciation of the key word from
the known value of the symbol. This
pronunciation in many instances differs
from that which I am accustomed to
give it, especially in foreign words.
Both of us may be wrong.
Wales? Most fortunately he has answered the question himself in a tract upon Welsh pronunciation written in English, and referring to many other languages to assist the English reader. The result was that with the exception of _y_, the sounds had remained the same for the last 300 years. Here then we have a solid foundation for future work,—the pronunciation of a certain number of words in the _xvi_th century determined with considerable certainty; and from this we are able to proceed to a study of the other works named, with more hope of a satisfactory result. These tracts of Salesbury are so rare, and one of them so little intelligible to the mass of readers, that at the suggestion of the Philological Society, they will be transferred to the pages of this essay,—the English treatise almost entire, the Welsh treatise complete with a translation.\(^1\)

The pronunciation of English during the _xvi_th century was thus rendered tolerably clear, and the mode in which it broke into that of the _xvii_th century became traceable. But the _xvii_th century was, like the _xv_th, one of civil war, that is of extraordinary commingling of the population, and consequently one of marked linguistic change. Between the _xiv_th and _xvi_th centuries our language was almost born anew.\(^2\) In the _xvii_th century the idiomatic changes are by no means so evident, but the pronunciation altered distinctly in some remarkable points. These facts and the breaking up of the _xvii_th into the _xviii_th century pronunciation, which when established scarcely differed from the present, are well brought to light by Wallis, Wilkins, Owen, Price, Cooper, Miège, and Jones, followed by Buchanan, Franklin, and Sheridan. It became therefore possible to assign with considerable accuracy, the pronunciation of Spenser, Shakspeare, Milton, Dryden, and Pope, or rather of their contemporaries.

This was much, but it was not enough. No treatise on Early English pronunciation could be satisfactory which did not include Chaucer. But here all authorities failed. Palegrave is the earliest author from whom we learn distinctly how any English sound was pronounced, and then only through the analogy of the French and Italian. Two principles, however, suggested themselves for trial. In tracing the alteration of vowel sounds from the _xvi_th through the _xvii_th to the _xviii_th century a certain definite line of change came to light, which was more or less confirmed by a comparison of the changes, as far as they can be traced, in

---

\(^1\) See Chapter VIII, §§ 1 and 2.  \(^2\) See Chapter IV § 1.
other languages. Hence the presumption was that from the xivth to the xvith centuries, if the sounds had altered at all, they would have altered in the same direction. But a second principle was necessary to make the first available. This was found in the fact that since writing was confined to a comparatively small number of persons, the majority of those who heard and enjoyed poetry would be ignorant of the spelling of the words. Hence the rhymes to be appreciated at all must have been rhymes to the ear, and not the modern monstrosity of rhymes to the eye. If we could have a manus- script in Chaucer’s own handwriting, we should therefore expect to find all the rhymes perfect. Hence we might conclude that when two words rhymed together in one of Chaucer’s couplets, they also rhymed together in his pronunciation, and if they would not have rhymed together in the xvi th century, one of them must have altered in the definite line of change already discovered. In conformity with these principles the whole of the rhymes in Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales as exhibited in the best available manuscript, together with those in all his other poems as edited by Mr. Morris, and those in Gower’s Confessio Amantis, have been carefully examined, and a system of pronunciation deduced for the xivth century.¹

Much uncertainty must necessarily prevail concerning the pronunciation of English from 1400, the death of Chaucer, to 1530, the date of Palsgrave’s French Grammar, as the changes were numerous and rapid, both in language and pronunciation. Similarly if we had lost the xvii th century books on English pronunciation, it would have been impossible to restore it, from a knowledge only of the pronuncia tions in the xvi th and xvii th centuries. But standing on the secure ground of the xiv th century we can, without much doubt penetrate into still more remote regions, espe cially with the help of Orrmin’s orthography, which lands us into Anglosaxon.

Before proceeding to the detailed investigation, it may be convenient to present the main results in a tabular form. This has been attempted in the merest outline, on the two following pages. An explanation of the construction of the table is added on p. 30.

¹ For a detailed account of this investigation, see Chapter IV.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Spelling</th>
<th>Chaucer</th>
<th>Spenser</th>
<th>Milton</th>
<th>Dryden</th>
<th>Pope</th>
<th>Goldsmith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a short</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a long</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>ææ</td>
<td>ææ</td>
<td>ææ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai, ay</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai, aai</td>
<td>æei, ee</td>
<td>æei, ee</td>
<td>æei, ee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au, ao</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>au, au</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e short</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e long</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee, ii</td>
<td>ee, ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ea</td>
<td>ee, e</td>
<td>ee, e</td>
<td>ee, e</td>
<td>ii, e</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei, ey</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai, ei, ai</td>
<td>eei, ee</td>
<td>eei, ee, ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eu, eo</td>
<td>eu, yy</td>
<td>yy, eu</td>
<td>iu, eu</td>
<td>iu</td>
<td>iu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh, h'</td>
<td>h'–</td>
<td>––</td>
<td>––</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, y short</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, y long</td>
<td>i'</td>
<td>i, ai</td>
<td>oi</td>
<td>oi</td>
<td>oi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o short</td>
<td>o, u</td>
<td>o, u</td>
<td>o, o</td>
<td>o, o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o long</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo, AA</td>
<td>oo, AA</td>
<td>oo, AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oi, oy</td>
<td>ui</td>
<td>oi, ui</td>
<td>ai, oi; ui, ei</td>
<td>oi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ou, ow</td>
<td>uu, oou</td>
<td>uu, oou</td>
<td>uu, oou</td>
<td>uu, oou</td>
<td>uu, oo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u short</td>
<td>u; i, e</td>
<td>u; i, e</td>
<td>u; i, e</td>
<td>u; i, e</td>
<td>u, i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u long</td>
<td>yy</td>
<td>yy</td>
<td>yy, iu</td>
<td>iu</td>
<td>iu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Spelling</td>
<td>Chaucer XIV</td>
<td>Spenser XVI</td>
<td>Milton XVII</td>
<td>Dryden XVII</td>
<td>Pope XVIII</td>
<td>Goldsmith XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>mend</td>
<td>mend</td>
<td>mend</td>
<td>mend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tale</td>
<td>taale</td>
<td>taal</td>
<td>teaol</td>
<td>teaol</td>
<td>teaol</td>
<td>teaol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rain, way</td>
<td>rain, wai</td>
<td>rain, wai</td>
<td>reain, wenei</td>
<td>reen, wenei</td>
<td>reen, weei</td>
<td>reen, weei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw, eye</td>
<td>sau, aau</td>
<td>sau, aau</td>
<td>saa, aa</td>
<td>saa, aa</td>
<td>saa, aa</td>
<td>saa, aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egg</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these, we</td>
<td>dheeze, wii</td>
<td>dheeze, wii</td>
<td>dheeze, wii</td>
<td>dheeze, wii</td>
<td>dhiiz, wii</td>
<td>dhiiz, wii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean, head</td>
<td>meen, need</td>
<td>meen, need</td>
<td>meen, need</td>
<td>meen, need</td>
<td>meen, need</td>
<td>meen, need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seen</td>
<td>seen</td>
<td>sin</td>
<td>sin</td>
<td>sin</td>
<td>sin</td>
<td>sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obey, they,</td>
<td>obei, dhai</td>
<td>obei, dheei</td>
<td>obei, dheei</td>
<td>obei, dheei</td>
<td>obei, dheei</td>
<td>obei, dheei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vein, receive</td>
<td>vein, reaisiv</td>
<td>vein, reaisiv</td>
<td>vein, reaisiv</td>
<td>vein, reaisiv</td>
<td>vein, reaisiv</td>
<td>vein, reaisiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feu, stone</td>
<td>feu, sty</td>
<td>feu, sty</td>
<td>feu, sty</td>
<td>feu, sty</td>
<td>feu, sty</td>
<td>feu, sty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>nikt</td>
<td>nikt, nikt'</td>
<td>nikt', ndt</td>
<td>nikt', ndt</td>
<td>nikt'</td>
<td>nikt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bite</td>
<td>bitte</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holly, wonder</td>
<td>hol'wun'der</td>
<td>hol'wun'der</td>
<td>hol'wun'der</td>
<td>hol'wun'der</td>
<td>hol'wun'der</td>
<td>hol'wun'der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hopes</td>
<td>hoop</td>
<td>hoop</td>
<td>hoop</td>
<td>hoop</td>
<td>hoop</td>
<td>hoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soap, broad</td>
<td>soap, brood</td>
<td>soap, brood</td>
<td>soap, brood</td>
<td>soap, broad</td>
<td>soap, braad</td>
<td>soap, braad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint, boil</td>
<td>dhoint, bull</td>
<td>dhoint, bull</td>
<td>dhoint, bull</td>
<td>dhoint, bull</td>
<td>dhoint, boil</td>
<td>dhoint, boil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fool, blood</td>
<td>fool, blud</td>
<td>fool, blud</td>
<td>fool, blad</td>
<td>fool, blad</td>
<td>fool, blad</td>
<td>fool, blad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noe, know</td>
<td>nau, knou</td>
<td>nau, knou</td>
<td>nau, nou</td>
<td>nau, nou</td>
<td>nau, nou</td>
<td>nau, nou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pull, but, bury</td>
<td>pul, but, biz'</td>
<td>pul, but, biz'</td>
<td>pul, bat, biz'</td>
<td>pul, bat, biz'</td>
<td>pul, bat, biz'</td>
<td>pul, bat, biz'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mune</td>
<td>myyz'e</td>
<td>myyz</td>
<td>myyz</td>
<td>myyz</td>
<td>miusz</td>
<td>miusz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking the principal modern combinations of vowels, and the one consonant combination, *gh*, for which the pronunciation of successive centuries have mainly differed, I have arranged them in the first column of the preceding table. It must be borne in mind that these spellings are modern, and in many cases replace at present other spellings which were current in the xivth to the xvith centuries. In the four next columns I give in palaeotype, as explained in the introduction, the pronunciations prevalent during the xivth, xviith, xviiith, and xviiith centuries. For this rough and general view of the subject there is no perceptible difference between the xviiiith and xixth centuries. It must not be supposed that the pronunciation here indicated prevailed throughout the centuries to which they are attributed. The xivth century pronunciation refers only to the latter half of that century. The xviith century is represented rather in its former half and middle than in the latter part when it was verging to the xviiith century pronunciation. The xviiith century pronunciation represents the fully established pronunciation of the time in the middle and latter part of the century. And the xviiiith century pronunciations is that of the latter part. Hence we may roughly term the pronunciations exhibited those of Chaucer, Spenser, Dryden, and Goldsmith. Shakspere and Milton are transitional between Spenser and Dryden, while Pope lies between Dryden and Goldsmith. These names are therefore placed at the top of the columns, and between the columns, as an assistance to the reader. As single letters are more difficult to appreciate than entire words, examples of each mode of speech are given. The same combination of letters was not always pronounced in the same way in all positions, even in the xivth century; hence it is sometimes necessary to give two sounds and two examples, and in this case the more usual (not the older) sound is put first. In the latter part of the xviith, in the xviiith and later centuries, anomalies of pronunciation became more common, and nothing but detailed lists of words, such as will be furnished hereafter, will serve to explain them. The reader must therefore remember that this table gives merely a general view to serve as a guide in studying the subsequent details.
CHAPTER II.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE PRONUNCIATION OF ENGLISH DURING THE SIXTEENTH, SEVENTEENTH, AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES.

§ 1. Sixteenth Century.

1530, 22 Henry VIII. Palgrave, John.

19 folios unmarked, 473 folios numbered, the English in black letter, the French in Roman characters. The book is written in English although the title is French. It was reprinted by the French Government, and edited by F. Génin, in 1852.

Palgrave graduated at Cambridge as well as in Paris, and was appointed French tutor to the princess Mary, sister of Henry VIII, when a marriage was negotiated between her and Louis XII of France in 1514. He was made a royal chaplain, and on going to live at Oxford in 1531, there took the degrees of M.A. and B.D. He is supposed to have died in 1554. He must consequently have spoken the educated southern and court dialect of the latter part of the xvth, and the early part of the xviith century.

This work contains a very elaborate account of French pronunciation, frequently elucidated by reference to contemporary English and Italian. The pronunciation of several English words is thus incidentally established with more or less certainty.

To the French reprint is added a reprint of

An Introductorie for to lerne to rede, to pronounce and to speke French trewly, compyled for the right bigh, excellent and most vertuous lady The Lady Mary of Englande, doughter to our most gracious soverayn Lorde Kyng Henry the Eight.

By Giles du Guez or du Wes, with no author's name, except as shewn by an initial acrostic, and no date, but apparently about 1532. The rules for pronunciation are few and insufficient, extending over three quarto pages.

1545, 37 Henry VIII. Meigret, Loys.
Traité touchant le commun usage de l'escritvre francoys, faict par Loys Meigret, Lyonnaïs : auquel est debattu

This little book incidentally enters into a discussion of the pronunciation of the French language, and thus renders Palsgrave's English analogues more certain. Where Meigret differs from Palsgrave, it is difficult to decide whether Palsgrave is in fault through want of appreciation and English habits, or Meigret from being a Lyonnese instead of a Parisian. See another work by Meigret described under its date 1550. This little work is also remarkable as having in some way suggested Hart's English work on Orthography, 1569, subsequently described. Hart says, translating his phonetic spelling into modern English orthography: "You may see by this little treatise I have been a traveller beyond the seas, among vulgar tongues, of which that small knowledge I have, hath been the cause of this mine entreprize. And therewithal the sight of a treatise set forth in print at Paris, Anno 1545, by a worthy man, well learned both in Greek and Latin, named Louis Meigret of Lyon, touching the abuse of the writing of the French tongue, whose reasons and arguments I do here before partly use, as he did Quintilian's, whom it appeared he had well studied. And I have seen divers French books put forth in print in that his manner of Orthography, of some well liked of, and received, and of others left and repugned. But what good & notable thing can take a speedy root, amongst a multitude, except the princes & governors, (by the grace which God may give them) do favour & somewhat countenance it."

1547, 38 Henry VI & 1 Edward VI. Salesbury, W.


The complete title is given below, Chapter VIII, § 2, which contains a transcript of the preliminary Welsh essay on English pronunciation, with a translation.

From Anthony a Wood's Athenae Oxonienses by Philip Bliss, London, 1813, vol. i, p. 358, we learn that Salesbury was born of an ancient family in Denbighshire, studied at Oxford, and was entered at Thavies Inn, Holborn, London. In his latter days he lived with Humph. Toy, a bookseller in St. Paul's Churchyard. He translated the New Testament into Welsh, and obtained a patent for printing it, from Queen Elizabeth, 1567. He wrote also other works, see under 1567.

As a Welshman, Salesbury was of course liable to mispronounce English, but he was so early removed to England, and had so long an opportunity of studying the Southern English pronunciation to which his treatises shew that he was fully alive, that any assertion of his must carry great weight with it, however much opposed it might be to theory. His pronunciation is evidently more modern than Palsgrave's.
1550, 4 Edward VI; 4 Henri II of France. *Meigret, Loys.*

This very curious French Grammar, (which is not noticed by M. Génin in his introduction to Palsgrave, although it was so nearly contemporary,) is entirely printed phonetically, apparently to carry out the suggestions of Meigret’s little book already described, better than he had done in a former work, which he alludes to thus: “l’écriture qe j’ey observé (cambien q’elle ne soru pas du tout selon qe regerent la rigueur de la prononciacion) en la transalcion du Mxteur de Luçian.” (fo. 10b.) His alphabet consists of the letters “a, e ouvri, e clôs, i Latin, o ouvert, ou clôs, u, y Grec de mème puissance qe l’i, b be, p pe, f ef, phi, u conso., c ca Latin, k ca Grec ou kappa, q qu, g ga ou gamma, ch cha aspiré, d de, t te, th the aspiré, f, ç, s, es, z zed, ch che, l el, l el molle, m em, n en, n en molle, r er, i ji consonante, x, cs, ks, gs, ix,” (fo. 15b) where I have used e for an e with a tail like ç, l for an l with a short mark over it like ī, and n for an n with the second stroke produced and terminating in a backward hook, which resembles the letter c, and with a short mark over it like ū. The powers of these letters, taken in order, appear to have been, (a, ẽ, e, i, o, u, y, i; b, p, f, f, v, k, k, g, k; d, t, t, s, zh, l, lj, m, n, nj, r, zh, ks, gz).

La Grammaire Française et les Grammairiens au XVIe siècle, par Ch.- L. Livet, Paris, 1859, gives an abstract of all Meigret’s works and of his controversies with G. des Autels, and J. Pelletier, from which it appears that Meigret lived in Paris, and had been an assiduous frequenter of the court of François I, (p. 139). The dispute principally affects Meigret’s e, e, (pp. 127, 132, 140), o, ou, (p. 139), ai, (p. 130), ao, (p. 122), eu, (p. 130), and shows the transitional state of French pronunciation at the time. M. Livet’s book also contains notices of Jacques Dubois (Jacobi Sylvii Isagoge, 1531), J. Pelletier (Dialogvs de l’orthographe et prononciacion française, 1555, a year after Meigret had been forced by his publisher to use the ordinary orthography), Pierre Ramus ou de la Ramée (Grammaire, 1 ed. 1562, 2 ed. 1572, last 1587), Jean Garnier (Institutio gallice lingue, 1558), Jean Pillot (Gallice lingue institutio, 1581), Abel Mathieu (Devis de la langue francaise, 1559), Robert Estienne (Dictionnaire franç.-lat., 1539, Traite de la Gram. franc, without date), Henri Estienne (H. Stephani Hypomneses, 1582, Traité de la conformité, Deux Dialogues, without date, 1578?, Précéllence, 1579), Claude de Saint-Lien (Claudii à Sancto Vinculo de pronunciatione ling. gall. 1580), Théodore de Bèze (De Franciæ lingue recta pronunciatione tractatus, Theod. Bezae sect. 1584). If to these we add Palsgrave & du Guez, neither of whom are abstracted by M. Livet, we can trace the change of French pronunciation from the earlier to the later part of the xvth century, till it subsided into a form practically the same as the present, by a course remarkably similar to that pursued by the contemporary English pronunciation.

Joannis Cheki Angli de pronunciatione Graecae potissimum linguæ disputationes cum Stephano Vuintoniensi Episcopo. Basle, 24mo.

In this work several illustrations of Greek sounds are drawn from English words which are printed phonetically in Greek letters, to give a conception of the author’s theoretical pronunciation of Greek. Adolph Mekerch of Bruges, in H. Stephanus’s collection De vera pronunciatione Graecae et Latinæ Linguæ, 1587, adopts in many places the very expressions of Cheke, but changes his illustrative words from English to Flemish, which he again prints phonetically in Greek letters. In this way a comparison of English and Flemish in the xvth century is instituted. Cheke born at Cambridge in 1614, moved in the best literary society, was secretary of state 1552, and died 1557.

1567, 10 Elizabeth. Salesbury, W.

A playne and familiar Introduction, teaching how to pronounce the letters in the Brytishe tongue, now commonly called Welsh . . . . London, 4to, English in black letter, Welsh in Roman.

All the portions of this rare book which are useful for the present investigation are reprinted, with illustrative notes, below, Chap. VIII, § 1. See 1547, supra p. 32.

1568, 11 Elizabeth. Smith, Sir Thomas.


A beautifully printed book in large Roman letters with tables of illustrative words printed according to a phonetic alphabet, without the ordinary spelling, Smith’s object being to improve the orthography not explain the pronunciation. The value of his 34 letters in the order of his alphabetic table (fo. 41) is apparently as follows, (a, aa, b, tsh, d, dh, e, ee, ii, f, v, g, dzh, R, Z, ei, k, l, m, n, o, oo, p, q, r, s, t, sh, t, th, u, uu, yy, ks.)

Smith uses s for (tsh), which has occasioned many misprints, S for (dh), a letter like the Anglosaxon Æ with a dieresis for (ii), an inverted A or V for v, the Anglosaxon ʒ for (dzh), a reflected z for (sh), θ for (th), ɔ for (yy). The long vowels he has represented by a dieresis, and as he considers (ei) to be the long of (e), he prints it †. Since then (ee) is e, and (ii) is a character almost identical in appearance, misprints occasionally occur. In all cases of phonetic writing when diacritic accents are employed, misfortunes of this kind are frequent. Hence the importance of indicating length by reduplication, as in palaeotype, or by some constant additional sign, as in Fis. Speech.

Sir Thomas Smith was born at Saffron Walden, Essex 1515, was fellow of Queen’s College, Cambridge 1531, public orator
1586, provost of Eton, master of requests to Edward VI, secretary of state 1548, privy councillor and assistant secretary of state 1571, succeeded Burleigh, and died 1577. Hence his pronunciation must be accepted as the most literary and courtly of a time somewhat subsequent to Palsgrave’s. He was not much acquainted with French, or probably with any other living language, and consequently without the assistance of Salesbury great doubts would be felt as to many of his pronunciations.

1569, 12 Elizabeth. Hart, John.
An Orthographie, conteyning the due order and reason, howe to write or painte thimage of mannes voice, most like to the life or nature. Composed by J. H. Chester, Heral. The contents whereof are next folowing. Sat citost (sic) sat bene. Anno. 1569. London, 12mo.
The first part in black letter, the latter part in italics with new letters for (sh, dzh, teh, dh, th, ’l,) and a dot under a short vowel sign to lengthen it. Reprinted in ligraphy by I. Pitman, 1850, the first part in the phonography or phonetic shorthand of that date, the latter part in a longhand writing imitating the italic original.
The name John Hart is taken from the British Museum catalogue. Dr. Gill calls him “e focialibus vnuz, qui eorum more ex gradu officii nomen sibi Chester assumpeit.” He is cited as “Master Chester” by Bullokar. It seems probable that he was a Welshman, as he writes (uuld) for (would), that is, he did not pronounce (wuu) as distinct from (nu).
This is a most disappointing book. The writer knew several languages, as French, German, Italian, Spanish, and there is little or no doubt as to the general value of his symbols, but in the words of Dr. Gill, “sermonem nostrum characteribus suis non sequi sed ducere meditabatur.” He has in fact chosen a pronunciation then coming in, heard by few, and distasteful to the old school. See below, Chapter III, § 3, EI, AI, and Chapter VIII, § 3. One of the causes of the writing and publication of this work, was Hart’s acquaintance with Meigret’s book of 1545, see above p. 31.
It appears that this book of Hart’s was twenty years older than its real date, which would bring it up to 1549, for he says (fo. 5b): “The liuing doe knowe themselves no furthir bounde to this our instant maner, than our predecessors were to the Saxon letters and writing, which hath bene altered as the speach hath chaunged, much

---

1 This he informs us of in the beginning of his treatise De vocis et emendatione lingua Graecæ pronunciatione Epistola, 1668, in which also several passages occur which are useful in the determination of English pronunciation. The two treatises are bound in one volume in the British Museum Library. He introduced Erasmus’s system of Greek pronunciation, which is similar to that now used at Eton, and would have been unintelligible most probably to Aristophanes, as it certainly would be to any modern Greek. While he was in Paris he met with a modern Greek, who was furious at the notion of introducing “tam vastos sonos et absonas diphthongas in Graecam linguam,” but the two disputants could not agree the point, “quoniam ego Gallicæ parum admodum, ille non intra multis, Latine nihil callebat,” fo. 5b.
differing from that which was used with in these five hundredth, I maye say within these two hundredth yeares: which I considered of about xx. yeares past, and thought it worth my labour, if I could finde the meane of remedie, of our present abuse. And so framed a treatise therevpon, and would then it had bene published, but I am the gladder it hath bene stayed vntill this time, wherein so well a learned gentilman, in the Greke & Latine tongues, & traualled in certain vulgarcs sir Thomas Smith knight, hath written his minde, touching this matter, in hys booke of late set forth in Latin, entituled, De recta & emendata lingua Anglica scriptione. Where-of and of this my treatise the summe, effect, and ende is one. Which is, to vse as many letters in our writing, as we doe voyces or breathes in our speaking, and no more; and neuer to abuse one for another, and to write as we speake: which we must needes doe if we will ever have our writing perfite."

1570, 13 Elizabeth. Levins, Peter.

Manipulus Vocabulorum: a Rhyming Dictionary of the English Language by Peter Levins. 4to.

This book has been reprinted by the Early English Text Society, under the able editorship of Mr. Henry B. Wheatley. The words are arranged according to their orthographies, so that very little assistance is given towards determining the pronunciation. The place of the accent, however, is generally marked, but as evident errors are committed, no reliance can be placed on it. It is chiefly valuable for shewing the received orthography of that period, and as such will be frequently cited.

1573, 16 Elizabeth. Bare, John.

An Alvearie or Triple Dictionarie, in Englishe, Latin and French: very profitable for all such as be desirous of any of these three languages. London, fo.

The introductory remarks upon each letter afford some slight assistance. John Bare, was fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1554. His pronunciation belongs therefore to the middle of the xviith century, and to the educated class, but his county is not known.

1580, 23 Elizabeth. Bullokar, William.

Bullokars Booke at large for the Amendment of Orthographie for English speech: wherein, a most perfect supplie is made, for the wantes and double sounde of letters in the olde Orthographie, with Examples for the same, with the easie conference and vse of both Orthographies, to saue expences in Bookes for a time, vntill this amendment grow to a generall vse, for the easie, speedie, and perfect reading and writing of English, (the speech not changed, as some vntruly and maliciously,
or at the least ignorantie blowe abroade,) by the which amendment the same Author hath also framed a ruled Grammar, to be imprinted hereafter, for the same speech, to no small commoditie of the English Nation, not only to come to easie, speedie, and perfect vse of our owne language, but also to their easie, speedie, and readie entrance into the secretes of other Languages, and and easie and speedie pathway to all Straunger, to vse our Language, heerefore very hard vnto them, to no small profite and credite to this our Nation, and stay therevnto in the weightiest causes. There is also imprinted with this Orthographie a short Pamphlet for all Learners, and a Primer agreeing to the same, and as learners shall go forward therein, other necessarie Bookes shall speedily be prouided with the same Orthographie. Herevnto are also ioyned written Copies with the same Orthographie. Giue God the praise, that teacheth alwaies. When truth trieth, error flieth. Scene and allowed according to order. Imprinted at London by Henrie Denham 1580. London 4to.

In black letter, the new characters being also in black letter, with divers points, hooks, etc., placed above and below. His object was to keep as closely as possible to the existing orthography, and mark the pronunciation, and also certain grammatical forms. The union of these two objects serves greatly to complicate his orthography, which perhaps no one but the inventor could have used. He reckons 37 letters, most of which have duplicate forms "for help in equo'y." These 37 letters in order apparently represent the sounds (a, b, s, k, tzh, d, e, ii, f, dzh, g, u, i, l, l', m, m, 'n, o, uu, p, kw, r, s, sh, t, th, th, y, u, v, w, wh, ks, x, z) Bullokar admits seven diphthongs (ai, an, eei, eu, oi, oum, uui) with ei "seldom in use," and rather uncertain in his text. The reduplicated forms and the fineness of the digraphic strokes, render his book troublesome to the reader, but the above interpretation, founded on Salesbury's information, furnishes a tolerably consistent account of English pronunciation. There are some long vowels not included in the scheme, namely (aa, ee, oo) which are generally represented by accents, as å, ò, ì, ý, ö, although æ is commonly employed for (ee). In the case of long i and ou, he seems to have retained the ancient sounds (û, uu,) in place of the (ei, ou) given by Salesbury and Smith, see Chapter III, § 3, I, but he unfortunately generally neglects to write the accent ou i.

The pronunciation of Bullokar was certainly antiquated in some particulars, agreeing better with Palsgrave's than with that of any intermediate author, and proceeding in a direction contrary to Hart's. Hence Gill looked upon him with favour, and says, "Bulokerus vt paucula mutavit, sic multa fideliter emendavit." Altogether the
book is very valuable for determining the pronunciation of the early part of the xviith century. See Chap. VIII, § 4.

1611, 9 James I. Cotgrave, Randle.
A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues, London imprinted by Adam Islip. Fo.

There is a short account of French pronunciation which incidentally gives some assistance towards the determination of English sounds. Although this book appeared in the xviiith century, its pronunciation belongs to the xviith.

1611, 9 James I. Florio, John.
Queen Anna’s New World of Words, or Dictionarie of the Italian and English tongues, collected, and newly much augmented by J. F., Reader of the Italian vnto the Soueraigne Maiestie of ANNA, crowned Queene of England, Scotland and Ireland, &c., and one of the Gentlemen of hir Royall Priuie Chamber. Whereunto are added certaine necessarie rules and short observa-
tions for the Italian tongue. Fo.

The first edition appeared in 1598, and of course had no reference to James’s queen, Anne of Denmark. It also did not contain any account of the pronunciation. This second edition, in treating of the Italian pronunciation of s, o, discriminates their open and close sounds, which are marked throughout the book, and exemplifies them, together with some of the consonants by a reference to English, which, allowing for Italian errors, is useful.


This second edition differs from the first mainly in the characters employed; there are, however, a few verbal differences in the text. The pronunciation exhibited, with perhaps two exceptions, that of long i and of au, was that of the middle of the xviiith century, although the book appears in the xviiith, for Dr. Gill evidently resisted all modern mincing and effeminacy of speech, as the new fashions appeared to him. He was born in Lincolnshire, 1564, the same year as Shakspere, became a student of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1583, and was made head master of St. Paul’s school in 1608. He died 1635. Milton is said to have been one of his pupils. Dr. Gill had several fancies besides old pronunciations, thinking it best to speak “ut docti inter-
dum”—anglicè, pedantically—rather than like the “indoctus,” although if the latter followed his ears in phonetic spelling the doctor says: “susque deque habeo.”
Dr. Gill's alphabet of 40 letters will be rendered in order by the following palaeotypic symbols,—(a as ą, ą b, t, h, d, h, e, e, f, v, g, dzh m, kh, i, i, k, kw l, m, n, o, o o, p, r, s, sh, t, th, y, y, u, u, w, wh, ks, j, z).

Dr. Gill's book enters at great length on the subject of pronunciation, without, however sufficiently describing the sounds, and is peculiarly valuable in giving numerous passages from Spenser and the Psalms written phonetically. See below Chapter VIII, § 5.

1633, 9 Charles I. Butler, Charles.
The English Grammar, or the Institution of Letters Syllables, and Words in the English tongue. Whereunto is annexed an Index of Words Like and Unlike. Oxford. 4to.
Printed phonetically with new characters for (i, i, i, d, t, h, k, g, p, s, sh, wh) and a mark of prolongation. There is great difficulty in determining the value of his vowel system. He was of Magdalen, Oxford, an M. A. and a country clergyman. His pronunciation belongs to the end of the xvith century, as he clearly fights against many of the new pronunciations which were starting up, and the true xvith century pronunciation seems not to have developed itself till the civil war had fairly begun. Butler published a work on the management and habits of bees, The Feminae Monarchy or History of the Bees, Oxford, 1634, both in the ordinary and in his phonetic character. These are the first English books entirely printed phonetically, as only half of Hart's was so presented. But Meigret's works were long anterior in French. See below Chapter VIII, § 6.

§ 2. Seventeenth Century.

1640, 16 Charles I. Jonson, Ben.
The English Grammar. Made by Ben. Johnson. For the benefit of all Strangers, out of his observation of the English Language now spoken, and in use. Fo.
This was published two years after Jonson's death, and the text is known to have been altered from his MS. in some parts. Jonson's pronunciation ought to have belonged to the xvith century, as he was born 1574, only ten years after Shakspere, but he seems to have inclined towards the xvith century use.

1646, 22 Charles I. Gataker, Thomas.
De Diphthongis Bivocalibus, de quo Literarum quarundam sono germano, naturâ genuinâ figurâ novâ, idoneâ, scripturâ veteri verâque. London, 24mo.
This is useful for a few diphthongs, but is not of much value generally.
1651, 3 Commonwealth. Willis, Thomas, of Thistlewood, Middlesex.

Vestibulum Linguae Latinae. A Dictionarie for children consisting of two parts: 1. English words of one syllable alphabetically with the Latine Words annexed. 2. Words of more syllables derived from the Latine words adjoined.

This first part consists of a vocabulary of more than 4000 monosyllables, professedly arranged in order of rhyme, but with very few exceptions arranged only according to the spelling. In some of these exceptions we find real rhymes with differing spelling, but on the other hand we have words classed together which do not rhyme, so that there is by no means so much to be learned from it, as was to be hoped. The following are the only rhymes which are noticeable throughout the whole vocabulary. The initial syllable in italics as -aff is that under which these words and others having the same termination are arranged. It is to be understood that only such words in each list are given in this extract as were in some respect curious or irregular, and that all other monosyllables having the prefixed termination are to be supplied by the reader.

| aff | -aff, laugh, chafe, safe, Raphe |
| --- | --- | --- |
| e | -ate, treie, weigh, whay |
| er | -ere, reign |
| it | -ait, eight, height, sleight, straight |
| arre | -ar, far, tar, warre |
| arfe | -are, dwarfe, scarfe, wharfe |
| am | -arm, swarm, warm |
| ard | -arm, warn |
| arp | -arp, warp |
| art | -art, heart, thwart |
| ash | -ash, quash, wash |
| aste | -aste, the waste meditullium |
| asle | -asle, Wai, what |
| ach | -ach, watch |

draught, naught fault, vault
-est, keie, the, yea
-ead, bead, knead, lead plumeb
-em, dream, phlegm, realm
-ear, blear, pear
-eas, ceas, gress, less, peace
-sc, scrye, brief, chief, grief, theef
-seal, yeald, field, shield
-end, friend
-ere, here, there, where
-esc, dew, due, few, glue, Jow, lieu, rue, sew sure, sue, shew, shrew, view, yew
-i = -iei, -ie, eie, buy, by, high, my, nigh, vie, skie, why, wry
-ile, guile, style
-ilt, guilt
-imme = -im, hymne
-inne, clime
-inne, signe
-irre, fire, myrrhe, sir

-eir, gir, liv, seiv
-e = -oes = -oe, bowe, blowe, crowe, glowe, growe, knowe, lowe, moye, rowse, slowe, owne, towne, throwe
-oad, broad, goad, load
-oh, though, cough, dough, though, trough, rough, through
-sule = -sule = -sole, bowle owater, jowle, powle tendere, prowle, rowle rotila, sole, soul, scrowle schedule, toll, towle sons, trowle adovleere
-on = -ones, John
-one = -oen, bone, groan, Joan
-o, = -oe, to, toe, doe agere, woe pro-
care
-cum, loom, Rome, toomb
-oes, goose anser, loes, noes nodus
-oes, moo, move, prove, prove
-ord, cord, foord, hordes, sword
-oce, hors eqwus
-oce, prose, rose, those, whose
-oath, oath, both, frothe, growth, loath, mothe, slothe
-othe, bothe, cloathe
-ox, dox, gloy, lov, shov
-out, bough, bow, brow, cow, how, mow
-samly, mow strumre, now, plough, prow, sow, thou, tow, yow
-ous, a hous
-ouse, to house
-un = -umne, some, summe, thumb
-urs, burs emporium, curs, nels, pur, to purs reponere
-ure, burst, enrest, worst
-us, bruise.


Wallis was born at Ashford in Kent 1616, and died in 1703. In 1649 he was appointed Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford. During the civil war he made himself useful to the parliamentary party by deciphering letters in secret characters. His chief fame rests on his mathematical powers.

The introductory treatise on sound is of great importance, and establishes with much certainty the meaning of every symbol used. He did not attempt an alphabet, and consequently did not write out complete passages according to the pronunciation, which is greatly to be regretted. This work is the chief authority for the middle of the xviiith century.

1668, 9 Charles II. Wilkins, John.

An Essay towards a Real Character, And a Philosophical Language. Folio.

Wilkins was born in Northamptonshire 1614, and was therefore older than Wallis, although his work was not published till much later. His father was a goldsmith at Oxford. He graduated at Oxford 1631, and was made warden of Wadham College, Oxford, in 1648, just before Wallis came to Oxford. The two must have been well acquainted, and were among the original promoters of the Royal Society. In 1668 he was made Bishop of Ripon. He died 1672.

In this curious work, there is a very good English treatise on phonetics. He used a complete phonetic alphabet, and wrote the Lords prayer and Creed in his character, reproduced in palaeotype, below Chapter IX, § 1.

The alphabetical scheme on p. 358 of his work when translated into palaeotype will read thus—

(k, g, q, h, q, k, gh, n, e, t, d, nh, n, th, dh, l, rh, r, sh, zh, s, z, jh, i, e, a, s, p, b, m, m, f, v, wh, u, o, y)

The short sound of (o) is not recognized in English. Long vowels are imperfectly represented by accents. Confusing, as so many have done, (j, w) with (i, u) he writes (i, i, u, u, u, i) for (ji, ju, wu, wi).
1668, 9 Charles II. *Price*, Owen.
English Orthographie or The Art of right spelling, reading, pronouncing, and writing all sorts of English Words. Wherein such, as one can possibly mistake, are digested in an Alphabetical Order, under their several, short, yet plain Rules. Also some Rules for the points, and pronunciation, and the using of the great letters. Together with the difference between words of like sound. All which are so suited to every Capacitie, that he, who studies this Art, according to the Directions in the Epistle, may be speedily, and exactly grounded in the whole Language. Oxford 4to. The author’s name is given on the authority of the British Museum copy in which it is pencilled.

As interpreted by Wallis and Wilkins, this book is of great use in discriminating the exact sounds of the different vowel digraphs in the xvii th century, furnishing almost a pronouncing vocabulary of the period. The author was probably a Welshman.

1669, 10 Charles II. *Holder*, William, D.D., F.R.S.
Elements of Speech, an Essay of Inquiry into the natural production of Letters with an appendix concerning persons Deaf and Dumb. 8vo.

Reprinted by Isaac Pitman, 1865. Not a very important treatise for our purpose, but useful in helping to fix some of the vowel sounds.

1677, 18 Charles II. *Poole*, Josua.
The English Parnassus: Or a Help to English Poesie. Containing a Collection of all the Rhythming Mono-syllables, &c. 8vo.

Not much confidence can be placed on the classifications of words, though they are not so purely orthographical as Willi’s. Thus base, bays, blaze, case, are made to rhyme; calf, half, Ralph are entered both under afe and als; Alice, else, ais, bails, which certainly never rhymed, are placed together; similarly ant, aunt, pant, vaunt, want; words with ee and simple e are separated from words with ea, so that the different uses of ea are not shown; and so on. The list seems to be rather one of allowable, than perfect rhymes, and consequently is of little service.

1685, 1 James II. *Cooper*, C., A.M.

The first 94 pages, out of the 200 which this book contains, are devoted to a consideration of the sounds of speech, and peculiarities
of orthography and pronunciation, with long lists of words containing the several vowel sounds, which render it of great use for the determination of the pronunciation of the xviiith century. I am indebted to Mr. J. Payne, of the Philological Society, for my acquaintance with this valuable work.

1688, 3 James II. Miege, Guy, gent.
The Great French Dictionary. In Two parts. The first French and English; the second English and French; according to the Ancient and Modern Orthography. Fo. London.
There is much valuable information prefixed to each English letter and digraph, concerning the customary pronunciation, written in French.

1700, 12 William and Mary. Lane, A.
A Key to the Art of Letters; or, English a Learned Language, Full of Art, Elegancy and Variety. Being an Essay to enable both Foreiners, and the English Youth of either Sex, to speak and write the English Tongue well and learnedly, according to the exactest Rules of Grammar. . . . London, 24mo, pp. xxiv, 112.

A meagre treatise on Grammar by way of question and answer, in which 16 pages are devoted to spelling. The vowels are six, y being admitted and w excluded, although it is said that "we usually sound w like the vowel u, and for the most part we write it instead of u, in the middle and end of words, as in Vowel, Law, Bow, etc.," and "when y begins a syllable, we sound it as in the word you, and then it is a real Consonant; everywhere else it is a vowel, and is sounded like i; and is always written at the end of words instead of i, as in my, thy, &c." The liquids are three, w being excluded "because a Mute before it cannot, without force, be sounded with it in the same Syllable with the Vowel after it." This should imply that n can be so sounded, and hence that k, g were pronounced in knot, gnat. The change of ti- before a vowel into (sh) is not recognized; "we sound ti before a Vowel, like st, as in the word Relation." The following assertion and its justification are curious: "E Serve is of great use in the English Tongue; for by its help we can borrow the most significant and useful Words from other Languages, to enrich our own; and so far disguise and transform them into good English, that others cannot lay claim to them as theirs; as for Example, these Latin words, Candela, Venus, Linea, Brutum, Centrum, are made good English, by the help of e Serve, thus; a Candle, a Vine, a Line, a Brute, a Centre. Q. What need is there to disguise words borrowed from other Languages? A. It is necessary to disguise Words borrowed from other Languages, because no free People should have a Foreign Face on their current Words, more than on their current coin, both being Badges of Conquest or Slavery." The following is a curious
conceit: "E Subjunctive is written at the end of a word after a single Consonant, to make the single Vowel before it long. . . . E Subjunctive is really sounded with the single Vowel before the Consonant, and so makes the Subjunctive or latter Vowel of a Diphthong; otherwise it could not make the Syllable long, as in the words, Fire, more, pale, read, Fier, muer, past." This leads us to suppose that he said (foor, muer, peecel); the two former are common, the last is adduced by Cooper (p. 42).

This author is cited by the Expert Orthographer (p. 46). In the title he is called, "M.A. late Master of the Free-School of Leominster in Herefordshire, now Teacher of a private School at Mile-end-green near Stepney." There is a certificate at the back of the title from the Masters of Merchant-Tailors, Charterhouse, Christ's Hospital, and Westminster, in favour of the use of this book to "all who desire to learn, pronounce, and write the English Tongue exactly." It is, of course, dedicated to the young Duke of Gloucester, and is of extremely little use as regards pronunciation, but belongs, like the following, to the xviiith century, whereas the Expert Orthographer who cites it, belongs entirely to the xviiiith century.

1701, 13 William and Mary. Jones, John, M.D.
Practical Phonography: or, the New Art of Rightly Spelling (sic) and Writing Words by the Sound thereof. And of Rightly Sounding and Reading Words by the Sight thereof. Applied to The English Tongue. Design'd more especially for the Use and Ease of the Duke of Gloucester, (sic). But that we are lamentably disappointed in our Joy and Hopes in him. By J. Jones, M.D. You may read the Preface, where you have an account of what the Book performs; which ('tis hoped) will not only answer Men's Wishes, but exceed their Imaginations; that there could be such mighty Helps contrived for Reading, Spelling, and Writing English, rightly and neatly; with so much Ease. London. 4to.

The above title is transcribed from a copy I have in my possession. The Duke of "Glocester" referred to, died 29th July, 1700, aged 11. In the copy in the British Museum, dated 1704, of which the whole text is identical with mine, the title runs thus—

"The New Art of Spelling. Design'd chiefly for Persons of Maturity, teaching them how to spell and write Words by the sound thereof, & to sound & read words by the sight thereof, rightly neatly and fashionably. I. It will instruct any person that can read & write to spell & write most languages that he can speak & uses to read in a few hours by a general rule contained in two or three lines, & the use of a spelling alphabet, which may be written on the 12th part of a sheet of paper to carry about them. II. Short & easy directions whereby any
one may be taught to spell tolerably well in a few days, & in half a year's time may be perfected in the art of true spelling.

III. A child or any person who can read or write may by the help of this book learn to spell & write perfectly in a small time. IV. Rules for foreigners by which they may sweeten their language, & directions how to invent a universal one.

Applied to the English Tongue by J. Jones, M.D."

Notwithstanding the prolixity of the title it gives but a very inadequate conception of the book, which is a sort of pronouncing dictionary arranged under the simple sounds and their various representations, in the form of a dialogue. Thus he asks "when is the sound of a written aa, ah, ac, ad, ada, ac, ae, ag, agh, ah, aha, ai, aia, aie, aig, aigh, al, alf, ana, ao, ap, ath, au, ave, aw, ay, ayo, e, ea, ei, ena, exa, ey, ha, i, ia, ina, ioa, o, oa, ua, wa, wha?"

And to each of these questions he gives an answer, often containing a long list of words, from which may be inferred, not always the pronunciation generally received as best, but certainly the different pronunciations which were more or less prevalent. This is in fact the peculiar value of the book to those who seek to know how people actually pronounced at the time when Dryden died (1700) and Pope (b. 1688) was in his teens.

His single rule for spelling is as follows:—All Words which can be sounded several ways, must be written according to the hardest, harshest, longest, and most unusual Sound. And the Spelling Alphabet, spoken of on his second title, runs thus:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The easier and pleasanter Sounds spoken</th>
<th>The harder and harsher Sounds written</th>
<th>A Spelling ALPHABET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>e, o . . .</td>
<td>as in Clerk, Wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>p . . .</td>
<td>as in Cupid, Deputy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>i, th . .</td>
<td>as in Hatton, Murther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>s, i, o . .</td>
<td>as in Girle, Beged, injure . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>e, o . .</td>
<td>as in he, Sheire, Women . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>c, ch . .</td>
<td>as in Clyster, Norwiche . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>n . .</td>
<td>as in Banbury . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>m . .</td>
<td>as in Ink, sink . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>s, ë . .</td>
<td>as in to, Bull . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>ch, s . .</td>
<td>as in Bench, Isyu . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>th . .</td>
<td>as in Thomas . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>f, ph . .</td>
<td>as in Face, Nephew . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë</td>
<td>a, e, i, o . .</td>
<td>as in Evan, even, Sir, Son .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>s . .</td>
<td>as in Base, cause . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then upon the principle of the grammarian,

Visum est Grammaticae metrica ei colore laborum Praeceptis,

he proceeds "for Memory's sake" to reduce the above to verse. Afterwards come long explanations of the use of this alphabet in teaching spelling, the last of which is, as he says, "more a Shift than a Rule," and is simply this:

"When you are (notwithstanding all that is directed) in Doubt of spelling a Word rightly, the last Shift will be to change the
Word or Expression, so as to preserve the Sense or Meaning: as suppose that you cannot, or are in Doubt of spelling the Word Affection, write Kindness, Love, Favour, &c. instead thereof... This was the "shift" employed in speaking by the deafmute Dr. Kitto, when he wished to use words that he knew well by sight but had never heard during his youth before the accident which made him stone deaf.—See Kitto's Lost Sense.

This book closes the xvii th century and trenches on the xviii th, because the Author was compelled by his plan to introduce all the most altered forms of speech as well as the least unaltered.

§ 3. Eighteenth Century.

1704, 3 Anne. Anonymous.
The Expert Orthographer: Teaching To Write True English Exactly, By Rule, and not by Rote. According to the Doctrine of Sounds. And By such Plain Orthographical Tables, As Condescend to the Meanest Capacity. The Like not Extant before. For the Use of such Writing and Charity Schools which have not the Benefit of the Latin Tongue. By a Schoolmaster, of above Thirty Years Standing, in London. Persons of Quality may be attended at their Habitations; Boarding Schools may be taught at convenient times. London: Printed for, and Sold by the Author, at his House at the Blue-Spikes in Spread-Eagle-Court in Grays-Inn-Lane. Where it is also Carefully Taught.

This little book, 8vo, 112 pages, for a knowledge of which I have been indebted to Mr. Payne of the Philological Society, is full of tables, but does not enter with sufficient minuteness into the "Doctrine of Sounds" (which is paradis in capital letters in the title page) to render delicate points at all appreciable. The great peculiarity of the work is, that though it bears date 1704 the same year as that on Jones's second title page, it belongs exclusively to the xviii th century, and differs as much from Jones, as Hart from Smith in the xvi th century. Thus Jones only allows eighteen words containing ea to be pronounced with (ii), this author (whom I shall call the Orthographer) gives a list of 255 such words, and allows only four words in ea, to have the sound of (ee), viz. bear s. and v., swear, tear v., wear. Again, Jones distinctly asserts that ei is "never" pronounced (ii), the Orthographer gives ten words in which ei is so spoken. These shew totally different systems of pronunciation. Dr. Jones was a physician, and hence we may better trust his pronunciation than that of a visiting schoolmaster living in a court turning out of Grays-Inn-Lane, who, attending "persons of quality" would naturally adopt the thinnest pronunciation for fear of being thought vulgar. The curious thing, however, is, that though Dr. Jones endeavoured to collect, and did actually collect
a great variety of even ridiculous pronunciations, for the purpose of assisting pronouncers of all kinds to spell, he seems to be entirely unconscious of these sweeping innovations, which are valuable as the foreshadows of coming events.

1710, 9 Anne. Anonymous.

A little tract in which the pronunciation of several words is approximately given in German letters. The Upper Palatinate was wasted by Louvois, general of Louis XIV. in 1688, and 5000 of the distressed people for whom this tract was intended emigrated to England in 1709.

1710, 9 Anne. Dyche, Thomas.

The pronunciation of nearly 200 words is imperfectly indicated by re-spelling them. E. Coote's English Schoolmaster 1673, which is bound up in the same volume in the British Museum, and is often referred to, contains no information on pronunciation. The fourteenth edition of Dyche's Guide, 1729, also in the British Museum, contains a few alterations, and has been chiefly followed.

1713, 12 Anne. Anonymous.

There is no date throughout the book, but as it is dedicated to the Queen, and as the example given for finding "the Moon's Age at any time," refers to 1 Jan. 1713, it was probably published about that time. The first part, consisting of 52 pages is devoted to Spelling and Pronunciation. The latter agrees almost exactly with that of the Expert Orthographtist (1704), but in the notes and especially from p. 43 to 52, there is a translation of many of Wallis's observations on phonetics and on English pronunciation, generally without acknowledgement, and evidently in happy ignorance of the fact that they belonged to a different stage of pronouncing English, and in several cases directly contradicted the rules which the author himself had previously given. It is a mere compilation, but corroborates other accounts of the xviii th century pronunciation.

1766, 7 George III. Buchanan, James.
Essay towards establishing a standard for an elegant and uniform pronunciation of the English Language, throughout the British Dominions, A Work entirely new; and whereby every one can be his own private
teacher. Designed for the Use of Schools, and of
Foreigners as well as Natives, especially such whose
Professions engage them to speak in Public. Extera
quid querat sua qui Vernacula nescit? As practised
by the Most Learned & Polite Speakers. London, 8vo.

This almost amounts to a pronouncing dictionary, and like it,
aspires rather to lead than follow general usage. The pronunciation
it exhibits does not materially differ from that now heard, except
in admitting many usages as "learned and polite," which would
probably be considered much the contrary by modern Orthoeptists.
The xviii th century pronunciation is fully established in this work.
But allowances must be made for certain Scotcicisms, which will be
more particularly pointed out in Chapter X, § 3.

1768, 9 George III. Franklin, Benjamin.
A Scheme for a New Alphabet & reformed mode of
Spelling, with Remarks & Examples concerning the
same, and an Enquiry into its Uses, in a correspondence
between Miss Stephenson & Dr. Franklin written in the
Characters of the Alphabet.

From the Complete Works in Philosophy, Politics, & Morals of
the late Benjamin Franklin; now first collected and arranged, with
memoirs of his early life, written by himself, 3 vols, London 8vo.

The preceding works from the time of Wilkins, exactly 100 years
previously, have furnished us with no connected specimen of English
speech. They have generally contented themselves with giving
lists of words illustrating particular usages. By this means the
whole pronunciation of a word had to be collected from different
lists, and some parts of it remained doubtful. This is not the case
in Buchanan's book, because he gives the pronunciation of every
part of the word. But even then the isolated words do not seem to
convey the same idea as connected sentences. The paper of Dr.
Franklin therefore, is very acceptable, and will be printed at length
in Chapter X, § 2. Being the pronunciation of a man of 62, who
had passed his life among colonial English, it has necessarily rather
an old appearance, and, notwithstanding the actual date, must be
considered as belonging to the earlier part of the xviii th century.

1780, 21 George III. Sheridan, Thomas.
A General Dictionary of the English Language, One
main Object of which, is, to establish a plain and per-
manent Standard of Pronunciation. To which is pre-
fixed a Rhetorical Grammar. London, 4to.

This is the first of the modern army of pronouncing dictionaries,
and indicates a pronunciation which only differs in isolated instances
from that now in use. It is therefore unnecessary to pursue the
list further.
CHAPTER III.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF ENGLISH IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, AND ITS GRADUAL CHANGE DURING THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES.

§ 1. Introduction.

The authorities enumerated in the preceding chapter, enable us to form a tolerably correct conception of the pronunciation of English during the xvi th century, and to note the principal changes which it underwent in the xvii th and xviii th centuries. It is the object of this chapter to shew as precisely as possible—although of course far from as precisely as desirable—what the pronunciation indicated for each period really was. The results which have been given by anticipation at the end of Chapter I, are arranged alphabetically. But it will be far more convenient to adopt a different order in the present chapter, and revert to the alphabetical in a subsequent recapitulation. See Chapter VI.

The principal authorities described in the last chapter will be better appreciated by arranging them chronologically in connection with the names of the contemporary sovereigns and the chief contemporary writers. Any statement can thus be immediately referred to its proper political and literary epoch.

It must be remembered that the authorities for a period are necessarily somewhat more recent in date than the period itself, for the account which an elderly man gives of pronunciation refers in general to that which he acquired as a youth. It is in most instances safe to assume that a man's system of pronunciation is fixed at twenty to twenty-five years of age. The first ten years of his life are spent in acquiring sounds from his nurse, his mother, and his family. In the next ten, he is jostled with his schoolmates or workmates, and he will probably adapt his mode of speech to his environment. After the mental faculties have matured, the acquired habits have become settled, and the environment fixed at twenty to twenty-five, little change may be expected, except under rare and peculiar circumstances. It is probable, therefore, that each of the authorities on the next page, refers to a pronunciation prevalent twenty or thirty years before the actual date.
## CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Work</th>
<th>Authority.</th>
<th>Writers.</th>
<th>Sovereigns.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the XVIth Century.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Palsgrave, London</td>
<td>LordSurrey, 1516–46</td>
<td>1509 Hen. VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tyndale’s Bible, 1535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Meigret, Lyons</td>
<td>Sydney 1544–86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Salesbury, Wales</td>
<td>Spenser 1553–98</td>
<td>1547 Edw. VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Meigret, Lyons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Cheke, Cambridge</td>
<td>Shakspere 1564–1616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Salesbury, Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>Smith, Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Levins</td>
<td>BenJonson 1574–1638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Bubber</td>
<td>Massinger 1584–1640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>Authorized Version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Florio, Italy</td>
<td>[1611] Milton 1608–1674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Gill, Lincolnshire</td>
<td>Butler 1612–80</td>
<td>1625 Charles I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the XVIIth Century.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Jonson, Westminster</td>
<td>Dryden 1631–1700</td>
<td>1649 Common-wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Gataker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Willis, Middlesex</td>
<td></td>
<td>1660 Charles II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Wallis, Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Wilkins, Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Miegel, France</td>
<td>Pope 1688–1744</td>
<td>1688 Wm. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Jones, Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td>1702 Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the XVIIIth Century.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Expert Orthographist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Dyche</td>
<td>S. Johnson 1709–84</td>
<td>1714 George I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Buchanan, Scotland</td>
<td>Goldsmith 1728–74</td>
<td>1727 George II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Franklin, U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1760 George III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Sheridan, Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 2. Combined Speech Sounds.

It is a favourite, and occasionally convenient theory, to suppose that there are three principal vowels (a, i, u), as that there are three principal colours, or rather pigments, blue, red, and yellow, whence the rest are formed by mixture. Neither theory must be taken literally, or be supposed to represent a fact in nature. Both partake of the same degree of partial truth and complete error, as the still older theory of the four elements. But as earth, water, air, fire, still represent solids, liquids, gases and chemical action, so the (a, i, u) represent the most open position of the mouth with respect both to tongue and lips, and the two most closed positions with respect to tongue and lips respectively through which a vowel sound can be produced. A vowel sound is properly a musical tone with a definite quality or timbre,¹ and, to be distinctly heard and recognized, the position of the vocal organs must be kept fixed for an appreciable duration of time, the longest time being really a small fraction of a second.² But vocal sounds may be also heard through changing positions. These are the “glides,”³ which are naturally generated in passing from any position of the organs of speech to any other, while the vocal ligaments of the glottis continue to act. The best mechanical illustration of this effect is obtained by sliding the finger down a violin string, while the bow is kept in action. This glide is the essence of all combination of vocal elements; the cement, as it were, which binds them into masses. In diphthongs, as (ai, au), the action is most clear, and Mr. Melville Bell has introduced a series of glide signs for exclusive use in diphthongs. But the same action is audible in (pa, ka), the glide commencing with the loosening of the contact, and continuing until the full sound of (a) is produced. It is this glide which alone gives sound and meaning to the (p, k). In palaeotype the isolated letters all mark fixed positions, whether initial or final, and their combination indicates the glide occurring between them, in addition to their own value, unless a comma (,) be interposed, which cuts out the glide, and thus distinguishes the dissyllable (u,i) French oui, from the monosyllable (ui) French oui, which again must be dis-

¹ This is Sir Charles Wheatstone’s theory, subsequently verified by Prof. H. Helmholtz, Die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen, 2nd ed. 1865, p. 163.
² The word set, although containing a long vowel, can be pronounced deliberately three times, and rapidly, four times in a second.
³ This phonetic term was introduced and explained by myself, Universal Writing and Printing, 1856, p. 6, col. 2, and English Phonetics, 1854, p. 8, § 61.
tinguished carefully from the monosyllable (wii), English *we*, where the first element is a buzz and not a vowel. This convention in notation will be strictly carried out and should be carefully observed by the reader. As a necessary consequence (aa, nn, ss) represent *prolonged* (a, n, s), but (a, a, n, n, s, s) *repeated* (a, n, s). The prolongation of consonantal sounds may appear strange, but if *unknown* is compared with *unowned* it will be readily perceived that the (n, s) in the second of each pair is really prolonged, thus (*en,oomd· ennoon*, mis·ril *missent*'), and that the orthography (*en,noon*, mis, sent') would not quite meet the latter case, as there is no cessation of sounds, no ending of the one (n, s) and beginning of the following. Again, in comparing *open opening*; *stable stabbling*; *schism schismatic* (*oop·nn oop·niq*; *steerb·l steerb·liq, siz·mm sizmeet·vl*), the greater length of sound of (n,l,m) in the first three words over that which it has in the second three, will be apparent. Generally, however, it is sufficient to mark (*oop·n, steerb·l, siz·m*), because the effort to pronounce (n, l, m) independently of any following vowel will necessarily lengthen the sound. But that some attention to this difference is occasionally necessary, is shown by such French words as *stable, schisme*, which French orthoepists also mark (stabl, shizm), although their sound is not at all (stabll, shizmm), but either (stabl', shizm') with the faintest vowel murmur following, thus making (l, m) initial and consequently shortening the sound, or (stabllh, shizmnh) with an entire remission of the vocal murmur. In palaeoty the distinction will often be made thus: English (steerb'l, siz'm), French (stabl', shizm'), so that ('l, 'm, 'n) = (ll, mm, nn).

The glide which connects two vocal elements has a tendency to draw those elements into nearer relation than they would have had if pronounced apart; that is, as in the course of speech it is necessary to pass rapidly from one position of the vocal organs to the other without intermitting the voice, the two positions naturally draw nearer to each other. It has long been observed that certain vowels affect certain consonants. Thus, in Polish, it is laid down as a rule in language, that "hard consonants when brought by inflection or derivation before high vowels are changed into softer or weak consonants."¹

The other Slavonic languages have similar rules. In the Gaelic language there is also a division of vowels into *broad* a, o, u, and *small* e, i—"leathan agus caol"—with the celebrated rule which so singularly influences their orthography, "broad

¹ *J. Biernacki*. Theoretisch-praktische Grammatik der polnischen Sprache,
to broad and small to small,—leathan ri leathan, an ’us caol ri caol.”1 Of course, this rule only indicates a change of the intermediate consonant in actual speech. In German we find ach, loch with one sound of ch (kh), ich, ächt, euch, löcher, tücher with another (kh), and auch, tuch with a third (kxh), thus (akh, lokh; i̯kh, ekht, oíkh, loék’ér, tyıy’ér; aukxk, tuukxk); so that the Germans find a natural character in this change. But no such change occurs in Dutch, or in Swiss patois, which do not possess (kh). Again, a modern Greek informs me that (kh) is always replaced by (kh) in his language, whatever be the adjacent vowel. This seems also to have been the case in old Sanscrit, where (kh) has given way to (sh), just as most Englishmen hear a Saxon say (i̯r’ish-mishnhaht) for (ir i̯kh mi̯ch ni̯kh) (i̯rr’ ich mi̯ch nicht), (dush) for (durkh). The old Germans had also a feeling of attraction in the vowel sounds in succeeding syllables, as zahn zähne, fuss füsse, bock böcke, mann männer, (tsaan īsk’ne, fuss fyu’se, bok bo’c’e, man men’er) which the moderns have lost, and which is simply unintelligible in the modern English tooth teeth, foot feet, man men, (tuuθ tiθ, fu’t fiθ, maν men). The initial consonant is in European languages mostly altered to suit the following vowel. We are familiar with the change of sound of c in the first and second syllable of cancel = (kæns’el), and are accustomed to regard it as a mechanical rule of pronunciation, whereas it is the modern product of an action of a vowel on the preceding consonant. Sometimes the action takes place by an apparent desire to avoid this attraction. Most persons are familiar with (kæd, gaæd) for card, guard, but few are aware that it was through a precisely similar change that Latin cantus, campus fell through (kænt, kæmp) into French chant, champ, both being now (ʃæʃ). In Arabic, however, the vowel yields to the consonant, and it is chiefly by the “widening” of the following vowel, properly due to extending the pharynx for the

1837, p. 8. The division of vowels and consonants referred to is, in palaeotype deep vowels (a, a:, e, o, uh, y, u)
high vowels (e, e:, e, e, i, ...)
soft consonants (b, d, g, x, kh, k, l, m, n, p, r, s, t, bh, z)
softer (ts, dz, dz, zh, sh, th, th, rz, sh, ts, zh)
weak (t’j, dz, zh, sj, sj, t’h, l, mj, nj, pj, sj, t’h, bjh, z’j)

Such a combination as (z’h) is impossible to a Pole, who is compelled to say either (ty) or (lį).

1 This is thus explained in J. Forres’s Double Grammar of English and Gaelic, 1843, p. 28: “’In words of more than one syllable, the last vowel of each preceding syllable, and the first of each succeeding one must be of the same class, i.e. both broad or both small; as caislag, a girl, seorag, a squirrel. It would be false orthography to write words thus: caislag, seor-eag, cui-lag, lir-eag, cir-adh, barreadh.’
pronunciation of the consonant, that an Englishman distinguishes Arabic ﺔ, whatever sounds Arabic scholars may finally agree that the latter symbols represent, from (t d s z). The rounding of the lips has often a similar effect in English, as in war, wan, what, wash, squall, = (waa1, wan, what, wash, wash, skwaal).

A final consonant may yield to the vowel, or force the vowel to consort with it. Both cases are common, the French fait as derived from Latin factum shows both effects. In English, and also in French, (l, r, r, s) have had very disturbing effects on the preceding vowel. But the greatest changes ensue when two vowels come together, first as pure diphthongs, and afterwards degenerating into a single derived vowel sound. It is precisely because (l, r) are so vowel-like in sound that they react so strongly on the preceding vowel.

Glides and mutual actions do not occur only between two vowels or vowel and consonant, but are also frequent between two consonants, and are especially marked where one is a mute (p t k), or sonant (b d g), and the other continuous. In German the sound (ts) initial is a true diphthong, like (tsh) initial in English. Many writers have considered (tsh, dzh) initial to be simple sounds in English, while (tsh, dzh) final as in watch, grudge, are generally recognized to be compounds. This is explained by a consideration of the nature of a syllable.

When a number of pure vowels come together with glides between them, it may so happen that there is a gradual change from a close to an open, an open to a close, or a close to an open and thence to another close position, as in (ia, ai, iai), or (ua, au, uau), or (iau, uai), etc. In all these cases the ear recognizes one undivided group (auλaβη) or syllable. But if the transition be from open to close and thence to open, as (uau, aia), the ear immediately recognizes two groups or syllables, and the division between them is felt to be the moment of the smallest opening of the vocal organs, thus in (aua) the syllable does not divide before or after (u), but during the pronunciation of the pure (u) as held fixed without any precedent or subsequent glide from or to the (a). There is in this case a decided interval between the two glides. In attempting to make the separation of the groups more evident, a speaker would either simply prolong (u), thus (auua), or prolong it with a cessation of force in

---

1 See (t th d th s z) in the palaeotype alphabet.
2 Omitting the last syllable, the forms seem to have been (fait, faut, faikt, fait, feet). The form (fait) probably originated the old spelling fait.
the middle, which might be expressed by (au-ua), or would absolutely pause and thus repeat the (u), as au,ua). In this way orthographers, by separating the glides, arrive at the conception of doubling the letter which indicates the smallest opening. This, however, becomes more strongly marked when the division of the two glides is a mere buzz, as (ava), or sonant as (aba), or mute as (apa), for in these cases prolongation being either difficult or impossible, the orthographer, trying to ascertain the letters, says (avya, ab,ba, ap,pa), and by thus separating the glides, actually alters the whole character of the word. In the English and other Teutonic languages real cases of prolonged medial consonants, or really separated glides, are rare, not occurring except in compound words or connected words, compare soappot, bootree, bookcase, penknife, till late, till eight, Miss Smith, yes sir, etc.\(^1\) Hence these nations readily adopted a system of doubled consonants for those cases where the first glide was unmistakeable; that is, where the first vowel being short and accented, it was difficult to leave out the glide and pronounce it independently of the vowel; for example (a,ba) is more difficult than (ab,a).\(^2\) The doubling of consonants came finally to be considered the mark of a short accented vowel, and is so consistently applied by Rapp,\(^3\) who, adopting the usual German grammatical term, calls this effect a “sharpening” (schärfung) of the vowel. But Orrin had used the same means of indicating short vowels even in unaccented syllables, in the first attempt at a regular English orthography, and lays the greatest stress upon this mode of marking short vowels.\(^4\)

To continue the theory of the syllable. The separation can be made, as we have seen, by a buzz, whisper, sonant, or mute, as well as by a vowel, and several of these being interposed, the syllable divides on the least vocal or narrowest aperture. Thus in watching (wathin), the syllable divides

---

\(^1\) Many speakers say (pen’fi) for (pen’naf), waiters are apt to fall into (jere) for (jere), and few care to distinguish Miss Smith from Miss Myth (mis’mith, mis’mith). In such a common name no mistake is likely, but would Miss Sterry be distinguished from Miss Terry, or Miss Stent from Miss Test, real names from the London Directory?

\(^2\) Mr. Melville Bell finds the division (a,ba) quite as easy as (ab,a), and hence always considers so much of the consonantal group which precedes any vowel as could be used at the beginning of a word—except in the case of manifest compounds—to belong to the syllable containing that vowel, thus discipline hoping, he would divide dis’ai,- pl’n b’e,g’n). Such divisions are mere matters of practice, and are beside the scientific investigation of the natural division of words into groups of sounds.

\(^3\) M. Rapp. Versuch einer Physiologie der Sprache, 1836-1841.

\(^4\) See the passage from the Orrumium quoted in Chapter V, § 2.
between the glide from (a) to (t), and the glide, in this case non-vocal, from (t) to (sh). The orthographer dividing the syllables then says (wat, tahiq), and hears first a (t) and then his presumed simple sound (tah); whence the orthography *tch*, which never occurs initially. Between *ch* in *chin*, and *tch* in *watching*, there is this difference, that in (tahin) there is only the glide from (t) to (sh), but in (watshiq) there is also the glide from (a) to (t). The palaeotypic orthography (watshiq) implies all this, for to remove the last named glide in the last word we must write (wat, tahiq).

In (watsh) we have the same effect of the (t) with its double glide, but as the second glide is entirely unvocal, the ear does not recognize a distinct group, and hence receives (watsh) as a single group or monosyllable. Indeed so little is a final whisper accounted, that it is generally introduced in English after final mutes, to give them the double glide and make them more audible; thus *Wat!* would be uttered (*Wat'!*) not (*Wat!*) as we should be almost forced to write if we wished to imply the absence of the ('). In the word *act* (ekt') we have first a mute (k) with only a precedent glide, so that the (t) would be inaudible without the ('). But to say (ekt') would be unpleasant and affectedly pedantic. This mode of overcoming a difficulty, which is so common and natural in Teutonic nations, is unknown in the Romanic or Semitic. The French say (akt'), or in poetry (akte), and are inclined even to (akt'). The Italians assimilate the (k) to the (t), and dividing the glides say (at, to). The consequence is that consonants have more weight in Romanic than in Teutonic tongues, and not only cannot so many be pronounced in succession, but when two consonants that cannot be pronounced as an initial combination follow a vowel, they necessarily lengthen the syllable—not the vowel, as grammarians erroneously assert.

The hisses are never felt to produce new groups, and hence are added on with the greatest liberality before as well as after close positions. Thus wrists, scrips, (rista, skripa), and in Polish *saczka* (shtshkatsj), to hiccough, in which we have a frequent combination (shtsh) containing one stop (t), preceding the stop (k) with the same ease to a Pole, as the simple (sh) before (t) and (p) in *stehn, sprechen, (shtee, en, shprekh'en)* presents to a German or Englishman, who are unaware of the difficulties which such combinations offer to Frenchmen and Italians, and to Arabs, whose easy sounds are in turn a very shibboleth to Europeans.

The division of syllables to the eye is therefore a great
difficulty, unless some mark be placed over or under the letter of division, or unless this mark, placed for convenience of printing before or after the letter of division, is to be understood as merely pointing that letter out. Thus writing the hyphen as usual for this purpose, (wa-tšiŋ) or (wa-tšiŋ) might be used, but the latter is objectionable as it divides a very close glide. In palaeotype it is not necessary to divide syllables, and when they are divided in speech, the consonants are really doubled, as already mentioned, thus (wat-tšiŋ). When the accent mark is written in palaeotype it is generally placed where it is convenient to the printer or writer, but as it forms a break to the eye it should not be interposed between close glides, so that either (wa-tšiŋ) or (wats̪h-rectangle) is preferable to (wat-tšiŋ).

Unaccented short vowels do not generally glide on to the following consonant; but this follows them legato (smoothly) and not staccato (abruptly), to use musical terms. Thus in event, society, (i,ventİ̆, só,seťı̆, etc) we have in English no glides —although it is seldom necessary to indicate their absence as above. On the other hand, the absence of marked accent in French makes the glide distinct, as in événement, société (even’ma, sos, etc). Grammarians, as usual, do not recognize these distinctions.

A short accented vowel is in English always followed by a consonant on to which it glides, almost before it begins to be heard; whereas a long accented vowel can be distinctly heard before the glide to the consonant. Consequently the glide with us affects the short more than the long vowel. One result of this is that English long and short accented vowels do not form precise pairs. Thus peat pit, gate get, father gather, sought sot, pool pull = (piit, geet, faad, geedd, saat, puul pull). The distinction is here made clear to the eye. The vowel (oo) does not occur as a short vowel in closed syllables in recognised English, but hole whole are not unfrequently distinguished as (hol, hol). The long vowels (ee, oo) are also very frequently pronounced (ee, ouu) or (eej, oo’w) with a faintly indicated (i, u), following them with the utmost rapidity just as the sound is expiring. It is only before the letter r (r) that this effect is generally avoided, and then the vowel sounds are changed, thus more, Mary, door, glory are properly (meer, Meer’ri, door, gloor’ri), although (moo’r, Meer’ri, door’r, gloor’ri) and even (Meer’ri, gloor’ri) are sometimes heard. This diversity of long and short vowels, similar to that which probably prevailed in Greece when the distinctions γ, ο, ω were introduced, while no written
difference was made between \( a \) and \( u \) long and short, serves to mark the difference between syllables with long and short vowels very clearly. If a foreigner neglects the distinction we, in the ignorance of our ears, often accuse him of lengthening the vowel, thus we write his *pity* (pit\(\text{i} \)) as *peetee*, confounding it with (pi\(\text{i}\)\(\text{tii} \)), and we make a Scotchman speak of his *meens-terr* and his *bůok* (mi\(\text{n} \text{es}t\text{e}r, \text{bu}k) when he only says (mi\(\text{n} \text{'i} \text{st}\text{e} \text{r, bu}k) in place of our (mi\(\text{n} \text{'i} \text{st}, \text{buk)*. Most of the old English writers thought that the vowel sounds in *bite bit* formed a pair, and we shall find Sir T. Smith completely puzzled with the English *ee* (ii) of which he knew no short sound. In languages like the Italian, where the short and long vowels exist in perfect pairs (ii i, ee e, ee e, aa a, oo o, unh uh, uu u) the distinction of long and short vowel is not much perceived, except before separated glides or doubled consonants, as they are termed, and consequently no necessity for indicating them orthographically has been felt. In Italian also, final short accented vowels occur unprotected by a following consonant, as *città amò ciò* (tshit,ta‘ amo‘ tsho‘) which however take a doubled consonant when followed by an enclitic syllable as *amovvi* (amov‘,vi).

These different usages are important to be allowed for, when we derive the pronunciation of any language through the observations of one who is not a native. He necessarily hears the sounds incorrectly and imitates them at first, if not always, with more or less reference to those with which he is familiar. Those Englishmen who hear a Scot or German say (man, man), hear the words as either (men) or (mon), sounds which being unfamiliar to the Scot and German are liable to sound in their ears as (men, mon).\(^1\) It is this difficulty in appreciating foreign sounds which renders the use of any universal system of writing so difficult. Yet indistinct and imperfect as a foreigner’s accounts must necessarily be, it is almost entirely by their means that we are able to arrive at a conception of the old sounds of our language. It

\(^1\) An amusing instance of the difficulty of hearing foreign sounds is quoted in Max Müller’s Lectures on the Science of Language, 2nd series, 1864, p. 169, from Marsh’s Lectures, and taken by him from “Constantinople and its Environs, by an American long resident,” New York, 1835, ii. 151. The writer is certain that he spells at least one word correctly, for it had been so impressed on his mind; this word is *bacitshoash* / letters which ought to mean (bektsteash), but were intended to mean (bakhshish), itself an error for (bakhshish‘). This letter (krh) is almost invariably confounded with (k) by Englishmen. Similarly, if an Englishman asks a Saxon to repeat after him *I had a hat on my head, instead of (ai nes a hat on mi hed) he will probably obtain (ai i Nes a hat on mi Hed), where the three English unusual sounds (nes a hat nes) are reduced to the one common German (nes) = hätt‘.
is the foreigner who generally wants to have the sounds explained, and we find the writers of pronouncing dictionaries of English to be mainly Welsh, Scotch, Irish, American, French, and German. Those early English writers who gave an account of our pronunciation had not studied the nature of spoken sounds sufficiently to refer them to any fixed positional scale, such as we now possess in Visible Speech. Hence they illustrated them as they best could by reference to other tongues; frequently indeed by Latin and Hebrew, which being very differently pronounced in different countries gave but an indifferent clue. It is only by making allowances for old habits, that we can hope to arrive at an approximate conception of the sounds they had in their mind. It is not therefore to be expected that we can assign the older pronunciation of our language with anything like the minute accuracy with which the modern pronunciation of English can be indicated by means of Palaeotype and Visible Speech. We can, however, approximate to the sounds so nearly that one who thus pronounced them would appear to utter familiar words in perhaps rather a singular manner, but not so strangely by far as a foreigner’s attempts at modern English, or as the modern English would have sounded in the ears of our ancestors.

§ 3. The Vowels.

A — xvith Century.

1530. PALGRAVE says: “The soundyng of a, which is most generally useid through out the frenche tonge, is suche as we use with vs, where the best englyshe is spoken, which is lyke as the Italians sounde a, or they with vs, that pronounce the latine tonge arght.”

The Italians at present always say (a), and never (a). The French at present generally say (a) but sometimes (a). The reference to Latin, as pronounced “aryght” ought to imply the existence of another English pronunciation in common use, which was not (a). This wrong pronunciation we have no means of eliciting. Then again the English pronunciation referred to is a theoretical standard, “where the best

1 The key-words in Visible Speech, p. 94, are pronounced differently by Mr. Melville Bell and myself, (p. 26, n. 1.)

2 While writing this I saw the words “One touch of nature,” placarded on the streets of London, as the name of a drama. Most of those who saw them would have read (wan tɔtəh ov neərɛtʃ), sounds which would have probably been unintelligible to their author (Shakespeare, T. & C. iii, 3, 175), who would have certainly understood (oon tɔtəh ov næstɪə), strange as this may now seem to our ears.
englysshe is spoken," implying that there was another pronunciation which Palsgrave did not approve of. The only clear result we obtain is negative,—the long sound was certainly not that now in use in England, "where the best englysshe is spoken," that is not (ee, ee, eei). But could we trust Palsgrave to have heard the difference between (a, a, a), or if he had heard it, to have thought it worth noting? In the next century at least Wallis heard the French a as (a), and we know that even at the beginning of the present century the French émigrés heard the English a in all as their a, and gave that as the French sound in their Grammars. Walker gives (iiklaːˈ) as the pronunciation of éclat, though Smart writes (eeklaːˈ), the Frenchmen Féline¹ and Tarver giving (ekla).

The sound (a) is more marked and was probably more ancient than the finer sound (a), for which the tongue has to be raised from a "low back" to a "mid back" position.¹ It is very possible that the French may have used (a) and have subsequently refined it into (a). It is very probable that the Anglo-Saxons used (a), as the present Germanic nations, and the Scotch, have still a great tendency so to do. Perhaps one of the sounds (a, ah, ə) was the faulty pronunciation of the Latin a, to which Palsgrave objected. Either (a) or (A) is still used in Scotch Latin. It is not likely that at so early a period the very thin (e),—a sound which Englishmen from historical tradition connect with (a), but which foreigners consulting their ears, refer to (e, ɛ)—was recognized as the use of those who spoke English best. It seems safest to conclude that Palsgrave, living in the latter part of the xvth and early part of the xviith century, recognized (aa) long and (a) short as the best pronunciation of English a, and that he would at any rate have accepted that pronunciation. This view is confirmed by Gilles du Guez's account of French pronunciation, probably printed in 1532, and reprinted at the end of the French reprint of Palsgrave. He says: "Ye

¹ Walker's Pronouncing Dictionary, and Smart's Walker Remodelled, are well known. Adrien Féline, Dictionnaire de la prononciation de la langue Française, indiqué au moyen de caractères phonétiques précédé d'un mémoire sur la réforme de l'alphabet. Paris, 1851. This and Tardy's Explanatory pronouncing dictionary of the French language in French and English, wherein the exact sound and articulation of every syllable are distinctly marked, according to the principles of the French pronunciation, developed in a short treatise by J. C. Tarver, French Master, Eton, London, (Longman) 1847, C. G. Joubert's Colloquial French, London, (Whittaker) 1854, and Thériat's Le Phonographe ou la Prononciation Française rendue facile à tous les étrangers, Paris, (chez les auteurs, rue de l'Ouest, 11,) 1857, are the best guides to modern French pronunciation that I have seen.

² These technical terms are explained in the introduction p. 13.
shal pronounce your a as wyde open mouthed as ye can," which ought to make French a = (a) ; "your e, as ye do in latyn, almost as brode as ye pronounce your a in englysh." This makes French e = (ε), and proves that English a was not (ε), because Gilles du Guez, as a Frenchman, would not have distinguished (ε, a). Neither du Guez nor Palsgrave separate the close from the open French e (ε, ε) which Meigret has found necessary to distinguish by two signs. Gilles du Guez was French master to Henry VIII. and his daughter, afterwards Mary I.

1567. Salesbury says of the Welsh sound of a that "it hath the true pronunciation of a in Latin," meaning of course his pronunciation of that letter, and that it is never sounded "so fully in the mouth as the Germaynes sound it in this word waggon." He also distinguishes it clearly from (a) with a following (u) or (i). This distinction, hereafter considered, leads me to suppose that his Welsh a was neither (a) nor (ε), and consequently that it was then true (a). The conclusion is not very safe, because certainly, in the next century, Wallis makes the Welsh a very "thin," that is closer than (a), and probably (ε), a sound said to be often heard in Wales to this day. 1

1547. Salesbury heard no difference between the English and Welsh a, whether long or short. He says:

"A in English is of the same sound as a in Welsh, as is evident in these words of English ale, aal, cervisia, pale, paal, sale, sal."

It is not usual in Welsh orthography to distinguish the long and short vowels, although Grammarians say that the former have an acute accent mark. In his account of English pronunciation, Salesbury does not always discriminate the long vowel, though, as here, he occasionally doubles the vowel sign to represent length, and doubles the consonant sign to imply the brevity of the preceding vowel. We must not suppose, however, that where he has neglected to double either, the sound was necessarily either long or short. No doubt sale was (saal), if ale, pale were (saal, paal). Again he writes narrow and spare for narrowe, sparrowe, although no doubt the consonant was not

---

1 During a short residence in Anglesa about ten years ago, I did not recognize (ε) as in general use in Welsh, although I was familiar with the sound, both long and short, from having resided two years in Bath, where (εε) is the regular sound of a long, as (Beesth, kæød). I have since been informed that it is commonly heard in Monmouthshire, just bordering on those Western English counties where (ε) prevails. A gentleman from Cardigan when asked to name the first letter in the Welsh alphabet, naturally called it (εε), though three other Welsh gentlemen present at the same time said (aa).
really doubled in either and the vowel was short in both. Numerous examples of such carelessness occur in the short list of words with which Salesbury has favoured us.\(^1\)

**SALESURY’S EXAMPLES OF A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Spelling</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Welsh Letters</th>
<th>Palaeotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ale</td>
<td>cervisia</td>
<td>sall</td>
<td>sall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pale</td>
<td>paal</td>
<td>paal</td>
<td>paal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sale</td>
<td>sal</td>
<td>saal</td>
<td>saal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babe</td>
<td>infans</td>
<td>baab</td>
<td>baab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face</td>
<td>facies</td>
<td>ffas</td>
<td>ffas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gracypouse</td>
<td>comis</td>
<td>grasiws</td>
<td>graa-si-us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able</td>
<td>abl</td>
<td>aab-b‘l</td>
<td>aab-b‘l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sable</td>
<td>sabl</td>
<td>saa-b‘l</td>
<td>saa-b‘l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bake</td>
<td>coquere panem</td>
<td>baak</td>
<td>baak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galaunt</td>
<td>galawnt</td>
<td>gal-'aunt</td>
<td>gal-'aunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plage</td>
<td>pestis</td>
<td>plaag</td>
<td>plaag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>accipere</td>
<td>haf</td>
<td>haaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady</td>
<td>domina</td>
<td>laa-'di</td>
<td>laa-'di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papyr</td>
<td>papyr</td>
<td>paa-'pir</td>
<td>paa-'pir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mase</td>
<td>maas</td>
<td>maaz</td>
<td>maaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shappe</td>
<td>forma</td>
<td>ssiapp</td>
<td>shaap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ape</td>
<td>simia</td>
<td>aap</td>
<td>aap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrowwe</td>
<td>angustus</td>
<td>narw</td>
<td>nar-'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sparrowwe</td>
<td>passer</td>
<td>sparw</td>
<td>spar-'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laddre</td>
<td>scala</td>
<td>lad-'dr</td>
<td>lad-'er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bladd'</td>
<td>vesica</td>
<td>blad-'der</td>
<td>blad-'er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naggo</td>
<td>mannus</td>
<td>nag</td>
<td>nag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pappe</td>
<td>mamma vel infantium cibus</td>
<td>papp</td>
<td>pap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarter</td>
<td>quarta pars</td>
<td>kwarter</td>
<td>kwarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>una manus</td>
<td>hande</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handes</td>
<td>duae v.plures manus</td>
<td>hands</td>
<td>hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>tomas</td>
<td>to-'mas</td>
<td>to-'mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flaxe</td>
<td>linum</td>
<td>flacs</td>
<td>flaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axe</td>
<td>securis</td>
<td>ags</td>
<td>aks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>ddat</td>
<td>dhat</td>
<td>dhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kappe</td>
<td>pila</td>
<td>cap</td>
<td>kap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus</td>
<td>angnus</td>
<td>aq-'nus</td>
<td>aq-'nus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) A complete alphabetical list of all these words will be found in Chapter VIII, § 2, at the close of the translation of his tract.
The preceding are all Salesbury's words containing a, in his English spelling, Welsh transcription, and my palaeotyptic translation of the last. The meaning is given in Latin where he has given it in Welsh, but not otherwise. The long a, so far as I can conjecture from other sources, is placed first. Words with the combinations al, an, ash, etc., which will be considered hereafter, are omitted. This long list of words in which the long and the short sound of a is represented by the same letter, occasionally doubled for the long sound, is conclusive in shewing that long a and short a were to Salesbury's ears, sounds differing only in duration. And as there could be no reasonable doubt that short a was then, as it still is generally in the provinces, and is admitted to be by some of our orthoepists in a great number of words, the true Italian (a), so we are led to conclude that the long a was also the true Italian (aa), to Salesbury.

1568. Sir T. Smith says: "A igitur Latinum Angli habent tam breue quam longum," and after giving some examples, adds: "et alia sexcenta, ubi nullius literarum sonus auditur in lingua nostrati nisi a vocalis Romane longae breuisque."

This ought to be decisive, but unfortunately we shall find that Smith considered the Latin i long to be the English i long, that is (ei) according to Salesbury, and hence he might have considered the Latin a long to be (ee) as in England to this day. Hence it is only by comparison with Salesbury and others that we can interpret his examples thus:

"A breuis (man) homo, (far) longe, (hat) petas aut galerus, (mar) corrupere, (pas) superare, (bar) vectis, (bak) dorsum.

"A longa (maan) juba equi, (faarwel) vale bene, (naat) odisse, (maar) equa, (paas) passus, (baar) nudus, (baak) inurn coquere."

The words (man, baak) being given in Salesbury interpret all the rest. Smith does not give the ordinary spelling, but always adds the Latin signification.

1569. Hart, in describing the "due and auncient soundes" of the five vowels, says of A, "the first, with wyde opening the mouth, as when a man yawneth," and he identifies it with the German, Italian, French, Spanish, and Welsh a.

This identification has the misfortune of being too wide and again leaving us in doubt as to (a, a, e). But (aa, a) seems the most probable. Still Gill's censure of Hart, which we shall find justified for ai, would make us doubtful of a, were not Hart confirmed by Palgrave and Salesbury.

1 Those of which staff, bath, baak, demand, are types. Other orthoepists, however, prefer (ah) in these words.
1580. Bullokar says, "that there be eight vowels of differing sounds in English speech: may appear by these words following, wherein are eight notes in voice differing one from another as divers notes in musicke."

The words are given in his phonetic orthography and are arranged in this order, "to lack, to leak, a leek, to lick, a lock, to look, luck, Luke," which, for reasons which will appear hereafter, I believe are meant for (tu lak, tu leek, a liik, tu lik, a lok, tu luuk, luu, Lyyk). The long a, the short e, and the long i, all of which Bullokar uses, are not noted in this list. Bullokar's sign for (ii) is a modification of (e), and hence there is no security that he should have considered (aa) to be the long of (a), although he so notes it. Perhaps his observation that a b d f k are the only "perfectly perfect" letters, that is, used according to their alphabetic names on all occasions, is meant to imply that long a is the sound of short a produced.

1621. Gill says, "In e et o, duplicatis, sonus à proprio aliquantulum distat; vt in grin lauenus, et greene viridis, sonus vnus est, sed in voco priori corrupus, in altera longus. Sic in bucke hic dama, et booke liber: neque in his soni differentia est, preter illam quae in quantitate percipitur."

As then he has a proper feeling for vowel pairs, we may feel sure that, when he says—

"A, est tenuis, aut lata: tenuis, aut brevis est vt in (taloou) TALLOWE sebum, aut deducta, ut in (taal) TALE fabula aut computus: lata, vt in (taal) TALLE procerus—"

the two first sounds really only differ in length, but the last differs in quality. We cannot, however, feel sure that the two first sounds were (a, aa) as written above. In fact, the sounds (ee, ææ) must have begun to be prevalent at the time Gill wrote, and it is only because he decidedly opposed innovations that I consider he really pronounced (a, aa) as was probably customary in the days of his youth.²

1633. Butler (translating his phonetic spelling) says: "A is in English, as in all other languages, the first vowel, and the first letter of the Alphabet; the which, like i and u, hath two sounds, one when it is short, an other when long, as in man and mane, hat and hate."

¹ In Levins,1670, we have "Grinne, pedice," on which Mr. Wheatley cites Cotgrave, "Lags. a snare, gunn or grin."
² Shakspere's rhyme at the close of Taming the Shrew, according to the folio 1623,—
I cannot find any confirmation of this even in later writers, until the time of Cooper, 1685, who admits a double use of a long, pairing can cast, ken cane, as will be presently considered. What Butler's pair was, whether (ææ, a) or (aa, æ) I cannot guess. But as his book was published about the time when a began to change from (a) to (æ), he probably did not adopt either of the true pairs (aa, a) or (ææ, æ).

The effect of the L, N, Nge, Sh upon a preceding A, changing it to (au, ai) or (AA, ee) will be most conveniently considered under Au, Ai and the above consonants. Omitting these from consideration, the best conclusion I have been able to draw from a consideration of the preceding authorities after repeated examination of all their passages bearing even remotely on the subject, is that—

A long and A short during the xvi th century had in general the sounds of (aa, a); but (aa, a) may have been frequent at the beginning and (aah, ah) towards the close of that period.

A — xvi th Century.

1640. Ben Jonson says: "A, with us, in most words is pronounced lesse, then the French â, as in, art. act. apple. ancient. But, when it comes before l. in the end of a syllable, it obtaineth the full French sound, and is utter'd with the mouth, and throat wide open'd, the tongue bent backe from the teeth, as in al. smal. gal. fal. tal. cal."

The description of French â would answer for either (a) or (æ). Although the sound had perhaps not broadened more than to (a) during Jonson's lifetime, it would not be safe to assume any other sound than (æ) for Ben Jonson's conception of the French sound, which must have been opener than the English. The precise value of the latter, however, is not fixed; but as Jonson was born in 1574, his pronunciation was probably that of the close of the xvi th century, and he therefore perhaps retained (aa, a).

1653-1699. Wallis is the great authority for the fully developed pronunciation of the xvi th century. He recognizes nine vowels, being, according to my interpretation, three guttural (α, ε, ο), three palatal (ε, η, ι), and three labial (ο, u, y), so that the sounds of (a, a) are both lost. The sound (æ) occurs only in the combinations at, au, av, under which it will be considered. Of the palatal vowels he says:

"Vocales Palatinae in Palato formantur, ære sollicit inter palati et linguæ medium moderate compresso: Dum nemo concavum
palati, elevato linguæ medio, minus redditur, quàm in gutturalibus proferendis. Suntque in triplici gradu, prout concavum magis minusve contrahitur. Quæ quidem diversitatis duobus modis fieri potest; vel fauces contrafendo, manente lingua in eodem situ; vel faucibus in eodem situ manentibus, linguæ medium altius et ad interiores palati partes elevando: utrovis enim modo fiat, vel etiam si utroque, perinde est.

"Majori apertura formatur Anglorum a, hoc est d ælxe. Quale auditur in vocibus, bat, vespertilio; bate, discordia; pal, palla Episcopalis; pale, pallidus; Sam (Samuelis contractio); same, idem; lamb, agnus; lame, claudus; dam, mater (brutorum); dame, domina; bar, vectis; bare, nudus; ban, exsecor; bane, pernicies; etc. Differt hic sonus a Germanorum d pingui seu aperto; eo quod Angli linguæ medium eleveunt, adeoque 1 aereum in Palato comprimant; Germani vero linguæ medium deprimant, adeoque aereum comprimant in guttura. Galli fere sonum illum proferunt ubi e praecedit literam m vel n, in eadem syllaba ut entendem, etc. Cambro-Britanni, hoc sono solent suum a pronunciare." Here the paragraph ends in the editions of 1653, 1664, 1674, which are all I have been able to find that were published during Wallis's life time; but the Oxford reprint of 1765 adds the words: "Italique suum." Again he says in another place "A plerumque pronunciatur sonus magis exili quam apud alias plerisque gentes: eodem fere modo quo Gallorum e sequente n in voce entendem, sed paulo acutius et clarius; seu ut Æ Italorum. Non autem ut Germanorum d pingue; quem sonum nos plerumque exprimere solemus per au vel an, si producatur; aut per d breve si corripiatur."

Now if we omit the reference to the Italian, and confine ourselves to the description, it certainly ought to give (æ) rather than (a). The tongue is, of course, more raised for (a) than for (æ) or (æ). The two latter are low vowels, the former is a mid vowel, but all are back vowels, that is, the nearest approach of the tongue and palato is made with the back not the middle of the tongue, as Wallis strictly points out. The three vowels made with the middle of the tongue, disregarding the effect of widening, are (é, e, i), or, taking the widening into effect, the three normal (e, e, i) and the three wide (é, e, i). Of these (æ) has the greater opening, "majori apertura formatur." With this view agrees the pairs of words he gives, which must have been either (aa, a) or (ææ, æ). That a change was taking place we have seen by the citation from Butler, (p. 64) and it will appear by Miegge, (p. 71) that the sounds (ææ, æ) were fully established in 1688, before the death of Wallis, and this view agrees with all the following accounts. At the present day the sounds (a, aa) are almost unknown in the pronunciation of many per-

1 The Oxford reprint erroneously inserts œ.
sons,\textsuperscript{1} and except in a few classes of words they are unknown among those who pride themselves on exact speaking. Hence we need not feel surprised that the fashion of (a, aa) had entirely gone out in Wallis’s time, and had been supplanted by (æ, ææ.) Nor is there any other period to which the change, which certainly occurred, can be distinctly traced.

It is a remarkable fact that in Somersetshire where the sound of (ææ) is very common, replacing all sounds of (aa) in use in the east of England, as (béeth, béesket, èeèk, kéèd, mëèd) = Bath, basket, ask, card, hard, the sound of (AA) or (ōa) degenerates into (aa) or (aat), as (lás, dree, kàaèd) = law, draw, cord.\textsuperscript{2} But in Wallis’s time the true sound of (AA) and not (aa) is guaranteed by his vowel pairs, “fall folly, call collar, cause cost, aw’d odd, saw’d sod.”

The reference to the French entendement is of very little assistance. We know how the present English stumble over the French nasals. We may hear now (ontondmon, øtøqdmøq, øqtøqdmøq), and it is very difficult to determine what is the oral basis of the orinasal vowel, so strangely is it modified by the nasal vibration. Most French writers refer the sound to (a), thus (AA), but English people refer it to (ο), thus (οa), very few keeping it distinct from on (οa, οa ?). As frequent allusions will be made to the four French nasals in vin, an, on, un, which are palaeotypically represented by (ea, əa, oα, əa), it may here be stated that Dr. Rapp writes (eΛ, əa, oα, əa əa), M. Félíne seems to mean (eΛ, əa, oα, əa), Mr. Melville Bell uses (ea, əΛ, oΛ, əa). M. Favarger, a Swiss gentleman, who has carefully studied the relation of French and English sounds, gives as the normal sounds (eΛ, əa, oα, əΛ). The differences are here more apparent than real, and probably all sets may be heard coexisting in France at the present day.

The reference to Welsh indicates certainly a very thin palatal (a) which must have closely approached to the (ο), if not exactly reached it, (p. 61 n.). The final reference to the Italian may have arisen from Wallis’s mispronouncing the Italian long a, making it as thin as the English long a.

\textsuperscript{1} Walker, 1732-1807, says that “the second sound of a ... answers nearly to the Italian a in Toscano, Romana &c., or to the final a in the naturalized Greek words papa and mamma; and in bas; the word adopted in almost all languages to express the cry of sheep. We seldom find the long sound of this letter in our language, except in mono-syllables ending with r, as far, far, man, &c., and in the word father.”—Principles, 77.

\textsuperscript{2} The fact was first forced on my attention by being asked in Bath for a piece of cord as I imagined, when a piece of cord was really wanted. Other old pronunciations in use at Bath, are (fair) fair, (keek) keys, (boek-n) beacon, but (boek-n) beam; while (AA) almost reappears in (noon) know.
In Ireland, where we shall see that the English pronunciation consorts in many other respects also with that of the xviiith century, the name sound of the first letter of the alphabet is (ææ), as was spontaneously pointed out to me by an Irish clergyman, the five vowels a e i o u being called (ææ, ee, æi, oo, juu), instead of (ee, ii, ai, oo, juu). A Danish lady informed me that the sound of (ææ) in lieu of (aa) was fashionable in Copenhagen. That the transition is easy and is not much perceived by the generality of speakers is evident from the present scarcely noticed co-existence of both sounds. But the transition from the xvith century (aa) to the xviii th and xix th century (ee, ee) is scarcely intelligible without the intermediate (ææ).

1668. Wilkins, after describing the vowel (aa) as formed with the tongue in "a more concave posture and removed further from the palate," says that "the Vowel a is framed by an emission of the Breath, betwixt the tongue and the concave of the palate; the upper superificies of the tongue being rendered less concave, and at a less distance from the palate," and he does not allow of any convexity of the tongue till he reaches (ee).

Now it is only for some very unusual mixed vowels that there is any approach to a concavity of the tongue, with respect to the palate, so this may be regarded as a theoretical error. His description must be considered to leave the question of (aa, a) in doubt. Although it will be seen that Wilkins and Wallis occasionally disagree, I am inclined to interpret Wilkins in this case by Wallis, and to consider that Wilkins's examples batt bate, val ley vale, fatt fate, mat mate, pal pale, Rad nor T rade, implied the pairs (bæt bææt, væl i, væsæl, fæt fææt, mat mææt, pel pææl, Ræd nor rææd).

1669. Holder writing at the same time says "We may imagine the vowel a to be made by the freest and openest passage of the throat through the mouth and so to have a kind of natural articulation without art, only by opening the mouth; a to be a little straitened by the boss of the tongue near the throat, and therefore if you try to pass from a to a you will find you thrust the end of your tongue something forward to raise the boss of the tongue towards the palate to straiten the passage." "In the mouth is more open, in a e i. the straitenings of the concavity of the mouth between the tongue and palate are gradual, both forward & nearer the roof."

By actual trial, I find that this would serve just as well to distinguish (α, æ), (AA, aa), or (AA, ææ). It is therefore not decisive. The illustrative words for a are full folly, for a are fate fat.

---

1 The words class, staff, demand, are even (ah, oh) are in occasional use by pronounced with (aa, a, ah, sah, æ, ææ), by different careful speakers, and others.
1685. Cooper seems to mark the beginning of a change which was not complete till the next century, and does not appear to be noticed by Mieg or even Jones, for he gives two sounds to a long, generally (ææ) as I conjecture, and occasionally (ee). In this respect Cooper bears a resemblance to Hart, who anticipated the general pronunciation of ai as (ee) by a century. Cooper says:

"A formatur à medio linguae ad concavum palatulum elevato. In his can possum, pass by praetero, a corruptur; in cast jaceo, past pro passed praeteritis, producitur. Frequentissimus audirit hic sonus apud Anglos, qui semper hoc modo pronsciant a latinum; ut in amabam. Sic etiam apud Cambrobritannos; quandoque apud Gallos; ut in animal, demande, rarè autem aut nunquam apud Germanos. Hunc sonum correpit & productum semper scribimus per a; at huic characteri praeterea adhibentur sonus unus & alter: prior, qui pro vocali ejus longâ habetur ut in cane, definitur sect. sequentì; posterior ut in was sect. septimâ sub o gutturalèm."

He here implies that cane although considered the long of can is not so. He also for the first time makes was = (waz), whereas Wilkins wrote waz = (wez) meaning (waż). These are both anticipations. He implies that though short (æ) was common, long (ææ) was uncommon, and identifies the sound with that of the Welsh a, which he must have taken as (ææ). He allows that it "sometimes" is in use in French, in which language it is to be supposed he called a generally (AA). The two examples animal, demande are insufficient to give assistance. He says that it never occurs among the Germans. The present German sound in great part of Germany is (ææ, a), and in Austria it becomes (aah, a) or perhaps (AA, A). But throughout North Germany the sounds (aa, a) are constantly heard from the more educated and refined speakers, and though Schmeller distinguishes the Italian from the common German a, neither Rapp nor Lepsius notice the difference. Yet in the xviiith century the general impression seems to have been that the French and Germans said (AA). Was this really the case? I think not. I would rather trace

1 Misprint for jacio?
2 Schmeller, Die Mundarten Bayerns, München 1821, Nos. 62. 66. Rapp, Physiologie der Sprache, passim. Lepsius, Standard Alphabet, London and Berlin, 1863, especially p. 56, where the English sounds are taken into consideration.
3 Mr. Blackie, the Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, when lecturing on the pronunciation of Greek before the Royal Institution, 3rd May, 1867, said that it had been established by the researches of Seyffarth, Liscov, etc., that long a in Greek had the sound of Italian a in amare, that is, (aa). And then he immediately said, "the long a should always be pronounced like the English aw or au, as in cow, maul, etc.,' that is, (AA). (Proceedings of the Royal Institution, vol. v. p. 149.) Here then we have a recent example of a lecturer upon pronunciation, confusing the two sounds (aa, AA). We must not expect our ancestors to have been much more particular.
it to the loss of the pure (aa, a) in refined English, and its separation into (AA) on the one hand, and (ee, e) on the other. To those accustomed to say (ee, AA) the intermediates (as, aa) would both be referred to (AA) rather than (ee).

The opinion that a long had become (ee) seems to derive additional force from the fact, first mentioned by Cooper, that a long had in many words become (ee). He says—

"E formatur à linguâ magis elevâtâ et expensâ quàm in a propriūs ad extremitatem, unde concavum palati minus redditur & sonus magis acutus; ut in ken video. Sic apud Germanos menschen homines. Apud Gallos rarâ at in excès, proteste, session, & Benjamin obsoleto. Hunc sonum correctum Angli semper exprimunt per e brevem; & e brevem nunquam aliter pronuntiacis nisi ante r, ubi propter tremulum ipsius motionem, & vocalis subtilitatem subitâ correctione comitatem, vix aliter efferit potest quam ur; ideo per in pertinæ persino, & pur in purpose propositum ejusdem sunt valoris. Vera hujusce soni productio scribitur per a, atque a longum falso denominatur; ut in cane cannæ, wane deflecto; & ante ge ut age etas; in cæteris autem vocabulis, (ni fallor) omnibus ubi e quiescens ad finem syllæbus post a, adjicitur; u gutturalis ... inseritur post a; ut in name nomen, quasi scriberetur na-um dissyllabum." He proceeds to say that this sound is usually written ai or ay, sometimes ey and rarely ea.

Here we have two curious facts, first the clear recognition of an (ee) sound of long a, and secondly the insertion of (e) after (ee) in all but a certain class of words. Thus cane, name = (kæn, neem). The peculiarity here is, that so far from inserting (e) in modern times, the tendency is to palatalize the sound still more by inserting (i) thus (neem). Cooper returns to this point again, saying—

"Post a in omnibus, nisi in cane cannæ, wane deflecto, stranger advenæ, strange alienæ, manger prescope, many scabiosus, & ante ge; ut age etas; inscribatur u gutturalis, quæ nihil aliud est quàm continuatio nudi murmuris postquæ a formatur, nam propter exiliatem, ni accuratius attenditur; ad proximam consonantem, sine interveniente u non-facilè transibit lingua. Differentia auribus, quæ sonos distinguere possunt, manifestè apparebit in exemplis sequenti ordine dispositis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a brevis</th>
<th>a longa</th>
<th>a exilis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bar vectis</td>
<td>Burge navicula</td>
<td>Bare nudus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blas effutio</td>
<td>blast flatus</td>
<td>blaston divulgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cap pileum</td>
<td>carking anxietas</td>
<td>cape capa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear carrus</td>
<td>carp carpo</td>
<td>care cura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat catus</td>
<td>cast jactus</td>
<td>case theca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dash allido</td>
<td>dart jaculum</td>
<td>date dactylus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flash fulguro</td>
<td>flasket corbis genus</td>
<td>flake flocculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gash cæsura</td>
<td>gase oscito</td>
<td>gate janua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a brevis  a longa  a exilis

grand  grandis  grant  concedo  grange  villa
land  terra  lanch  solvo  lane  viculus
masch  farrago  mask  larva  mason  lapidarius
put  aptus  path  semita  pate  caput
tar  pix  fluida  tart  scribilia  tares  lolia

Si quid amplius ad hanc veritatem confermandam velles, accipe exempla sequentia; in quibus ar leniter pronunciata sonum habet a pura; ut in cane, a verò post se admittit u gutturalem ut,

Bain balneum  Hail  grando  Maid  virgo
bano  venenum  hale  traho  made  factus
main  magnus  lay'n  jacui  pain  dolor
mane  juba  lane  viculus  pane  quadra
plain  manifestus  sa'ad  castratus  tail  cauda
plane  levigo  spade  ligo  tale  fabula.

Here I interpret a brevis = (æ), a longa = (ææ), a exilis = (æe), thus (beer, baserdzeh, beer), and in the last list I read (beer bee, meen meen, pleen pleen) or (beer bee'n), etc.

1688. Miège says: Dans la langue Anglaise cette voyelle A s'appelle et se prononce ai. Lors qu'elle est jointe avec d'autres Lettres, elle retient ce même Son dans la plupart des Mots; mais il se prononce tantôt long, tantôt bref. L'a se prononce en ai long généralement lorsqu'il est suivi immédiatement d'une consonne, et d'une e final. Exemple fare, tare, care, grace, fable, qui se prononcent ainsi, suire, taire, oire, graice, faible ....... D'ailleurs, a se prononce en ai bref ou en e ouvert, lorsqu'il se trouve entre deux Consonnes, au milieu des Monosyllabes; comme hat, cap, mad. Mais il approche du Son de notre a, à la fin des Noms en ai, ar, & ard qui ont plus d'une syllabe. Exemple general, special, animal, Grammar, altar, singular, particular; mustard, custard, bastard, visard, & autres semblables. Excepté regard, qui se prononce re-gaird; award & reward où il sonne comme en Français ...... Dans le mot de Jane l'a se prononce on e masculin, Dgène."

To understand this we must remember that English hat, cap, mad were never, and are not now, called (hot, kep, mæd) but that Frenchmen, and even Germans, do not distinguish them from these sounds. Indeed the true sounds (hæt, kæp, mæd) only differ from the former by the widening of the pharyngeal aperture. My own pronunciation of (æ) has been constantly misunderstood, and considered as (e) or (æ). As to the long sound (ææ) it is now so little known in the East of England and on the continent, that it would be invariably taken for (æe) or (æe). When then Miège distinguishes Jane = Dgène (Dzhee) from grace = graice (grees, grees), we may feel pretty sure that, since in modern English (grees) is as difficult to English organs as (græes) would be to
French organs, the words containing a to which he assigns ai long and short, were really pronounced with (ææ, æ).

As to those words in which he considered the a to be pronounced as in French, we know they had the sound (AA) and not (aa) and we also know that at present most Frenchmen pronounce our (AA) as (aa) or (aa), neglecting the labial effect. The exception regard, was probably (regæar'd), with the palatal (g) which is still so prevalent in this word, and which may have caused the pure sound of (ææ) to be preserved. Whether the sound of (aa) occurred in mustard, custard, etc., we cannot tell. At any rate, this notice is not sufficient to establish the fact.

1701. Jones's book is so curiously arranged that it is difficult to determine the sound of a long from it except by inference. It is certain that at this time ai was sounded (ee) or (ee), probably the former. When Jones therefore gives a list of words in which ai has the sound of a, but may be sounded as ai, he certainly distinguishes the two sounds. That is although in some words ai was by some people sounded as a, this was not universal or considered best, even in those words. They are Abigail, aid, bargain, captain, certain, chair, complaisant, fair, glair, hair, laid, maid, pain, pair, plaister, stairs, etc., (32 examples are given) of which plaister is now generally pronounced (plaas'ter). Then he adds this note:

"The capacity of being sounded ai distinguishes them from such as are written with an a; because these cannot be sounded ai, as are, chare, fare, glare, hare, lade, made, pane, pare, stares, etc."

Again, the question, "when is the sound of ai written a?" is not asked, and the answer to the question, "when is the sound of e written a?" is only answered by the cases of unaccented -ar as altar, beggar, emissary, bastard, etc. As then Jones could not have said (ee) or (aa), I conclude that he said (ææ), and this agrees with the fact that Jones only recognizes two sounds of a as in an, as, at, and as in all, ball, so that his sound of a long, when evidently not (AA), should be the long sound of his a in at which was certainly (a).

From all these considerations I conclude that a short was (æ) very early in the xvii th century, and that it has retained that sound to this day, except in the provinces, and also that a long was generally (ææ) from at least the middle of the xvii th century to its close, although about the close it began to degenerate into (ee) in many words. It is possible, however, that the sound of (aa) may have remained unrecognized before r when
not followed by a vowel, and even in several of those words, as bath, ask, grant, etc., because it may still be so heard in the xixth century.

Rhymes at the latter end of the xviith and during the xviiith centuries are not of much use in determining sound, unless they are frequent usual normal rhymes. Thus from Shakspeare's rhymes in—

_Venus and Adonis_ v. 47, broken open, 134 voice juice, 419 young strong, 592 neck back, 773 nurse worse; and in _Luceo_ v. 13 beauties duties, 62 fight white, 72 field killed, 78 tongue wrong, 113 bitter weather, 303 ward regard heard, 408 blue knew, 554 dally folly, _Sonnet 20_ created defeated; _Lover's Complaint_ 302 matter water; _Passionate Pilgrim_ 308 talk halt.

nothing could be inferred. But when on looking through the whole of his poems (exclusive of his plays) I find only the following examples of long a rhyming to ai, _Venus_ v. 271 mane again, 529 gait late, _Luceo_ v. 6, waist chaste, _Sonnet 128_ state gait, of which gait and waist are only modern forms for _gate waste_,1 so that there is only one real example left (mane again), we may safely conclude that Shakspeare pronounced the sounds differently, that is, as I believe (na, ai).

When in the xviiith century, _a long_ and _ai_ altered, as I think, to (ee, ei) and in the latter part of the century _ai_ became (eel) or (ee), we may well expect to find these rhymes more abundant. In Milton's rhymed poems I find only—

_Lycidas_ care hair, raise blaze praise, _L'Allegro_ maid shade, fail ale, cares airs, _Il Penseroso_ cares airs, state gait, fail pale, _Arcades_ blaze, praise, _Sonnets_ 8 spare air bare, 15 praise amaze raise displays, 19 state wait, 20 air space, _Nativity_, near the end, pale jail, _Fair Infant_ air care, _Solemn Music_ made sway'd, _Anna Salis_ xix (1627) aid made, _Psalm_ 2 made sway'd, 4 spare prayer, 80 declare prayer, made made, 83 said invade, strays blaze, 88 prayer are.

These cannot be considered numerous in such a large collection of verses. But Milton's contemporary Waller has, in some 130 pages of his works which I have examined, 21

---

1 In _Merry Wives_, act i., sc. 3, l. 41 (Globe edn.) according to the old quarto of 1619, supposed to be the first sketch, we have the following orthography of _water_ : "_Wat_. Well my honest lads, Ile tell you what I am about. _Paw_. Two yards and more. _Pau_. No gibes now _Pistoll_; indeed I am two yards in the _waste_, but now I am about no _waste_: briefly, I am about thrift you rogue you." In the quarto of 1630 the two words are _wast, waste_. The Promptorium has _"waste of a manny's myd-dyl," and Palgrave _"west a mydiddle;"_ the word is not in Levis in this sense. In the same 4to. of 1630, act 1, sc. 4, l. 31 (Globe edn.) and act 3, sc. 3, l. 68, we have first _"I should remember him, do's hee not hold vp his head (as it were?)" and strut in _his gate?"_ and secondly _"the firme fixture of thy foote, would give an excellent motion to thy gate in a semicircled farthingale." I do not find the word in this sense in Promptorium, Palegrave, or Levins.
cases of a similar kind. Dryden has 27 instances in his Fable of Palamon and Arcite alone, which belonged to the close of the xvii th century.

Now (ææ) and (œœ) are not very unlike, and before (x) it is difficult to distinguish them, as care, air (kær, eər), especially if the (œœ) be deepened into (œœ) as is sometimes done. Hence we must not be surprised that poets to whom, as Byron confesses

"sometimes
Monarchs are less imperious than rhymers,"

should take the liberty of considering these sounds as identical. If they had been (ææ, æœ) they would have passed for rhymes, just as few of those who now insert an (i) after (œœ) as in (weæt, streæt) wait, straight, are even aware of the fact, much less would feel that the rhyme were injured, if others said (œœt, greæt) or even (œœt, greæt) for state, great. The German habit of rhyming (œœ, e) and (y, i) although justified by the pronunciation of the unlettered, is yet admitted by the best poets. In this case the vowels differ by the important distinction of labialisation, whereas (œœ, æœ) as they may have been sounded, differ only by the effect of widening, which is constantly disregarded.

A — xviii th Century.

1704. The Expert Orthographist talks of the "short and long sound common to all the vowels in rat & rate." This ought to mean that these words were (ræt, ræt), but with a person so destitute of real phonetic feeling, (ræt, ræt) might have been thought to have a "common sound." His expression also might not have meant that the long sound and the short sound were the same. The following passage is noteworthy.

"Take special notice that the Diphthong æœ and the Vowel æ are very apt to be mistaken," i.e., confused one for the other, "the Londoners, affecting (as they think) a finer pronunciation, would quite lose the sound of the proper diphthong æœ, as too broad and clownish for their fine smooth Tongues; but the honest Countryman, not to say our Universities will (by no means) part with authentick Custom, time out of mind, according to its natural sound; however, to reconcile this difference, you must be sure to keep close to the

1 The story that King James I, wishing to bestow the bishopric of either Bath or Wells on a west country divine, asked him which he would have, and on being told Bath (Bæseth), replied "Bæth (beeth) say ye, then bæth ye sal hae," and united the bishoprics, although it labours under the historical difficulty of uniting the æœ 500 years after their union, serves to show the near coincidence of the sounds.
orthography, which that you may the better do; always remember
that the single a must end no English word; but if they will speak
fine, yet be sure that you write true, by adding y, not da but day.
Observe that tho' many times this Diphthong ao is parted in proper
names, as Ja-ir, La-ish, Sephara-im &c. yet i is usually swallowed
up, in the sound of the forgoing a, especially when the word ends
in ah as Benai-ah, Serai-ah &c. the i is not sounded."

This feeble attempt to keep long a and ai apart seems to
be dictated by theoretical grounds. He had previously said
there were 15 sounds: "five short and five long sounds be-
longing to the vowels, besides five such proper diphthongs as
make five other distinct sounds, differing from the foregoing
ten sounds." And he assigns as his first reason for admitting
none other but ai, au, oi, oo, and ou to be proper diphthongs,
that "none but these five have such a plain distinct sound,
different from the five vowels." Hence it was important
for him to distinguish long a and ai, though in pronunciation,
the utmost difference which I can suppose him, with his
palatal tendencies, to have made, is to have called long a (ee)
and ai (eii). The first conclusion is strengthened by his
identifying his long a with the vowel in there, were, where,
which was certainly (ee).

1710. Dyché distinctly says ai, ay = a in care, and as
Cooper in 1885 had given the pairs sell sail, sent saint, tell
tail, tent taint, there ought to be no doubt that at this time
the change of the sound of long a from (as) to (ee) was fully
established, notwithstanding that Jones only nine years be-
fore would not allow that long a was pronounced as ai. At
the same date as Dyché, the anonymous instructor of the
Palatines writes the words I make, I have, care in German
letters ei mähk, ei hühf, kähr which should mean (ei meek,
ei heef, keer), but would have been written even if the real
sound had been (es). Here have is made to have long a,
as it used to have; it is now (heev) and the pronunciation,
(heev), indicated by the German letters is very doubtful.

1766. BuchanAn always uses ai to represent the long
sound of a.

1768. Franklin simply gives men, lend, name, lane as
examples of the same sound, and this is nearly the modern
practise.

This change of (a) into (e) has also occurred in French.
Chevallet\(^1\) says: "Le changement de a en e est fréquent dans
le langage du peuple de Paris: . . . dès le commencement

du xvié siècle Geoffroi Tory observe chez les dames de Paris la tendance que je viens de signaler. . . . ‘Les dames de Paris au lieu de a prononcent è bien souvent, quant elles disent: ‘Mon mery est a la porte de Peris où il se faict peier’ . . . telle maniere de parler vient d’accoustement de jeunesse;’ Geoffroi Tory, Champfleury, fo. xxxiii, V.’ The same writer quotes (vol. i. part 2, p. 55) from various imitators of popular pronunciation, érièr, trémontane, terrir, douanier, errhes, ouète, plaine, clérinette, épaigneul, for arrière, tramontane, tarir, douanier, arrhes, ouate, plane, clarinette, épagneul.

1780. Sheridan seems altogether to ignore the sound of (aa) in English, allowing only (ææ) to the English a in far, bar, psalm, balm. Being an Irishman who had devoted his attention for years to English pronunciation, while his frequent residences in Ireland kept his ear alive to the Irish pronunciations of English then current in educated society, his remarks upon Irish pronunciation are of considerable importance. They serve to shew generally that the Irish peculiarities arose partly from the persistence of xvii th century pronunciations, and partly from an endeavour to correct that pronunciation by the then current English usage, which, learned rather by rule than custom, was carried to an excess. There will be frequent occasion to notice this as we proceed. With respect to a, long a is frequently (ææ) in Irish where it is (æ) in English, and sometimes (ææ) in Irish against (æ) in English. He instances patron, matron, rather, which in England were (pee’tрон, mee’tрон, redh’æ) and in Ireland (pee’tрон, mee’tрон, redh’æ). These were evidently the older, xvii th century sounds, which have again become current in England, where even the older (ra’ðæ) is common. The pronunciation (redh’æ), may be heard from Americans, among whom there is also a great tendency towards the pronunciation of the earlier settlers, 1628. Thus the true sound (æært) may be heard in America, which is very rare in England.

As a general rule the words in -alm, which Sheridan pronounced (-æem), were according to him, called (-æem) in Ireland, as (baam, saam, kwaam, kaam, kaaf) for balm, psalm, qualm, calm, calf, and this was a distinct xvii th century sound. In the following words, which he cites, there is sometimes an “overcorrection” of the kind above alluded to: gape, gather, catch, quash, clamour, wrath, wroth, farewell, squadron, were then pronounced in England (gææp, gedh’ær, ketsh, kwæsh, klæm’ær, raæth, ræth, fæ’wel, skwædræn) and in Ireland (geep, gedh’ær, ketsh, kwæsh, klæm’ær,
The received usage of the xix th century varies between the two, and may be taken as (geep, gedh'x, kezah, kwash, klaem'x, raath, raath, feer'-wel', skwæ'dron.) The recognized pronunciation in the xvii th century seems then to have been, short a = (e) in all cases, long a generally = (ee), the exact quality (ee, ee, ee) being doubtful, and in those cases in which (aa) is now frequently heard, as in dart, father, etc., long a was = (æe), as it always was in the xvii th century.

E, EE, EA — xvith Century.

1530. Palsgrave says: "E in the frenche tong hath thre dyverse sowndes, for somtyme they sownde hym lyke as we do in our tonge in these words, a beere, a beest a peere, a beene and suche lyke.... The sowndyng of e, which is most generally kepte with them, is suche as we gyve to e in our tonge in these wordes aboue rehearsed, that is to say, lyke as the Italuanes sounde e, or they with vs that pronounce the latine tonge aright: so that e in frenche hath neuer suche a sownde as we vse to gyue hym in these wordes, a bee suche as maketh honny, a beere to lay a deed corps on, a peere a make or felowe, and as we sounde dyuers of our pronounnes endynge in e, as we, me, the, he, she, and suche lyke, for suche a kynde of soundyng both in frenche and latine, is almooste the ryght pronunc-iation of i, as shall here after appere."

Here are laid down two sounds of English e long, as (ee) in bear, beast, pear, bean, and as (ii) in bee, bier, peer; we, me, thee, he, she, but the spelling of the two sets of words is not distinguished. We shall see that in the xiv th century all these words were pronounced with (ee) and that they were spelled indifferently with e or ee, sometimes with ie, and rarely, if ever, with ea. In Palsgrave's text ea is very rare, but in his vocabularies he uses it freely. The following words taken from his vocabulary of substantives will illustrate his confused use of e, ee, ea. To shew a further advanced state of spelling I add Levins's orthography 1570 of the same words preceded by two dots, after Palsgrave's explanations.

"Bee a fyfe... bee, beche tree... bech, bed of stone or wode... bead, beane corne... beane, befe meat... beefe, beakyn fev au gnet... beacon, beame of an house... beame, beare a he beest... beare, beere for deed men... beare, beest... beast, beatyng... beate, dede acte... deede, dead body... dead, deane of a church, defnesse lacke of herenyng... deafe, demnyng judging... deeme, derenosse chierté... deare, derlyng a man mignon... darling, eare of a man or beeste... eare, easie rest... easie, easter a hye feest... easter feast, feanyng faincto... fain, feate of arms...
... feate, fedynge place... feede, feleynge... feelc... soayng... fear, fesant coke faisant... fesant, fost... feast, fether... fether, gero clothing... geare, goest a blake stone, heed pate or nob... head, hope of money... heape, heale of body... heale, heale of the fote... heele, helthe... healthy, heape a great quantite... heape, her of the heed cheuwel... heyry, hezce, a deed body... herze, herryng a fysehe... her-ring, herryng the place whereby we here oyse... heare, her of any beest weuer... heartie, herthe of a chymney... herth, heate... heate, hewayne ciel... heaven, telowe... jelouse, kopyng observation... keepe, leche a surgion... leche, leed a metall... leado, leas pasture, lesto of a tree... leafe, lefonesse chereté... liefer, leuge two mile... league, leunning to... leane, leke an herb... lecke, lenonesse maigreté... leane, lepe or start satil... leape, leus lycence... leave, leuen for breddie... leven, leseuer to lyfte with... lever, meale of meate... meale, meane of a songe moyen... meane, measure of two gallons... measure, mede drinke... mede rewarde... mede, medeuse felde... medowe, mekonesse tumulte... mecke, mele besoing... neede, medyll to sowe with... needil, meare of a beest roigone, meyng with the nose esternement... sneece, meates ledder cordovayn... peace... peace, pece or parte of a thynge... pece, peacocke a frute... peache, peococke a byrde, peake of a ladys mournyng heede... peake, peole of belles, pele for an oyve... peele, peele a stone... pearle, peo true poys... pease, peocodde, quene lady... queene, queanne garse... queane, realme rosaulme, rede to plaie or pyhe with... rede, reed hernyng... rede, reed broset a byrde... breest, readnesse rogyver, redy money... redy, role for yanre... reele, rehersor... reherse, release forgvyenesse, reame of paper... reame, ree brentel ralias, reweredes of men arriore garde... rewerarde, reazonableness... reasonable, reason... reason, season tyme... season, see water mer... sea, secole charbon de terre, sedo of herbes... sedo, sowe before a castell... sowe, sokenese maladies... sicknesse, secke, sekyng or sorceryng... secke, secole a fysehe... seale, seane of sowyng... seane, seme for to frye with seyn de pourceau [saindeux], semelynesse... semely, see breame a fysehe, sorte enqyure... searce, seate a place... seate, teching lerning... teache, teadnesses... tedious, teele a byrde plignon... teale, telo a byrde plingset... teale, teme of a plough or oxen... teame, teere of wepyng... teare, tele, pappe or dogge, a womans breest... teate, tehe... dene... teethe, veole fleshe... veale, seede clothing... weede, weke for candells... weak, werykenesse flesesse... wayk, wheke a senyght... whecke, welthe... welth, wepyng pleur... wepee, were to take fysehe, worynesse or grefe... wearie, wesent the pype... weysand, wesyll a beest... wesyll, weyng frame... weave, whelo of a carte... wheele, whole corne... wheate, yere xii monethes... yeare, yest or barne for ale, zele love or frenshyp... zecele, Zeulande a countrey.

This long list will show that in Palsgrave’s time no definite rule had been laid down for the spelling of these words, and hence the reader could not discriminate the sounds. It was not till after the middle of the xvi th century that anything like a rule appeared, and then ee was used for (ii), and ea for (ee). But Levins shews that the rule was by no means consistently
applied so early as 1570. And even at a later period ea was often used for (e) the short vowel, and simple e often represented (ee) and sometimes perhaps, but not often, (ii). We often find hee, mee written like thee to give the full sound of (ii) and prevent the pronunciation (ee), which was given to the. The introduction of the difference ee, ea was therefore a phonetic device, intended to assist the reader. Great difficulty again arose as many words in ea came to be pronounced (ii) without any change being made in the spelling, and we find orthoepists obliged to give long lists of words with ea as (ee), as (e) and as (ii). If it had only been recognized that ea was a modern innovation, introduced with a phonetic purpose,1 writers and printers might not have hesitated to replace ea by e, ee in the two last cases. It is now perhaps too late to write feest, beest, reep, beem, etc., but there is no reason but habit against this spelling, and abundance of historical authority in its favour.

Palsgrave in saying that e was sounded as in Italian, takes no notice either in French or Italian of the double sound (e, e) into which (e) splits, although Meigret, 1550, finds it necessary to use two distinct vowel signs for the two sounds. In modern English we distinguish ail, air, = (eel, eel), but in some parts in the north of England I find this distinction unknown, and (ee) alone pronounced. Hence I suspect that the older English sounds were (ee, e). The short sound (e) has remained, apparently unchanged, from the earliest English times to the present day.

1547. Salesbury gives the two sounds (ee, ii) and also notices the mute or unpronounced e. He scarcely ever uses ee or ea. As examples of (ee, e) he gives in his Welsh pronunciation a were, wreke, breke, wreste = a weir, wreak, break, wrest, and calls attention to the difference of meaning in bere, per, helf, mele according as they are pronounced with (ii) = bier, peer, heel, meel (to meddle?), or with (ee) = bear, pear, heal, meal. Omitting mute e and ea, the following are all the words containing e, of which he gives the sounds; the old spelling is in small capitals, and the Welsh transcription in italics:

Brede bred (bred) panis, laedre lad-dr (lad-er), evermore efer-moor (ev-vermoor) in acternum, thondre thondr (thund-er), wondre wondr (und-er = wund-er), chere leis (tahiis) caseus, frender frinds

1 This was so little suspected that we find Wallis imagining that ea was properly pronounced as (ees) or (ee) per e masculinum, adjuncto etiam si libet exilia e sono raptissimo pronun-
(frīnds) amici, treetri (trīi-rīz) arbores, suffere suoffre (suf-er) sinece, gelding golding (geld-iq), Gylbert Gilbert (Gil-bert), gynger tsintser (dzhin-džer) zinziber, begoyng beeging (bega-iq), egg ege (eg) ovum, Jesu tseeu (Dzhee'zey) quee keuin (kwiin) regina, rent rent (rent), thescue treasure (trecz-ytr) thesaurus, velvet velset (vel-vet) holosericum, vextue vertuwo (vec'-titty), the dde (the), togethe with the Latin ego egu (eg'u), Dei deei (dee'i).

Of these the words these, frendes, quene have the sound of (ii). It should be observed that Bullokar also gives (frīnds), and so does Wallis, and so late as 1701 Jones admits this sound, thus making the new spelling ie indicate (ii) in “Algier, bier, canonier, friend, fusilier, grenadier, Tangier,” and harmonizing friend, fiend, both formerly (freend, feend), but then (frīnd, fiind), and now (frend, fiend).

As respects ea Salesbury agrees with others in giving sea see (see) mare, yea ie (jeo), season seesyn (seez'in) tempestas vel occasio, but he is peculiar in ease ies (jeez) otium, leau leif (leev) licentia, since Hart gives easy (ee-z'i), and Gill writes leare (leev). I can find no authority for the insertion of i==(a), and am inclined suspect a misprint, because the four words ease, leau, sea, yea are given together and transcribed ies, lief, see, ie, so that the last ie may have occasioned the two former, and he introduces them by saying: “In certain words they place a sometimes, as we should consider it, rather carelessly according to our custom, out of its own power and rather metamorphosed into the vowel e,” this should merely imply that ea was written for ee, meaning prolonged e (ee), and not that in two of the words e was also altered into the Welsh i, meaning English y. If then we read ees, leof for ies, lief, in Salesbury’s Welsh transcription, we shall reconcile it with his observation and with the usages of other orthoepists.

1568. SMITH, agreeing generally with Salesbury, calling the English e “e Latina,” pronounces yet, yes (jiz, jis), but gives also the pronunciation (jet, jes), though by introducing it with an “alli vocant,” he clearly prefers the former.

1569. HART says, describing this vowel: “The seconde with somewhat more closing the mouth,” than for a, “thrusting softlye the inner part of the tongue to the inner and vpper great teeth, (or gummies for want of teeth) and is marked e.” He writes (dheez) for these, and (mi:terz, hier) for metres, here. In 1580, Bullokar writes both (heer) and (hiir) for here,¹ and has also (siul’dum) for seldom.

¹ Henry IV., part 1, act i, sc. 2, l. 65, Quarto 1613: “were it not here sight that thou art heere apparant,” ought to have been pronounced (wer a
1621. Gill says, "E, breuis est formâ (e), vt in (net) rete: et longa sic, (ce), vt in (neet) neate. i. nitidus adiectivum: Substantivum neate significat omne genus bouum."

The pronunciation in the xvi th century is therefore tolerably certain. All words now spelled with ee had (ii), a few final e as he, me, she, we, had also (ii), almost every word now written with ea, or words written with ea in the latter part of the century had (ee) though some had (e). All simple e long were (ee). Exceptions were here (hiir) occasionally, hear, year (hiir, jiir) in Bullokar, appear is marked (apiir") in Butler 1633, who also distinguishes (teer) lacerare, (tiir) lacryma, and wishes dear, weary, hear to be called (deer, wee'r, neer) instead of (diir, wiir, hiir) which he therefore implies to have been the more usual pronunciation.

E, EE, EA.—xvii th Century.

It would be waste of time to establish that through the xvii th century and down to our own times short e has remained (e) and ee has been (ii). The difficulty only turns upon the pronunciation of long e and of ea.

1653. Wallis says: "s profertur sono acuto claroque ut Gallorum é masculinum," except before r as will be hereafter considered; "ea effertur nunc dierum ut é longum: sono ipsius a penitus suppresso, et sono literae e producto. Nempe illud solum prestat a ut syllaba reputetur longa. Ita met obviam factus, met victus, set sisto, sedere facio, set at sella, etc., non sono different nisi quod vocalis illic correta, hic producta intelligatur."

He however gives the exceptions near, dear, hear = (niir, diir, hiir). Wilkins has (ii-vil) for evil, but he writes Jesus as (Dzhee'ses), where the first (a) is probably a mere oversight for (z).

1668. Price says: "E soundes like, ee, (ii, i) in be, even, evening, England, English, he, here, me, she, we, ye," probably the complete list at that time. He also says: "ea soundes e, d-r-a-w-n out long as lead, weak." And then subjoins the following list:—

Appeal, appease. Bean, bear, beast, beat, beneath, breach, break,

not hear spar, that dhou art hair sparing), but for the sake of the joke we may suppose Falstaff to have pronounced in Hart's way, and called hear (heer), a pronunciation certainly well known in Shakspeare's time, although censured by Gill so late as 1621. Again, in the same play, act ii., sc. 4, l. 264: "If reasons were as plenty as blackberries," was (if reer'ns wer as plen'ty as blak-berries), and the joke consisted in alluding to raisins, pronounced in the usual but unrecognized manner (reez'ns), a pronunciation given by Price 1668 as the correct sound, and, as we see by Hart, well known at the time.

1 The aks. forms yfel, cofel, point to the sounds (yivel, ce'vel), at a very early period, and consequently to a concurrent (ii-vil, ce'vil) in old English. The contracted form siil shows that the (ii) sound had the preference.
to break. Cease, cheat, clean, cleave, compleat, conceal, congeal.
Deal, decrease, defeat, displease, dream. Eager, ean, ear, earn, ease, Easter, endeavours, estreat, eat, eaves. Feature, forswear.

Of these the following are still either (ee, ea) or (e), hear, break, earn, endeavours, forswear, jealousies, spread, swear, while the rest have become (ii). "Ea sounds short (e) in head, dead, ready. Bedstead, beard. Earl. Feather. Heaven. Measure. Pearl, pleasure. Search, steal, sweat. Thread, threaten, treasure, treasure. Wealth, weary, weather," of which only beard, weary have now changed.

John Kemble used to be laughed at for speaking of his bird, meaning beard; we have here old authority for the sound. Price makes ea sound as a and there is considerable probability that he meant (ea) and neither (a) nor (aa), in heard, heart, hearken, searge. Jones said both hard and herd for heard (p. 86); serge, is borne out by the modern (klaak, saardzhem) for clerk, sergeant. The only words in which Price admits ea to sound as ee (ii) are dear, appear; bleary-eyed, cheer, clear, hear, near, read, year, which short list also embraces all Wallis’s exceptions.

1655. Cooper has not named any instances in which e long is (ii), but he enters fully into ea.

First ea = (e) in already, behead, bread, breadth, breakfast, breath, cleanse, deadly, death, dearth, dear, earth, endeavour, feather, head-y, health, heaven, heavy, leather, leaven, leaver[lever]
leavoret [leveret], pageant, reachles [reckless], ready, realm, spread, stealth, threaten, treachery, tread, wealth. Here endeavour has (e) instead of (ee) as in Price; breakfast is shortened as at present, and lever has now become (ii).

Second ea = (ee), of which more presently. This is a long list beginning with appeal, appease, beacon, etc. Most of the words now have (ii), except break, forswear, great, sweat, swear. The words ean = yeam, enitor, eaves = eaves, subgrunda, leam lamps, lease formula locationis, deserve note.

Third ea = (EE), of which more presently. With the single exception of scream clamo, all the words have the combination ear, as bear, beard, earl, early, earn, earnest, learn, rehearse, searce criburn, search, shear, potsherd, swear, tear, swear.

1 Sheridan, 1780, giving a list of Irishisms, notes (bird) as the Irish and (brend) as the English pronunciation of beard. Most probably (bird) was at that time one of the mistakes made by Irishmen, who, wishing to imitate the English (ii) pronunciation of ea, carried it too far, as Sheridan points out in some other cases, (p. 92).
Fourth *ea* = a, which we have identified with (ə), (p. 71), in *heartless*, *hearten*, *hearth*.

Fifth *ea* = (ii) in *arrear*, *besmear*, *blear-ey'd*, *dear*, *ear-wig*, *fear*, *gear*, *hear*, *near*, *sear*, *shears*, *spear*, *tear laeryma*, *weary*, whereas Price speaks *weary* with (e). Here *arrear*, *ear-wig*, *fear*, *gear*, *sear*, *shears*, *spear*, *tear* s., *weary*, are in addition to Price's list, which also contains words not here found. It is clear that the (ii) sound was beginning to assert its claims to the domain which it has since almost entirely conquered, and from which the orthography *ea* was intended to drive it, so powerless is the artificial barrier of spelling, to arrest the natural flow of speech.

Cooper's vowel system is peculiar, and is clearly founded upon a careful analysis of his own pronunciation. His list of exact pairs of long and short vowel sounds is as follows:

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
can ken will folly full up meet foot
cast cane weal fall foale — need fool.
```

Now there can be little doubt that the series of short vowels in the upper line was meant for (ə, e, i, A, u, o, i, u), although (e, a), may have been used for (e, o). Hence the long vowels should be (ææ, ee, ii, AA, uu, —, ii, uu). The second may of course have been (EE), and the third may have been (ee) rather than (ii). The two sounds are closely enough allied for even a careful analyzer to confuse. In order to bring a Frenchman to the sound of (i) it is necessary to exaggerate the sound into (e). Persons endeavouring to prolong (i) are very apt to fall into (ee). Other orthoepists seem to have confused Cooper's second long vowel with (ææ) when it was spelt a as in *cane*, and with (ee) in other cases.

It is to be remarked also that Cooper finds his second long vowel expressed by *ea* almost only before r. This rather points to (ææ, EE, ëe) as his first three vowels, which others reduced to two (ææ, ee). There is no evidence, beyond Cooper, for (ii) occurring long, or (e) short, in English. The inference is that Cooper had either a peculiar pronunciation, or that vowel sounds appeared to him exact pairs, which do not so appear to us. He seems not to have been satisfied with the pair (ii, i), which is even now commonly adopted, and hence he tried to find (ii, i) in the English (need, meet), although he owns that in this case "minima datur differentia inter correctionem et productionem," and indeed the difference is rather due to the consonants than to the vowels, the sonant (d) having a sound of its own in addition to the glide from (ii). Again he strove to find a proper long vowel to
(i), and, observing a difference then between weal and wear, corresponding to the modern difference between ail and air (eel, eet), he assumed that the finer sound was the real long of (i), and thus paired (ee, i). Acting upon this conclusion I shall transcribe Cooper’s vowels accordingly. He seems, precisely in the same way, to have heard the difference (uu, u) and refusing to consider them as pairs, endeavoured to hear (u) in foot as distinct from fool and full, and then, not finding the real long sound of his (u), took (oo) in fool as its nearest representative. This would reduce his vowel scale to the following, which I shall adopt in future citations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
ken ken wil fal 5d ap mit fut
keest keen weel fal fool — niid fuul

The distinction between the words in ea which Cooper pronounces (ee), and those in ea which he pronounces (EE), may have been a step in the direction of change from (ee) to (ii) which may have been commencing at his time in the long list of words to which he assigns (ee), although it was not accomplished till much later.

HOLDER, 1669, does not make these distinctions, contenting himself with fate fat, seal sell, eel ill (keest fat, seel sel, il il), but admits that some vowel may lie between (a) and (ee). In comparing Cooper with his contemporaries we must then consider his (ee, EE) as represented by their single (ee).

1688. MIEGOR after laying down the rule that è long is (ee), the French è aigu, and è short is (e), the French è ouvert, excepts the following which have the sound of (ii, i), be, he, she, me, we, “qui s’écrivaient autrefois avec deux è,” yes, besom, evil; eee, even, evening, here; the termination -eous; employment, enquiry, “qui s’écrivent indifféremment avec un e ou avec un i,” ten, linnen, penny, hence, then, thence, when, whence, which he transcribes in French letters “tinn lininn, peny, hinnc, denn, dence, hoinn, hoince,” so that he gives è and not i in three of the words (by mistake?). This last list is peculiar to this author.

Miege gives long è masculin, (ee), as the general pronunciation of ea, but says that the a counts for nothing in the following words, for which ea therefore = (e), beard, bread, breakfast, breath a., deal, earth, death, Earl, early, to earn, earnest, earth, feather, head, health, heard, hearken, heart, heaven, heavy, leap, learn, leather, leaven, leaver, meadow, pasture, peasant, pillow-bear, poteheard, read “le Prétérit et Participe,” ready, realm, to rehearse, searce, search, steadfast, threaten, treachery, tread, wealth, weather; of which beard,
leap, lever, pillow-beer, have now (ii). It is observable that he gives hearken to (e), and also that the vowel in breakfast was shortened at so early a period.

Miege makes ea = (ii) in these words only, besmear, blear-eyed, clear, dear, gear, hear, near, shears, spear, in which we miss some of Price's words, though the list is increased by besmear, gear, shears, spear.

"Bear un ours et pear une poire, se prononce bair, pair."
There is a modern American pronunciation, probably (baes), but generally heard by Englishmen as (baa), which may date from this time, for as Miege evidently means bear to have a broader sound than he heard in other words, the real sound may have been (baes). See Cooper's third list as noted above, (p. 82).

1701. Jones says that the sound of e (ee) is written ea "in all words or syllables, that are, or may be sounded long," except a certain number of words where it is written e only, and it is perhaps worth giving these lists as shewing many words in e, e-e, now mostly pronounced with (ii), which had all (ee) so lately as the end of the xviiith century, because the fact is little known, and its announcement is generally received with incredulity. Those marked (*) have still (ee) or (e).

1) eke, *e're (ever), *e're (before), mere, mere, the, *there, these, *were, *where; glebe, Medes, mete, nepe, scene, scheme, sphere, Swepe, Thebe, Theme.
3) "all Scripture names and proper names from other languages, as Bolus, Jehu, Jesus, &c."
4) "all that begin with the sound of ce, ce, e, per, pre, re, se."

With these we must contrast the words in which e had the sounds (ii, i);
1) the termination -sous.
2) initial be- as become, bedow, before, &c.
3) the six words, be, he, me, she, we, ye.
4) the ten words, chisel [chisel], crete, England, English, here, mere, metre, Peter, saltpetre, Tweede.
5) the six words, Evan, Eve, Exiling, even, evening, evil. To which in another place he adds devil.¹

In the following list e is said to be sounded as a, which

¹ Jones says that devil is "sounded de'il, are curious in connection with the derivation of ill from evil..." This, and the Scotch de'il, are curious in connection with the
was most probably short (æ): Berks, clerk, eleven, Herbert, merchant, mercy, Owen, phrentick, verdict, yellow, etc.; of which phrentick has asserted itself in the orthography frantic; mercy, yellow, and sometimes verdict are known as vulgarisms; eleven, Herbert are now unknown, merchant is known as an archaism, and Berks, clerk are very common. This list seems to show that Myers’s service, bear, pear in which he makes æ = ai French, had the same sound, especially as (saar-ve) is a well-known vulgarism at the present day.

The only words in which Jones allows ea to be like a (æ) are heard, heart “to distinguish them from hard (not soft), Hart (or Stag),” but he also gives heard the sound of (herd).

Jones makes ea short = (e), in beard, bread, breadth, breast, breath, cleanse, dead, dealt, dear, dearth, death, dread, ear, earn, earth, head, heard, heart, lead, leap, meant, mesh, Pearce, pearl, reach, read, real, realm, scarce, search, scarse, sheard, shred, steal, spread, steal, stealth, sweat, thread, threat, tread, wealth, yearn;—bedstead, bestead, heaven, heavy, leacher, leather, leaven, measure, peasant, pheasant, pleasant, steady, treasure, weapon, weasand, weather; most of which have preserved their sounds, though some have changed their spelling.

The only words in which Jones allows ea to have the sound (ii) are cheer, clear, dear, ear, gear, hear, near, ear, yea;—appear, beadle, beaw (biu) now (boo), instead, steam, team, yea, yeast.

Collecting together all the words spelled with ea and pronounced with (ii) as given in the preceding lists, we find them limited to the following—all others in ea having (ee) or (œ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appear</td>
<td>dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrear</td>
<td>ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beadle</td>
<td>earwig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>besmear</td>
<td>fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bleary-eyed</td>
<td>gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheer'</td>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear'</td>
<td>instead²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those marked (1) are now spelled cheer, mere, seré; those marked (2) had often the sound (e) at that time, and perhaps more regularly; (3) the word yea is not marked (iii) except by Jones.

This list must be borne in mind in judging of rhymes in the xvii th century. In Croker’s Johnson, ed. 1848, p. 57, it is said respecting Rowe’s couplet

As if misfortune made the throne her seat,
And none could be unhappy but the great,

which Dr. Johnson in his Plan of a Dictionary in 1747 had
adduced to shew that great had sometimes the sound (griit), that Lord Chesterfield remarked it was "Undoubtedly a bad rhyme, tho' found in a great poet,"—an observation which shewed first that Lord Chesterfield did not know the pronunciation of English when Rowe was young, and secondly that he was so little aware of the habits of great poets (at least if he reckoned Shakspere and Dryden among them) that he looked to their greatness as a guarantee for the perfection of their rhymes. Now Rowe lived from 1673 to 1718. We may therefore expect to gather his pronunciation from Cooper, Miege, and Jones. The first gives (seet, greet), the rules of the others would imply (seet, greet). The rhyme was therefore perfect. While Pope's couplet, adduced by Johnson to shew the other sound of great,

For Swift and him despis'd the farce of state  
The sober follies of the wise and great,

would have been to Rowe a somewhat imperfect rhyme (see, ee), and one which I have but rarely found when examining the rhymes of this period.

As the point has been so much disputed, the orthoepical accounts have been given at great length, and it will be interesting to add the result of an examination of Dryden's rhymes in his Absalom and Achitophel, Annu Mirabilis, Palamon and Arcite, Wife of Bath, Good Parson, Theodore and Honoria, Religio Laici, Flower and Leaf, Cymon and Iphigenia, with respect to the pronunciation of the long e and ea. Rejecting those in which both spelling and sound were, as far as is known, identical in the rhyming terminations, the following are the results.

1) Regular rhymes, (ee, ee); ease with these seize, sea with survey prey weigh key lay way sway, wear despair, reveal frail, leave with deceive receive, mean obscene, congeal hail, remain'd glean'd, there hair, please these, theme dream, bear heir;

2) Nearly regular rhymes, a long with its corresponding short vowel (ee, e); feast with breast guest address'd rest, set with great retreat, increase less, heat with sweat threat, beat threat, conceal with tel dispel, appeal rebel e., zeal dwell, please with grievances images, yet great, extreme stem, supreme them;

3) Regular rhymes (ii, ii), cheer with clear year, years ears, appear with year ear tear s. steer gear cheer clear, near with clear ear, dear here, clear ear, career spear, fear with leer cheer near steer tear s. ear;

4) Possibly regular rhymes owing to variety of pronunciation, (ii, ii); rear with fear appear, to bear with hear year tear s. hear appear spear, but also bear with heir hair fair were, and were with career spear appear; where with clear near, there with spear appear
disappear clear fear; for we still hear were, where, there pronounced (wiili wii phi iis) as vulgarisms;

5) Rare irregular rhymes (ee, ii) now become regular as (ii, ii); heap sweep, retreat feet, deal wheel, disease degrees (?), severe bier, pleased freed, repeat sweet, unclean seen;

6) Faulty rhymes, (ee, ii) petitioners years, pensioners fears, steed with fled head, feet sweat, field beheld, kneel’d compell’d, unseen men, reed head,—(ee, i) contest resist, sense prince, but civil devil, does not belong to this place, for the rhyme was perfect (i, i);—(ee, am) wear care, tears e. spares.

These rhymes, notwithstanding an occasional laxity which Dryden seems to have preferred as a relief,1 serve to show the general correctness of the rules laid down by the orthoepists on this point.

E, EE, EA — xviiith Century.

1704. The Expert Orthographist dashes at once into the full sounds of the xviiith century. "Tho' ee be reckoned among the Diphongs," says he, "yet what difference is there in the sound of meet to come together, and mete to measure, in proceed and intercede?" Hence making the exceptions that there, were, where, "though they have e at the end, yet it serveth only to lengthen the foregoing e into a long," that is (ee), he gives the following 17 monosyllables and 26 polysyllables as having the sound (ii), which may be contrasted with Jones's lists, (p. 85: Bede, Creste, ere even now (sex), glebe, glede a kite, here, Mede, mere, mete, Pede, mere now rear, scene, scheme, sphere, these, Vere; adhere, aposeme, austere, blaspheme, cohere, complete, condene, concrete, convene, extreme which Jones spelled extream, greece "or Lord," impede, intercede, interfere, interceme, Nicene, obscene, portgreeve, precede, recede, replete, revere, severe, sincere, supercede, supreme.

Jones gives only 18 words out of the 28, (p. 86), in which he and preceding orthoepists allow ea to have the sound of (ii), resemblance between the vowels; thus Dryden could not have rhymed son with seen pain cane, or beast with coat, etc. Some even of the above may be referred to peculiar or archaic pronunciations, so that Dryden's rhymes are not, properly speaking, the monsters of modern times, known as rhymes to the eye, as move love grove, has was gas, seat great, pour flour, changed hanged.

That keep the word of promise to our eye
And break it to our ear.

See a further examination of Dryden's rhymes in Chap. IX, § 3.
59 others having short (e) and all the rest having long (ee) for ea. The orthographer only admits 4 words in which ea is sounded like a long, that is (ee); viz. bear s. and v., swear, tear v., weer; 3 words in which ea “is sounded like a short,” that is (æ), viz. hearken, heart and its derivatives, hearth; but gives 95 examples of ea sounded as (e) short including beard; and then no less than 255 in which “ea is sounded ee or e long” that is (ii). This last list of ea = (ii), includes the words break, deaf, deafen, great, indeavour,—but endeavour is in the list of ea = (e),—leassee, pear, shear, yea, yearn, in all of which, except shear which is often (shiţ), and yearn which is (xnt), the old long (ee) is still preserved; and though (briik, griiţ) may still be heard from a very few, I have not been so fortunate as to hear (diif, indii-vъ, liisiţ; piiţ, jiit, jiiţ). We can imagine a Gill of the period claiming again: “Non nostras hic voces habes, sed Mopsarum fictitiis!” It is impossible to believe that this represented the generally-received pronunciation of the time.

1710. Dyche, so far as I can understand his notation, agrees with Jones, but between him and Buchanan 1766, were fifty years, which seem to have had a great effect on our pronunciation, in settling long a to (ee) and long e and ea to (ii). They were years in which there was a remarkable tendency to thinness and meagreness of sound owing to a predilection for the higher lingual or palatal vowels. The change from (ee) to (ii) was attempted to be carried much further than actually succeeded. Thus chair,1 steak, break, great were (tshiţ, stiiţ, briik, griiţ), oblige was (oblidiţh)2 and (k, g) before (aa), where the sound of (aa) really remained, were palatalised into (k, g) as in (kaad, gaad). All these sounds might have been heard from elderly speakers some thirty years ago, and those which have remained to the present day, are accounted old pronunciations. In the xviiith century however, they were modernisms which did not set through, and our present pronunciations (sheer, steek, breek, greet, obloidzht) were older, although not all of them the oldest forms. In the provinces (tshiţ) is still frequent, and (oblidiţh) is nearly universal in Scotland.

1710. The anonymous instructor of the Palatines, writes me, he, we, she, be in German letters mi, hi, wi, schi, bi as particular exceptions, and gives as examples of ea sounding (tcheer, tshiţ) the latter being one of the words which had then changed its sound, notwithstanding the spelling cheerr, since altered to cheerr.

1 “Why is a stout man always happy? Because he is a cheerful (chair full).” This is a conundrum of that period, and could not have belonged to any other, for in the xviiith century, chair, cheerr were

2 So pronounced by Dyche.
sometimes almost (bieweilen fast) as German i (ii), the words 
heap, heat, cheap, clean, clear.

1766–8. Buchanan and Franklin may be said to have 
completely adopted the present usage respecting e long 
and ea. The following are all the words in Franklin’s 
examples, with his transcriptions, translated into palaeotype, 
and following all his inaccuracies:

Long e, sermon siriun, editions iidiahons, religion ridibahan, idea aidia;
—oa long, pleased pliiz’d, stream strium, clear kliir, meaning mimiq, 
easiest iirzuest, least list, increasing inkrisiq, speaker spiker, readers 
riders, to read riid, dear diir;—greater greeter greter;—oa short, 
heaven hev’n, already already already, I have read red, unlearned 
enlarm’d.

An Irish gentleman, born in 1755, told me he remembered 
the change. It is to be observed that the change is not yet 
made among the less educated class in Ireland, and was 
probably universal in Ireland when this gentleman was a 
youth. He came to England as a young man, and observed 
the custom growing. He distinctly remembered a youth who 
asked for (piiz) pees, being told to say (peoz) “like a man.”
The thinner voice of woman has perhaps occasioned all thin-
ness of utterance to be called effeminate. Thus Meigret says:

“Je vou’ less’ a penser quelle grac’ aors l’e clos en se’ vocables 
mes, tes, ess, si nou’ l’y prononçons, c’me nou’ fezons en pere mere: 
ex come font je ne scy qels effenxez mixons [x = (nj)] auxq vn 
presq clos resserrement de bouche: crenzans a mon auis qa la voes 
virile de l’home ne sozt point tant harmonieuze, ny aggzebl’ aoz 
dames q’une lache, foebi’ ex femene. Or quant a mox ie ne 
poursuy pas icy çete dolzett? [L = l] ex effeninez façon de parler: 
car je la less’ aoz amoureuz poursuyvant tant seulement çete 
dierall’ ex comune façon, qi sent son home, e qi ez réçu’ entre le’ 
mieux appriz.”

Just in the same way Smith exclaims against the “mulier-
culce delications et nonnulli qui volunt isto modo videri loqui 
urbaniüs” who use (ei) for (ai). And Dr. Gill works him-
self up into absolute rudeness, in the following noteworthy 
passage. After observing that the eastern English are fond 
of thinning their words, saying (fir, kiver, deans) for (feier, 
kuver, dans), fire, over, dance, he goes on to say:

“λανθότηται autem illam magnopere affectant πνευστόλοι

1 Printed λανθότητα by an error, but 
corrected in the errata. All palatali-
sation or diminution of the lingual 
aperture in vowels produces this effect 
of magherness, thinness of sound.
2 This is an unusual word found in 
Hes. Op. 371, which Liddell says 
means “with a sweeping train,” as a 
parody of the Homeric ἥσεσθαν, 
“if it be not rather lecd, lecherous.” 
The allusion is evidently to πρῆθη, 
and the word might be translated “wrig-
gling,” as a mark of affectation.
noster Mopsus quae quidem ita omnia attennunt, vt a et e, non alter perhorrescor videantur quam Appius Claudius z, sic enim nostrae non emunt (laon) laum, et (kaambrik) sambric, sindonis species; sed (leen) et (keembrick); nec edunt (kaenp) capon caponem, sed (keepn) et ferè (kiirn); nec unquam (butsherz meet) wucherz meat carnem λaonis, sed (bitsherz miiť). Et quum sunt omnes (dzhintlimın) non (dzhentlivmen) gentilcomen, i.e. matrone nobiles, nec maid ancillas voçant (maidiz) sed (meedz). Quod autem dixi de a, recanto; nam si quando graviotropum audiretur, locum concedunt ipsi a, sic enim aliquotes ad me pippient (ei pro sa giur skalerz liiv ta plee) pro (ei prai vou giv juur skolars leev tu plai), I pray you give your scholars leave to play. Queso concede tus discipulis veniam ludendi.”

We cannot but regret that Dr. Gill had not greatly extended his list. (Leen) does not seem to have survived, but (keembrick) is now the recognized pronunciation, though I have heard (kaambrick). So with (keepr'n). This anticipation of the change from (aa) to (ee), which was not fully accomplished till nearly a century after Gill's time, is remarkable. It must, however, be considered as a xviith th and not a xviith century sound. (Bitsher, meeds, plee) will be considered hereafter. Here we are principally interested in the anticipations (miiť, liiv) for, (meet, leev), meat, leave, which are not named as exceptions by any professedly xviith century writers, and (meet, leev) being then the rule, would have sounded most probably as affected to Price, Cooper, and Jones as they did to Gill.

Generally with regard to the change of (ee) into (ii) it is observable that in Modern Greek (as has been probably the custom for nearly 2000 years), ε is pronounced (ii), while there seems reason to suppose that it was originally (ee) or perhaps (ee), although, at least in one word, it was confounded with (ii) at an early period. Also in the passage from Latin to the modern Romance language, (ee) fell not unfrequently

1 It would be difficult to find any authority for this piece of Latin. The English is mapseyx, sluts, which may be related to mop, mope.
2 The pronunciation is an exact palatotyptic reproduction of Gill's, and the ordinary spelling in italics is my addition throughout.
3 Both words require to be written with (l), or else to have (i) inserted after (l), as (dzhintl,men, dhentlivmen,) to avoid a pronunciation in three syllables.
4 This pipping, chirping effect is precisely that now produced upon our ears by the dunkey (Dzhilms) of the present day, ignorant as we are of the effect that our pronunciation would have produced on our ancestors.
5 Probably an inaccuracy for (m).
6 The old quotation δ' δίδωσι δοκερ πράσατον βη βη λέγων βαθίςει, does not absolutely establish (ee) or even (ee) as the sound. The latter is far more bleating, and Schmeller calls it that vowel which any lamb can teach us, “über den uns jedes Lämmechen belehren kann.” The well-known passage in Plato, Crat. c. 16, όουν, αϊ μων λυχνίατοι λυγα ς την ημέραν καιλουν, only shows that some old people pronounced that particular word in that way.
into (ii), and as the Latin me, te, se became the Italian mi, ti, si, so the English pronouns he, she, me, we, thee, as some of the commonest words, were the first which fell into (iii, shii, mi, dhii), having remained as (hee, shee, mee, dhee) to the close of the xiv th century.

1710. Sheridan's usage agrees with the modern, but his observations on educated Irish usage are important. He says that ee, ie were pronounced as (ii) both in England and in Ireland, but that ea, ei, e when sounded with (ii) in England "almost universally" received the sound of (ee) in Ireland, as (tee, see, pleez) tea, sea, please. But he adds that "gentlemen of Ireland, after sometime of residence in London, are apt to fall into the general rule, and pronounce these words" great, a pear, a bear, to bear, forbear, swear, to tear, wear, which were exceptionally pronounced with (ee) in England, "as if spelled greet, beer, sweet," that is, as (griit, piir, biir, swiir, tiir, wiir). Omitting these mistakes, which had nothing to do with the true Irish habits of the time, we see that the latter really belonged to the xvii th century. Again Sheridan says: "the final mute e makes the preceding e in the same syllable, when accented, have the sound of (ii) as in the words supreme, sincere, replete. This rule is almost universally broken through by the Irish, who pronounce such words as if written suprume, sinsare, repaste" that is with (ee) as in the xvii th century. In Sheridan's list of miscellaneous words with Irish pronunciations, we find several examples of forcing a rule too far, as above stated (see also p. 76). The complete list is as follows, to which I have annexed my own pronunciation in the present century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>English 1780</th>
<th>English, 1868</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>tshiir-ful</td>
<td>taher-ful</td>
<td>tshiir-ful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fearful</td>
<td>fiir-ful</td>
<td>fzer-ful</td>
<td>fiir-ful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beard</td>
<td>biird</td>
<td>berd</td>
<td>biid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisure</td>
<td>lezh-aar</td>
<td>liizh-ar</td>
<td>lezh-ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search</td>
<td>seerstsh</td>
<td>sertsh</td>
<td>srtsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>ten 'jor</td>
<td>tii 'jor</td>
<td>ten 'iur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenable</td>
<td>ten 'æbl</td>
<td>tii 'æbl</td>
<td>ten 'æbl'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Diez, Gram. der rom. Sprachen, 2nd ed., vol. i., p. 159, as gives as examples, Italian Corniglia (Cornelia), Messina (Messen), sarracino (sara-
census)—to which the initial di-, ri-
and several others may be added.—Span.
consigo (secum), venino (venenum); port.
viso (sensus sense).—Prov. berbiz
(versecum), pouz (pullicenus), razin
(racenmus), sarrac. — French, brebis,
cire (corn), marquis (marchensis), mered
(mercedem), pris (prensus), pouzain,
raisin, tapis (tapetum), venin; old
French, puis (pagense, now pays), selins
(sagenus), seri (serenus). He also re-
marks on the same tendency in the old
high German fira (terise), pina (Ital.
pensa), episa (spessa), which have under-
gone another change in modern times,
becoming Feier, Pina, Speise.
### Written, Irish, English, 1780, English, 1868.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>English, 1780</th>
<th>English, 1868</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>dhiir-fur</td>
<td>dher-fur</td>
<td>dher-fur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breadth</td>
<td>bresht</td>
<td>brendth</td>
<td>brendth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endeavour</td>
<td>endv-var</td>
<td>endevar</td>
<td>endevar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mischievous</td>
<td>misthaivus</td>
<td>misthaivus</td>
<td>misthaivus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reach</td>
<td>retsh</td>
<td>riitsh</td>
<td>riitsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zealous</td>
<td>ziil-esit</td>
<td>zel-vst</td>
<td>zel-vst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zealot</td>
<td>zii-lat</td>
<td>zel-vst</td>
<td>zel-vst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1530. **Palgrave** says: “*O* in the frende tong hath two dierens maners of soundynges, the soundyng of *o*, whiche is most generall with them, is lyke as we sounde *o* in these words in our tonge a boore, a soore, a coore, and suche lyke, that is to say, like as the Italians sounde *a*, or they with *v* that sounde the latin tong aight.”

1567. **Salesbury** says: “*O* in Welsh is soundad in the right sounding of it in Latin: eyther else as the sound of *o* is in these Englyshe wordes: a Doe, a Roc, a Tve: and *o* never soundeth in Welsh as it doth in these wordes of Englysh: to, do, two.” And again, 1547, speaking of English, he says: “*O* takes the sound of [Welsh] *a* (*o*) in some words, and in others the sound of *v* (*u*); thus ro, to, (too), digitus pedis; so, so, (soo), sic; two, tue, (tuu) duo; ro, tw (tu) ad; schole, scowl, (skuul) schola . . . . But two oo together are soundad like *w* in Welsh, as good goed (guul) bonus; poore puer (puur) pauper.”

1568.—Sir T. Smith simply says: “*O* Latina,” giving as examples the following words, which he only writes phonomically, but are here given in ordinary spelling—

**Short**—smock, horse, hop, sop, not, rob, bot, pop.

**Long**—smoke, hoarse, hope, soap, note, robe, boat, pope.

Smith makes oo in boot, look, mood, fool, pool, too the same as the Latin *u* long, meaning (*u*). See under U.

1569. **Hart** says: “The fourth [vowel], by taking awaye of all the tonge, cleane from the teeth or gummes, as is sayde for the *a*, and turning the lippes rounde as a ring, and thrusting forth of a sounding breath, which roundnesse to signifie the shape of the letter, was made (of the first inmentor) in like sort, thus *o*.” And his English examples are no, not, so.

1580. **Bullokar** says: “*O* hath threk soundes, and all of them voweles; the one sound agreeing to his olde and continued name, another sound, between the accustomed name of *o*, and the old name of *v*, and the same sound long, for which they write oo,¹ (as I do also, but giving it a proper name, according to the sound thereof), the thirde sounde is as *v*, flat and short, that is to say, as this sable *ov*, short sounded: for which some of the better learned did many times use, oo & *v*, according to their sounds, but most times

¹ The two *o’s* are united in one type as the *o* and *e* are in the type *œ*. 
with superfluous letters.” He illustrates the three sounds by the words.

1) sonne slius, eson, boneme (first vowel), orme, close.
2) sonne sol, ou, boneme (second vowel), some.
3) loked, take, bace, some.

1611. Flora says, speaking of the Italian (uh, o): “So likewise to the close O, I have throughout my book given this oualle forme O, and to the open this round form O. The first close or oualle is euerc pronounced as the English single V. in these wordes, Bun, Dug, Flud, Gud, Rud, Stud, Tun, &c., whereas the other round or open is euerc pronounced as our O. in these wordes Bone, Dog, Flow, God, Rod, Stone, Tone &c. as for example in these Italian wordes, Io homo il mio Dio cedo ogni diestiona, where euerc, O. is close and oualle. And in these, lui mi vuole torre la mia rósa; where Tórre with an open or round O. is a verbe and signifieth to take, and tórre with a close or oualle O. is a noune substantiue, and signifieth a tower; and Rósa with an oualle and close O. is a participle of the verb Róder, and signifieth Gnawne or Nibled, and Rósa with a round or open O. is a noune substantiue, and signifieth the floure that we call a Rose.”

1621. Gill gives as key words for his long and short o, “coale, to coll,” and calls them oo, o.

In endeavouring to discover what are the sounds intended, it is necessary first to examine what sounds of o exist. They are all round vowels, that is, the action of the lips with a tolerably round opening is necessary. The tongue must also not be much raised, or the sound falls into (u, u) or at least (uh) the Italian o chiuso. At the same time the tongue must not be too much depressed, or the sounds become (a, o), the last of which is the modern English o in odd, which Mr. M. Boll considers to be a wide form of (a), and which is generally, though inaccurately, confounded with (a), just as (i) is usually confounded with (i). Hence we obtain two forms, by raising the back of the tongue to a mid position, and rounding the lips in a medium manner, namely (o, o), the latter being the wide of the former. In present English (o) only occurs as a long vowel, and in the south it usually has a faint sound of (u) after it, thus (hooum, hoo’um) home, but this is unhistorical, except where a w is written; thus we may distinguish no, know as (noo, noou). The other sound (oo) is often heard long in provincial English as (hoom) home. Unaccustomed ears then confound it with (aa) or (oo). The long sound (oo) is also sometimes heard from those London speakers who wish to prolong the sound of o in dog, cross, off, office, without degenerating into (daag, kraas, aaf, aaf’s), or being even so broad as (dog, kroos, oof, oof’s). It is also the sound now most esteemed in oar, glory, story, memorial,
once called, and still so called by elderly people, (oo'ɪ, gloo'ɪri, stoo'ɪri, memoo'ɪriel), but now professedly called (oo, gloo'ɪri, stoo'ɪri, memoo'ɪriel), the action of the glide from (oo) to (ɪ) having resulted in widening the vowel.¹ Mr. M. Bell recognizes two other sounds (oh, oh) related to (o, o) by being mixed instead of back vowels. The former he hears in the French homme, where I hear (o), and the latter in the American stone, where I hear (o). The sounds are unusual to English ears, and it will be unnecessary to distinguish (o, oh) or (o, oh) for any purpose in this treatise. Generally (ston) is heard as (stan), which is the modern English form in such phrases as to weigh twelve stone (tu weci twelv ston). The sound (hol) for (hoel) whole, is by no means uncommon, although most persons hear it as (hol), and it is imitated by writing “the hull of a thing.”

Now long o being (oo) and short o in closed syllables being (o), as note, not (noot, not), English writers have got so much into the habit of considering these two sounds as a pair, that when they speak of long and short o we naturally expect these sounds and not (oo, o). This creates the difficulty. The ear and judgment are confused. Sir T. Smith may have pronounced his key words (smok smook, hors hoors, hop, hoop), and yet have considered them as pairs, for he actually has so considered the more distant sounds (beit, bit). As the Welsh at the present day, so far as I have observed, say (oo, o) and do not use either (o) or (o), they probably so pronounced in Salesbury’s time. But Salesbury would in that case have heard (oo, o) as (oo, o), so that his identification of the English with the Welsh o, although probably correct, would not suffice to decide so delicate a point. Quite recently I have heard Welsh gentlemen who seemed to me to say (poob) and not (poob) declare that the vowel sounded to them the same as that in my pronunciation of robe (roob). Hart’s description, giving the lingual positions for a (a) and the rounding of the lips should produce (o) exactly. And I am inclined to think that the normal English sound up to the end of the xvi th century was (oo, o), both long and short. This would make sense of Hart’s examples no, not, so as (n̂oo, not, soo), and would make Smith’s and Gill’s long and short o, perfect pairs, thus: Gill coll, coal, (kol, kool); Smith smock, smoke, (smok, smook).

¹ Of course this sound degenerates into (oo) or (ʌʌ), so that (glaɪtri) or even (diʌʌrɪ) may often be heard in London. I have heard clergymen, who, anxious to correct this, say (glas, ɪtri), without any (ɪ), the effect of which was decidedly unpleasant.
My own impression, after considerable thought on the subject, though it would be difficult to enumerate all the reasons which have led me to this conclusion, is, that (oo, o) must be considered as the normal sound, intermediate to (a) and (u); and that (u, u) are felt as approximations towards (u), and (o, a) as approximations towards (a). To me the Italian sounds o chiuso and o aperto, close and open o, are respectively (uh, o), the former coming from Latin u, the latter from Latin o. The regular short German and French o I also consider to be (o). To show however the ease with which sounds so near may be confused, I may mention that Mr. Melville Bell in taking down sounds from my dictation, heard my (o, on) as (oh, un).1

I shall assume as at least most likely that (oo, o) was the original sound of long and short o previous to the xvi th century, but that (oo) inclining often towards (u) had become (uu) in many words in the xvi th century, other words retaining the pure (oo).2 It was, I believe, to separate these two effects that a diversity of spelling was introduced. The o which became (uu) was written oo, and the o which remained unchanged became oa. The change was precisely similar to the introduction of the two spellings ee, ea at the same period, and the device was the same, viz., the more guttural sounds of each, that is, the sounds more nearly approaching to a, were represented by adding on a as ea, oa, and the other sounds further from a, were represented by simple duplication as ee, oo. When o had changed to (u) the spelling u gradually prevailed, but sometimes simple o and sometimes oo was employed. The older spelling ou also occasionally remained. We have seen that the orthography ee, ea was not fixed in Palsgrave’s time. Similarly we find him writing in the passage first quoted under this letter, (p. 93), boore, soore, coore for boar, sore, core. Reverting to Palsgrave’s vocabulary of nouns, we find the following spellings, to which I add Levins’s, as under EA (p. 77): “Boke... booke, boke othe... othe, bokeram, bockette for a well... bucket, bokyll... buckle, bocter for defence... beckler, bone a request...”

1 See Visible Speech, Plate viii. containing the speech of Portia on Mercy, written in Visible Speech letters from my dictation, where (u, sh, dreh-peth) are written for what I intended to pronounce as (not, dropeth). This speech will be found as an example in Chap. VIII, § 8, Ex. 1. The differences between the pronunciation there exhibited and that given by Mr. M. Bell, must generally be attributed to further investigation on my part.

2 In the examination of Chaucer’s pronunciation I shall endeavour to show that in his time the sound of o had not split into two, although I think that o was written not unfrequently for an original (u).
boone, bourage herbe, boore beest .. bore, boorde for buylding .. boord, borde cloth nappe .. borde, boorder that gothe to borde .. border, boster vantver, boste to Rowe in bateau .. bote, boly that man of warre take .. botty, botlar .. butler, buttras .. butresse, buttrye .. butterie, boote of lether .. boote, boote, bothe, bullyon in a woman's girdle, boute of clothes, cloke a garment .. cloke, coke that sellethe meate .. coke, cole, of fyre .. cole, coupe [coop], core of frute .. core, core or a deed body .. core, courser of horses .. course, coysyn kynsman .. cousin, coste charge .. coste, cost of a countre .. coaste, coate, coate a byrde .. coote, coat for a ladde .. coat, cover .. cover, couple .. couple, course .. course, deo a beest .. doe, dokelyng .. duckling, dole .. doole, dome .. dome, doun hyll, dungil, dore a gate .. door, doublet, dove .. doove, doule .. double, foole .. foole, foole a colte .. foole, foome .. fome, foo .. foe, forow .. furrowe, fote .. foote, foule for shope .. fould, foule .. foule, good .. good, golde a metall .. golden, goule of corne, so moche as may lye bytwene two postes, otherwyse a baye .. gulfie, gode for a carter .. gode, goore of a smock .. gore, gosse a foule .. goose, goosberry .. goosberrie, goost .. ghoste, gote a beest .. gote, gottensmyl, grome .. groome, gote money .. gote, hode .. hode, hoke .. hooke, hole .. hole, holy .. holy, honye .. honye, honny combe, honny-suckell .. honysuckle, hone .. where, hops .. hope, hole .. house .. hote, horse a beest .. horse, hoorsnesse of the throte .. horse, host .. hoste, hose for ones legges .. hose, houpe [hoop], jonkete .. junkets, louse .. luce, lode [load], lose of brede .. lose, lose .. looke, lype [loop], lyme [loam], longing perdition .. lose, love .. loved, mole moule a beest .. moule, molyne an herbe, molet a fysshe .. mullet, moone a planet .. moone, moneth .. month, mode in a verbe .. moode, more a fen .. moore, mote a dytche .. mote, mote in the sonne .. mote, moton [mutton], moultytude .. multitude, mould a form .. mould, mournyng .. mourne, moone mynday .. moone, norn .. a religous woman .. nunne, noriashyn .. nourish, nos in [the body of his work constantly written nose] .. nose, ore of a bote .. ore, ote corne .. otes, othe sweryng .. othe, oulde mayde .. ould, plume a frute .. plume, pudding, piddell a slough .. puddel, poke or bagge .. poke, poche or blyaye .. poche, pole a staffe .. pole, pompe [pump], pond .. pond, pore .. pore, poore [poor], profe .. proofe, prose .. rho bucke a beest .. roe buck, robe .. robe, roche a fysshe .. rochet, rode a crosse .. roode, rofe .. rofe, roke .. rooke, rope .. rope, rose .. rose, rote of a tree .. roote, sloo worme .. sloe, smoke .. smooke, sokelyn .. souke, sole a fysshe .. sole, sole of a fote .. sole, sole of a shoo .. sole, somme [sum] .. sonne .. sonne, sop to washe with .. sop, soper .. supper, sore a wound .. sore, sole of a chymbey .. sooty, sothenesse [soothness], sodayne [sudden] .. sodayne, soule [soul] .. soule, soulier .. soldiourie, soutier sauctier, soveraynte of a kyng .. soveraygne, spoke of a wheel .. spoke, stubble .. stubill, stone .. stone, store .. store, tode [toad] .. tode, too of ones fot .. toe, toes of breed .. toste, tothe dent ..

1 The adjective cores is also spelled courser both by Palsgrave and Levins.
2 The verb to duck is spelled duch both by Palsgrave and Levins.
3 Levins uses ore for a metallic cores.
4 Both Palsgrave and Levins use sonne for both son and sun.
tooth, sout under the ground...valte, wood [woad]. woodwasse, woodwose, wood or tre that is fallen...wood, woode to burne...wood, woodwasse rage...woode, wols...wolfish, woman...woman, wombe, wonders...wonder, wo sorowe...woe."

It is evident that long o and oo were not yet separated by Palsgrave to whom also the device of oo or oe final, (see doo, foo, wo) had not yet occurred, and although oo was freely used by Levins, oo was almost unknown to him.

A comparison of Bullokar's notation of the three classes of words he cites, leads me to the conclusion that their sounds were, in palaeotype—

1) son, upon, boz'um, koorn, kloos.
2) sun, ut, boz'um, kum.
3) luuked, tuuk, buuk, suun.

The pronunciation (son) is however peculiar. Smith gives (sun). Where direct authority cannot be obtained it is extremely difficult to distinguish which of these sounds should be given to o in any words of the xvi th century. Generally we may conclude that the o, oo,—not the oe,—which is now (oo) or (ou) was then (oo), being the old sound but very slightly altered; what is now (uu) it is not so safe to conclude was then (uu) unless in the course of the century we find the spelling oo adopted. What is now (o) was pretty certainly (o) at that time, being almost the old sound preserved. But it is not quite so certain that what is now (e) was formerly (u), for some of these may have been (o), or both sounds may have prevailed, thus Bullokar and Smith differ respecting son, and none, one were (noon, oon). It is also very probable that many o represented (u) even as early as Chaucer's time. The following cases of o, oo, oa = (u) or (uu) are taken from the authorities for this century.

above    cook    hood    ooze    some    two    wood
afford    cool    hoof    other    soon    whom    woof
among    coot    hoop    pool    soothe    whoop    wool
blood    cover    loof    poor    stood    whore    Worcester
board    do    look    prove    stool    wolf    word
bombast    done    loose    rook    sword    womb    work
book    food    loving    room    thorough    woman    worm
boot    foot    mood    root    to    won    worship
brood    forth    mother    shoe    ton    wonder    worst
broom    good    mouth    shovel    too    wont    worth
come    goose    move    smother    took    woo    wost

To these Shakspere authorises the addition of Rome.¹

¹ Julius Cesar act i. sc. 2, v. 156:—
Now is it Rome indeed, and Rome enough
When there is in it but one onely man.
The following are all the words containing o which Salesbury adduces, leaving ou, ow, oi, ol to be considered hereafter.

God God (God); condicton condicton (condis'tun); suermore suermore (e-v'ermoor); thondde thondre (thun'der); wonder wonder (wun'der); hope hoop (hoop); orangs orangs (or-cindzhye); pole pole (funl); holly holly (hooli, holi); honest honest (on'est); honour honour (on'or); ehibition ehibition (eksibis'yun); prohibition prohibion (proo,ibis'inun); john bock (buuk); to, to (too) meaning a toe; so so (soo); two tu (tuu); to to (tu) the preposition; scholae schol (aknul); soon, good (gloud); booke booke (puur); ros ros (rooz); a rose, season season (seez'in); top top (top); thomas tomas (Tom'as); throne truen (truum); oke oke (oks).

Florio (p. 94), evidently heard bone, dog as (boon, dog), and, if (beon) had been said, he would have most probably heard that sound as (bushn), just as at present Englishmen confuse the Italian (uuh, o), o chiuso long and o aperto short, with their own (oo, o). Hence his remarks give a presumption in favour of (oo, o).

O, OO, OA—xvii th Century.

1653. Wallis says of the guttural vowels "d δ v" aperta: Si apertură majori seu pleno rictus spiritus exeat, formatur Germanorum d vel δ 'apertum. Neque Germani solùm sed et Galli, aliquae non pauci, codem sono suum a plerumque proerunt. Angli sonum illum corrompt quod δ breue: productum vero plerumque per au vel au, rarius per d exprimunt. Nam in fall, folly; haul, hooly; call, collar; lawes, loss; cause, cost; aw'd, odd; sawd, sod; alisquae similibus; idem prorsus Vocalium sonus auditur in primis syllabis, nisi quòd illic producatur his corripiatur. Atque hinc est quod Hebrevi suum camets longum, et camets breve seu camets chatuph, (hoc est, nostrum d apertum et δ breue,) codem charactere scribunt. Nam eorum ụ ụ et ụ ụ non aliter differunt quàm nostrum call et call. ụ ụ

"d rotundum. Majori labororum apertura formatur d rotundum; quo sono plerique proferunt Graecorum oo. Hoc sono Galli plerumque proferunt suum au. Angli ita fere semper proferunt o productum vel etiam oo (ipso a nimirum nunc dierum quasi evanescente; de quo idem hic judicium ferendum est ac super de oo'): Ut, one,

1 The inserted w is perplexing, it should give the sound (muor), and Price uses so to indicate (wu). But Smith pronounces (muor).
2 The initial w has been supplied, because its omission has been regarded as a Welsh habit, and Salesbury's mode of writing did not give him the means of representing (wu).
3 Salesbury does not distinguish holly, holy either in sound or spelling, but his interpretation shows that both words were meant. This shows that the quality of the long and short o was the same to him.
4 The origin of this y is not apparent. The real sound of the word seems to have been (seez'n).
5 The Oxford reprint has δ in each case, which is erroneous.
6 We have seen that the a was never pronounced in either case; that it was a mere orthographical device.
O, oo, oo — XVIIth Century.  Chap. III. § 3.

 unus; nona, nullus; whole, totus; hole foramen; coal, carbo; boat, cymbal; oai,avena; those, illi; chose, eligi; etc. At ubi a breve est, ut plurimum per σ apertum (de quo supra) rarius per σ rotundum pronunciatur.

"Oo sonatur ut Germanorum ã pingue, seu Gallorum ou. Ut in vocibus good bonus, stood stabam, root radix, foot pes, loose laxus, loose lasso, amitta.

"Nonnumquam o & ou negligentiis pronunciandis eodem sono" ã ã obscurum = (α), "efferunt, ut in cōme, venio; sōme, aliquis; dōne, actum; company, consortium; country, rus; couple, par; cōvet, concupisco; ðves, amo; alisque aliquot; quæ alio tamen sono rectius proferri debent."

These extracts seem to make long o a true labial (oo),¹ short o a true gutturo-labial (α)—for which however the softer (o) may have been really sounded, and occasionally (β), a new sound, which will be considered under U,—and long or short oo the true (uu, u), which however may have been (uu, u). Hence long and short o had ceased to be a pair (oo, o), and had become the different vowels (oo, o) or (oo, α). This fully agrees with Wilkins, 1668, who gives the following pairs, leaving (oo) without a mate,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>bot-tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paule Rawd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but he also gives amongst as containing (α).²

1668. Price distinguishes three sounds of o, long as in no, "fo," more, most = (oo) according to Wallis; short as in lot, not, for = (α); "obscure like short u (α) as in son, tongue, London, above, *approxe, *behoveth, brother, come, companie, come, conduit, doen, dost, doth, love, mother, *move, plover, pome, *prove, *remove, shoevel, some, venom, *whom," all of which with the exception of those marked * retain the sound of (α).³

Price also says: "o after w, soundes like short u, (α) as world, *sword, *woman, woen, except, o, soundes, ee, in women, and o long in wo, wore, woke," (swaad, wom-en) are uncommon. Then follows a long list of final om, on sounded as as (sm, on), including some words in which the sound is now (n).

¹ The French distinguish two sounds of o, the close au and the open o, which to my ears sound as (o, o).
² As regards prove, it is an ancient university story of the late Prof. Vince, of Cambridge, that he used to say:

"If a man say I lie, I say (prov) it; if he (prov) it, then I lie; if he don't (prov) it, then he lies, and there's an end on t."

³
"O, sounds like (woo) oo in *Rome, do, shoe, cuckoe, *go, *hord, mushroom, undo, who, *whore." (Ruum) we have seen was heard in Shakspere's time, and may still occasionally be heard; (guu) is mentioned by Wallis in terms of disapproval; (nuurd) may be classed with (afuurd) afford; and mushroom has changed its spelling.

Price makes oo the long o, (oo), and oo generally "like woo" (uu), but "like u" (u) in good, wool, hood, wood, stood.

1685. Cooper pairs the vowels fall, folly, and fool, full. By the latter pair he could not have meant (fuui ful), or (fuuih fuhl). His (ful, ful, fuhl, fol) whichever way he pronounced it, contained the nearest vowel sound to (fool) that he was acquainted with (p. 84). He says:

"O formatur à labiis paululum contractis, dum spiritus orbiculatus emittur: ut in hope spea; productum semper, nisi in paucis que per oo (uu) sonantur; et ante l per ou (uu, ou) labiales: ut in bold audax) hoc modo pronunciat Angli, quem aliquando scribunt per oo; ut coach currus; correetus rarò auditur, nisi in paucis, que à consonante labiali incipiant; ut post w in wolf lupus, wonder mirum; & in syllaba sor; plura non memini: in quibusdam u hoc modo pronunciatur, ubi precedens vocalis est labialis; ut pull, vello, full plenus; non quia debet, sed quoniam aliter faciliius efferri nequit: Et oo in good bonus, hood cucullus, wood lignum; I stood steti; Galli per o ut globus globus, proteste protestor; in copy exemplar corrigitur. Germani per o, ut ostern pentecoste; quem in principio dictionum ferè producunt: in wort verbum; Gott Deus corrigitur."

Whence it appears that Cooper did not distinguish (u) from (o) or even (o). In fact he hardly knew the true short (u) for after describing oo he says "inter sonum correetum & productum minima datur differentia," and he pairs fool short, foot long, where the difference of length is solely due to the following consonant. As I have found it necessary to suppose that Cooper paired (ee, i), see p. 83, so here I presume he paired (oo, u), sounds which have nearly the same degree of diversity. This occasions a slight difficulty in his diphthong ou, which will have to be afterwards considered.

Cooper gives the following list of words in o, oo which have the sound of (uu), those marked * being unusual: *aboard, *afford, *behoves, *boar; *born carried, *force, *forces, move, *sword, *sworn, tomb, two, who, whom, where, whosoever, womb, *worn. The words *board, *forth, prove, stoup he says are also written boord, foorth, prove, stoop. In the following words he hears his short o = (u); blood-i-ly, good-ly-ness, flood.

1 Price's own notation, not palaeotype. As a Welshman he evidently called woo (uu), the same as oo.

2 This is boor, the animal, not boar as given afterwards by Jones.
hood, brotherhood, sisterhood, neighbourhood, falsehood, root, stood, wood, wool. The exceptions damosel, women (dam'zel, wim'en) are noted. After giving examples of oo as (oo), which are often written with o-e, he says, as cloak, cloke, he admits the sound of (a), as now usual, in abroad, broad, groat.

1686. Migeon agrees in the main with the former, but he hears long o as French o (oo), and the short o when it was (o) as the French short o also, that is either (o) or (o) while he says: “Il y a bien des mots ou l' o a un son mêlé de celui de l' a, et où sans scrupule on le peut sonner comme un a,” that is, he confused (a, o) or (a, A). Interpreting his signs by former explanations we find the following novelties. O is short = (o) in compounds of most, as hitherto. Borne = (boorn), born = (baarz); form a bench = (foorm), form a shape = (faarm); holy = (hooli), holy day = (hal'li). York, maggot, anchor, women = (jelk, meq'-et, en'ker, wim'en). Rome = (Ruam). On = ('n) in capon, mutton, lesson, reckon, reason, season, apron, citron, saffron, iron, fashion, cushion, puncheon.

1701. Jones confirms the others. The following is his list of long o sounded as (uu) afford, bomb, comb, Ford, ford, gamboge, gold, Monday, More, Rome, tomb, womb, in which most are unusual, and gold, Monday are noteworthy. The oo as (uu) are “aboard, boar a clown,” now written boor, “board.” The words doe, does, doest, doeth, shoe, woe, he likewise hears pronounced with (uu), although he also gives (dez) for does. He admits the sound of (o) for o in “the beginning” of colonel, colour, etc., comfort, company, etc., coney, conjure, etc., money, monkey, etc., monger, etc.; blomary, bombast, borage, bosom, botargo, brocado, chocolate, cognisance, colander, coral, coroner, cozen, Devon, dozen, forsooth, gormandise, gromel, London, onion, poltroon, pomado, poniard, porcelane, potato, recogniscance, sojourn, Somerset, stomach, tobacco; in final -come, -dom, -some, -son; in the last syllables of chibol, gambol, symbol. Even the unusual cases will be recognized as still occasionally heard, but they evidently bear the same relation to the present pronunciation with (o), as (griet, breet, tshieet) do to (greet, breek, tshieet). Both resulted from overdriving a new attenuative habit.

In the xvii th century then the change from (oo, o) into (oo, a) or (oo, o) was complete; a few more of the (oo) had advanced into (uu), more indeed than those which maintained their position, and those formerly heard as (u) or (u) had become (o), a change to be considered under U.
O, OO, OA — XVIII TH Century.

During the XVIII th century the change in the use of these letters as just described, was so slight that it will be quite unnecessary to enter into many particulars. It will be sufficient to note some examples, chiefly of exceptions to the general rule that o long and oa = (oo), o short = (ɔ) or (ʌ), and oo long and short = (uu, u), or of exceptions to the preceding exceptions to this rule.

1704. The Expert Orthographist gives oo in flood, blood the sound of (o), and in door, floor, moor, poor the sound of (oo). He also makes o = (uu) in *woif, wolves, Rome, comb, tomb, divorce, force, forge, form* to sit on, born endured, supported, forth abroad, port and its compounds *com, de, in, sup, trans-port, sport, thorn and torn, engross, Ghost, most, post, rost,* and o between w and r for the most part is sounded oo (uu) as word, work, world, worm, worry, worship, worse-st, worsted, worst, and worth; and in approve, behave, move, prove, remove, reprove; but like short u (ɔ) in dove, glove, love, cover, covet, groveling.” He admits oo to be a mode of lengthening o, but says “oa in abroad, broad, and groat, have a peculiar broad sound” without saying that it is the same as au (ʌ), and “oa sounds ai in goaf pronounced jail, (dzheel).”

1766. Buchanan writes London Lon’ën, won won, lot lot; dost dost, work work, worship worship, woman wom’in, women wim’in, wonder wan’dir, mouth mouth, money mën; son son; two’pence tap’ins, poolroom poltruuun, forth forth; globe gloob, robe roob, whole whool; who huu, do duu, tomb tuum, gold guuld, Rome Ruum; move muuv, one wëen, once wëns, only on’ï, come kem; soap soop, broad brood, oats oot; laath laath, great, greæt.

1768. Franklin has of av, bosom bozëm, compared kampeerd; other edhr-ër, government gëvernment, London Lon’den; only oon’ï, spoke spook, wrote root, some som, one wëen, once wëns, to too, in which will be found some uses different from Buchanan’s.

1780. Sheridan notes the Irishisms: (duur) door, (fluur) floor, (kuurs) both coarse and course, (strëw) strove, (drev) drove, (rod) rode, (strood) strode, (shoon) shone, (fist) foot, which he says were pronounced in England (door, floor, koors, stroov, droov, rood, strad, shan, fist). Most of these Irishisms are clearly, all of them are probably, as usual, remnants of the XVIII th century.
When \( y, i \) were consonants, they were employed like the modern \( y, j = (\ddot{s}, dzh) \), and were never interchanged in the old writers, although the sound of \( \ddot{s} \) was not usually considered a consonant, as will be noted under \( y, w \). When \( y, i \) were vowels they were used indiscriminately, except perhaps that \( I \) was always\(^1\) used as the personal pronoun, and was not employed at the end of any other word. For the present section they must be considered as identical.

**Table Shewing the Introduction of IE for E, EE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>beliefe</td>
<td>belieue</td>
<td>belieue</td>
<td>beleuennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>besiege</td>
<td>beisege</td>
<td>beare</td>
<td>beere</td>
<td>beere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bier</td>
<td>beere (bieere)</td>
<td>breese</td>
<td>breve</td>
<td>breve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brief</td>
<td>breife (breife)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cavalier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cashier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[field]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fend]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fierce]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[grieve]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerchief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lief]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pierce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[priest]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[shield]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sirese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IE was often used at the end of words where we now use \( y \). IE in the middle of words was employed in the xvth century indiscriminately with \( e \) or \( ee \), but not very frequently. In the xvth and xviith centuries it had fallen out of use, though we find it fully established with the modern sound of (ii) in the xviiith century, in which is included also the word *friend* as already noted (p. 80). The preceding table containing all Price's list and a few other words in brackets,

\(^1\) In MSS. \( y \) was not unfrequently used even for the personal pronoun in the xvth century and earlier.
will shew the corresponding spellings in the Promptorium 1440, Palsgrave 1530, and Levin 1570, and Minshew 1617; the spellings in parenthesis in Minshew’s column, are spellings which he recognizes and gives in cross references, but the other spellings are those under which he explains the words. It will be seen that Minshew’s book shews the exact period of the transition, when generally both spellings were sufficiently known to require notice, but one was decidedly preferred by the author, and that one was only occasionally *ie*. The French *niece, pièce, fier, siège* and occasionally *chief* may have influenced some words, but others, as *believe, bier, friend, field, lief, thief, yield*, seem to have no reason, either in sound or etymology, for this curious change of custom in spelling. For our present purpose, then, we may dismiss *ie*, considering it, in the middle of words, as a fanciful variation of *ee* and having precisely the same value (ii) towards the close of the xvth century, and, at the end of words as an archaism for *y*, having the same sound (i).1

There seems to have been only one sound of short *i* and, with rare exceptions, such as *machine*, only one sound of long *i*, during the xvth and subsequent centuries. At the present day, English short *i* or (i) is the *mide* sound of the Italian or European short *i* or (i). The fine sharp clear (i) is very difficult for an Englishman to pronounce, and although the Scotch can and do pronounce it,2 they not unfrequently replace it with (e) or (e), not (e). In this respect they resemble the Italians who have so frequently replaced Latin *i* by their *e chiuso* or (e). The Dutch may be said not to know (i), as they regularly replace it by (e). The English sound (i) lies between (i) and (e). The position of the tongue is the same as for (i), but the whole of the pharynx and back parts of the mouth are enlarged, making the sound deeper and obscurer. According to Mr. M. Bell there is the same distinction between (e) and (e), the latter being the wide form of the former, and he hears (e)

---

1 The word *pierce* seems to have retained the spelling *perse*, and the corresponding pronunciation to a later time. We still write *Percy*, and *Perce* is called (Pee) or (Psee) in America. In *Love’s Labour Lost*, Act iv. sc. 2, l. 85, 1523, Comedies p. 123, we find “Master Person, quasi Person? And if one should be persit, Which is the one?” which indicates the pronunciation (“Master Persion, kwo’sl’ Pers-oon?”). And if “oon” should be “perst,” which is the “oon”’?

2 Mr. Melville Bell says in a private letter, that the sound of the short “(i)” for *i* is very common, as in *give = (gi)*, gied, gien, gie’s [derivatives], whig, wig, big [to build], build, -er, built [often bolt] king-dom, wick, gig, gingham, widow, Britain, finish, whin, etc.” In such words the Englishman hears the long (ii). This is a point which will have to be considered hereafter. See especially the examples of Scotch pronunciation in Chap. XI. § 4.
in the French et, and English day, (dei, deel), and (e) in the Scotch ill, English ailment (el eeil-ment) and English air (eeæ), and also in my own pronunciation of the English ell, whereas he supposes the true sounds of English men, man to be (men, men) and to differ precisely as (i, i). My own pronunciation of man he finds frequently the same as his pronunciation of men, so that to him I pronounce men, man as (men, men). To me (e) is a much deeper sound than (e, e) and is heard in the French même, German spräche (meem', shpreekh'e). This discussion will serve to shew the nature of the difference (i, i), and the ease with which they may be confounded. Almost every Englishman pronounces French il as English ill (il), and almost every Frenchman pronounces English ill as French il (il), French tel, English eel being identically (ill). Now the true long sound of (i) is not an acknowledged sound in our language, although in frequent use among such singers as refuse so say happee, steal, eel, when they have to lengthen happy, still, ill. They say (haep'il, stil, ill) although some may prefer (still, ill) which has a bad effect. Where the long sound of (i) might be expected, we get the long i, to be presently noticed. Hence most of those who examined sounds, as Wallis, naturally paired (ii), whose short sound was absent, and (i) which was without a long sound, and probably did not hear the difference, though Sir Thomas Smith could find no short sound for (ii) in the English language. What we have to conclude from this is, that because ee long and i short are represented generally by the same character, with or without a mark of prolongation, by orthoepists, it by no means follows that they had the same sound. My own belief is that short i was (i) from the

---

1 This was remarked by Dr. Young, Lectures on Natural Philosophy. 4to. vol. ii. p. 277: "When ip is lengthened in singing it does not become leap." Observe the singing of "still so gently o'er me stealing," which becomes (still so dzheem'il, oor mill still-i'ic). Dryden's line, from his Feni Creator, "And make us temples worthy thee," is well adapted to render the difference of the vowels in (-dhi' dhiii) sensible.

2 The present writer should be the last to throw stones at those who do not hear the difference between (i, i) for in his Alphabet of Nature, 1845, p. 65, the first work on phonetics which he published, he objected to Knowles's assertion that (i) was an independent vowel sound, and absolutely paired (ii, i). This is by no means the only point in phonetics concerning which the experience of nearly a quarter of a century has enlightened him. He would, however, particularly notice the stopped vowels, which on p. 63 of that work, he found himself unable to separate from their consonants, as in (pet, pet, pat, pot, pat, pat), but which he has been in the habit of separating for many years.

3 See p. 122. Cooper, as we have seen (p. 83), forms an exception; he appears to pair (ee, i), and certainly does not pair (ii, i).
earliest times to the present day. Against this supposition must be placed the facts that, as already pointed out, short (i) is not at all unfrequent in Scotland, and was apparently recognized in English in 1701 by Jones, a Welshman, and 1766 by Buchanan, a Scotchman, and also that in Ireland final -y, which is in England (-i), is invariably (-i). The Irish English generally representing a xviith century English pronunciation, there is a possibility of (i) having been somewhat common in England during the end of the xviith and beginning of the xviiiith centuries, a period of English pronunciation remarkable for a tendency to thinness of sound. The true long vowel (ii) will come under consideration again in the next Chapter under I, Y, when the importance of the preceding discussion will more clearly appear.

As to long i in English at present, it is without doubt, a diphthong, and has been generally recognized as such from early times. But orthoepists are not agreed as to the nature of its first element, and this becomes an important consideration. The Italians and French only approach the sound of our long i very loosely, in the Italian words diaino, laido, zaino, and the French paiten, patience. These may be more properly written (daai'no, laai'do, tsaa'no; paii'zá, farii'as), so that in the Italian the first element, in the French the second element is lengthened. In Germany the sound written ei, ey, ai, ay is intended to be (ai), although these diphthongs are very variously pronounced. Rapp gives the literary high varieties (ai, ei, ei, ei) and Schmeller notices the Bavarian dialectic varieties (a, ai, ei, e, ei, ii). The different Scotch sounds of long i will be fully considered in Chapter IV. § 2, under I. In England we have only one recognized pronunciation of i long, but we have also two recognized sounds which may be heard in Isaiah, or in the usual English pronunciation of xelə, xaiə, and the distinction is, or used to be, strongly insisted on at Eton. The second of these sounds, the English pronunciation of the Greek αι, is (ai). What is the first? Knowles, following Sheridan, says it is (A), the only difference between i long and oy consisting in the brevity with which the first element is dwelt upon in the first sound. This is an Irishism no doubt, although he is closely followed by Haldeman, who makes

2 James Knowles, Pronouncing and Explanatory Dictionary of the English Language, founded on a correct development of the nature, the number, and the various properties of all its simple and compound sounds, as combined into syllables and words. London, 1847, 8vo.
3 Analytic Orthography, § 106, 400, and examples § 602, 610.
the first element \((a)\), and identifies English long \(i\) with the German \(e_i\), of which Schmeller makes the first element \((a)\). Mr. Melville Bell identifies the first element of his pronunciation of English long \(i\) with \((a)\). The first element of my pronunciation of the German \(ai\) he considers to be \((ah)\), a sound that I can only with difficulty distinguish from \((a)\), as I am apt to labialise \((a)\) in speaking. But in unaccented syllables he makes the first element of his pronunciation of long \(i\) to be \((ah)\). This was the element he recognized in my own pronunciation of this diphthong in all cases. Many Londoners certainly use \((ə)\) as the first element. Again, Wilkins and Franklin call the first element \((ə)\). And Smart making the first element \(ur\) without sounding the \(r\) must mean \((ə)\). The second element is of course the glide, and the last element (or second as it is usually called) is the vowel \((i)\) or \((i)\), very often the latter I believe in English. Mr. Bell only recognizes the glide, \(5c\) (see p. 15), that is, the glide to the \((i)\) position. According to the mode of writing diphthongs which I adopt I must give \((i)\) or \((i)\) as the final element, leaving the glide to be denoted by juxtaposition. Hence we have the following

**Analyses of English long I—**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheridan and Knowles</th>
<th>((ai))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haldeman</td>
<td>((ai))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker and Melville Bell</td>
<td>((ai)) accented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville Bell</td>
<td>((ahi)) unaccented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londoners</td>
<td>((ei))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
<td>((ei, ei, xi, ai, ai, ahi))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins and Franklin</td>
<td>((ai))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis and Smart</td>
<td>((oi))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now this being the sound of the personal pronoun, is heard every day and constantly; but after competent orthoepists have carefully examined it, they are unable to agree as to its analysis. One reason is of course a real difference of pronunciation, but another appears to be that the first element is pronounced with extreme brevity, so that in British speech it is not sufficiently heard as distinct from the following glide. In endeavouring therefore to fix it, different observers either begin far back in the scale of distinct vowels, or catch the sound closer and closer to \((i)\). Thus it may be that the whole series of sounds \((ə-əhəə-əhəəi)\) may be heard in this diphthong, all gliding into each other with immense rapidity. Again the first element being so indistinct, others, as Wilkins and Franklin, or Wallis and Smart, take refuge in one of the colourless sounds as \((ə, ə)\).
Now I hear the vowel (a) very clearly in (ai) as in the Etonian pronunciation of χαδος; but I cannot hear it in the Etonian pronunciation of χελο, nor do I hear an (e) there. I therefore prefer to represent the English i long, the Etonian pronunciation of Greek a by (oi), and the English aye, yes, the Etonian pronunciation of the Greek a by (ai). The preceding discussion will apply, as to the first element, to the present pronunciation of on in now, how, con.

We are now better prepared to understand what our authorities say on the subject. The first one is sufficiently perplexing.

1530. Palsgrave says: "I in the frenche tong hath ii. dyuere maners of soundynge, the soundynge of ϐ, which is most generally vsed in the frenche tong, is like as the Italians sounde i, and suche with vs as sounde the latin tong aright, which is almost as we sounde e in these words a bee a flie, a beere for a deed corps, a peere a felowe, a fee a rewarde, a little more soundynge towards i, as we sound i with vs."

Now du Guez says: "Ye shal pronounce . . . your i, as sharpe as can be," by which I understand, with the smallest lingual and pharyngal aperture, or as clearly (i) as possible. When Palsgrave says: "almost as we sounde e," etc., the almost is merely one of those safeguards which orthoepists love to insert, and can scarcely avoid inserting, when they give the equivalent for a foreign sound which they seem to hear in their own tongue, but doubt the correctness of their hearing. But what does he mean by "a little more soundynge towards i, as we sound i with vs"? A vowel cannot sound a little more towards a diphthong, and yet long i was certainly most generally recognized to be a diphthong in the xvi th century, although it is probable that Palsgrave may have had an older pronunciation, rather of the xv th than of the xvi th century. Could he mean that the sound seemed between (i) and (e)? It would be difficult to insert one. Could he mean that as he pronounced those English words the sound had a tinge of (e) in it as it were (ii), and that the French pronounced a clearer (i)? The matter becomes still more emigmatic as he goes on to say:

"If i be the first letter in a frenche worde or the laste, he shall in those two places be sounded lyke as we do this letter y, in these words with vs, by and by, a spy, a flye, avory, and suche other: in whiche places in those frenche bokes, as be diligently imprinted, they vse to write this letter y: but whether the frenche worde be written with i or y, in these two places he shall be sounded, as I have shewed here in this rule, as in ymage, conuertry, ydole, estourdy, in whiche the y hath suche sounde, as we wolde give him in our tong."
This sound, whatever it was, must be distinct from the other sound of \( i \). Now as Palsgrave noways describes the sound, or hints at its being a diphthong, we can do nothing but refer to Meigret 1550, who writes: "je vi, oi, aost, jey bati, je bati ou batis" with precisely the same sign as he uses in "Louis Meigret, Lioonez." Perhaps Palsgrave would rejoin: "true, but he was a Lyonnais; I give the Parisian pronunciation." In the mean time we are not assisted towards Palsgrave's own pronunciation of the English "by and by, a spy, a flye, awry." \(^1\) What follows is as perplexing:—

"For as moche as \( e \) and \( i \) come often together in the frenche tonge, where as the \( e \) hath with them his distinct sounde, and the \( i \) is sounded shortly & confessely, which is the proprrete of a diphthonge. I reken \( ei \) also among the diphthonges in the frenche tonge, whiche when they come together, shall have suche a sounde in frenche wordes, as we gyve hym in these wordes in our tong, a swyne, I dwyne, I twyne, so that these wordes agwyvler, agwyvillion, condvyle, dedvyle, avivdhey, mehhey, and all suche shall sounde theyr \( e \) and \( i \) shortly together, as we do in our tong in the words I have gyven example of, and nat ech of them distinctly by himselfe, as we of our tong be inclined to sound them, whiche wolde rather say avivdheuy, dedvyle, saufecondvyle, gyuyen both to \( e \) and \( i \) theyr distinct sounde, than to sounde them as the frenche men do in dede, which say avivdhey, dedvyle, saufecondvyle, soundyng them both shortly together, and so of all suche other."

It is a well-known modern English error to say (Iwii) for (Iyi) \( tud \). Palsgrave, whose ears cannot have been very acute, here seems to authorize a similar use. At the same time the conversion of \( y \) into a consonant as \( w \), is directly opposed to the previous direction to give \( y \) its "distinct sound," and pronounce \( i \) "confusely." But can Palsgrave have also meant that the second element in \( ui \) in the French words cited was the same as in swyne, dwayne, twyne? The \( y \) in the French words is not even final or initial. It could have had no sound but (ii) even according to Palsgrave. Did Palsgrave say (swiin, dwiin, twiin) or (swiin, dwiin, twiin)? It is the only legitimate inference, and there is no slight probability of its being correct. We shall see that Palsgrave pronounced \( ou \) as \( uu \), which was a xiv th century pronunciation continued archaically into the xvi th century, and although

\(^{1}\) It deserves however to be recorded that Gill writes (en-emoi), not (en-em), and has at least once (aim-adzhis), although on another occasion he writes (im-adzh) so that the former may be a misprint. The God save the king of James the First's time has: "O Lord our God arise, Scatter his enemies," giving (en-emaiz), if the rhyme is to be preserved, though in modern practice we sacrifice the rhyme and often sing (en-imaiz).
the recognized pronunciation at that time was (ou), yet the example of Bullokar (pp. 94, 98,) shews that there were still many who preferred the (uu) sound. In the same way perhaps both Palsgrave and Bullokar preserved the (ii) sound of long i, usual in the xiv th century, notwithstanding the general adoption of (ei). The new (ei, ou) and the old (ii, uu) stand precisely on the same ground, and therefore I am inclined to think that Palsgrave and Bullokar said (ii), as distinct from (ii). Further reference to this curious retention of an old sound will have to be made in the next chapter under I.

1547. Salesbury does not leave us in much doubt, for he writes (ei) for long i, thus:

I ei (ei), вне vein (vein), Wyne wein (wein); Duches deiysa (deitsa-viz); Thynne ddein (dhein); signes soins (seinz); Latin dico deiu ( dei-ku), Teth tebei (tea-bei), Dei Deei (Dee-i), qui quei (kwei).

At the same time he reprobates this pronunciation of Latin, and says:

"I in Welsh hath the mere pronunciation of i in Latine, as learned men in our time vse to sounde it, and not as they... with their Ioticisme corrupting the pronunciation make a diphthong of it, saying vei nei, tebeoi, for ei déi, tibi." "I in their language is equivalent to the following two letters in ours ei, but they are compressed so as to be pronounced in one sound or a diphthong, as in that word of theirs I, ei, (ei) ego." "Y ofen has the sound of the diphthong ei as thynne, ddein (dhein), teus; & its own sound as in the word thynne, thynn, (thin), gracilis."

That Salesbury's ei was different from his ai, and that he meant to indicate a different sound in such English words that have long i, from that in other words having ai in his transcription, is I think evident, because he never confounds the two sounds, and because in modern Welsh the sound ei sounds to me as (ei), and ai as (ai). I think, however, that his letters ei justify me in considering, or rather leave me no option but to consider that the English diphthong sounded (ei) to Salesbury.

As to the short i, he identifies it with Welsh y, considering the latter the especial sound. He also says that Welsh u "soundeth as the vulgar English people sound it in these worde of English, trust, bury, busy, Huberden." I think that he cannot point to any other sound but (i), supposing the true Welsh to be (y), a sound which Mr. Melville Bell hears in the unaccented syllables: the houses, (dhy nauzyz) as he would write the sounds. The difference between (i, y) is very slight indeed. In practice Salesbury is not very precise,
as may be seen by the following list of words in which short ı occurs, but his theory leads me to adopt (ı) as the true sound of English short ı in his time.¹

God be wyth you God biwio (God bi-wi-o), graciously grasilus (gra-as’i-us), condicyon condisyon (kon-di’s’un), twyncle twinkel (twiq’k’l), wyyncle wrinkel (wriq’k’l), ynges kings (kig’z), gelding gelding (geld’i-q); Gilberty, Gilberty (Gil’ber-t), gynger tsaintir (dzhin’dzhir), beggynge, begging (beg’i-q); holi, holy (hoo’i, ho’l); exhibition acsibisun (eksibis’i-un); prohibition, proboisun (pro-bo’is’un); lylx lylx (lil’i), lady ladi (lau’di); paper paper (pa’a’pir), nyght richt (rikht); thystile, thistle (ths’t’l); this ddis (dis); busz bust (biz’i); wynne wynn (win); thynne thynn (thin); knyxt knight (kniikt).

1568. Sir T. Smith says: “I Latina, quae per se prolata, apud nos tantum valet quantum Latinic, ego, aut oculus, aut etiam,” by which I understand that the three words I, eye, aye had the same sound, precisely as we are told by Shakespere, Romeo and Juliet, Act iii, Sc. 2, v. 45; (I quote from Steevens’ reprint of the quarto of 1609, which agrees in this passage with the folio of 1623; the lines do not occur in the quarto of 1597):

Hath Romeo slaine himselfe? say thou but I
And that bare vowell I shall poysen more
Then the death-darting eye of cockatrice,
I am not I, if there be such an I.

Here aye is spelled I, and thoroughly identified with it, as “that bare vowell I,” and with the suggested “eye of cockatrice” in the next line. Although Smith identifies these three words, he spells them differently, introducing ı as the sign for long ı, and pairing it with short ı. He thus deprives the Latin language of the sound of (ii), for he pronounced Latin e as (ee). Hence when he comes to the sound of (ii) in English, he exclaims in perplexity:

“Quid autem fict ubi sonus inventur quem neque Græci, neque Latini habuerunt, presertim cum omnes corum litteræ in similibus corum sonis fuerunt absuntæ? Ecce autem sonum Anglorum et Scotorum alium diversumque ab omnibus his,² qui nec ı (ee) nec ı (ei) reddid auribus, sed quoddam medium, et tamen simplex est, literaque debet dici: est autem semper forç longa.”

His examples are me, see, meet, deep, steep, feel, feet, sheep, queen, mean,³ seek, she, week, leek, beef, meese, bee apes,

¹ So far as I could hear, the Welsh dim was pronounced by several Welsh gentlemen precisely as the English dim, that is (dim), and they all objected to the pronunciation (dim).
² That is, not one of the sounds which he had already considered, and which were apparently (aa a, ee e, ei i, oo o, uu u, yy).
³ “Intelligere.” Qu. mim, vultus?
whence, through Salesbury and Palsgrave, we know that the
tound was (ii). Smith therefore recognized no short (i) in
English. The sound of his i short must therefore have been
different from (i), that is, as I believe (i), agreeing with
Salesbury.

Smith recognizes the two diphthongs (ei, ai) but finds
scarcely any difference between them, although he says that
”muliercula” pronounce (ei) for (ai). This will be con-
sidered under (ai), p. 122. In no case in which the or-
thography uses long i does Smith write ei, so that but for
his rather veiled identification of I with eye, we should have
had no clue to the sound intended.

1569. Hart says: “Out of all doubt, no nation of the foresside
but we and the Scottish, doe at any time sound i, in the aforesayde
sound of ei: wherefore that English Greek reader which shall give
the same sound to i which he doth to ei, doth further this errour
much amongst vs.”

He also writes (reid bei) for ride by. But he makes ee in
Greeks the long sound of i in in, that is (ii), and is thus not
so accurate as Smith, who distinguishes the sound as (ii).

1580 Bullokar calls long i a vowel, and does seem to know
that it has a different sound from short i. He says: “I,
hath two soundes, the one agreeing to his olde & continued
name, and is then a vowel, the other sounde agreeing to the
olde name of g, and of my g’ (dzh), and is then a consonant.”
He gives as examples: “I ly in my sisterz kitchen with a
pillo’w besyd her peticôt, and thy whyt pilion,” where
the accent denotes length, and o’w means (u). What “the old
and continued name” is, he does not write. He has no other
distinction between long and short i but this accent, and
never even hints at the possibility of their having two sounds.
He uses the accent to indicate the long a, e, y, o only, and
has a new sign e’ for (ii), on which he says, and it is the only
cue I can find:

“e hath two soundes, and vowels both, the one flat, agreeing to
his olde and continued name: and the other sounde more sharpe and
betwene the old sound of the old name of :e: and the name of :i:
for such difference the best writers did use :ea: for :e: flat and long:
& ea, ee, ie, eo for :e: sharpe.”

This “flat e,” was undoubtedly (ee), and the “sharpe e”
was (ii). The “old name of e” is therefore (ee), and the
“sharp” sound of e, or (ii) is said to lie between (ee) and
the name of i, that is, its long sound, whatever that may be.
Now we have seen that Smith says that (ii) is “quoddam
medium,” between (ee) and (ei), so that we need not expect
more precision in Bullokar, and although it is really nonsense to say that (ii) lies between (ee) and (ei), since (ei) is compounded of (ee) and (ii), yet as Smith actually said so, Bullokar may have meant the same. But Bullokar constantly neglects to write the acute accent, his sign of prolongation, over i. Thus he has _cyntrix_, _cyntrix_ in successive lines. Again he always writes _wryth_ = _written_ with a long y, and it would be difficult to believe that even a pedantic theorist ever said (ruet'n). Gill writes _writ'n_. If however we suppose that Bullokar, as well as Palsgrave, pronounced long i as (ii) and short i as (i), all difficulty arising from this source would disappear. And although the statement that (ii) lies between (ee) and (ii) is not so correct as that (ii) lies between (ee) and (ii), yet it is not at all extravagant for a phonetist of that time. If, as will appear in the next chapter, (ii, uu) were probably the xivth century pronunciations of long i and ou, then the retention of (ii) by Bullokar and Palsgrave will be precisely parallel to their undoubted retention of (uu), and would have precisely the same archaic effect in the midst of the general (ei, ou) as (oblidzh', griit, briik) have at the present day amidst the usual (oblidzh', greet, breek). The whole subject will be properly discussed in the next chapter, and in the mean time the only legitimate inference from Bullokar's notation and practice seems to be that he pronounced long i as (ii).

1621. Gill uses also a simple sign for long i, namely j. He says:

"Differentia significat (quoed fieri potest, & sonus permittit) orthographi discriminatur. Sic _j_. ego. _ei_ oculus, _ei_ ita."—"Nec _s_, _sēpius preponitur_, i, _dicitus enim hēi_ (neei), _adhortantes aut laudantes, & _e_ (ei) _ey_ oculus, _ei_ (cei) etiam, _ita_ : _vbi tamen sonus vocalis, exiguum distat ab illo qui auditur in _ejn_ tuus, & _mjn_ meus."—"Communis dialectus aliquando est ambiguus. Audies enim _ei_, aut _ei_ (dhai, dhei) _they_, _illī_."—"_I_, est tenuis, aut _crassa_: _tenuis est breuis, aut longa_: _breuis sic notatur i, vt in _sin_ sinne peccatum_: longa sic i. _vt in _sin_ senne visus_, a, _um_: _crassa autem fere est diphthongus _ei_; _sed quia sono exillior paulo quam si diffunderemur in _e_, retinebimus antiquum illum et masculinum sonum ... eunque signabimus hoc charactere j. _vt in _jen_ signe_ signum. Omnia differentia est in _win_ winne vinco, _win_ _weone_ opinor, _wejn_ _wyne_ vinum."

The meaning of these passages is not very clear, and they have occasioned me considerable difficulty, as I felt it important to determine the precise signification of Gill's symbols. It is clear that his j was little, if at all, different from (ei), and that this difference consisted mainly in dwelling more upon
the (e) sound in the diphthong which he writes (ei) than in that which he writes j; this is the only sense I can attach to the expression that the sound of j "fere est diphthongus ei, sed sono exilior quam si diffunderemur in e," as it were, than if we were diffuse over the e. The distinction is then precisely similar to that which Sheridan and Knowles make between modern I, oy, where they suppose the first element in each case to be (a), but to be instantly lost in I, and retained long enough to be distinctly heard in oy, (p. 107). We seem to have only to change (a) into (e) to obtain Gill's distinction between I, eye. Gill frequently interchanges (ai, aei) and does not seem to be very particular about the distinction between (ei, eei), but he appears to have always attached great importance to the first element in (ei) and (ai). He says of diphthongs generally:

"Nec tamen in omnium diphthongorum elatione, utrique vocali sonus integer ubique constabit. Etenim vocalis precedens sepe-numero acutius sonare videtur, & clarit; in ai et ei, ita aures implere, ut .i. subiungi aequius esset, quam ad latus adhaerere,"

alluding evidently to the Greek forms ο, π. The conclusion would appear to be that Gill's j, ei, ai were more properly ('ei, e'i, a'i) where the apostrophe indicates for the moment the extremely unaccented or unimportant character of the element to which it is prefixed. For this we might write (ei, eei, aai) if Gill did not occasionally distinguish between (ei, ai) and (eei, aai). We must not forget however that Gill blames Hart for writing ei in place of I, where Gill prints I meaning, probably, j. In this case his j would appear to be considerably different from his (ei).

Another hypothesis is possible. We shall see that at the time of Wallis, 1653, (ei) was a common form of long i. It is possible that this was one of the xvii th century pronunciations which Gill adopted, and hence his j, ei, ai may mean (ei, ei, ai), and as this is the most convenient distinction which I can draw between the sounds, and also agrees in making j but slightly different, and yet decidedly different, from (ei), I shall adopt it in transcribing Gill.

But for the xvi th century generally, the positive assertion of Salesbury that long i was (ei), and the identification of the sounds of I, eye, aye by Smith, leave me no choice but to use (ei) for long i. Shakspere was born the same year as Gill, yet as he did not live so long into the xvii th century, he may have used the same pronunciation as Smith and Salesbury. Certainly his I, eye, aye must have had the same sound (p. 112). But perhaps long i was also often
called (ai) as it still is, and as it probably was in the xivth century.

If the hypothesis here adopted for the pronunciations of long i by Palsgrave and Bullokar; Salesbury, Smith and Hart; and Gill, namely (ii, ei, ai) be correct, we have the phenomenon of the coexistence of two extreme sounds (ii, oi) with their link (ei), during the greater part of the xviith century, bringing the pronunciation of the xivth and xviiith centuries almost together upon one point. A curious example of the present coexistence of similar sounds in the various Scotch dialects will be given in the next chapter.

The short sound of i, I take to be (i) and not (i), notwithstanding that Gill and subsequent writers consider (ii) to have been its long sound. This conclusion rests principally on the authority of Smith and Salesbury.

Y, I, IE — xviiith Century.

Price's list of words in ie = (ii) has already been given, (p. 104.) and no further notice of this combination in the xviiith century is required.

1640. Ben Jonson, like Bullokar, entirely ignores the diphthongal character of long i. His description answers to (i) or (ii), but certainly not to the diphthongs (ei, ai), one of which he most probably uttered for his i. He says:

"I, is of a narrower sound then e, and uttered with lesse opening of the mouth; the tongue brought backe to the palate, and striking the teeth next the cheeks-teeth. It is a Letter of a double power. As a Vowell in the former, or single Syllabes, it hath sometimes the sharpe accent; as in binding, minding, pining, whining, wiving, thriving, mine, thine. Or, all words of one Syllabe qualified by e. But, the flat in more, as in these, bill, bitter, giddy, little, incident, and the like ...... In Syllabes, and words compos'd of the same Elements, it varieth the sound, now sharpe, now flat; as in give, give, alive, live, drive, driven. title, title. But these, use of speaking, and acquaintance in reading, will teach, rather then rule."

1653. Wallis says: "I vocalis quoties brevis est sonatur plumque (ut apud Gallos aliosque) exili sono. Ut in bit morus, will volo, still semper, wit lucro, pin acicula, sin peccatum, fill imploeo. At quocies longa est plumque profertur ut Græcorum et. Ut bite mordeo, wit stratagem, stile stilius, witne vinum, pitha tabe consumor, etc., codem fere modo quo Gallorum at in vocibus main manus, pain panis, etc. nempe sonum habet compositor ex Gallo- rum e foeminino et i vel y."

This should be (oi), or (oei), or (owi), the difference being slight, and all so like (ei) that we may take that as the sound,
especially as Wilkins adopts this form. Wallis also admits this sound in the first element of boil, toil, oil, boil globus, owl, which he pronounces (beil, toil, oil, boul, sul). In another place he says that long i is "idem omnino sonus cum Graecorum et."

1668. Wilkins gives distinctly "(si) our English i in bite," the first element being identified with u in "but, full, butt-on, pull, rudd-er," which is meant for (ə), as it is stated to be wholly guttural, and to be represented by y in Welsh.

1668. Price merely talks of long and short i.

1669. Holder says: "Our vulgar i as in stile, seems to be such a diphthong (or rather syllable or part of a syllable) composed of a, i or e, i (ai, ei), and not a simple original vowel."

1665. Cooper says: "U in Cut et i (ai), diphongum facillimum constituunt, quam i longum vocamus; ut wine, vinum, hoc modo pronunciatur ante nd finales; ut blind cecus, wind ventus: at pin'd pro pinned acicula subnexus; a verbo to pin; brevis est; pinned marcidus; a to pine marceo; diphongus est. Scribitur per us in beguile fallo; disguise dissimulo; guide dux; guidon Imperatoris baeclus: per oi in in-join in-jungo, joint junctura; jointure dos, broil torreo, ointment unguentum.”

1688. Miege says: "L’autre i a un Son particulier, et qu’on ne saurait mieux vous représenter par la plume que par ces deux Voyelles at; comme dans les mots I, pride, crime. Il est vrai que ce Son paroit d’abord un peu rude et grossier; mais les Anglois lui donnent un certain Adoucissement, dont les Etrangers se rendent bien tôt capable. Cet Adoucissement consiste, en partie, à ne faire qu’un Son d’at, en sorte que ces deux Voyelles ne sont pas tout-à-fait distinctement prononcées.” This expression seems to point to that extreme brevity of the first element which still prevails, and makes the analysis of this English sound so difficult. It must be also remembered that there is nothing approaching the compactness of English diphthongs in French, where a looseness prevails similar to that in our oy.

1701. Jones says in one place that the sound of short u (ə) is written o before i in boil, coil, coin,foil, moil, &c., and in another place that the sound of i is written oi in those words. It follows that he analyzed long i into (si).

It appears therefore that the long i of the xvii th century was the same as at present, and hence it must have been so during the xviii th century, and indeed Franklin, 1768, writes (si), and Sheridan, 1780 analyzes long i into (ai) with very short (ə), (p. 107.), and Walker into (əi) or (ai).
EI, AI — XVI TH CENTURY.

1530. Palsgrave says: "EI vniversally through out all the frenche tong shalbe sounded like as he is with vs in these worde, obey, a sley, a grey, that is to say, the e shall have his distinct sounde, and the i to be sounded shortly and confusedly, as conseil, suermel, and so of all suche other."

"Ai in the frenche tong is sounded lyke as we sounde ay in these worde in our tong rayne, payne,ayne, disayne, that is to say, a, distinctly and the i shortly & confusedly."

The forms ey, ay, are mere varieties of ei, ai, and need not be separately considered. Palsgrave’s words ought to imply that the English and French ei, ai, were pronounced (ei, ai) or else (eæ, aæ). This is very different from the present pronunciation in English, where they are generally (ii, ee), or in French, where they are generally (ee, ee); hence some confirmation is required.

Menestrelt says: “Considerons si aî, se treune tousjours raysonnablement escrit, de sorte que les deux voyoys soient en la prononciation comme nous les voyons en aymant, aydant, hair. Il n’y a point de doube qu’en mais, maistre, aise, vous ny trouuerez aucunes nouuelles de la diphongue ay, mais tant seulement d’vn e qui s’appelle ô ouvert, comme il l’ay dit. Parquoy telle maniere d’escriture est vicieuse en ceu xà, et en tous autres semblables, es quelz la prononciation est autre que d’ai: comme vous pourrez cognoistre si vous les paragonnez a aydant, aymant, es quelz elle est veritablement prononcee. Je treune d’auantage que nous faisons bien souuent vsurper à la diphongue ai la puissance de ei, comme en ces vocables saingnt, main, maintenier: es quelz sans point de doube nous prononçons la diphongue ei tout ainsi qu’en ceint, ceinture, peindre, peinture, meine, emmeine. De sorte que si tu te ioues de vouloir prononcer aî en ceux là, tu seras troué lourd, et de mauuais grace, et auec aussi bonne rayson c’est le meun peuple de Paris quant il prononce ‘main, pain’ par aî."

Again in his phonetic grammar, he says—

"En commencast donc a celles qui ont a en tête, nous em ansone vn en ai ou ay (car je ne fes point de different, entre l i e y Grec) comme payant gajant [gayan] ayant .... Or commenç en nostre langue la diphongne, en par e ouvert, succeder a celle d’ai en aucuns vocables: tellement quen nou n’oyons plus dire aeymer, si souuent q’aymer. Ao regard d’amé, e amez dont no’ lettres de comissions sont pleines, l’uzage de l eloquence Francoëze les a ja de si long vrais casset, que ie ne pense pas qu’il se puisse aoiourduhuy trouver home qui les aye vu jamaz en auctorité, pour etre commune-ment prononcez d’un bon courtizant."

These extracts establish a French diphthong (ei, ei), it is impossible to say which; and also a French diphthong (ai) or (aæ), entirely different from the former, but gliding into
it, so that the pronunciation was then beginning to change, and that in several words as *mais, maistre* the diphthong (*ai*) had become the simple vowel (*ee*).\(^1\)

1547. Salesbury in no place gives an English word which he spells with *ei*, *ey*, but as he explains the word *wayne* by the Welsh *guythen ne voc*, i.e. *vene vel vannis*, it must be held to include both the words *vein* and *vain*. He pronounces them both *vain* (*vain*), and hence makes no difference between *ei* and *ai*. But he distinguishes both from long *i*, as he had immediately before written *vynne*, *vein* (*vein*), vitis. The following are all Salesbury's words containing *ai* with their pronunciation; he has no special observations on the combination. Quayle has no pronunciation assigned; *nayle* *nayl* (*nail*) unguis vel clavus, *nayles* *nayls* (*nails*) *rayle* *rayls* (*rail*) *cancellus*, *rayles* *rayls* (*rails*), *vayne* *vain* (*vain*)

\(^1\) The work of M. Livet, described on p. 33, enables us to confirm this view by the very objection which G. des Autels opposed to it, "Aussi triumphes-tu de dire," said he to Meigret, according to p. 129 of M. Livet's book, "que les diphongues gardent toujours en une syllabe le propre et entier son de deux voyelles conjointes; et sont encore plus gaillardes que des exemples de *payant* et *royal* ... Je te dy donc qu'il n'y a point de diphongue en ces mots *payant*, *payant*, *royal* et *loyal*, mais seulement une contraction, qui encore ne se fait là où tu prends la diphongue, mais en la syllabe suivante, car en *ayant*, *a* est une syllabe et *ayant* une autre par contraction de deux." On which M. Livet remarks: "Ce passage montre assez la prononciation de *ayant*, *payant*, qui s'est conservée dans le centre de la France et en Anjou. En Picardie, on dit *gawe* pour *goële* (d'abus de *goële*), et le colosse d'osier qu'on promène dans les rues de Douai sous le nom de *Gayan*, à l'époque de la Ducasse, n'est autre que le *Giant*, pris absolument. Cf. Escalier. *Remarques sur le patois*, t. vol. in-8, 1856, p. 22." And Pierre Ramus (Livet p. 205) gives for *ai* the examples, (in his orthography, using *e* for his broad and mute *e* respectively) "paignant, guiant, sidant," and for *ei*, "minde, prende, craindre, paine, fontaina," where the two last words have no suspicion of a nasal vowel. On *payer* in the xvth century, see supra, p. 76. There is a fight between Meigret and his opponents respecting the mute *e*. Meigret only admits his *e* (*e* or *o*?) long and short, and identifies what G. des Autels, Pelletier, Ramus, and others, according to Livet's language, call the 'mute e,' with his 'short e' (*o*). Livet (p. 133) concludes: "d'une part que les différents sons de l'e étaient alors ce qu'ils sont maintenant, et d'autre part qu'on ne s'entendait pas sur la manière de les noter ou de les nommer." But my German experience leads me to a different conclusion. In the words *eine gute Gabe*, the final *e* is pronounced in the greater part of Germany very securely and more like (*o*), as most Englishmen pronounce their final *a* in *china*, *tides*, and some their final -er in *gaiter* (which word they then speak like a common mid-German mispronunciation of *Goethe*), than like (*o*). Yet theoretically (*o*) is held to be the sound uttered, and in some parts of the Austrian dominions I have heard this distinct short final (*o*), which of course had an unpleasant effect on my unaccustomed ears. Now it is quite possible that Meigret may have, as an older and provincial man, retained the clear (*a*), that his younger opponents may have used the obscurer (*o*), which in course of time sank to the present (*o*) or entirely disappeared. This theory at least accounts for the conflict of opinion, the decided retention of the final *e* in the phonetic writing of Pelletier and Ramus as well as of Meigret, and hence its continued use in the poetry of the xvii th century which set the rule for French versification.
vena vel vanus. But it is to be observed that he pronounces
ORANGES oreintys (or-eindzhiz), and that he says that before
gs, sh, tch the sound of "a is thought to decline toward the
sound of the dipthong ai, and the words" domage, heritage,
language, ashe, lashe, watch are "to be read in thys wyse,
domaige, heritéage, langaige; aíshe, wáitche." We have very
little trace of this custom left. The unaccented syllables are
apt to be pronounced with (i) or perhaps (y), as (or-eindzhiz)
dem'ídzh, her'ídzh, leq'gwådzh, but ash, watch have be-
come (eesh, wætsh), instead of (eesh, weetsh) as might have
been expected. Salesbury therefore only recognizes the
diphthong (ai) and does not acknowledge a diphthong (ei)
as distinct from the representations of long i. Yet long
i, ei, ai have in subsequent times traversed with different
velocities three distinct paths ending in (ei, ii, ee) respectively.

1668. Sir T. Smith says: "Inter Ai & Ei diphthongos minima
differentia est, præsertim apud nostræs, apud nos tamen audiuntur
hi soni. (Fein) fingere, (deinti) delicatus, (peint) pingere, (feint)
languidus. Sed non hæc tantum verba per ei pronuntiantur, sed
cetera omnia per ai scripta mulieræque quædam delicatæs, et non-
nulli qui volunt isto modo videri loqui vrbanius per ei (ei, eei) sonant,

1 Compare Palsgrave: "Also all
words in the frenche tong which in
writtyng ende in ages shall in redyn
g and spekynge sounde an i between a and
g, as though that a were this diphthong
ai: as for langage, heritage, edge, dam-
edge, bocedge, apprenitissage, they
sounde langaige, heritage, saige, dam-
maige, bocmaige, apprenitissage, and so
of all suche lyke excepte rage. And
note that many tymes I fynde suche
nownes which have the i in writting
between the a and g, but, whether he be
written or nat, in redyn or spekynge he
shaibe sounded, according as I have
here shewyd by example." M. Ed. Le
Hériche (Histoire et Glossaire du
Normand, de l'Anglais, et de la langue
Française, d'après la méthode histo-
rique naturelle et étymologique, 1862,
vol. 1, p. 24) entirely misunderstands
this passage, when he says: "C'était
une règle du français, formulée d'ail-
leurs par Palsgrave dans ses Eclair-
cissemens de la langue française, que la
première lettre de l'Alphabet se pro-
nonçait A et Ai." That M. Le Hér-
cher means that Palsgrave asserted
French A to be (a) or (α), and that
generally, instead of generally (a), but
(ai) in a very limited class of words,
appears by his next remark: "Ce der-
nier son prévaut en anglais: il était
aussi précédant en normand." The
very few examples which he cites for
such an extraordinary assertion as the
last, are far from establishing the fact.
They are an assertion by Thierry that
Grainville was pronounced Grainville
by the Normans: that in a MS. of the
xiv th century at Avranches faire des-
clare rhyme, whereas they may be only
an assonance as in modern Spanish: that
in the xvth century a Caen farce
has consecutive lines ending in unego
grieos plaioe, and that airs, saige, etc.
were finally written and printed, so
that a sea song of Ol. Baselin has a
set of rhymes in -aigs, the termination
pointed out by Palsgrave. "C'est
cette prononciation de l'A qui fait une
des principales différences entre la
langue des troubadours et celle des
trouvères." This assertion must be
received with due caution. Mr. W.
Babington has kindly made inquiries
for me of inhabitants of various depart-
ments in Normandy, and none were
acquainted with an existing pronuncia-
tion of a as ai in any part of the country.
Hence it must be very limited in ex-
tent, and probably comparable to the
cases mentioned above p. 76.
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vt haec ipsa quae nos per ei (ei) scribimus, alij sonant et pronuntiant per ai, tam dδδθφοροι sumus in his duntaxat duabus dipthongis Angli."

11 Est dipthongus omnis sonus è duabus vocalibus conflatus ut: AI, (pai) solvere, (daia) dies, (wai) via, (maia) possum, (laia) ponere, (sai) dicere, (esai) tentare, (taial) cauda, (fail) deficiere, (faiai) libens ac volens, (pain) poena, (disdain) dignor, (claim) vendico, (plai) ludere, (arai) vestire seu ornare. In his est utraque litera brevis apud vulgarium pronunciante. Rustici utranque aut extremo saltem literam longam sonantes, pinguem quendam odiosum, et nimirum adipatum sonum reddunt. (Psai) solvere, (daai) dies, (waai) via, (maai) possum, (laai) ponere. Sicut qui valde delicet voces has pronuntiant, multerculae praesertim, explicant plane Romanam diphthongum ae. AE diphthongus Latinae. Pae solvere, dae dies, wae via, maes possum, laes ponere 77 = (pee, dee, wee, mee, lee) I suppose, since the Latin ae had long been pronounced (ee), as we know, among other reasons from the frequency with which it is written e in works before this time. 11 Scoti et Transtrentani quidam Angli voces has per imprropriam diphthongum Greca e proferunt ut nec i nec e nimi obscurissimæ audiatur. A diphthongus imprroprie Greca (pae, 4 dae, wae, maia, laa)."

Again, in his De recta et emendata linguae Graecae pronuntiatione ... ad Vintioniensem Episcopum Epistola, Paris, 1568: "Diphthongi quo modo sonantur dicere in promptu est: Nam si duas vocales recte prius extuleris, & casdem coniunxeris, diphthongum habes, hoc est sonum quendam duplicem ex duobus commixtis inter se factum. Vt si nesciam mulsum quid sit, & audiam ex aqua & melle factum esse, potero fortissim commisceendo tale quid efficer, mel vt sentiatur & aqua ne dispararet. Aut si talem colorem habuisse veteres, quales viridem appellant, & hunc ex fluo luteo et ceruleo fuisse constectum, potero credo commiscendo videre, cuiusmodi sit illud quod imitari cupiam, vt nec alterum ab altero colorem prorsus extinctum & obliteratum reliquam, & tamen utranque pariter in tertio conspici ac relucere faciam. Sed, diphthongi quo modo sonant debent, quivis etiam ex triuo puer qui litteras didicere explicabit. Heus tu dic sodis, a & i quid faciunt? dicit certe ai, ai. Si p praeponas, facit pai, παι, solue. sin m, mai, μαι, Maius mensis: sin ω, wai, obal, via; neque nunc pa i dicit, nec ma i, sed pai & mai, vt constituere diphthongos non dissolure videatur. Idem dicendum puto & de ei, quod nos exprimus cum hinnire, hoc est ney dicimus: & fœmine quedam delicatores cuncta feré que per ay dicuntur per ei exprimunt: vt wey, dey, pei, vt eadem Eurozoxones populares mei rusticiores, nimirae pingui et adipato sono, way, day, pay: vt etiam tinnitum illud i redat in fine. Scoti & Borei quidem Angli per a, vix vt illud i audiatur, pa, da, wa, aut

1 In one case (faiai) he has marked the vowel as long; perhaps a misprint.
2 Meaning the first element?
3 An orthoepical safeguard. In his examples he shews that the sound was not heard at all. The present sound is (aa'), see chapter XI.
4 Pay is now called (pae) in Norfolk.
potius per ae proferunt. Illud observandum ne nimis videamur
obèsè loqui propter exilissime litere prope latissimæ ex breuius
nimium tinnientias sumon, cum ai & oi dictionem finiant, breuter &
correctæ proferendas esse: quod Graci Grammatici notarunt, ne
aliaqui crassum illum & apidatum sumon rusticorum nostratum
imitemur, qui cum a gay, boy, ore pleno literis diductis in immen-
sum dicunt, nimis profectò inurbanè loqui ab elegantionibus in-
dicemur.”

It would seem that Smith’s (ei) were precisely the same as
his long i, and that as a general rule, I, eye, aye were pro-
nounced alike. Yet the two sounds (ei, ai) were recognized
also as different, and (ei) was considered to be a dainty
effeminate pronunciation of (ai), which when urged to excess,
through (eeii), merged into (ee), but of this mincing sound he
decidedly disapproved. This change makes it probable that
eye and therefore long i was rather pronounced (ei) than (ai),
because although (ei) could easily become (eeii) and thence
(ee), the course from (ai) to (ee) does not seem so straight.
The sound of (ai) has not yet disappeared in our provinces.
I have frequently heard (daii, waii) or even (daai, waaii) used
by rustics. Smith seems decidedly to disapprove of this
lengthening of the first vowel, which however is not un-
common in Gill.

1569. HART in the very next year after Smith had repro-
bated the use of (ee) for (ai), published his treatise, in which
he invariably uses (ee), and does not even give (ai) in his
enumeration of diphthongs. In his French Lord’s Prayer
he transcribes faité as (feetan), which agrees with Meigret’s
(féesthe). It was Hart’s English use of (ee) for (ai) that
especially excited the ire of Dr. Gill.

“Ille,” says Dr. Gill speaking of Hart, “præterquam quod
nonnullas literas ad vsum pernecessarias omisit, seremonem nostrum
characteribus suis non sequi, sed ducere meditabatur. Multa
omitted. Neque enim bene facta malignè Detrectare, meum est:
tamen hæc paucula adnoto, ne me homini probo falsum crimenes
affixisse putes. Emendato nostro charactere vtrumque leges, quia
de sono tantum certamen est.¹ Sic igitur ille, folio 66, b.
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¹ For the same reason, and also for
greater ease to the reader, Gill’s sym-
boles are here replaced by palaeotype.
² Gill has here mistaken Hart’s sign
which was meant for (yyz), as will be
shown under U below.
The withering character of this denunciation will be well understood by referring to the passage quoted above, p. 91, where he reproaches the “Mopseys” with saying (meedz, plee) for (maidz, plai), although Gill himself writes (reseev’, deesev’) in place of (reseiv’, deseiv’), receive, deceive, which is a change in the same direction. After this expression of opinion by Dr. Gill it is impossible to accept Hart’s pronunciation as that generally used in his time, though it is evidence of an existing pronunciation, then only patronized by a few, but becoming ultimately dominant.

1580. Bullokar says: “that there be seuen diphthongs of seuerall notes in voice, and differing from the notes of euerly of the eight vowels aforesaid,’ may appeare by the wordes following—

a hay or net: in Latine, Plaga, Italian, Reto da pig’iar animali salvatichi, French, Bouroetts a chasseer.

hey: in Latine, fanum, Italian, Pieno, French, Du foin.

a boy: in Latine, Puor, Italian, Garzane, French, Garson.

a boy4 that is fastened to an anker with a rope to weigh the anker:

in Italian, Amenaria.

a ha, u,3 in the eie: in Latine, Vnguis, French, Paille.

’tow he, u smaller: in Latine, Concidere, Italian, Tagliare minutamente, French, Hacher menu.

a bow: in Latine, Arou, Italian, Arco da saetture, French, Arc.”

These diphthongs I read (ai, ei, oi, uui, au, eu, ou) of which the two last will be elsewhere considered, and (uui) is only a variety of (oi). Bullokar consistently uses (ei, ai) for ei, ai, thus (dhei konseiv’) would be quite distinct from (dhai konsaiv’) which the modern English ear hears as (dhai konsaiv’).4

1621. Gill distinguishes (ei, eei, ai, sai), but he is not very certain in the use of (ai, sai). I find the following words in Gill’s phonetic transcriptions.

ei (ei) eye, (eiz) eyes, (either) either, (vallez)4 valleys,—(reseev’) receive, (deesev’, deeseev’) deceive.—(dheei) they, (dheer) their, (reecineth) reigneth.

1 See p. 64.

3 The a is in Bullokar a new letter made by the union of the two oo.

4 The comma before a and inverted apostrophe before t are printed under the letters in Bullokar, to indicate, first that a has the sound (u) or (u), and secondly that ,t is the preposition.

4 Palmeira Square at Brighton is always called (Palmairora), and thus confused with Palmyra, the original Portuguese (Palmeira) not being understood. Few English observe the peculiar Scotch (ei) for (oi). They at most take it for a Scotch way of saying (ai), but recognize the latter diphthong.

5 It is not to be supposed that (vallez) was meant, and not (vallez), but in transcribing, I have thought it best to give Gill’s own forms, however careless and irregular they may be at times. Corrections must be always theoretical.
1623. BUTLER says (using the common orthography):

"The right sound of ai, au, ei, eu, oi, ou; is the mixed sound of the two vowels, whereof they are made: as (bait, vaut, nei, neu, koi, kou): no otherwise than it is in the Greek."

This might lead to (ai, AA, oi, eu, oi, ou), but it is impossible to say exactly how Butler pronounced Greek av, et. Sir T. Smith's pronunciation of the Greek diphthongs ai, ei, oi, av, eu, eu, ou, ou seems to have been decidedly (ai, ei, oi, au, eu, eeu, ou, ou, wi wei).

"But ai in imitation of the French, is sometime corruptly sounded like o: as in may, nay, play, pray, say, stay, fray, sly: specially in words originally French, as in pay, bai, travail: though plaint have lost his natural orthography, and we write as we speak plead (pleed)."

This implies that though some speakers insisted on preserving (ai) in these words, (ee) was the most general pronunciation—which may seem a curious interpretation of "sometimes corruptly," but allowance must be made for the mode in which orthoepists speak of common pronunciations which differ from their own, or from what they recommend,—by no means always the same thing.

1653. WALLIS tells us that ei, ey, were (ei) or even simply (ee) without the (i), but adds "Nonnulli tamen plenius efferunt, acsi per ai scripta essent." The diphthong ai he upholds still as a diphthong, "Ai vel ay sonum exprimunt compositum ex á Anglico (hoc est, exili) correpito, et y. Ut in voces day dies, praise laus," which, if our interpretation of Wallis's á be correct is (dæi, præiz) very slightly different from (dæei, præeiz) and readily passing into (dæi, præiz) which is almost the sound of the present day. But the real transition was into (xe, ee), as we shall learn from Cooper.

1668. WILKINS writes, (dæi) day, (dæil) daily, (against) against, (saints) saints, preserving the diphthong like Wallis, but has (kanseevd) conceived, dropping the (i) entirely.

1668. PRICE in the same year apparently agrees with the other two. He divides diphthongs, or, as he spells the word, "dipthongs," into two classes, proper and improper:

"That is a proper diphthong wherein both vowels keep their sound. There are twelve proper diphthongs, ay ey oy, ai ei, oi, au ew ow, au eu ou,“
which practically reduce to six, ai ei oi, au eu ou, and as we know that in oi both vowels kept their sounds, we should conclude that the vowels in the other two diphthongs did so too.

"That is an improper diphthong that loseth the sound of one vowel. There are eight improper diphthongs, ea ee ie eo, ea oo ui, ou obscure as in cousin."

Then, after giving a list of words in ai, comes the question, "Doth a-i always keep its sound?" the hyphen seeming to imply separation. The answer is

"Ai sounds like e in bargain, chaplain, against, chamberlain, curtail, plaited, raisin, travail, wainscot."

This is therefore an exceptional list of words in which ai = (ee), and hence implies that generally, and in all other words ai = (ei), with the (e) of the period. Again he says:

"Ey sounds like, ey, in they, obey, convey, conveyance, obeyance, prey (or spoil), survey, surveyor, they, but ey sounds i (oi) in eye, eyes," and "EI sounds like ay in heir, feign, weight, neighbour, deign, eight, foreign, inveigh, to neigh, straight, straighten, veins."

Now when it is remembered that these lists of words are opposed to those in which ey, ei have the sounds of (ee, e, i) it is evident that the general sound of ai was still (ai), although it had become (ee) in a few words cited, and that ey in the above lists was (ei).

"Ey sounds like ee (i) in valley, Turkey, barley, monkey, parsley, talley, tansey." "Ey sounds e (c) in country, attourney, abbey, alley, Anglesey, causey, chimney, cockney, comfrey, Hackney, journey, a Grey, key, kidney, lamprey, money, pulley."

It is doubtful for how long the short (e) in these words kept its place, and whether the final unaccented (e) and (i) in these two lists were ever kept very clearly separated. The long key = (kee) remained for sometime, and should be considered as belonging to the next list.

"EI sounds e long (ee) in receive, carreir, conceit, deceit, deceive, enterfer, either, heifer, leisure, neighbour, peruycit, receipt, seise."

Many of these words are now spelt differently. Usage differs in leisure (lezh-ə, lii'-zhə) and in either (iər-ði, aɪər-ðə).

1685. Cooper begins to recognizes ai as (ee) though he is not quite consistent with himself. After describing (e) he says:

"Vera hujusce soni productio scribitur per a, atque a longum falsè denominatur, ut in cane canna ... hic sonus, quando purè sonatur," that is when it is not (ee), "scribitur per ai vel ay; ut pain dolor, day dies; que hoe modo in omnibus fer: dictionibus plerumque pronunciantur: per ey in convey deporte, obey obedie,
purvey rebus necessariis provideo, survey lustro, they illi, trey trulla, whey serum lactis: quandoque rarō autem per ea; ut pearl margarita.

Curritur in Producitur in
sell vendo sail navigo
sent missus saint sanctus
tell nuncio tail cauda
tent tentorium taint inficio.

This makes ai (ex) except in a few words. But afterwards he says:

"Ai leniœs prolatœ sonatœ ut a in cane; fortius, plenum assumit sonum dipthongi ai; ut brain cerebrum, frail fragilis; ay finalis ut a, sic day dies; ai ante r scribitur pro a in affairs res, air-y aereus, dairy lactarium, debonair candidus, despair desero, fair pulcher, fairy lamis, hair crisus, pair par, repair reparo, stairs scala, cetera cum are; ut are sunt,‘ dare audeo . . . . Ai in bargain pactum, captain dux, certain certus, chaplain capellanus, curtain velum, forrain extraneus, fountain fons, mountain mons, villain furcifer, & prior as in maintain sonatœ ut a correptum sive e breve." Again he says: "Sonus a in I can possum; I cast jacio; conjunctus cum i sonum literae oe exprimente; constituit dipthongum in bait ecca; caitiff homo improbus; ay pro I vel yea imo; & eight quam vulgariter pronunciamus ai. Pkures hand scio." This must be (ai); he seems to have thought of brain and frail afterwards. Then he adds: "E in ken, vel a in Cane i prepositus dipthongum (ai) priori (ai) subtiliorem constituit; ut prassæ laus; in pacnis scribimus ei vel ey finalem; ut height altitudo; weight pondus, & convey deporto, aliaque que supra sub e ostendimus; quibus exceptis cetera scribuntur cum ai vel ay ut hainous detestabilis, plurunque autem in colloquio familiaris, negligenter loquentes pronunciat as prout a similem (ee) in Cane."

Hence we may collect, that in the very few words bait, caitiff, ay, eight, brain, frail, Cooper still admitted the diphthong (ai), and that he also endeavoured to establish a diphthong (ei) or (eai), but that he was obliged to own that the generality of words written ai or ei were then (ee) or (ee).

1688. Miege, writing nearly at the same time as Cooper, heard long a as French (ai), supra p. 71, and of Ai he says:

"cette diphtongue a le même son en Anglois qu'en ces Mots Francois, faire, taire, &c. Exemple, fair, despair, hair, repair, airy, dairy. J'en excepte, 1. Les Mots finissans en ain, où l'ai se prononce à la Françoise, comme en ces Mots, villain, certain, &c. 2. Raisins, qu'il faut prononcer Résins."

Although his French ai seemed in the first place to imply English (æai), it can be hardly other than (ee) in the

1 This is peculiar, but still heard, in the form (eæai).
present. Frenchmen do not generally distinguish these two related sounds, as they are unacquainted with English (ææ). Similarly Englishmen hear French (ee) as their own (ee). The meaning of the first exception is not very clear, because the French pronunciation of French final -ain is uncertain. Nothing can be clearer than that Englishmen never pronounced their final -ain as (-ea). Did the French say (-eain)? Miege says that a final is pronounced, “d’une manière plus forte en Anglois qu’en Françoís,” and this is his only allusion to what is now the French nasal. Was the English (vil-ên, ar-ten), or (vilyn, ar’tyn), as at present? We cannot learn from this passage, but it is probable that (vil-ên, ser-ten) represent the sounds with sufficient exactness. The e masculine in rézins, evidently implies (reez’inz) or (reez’inz). The distinction here made between (ee) and (ee) or (ee), though real enough in French, is probably due only to insufficient observation or appreciation of the English sounds, and cannot be insisted on.

“EI. Cette Diphtongue se prononce en Anglois comme en français. Exemple vein une veine, weight, un poids” (vein, weit; vein, weeit)? “Excepté 1. ces Mots où elle soune comme un e masculin, ou é. Savoir to conceive, deceive, perceive, receive, seize, inveigh, leisure, & leurs Derivatifs” (konseerv, deserv”) &c.? “2. Ceux-ci, où la Diphtongue prend le Son d’un e feminin. Savoir forœil, foreign, surfeit, heifer, either, neither,” (for’fot, for-ên, surfot, nofur, oûfyr, nœther) “3. Ce Mot height, qui se prononce hait,” (hait). This should be (hait) according to Miege’s custom of confusing (a) with French a, and according to other authorities it should be (hait). We have still a double pronunciation (neet, naît).

1701. Jones seems not to have made up his mind entirely that ai was to be pronounced as (ee). Thus he says that the sound of ai (whatever it may be) is written ci in 12 words, blein, conceit, deceit, distrein, heifer, heinous, heir, reins, their, veil, vein, weif; and eign in 5 words, darreign, deign, feign, reign, sovereign (“or soveraign’’); and eigh in 12 words, con-veigh, eight, freight, height, inveigh, neigh, neighbour, purveigh, straight, surveigh, weigh, and their derivatives, as eighteen, weight, etc., and eip “in receipt sounded resait,” and es “in demesn sounded demain,” and ey in 12 monosyllables brey, Grey, grey, keyl key, prey, Sey, sey, they, trey, Wey (a River), whey, and their derivatives as breying, Weymouth, etc. It is to be observed that he never asks when is the sound of ai written e, that is (ee)?

He next says the sound of e is written ai, “when it may be sounded ai,” which should imply that the sound of e was
different from that of ai, "as in abigail, afraid, again, against, bargain, capstan, captain, certain, chamberlain, chaplain, complaisant, curtain, debonair, hainous, mountain, mur-rain, Prestain, raisin, said, Suis (?), suddain, vereain, villain" adding, "see a—ai." He also says the sound of e may be written ay "when it may be sounded ay in the end of words or before a vowel; as decay, decaying, etc." These expressions ought to imply that Jones distinguished the sounds of ai, e, but whether as (ei, ee) or (ai, ei) cannot be collected.

But the above conclusion is not certain, for he says that the sound of e is written eig "in these six, darreign, deign, feign, reign, Seignior (sounded senior), sovereign," five of which darreign, deign, feign, reign, and sovereign are the five in which the sound of ai is said to be spelled eign. This would shew that these words were pronounced both ways, in accordance with Jones's custom of giving both ways of pronouncing. In reply to the question, when is the sound of e written eigh? he says, "see ai—eigh; where you have all such," so that these words had also both pronunciations.

Jones says the sound of e (e) is written ei in 30 words atheist, conceit, conceive, counterfeit, deceit, deceive, deity, disease, diseasen, either, forfeit, heifer, heinous, heir, inveigle, leisure, Marseilles, *neigh, *neighbour, neither, perceive, receive, receipt, seise, seisin, seive, surfet, teice, their. Those marked with * are in a previous list giving the sound of ai, shewing again that the sounds of ai, e, if different, were at least frequently confused. He also says that Leicester was pronounced Lester, and gives a list of 32 proper names as Anglesey, Awbrey, etc., in which ey final had the sound of e (e), and of 39 other words with ey final having the same sound (e), some of which are words in which eigh was said to have the sound of ai, and others are words to which Price gave the sound of (i); they are abbey, alley, attournay, barley, brey, causey, chimney, cockney, coney, coney, cumfrey, grey, hackney, hey-dey! honey, journey, sneeze, key, kidney, lackey, lamprey, medley, money, monkey, obey, parley, parsley, prey, pulley, purvey, sey, survey, talley, tansey, they, trey, turkey, valley, whey. In answer to the question when is the sound of ee (ii) written ei? He replies, sternly, "Never." And adds, "Note then that it is ie not ei, which often sounds ee; as in field, siege, etc." We may therefore conclude that ei, ey were always (ee) and never (ii); although ai, being generally (ai) or (ei) was sometimes (ee).

1 These must be meant to include erroneous pronunciations. Price says: "This diphthong ei is parted in atheism, atheist, deist, polytheism."
EI, AI — XVIIIth Century.

EI, AI seem to have remained at (ee) during most of the XVIII th century; at least ai was fixed in that sound and has come down to us with the slight alteration into (ee), although, in the south of England, (eci) is more commonly heard.

1704. The Expert Orthograplist says that "ai, ei, ay, ey are much the same sound, in many words, as pail, pay, eight, they," but gives a list of 11 words in which "the sound of e is lengthened by ei," that is, in which ei is pronounced (ii) contrary to the express "never" of Dr. Jones; they are conceit s. and v. conceive, deceit, deceive, either, inveigle, receive, receive, wield now wield. It is curious that while he gives (ii) to conceit spelled thus, he admits (ee), or rather, "the sound of ai," as the sound of ei in "con, de, re, ceipt or ceive, heir, leisure, neither.1 rein, reign, their, vein, height, inveigh, neighbour, weight." He did not really distinguish ai from a long (ee) as may be seen under A, p. 74.


Also (reen) rain, (pee) pay, (aeganst) against, (ree-sin) raisin, (ween-skot) wainscot, (heser-gen) bargain, (tshæem-birlin) chamberlain, (kar-tin) curtain, (trev-il) travail.

Except then in very few words the usages are those of the present day.

1768. Franklin has: (steens) stains, (reens) rains, (feer) fair, (asorteen) ascertain, (ateen) attain, (aasorteen) uncertain.

Also (dher, dheer, dhier), their, (dheer) they; (aider) either, and (farenzor) foreigners.

1780. Sheridan in his remarks on the Irish pronunciation (disceet, risee) deceit, receive, which belongs to the XVIIIth century, notes that "the Irish in attempting to pronounce like the English," and to convert their ei, ey into (ii), often overstrained the rule, and said (prii, kanvi) prey, convoy; this was simply an error of the same kind as that noticed above, p. 92.

Hence in the XIXth century we may assume ei, ai, to be (ei eei, ai aai); in the XVIIth (ei eei ee, ee eei) and in the XVIIIth (ee ii ei, ee). But in the XIXth century both ei, ai were apt to be confused with one another and with long e under the common sound of (ee). Also

1 Yet he writes (iidh'er). This reminds us of the question and answer "(Niddher, sir.) (erasmible if not erai), "Dr. John-
even in the xviith century a large section of people pronounced (ai) as (ee), but this, though adopted by Hart, was thought effeminate by Sir T. Smith and Dr. Gill. It however allowed Shaksper to pun on reasons and raisins and on here, heir (suprâ p. 80 note).

OI — XviTH Century.

1530. Palsgrave says: "Oi in the frenche tonge hath .ii. diuerse soundes, for sometyme it is sounded lyke as we sounde oy in these words, a boye, a froyse, coye, and suche lyke, and somtyme they sound the i of oy almost like an a."

1545. Meigret says: "En moins, royal, loyal, nous oyons euidement en la proluction la diphongue commencer par o & finir par i. Au contraire en moy, toy, soy, nous oyons la fin de la diphongue, non seulement en e, mais encore, en e ouvert, qui est moien entre a & e clos, & par consequence bien estrange de la prononciation de l'i, on y grec. Nous escrirons doncq loé, roé et loyal, royal." And 1550, in his Grammar he says that "as regard de l'o ouvert il ne fêt point de diphongue précédant l'a, pas que j'aye decouuert; ne parlemment aucq l'e clos: moi's joient a l'e ouvert il est fort frequent en la prononciacion Françœcze, qur ce la plume n'en neyt james fêt conte, vzant qelqesfois (come j'y'ja dit) de la diphongue, oy, es ascuns des vocables: come, moy, toy, soy, loy, foy: pour mœ, loz, sez, loz, foz, qelqesfois asi pour fœz encor pis, il luy ont ajouté une s; come, cnoisistre pour cnostré. e non contans de cete lourderie, qazi come tumbans de fieur en chaq' mal, il nous ont introduit oient pour ox', e tierses personnes plurieres du preterit imperfst: escriuans estoyest, disoient, venoyent, pour esto't, dizo't, veno't."

It was this broad (e) which Palsgrave apparently confounded with (a), and indeed we are told that in Parisian pronunciation it was already sometimes (a). Even now the oi is

1 Meigret's analysis of the French diphonge ai = (ox) is confirmed by Pelletier, who writes (Livet, p. 174) "Françœs, disoët, cnoestrè," but "point, voyele." Ramus (ib. 206) writes 'moz, loz' for moi, lot. Beza (ib. 622) is fuller and says: "cette diphongue fait entendre à la fois, mais rapidement, le son de l'o et de l' i, quand elle est suivie de n, comme loin, besoin, tessoin, mots que quelquesfois terminent, à tort, par un g. Non suivie de n, la diphongue oi prend une prononciation voisine de celle de la triphongue oei ou de la diphongue ai ou e ouvert; il a le son oei dans loi, moi, foi qu'on trouve souvent écrit, à tort, avec un y: quelques-uns, supposant le son e, prononcent seulement ai: ainsi les Normands écrivent et prononcent fai, pour foi, et le peuple parisien dit parler, aller, venir pour parler, aller, venir; les imitateurs de l' italien prononcent de même Anglë, Françoés, Ecossois pour Anglois, François, Écossois. — Une faute très-grand des Parisiens c'est de prononcer voirre (ou ore), foivre falne, trois, comme voirre, fourre, trois ou même trois." This last passage may be compared with Gill's denunciation of the Mopeys, p. 90. The two passages show how careful we should be not to stigmatize a pronunciation as faulty, when it differs from what we hold best, as the faults of one century become the
acknowledged to be (os) or (ue) by eminent French orthoepists, though it is generally admitted to be (us, u). After a consonant the real effect of oi, at present, is generally to labialise that consonant and subjoin (a, a), as roi, loi (reaa, lwa), where the ordinary Englishman is apt to hear (rwaa, lwaa), and in the cry vive le roi, he often falls into (viv le raa). I have elsewhere given my reasons for supposing that the original diphthong from which the modern English (oi) descended, was (ui). In the French language, the intention of inserting o before a Latin e, as in roi, loi from rex, lex seems to have been to indicate a thickening or labialisation of the preceding consonant, as opposed to the thinning or palatalisation, which would have been naturally occasioned by the following palatal vowel. Its use was much the same as the inserted u after g in French and Spanish before i, to prevent the palatisation of (g) into (zh) or (x), but whereas in the latter case, as in the use of gh under similar circumstances in Italian, the (g) was generally, not always, kept pure, in the former case the labial effect became finally constant.

In Palsgrave’s time the English oi must probably be assumed as (oi) or (oe), the latter being a diphthong still found in Welsh oedd (oedh). The stress was, as usual, on the first element, and the apparent stress on the second element in modern French is due to the real absorption of the first element by the labialised consonant.

1547. Slaesburtv recognizes the diphthong oy solely by transcribing íoynnt into tsiynt, meaning (dzhoynnt).

1568. Sir T. Smith says: “OI per o breuem (o) & i (i). Diphthongus Oi, vt Gallis frequentissima, ita nobis est rarissima: habemus tamen & hanc sonum (Coit) iacere discum, (boi) puer, (toi) ludicrum, (toil, turmoil) laborare, (foil) bractea, (soil) solum, (koi) verberare, (broil) assare in craticula, & (point) quae vox munrernem, et indice monstrare, et ligulam nobis notat, & (koi) quisque ineptum et à familiaritate alienum significamus. In his, propter breuitatem received usages of another. Beza’s reparation of the Parisian os for os, that is, oi, explains the last words of Palsgrave, but his supposition that the Norman fey resulted, like the usual French as in the words cited, from the rejection of the prefixed a, does not seem historically correct, as this orthography, or fey, is very old in Norman French. We shall have to consider this point in Chap. V, § 1, No. 3, where the Norman et and French et — (ei, ue) will be considered as mutations of the Latin e, precisely as the French ou and Spanish os were mutations of the Latin e, p. 138, note. It is worth noticing in reference to Meigret’s os, considered as o elo, that Beza proceeds to say: “this diphthonge os a un son propre qui sient de l’o et de l’u. Il faut se garder de prononcer comme à Lyon os pour O (comme nous pour no), et comme dans le Dauphiné et la Savoie ou pour ou : tels cependant, ou pour oii etc.”

soni, et quia breuis o non multum ab u differt, et propterea fuit à
Gracie dicta o μουρόν. Poterit' fortasse à quibusdam indicari haec
melius possee per vi describi. Videmus et veteres volit & vestris per
o scripsisse, quae posteriores per vuilit & vestris scripserunt. Certè
soni sepessimè variant. At sequum est scripturam sonos sequi vt
picturam corpus, testenturque scripturae sonum ætatis, vt aulæa
formæ vestium. ζ O Dipthongus improprì Græca Apud nos in-
cognita est. Scoti tamen quæ nos per oï scribimus per ω pronun-
ciant, vix vt i audiatur."

And in his Greek pronunciation he says: "οι. Referimus nos
cum puerum a toy dicimus, & cum ludicrum a toy, & delicatiorem
hominem vocant Borei nostrates nysë & coy, frequentatur hæc diph-
thongus à Gallis plurimum, quorum lingua cum elegiariam
studiois apud nostros vaqœadeo placeat, miror ab his qui hunc
sonum tam contemptim aspernantur non invrbanissimam iudicari.
Hi cum volunt me, to, tacitum, fodem dicere moy, toy, coy, foï dicunt:
cêunque Normani Scythica Danorum gens partem occupant Galliae,
& quod in Grancia Turci, iam in Gallia fecerunt, vt linguam Gallii-
cam vnà discerent, & peruersè commutarent nunquam tamen poterant
effugere Normani, quin si nunc quisquam eorum rusticior pro moy,
toy, coy, foï, quod non rarè euenit, my, ty, ky, fy, dicat, irri-
deatur à ceteris Gallia, & non vrbææ æ civiliæ, sed insciæ æ
rusticæ loqui existemetur."

We have therefore evidence that Sir T. Smith heard little
if any difference between (oi, ui), as he doubted which would
be the best orthography. In the next chapter further reasons
will be given for supposing (ui) to have been the older form.

1569. Hart's views of diphthongs are rather peculiar,
owing to his considering (x, w) as the pure vowels (i, u)
forming a diphthong with the following vowel, so that to
understand his account of oï it will be convenient to cite his
description of diphthongs at length. He says:

"Now will I shew you examples of the Diphthongs made of two
short vowels, and of others of one short and of another long. And
then of triphthongs. With short vowels, as thus, (ui uiil reid bei
ionder nel; treme dhe uat us uelene taakn bei dhe luq nond)
which is written for [we wyll ride by yonder well where the Wst
was wel neare taken by the yong hound] which doe come very
often in our speach. Of diphthongs whereof one vowell is short,
and the other long as (iuu neer uakqin in dhe fourth touur, huer
as dhe bues did pouer uater upon' dhe mect flourich) which I
write for [you were waking in the fowerth tower, when as the
boye did poure water vppon the wheate flower] which also doe
come verie often. And for triphthongs as (bi neiz ov dhe muelz
buelt) for, [be wise of the hoyes bowy]. And (mark dhe kat dauth
miou muelz iuu milk dhe icu) for [hark the Cat doth mewe, whiles

1 Evidently there is a mispunctulation here, it should be "ο μουρόν, poterit."
you milke the yowe]. And a Basin and (eaur), for, [eawer], and
certaine others as will be seene hereafter. And for three vowels
comming together, and making two sillables as in example (the
vyv,er seeth syy,er it is pyy,er) for [the viewer sayth sure it is
pure]’’ where, as will be explained hereafter, Hart writes (iu) for
(yy), “and as in these worudes (this bei,er is hei,er ov pou,er then
dhe dei,er bei hiz fei,er). For [this bier is higher of power, than
the dier by his fire].”

He seems therefore to write (buie, hueiz, buei) for boy,
hoy’s, buoy, though the precise value of the two last words
is not very clear, and may (wheiz buei). Nautical men
costantly call buoy (buui), and (bui, boi) are not uncommon
provincial forms of boy. Compare the Bavarian dialectic
(bua) for (buu-be) bube, which leads to the notion that boy is
a form of booby, a word of very doubtful origin. Although
Hart thus confirms Smith’s (ui) in one word, he differs from
him in writing (vois’es).

1680. Bullockar, as we have seen, distinguishes boy, buoy
as (bou, buui), and he gives no examples of oy as (ui, uui).

1621. Gill has the varieties (oi, ui, uui), as in the words: soil
(soul, suuil), boil (boil, buuill), spoil (spoil, spuuill), tol (toil,
tuuiil), joint (dzhuuint), disappoint (disappuuint), buoy (buui),
rejoice (redzhois), voice (vois), oil (oil). In these the double
tendency is clear, and as the (ui) sounds must have been
the more ancient, they were no doubt in existence, though dis-
regarded, when older orthoepists wrote. Thus Salebury’s
(dzhoint) is really more modern than Gill’s (dzhuuint).

1633. Butler says “Of in boy we sound [as the French do]
(woe), for whereas they write bois, soil, droict they say (bwoes,
swoet, drwoet).”

OI — XVIIth Century.

1653. Wallis says: “In oi . . . vel oy . . . preponitur aliquando
ō apertum (ut in Anglorum bōy puer, bōys nuge . . .), aliquando
ō obscūrum, (ut in Anglorum bōil coqueo, tōil labor, ōil oleum . . .),
quanquam non negem etiam horum nonnulla à quibusdam per ō
apertum pronunciari.”

That is he said (bai, tai, boil, tail, oil) but admitted the
pronunciation (bail, tail, ail). It will be seen that Wallis is
the first writer who acknowledges the vowel (ō) and the

1 The (w) in the two words is merely
a sound developed by Butler himself.
Thus, when I was nearing Alloa in the
steamer, the name of the place was
called out in a slow measured tone by
the boatman, and although I knew
that the sounds were (Al-loo-oo’), the
syllables being lengthened out, yet I
could not divest myself of the feeling,
that (Al-loo-oo’) was really said, so
strongly was the sound of (w) developed
in the glide from oo to (ee).
diphthong (oi). It is quite in conformity with this that he
changes Gill’s (buuil, tuuil) into (boil, tail), and his further
pronunciation (oil) should imply that (uuil) as well as (oil)
was prevalent in Gill’s time.

1668. Wilkins writes (bai) for boy.

1668. Price says:
"Oi never ends a word, but, oy, as boy, cloy." "Oy sounds
broader than, oi, as moyst, joiner, joint, boisterous, cloy, cloysters,
embroider, emroides [hemorrhoids], employ, exploit, foyl, moyst,
noise, noysom, oy, ointment, poise, quoif [coif], voif."

It is possible that Price’s broader oy may be (ai) and the
other (oi), which would give (dzheint, beîstæres, eksplait’,
neiz, ointment, poiz, kœf, veid,) of which some are confirmed
by subsequent writers.

1685. Cooper generally gives oi as (ai), "o in loss, lost,
i praepositus ... semper Græce, ut πωλλον, but he admits (ui)
in boil, moil, point, poison, only, to which he says "oy in
Gallico buoy supporto, quod nos scriberemus buoy" is equiva-
 lent, it is therefore to be presumed that he said (buoi). The
most curious is his remark that "boy puer dissylabum est, scilicet (buai)," which is not confirmed by others. He
likewise admits oi to be (oi) in in-join, joint, jointure, broil,
ointment, see supra p. 117, and also, "ut i diphthongus," in
anoint, moil, toil, point.

1701. Jones says that the sound of ooi was always written oi,
"in the middle of words or before a consonant, as boil, coil, join,
&c.," which were therefore occasionally called (buuil, kuuil,
dzhuuin), as in times past, and that the sound of i (ai) is written
oi, "when it may be sounded oi or ooi (oi, uai) in the beginning or
middle of words; as in boil, broil, coil, foil, foint, froise, groim, noise,
join, loim, moil, oilet, poise, poison, soil, spoil, tortois, which some
sound as with an i," i.e. (boil, broil, koil, foil) etc.; and that
(aei) is written oy "when it may be sounded oy in the end of words,
or before a vowel; Chandois, decoy, &c.—loyal, royal, voyage; some-
times abusively sounded as with an i," i.e. (Sham’dois, deko’,
lo’al, ro’al, vo’idgh).

1688. Miege says nothing of the pronunciation of the
English oi, but for the French oi he lays down rules some-
what different from those now followed, saying:
"The diphthong oi is pronounced oai (oe) as foi, loi, foire, toile.
Except in some Cases, wherein 'tis pronounced ai (x). And 1. In
such Tenses of Verbs as these; viz. J’aïmois, tu aïmois, il aïmoit,
J’aïmerois, tu aïmerois, il aïmeroit. 2. In those Verbs whose In-
finite endings in ottre ; as conotre, parottre. To which add the Verb

1 Compare the sailor’s spelling wig is i, g = (oi, dxh), according to the
for (waidzh), i.e. voyage, where iy, that alphabetic names of the letters.
croire, and this tense of the Verb Etre, Je sois, tu sois, il soit. 3. In these National Names, Anglois, Françoís, Ecossois, Irlandois, Hollandois, Milanois, Polonois; with all their feminines in oise, as Angloise, Françoise, &c. 4. In these Words, droit, (Adj.) endroit, estrait, espostement, foible, froid, and the Derivations of the two last. But before n, the t keeps its proper Sound; as foine, loin, joindre, point. Oignon is pronounced, and begins to be spelt ognon. Oie is a Triphthong, and is pronounced ai in such Tenses of Verbs as these are, ils aimoient, ils aimaient, ils soient, where the n is left unpronounced. But it is no Triphthong, where it ends a Word, the last e making a distinct Syllable of it self, though almost mute. As in these Words foie, joie, anchois, where oi is pronounced oai; monoe, yerøie, where it is sounded ai.”

OI — XVIII th Century.

1704. The Expert Orthographeist admits (oi, ai) in choice, exploit, froise, noise, poise, quoif, quoit, rejoice, voice, void, but says that “in the middle of most other words oi sounds long (oi), as anoint, boil, broil, coin, loan, moil, toil, poison, point.” Of these (boil, loan, poiz’n, point) are still well-known vulgarisms.

1796. Buchanan admits (ai, oi) only, to the exclusion of (ui, oi).

1768. Franklin writes (distræoid) destroyed, but unfortunately gives no other word in oi.

We may conclude then that in the XVI th century (oi, ui, uui) all prevailed, (oi) being most in favour; in the XVII th century, most words had (oi, Ai) and a few words (ui, oi); in the beginning of the XVIII th century (oi, Ai, oi) were acknowledged, but at the latter end of that century only (oi, Ai) were admitted by orthoepists.

UI — XVI, XVII, XVIII th Centuries.

The combination ui-belongs to the XVII th and later centuries, except perhaps in one or two words, in which French spelling had an influence, as the following comparison of the orthography of the Promptorium 1440, Palsgrave 1530, Levins 1570, and Price 1663 will shew.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Leviis</th>
<th>Palsgrave</th>
<th>Promptorium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. build</td>
<td>beald</td>
<td>beldying</td>
<td>beeldynge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circuit</td>
<td>circuite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduit</td>
<td>condit</td>
<td>(condyte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(conduyte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guild</td>
<td>giltie</td>
<td>gylte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. buy</td>
<td>bye</td>
<td>bye</td>
<td>byyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide</td>
<td>gyde</td>
<td>gyde</td>
<td>gyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guile</td>
<td>gyle</td>
<td>gyle</td>
<td>gyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guise</td>
<td>gyse</td>
<td>gyse</td>
<td>gyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. bruise</td>
<td>broose</td>
<td>broseyn</td>
<td>broyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>frute</td>
<td>frute</td>
<td>frute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juice</td>
<td>juce</td>
<td>iuce</td>
<td>iowce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suit</td>
<td>sute</td>
<td>sute</td>
<td>sute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence we must consider the combination as an inorganic ı or u and it must follow the laws of those letters. In the above table the first group had short ı,¹ the second long ı, and the third the u or oo of the period.

EU, AU, OU.

The forms ew, aw, ow are identical in signification with eu, au ou, and need not be separately considered.

The modern sounds of eu are (iu) or (ju, ru), and occasionally (oo), of au (AA), and of ou (ou) or (a), occasionally (ouu, uu). But the diphthongal sound (eu) runs through all the varieties (ou, au, au, ah, eu, eu, ou), and Franklin gives (au), while even (ou) may be occasionally heard, and, owing to the orthography, this analysis is very commonly accepted. The Germans hear the diphthong always as their au = (au). The pronunciation (eu), a diphthong acknowledged in the Italian Europa = (euroopa), is heard in America for ou as (deun teun) for down town, and is said to be a common cockneyism, although the cockney sound is, as Mr. M. Bell says, more probably (ouu) as (deun teun).² Many words now spelled with u were written with ew in the xvi th century. As these, and some others still spelled with ew, were pro-

¹ Dr. Gill stumbles over build, giving the three sounds (bild, bild, byild). The more ancient sound must have been (beild) or (bide) whence (bild) descends easily. Mr. Melville Bell says that build is often pronounced (bile) in Scotland, a variety of (byild).
² In Mrs. Barney Williams’s Yankee song “Bobbing around,” which was so popular a few years ago, I seemed to hear (ewse, und) or (ewse, und), the first element being lengthened and somewhat nasalized. The Rev. Mr. D’Orsey informed me that he found the use of (eu) for (ou) very common among Londoners, even of education, whose pronunciation he had to correct. In Norfolk ou is regularly pronounced (eu, eu).
nounced with the long u of that time, which requires special consideration, it will be most convenient to postpone their consideration till afterwards. The sounds attributed to au, ou in the xvth century were also frequently attached to simple a, o before l or r, and these will be considered under L.

EU — xvth Century.

1530. Palgrave says: “Ev in the frechne cong hath two dyverse soundynge, for sometyme they sound hym lyke as we do in our tonge, in these wordes a dewe, a shrewe, a fewe,” this is the sound which will be considered here, “and somtyme like as we do in these wordes, trewe, glewe, reve, a meve,” which will be considered under U. “The soundyng of ev, which is most general in the frechne tong, is suche as I haue shewed by example in these wordes, a dewe, a shrewe, a fewe, that is to saye, lyke as the Italians sound ev, or they with vs, that pronounce the latine tonge aryght, as verex, irex, iex, diec.”

The reference to Italian completely establishes the sound, which is as singular and curious in French as in English. According to Meigret, however, the sound was (ey), for he says:

“Cet e clos fät ecores vn’ aotre diphthong” auce u, come xn eur, pen, ven, eureus. Finablemt il fät vne triphthonge se jonant a çalle de ao; come xn veao, beao, moreao. Dont je m’ emervalde de çeus qui premiers ont terminé çete triphthong’ en u : vu qe la prononciaçon ne tient rien de l’ une mèmes de l’ ou clos q à qelq’ affinité auq l’u.”

1 We find in Levins 1570, dencs debutum, clewe, glewe, reve, spewe, blewe, trewe, esseu, rewsene, enewe, enewe, but vertue although inserted under “E ante W”,” enewe, continuous, purewe, buildings, trewe, heoeg, rwele, trewe, but entruth although under the heading entwth. Words still written with eo, and pronounced then as long u according to Sir T. Smith 1666, are monc, elec, now, brewe, bleu.

2 See the long extract from Meigret concerning au, au, on p. 141-2 below. G. des Autels objects strongly to Meigret’s analysis (ey) of the French au. Speaking of Meigret’s assertion that both sounds were heard in a diphthong, he asks (Livet, p. 130): “Je ne demande si la diphthongue francoise eu en ces mots jeu et jeu garde le son entier de l’u?” “Il ne faut done pas que les voyelles gardent aux diph- thongues leur son propre et entier, mais bien qu’elles servent toutes deux, soit en leur son propre ou en un autre voisin, à faute de lettres plus idoines (convénables).” Pelletier (ib. p. 138) is indistinct, at least as cited, but Ramus (ib. p. 189) says: “La sixième voyelle c’est ung son que nous ecrivions par deux voyelles, a et u, comme en ces mots puer, meur, sour, and he proposes a simple sign for it. Beza (ib. p. 521) as analysed by Livet says: “Dans cette diphthongue eu ou n’entend ni l’e ni l’u, mais un son qui tient de l’un et de l’autre: breif, neuf, peu pavem, sour soron, seu vortum, et un grand nombre d’autres que les Picards prononcent souvent u simple, disant Dieu, ju pour Dieu, jeu. Les Français imitent quelques les Picards, en ce qu’ils prononcent par u simple les mots sour excusus et ses dérivés... meur matu- rus... and en général tous les noms en eure long [now -ur] dérivés des verbes...; il en est de même dans les participe passés passifs, masculins ou fémi- nins, terminés en eu, eu [now -u, -ue] comme beu, beue...; c’est à tort qu’à Chartres et à Orléans on prononce, with an intensified, eu, and, d’autre part, qu’on fait rimer, heur et dur, engreuvir et figure, heurs et nature, faute qu’on
But Englishmen heard this (cy) as (eu), as appears from Hart, who in his French Lord’s Prayer, gives (siez, seu) for ciez, ceux. As to the combination eu, which Meigret says was (eao), we have the word beauty, written beuto, beautye in the Promptorium, beautie in Palegrave, and beutye in Levins. Hart gives (beaut’fi), Gill pronounces (beaut’i) and Butler (beaut’r) which may mean (beaut’i), though some doubt attaches to the last pronunciation.1

1547. Salesbury does not notice the combination eu, and gives no English word in which it occurs.


Observe that meow for hawks had the sound of long u.

1569. Hart, as shewn by the citation on p. 132, distinguishes meow (mieu), eve (jeu), you (jou).

1580. Bullokar recognized the diphthong (eu) distinctly by writing the word hew thus: heu, the comma, which he wrote under the u, meaning that it had the sound of (u). In his list of synonymous signs he gives e, v, e, u eu (where the comma should be subscribed to the e, u) as identical, and I find the word sheured meaning (sheured).

retrouve en Guyenne.” These last examples point to a remnant of an (ey) diphthong, which is a real natural diphthong, and was distinctly pronounced to me every morning at Norwich by a vender of fish monoting under my windows, (ny bloo-tzis ti) = new boaters here! The real mutations of the Latin e, besides its natural change into (eu), were however two, closely related, first (oe) falling into (ue), and secondly (eo) falling into (eu). The form (ue) appears in very early French, where it was probably soon discontinued, since (ue) was also used as a mutation of Latin e, but it remains the regular Spanish mutation. The second form (eo, eu) gradually prevailed in French, and became replaced by (e) apparently just about the time that Meigret wrote, so that he retained an old (eu) or (cy) pronunciation (it is not quite clear which) and his more youthful opponents ignored the old sound altogether. The subject requires much careful investigation. Livet observes (ib. p. 138) : “Rien de plus vague, de plus indéterminé, que la prononciation de, ui, eu, o o au moyen âge et encore au xvie siècle. Nous ne pouvons mieux faire, au lieu de donner d’innumerables exemples de cette confusion, que de renvoyer au Traité de Vérification francois de M. Quicherat pp. 354-359. Cf. Observations etc. de Ménage, t. 1, p. 291, 324, 481. Glosaire picard par l’abbé Corbier, p. 131. Sur la confusion de eu et eu en particulier, Cf. Quicherat, ouv. cit. p. 384-365.”

1 Ramus (Livet p. 207) makes the combination eau a diphthong, the first element being its mute e and the second his simple vowel au. The difference of Meigret’s sound and his may have been very slight (eao, eao), but the latter prevailed. Beza (ib. p. 523) analyses in the same way as Ramus. These analyses at least show the existence of an old e sound at the commencement, and hence account for the English translation of the combination into the familiar diphthong (eu).
1621. Gill, in his anxiety to give prominence to the first element, lengthens it, thus: "Esæpius preceedit u, vt, in (eeu) Eawe ovicula, (feeu) fewe pauci, (seeu’er) sewer diaperif.”

1633. Butler distinctly recognizes (eu) in deu, eue, few, heu, shew, rew, saw, strew, shrew, pewer, see under U.

It will be seen in the next chapter that Chaucer distinguished the two sounds of eu by an etymological rule, the sound (eu) being reserved for those which were not of French origin. This distinction was lost during the xvith century, so that in the xviith no general rule can be given, but each word must rest on its own independent authority. For lists of such words see Chapter IV, § 2, under EU.

EU — xvii th Century.

1653. Wallis, says: “Eeu, eeu, eau sonantur per Æ clarum et u, (eu). Ut in neuter neutralis, few pauci, beauty pulchritudo. Quidam tamen pauno acutius efferunt acsi scriberenter, nieuter, fiew, biewty, vel nieuter, fia, biewty; presertim in vocibus new novus, knew sciebam, new ningeabat. At prior pronunciatio rector est.”

That is Wallis had heard some persons say (niuer, fieu, bieu’ti) although many, perhaps most, at that time said distinctly (niuter, fiu, biuer’ti) and he found this pronunciation particularly prevalent in new, which in the next century Franklin called (nuu) and which is still frequently so called. The sound (eu) was undoubtedly beginning to be unfrequent. The sound (iu) however cropped up chiefly in those words previously pronounced as long u.

1688. Wilkins acknowledges (eu) in new, and Price in the same year allows (eu), that is, says “ew keeps its sound” in bresewes, few, lewd, eue, feu’d, neuter, pleuriac, but gives (iu), that is, says “ew hath now obtained the sound of iu” in bleeew, breew, chieew, crew, dreew, embreew, escheew, heew, geegwawes, knew, sewewr,” stlew, stew, stewriter, vineew,”^2 monsieur, adieu, liew.

1685. Cooper hears only (iu), the same sound as long u. The diphthong is in America more frequently (iu) than (iu), and even (eu) remains there in some parts.

1701. Jones seems still to have a lingering feeling of the difference between (eu) and (iu). He asks when may the sound of eu be written eu ? and answers: “In the beginning

---

1 In 1849 the present writer published a newspaper called the Phonetic News, printed phonetically, and therefore bearing the title (Fonetic Neu).
2 Why do you write (niuz)?” asked a newsynder, “we always call it (nuuz).”
3 Probably in the sense of a waiter at table.
4 Probably, venue.
of all words, except *eu, ever, Ewin,* and "in all foreign words from the Latine, Greek &c as adieu, beuf, cavaliere, Decaljon, Deuteronomy, feumet, geuls, grandeur, lieu, Meuse, Monsieur, neuter, parfieu, pleurisy, purlieu, Reuben, rheubarb, rheum, Theudas, Zeurin &c except view." And he allows the same sound to be written *eu* "in all English words as crewet, dew, peuter &c." But he never asks, when may the sound of *eu* be written *u*? On the other hand he does ask when may the sound of *u* be written *eu* or *eu*? And he answers, the first "when it may be sounded *eu* in foreign words, as *neuter &c," referring to the list just given, and thus distinctly distinguishing the two sounds (*eu*) and (*iu*); and the second "when it may be sounded *eu* in English words, that are purely¹ such, as in askew, crewel, dewberries, escheew, ewer, gewgaws, Hecuet, jezel, nepehue, pewet, sinew, cinew, and in blew, chez, clew, crew, Crew, drew, few, flew, Greew, grewe, Jew, knew, meew, new, sclew, shew, skew, slaw, spew, stlew, stews, strew, threw."

Jones says that the sound of *o* and *ou,* evidently meaning (*oo, ou*), is written *eu* when it may be sounded *eu* as in *chew,* escheew, shew, shrew, shrewd, Shrewsbury, pronounced "cho, shrode, Shrosbury &c." (Shoe, Shrooze-bert) are the only sounds here remaining. But that (shroo) must have been known in Shakspere’s time appears from the last couplet of *Taming of the Shrew,* fo. 1623, the preceding 14 lines being in rhyming couplets:

*Horton.* Now goe thy wayes, thou hast tam’d a curst Shrow.

*Luc.* Tis a wonder, by your leave, she will be tam’d so.

*Ewe* has still a provincial pronunciation (*juoo, jaa*).

*Eau* as is seen by the quotation from Wallis, follows the fortune of *eu.* Wallis has (beu’ti) admitting that some say (bieu’ti). Miege has (biu’ti). Jones says that *beau* is "sounded beu in the beginning of all words," referring to e-ea, which shews that he considers *ea in eau* to be the digraph *ea,* that is, a mere representative of (ee), and satisfactorily determines his pronunciation. Even the word "*Beau a name*" he writes *beu.* But he never allows the sound to be long *u,* that is, (*iu*). On the other hand he also says the sound of long *o* is written *eau* "in the sound of *beau* in the beginning of all words," which should imply that (beu’ti) was heard as well as (beu’ti). He also says that *Bourdeaux* is "sounded *Boordo*" (Buur’doo).

The conclusion seems to be that some speakers still said (*eu*) and Jones recognized it as an admissible and theo-

¹ The following list would imply that Dr. Jones did not know much of etymology.
retically the best sound, but that he frequently heard and admitted without any word of blame, the newer sound of (iu).

EU — XVIII TH CENTURY.

1704. The Expert Orthographer says: "It must be a very critical ear, that can distinguish the sound of eu in eucharist from the long u in unity, and the eu in rhubarb from the long u in rumour, without an apparent and too affected constraint, contrary to the usual pronunciation observed by the generality, which (in this case) would sound very pedantic."

Here, the confusion of thought and consequent nebulousity of expression, which makes it difficult for an ear to distinguish sounds without a constraint which would sound pedantic, and which is contrary to the general pronunciation, is a good example of the darkness in which we have to grope for our results. It is to be presumed that the writer did not distinguish eu as (eu) from u as (iu), and found the utterance of those who still attempted to do so, affected and constrained. But did he pronounce all his 32 words having ew final, with (iu), including "sow or did sow with a needle, sewer a drain, shew or did show"? This is more than doubtful, and the distinctions here made between present sow, show, past sew, shew, are entirely without corroboration.

1766. Buchanan generally makes eu, ew = long u or (iu), but writes sewer (shoor), shew (shoo) sew (soo). His ewe, monsieur, lieutenant are (iu, monsiur, liuten'int), chew (shhuu), beauty (biu'ti), beau, beaux (boo, booz).

1788. Franklin writes (nru) for new.

The usages of the XVIII th century did not therefore sensibly differ from those of the XIX th. But to shew how (eu) still lingers, it is enough to cite the pronunciation (shwu), clearly a variety of (sheu), heard from a highly educated speaker, during the preparation of these pages.

AU — XVI TH CENTURY.

1530. Palegrave says: "Au in the frenche tonge shalbe sounded lyke as we sounded lyke as we sounde hym in these worde in our tonge, a dawe, a mawe, an hawe. Except where a frenche word begynneth with this diphthong av, as in these wordes, auclain, dlvre, au, avest, avx, and aucler, and all suche lyke: in whiche they sounde the a, almost lyke an o, and as for in dvenr, a and v be distinct syllables, as shal appere by his writtyng in the frenche vocabular."

Now Meigret says: "vn' aotr' en so, come sotant, aos, loyaos:
pour laquelle l’écriture François’ abuse de la diphthonge au, que la prononciation ne connaît point. Car com’ autresfois je vous ay dit, la diphthonge et de taible nature qu’elle requiert la proloction en vne même syllabe de deu’ voyelles qu’ la composent : comme nou’ le diconons communément : e cônvers observe l’écriture, en moindre, peindre : e ques nou’ prononçons les’ diph thonges oy, e ci, en vne même syllabe. e pourtant sont abusées tous ces qui se persuadent que deu’ voyelles conjonctes ensemble, caozet vn tiers son, qu’ ne tient ne de l’une, ne de l’autre : come rant vous ecuiriez mais, pour me’s, il dizet qu’ a, e, i, conjoin ensemble, forjet la proloction de e, ouvert : suyuant leur règle donq ie direy qe ayant, aors en sa prononciation tant ; payant, peye, peant, peo, je direy le semblable de toutes autres diph thonges que vou’ prononçes com’ elles sont ecrites, qu’ elles dorasct fe’r vn tiers son, aors qe celyu deu’ voyelles con jointes ensemble : e qu’ consequemment vous ecuiriez mal moins, eureus, eajc (on dit bien aiso aje, e et la diphthonge ca, bien rar’ en François) vn qu vou’ prononçez les’ mêmes voyelles qu’ sont ecrites, e qu’ elles ne forjet point la vn tiers son. Vous doyes donez qu’ elle opiniatreté d’abas caoz’ en erreur immetter : tant est difficile à l’home la reconnoissance d’une foete pour vne par trop grand’ estim’ e pezerosion de sa suffisance connoint’ a vne meconnoissance de l’im- bréquité, e imperfoctio de nous’ entendement : Ao regard d’au par ou clôs je ne l’ey point decouvert, q’ao mot aout, qu vous ecuiriez Aoust, etant a superbité.”

This long quotation will serve to shew that Meigret’s diphthongs must be accepted as such, with the exception of ou, of which he says “aortrement ne l’oze je noter,” and which was the vowel (u) simply. Hence as Meigret only heard (au) in the one word aout, now (uu), and heard (ao) in all other words, either the English must have been (ao), or, if it were (au), Palegrave misheard the unfamiliar (ao) as the familiar (au). The latter is à priori more probable and agrees with all the other indications we possess.1

1 G. des Autels was very vehement against Meigret for using the diph- thong (ao). “Je luy demande,” says he according to p. 130 of Livet, “où est le son, non entier, mais demy ou encore moins, de l’a en la diphthonge de sa nouvelle forge ao ?” To the first objection he had raised Meigret had replied : “si vous n’avez le cerveau bien troublé d’opioniatreté, vous trou- verz e qu’en introduisant la diphthongue ao, je ne fais qu’accorder l’écriture à la prononciation,” (ib. p. 122), and to the above question he answered : “le plus opiniatre sordaud du monde ne saurait nier qu’il n’oye (entende) en aosi (aussi) un a puis un o qui luy est conjoint en une même syllabe,” (ib. p. 133). It is evident then that Meigret used and was familiar with (ao). Livet (ib. p. 122) remarks : “il est certain qu’en Anjou l’on prononce de la choas, j’ai choa, chevres, en appuyant sur l’a et glissant légèrement sur le qui ne s’entend guère plus qu’un e mutet;” but this must be a recent de- velopment, the unstable (ao) becoming in this case (ao), while in the classical French it must have passed through an (ao) form. That the a was originally pronounced there can of course be ety- mologically no doubts, and the change of (ao) to (oo) is precisely similar to the change of (au) into (aa), which will be seen to have taken place in English. In Welsh we find Salesbury’s au be-
Palsgrave, speaking of French pronunciation, says:

"If m or n folowe next after a, in a freche worde, all in one syllable, than a shall be sounded lyke this diphthong au, and somethynge in the noose, as these wordes ámbre, chambre, mandér, amánt, tant, quant, parlánt, regardánt, shall in redyne and spekynge be sownded aumber, chaumber, maunder, amaunt, launt, quaunt, parlaunt, regardyaunt, soundyng the a like au, and somethynge in the noose."

Of this there is no trace in Meigret, but the observation is important as explaining the English pronunciation of words from the French, and the nasalisation of au is remarkable when compared with Jacob Grimm's observation that modern English au, which = (AA), is pronounced "as a lengthened a, something in the nose" (wie gedehnte a, ein wenig genäselt).¹

1547. Salesbury has no special article on au, but he says:

"w English & w Welsh do not differ in sound, as wawe, wawounda, ...... Also w is mute at the end of words in English, as in the following awu ...... pronounced thus a (aa) terror." Also he says that "sometimes a has the sound of the diphthong aw (au) especially when it precedes l or ll, as may be more clearly seen in these words balde, baued (baul) calvus, ball, baul (baul) pilæ, wall, wawol (waul) murula." And he writes "galaunt, galaut (galaut)."

The word (aa) for (aa) aue is here singular, especially as it is added as an instance of the omitted (u). Smith pronounces this word (au) and Gill (AAu). Salesbury is also inconsistent with himself, for in his Welsh pronunciation he says:

"All though the Germanus vse wv yet in some wordes sounde they it (to my hearing) as the forther w were a vowel, and the latter o (sic) consonant, where we Britons sounde both au wholly together as one vowell, wythout anye seuerall distinction, but beynge alwayes eyther the forther or the latter parte of a diphthonge in Englyshe on thys wyse: wyth aw, and in Welsh as thus wyth aueen."

Coming modern o. In Italian o oporta has succeeded frequently to Latin au, and so on. The question of importance here however is, when did the change take place? The testimony of Palsgrave to (au) and Meigret to (ao), and the objections of des Autels and Pelletier—who says to Meigret (ib. p. 188) "il t' eût autant valu mettre un o simple"—and the assertion of Ramus (ib. p. 186) that it is "le son que nous escrivons par deux voyelles A et U, comme en ces mots: autre, aultre, on nous prononcons toutefois une voyelle indivisible," together with the dictum of Beza (ib. p. 520) "la diphthongue au ne diffère pas sensiblement de la voyelle a," to which he adds: "les Normands la prononcent en faisant entendre distinctement a, o: disant a-o-tant pour autant: peut-être est-ce la vraie et ancienne prononciation comme la vraie orthographie de cette diphongue"—seem to show that the change took place in the first half of the xviith century; that is, that about this time the simple vowel (oo) prevailed over the diphthong (ao) or (au), although the latter did not absolutely die out.

It would seem impossible after the preceding remark to suppose that \( u \) were mute in \( au \). Indeed \( wyth \) \( au \) seems to be rather a Welsh phonetic transcription than the usual orthography, in which, as in the other passage quoted above, we should expect \textit{awe}.

1568. Smith simply gives "\( AU \) seu \( au \). (Dau) monedula, (clau) unguiis auium, (rau) crudus, (naunt) nihil, (taunt) doctus, (lau) lex, (mau) stomachus, (sau) serru, (au) terror, (launter) risus, (faunt)\(^1\) pugnavit, (stra) stramen." But in his Greek pronunciation he adds: "\( au, ev, \gamma \nu \).

Eandem rationem sequitur, quam in reliquis. Nam si fuisse apud veteres tanta soni commutatio, profecto Grammaticorum diligentia nov hoc tam insignis discrimen præteritum reliquisset. Itaque sic \textit{aids}o loquimur, vt audio nostrates vnguen, \textit{clau}, & scabere \textit{clau}". So that his \( au \) was certainly (au).

1569. Hart says: "The Dutch" that is the Germans, "doe vse also \( au, ai, \& is, rightly as I do hereafter."

Now the German sounds are, and probably were, (au, ai, jee) or (ii), but Hart clearly did not refer to this last sound. When then Hart writes (autours, auluaiz, aulo, tehaundzh, bikaus, radikaul) for \textit{authors, always, also, change, because, radical}, he meant (au) to be sounded as in German.

1580. Bullokar distinctly writes \textit{ha,u}, meaning (hau), and uses (kaul, kau\-ai) for \textit{caul}, \textit{causey} = \textit{cause-way}. His notation \textit{at} \textit{an} \textit{ah} he explains as \( = \) (aul, aum, aun). "This agrees with the rest.

Up to this time therefore, when Shakspere was 16, the pronunciation of \( au \) seems to have been indisputably (au) the same as the modern German \( au \). There can be little doubt that Shakspere in his youthful days must have said (au), but during his lifetime the general pronunciation seems to have changed. Between Bullokar's and Gill's books, 41 years elapsed, and although Gill had an old pronunciation, yet he seems to have followed the times somewhat in this combination. In determining the pronunciation of Shakspere, we must remember that he and Dr. Gill were born in the same year, 1564, and that Shakspere died, 1616, eight years after Gill had been made master of St. Paul's school, and five years before the publication of Gill's book. Hence Gill's pronunciation is the best authority which we have for Shakspere's, and certainly gives us the pronunciation of Shakspere's time. It is therefore singularly vexatious that we cannot make out a very clear account either of long \( i \), (p. 114,) or of this diphthong \( au \), from Gill.

\(^1\) In the original (faunt), which is clearly a misprint. Possibly (lau) for (lau) was also a misprint.
1621. Gill says: "A, est tenuis, aut lata; tenuis, aut brevis est, vt in (tallo) tallowe sedum; aut deducta, ut in (taal) tale fabula aut computus: lata, vt in tal talle procerus. Hunc sonum Germani exprimunt per aa. vt in maal conuuium, haer coma: nos vnico charactere, circumflexo ã, contenti erimus."

This ought to imply that a in tall was a simple vowel and not a diphthong,¹ and that it was (aa, ah) or (AA). The Germans perhaps really said (aa) or at most (aah), but (AA) was the sound which appears certainly to have been heard by the English in the xviith century. But Gill, who is so particular in his phonetics, absolutely confuses the diphthong (au) with his a, in the following curious paragraph, where I leave his symbols untranslated.

"A praeponitur e, ut in aerë aeris aeruus. o nunquam; sêpius i, et u, vt, in aid auxilium; balâ esca; lauvs sindonis species; & e paun pigmus: vbi aduerte au nihil differre ab â. Eodem enim sono proferimus a bâl, bâll pila; et tu bâl, baule, vociferari: at ubi verè diphthongus est, a, deducitur in â, vt âu aue imperium; âuger terebra."

Here he admits that au in his own phonetic writing is sometimes the sound which he represents as a simple vowel, his "broad â" and sometimes "truly a diphthong," but then becomes âu or â + u. I feel therefore bound to take his au as = his â or (AA), and his âu as = (AAu). In this point then Gill must have given in to the xviith century pronunciation. The pronunciation (AAu) is not recognised by others. In Gill's first edition, 1619, he uses au instead of â, for (AA) and in the case of "the true diphthong" to make the u apparent, he considers the u and not the a to be lengthened. The meaning is evidently the same.

1633. Butler is still less explicit, for after saying that "the right sound is a mixed sound of two vowels whereof they (diphthongs) are made," and referring to the Greek, he merely tells us that "au in Paul's and his compounds, Pauls-cross, Pauls-eyre-yard,"² the Londoners pronounce after the French manner, as ow.

We are therefore driven to Ben Jonson's grammar 1640, which was not published till two years after his death, and which has probably been tampered with. Jonson was born in 1574, ten years after Gill and Shakspere, and his prose

¹ But that it does not necessarily do so, appears from his calling long ï, which was "fere diphthongus ëi," the "thick ï," or "crasse." So that his assertion that a in tall is "a lata" or "broad â" would not be inconsistent with his admitting it afterwards to be "fere diphthongus au," and, as it will be seen, he almost uses these very words.

² The Greek e here represents a crossed e, much resembling it in form.
nunciation at best belongs to the very edge of the xvi th century. He says,

when a " comes before l. in the end of a Syllable, it obtaineth the full French sound, and is utter'd with the mouth and throat wide open'd, the tongue bent backe from the teeth, as in al. smal. gat. fals. tal. cal. So in Syllabes, where a Consonant followeth the l. as in salt. malt. balme. calme."

Bullock writes (ba'l'm ku'l'm = bau'l'm kau'l'm) for balm, calm. Salesbury gives calme, call in his Welsh pronunciation, as words in which "a is thought to decline toward the sound of the diphthong au, and the wordes to be read in thys wyse caut, caultme." Gill gives balm as (baam) according to our present interpretation of his d = au. Ben Jonson's explanation of his a before l will really apply better to (aa) than to (AA), because he omits all mention of labial action, but I suspect that (AA) was fully developed in England at the latter end of his life, and that he intended to indicate its sound, but had not noticed its labial character. It is worthy of remark however that Jonson's account of this sound is almost translated from the description of Latin A in Terentianus Maurus whom he cites in a note:

A, prima locum littera sic ab ore sumit,
Immivia, rictu patulo, tenere labra;
Linguamque nescat est ita pandulam reduci,
Ut nisus in illam valeat subire vocis,
Nec partibus ullis aliquos ferire dentes.

and this renders his description altogether suspicious, as if it were the result of learning, not of observation.

The result is that in the earlier part and middle of the xvi th century and at least to 1580 the sound of au was (au) or (aau); that at the close it may have passed into (aa) ready to fall positively into (AA) in the next century. The modern contest between (aa) and (AA) in such words as gaunt, haunt, haunt = (gaunt, haunt, dzhaunt) or (gaant, haant, dzhaant), while aunts has remained (aunt),—seems to point to a time of (aa) or (aa) before (AA) was evolved. In giving the pronunciation of Shakspere, however, having regard to the archaic habits of the stage, I think it will be more correct to write the full diphthong (au), see Chapter VIII. § 8. The change of (a) by the action of (u) would naturally be to the round form (o), for which in French, the narrower form (o) has prevailed. But if the (a) fell first into (a), the (u) would labialize it into (o), for which the narrower form (a) is frequently substituted.
The distinction between primary, or narrow, and wide forms, is seldom upheld in its purity, and the sound varies frequently, unnoticed, from narrow to wide in different individuals, who believe themselves to be speaking alike.

AU — XVIIIth Century.


This is just the conclusion that Dr. Gill had arrived at, but he does not acknowledge the pair, fall folly, of Wallis = (fAA fali).

1668. Wilkins entirely agrees with Wallis. Price only says that "au soundes broader then au as dawb, haunt," the meaning of which is not clear.

1685. Cooper, as usual, is rather peculiar. He says:

"A in con, cast, cum u coulescens (eou) ... nunquam occurrit in nostrâ linguâ. Lance hâsta, lancet scalprum chirurgicum, à lanceola; lanch navem solvere à G. lanceor, laculari, Ganch in sudes acutas precipitem dare, hant à G. hanter frequento; hanch à G. hanches femur; Gant, macer quasi want ab A.S. wanna cœrens, gantlet chir- rotheca ferrea, landress à lavando, nullo modo scribi debent cum u; contrâ enim suadent sonus et derivatio; falsè itaque scribuntur lancece &c. Quedam vocabula à latinis precipe derivate scribimus per au pronunciamus prout au vel a (AA) audacious audax; manuder murmurare; à G. audire maledicere . . . . O in lose, lost conjunctus cum u semper scribimus per au (au), ut audible audibilis, audience audience; audit-er-y auditorium, augment augeo, augury anguirum, augustus augustus, auricular auricularis, austerity austeritas, authentick authenticus, authority authoritas, cautious cautus, fraudu lent dolosus, laudable landabilis, laurel laurus, plausible plausibilis, negligenter loquentes pronunciam prout a (AA); in ceteris vocibus au & au semper prout a (AA) pronunciamus."

This fancy for pronouncing au as (au) or (ou) in certain words, seems peculiar to Cooper; it may, however, have represented one of the transitional stages (au, au, AA, AA) or (au, au, a, aa, AA). We can readily conceive that the sound had passed through all these stages; the (aa) often heard at

1 As to sound, many even now say (llANtsh lAANDsh, hAARDH, hAANDH hAAANDH, GAANt-let, lAAND-drell). As to derivation, the insertion of (u) before (m, n) when they represented what are now the French nasals, was a regular indication of their origin, see supra p. 143, and M, N below.
present in haunt, gaunt, jaunt, favours the notion that (aa) once existed. Cooper’s "negligenter loquentes" refers of course to the general pronunciation, which was opposed to his ideas of correctness. Whenever an orthoepist talks of a "careless" pronunciation, he means that which is most prevalent, and which is therefore most valuable to the student of changes, while his "careful" pronunciation is that of Dr. Gill's "docti interdum," seldom or never heard when speakers are thinking of the meaning, rather than the sound, of what they say.

1686. Miezè says: "La diphthonge au en Angois se prononce comme nôtre a en François, Exemple, Cause, Author. Il en faut excepter Auncient, & ses Derivatifs, où la Diphthongue se prononce comme l'a simple en Anglais. De même en est il des mots finissans en aunt, comme aunt, to daunt, qu'il faut prononcer aint, tou daint. To laugh, se prononca laif. Paul suit la Règle, hormis quand on parle de l' Eglise Cathedrale de S. Paul à Londres. Alors on l'appelle Pâls. . . . La Diphthongue au sonne comme un a long en François. Exemple, Law, flaw qu'il faut prononcé là, flà. Mais il se prononce bref, dans avry."

The difficulty experienced by the French in distinguishing (œ) from (œ), and (a) or (æ) from (ʌ) has been noticed on pp. 71-2. The preceding indications lead me to suppose that Miezè meant to express the sounds, (kæz, æ-θər, æn-ʃənt æn-ʃənt, ænt, dænt, leæf, Paal Poulz, læ æ). The sound of ancient is doubtful. The use of (œæ) in aunt, daunt is rather a thin pronunciation at the present day, which some ladies even still further thin to (ænt, dænt). The sound (Poulz) is not now heard, but as Chaucer writes Powl, and as Butler gives the pronunciation (Poulz) "in the French manner," we see that this pronunciation was very old, and was probably confined to this single word.

1701. Jones simply identifies a, au, aw in all, Paul, awl. But he gives the following list of words in au, "which many sound as with an o. Auburn, auction, audacious, audible, audience, audit, auditor, auf awe, augment, augre, August, aumber, aumelet, aunt, auspicious, austere, authen-tick, author, Autumn, auxiliary, because, cautious, centaury, daunt, Dauphin, debauch, fault, flaunt, fraud, herald, Hesil, jaundice, laudable, maudlin, maugre, nauseous, Pauls, plausible, restauration, sausage, ribauldry, vault."

He does not say whether the o is long (oo) or short (ɔ). In sausages we now use (ʌ), and frequently in because (bizəz, bikoz'), but auf awe is now written oaf (oaf). Dauphin is frequently pronounced as French (Doofes'). The cases in which Jones finds al written for au will be considered under
L; and those in which au is written as a written before M. N, R will be considered under those letters.

In the xviiith century, then, au was almost universally pronounced (AA), but there were a few exceptions, so that on the whole the rules resembled those now in use.

**AU — xviiith Century.**

1704. The Expert Orthographist take the sound of au for granted, and must have pronounced (AA). The following with the sound of (AA) are noteworthy, sausage, taunt, vaunt, launcest, launch.

1766. Buchanan has (AA) in daw, maw, awe, vault, daunt, fault, taunt, but has (ææ) in aunt, laugh, where Sheridan has (æ).

1768. Franklin has (laa) meaning probably (laaz) laws.

The usages with regard to au seem to have been nearly the same in the xviiith century as in the xixth century, but the orthoepists of the xviiith ignore the sound (aa) altogether, and consequently do not notice the sounds (aant, laaf), which are now extremely prevalent, and probably were frequently heard during the preceding century. Our present orthoepists reject the sounds also.

**OU — xviith Century.**

1530. Palsgrave says: "Ov in the frenche tong shalbe sounded lyke as the Italians sounde this vowel v, or they with vs that sounde the latine tong aright, that is to say, almost as we sounde hym in these wordes, a cowe, a cowe, a sowe, as ovitre, ovdayn, ovbiwr, and so of suche other."

The ou in French is called "ou clos" and sometimes "o clos" by Meigret, which would lead to suppose it rather (uh) than (u), see p. 131, note. There can be no doubt of the Italian u, which was certainly (uu). But it seems from other writers that this pronunciation of (kuu, muu, suu), although still heard in the North of England, was going out. Palsgrave's pronunciation is probably of the xvth century in this point. We shall see that these words were so pronounced in the xivth century, and it will hence be most convenient to defer the consideration of the change of (uu) into (ou) to the next chapter. We are not to suppose that ou was universally pronounced as (uu), even by Palsgrave and older writers. In many words, ou derived from augs. aw, was called (ouu). Palsgrave says in another place:

"If m or n followe next after o in a frenche worde both in one syllable, than shall the o be sounded almost lyke this diphthonge
ov, and something in the noose: as these words mon, ton, son, renom, shalbe sownded morn, tovn, sovn, renom and so of all suche other, and in like wyse shall o be sownded though the next syllable folowyng beginne with an other m or n, as in these wordes bôme, bôme, bôme, tînne, whiche they sounde bôume, boun, soumme, tounne, and so of suche other."

Meigret knows nothing of this, but the effect on English ears is important in the transference of French words to English, where on, when, at present, nasal, became oun, meaning (uun), which afterwards, as we shall see, fell into (oun). Thus Hart in giving the pronunciation of the French Lord's prayer, writes (tun, nam, volunte', küm'ah, dün'e, pardun'ah, pardun'onz, unt), for, ton, nom, volonté, comme, donnez, pardonne, pardonnons, ont.

1547. Salesbury gives no special article on ou, but he has the following words, involving this combination, which may be classified as follows.

(oo) bowe, bo (boo) arcus; crowe kro (kroo) cornix; trowe tro (troo) opinor.

(o) honoure or (or-or) honos;—probably a mistake for onor (on-or).

(uu) wowe, w (wu) petere ut procus;—a Welshism for (wu) now written wuo.

(u) narrow, narw (nar'w) angustus; sparowe, sparw (spar'w) passer; grachtoue, grasis (gra'si,us) comis; emperoue, emperer (em-perer) imperator; double, dobyl (dub'îl), see also under (ou).

(ou) low low (lou) mugire; nowe now (now) nune; thou dhow (dhou); double u dobyl uw (dou'îl yu), see also under (u).

It is evident that "the (ou)z have it," but the (ouz) are in force. Those words marked (oo) by Salesbury were probably (ou), as at present, but the (u) was possibly faint and disregarded.

1555. Cheke says: "foule, boule, houle foul, boul, ful ful hul latinus u est, nam lumen mustij acute argute âmuou vouruu anûte argunte âcic Greece transferuntur."

Since Mekerch in taking the passage transfers it thus "moule concha, douken panni, μύλ, δήκ mul duk u Latinum est," and we know that in the old Dutch words cited ou was (ou) or (ou), we see at once that these scholars were led away by their interpretation of the Greek ou as (ou), to imagine that the Latin u had the same sound, instead of, conversely, from the known (uu) sound of Latin u concluding the (uu) sound of Greek ou. In Cheke's time then the English "foule, boule, houle" were (foul, boul, houl).

1 The modern forms are mouse, moune, molle, (mou, mound, mol-e), and dock (duke).
1568. Sir T. Smith fully endorses Cheko’s inference that the Latin long u was pronounced as he pronounced Greek ou, that is, (ou), saying:

"OT diphthongus Graecus, (ou) et ou, (ouu). Ex (o) breui & (u), diphthongum habebant Latini, quæ si non cadem, vicinissima certè est ou Graecæ diphthongo, & proximè accedit ad sonum w Latinæ. Ita quæ Latinæ per u longum scribendar, Graeci exprimebant per ou. quæ per u breuem, per u, quasi sonos vicinissimos. At ex (oo) longa & (u) diphthongus apud nos frequens est, apud Graecos rara, nisi apud Ionas: apud Latinos haud scio an fuit vnum in vssu.

(ou), (bou) flectere, (boul) sphæra, (kould) poteram, (mou) meta femni, (sou) sus femina.

ou (bou) arcus, (boul) sinum aut scaphium, (kould) frigidus, (mou) metere, aut irridere os distorquendo, (sou) seminare, aut suere."1

And again in his Greek pronunciation, he adds: "ou ab omnibus rectè sonatur, & u facit Latinum quando productur, vt aduerit Terentianus: differt ou granditate vocis, vt etiam vev ab eu distinguimus.

ou, bou, βου, flectere. a hay mou, μου, feni congeries, a goune, γουν, toga.

ou, a bou, βου, arcus. to mou, μου, metere, vel os torquere. gou, γου, abeamus.

v breue Latinum. a bull taurus. u longum vel ou, a boul, βουλ, globus. ou, a boule βουλε, Sinum ligneum, vas in quo lac seruatur, vel vnde ruri bibitur.

Here Smith agrees with Salesbury in the close diphthong (ou), but distinguishes an (ouu) where Salesbury only heard (oo) as in bove, arcus. In the same way at the present day, very few of those who say (boou) acknowledge the final (u), because most of them insert it in no, go, etc., saying (nou, gouu) for (nou, gou), and hence consider that they pronounce simple (oo) in both cases. Very few would say (ai nou no boou soo boou) for I know no bow so low, or would distinguish no bow as (nou boou) from know bow (nou boou). Smith at the same time absolutely disagrees with Palgrave in mou, sou, saying (mou, sou) where the latter says (muu, suu). It is singular that this difference, to which we shall have to allude again presently, turns upon precisely the error con-

1 At present it is usual to distinguish sou semiare, soue suere, which would lead to saying (souu, seu). We find for soue semiare *sowyn corne, or any oþer sedys* in the Promptorium, *I sowe corne, or any other seeds* in Palgrave; and for soue suere, *sowe clothys or oþer sedys* in Promptorium, *I sowe with a nedell* in Palgrave, while Levins gives both soue and soue for suere, and does not appear to give the English for semiare at all. Probably Levins's soue should have been explained semiare.
cerning Greek *ou*. Although there were then living persons who pronounced (uu) for *ou*, yet Cheke and Smith both refer their sound (ou) to the Greek *ou*, and then infer the monstrous conclusion that the Latins pronounced their long *u* in the same way.

1569. Hart, in the passage already quoted, p. 132, writes *fowerth*, (fourth) *tozer* (tourur), *poure* (pourr), *flouer* (flour), marking the second element of the diphthong as long. There is no doubt that in prolonging a diphthong the second element must be lengthened, because the first and the glide must pass in the usual time in order to preserve the character of the diphthong. As however the lengthening of the second element is accidental, it is not usually marked in palaeotype. In the course of his work, however, Hart does not mark the second element as long; for example I find, (nou, sound). Hart also leaves out the (u) occasionally as (vo,olz, knoon, thon't, knoledzh,) for *vowels*, *known*, *thought*, *knowledge*. Hart also writes (dub'l) for *double*, thus agreeing with one of Salesbury's notations for this word.

1580. Bullokar in writing of the sounds of *o* (supra p. 93) says that the third sound is “as, v, flat and short, that is to say, as this sillage *ou*, short sounded.” Again, under *u* he talks of one of the vowel sounds of *u* being “of flat sound, agreeing to the olde and continued sound of the diphthong: *ou*: but always of short sound.” This he distinguishes by writing a hook, like a comma below, which will be here, for convenience, printed as a comma before. He then identifies in his notation *o,v o,u ,ou ,ouw ,p ,u ,e ,oo*, where the two o’s are united into one sign like Greek *ω*, observing “that no diphthong is of so short sounde as any short vowell, and that as well short vowels, as diphthongs ending a sillage, are of meane time, that is, betwenee short and long, their time before shewed notwithstanding.” The following are some of the words in the ordinary spelling in which he uses these notations *sum*, *sound*, *doubt*, *other*, *fully*, *some*, *such*, *without*, *precious*, *youth*, *good*, *much*, *under*, *colour*, *unwilling*, *comfort*, *double*, *vowels*, *come*, *but*, *word*, *our*. With the exception of *sound*, *doubt*, *without*, *vowels*, *our*, which have now *(ou)* and *youth* which has *(uu)*, all the above words have now *(ə)*, and it will be shewn under U that we may infer an elder *(u)* or *(u)* from a modern *(ə)*. There is therefore no doubt that Bullokar pronounced *ou* as *(u)* at times; at other times I think it must have been *(uu)*, for he would not have used the phrase “*ou* short sounded” unless there had been an “*ou* long sounded.” Thus it is probable that the word
vowels was called by him (vuuvelz) rather than (vuvelz). We have here then a direct confirmation of Palsgrave and contradiction to Smith. Thus bow flectere == (bou) in Smith, and (buu) in Bullokar, both giving bow arcus as (bouu). We are reminded here of the distinction between the English (bou) and the Scotch (buu). Again bowl sinum is (bouul) in Salisbury, Smith, Bullokar; but bowl sphera, is (boul) in Smith and (buul) in Bullokar. The celebrated bowling greens at Nottingham are commonly called (bouuliq) or (bouliq griinz) to this day. Walker says on the word bowl sphera, which he calls (bouul) meaning (bouul):

"Many respectable speakers pronounce this word so as to rhyme with bouquet (bouul) the noise made by a dog. Dr. Johnson, Mr. Elphinston and Mr. Perry declare for it; but Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Scott, Dr. Kenrick and Mr. Smith, pronounce it as the vessel to hold liquor, rhyming with hole (bouul, bouul). I remember having been corrected by Mr. Garrick for pronouncing it like bowl; and am upon the whole of opinion, that pronouncing it as I have marked it, (bouul), is the preferable mode, though the least analogical."

Walker derived his knowledge entirely from observing the spelling and custom of his time. Hence his argument is perfectly groundless. Bowl, the cup, is connected with boll, bale, and the sound of (oo) is to be expected, the additional (u) arising merely from the following l, as will be shewn under L. But bouet, the ball, was the French boule, correctly written boul or bouet in older English, not only as we see from Bullokar, who calls this sound of ou its "old and continued sound," but as will appear from the study of Chaucer’s orthography. The change of (uu) into (ou) in English, which occurred partly perhaps in the xvth century, but which we see by Palsgrave and Bullokar, was not fully completed in the xvi th, and which the words through, youth, you, a wound some say (a wound), could, would, should, flumk (a flounder), soup, group, rouge, route, occasionally called (roue) like rout, Cowper, only called (kourper) by those who do not know the family, Brougham, (Bruum) as spoken by Lord Brougham, though the carriage is often called (Broo’om), will convince us that the change is not yet complete. The nature and laws of this change will best be considered hereafter.1

1 Walker continues as follows, and it is worth while, perhaps, in a note, to draw attention to the extreme confusion of ideas concerning language that possessed this respectable orthoepist, because it is still widely prevalent, as I have had frequent opportunities of observing. "But as the vessel bowl has indisputably this sound it is rendering the language still more irregular to give the ball bowl a different one.” That is, because in early times of our orthography, when the writer did not know exactly how to represent
the sound of (nu), but wandered be-
 tween o and ou, ow, which last hap-
pended to be also appropriated to sounds
which were distinctly (ou), and be-
cause people following the tendencies of
sound, quite independently of spell-
ing, altered the sound of (nu) in many
words to (ou, ou), so as still to keep
up a distinction in speech between
words previously distinguished though
in a different way,—all these tendencies
are to be given up for the sake of a
casual similarity of spelling; and it is
to be deemed less irregular, because the
spelling is alike, to change the sound
of one of the words, than to give a dif-
ferent sound to two words spelled alike,
or to change the spelling of one of
them. Of course, then, know now should
be pronounced alike, as also the latter
parts of shoe, hoe, changed hanged. The
irregularity was not in the sound but
in the clumsy orthography. Walker
proceeds thus, “The inconvenience of
this irregularity is often perceived in the
word bow;” the irregularity was spelling
bowd, the sound bowd, in the same
way; Walker assumes it
to be, pronouncing one word, i.e. one
collection of letters, in two ways.
The confusion of writing and sound
could not be more complete. “To
have the same word ‘i.e. sound, ‘sig-
nify different things, is the fate of all
languages; but pronouncing the same
word ‘i.e. written symbol, ‘differently
to signify different things, is multiplying
difficulties without necessity;” to
the reader, not the listener, and the
remedy is with the writer, not the
speaker, “for though it may be alleged
that a different pronunciation of the
same word ‘i.e. written symbol, ‘to
signify a different thing, is in some
measure remedying the poverty and
ambiguity of language.” i.e. written
symbols, “it may be answered, that it is
in reality increasing the ambiguity”
of orthography, not of language, “by
setting the eye and ear at variance,
and obliging the reader to understand
the context before he can pronounce
the word.” A good argument against
unphonetic spelling. But to conclude
that pronunciation must follow the un-
phonetic spelling, is to determine that
every baby should learn to read before
it speaks. This would almost beat
those celebrated Irish infants of whom
a native, it is sad, by Sir Jonathan
Barrington in his Memoirs, to have
declared, inveighing against the pre-
ocious wickedness of his times, that,
‘little children who could neither walk
nor talk, ran about the streets blas-
pheming.’ Walker continues: “It
may be urged that the Greek and Latin
languages had these ambiguities in
words” written symbols, “which were
only distinguished by their quantity or
accent.” That is, words differing in
the accent given to the syllables, or in
the length of vowel sounds were written
alike—a defect in orthography, but
certainly not in the language which
distinguished the sounds. “But it is
highly probable that the Greek lan-
guage had a written accent to distin-
guish such words as were pronounced
differently to signify different things,”
as the Greek accents were an invention
of later grammarians chiefly to assist
foreigners, it will be more satisfactory if Walker had mentioned
the grounds of this ‘high probability,’
“and this is equivalent to a different
spelling,” of course, when the accent
points to a difference of sound, and is
not merely, as old Bullocke used it,
and as we find in French a, à, ‘for
the sake of equivocality,’ just as we may
imagine Walker would have looked on
the diverse spellings rite, write, right,
or air, ear, eair, era, ear. Walker
continues, “and though the
Latin word lego signified either to read
or to send, according to the quantity
with which the first syllable was pro-
nounced,” that is, the word (leg-o)
meant I gather or read, and the word
(leg-oo) meant I send, and the two
words were in this particular inflection
written alike, “it was certainly an im-
perfection in that language,” read, or
thography, “which ought not to be
imitated. Ideas and combinations of
ideas will always be more numerous
than words; and therefore the same
word will often stand for very different
ideas.”; and Walker has in this note
strangely illustrated the danger of such
results in bad writers and loose thinkers,
He has however some remnants of the (uu, u) sounds, as (kuurts) courts, (kuudl) could, where Smith has (kould), and admits (wound) as a Northern pronunciation of wound.

1653. Butler says (translating his symbols): "ou in the substantitive termination our, as honour, labour, succour; and in the adjective termination ous, as glorious, gracious, prosperous is sound as oo or us short" that is (u) or (us). "This being general, may be suffered as an Idiom: but in other syllables of some few words, whereof there is no certain rule to be given, it is not so excusable: as when we write bloud, bloud, courage, scourge, flourish, nourish, young, youth, wulf, double, trouble, &c., for blood, flood, courage, scurge, floorish, nurish, yung, yuth, wulf, double, trouble, &c.," meaning (blad, blad, kur-adzh, skuardzh, flourish, nurish, suq, yuth?, wulf, dub-l, trab-l), "for the same writing hath another sound in loud, proud, cour, sour, mounds, mouth, coul, scoul, doubl, troul, and the same sound hath another writing in good, stood, bud, mud, burge, purge, furrow, murrain, bung, gulf, double, stubble, &c.," which had (u). "Neither is there any more reason why in would, could, should, run, woun, wound, ou should be written for oo long; than that for cool, pour, tool, school, stood, hoof, bow, moon, doom; we should write coul, pour, cool, tout, scoul, stoul, houf, bourn, moon, doun. The cause of this cacography which causeth such difficulty is a causeless affection of the French dialect; who for the sound of oo (which in their language is frequent) do sometimes write o and oftentimes ou; as they write i, ai, oi, and sound (ii, e, woe), or as they write en, an, av, and sound an, aun, ou for entend, command, couteau, saying antand, command, couteau. But that they speak otherwise than they

by confusing a spoken and a written word, language, and orthography; "but altering the sound of a word, without altering the spelling, is forming an unwritten language." The orthoepist the orthographer, the word-pedlar, is here shewn to the life. It is a horror to him, a monstrosity, this formation of an "unwritten language." As if all languages were not formed unwritten, were not to the great majority of present speakers, unwritten. As if all those who made languages, who altered their sounds, who brought them to their present speech-form, knew or cared about writing; as if even the majority of those who speak, pause to consider in the rapidity of discourse, how the printers of the day choose to print, and the writing-masters choose to order their pupils to write! No, it is not the language, or the speakers that are in fault in obeying and carrying out the organic laws of speech and word formation. It is those word-pedlars, those letter-drivers, those stiff-necked, pedantic, unphilosophical, miserably-informed, and therefore supremely certain, self-confident, and self-conceited orthogaphers who make default, when they will not alter the spelling after the sound has changed, and maintain that though their rules must be right, it is only the exceptions which prove them—forgetting that as some foreigner pithily said, "English orthographical rules are all exceptions."

1 Meaning couer, written covyrn in the Promptorium, coure in Palsgrave, and coure in Levins.
2 Query, borage, as written in the Promptorium, the bourage of Palsgrave and burrage of Levins, exhibiting the three common spellings for the same sound.
3 Room, woff "of woffen, as warp because warped or wrapped round the beam" adds Butler.
4 Butler belongs to the latter part of the xviith or to the xvith century, in his French, when the change of the French ai from (a) to (ə) was complete.
write, is no reason why we should write otherwise than we speak; considering what an ease and certainty it would be both to readers and writers, that every letter were content with its own sound, and none did intrude upon the right of another. The termination our accented, is sounded in two syllables: as in devour, destiver; and in all monosyllables, as our, hour, hour, flour, tour, sour, lour, scour, pour. Verb fundo: the Noun is, for difference, written in two syllables power potestar, and so are all the substantives in the plural number; as flowers, townes, Showers: and sometime in the singular not only in verse: but in prose also."

OU — XVITH Century.

1653. Wal lis says: "Ow et ow duplicem sonum obtinent; alterum clariorem, alterum obscuriorem. In quibusdam vocabulis effertur sono clariori per o apertum,1 et ow. Ut in soul anima, sound vendebam, vendidum, snow nix, know nio, say seco, snow, snow debeo, bowl poculum, etc., quo etiam sono et & simplex nonnullum effertur nempæ ante lâ ut in gold aurum, sold rixor, hold teneo, sold frigidus, old senex, antiquus, etc., et ante ll in poll caput, roll volvo, tolk vectigal, etc. Sed et haec omnia ab aliis effrentur simpliciter per δ rotundum acsi scripta essent sola, sold, mowel &c. In alius vocabulis obscuriori sono effertur; sono nempæ composite ex δ vel α obscuris (a), et ow (au). Ut in house domus, mouse mus, isowe pediculus, bowl globulus, our noster, but ex, debt bubo, towen oppidum, found immundus, mowel volucris, bown fleeto, bough ramus, bow sus, etc. At would vellem, should deberem, could possem, curse cursus, court aula, curia, et pauca forsan alia, quamvis (ut proxime precedentia) per ow pronunciari debeant, vulgo tamen neglectius efferri solent per oo (uu)."

Wallis seems to say that (soul, sound, snow) as well as (sool, soold, snoo) were heard, and that (goul, skould, bould, kould, ould) were used, although he did not approve of them. This effect of L will be considered hereafter. The sound (nous, mous) &c. is the same as the modern English, and must be distinguished from the former. Wallis's dictum concerning would, etc., is only borne out by Smith's very peculiar (kould) could, suprâ p. 151. We have seen that Gill said (kuurt); (kuurs) is still common in the North. Wallis wishes that the two sounds were distinguished in writing.

1 This must mean "δ apertum," that is (ω), giving the diphthong (au); although it is certainly very singular, as the words given were pronounced with (oo) in the XVIth century, and he makes some of them have (oo). This (au) is the diphthong recognized in a few words by Cooper, suprâ p. 147.

I suspect that this is a theoretical pronunciation, arising from Wallis's considering the vowel o short in the diphthong and his having no notation for (o). The δ apertum he usually marks ω, but here he has employed δ, apparently to connect the sound with his δ = (oo), so that he may really mean (au).
using ōu ów or òu òw or simply ow for (ou, oo) and òu òw or simply ow for (ou). Yet how many would feel their eyes offended by seeing know, nov, hou, low, sou, sow, row, rov, notwithstanding the infinitesimal nature of the change.

1668. Wilkins speaks of (œu) only as the sound of ow in "owr, owle." It is curious that, though (œu) is the common Norfolkism now, Wilkins says that (œ) before (u) "will not coalesce into a plain sound." Writers on phonetics are too apt to measure the pronouncing powers of others by their own, although the extreme difficulty with which unfamiliar combinations of familiar elements become current to their organs, and the mistakes they make in hearing and imitating unfamiliar sounds and slight variations of familiar sounds, should teach them to be less confident.

1668. Price makes several categories of ow, ou.

1) œu, ou sound "like o," that is, either (œo) or (o) in bestow, know, a bow, flow, low, window, throw, grow, glow; succour, brought, endeavour, although, armour, behaviour, clamour, colour, ambassador, emperor, error, gourd, harbour, mammour, nought, odour, ought, rigour, solicitor, soul, though, thought, wrought; in some of which we have now (o, a).

2) œu, ou keep their "full sound" (œu) in bow, to bow, froward, allow, cow, coward, now, toward, devout, flout, fourth, our Saviour, stout. Although (tou-ad) may be occasionally heard, it is unfrequent; (tou-ad) I do not remember to have heard; (fourth) is also strange, and (see-ri, ou) the strangest of all.

3) Ou sounds "like short u," that is (o), in cousin, double, courage, adjourn, blood, couple, courtesy, discourage, doubled, encourage, fleet, flourish, journey, journal, nourish, ougly, scourge, touchstone, touchy, young. All these pronunciations remain in use although we no longer write blood, fleud, ougly.

4) œu, ou sound "like woo," that is (uu) in arrow, pillow, barrow, borrow, fallow, follow, hallow, morrow, shaddow, sorrow, swallow, widdow, willow, winnow, couch, course, discourse, court, courtier.

5) "Ou soundes like iw in youth," meaning (iathing)? This certainly ought to have formed part of the preceding list.

1685. Cooper says "O in full, fole (u, oo) cum u (u) conjunctus constituit diphthongum in coulter vomis, four quatuor, mould panifico, mucusco, typus in quos respurator; mouller plumas exuere, poulerer avicularius, poutry alites villatici, shoulder humerus, soul anima; in ceteris hunc sonum scribimus per o ante li finalem, vel l, quando prcedit aliam consonantem; ut bold audax; quidam hoc modo pronunciant oue."

"U guttarelam (o), ante u Germanicum oo anglicè exprimentem (u) semper scribimus per ou; ut out ex; about circa; ou tamen aliquando, præter sonum priorem, sonatur ut oo (uu); ut I could possem; ut u gutturalis (o), couple copulo; ut a (aa) bought emptus."
The first diphthong must be written theoretically (wu), but it was probably meant to be the same as (ou), coinciding with Wallis’s diphthong, because Cooper does not distinguish (u, o). The second diphthong was of course the modern (eu).

The words in ou which Cooper pronounces with the first diphthong (wu) or (ou), as above mentioned, all contain oul, and to these he adds the following with a simple o before l, behold, bold, bolster, bolt, cold, colt, dolt, droll, enroll, fold, gold, hold, inhodeler hospes, joll, knoll, manifold, motten, poll, roller, rolls, scold, sold, told, upholster plamaruis. He also says: “Quidem scribunt troll vel trivel leviter eo, ita controll controul, redarguo, joll jole caput,” jowl is common now, with the sound (dzbaul), “toll tole vectigal &c, mold vel mowld humus, at mould typus,” a distinction now lost, if it were ever made by others beside Cooper, “bowl bole patera.”

The sound of the second diphthong (eu) is given by Cooper to all other words in ou, as “boul globulus, gout podagra, &c,” some of which he allows to be written ow, as: adwerson, allow, acow, bow torqueo, bowels, bover, brow, brown, bronze, carousez, cow, coward, crow, crown, down, drown, frown, gown, how, houl, lower frontem capero, now fenile, now, owel, plow arco, rowel, rovin fenum seerininum, shower, sow s., towel, tower, travel, vow, vowel. He adds, “bounce crepo, bowser thesaurus, cloven colonus, drouse somnolentus, loud sonorous, house pedicular, renoun gloria, rouse excito, souse omasum, touze plurimum vello; etc., scribuntur item cum ou. W quiescens adjungitur post o finale, (præter in do facio, go eo, no non, so sic, to ad) ut bowe arcus, dowe farina subacta” i.e. dough, “owe deboo, sove sero, tow lini floccus, &c, & in own assero, disoun denego, bellow’s follis, gallows patibulum, towardness indoles.”

Hence Cooper admits (ou) but not (ou) making the latter purely (oo). He gives no list of words with ou pronounced as (o) or (u, uu).

1686. Miege’s lists are as follows : ou generally = aou, meaning (eu), not (au), although Miege confuses French a with English (aa).

1) ou = o, meaning (o), in adjourn, bloud, floud, country, couple, courage, courtesy, double, doublet, flourish, gourment, journey, Journal, nourish, scourge, scoundrel, touch, trouble, young, in which (skaw-drel) is new.

2) ou = “o un peu long,” meaning (o) or (oo), or sometimes one and sometimes the other, or else (ou) which he was unable to express in French letters: in couler, moulter, poultice, poultry, four,
course, concourse, discourse, soul, soildier, shoulder, mould, trough, dough, though, although.

3) ou, value not named, and hence probably French ou (u), see Jones, just below, in substantives ending in our as Saviour, factour, neighbour.

4) ou, value not named, probably French ou (u), in adjectives ending in ous, as vicious, malicious, righteous, monstrous, treacherous.

5) ough = a long, that is (ÂÀ) in ought, nought, brought, bought, sought, thought, wrought = ât, nât, brât, bât, &c., (ÂÀ, naât) &c. except drought, doughty = draout, draouty (drouut, dou'tâ); borough, thorough = borâ, thorâ (bor'â, thor'â); cough = câff (kaaff); rough, tough, enough = roff, toff, enoff (raf, tof, enaf).

6) ou = ou French (uu) in would, could, should, you, your, source, youth, — Portsmouth, Plumouth, Yarmouth, Weymouth, Mammouth.

1701. Jones says "that on and ow have two very different sounds; (1) that in soul, bowl, old, told, &c., which is the true sound of o and oo join'd together in one syllable (ou, ou); (2) that in bough, cow, now, &c., which is the true sound of o short, in but, cut, &c., and oo join'd together in one syllable (ou)."

But he characteristically seldom distinguishes which he means when he talks of the sound of ou, ou. He also says that ou is pronounced o, meaning either (oo) or (o), or even (ÂÀ) in "Gloucester, sounded Gloster; although, besought, borough, bough," of course, bought, cough, dough, doughty; drought, enough, fought, hicough, hough, lough, Lougher, mought, nought, ought, plough," of course, cough, thought, through, tough, trough, whoough, wrought; and "in souldier, sounded sodier," the parent of the "sojer" of our plays and jest books.

The sound of o is also written ou, Jones says: "When it may be sounded ow in the End of words, or before a vowel, as ow, owing; follow, following, &c., otherwise it is always o, when it cannot be sounded ow (ou?) unless it be one of those above, that are written ough."

Ou= (uu) is much more extended by Jones than by the preceding authorities, first to the terminations -our, -ous "when it may be sounded ou," which seems very questionable, and then in the following words: couch, could, course, court, courtship; courteous, crouch, fourth, gouge, gourd, mouch, mourn, should, slouch, souse, touch, would; accoutre, amour,

1 Surely a mistake.
2 (Dou'tâ) not (doo'tâ) according to Mige, and present use.
3 Meaning (enou)?
4 The Authorized Version has plow.
5 Now (raf, alsf aie, tof).
boutefeu, Bourdeaux, capouch, capouchine, coupee, courrier, Courtine, courtney, coursee, enamour'd, gourmandise, Louvain, Louvre, rendezvous, rencontre, Toulon. For ou = (ə), see p.183.

Hence in the xvii th century ou, or ouw had two sounds, the first (ou) or (ouw) corresponding to our present theoretical (oo) and secondly (ou) where it is still so called. The sound of ou as (uu) was exceptional, and seems to have been used in a few more words than at present.

OU — xvii th Century.

1704. The Expert Orthographist seems to pronounce ou as (ou) in touch, Souch, gouge, rouge, coulier, boulter, poultry, moulter, shoulder, poultice, wound, pour, bowel, cowcumber. But to distinguish bow fletcre as (bou) from bow arcsus as (boou), and says that “All polysyllables ending in obscure o have w added for ornament’s sake as arrow, bellows, &c.”

1766. Buchanan writes, (naat) nought, (mous) mouse, (foul) foul, (bou) bow fleterere, (koun’ti) county, (koutah) couch, (you’il) vowel, (sou) sow sus, (boul) bowl globus et crater; (dhow) though, (koors) course, (koort) court, (nou) know, (bloo) blow, (bistoo’) bestow, (sool) soul, (nær’oo) narrow, (ə lou) a low; (suup) soup, (wud) would, (kud) could, (ruu) you; (jəq) young, (trob’l) trouble, (kəp’l) couple, (kər’idzh) courage, (kən’tri) country, (nær’ish) nourish; (thaat) thought, (baat) bought.

1768. Franklin writes (faul, aur, daun, thauz’and, plau’men; koors) for foul, our, down, thousand, ploughman, course, where if (au) is not a mistake, it is a singular form of the diphthong, agreeing however with the analysis of Sheridan and Knowles. Among the Irish uses noted by Sheridan, 1780, we find (kuurt) court, (suurs) source, and (kauld, baud) cold, bold, all of which clearly belong to the xvii th century. Sheridan pronounces (koort, soors, koold, boold). The Irish (druuth) drought, English (draut) according to Sheridan, is very singular.

U — Round or Labialised Vowels.

U has been reserved to the last, as in order to understand the relations of the various sounds which have been expressed by u in our own and other languages, especial attention must be directed to the twofold manner in which the aperture of the mouth is varied. Speech sounds are essentially produced in the same manner as those in organ reed pipes.
In the larynx two highly elastic vocal ligaments, stretched to various degrees of tension at will, are put into vibration by the rushing of wind from the lungs through the windpipe. The sound thus produced is highly complicated, consisting, as Helmholtz has shewn,1 of a great number of simple tones, producing on the whole a buzzing, droning, imperfect effect, which would not be well heard. To make it penetrate as a clear distinct sound, a resonance tube must be added. This tube, according to its shape or length, will reinforce a greater or less number of simple tones, which it selects out of the confused number produced by the unarmed elastic ligaments, thus generating, by the mere change of its shape and size a marked change in the sound heard, even when the original mode of vibration remains unaltered.

Now above the larynx is situated a highly variable fleshy bag, the pharynx, communicating with two external apertures, the nose and the mouth, either or both of which can be opened or closed at will. The back nostrils are the entrance and the external nostrils the exit from the upper passage, where the sound passes through various galleries and encounters various membranes, which produce the well-known nasal modifications. The lower passage or mouth is principally modified by the tongue, which acts as a variable plug, and the lips, which form a variable diaphragm. By this means the volume of the mouth is divided into two bent tubes of which the first may be termed the lingual passage as its front extremity is formed by the tongue, and the second, the labial passage. When the labial passage is large and unconstrained by rounding or narrowing of the labial orifice, the effects may be called simply lingual, and when the tongue is brought so low as to remove the separation between the lingual and labial passages, the effects might be termed labial. Mr. Melville Bell has acutely preferred, however, to consider as lingual all positions in which the labial aperture produces no sensible effect, and then to consider the labial effect to be superadded to the lingual, by more or less rounding the lips while the lingual position is held. It was not generally noticed before the publication of his Visible Speech, that the two labial vowels, as they have been called, (uu, oo) really required a distinct position of the tongue in order to produce them.2 This however may be

---

1 The only satisfactory account of musical and vocal tones which has yet been published will be found in Helmholtz’s Lehre von den Tonempfindungen, Brunswick, 8vo, pp. 600 first edition 1863, 2nd ed. 1865. It has been translated into French, but, unfortunately, not yet into English.

2 See however the subsequent reference to Holder, 1669, p. 178.
practically felt by producing these sounds, and, while, uttering them, seizing the upper and lower lips with the two hands and rapidly separating them. Two new sounds will be produced, of which the first (œœ) is a Gaelic vowel, which is the despair of most Englishmen, and the second is a sound (œ) often given to our short u in but, and considered by Mr. M. Bell as its normal sound. On producing the effect, which after a little practice can be obtained without the use of the fingers, it will be found that the back of the tongue is much higher for (œœ) than it is for (œ).\(^1\) Although both effects are different, and also different from the sound with which I pronounce u in but, namely (œ), few English ears would readily distinguish (œœ œœ) in conversation. Hence we have this relation between (u) and (œ), that (u) is almost (œ) labialized or rounded.\(^2\)

Again, for the common vowels (ii, ee) the lingual passage is greatly reduced by means of the front of the tongue which for (ii) is brought very near the palate, and very forward but not quite so forward for (ee), the lips being wide open. Now round the lips upon (ii, ee) and the effect is (i, ø), one a sound often heard in Germany for ü and in Sweden for y, and the other heard for the so-called French e mute when sounded and prolonged in singing, as heard in keur and the first syllable of heureux.\(^3\)

It is now necessary to attend to a third modification, principally in the pharynx. This consists in widening the bag of the pharynx and all the lingual passage behind the narrowest aperture, and also increasing the volume of the labial passage. We are familiar with this in English in the passage from (i) to (i), and from (e) to (e). Applied to the rounded or labialized forms of these vowels, (i, ø) it con-

---

1 In reading this discussion the diagrams of the vowel positions in the Introduction, p. 14, should be frequently consulted.

2 The true sound of (œ) has the back of the tongue lower and the front higher than for (œ); the tongue is altogether raised, but is nearly parallel to the palate throughout. The labial or 'round' form of (œ) is (œh), scarcely distinguishable from (œ) by unpractised ears.

3 Mr. M. Bell gives it as the French œ in one, but this is not my own pronunciation, nor does it agree with my own observations. M. Favarger considers the French e mute to be (œh) the labialisation of (œ), rather than (œ) the labialisation of (œ) and assigns the latter value to the French œœ, which I have been in the habit of pronouncing as the wide of (œ). Thus heureux according to Féline has the first syllable as in je and the second as in jou. These I pronounce (œœ, œœœ), but M. Favarger considers they should be (œœ, œœœ). Undoubtedly the sounds vary from individual to individual, and hence the necessity of a diagrammatic vowel scale like Mr. Melville Bell's, which is independent of key words. The Swedish œ or (œ) which is very peculiar is closely related to (i), being produced in the same way, with rather a greater separation between the tongue and the palate.
verts them into (γ, ο), which are the common forms, as I
hear them, of the French u in une and eu in jou. Hence (γ)
is the 'wide' form of (i), and the 'round' or labialised form
of (i). If we apply the widening to (u, o) we produce (u, o),
and the Italian o chiuso or (uh) appears to be the 'wide'
form of the Swedish (u) already described.

We can then understand that (u, u) may be readily con-
fused, for no modification is so subtle as that produced by
the backward widening. Again, by merely neglecting to
labialise, (u, u) are converted into (a, u), both of which are
confused with (ə) by Englishmen. The last, (u), is indeed
a very common sound in English, but it is only looked upon
as unaccented or indistinct (ə), in motion, ocean, etc.

Again, if when we are pronouncing (u) or (u) we suddenly
throw the front of the tongue up to the (i) position without
altering the form of the lips, we obtain (i) or (γ). There
are some persons so used thus to throw up the front of the
tongue that they have great difficulty in pronouncing (u) at
all. To succeed they must exercise themselves in keeping
down the front of the tongue by a muscular effort.

Roughly, we may say that (a) is (u) deprived of its labial
character, and that (γ) is (u) with a palatal character,
or that (γ) is an attempt to pronounce both (i) and (u)
at the same instant. The further step, then, to pro-
nouncing first (i) and then (u), producing (iu), is easy,
and since the (i) character predominates and gives the
key to the sound, it would be natural in the absence of
a proper sign for (γ) to represent that sound by (iu).

U — xvth Century.

1530. Palsgrave says: "U, in the frenche tong, wheresoeuer he
is a vowel by hymselfe, shall be sowned like as we sownde eu in
these wordes in our tong, reve an herbe, a mew for a hauke, a clew
of threde, and such lyke restyng apon1 the proumynsyng of hym:
as for these wordes plus, nul, fus, uer, humblle, ertu, they sound
plevus, novul, fevus, evuser, hevumble, ertevu, and so in all other
wordes, where v is a vowel by hymselfe alone; so that in the
soundynge of this vowel, they diffe re both from the Latin tong
and from vs."

On referring to Eu, p. 137, it will be seen that Palsgrave
divided the English eu into two categories, treve, glewe, reve,
meve and clew having the sound of the French u, and deve,
shreve, feve having the sound of the Italian eu. The latter
we have identified with (eu). There can be but little doubt

1 Misprint for upon.
that the former was (y), because we know from Meigret that it was not (o) or (u).

When Palsgrave here says that the sound of French *u* was different from that of Latin or English *u*, he must mean by the latter, English *u* short, because English *u* long was certainly not the same as the real Latin *u* long, even at a much earlier period than the xviith century. Hence corroboration, and contemporary explanations, are necessary.

1547. Salesbury says: "*u* vowel, answers to the power of the two Welsh letters *u*, *w* and its usual power is *uw*, as shewn in the following words *true* true verus, *vertrue* vertue probitas. And sometimes they give it its own proper sound and pronounce it like the Latins or like our own *v* (*u*), as in the words *bucke* buck (*buk*) dama mas, *lust* lust (lust) libido. But it is seldom this vowel sound corresponds with the sound we give the same letter, but it does in some cases, as in *busi* busi, occupatus aut se immiscens."

Again in his pronunciation of Welsh he says: "*u* written after this manner *uu*," that is, not as *v* which was at that time inter-changeable with *u* in English and French but not in Welsh, "is a vowel and soundeth as the vulgar English *trust*, bury, busy, Huber-den. But know well that it is neuer sounded in Welsh, as it is done in any of these two Englyshe words (notwytstanding the diuersitie of their sound) *sure*, *bucke*. Also the sound of *u* in French, or *u* with two pricks over the heade in Duch, or the Scottish pronunciation of *u* alludeth somewhat nere vnto the sound of it in Welshe, thoughhe yet none of them all, doeth so exactly (as I thynk) expresse it, as the Hebrack Kubuts doeth. For the Welsh *u* is none other thing, but a meane sounde betwyxte *u* and *y* byeng Latin vowels."

The precise value of the Welsh *u* is considered in a note on the above passage, chapter VIII, § 1, where it is shewn that it must be considered as the Welsh representative of (y), and that (i) or (y) is practically the sound it receives. If then Salesbury had to represent the sound (yy), he could not have selected any more suggestive Welsh combination than *wu*. To have written *uu* would have been to give too much of the (i) or (i) character, for when *u* was short he did not distinguish the sound from (i), as shewn by *busi* which he writes *busi*, meaning (biz'i). If he had written *owo* he would have conveyed a completely false notion, and *iw* would have led to the diphthong (iu) which he wished to distinguish from *uw*.

---

1 Germans who distinguish their *ü* from (ii) very clearly when it is long, readily pronounce short *ü* as (i) especially when *r* follows, as (bhr'-de) for (bhr'-de) *würde*. The Welsh *u* long is heard by Englishmen as (ii) and often so pronounced by the Welsh in familiar conversation. In the same way *Stiele* handles and *Stüle* chairs, are identified in the common Dresden pronunciation of German.
Now my own Welsh master at Beaumaris told me that Welsh *duw* and English *due*, *dew* were so distinct to a Welshman that he could tell an Englishman immediately by his faulty pronunciation. The difference may be (*dru*) Welsh and (*diu*) English. It is very difficult to seize, and some Welshmen themselves deny the difference.¹

Adopting then the hypothesis that Salesbury’s *uw* meant (*yy*), but his *u* short meant (*s*), so far as the English sounds which he wished to imitate are concerned,—an hypothesis which agrees with Palsgrave’s remarks and will be confirmed shortly—we may represent all the English words containing *u*, (or *ew* pronounced as *u*, according to Palsgrave’s intimation,) which are transcribed by Salesbury, as follows.

**Churchi teura tiwra** (tabutah) ecclesia; **duke duwck** (dyduck) duk, suffre sufffrer (suffer) sinere, gutte goyt (gut) viscera; **Jesu tiaww** (Dzbez-yyz) y; **sucker buck** (buk) dama mas; **bull bu** (bu) a rustic pronunciation, *queen kwin* (kwim) regina; *quarter kwarter* (kwarter) quarta pars; *muse muswes* (muyz) meditari; **treasure tez-yrr** thesaurus; *true true* (tryy) verus, this is one of the words cited by Palsgrave, under the form *trowe*, as containing the sound of the French *u* (*y*); *vertue vertuo* (ver-tyy) probitas; *lust lust* (lust) libido, *busi busi* (biz-i), *much good do it you mych goditio* (mithe godito). This much contracted phrase is also given by Cotgrave, 1611, who writes it *muskekitt*, meaning perhaps (*musekedit*)..., and translates *much good may doe unto you.*²

1555. Cheke says: “*Cum duke tuke late rebuke duk tuv* λυς ρεβυκ dicimus, Grecum *u* sonaremus.” Of this Greek *u* he says “*simplex est, nihil admixtum, nihil adjunctum habet,*” and it was therefore a pure vowel, with which he identifies the English long *u*. Mekerch in adopting Cheke’s words changes his examples thus, “*quum Gallicè *mule*, id est mula, Belgicè *duken*, id est abscondere, *mul duk* dicimus, Grecum *u* sonamus.” Mekerch, therefore, intending to give the same sound to Greek *u* as Cheke did, makes it (*yy*). This was the sound which Cheke identified with English long *u* and declared to be a simple sound, that is, not a diphthong.

¹ Dr. Benjamin Davies could see no difference in ordinary conversation, but admitted that one was attempted to be made in “stilted utterance,” and then it seemed to me to be like (dru).
² The same writer gives as the contraction for *God give you good evening*, Godigodin, meaning perhaps (*Godi-gudin*). In Romeo and Juliet, Folio 1623, Tragedies p. 70 col. 1, we find *Nor*. I speak no treason.

*Father, O Godigoden,*
*which is transliterated in the Globe edition, act iii, sc. 5, v. 173,*
*Nor. I speak no treason.*

*Cap.*
*O, God ye god-den,*
*an evident mistake, as *Godi-* is a con-
*traction for *God* gi’you. The sentence*
*should be as much wrapped up into*
*one word, as the ordinary *good bye.*
1568. **Sir Thomas Smith** is still more precise and circumstantial. He says:

"Y vel v Græcum aut Gallicum, quod per se apud nos taxum arborem significat. taxus v" meaning that *yew =* sound of Greek *v*; i.e. as he immediately proceeds to shew, and as I shall assume in transcribing his characters, *yew = (yy)*, though perhaps this particular word was *(yy)*. The following are his examples: *(snyny)* ningebat, *(styny)* occidit, *(tryy)* verum, *(tyyn)* tonus, *(kyy)* q. litera, *(ryy)* ruta, *(myy)* cavea in qua tenestur accipites, *(nyy)* novum; *(tyyl)*₁ valetudinarius, *(dyyk)* dux, *(myyl)* mula, *(flyyt)* tibia Germanorum, *(dyy)* debitum, *(lyyt)* testudo, *(bryy)* ceruia facere, *(myyl)* mulus, *(hlyy)* cæruleum, *(akkyyzz)*₂ accusare."

In this list we have *true, rue, mev*, which are the same as Palsgrave’s examples of *ew* sounded as French *u*; and *duke*, *true*, the same as Salesbury’s examples of *u* sounded as Welsh *uw*. This would identify both sounds with *(yy)* if we could be satisfied of Smith’s pronunciation. Now he says explicitly:—

"Quod genus pronunciationis nos à Gallis accepisse arguit, quodd rarius quidem nos Angli in pronuntiando hac utimur litera. Scoti autem qui Gallicia lingua suam veterem quasi oblitterarant, et qui trans Trentam fluvium habitant, vicinioresque sunt Scotis, frequen-tissimè, adeo vt quod nos per V Romanum songamus *(u)*, illi liberenter proferunt per *(y)* Graecum aut Gallicum *(yy)*; nam et hic sonus tam Gallis est peculiaris, ut omnia fere Romanae scriptae per *(y)* et *(u)* proferunt, vt pro Dominus (Dominyyss) et Iesvs (Jesyyvs),₂ intantum vt quæ brevia sint natura, vt illud macrum *(y)* exprimant melius, sua pronuncazione longa faciunt. Hunc sonum Anglosaxones, de quibus postea mentionem faciemus, per *(y)* exprimebant, ut verus Anglosaxonicorum ḳy. Angli *(nuur)* meretrix, *(kuuk)* coquus, *(guud)* bonum, *(bluuud)* sanguis, *(nuudd)* ceculus, *(fluuud)* fluvius, *(brruuuk)* liber, *(tuuk)* cepit; Scoti *(nyyr)*, *(kyyk)*, gyyd, bïyyd, *(nyyyd)*, *(flyyyd)*, *(byyy)*, *(tryyk)*. And again, "O rotundo ore et robustius quam priores effertur, us angustiore, cæstera similis ṭṟō o. Sed us *(yy)* compressissim propemodum labris, multò exilius tenuissique resonat quàm.

₁ "Tuly, Poorly. 'Tuly-stomached.'
₂ A well nabsb, how de yew fare? 'Wa' nasba, but tuly.' ... Tuality, vexed, ill-tempered, Satopy. ... twwily, restless, wearsome, Somerset; twelly, small and weaksy, Dorset. Twwly, qualmish, in delicate health, Essex, [Sir T. Smith’s county] and Camb. Twwll; a whim, Suff." John Greats Nell, Chapters on the East Anglian Coast, 2 vols., 8vo, 1866, vol. 2. Etymological and Comparative Glossary of the Dialect and Provincialisms of East Anglia.
o aut u, (boot) scapha, (buut) ocrea, (byyt) Scoticæ pronunciatione, ocrea.” And again in his Greek Pronunciation: “υ Græcum Scoti & Borei Angli tum exprimunt cum taurum sonant, & pro buλ, dicunt exiliter contractioribus labiis sono suppresso & quasi praecato inter i & u bɔl (byl).”

It is scarcely possible to indicate the sound of (yy) more clearly and precisely in common language.

Respecting u short, Smith says:

“V Latinam, apertissimam habemus Angli, quamvis illam non agnoscimus, jam longo tempore à Gallis magistris decepti: at pronoctio sonusque noster non potest non agnoscer. Brevis (but) sed, (luk) fortuna, (buk) dama mas, (mud) limus, (ful) plenus, (pul) deplumare, (tu) ad; longa (buut) ocrea, (luuk) aspicere, (buuk) liber, (muud) irs aut affectus, (fuul) stultus, (puul) piscina, (tuu) duo, etiam.”

(Buk) being in Salesbury’s list serves to identify the two methods of symbolisation. Of course no such fine distinctions as (u, u) are to be expected, nor indeed are they generally necessary to be insisted on. An attentive examination of the sounds of fool full in our present pronunciation will however shew that they contain different vowels (fuul, full), each of which can be pronounced long or short (fuul ful, fuul ful) and that these differ as (i, i) by the pharyngeal action already explained. As however short (u) rarely if ever occurs in closed syllables, and (uu) long never occurs in accented syllables, except before r (u), it would be generally intelligible to make no distinction between (u) and (uu) except in rare instances. One marked difference between the sounds (i, u) and (i, u) is that (i) may be easily sung to a deep note, but (i) cannot; and on the contrary (u) may be sung to a very high note, but (u) cannot.

1669. Hart calls u long a diphthong, but in his explanation he makes it arise from the attempt to pronounce (i) and (u) simultaneously, and he clearly points out that both the lingual position of (i) and the labial position of (u) are held on steadily during the sound of long u, so that if the (i) position be relaxed, the sound of (u) results, and if the (u) position be relaxed the sound of (i) results. This, as we have seen, amounts to a very accurate description of the simple sound (yy), which is therefore the sound which he means by the inaccurate title and notation of “the diphthong iu.” His words are:

“Now to come to the u. I sayde the French, Spanish, & Brutes,1 I maye adde the Scottish, doe abuse it with vs in sounde and for

1 That is, Welsh.
consonant, except the Brutes as is sayd: the French doe neuer sound it right, but vsurpe ou, for it, the Spanyard doth often vs it right as we doe, but often also abuse it with vs; the French and the Scotch in the sounde of a Diphthong: which keeping the vowels in their due sounds, commeth of i & u, (or verie neare it) is made and put together vnder one breath, confounding the soundes of i, & u, togeth: which you may perceyue in shapings thereof, if you take away the inner part of the tongue, from the upper teeth or Gummies, then shall you sound the u right, or in sounding the French and Scotch u, holding still your tongue to the ypper teeth or gums, & opening your lippes somewhat, you shall perceyue the right sounde of i." Thus Hart writes: (ui did not mutah abiyz dhem) as I shall hereafter transliterate his ui.

1573. Barets says, after speaking of the sound of v consonant:

"And as for the sound of V consonant whether it be to be sounded more sharply as in spelling blue or more grossly like oo, as we sound Book, it were long here to discusse. Some therefore think that this sharpe Scotch V is rather a diphthong than a vowel, being compounded of our English e and u, as indeed we may partly perceyue in pronouncing it, our tongue at the beginning lying flat in our mouth, and at the ende rising up with the lips also there-withall somewhat more drawen togeth:"

This would certainly make a diphthong because there would be a change of position, but what is the initial sound? The tongue does not certainly "lie flat in our mouth for e." The nearest sounds answering to this description are (eh a, a o) and it is impossible to suppose any of these to be the initial of such a diphthong. The only interpretation I can put on this somewhat confused description is, that Barets was speaking of the position of the tongue before commencing to utter any sound, and that when the sound was uttering, the tongue rose and the lips rounded simultaneously, and this agrees with the other descriptions, making the sound (yy).

1580. Bullokars says: "U also hath thrée soundes: The one of them a méere consonant, the other two soundes, are both vowels: the one of these vowels hath a sharpe sound, agreeing to his olde and continued name: the other is of flat sound, agreeing to the olde and continued sound of the diphthong: ou: but alwaies of short sounde." And further, translating his phonetic into ordinary spelling: "and for our three sounds used in, v, the French do at this day use only two unto it: that is, the sound agreeing to his old and continued name, and the sound of the consonant, v."

1 That is, sometimes say (u), and 2 Evidently a misprint for vowel. sometimes (yy), but this is not the I quote from the edition of 1590. case certainly in modern Castillian.
From these two passages it is clear that the "old and continued name" of long \( u \) in English was the sound of the French \( u \), that is (yy). The flat sound we shewed in treating of \( ou \) (p. 152), was probably (\( u \)). Bullokar adds, where I translate his phonetic examples into palaeotype:

"U. sharpe, agreeing to the sound of his olde and continued name, is so sounded when it is a sylable by itself, or when it is the last letter in a sylable, or when it commeth before one consonant, &c. ending next after the consonant, in one sylable thus: vony, vnuersally procureth vse to be occupied, and leisure allureth the vnruyl to the lute: which I write, thus: (yynti yyniversualli prokyyretth yys tuu bii okkyyypied and leizyyr allyyreth the un-ryyll tuu dhe lyyt).

"\( U \) flat is used alwaies after : a: e: or o: in diphthongs, or next before a single consonant in one sylable, hauing no: e: after that consonant, or before a double consonant, or two consonants next after it: though : e: followe that double consonant, or two consonants all in one or diuere sylables, thus: the vnuist are vnluckly, not worth a button or rush, vntrusty, vpholding trumpery at their full lust: which I write, thus: (dhe un-dzhust aar un-fuki, not wurth a but'n or rush up-noouldiq trumperi at dheir ful lust).

The word full is the same as one of Smith's examples of \( u \) short, and hence fixes the sound of Bullokar's \( u \) flat, which he does not otherwise explain.

1611. Cotgrave says: "V is sounded as if you whistle it out, as in the word a lute." Now the French \( u \) (yy) has a very whistling effect, both tongue and lip being disposed in a favourable position for the purpose.

1621. Gill is again not so distinct as could be wished, he merely says, preserving his notation, and his italics:

"\( V, est teneis, aut crassa: teneis v, est in Verbo tu vz vsce utor; crassa breuis est u, vz in pronomine us nos\); aut longa \( u \): et in verbo tu uz oesr scaturio, aut semem eseo mori aqae vi expressae."

Gill never alludes to any diphthong (iu). He uniformly uses a single sign, the Roman \( v \), for the sound of long \( u \), employing the Italic \( v \) for (\( v \)). He also uses a single character for the diphthong long \( i \), but then he admits that it is only slightly different from the diphthong (ei). There are very few indications of the sound he really meant to express by his \( v \). First we must assume that it was a simple sound and "thinner" than (uu). This should mean that the entrance to the lingual aperture was diminished by bringing the tongue more into the (i) position. But this converts (\( u \)) into (y), and hence leads us to Gill's \( v = (yy) \), as the sound

\footnote{Misprinted \textit{nrm}.}
is always long. Next in his alphabet he calls it ῥυπάλαυν, which should imply that it had the theoretical sound assigned to the Greek υ. This we have seen from Cheke and Smith was (yy). But then the example in the alphabet is "sur sure certus," and Salesbury says that Welsh u is unlike the sound of English sure. This may mean that sure must have been written suuer in the nearest Welsh characters, because sur would have sounded too like (siiu). Hart and Bullokar both give (syy’er). Lastly, in mentioning the words taken from the French he says: "Redvite nupera vox est à reduco, munimentum pro tempore aut occasione factum." This should be the French réduit, with a wrong e added, and hence ought to establish the value (yy) for Gill’s v. This therefore is the result to which all parts of the investigation tend, so that we must assume it to be correct. On the other hand there can be no doubt that the ù, u of Gill were (nu, u).

1633. Butler is unsatisfactory, when he says that:

"a, i, u differing from themselves in quantity differ also in sound: having one sound when they are long, and another when they are short, as in mane and man, shine and shin, tune and tun appeareth. . . . Likewise oo and u long differ much in sound: as in fool and fule, road and rude, moat and mute, but when they are short, they are all one; for good and gud, blood and blud, woolf and wulf have the same sound."

From this we learn with certainty that short u was (u) or (u), and that long u was not (uu), but we cannot tell whether it was (yy) or (iu). As long i was (ei) at that time, and no allusion is made by Butler to its being a diphthong, we are unable to assume that long u was a simple sound. We might indeed be led by the following passage to suspect that Butler had begun to embrace the (iu) sound which must certainly have widely prevailed, when his work was published, although it is not distinctly acknowledged:

"I and u short have a manifest difference from the same long; as in ride rid, rude rud, dine din, done dun, tine tin, tune tun; for as i short hath the sound of ee short; so has u short the sound of oo short. . . . E and i short with u have the very sound of u long: as in hew, knew, true appeareth. But because u is the more simple and ready way; and therefore is this sound rather to be expressed by it:" but he prefers eeu for etymological reasons in "breew, kneew, bleew, growew, trowew, sneew," where breew, trowew, sneew are in Smith’s list of words having the sound (yy). Butler finally asks

“But why are some of these written with the diphthong eu? whose sound is manifestly different, as in dew, eue, few, hew, chew, rew, scow, strow, shew, shrow, pouer.""

1 Misprinted reduco.
Now *dew*, *few*, *shew* are in Palsgrave’s list of (eu) sounds; and the same, together with *strew*, are in Smith’s (eu) list. Hence it is clear that Butler distinguished (eu) from the other sound of *u* long, and it is possible that his *u* long may have been (iu), but as Hart called (yy) a diphthong and represented it by (iu), while his careful description determined it to be (yy), so Butler may have said (yy).

At any rate it is clear that quite to the close of the XVIth century, (yy) was the universal pronunciation of long *u* in the best circles of English life, and that it remained into the xviiith century we shall shortly have further evidence. Provincially it is still common. In East Anglia, in Devonshire, in Cumberland, as well as in Scotland, (yy) and its related sounds are quite at home. The southerns are apt to look upon these dialectic forms as mispronunciations, as mistakes on the part of rustics or provincials. They are now seen to be remnants of an older pronunciation which was once general, or of a peculiar dialectic form of our language of at least equal antiquity. The sound of short *u* was also always (u) or (s). There is no hint or allusion of any kind to such a sound as (e). The (u), still common in the provinces, was then universal.

**U — XVII TH Century.**

1640. Ben Jonson says: “V is sounded with a narrower, and meane compass, and some depression of the middle of the tongue, and is, like our letter i, a letter of double power.”

By this he probably only means that it was both a vowel and a consonant (v). In his notes he gives quotations concern-Greek *u*, *ov*, the latter of which he identifies with (uu), though the cry of the owl, which is rendered *tu tu* in Plautus, Menechmi, act iv, sc. 2, v. 90.


From these notes Jonson may have possibly distinguished long and short *u* as (yy, u).

1653. Wallis clearly recognizes (yy) as long *u* and distinguishes it carefully from the diphthong (iu). He says:

“*Ibidem etiam, “ that is, *in labiis, “ sed Minorí adhuc apertura” than (uu), “formatur ú exile; Anglis simul et Gallis notissimum. Hoc sono Angli suum *u* longum ubique proferunt (nonnunquam etiam *eu* et *eo* quae tamen rectius pronunciantur retento etiam sono *e* masculi’): *Ut muse, musa; tune, modulatio; lute, barbitum;*

1 That is, as (eu).
duro, duro; mute, mutus; nee, novus; brev, misceo (cerevisiam coquo); brev, novi; jove, aspicio; iue, vice, etc. Hunc sonum extranei fere sequuntur, si diphthongum in contentur pronunciare; nempe i exile litterae u vel w præponentes, (ut in Hispanorum cidad civitas,') non tamen idem est omnino sonus, quamvis ad illum proximum accedat; est enim in sonus compositus, at Anglicorum et Gallorum u et sonus simplex. Cambro-Britannii hunc fere sonum utcunque per in, yve, wv describunt, ut in ilive color; ilive gubernaculum navis; Duce Deus, alienus innumeris."

Wallis therefore distinctly recognized the identity of the English and French sounds, and says that they are different from the diphthong (iu) because they are simple and not compound sounds, but approach nearly to that diphthong, evidently because (yy) unites the lingual position of (i) with the labial position of (u). He also notices the proximity of the Welsh iw, yw, uw to the sound of (yy), and thus explains how Salesbury came to hit upon uw as the best combination of Welsh letters to convey an approximate idea of the sound to his countrymen. Further on he says:

"U longum effertur ut Gallorum æ exile. Ut in late barbicum, mute mutus, missa musa, cäre cura, etc. Sono nempe quasi composito ex i et w,"

where he saves himself from the diphthong by a "quasi."

As regards short u he says:

"U vocalis quando corrigitur effertur sono obscuro. Ut in but sed, cut seco, bur lappa, burst raptus, curst maledictus, etc. Sonum hunc Galli proferunt in ultima syllaba vocis servitum. Differit à Gallorum ë feminino, non alter quod ore minus aperto effertur. Discrimen hoc animadvertent Angli dum pronounciant voces Latinas ier, iur; iter, turtur; cordo surdo; tertius Turrus; terris turris; referunt, furtum, &c."

In his theoretical part he gives the following further particulars of the French ë femininum and the ë obscumum.

"Eodem loco," that is, in summo gutture, "sed apertura faucium mediocri," i.e. less than for (aa), "formatur Gallorum ë femininum; sono nempe obscuro. Non alter ipsius formatio differit à formatione precedentis ë aperti (aa), quam quod magis contrahantur faucis, minus autem quam in formatione Vocalis sequentis (u). Hunc sonum Angli vix uspiam agnoscent; nisi cum vocalis ë brevis immediatì precedat literam r (atque hoc quidem non tam quia debeat sic efferri, sed quia vix commodè possit aliter; licet enim, si citra molestiam fieri possit, etiam illic sono vivido, hoc est, masculo, efferre; ut vertus virtus, libery libertas &c.

"Ibidem etiam, sed Minoris adhuc faucium aperturæ sonatur ë vel ë obscumum. Differit à Gallorum ë femininum non alter quâm

1 The English usually call this word (thiada), it is probably (cinerea = ñiuæ tææræ); the in represents the pure (iu) diphthong.
Wallis therefore heard the French feminine e in the last syllable of serviteur, sacrificateur. In this he agrees with Féline, who draws a distinction between the first and second syllable of heureux, making the first the same as the sound now considered.¹ But Wallis makes the aperture of the lingual passage grow smaller at the back for ã, e feminine, ã, the first being (AA) with the greatest depression, and he has an action of the lips for ã. This ought to give (AA, ã, u) for the three sounds. But this cannot be right for ã, because Wallis distinguished it from (u). Hence we must disregard the lip action of the last, and write (AA, ã, a). This however, is scarcely probable. There is another difficulty. The sound of e in ternus is not at present formed with a wider opening of the mouth than the sound of u in Turnus. When any distinction at all is made it is rather the reverse.² The

¹ See supra, p. 162, note 3. Tarver gives the same vowel sound to le, feu, Europe, neud, pest, ail, auteur, bonheur. Féline makes the vowel sound in le, Europe, pest, ail, auteur, bonheur the same; but distinguishes it from that in feu, neud. In M. Féline’s Mémoire sur la Réforme de l’Alphabet prefixed to his Dictionnaire de la prononciation de la langue Française, giving an account of the deliberations of a committee on French pronunciation, formed at his request, he says: “La conclusion fut que l’es muet proprement dit existe dans l’orthographe, mais non pas dans la langue; que, dans tous les mots où il est nécessaire de le prononcer, il exprime un son réel comme tous les autres signes, et que ce son devrait être appelé sourd et non pas muet, cette dernière dénomination n’étant qu’un non-sens. Après l’es on passa au son eu. On reconnut qu’il existe bien dans la langue française, et l’on remarqua qu’il présente avec l’es que je viens d’appeler sourd le même rapport qu’on avait trouvé entre les deux sons des premières voyelles a et â, ã et â, o et ô. Ce rapport est en effet si bien marqué, que, dans une foule de mots, comme jeune, pêcheur, on fait entendre le son de l’es sourd et non celui de l’eu tel qu’il est donné par les mots jeûne, pêcheuse.” Now to my ears a â, â, o ô are (a, ã, u, o). In the first two pairs the circumflexed vowel expresses a deeper sound, formed by depressing the tongue; in the last pair the uncircumflexed vowel is the wide sound of the circumflexed. The relations, then being different do not lead to the discovery of the relations between e, eu. These may be, that for eu the tongue is more depressed than for e, which would suit for e, eu = (e, ë); or it may be that eu is the wide of e, this would suit e, eu = (e, œ), which agrees with my own pronunciation.

² Mr. M. Bell who says (a, u) in ternus, Turnus respectively, makes the opening for (a) wider than for (u). I would rather write (t-nus, T-nus) respectively, if any difference at all has to be recognized.
peculiarity of the smaller lingual aperture and the action of the lips may however bring us to (uh) as the last sound, and induce us to consider the three sounds as (ʌ, a, uh). So far as the English passage of short u from (u) or (ʊ) to (ə), the present sound, is concerned (uh) forms a very appropriate link, because Englishmen find it difficult to distinguish the Italian *somma* (sumˈma) from (sumˈa) on the one hand and (somˈa) on the other. And we have seen (p. 94) that in 1611, the Italian Florio actually identified English (u) with Italian (uh), just as 1685, Cooper identified (u, ʊ), p. 101. But this sound hardly agrees with Wallis’s identification of ʊ with the Welsh y. On this sound, see the footnote on Y, in Chapter VIII, § 1, when it appears that the Welsh sound represents the vowel (ə) but that in common discourse it passes into (ə) on the one hand, and (i) on the other, and may be always sounded (i). Wallis no doubt referred to the sound (ə).

Lastly, if we reflect that (ə) is the de-labialized (u), and that this would be a natural transition from (u) to (ə), we might revert to the original deduction from Wallis’s description, and make his ʊ = (ə).

On the whole I am inclined to think that the three sounds he meant were (ʌ, a, ə). Many English consider the French *e muet*, or *sourd*, to be deeper than (ə), but of the same nature. The question however is impossible to decide, and I think it safest to transliterate *a*, *e* feminine, ʊ by (ʌ, a, ə), which indicates the modern pronunciation of the English vowels.

The great peculiarity, the marked singularity, of Wallis’s account, is the recognition and introduction of a sound resembling (ə) into the English language in place of (u). Of this sound no trace appears in any former writer that I have consulted. But from this time forth it becomes the common sound. Wallis in this respect marks an era in English pro-

---

1 In the passage cited from Gill *suprā* p. 90, in which he inveighs against the thin utterance of affected women, we find (bæthers) for (bæthers). This is quite comparable to the Eastern English (kɪvˈər) for (kəvˈər), which Gill had just mentioned, and appears to have no connection with the sound (bæthers) which is only heard from a small number of people at the present day. But when he says that these affected dames said (rɑ, jər skələrz, tsə) for (rʊ, juər skələrs, tu), it is just possible that he might have intended to indicate the sounds (rɑ, jər skələrz, tsə), for which he had no symbols. This is the closest allusion to the sound that I have discovered. For though the account given by Florio, 1611, p. 94, which identifies short (u) with (uh), might seem to indicate (ə) as well as (u), yet as the Italians confuse (ə) rather with (a), which is nearly its wide form, than with (uh), and as (u, wh) would probably be indistinguishable to an Italian ear, the inference is rather that the sound really uttered before Florio was (u) and not (ə).
nunciation, the transition between the old and the new. This is more striking, because as he is the first to give \( u \) short as (\( o \)), so is he practically the last to give \( u \) long as (\( y \)) except dialectically.

At the present day (\( y \)) has vanished from polite society, and is only heard as a provincialism, from Norfolk, Devon, or Cumberland, or as a Scotticism. No pronouncing dictionary admits the sound under any pretence. Indeed most English people find it very difficult to pronounce, either long or short, and consequently play sad tricks with French. But the case is different with (\( u, o \)). The two sounds coexist in many words. Several careful speakers say (\( tu \) put, butsh'er), though the majority say (\( tu \) put, butsh'er). All talk of a put (\( pot \)). Walker gives the following as the complete list of words in which \( u \) short is still (\( u \)).

\textit{bull, pull, full, and words compounded with ful; bullock, bully, bullet, bulwark, fuller, fullingmill, pulley, puller, push, bush, bushel, pulpit, pus, pulion, butcher, cushion, cuckoo, pudding, sugar, [he makes sure = (shiut)], hussar, hussa, and to put, with Futham,} but says that “some speakers, indeed, have attempted to give \textit{bulk} and \textit{punish} this obtuse sound of \( u \), but luckily have not been followed. The words which have already adopted it are sufficiently numerous; and we cannot be too careful to check the growth of so unmeaning an irregularity.”

Here the orthoepist unfortunately reverses the order of things, and esteems “the old and continued” sound of (\( u \)) an irregularity, and what is more, an “unmeaning irregularity,” and is not aware that every change of (\( u \)) to (\( o \)) has been a modern encroachment. But if the territories of (\( u \)) and (\( o \)) can be so strictly defined in the south of England, in the middle and north the war is still raging, and though education has imported large quantities of (\( o \)) from the south, even magnates in the north often delight to use their old (\( u \)).

\footnote{1} Smart adds, bullace, fullage, fullery, cushion, hurrah! to the above list. It is curious that Walker (art. 177) speaks of fuller as a “pure English word,” and Smart (art. 117) calls it a word “of classical derivation.” Orthoepists are not always good in etymology, but Walker appears to have the best of it here, and if, as seems more than probable, \textit{fuller} is a derivative of \textit{full}, (the Promptorium has \textit{fulness} of \textit{mete}, sancta,) there would be a reason for retaining the sound (\( ful \)) in the first syllable. At any rate the usage of speakers with regard to (\textit{fulsum}) and (\textit{fulsum}) varies greatly. As to (bulk, malk) they are not common, but may be heard; (\textit{panwh}) was heard lately from an educated gentleman in Cornwall.

\footnote{2} In the Midland counties the Southern usage is almost reversed, (\textit{pat, fat}) standing beside (\textit{kut, kem}).

\footnote{3} A Yorkshire country gentleman who wrote his name \textit{Hutton}, and whom all his friends called (\textit{natt-n}), always spoke of himself as (\textit{natt-n}), and on one occasion spelled his name so to me with phonetic letters. He would have been about 90 years old now, were he still alive. All the Yorkshire and Midland peasantry use (\( u \)) as a matter of course.
That there is nothing intrinsically pleasing in the sound of (ə), may be seen at once by calling good, stood (god stød), to rhyme with blood, flood, (bled, fład). Those speakers, to whom (wu) presents a difficulty are apt to change it into (we) as (wed, wəm-wən) for (wud, wəm-wən), and the effect is anything but pleasing. In general the long Saxon (oo), which first became (uu) and then fell into (u) or (u), has resisted the further change into (ə). This difference of evolution is similar to that which has befallen i, ei, ai, which Shakspeare pronounced sufficiently alike to introduce a conceit upon them in one of his most tragic speeches, already cited (p. 112), but which have become three quite distinct sounds (ei, ii, eei), (p. 120). Both changes have occurred rather among the reading than the merely speaking section of our population.

1668. Wilkins and Wallis were contemporaries; although the latter was the elder, and born in Kent, and the former was born in Oxford, they lived as fellow collegians for some time in Oxford, and they mixed in the same society. Yet we have a striking difference in their pronunciation of long u. We have seen how Wallis identified the French and English u, how he considered the (yy) sound to be familiar to all Englishmen, and especially distinguished it from the diphthong (iu), and this he continued to do through all the editions of his grammar. Wilkins at the same moment can scarcely pronounce (yy) at all, denies that Englishmen use it, and makes every long u into (iu).

"As for the u Gallicum or whistling u" says he, p. 363, "though it cannot be denied to be a distinct simple vowel; yet it is of so laborious and difficult pronunciation to all those Nations amongst whom it is not used, (as to the English) especially in the distinction of long and short, and framing of Diphthongs, that though I have enumerated it with the rest, and shall make provision for the expression of it, yet shall I make less use of it, than of the others; and for that reason, not proceed to any further explication of it." And again, p. 382, "u," which is his character for (yy), "is I think proper to the French and used by none else."

This is a strong contradiction to Wallis, whose treatise Wilkins had read, and apparently studied. The only word which contains long u that Wilkins transliterates, is communion, and this he writes (kammiuuonian), using (iuu) and not (yy) in the accented syllable.

1 He says, p. 357, "Dr. Wallis ..., and subtlety to have considered the amongst all that I have seen published, seems to me, with greatest Accurateness Philosophy of Articulate sounds."
Short u is thus exemplified by Wilkins and distinguished from (uu, u), meaning (uu, u) most probably:

(u) short full fut pul
(uu) long boote foote foote poole roode
(o) short but full¹ futt¹ mutt-on pull¹ rudd-er
(œ) long amongst

The sound, which he represents by y with a peculiar flourish added to its tail, and which I have translated into my (œ), he describes as “a simple letter, apter, sonorous, guttural; being framed by a free emission of the breath from the throat.”² Again, p. 364, he says “the vowel (œ) is wholly Guttural, being an emission of the breath from the throat without any particular motion of the tongue or lips. 'Tis expressed by this character,” a variety of y, “which is already appropriated by the Welsh for the picture of this sound.” As he here rejects both tongue and lips in the formation of (œ) he differs considerably from Wallis in explaining its formation. In another place he says that the Hebrew “Shevah” is rapidly pronounced “probably as our short (œ).” He gives (œi, œu) as the analysis of “our English i in bite,” and of the sound in “over, oval.” And finally he says: “y” meaning (œ) “is scarce acknowledged by any nation except the Welsh.” The words in which he employs this sign, omitting the combinations (œi, œu) are: kingdom, come, done, but, Jesus, son, under, Pontius, buried, third, judge, church, resurrection, which he writes (kiq’dam, kom, don, bot, Dzhesos, sén, onder, Pansiša, beri, ed, thord, dzhedzh, tshartsh, resorreksion), in which I give all his errors. I assume this sound to be (œ) both in Wallis and Wilkins, but what particular shade of this sound they pronounced, and whether they both used the same shade, it would be rash to assert.

1668. Price does not help us to the sound of short u when he says:

“The u is twofold. 1. short, as in but, must, burst, 2. long as in lute, muse, refuse as if it were the compound of iv.”

This iv may mean (iu), agreeing with Wilkins, but it may also mean (yy) agreeing with Wallis. I am inclined to treat it as (iu). The short u I have, on the combined

¹ These words judging from full, are all fancy words, (ful, fut, pul), introduced to contrast with the (ful, fut, pul), in a preceding line, and most probably the doubling of the final consonant was intended to indicate the sound (œ), whereas fut, pul were previously written with one final consonant to indicate the sound (œ). If this theory be correct, the word full in the first line, was a misprint for fut.

² This description is made up from the different headings of the table p. 360.
authority of Wallis and Wilkins, been in the habit of considering to be (a). The following notices agree with this:

"O after u sounds like short u as world, sword, woman, won... O before m or n in the last syllable sounds like short u as freedom, reckon, bacon... Ou sounds like short u in cousin, double, courage."

But there is one notice which, thus interpreted, has a singular effect: "Oo sounds like short u in good, wool, hood, wood, stood." The general use of (god, wel, nod, wed, stad) is difficult to believe in, though it is well known provincially, and is also mentioned by Jones, (p. 183).

1669. Though Holder's work was not published till this year, Wilkins had seen it in manuscript, and speaks highly of it. Yet in the letter u, both long and short, Holder differs from Wilkins. Holder has very acutely anticipated Mr. M. Bell's separation of the lingual and labial passages, and the possibility of adding a labial passage to every lingual one. He says:

In o the larynx is depressed, or rather drawn back by contraction of the aspera arteria. And the tongue likewise is drawn back and curved; and the throat more open to make a round passage: and though the lips be not of necessity, yet the drawing them a little ronder, helps to accomplish the pronunciation of it, which is not enough to denominate it a labial vowel, because it receives not its articulation from the lips. Oo seems to be made by a like posture of the tongue and throat with o but the larynx somewhat more depressed. And if at the same time the lips be contracted, and borne stiffly near together, then is made u; u with the tongue in the posture of o but not so stiff, and the lip borne near the upper lip by a strong tension of the muscles, and bearing upon it at either corner of the mouth."

"u is made by the throat and tongue and lip; in u the tongue being in the posture, which makes oo; and in u in the same posture, which makes i, and in this u and u are peculiar, that they are framed by a double motion of organs, that of the lip, added to that of the tongue; and yet either of them is a single letter, and not two, because the motions are at the same time, and not successive, as are

1 He says: "But besides such," namely, "in later times... Erasmus, both the Scaligers, Lipsius, Salmasius, Vossius, Jacobus Mathias, Adolphus Metzerohn, Bernardus Malincho, etc., besides several of our countrymen, Sir Thomas Smith, Bullokar, Alexander Gill, and Doctor Wallis." "(whose considerations upon this subject are made publick) I must not forget to acknowledge the favour and good hap I have have had to peruse from their private papers the distinct Theories of some other Learned and Ingenious persons." Dr. William Holder and Mr. Lodowick are named in the margin, "who have with great judgment applied their thoughts to this enquiry; in each of whose Papers, there are several suggestions that are new, out of the common rode, and very considerable."
eu, pla &c. Yet for this reason they seem not to be absolutely so simple vowels as the rest, because the voice passeth successively from the throat to the lips in ɐ and from the palate to the lips in u̯, being there first moulded into the figures of oo and ə̯, before it be fully articulated by the lips. And yet either these two, ɐ and u̯, are to be admitted for single vowels, or else we must exclude the lips from being the organs of any single vowel since that the mouth being necessary to conduct the voice to the lips, will, according to the shape of its cavity, necessarily give the voice some particular affection of sound in its passage, before it come to the lips; which will seem to make some such composition in any vowel which is labial. I have been inclined to think, that there is no labial vowel, but that the same affection from the lips may, somewhat in the nature of a consonant, be added to every of the vowels, but most subtly and aptly to two of them, whose figures are in the extremes of aperture and situation, one being the closest and forwardest, which is ə̯, and the other most open and backward; there being reason to allow a vowel of like sound in the throat with ɐ̯, but distinct from it as not being labial, which will be more familiar to our eye if it be written oo; as in cut coot, full fool, tut toot, in which the lip does not concur; and this is that other. Thus u̯ will be only ɐ̯ labial, and ɐ̯ will be oo labial, that is, by adding that motion of the under-lip, ɐ̯ will become u̯, and oo will become ɐ.⁴ He proceeds to use his ə̯, u̯, ɐ̯ in the formation of diphthongs and concludes thus: "Concerning ɐ̯ and u̯, this may be observed, that in subjoining them to another vowel, ɐ̯ is apter to follow a and e, because of their resemblance in the posture of the tongue, as hath been said; and for the like reason u̯ is apter to follow a and e, as ɐ̯al vowel; engs etc. But generally if the vowels follow, then it is ɐ precedes and not u̯."

No doubt the descriptions give very accurately oo = (æœ), ɐ̯ = (uu), u̯ = (ə) or (y̯). And the short (æ) would then be Holder’s sound in full. Now it is impossible to believe that fool was ever pronounced (fœœl), the sound being extremely difficult to any one but a Highlander (in whose word laoagh it occurs), until the trick of removing the labial action from (uu) has been acquired. But if we remember that now full is rather (ful) than (ful); and that the widening of the back of the throat, by which (u̯) differs from (u) is so much the most essential part of the sound, that a very good imitation of it can be produced with the mouth wide open, it is very probable that Holder called fool full at least when theorizing (fuœœl ful). The pairs of examples he gives are cut coot, full fool, tut toot, of which cut, tut would have been (kat, tat) according to Wallis and Wilkins, who would have perhaps preserved the old pronunciation (ful) or (ful). Did Holder say or intend to say (kat kuent, ful fuœœl, tut taut)? In this case he must have altogether ignored the vowel (ə). Or did
he mean to say (ket keet, fel feel, tat toot) ? or did he mean—what he has written—(ket keet, fel feel, tat toot) ? sounds which he may have imagined he said, but which other people are scarcely likely to have really pronounced. The distinction which Holder makes between the vowels in fool, two is peculiar to himself. Wilkins gives fool as an example of the long (uu), and full as an example of both the short (u) or (u) and of (e), suprâ p. 177, note 1. This throws a doubt over the pronunciation of this particular word full, and renders Holder’s explanations still more mysterious. Can it be that Holder’s pronunciation was very peculiar so that he actually confused (u, ə) at a time when the transition from old (u) to (ə) was coming into vogue? His (ə) would not be a bad middle between the extremes of (u, ə). His long u in rule, which is usually now (uu), was manifestly (yy), if his explanation of superadding the labial to the lingual effect is to be trusted. His only notice of a diphthongal u is in the word euge, just cited, which must have been (ey’dzhê), if his explanation is to be relied on, but this is very doubtful.

1685. Cooper pairs the vowels in full, fole, or as he sometimes writes foale,¹ that is, in full he takes the vowel to be short (o). He may however have used (u) or (uh). See the discussion on p. 84, and the passage quoted on p. 101. The observations in that passage serve to shew that u in full had at that time much of the (o) element in it; that some persons may have pronounced it quite as (o); and others as (u) the usual sound into which (o) degenerates, or (u), which is the more common English sound; the true short (u) is so unusual to our organs, that when we hear it we take it for the long (uu), and we can hardly pronounce it except when long. The English (uu, u) as has been already mentioned, are related precisely like the English (ii, i). I shall, as already stated, p. 84, consider that Cooper pairs (oo, u). But Cooper also distinguished (uu, u) in food foot, see suprâ p. 101. He illustrates this sound by German zufluch (misprint for zuflucht as shewn by the meaning refugium) and French coupe poculum, now (tsuu-flukht, kup).

Cooper is very copious upon short u which he clearly means to be (ə) or one of those vowels, as (ə, ə), which he would scarcely distinguish from (ə). The long u he makes (iu) and seems to have great difficulty in understanding the French u (yy). His words are:

"U formatur tântûm in gutture, à larynge spiritum vibrante,

¹ As foole used to be written fole, the more common spelling foole could nothing but Cooper’s having once used have shown us what word he meant.
nudum efficiens murmure, quod idem est cum gemitu hominis segritudine vel dolore exsorciati; quodque infantes (priusquam loqui valent) primum edunt: Et fundamentum est, a quo omnes cellere vocales, variat modificatone constituantur...

Hunc sonum correptum vix unquam alter pronunciat Angli quam in nut nux; prout etiam in lingua latina, ubi consonans praecedens sit labialis, ut prius dixi, et labis dat formam quas sonus plenior effertur, ut in pull vello, inter hos minimâ datur, datur tamen specifica, differentia; ille eternum sonus dilutor est, hic plenior, ille formatur a larynges tantum in gutture, hic a labii contractis; dum itaque o labis formatur in sono continuato, si recedant labia in oblongam formam formatur u gutturalis; in quibusdam scribitur per o ut, to come venire; Galli hoo modo, vel saltam persimilis; olim sonarunt...

1 The natural vowel should be the sound of the voice, that is of the vocal ligaments or glottal reed, without any resonance tube, p. 161. This is of course impossible to hear. But it must resemble the reed sound of the clarionet or hautboy, or the whistle of the flute or flageolet, and contain in itself all the tones which the variously formed resonance tubes prefixed to it in speaking, by means of the pharynx, nose, tongue, mouth and lips, develop or render audible. It is as the resonance tubes clearly separate the tones, or allow many nearly coincident to be heard together, that we obtain distinct or confused, coloured or colourless, vowel qualities of tone.

2 This remark is important as shewing the ease with which (u, a, o) were confused by speakers at the time of the transition of short u from (o) to (u).

3 If the lips are mechanically opened by the hands while we are pronouncing (oo) we shall pronounce (aa), which is the form that Mr. M. Bell adopts for the long sound of u in up. Hence Cooper is quite consistent when he makes u in full the short (e), and u in nut the dehlabialised short (o) or (a). This is the most accurate description of the sound that I have met with in any old book, and may be advantageously compared with Holder's, given above p. 178.

4 Probably to is not intended as an example, but only come. Both are italicised in the original.

5 As Mr. M. Bell hears (a) in English up and (o) in French que, and (u, o) only differ as back and mixed vowels of the same class, Cooper's ear was not far out. To me however now, the French in que sounds (e), which is a 'round' vowel. English ears, however, readily confound (a, e, o; s, 6, sh) with one another and with (o), and (ê). What was however the old pronunciation of the present French mue s? Meigret, 1560, writes the same vowel in the first and last syllables of "merite, benit, perir, mer, pere," which Feline writes (merit, benit, perir, meer, peer) with two different vowels. I understand Meigret to mean (o) in both cases. But the lightly spoken unaccented (ê) drifts very easily into (u, a, 6). From (o) therefore (ê) could have easily descended. In fact (o) is only the 'round' or labialized (ê). This recalls an apparently inexplicable remark by Palgrave, 1530, who says: "If e be the laste vowel in a frence worde beynge of many syllables, eyther alone or with an e folowynge him, the worde nat havynge his accent upon the same e, then shall he in that place be sounded almost like an and very moche in the noose, as these words homme, femme, homose, pâtre, hooones, femmes, homest, aveques, shall have the laste e sounded in manner lyke an a, as homme, femme, homose, pâtre, hooones, femmes, homestes, aveques; so that, if the reder lyft up his voyce upon the syllable that commeth nexte before the same e, and sodanyly depress his voyce when he cometh to the soundyng of hym, and also sound hym very moche in the noose, he shall sounde e beyng written in this place accordyng as the Frenchmen do. Which upon this warnynge if the lerner wyll observe by the frence mens spekyng, he shall easely perceyue." The nasality may be an erroneous observation, and the whole history may be a clumsy expression of the sound of (ê), for which the rounding of the lips suggested (o). See supra, p. 112, note, col. 2.
femininum e, ut in providence. Germani syllabus ham\(^1\) & berg\(^2\) in propriis nominibus. Nuncum in proprio sono apud nos productum audivi, ni in musicâ modulatione,\(^3\) vel inter populos, precipuè pueros cunctanter pronunciante; pro longâ enim vocali assumit diphongum eu (iu); unde etiam denominatur; ut mute mutus; prout in Neuter, Ψευδος, idem fere cum Gallorum u de quo inter diphongos dicitur."

"E in will, wool (i, oo) cum u (u) coalescens nobis familiarissimus est, quem vocamus u longum; ut funeral funus, huge inus;\(^4\) juice succus, scribimus per eu; ut chew mastico; know cognovi; allisque temporibus verborum preteritis; quando syllabam finalem claudit, additur e, true versus; rarò per eu, rheum rheuma; sic semper pronunciamus eu latinum, & eu Grecum: et Galli plerumque illorum u, quandoque autem subtilius quasi sonus esset simplex, sed hæc difficilis & Gallis propria."

The last words shew that his confusion of (yy) with (iu) in French pronunciation was really fault of ear, and that he was quite ignorant of (yy) as an English sound. Cooper is very particular in shewing how all vowels fall into (a) in unaccented syllables before r. These will be considered under R.

1688. Miegé of course hears the English long u as the French, but as the diphong (iu) does not occur in French, this only shews the same defect of ear which makes him identify short u in cut with French o (o), and short u in us with French eu (oo). He says:

"La Prononciation commune de l'U Voyelle en Anglois est la même qu'en Fransois. Mais, entre deux Consonnes dans une même Syllabe, elle se prononce ordinairement en o; Comme but, cut, rub, up, humble, under, run. Quéquefois en ou: Exemple chaise, pues, bull, pull, full. En eu, comme us, faculty, difficult, difficulty. Bury & bury se prononcent bery, bisy. Et dans les Mots qui finissent en us, l'u semble reverir le Son d'un e feminin, sur tout quand on parle vite. Comme nature, picture, fracture, qui se prononcent familierement nairer, picter, frecter." And again: "U vowel, by itself, is pronounced in French according to the Sound it has in the Word Abuse in English.

1701. Jones says: "the Sound of u in but, cut, &c. is the Sound

---

\(^1\) Dr. Froembling, in his Elements of the German Language, 2nd edit. 1855, p. 2, says that the German a "is pronounced like a in father, if long; and like u in hut if short." This is the only other instance I know in which German short a has been identified with English (a); it is usually confused with English (A), which however would give a very broad Austrian pronunciation, and it was to avoid this on the one hand, and (o) on the other, that Dr. Froembling (who speaks English excellently) hit upon this contrivance. Cooper having heard ham us (ham) in proper names only, must have been mistaken; German proper names do not end in ham but in him.

\(^2\) This must have been a mere Anglicism.

\(^3\) One of the best means of observing the prolonged effect of short vowel sounds.

\(^4\) Misprint for ingens or immensus?
of the natural humane Voice, and therefore the easiest of all the Sounds that are made by the humane Voice."

And yet this easy sound is a stumbling block to all European nations, and is rarely heard except among Asiatics. It may be doubtful indeed whether the Asiatics pronounce the same variety of (ə) as we do. Many Welshmen do not admit it as a proper Welsh sound, though their language is supposed to have an appropriate letter y to represent it. As, however, y in Welsh also represents another sound, it cannot be more properly considered the special representative of (ə) than the English u, so that there is really no European means of representing the sound, although, owing to its supposed relation to the French e mute, (ə), so many writers have employed an inverted e, that this has been adopted as the best understood form in palaeotype. The sound of long u, Jones says, is compound, but he does not analyze it.

Jones gives many lists for the representation of the sound of short u by various vowel forms, which need not be cited at length as they agree generally with modern use. In the following words the italic letter might be, or occasionally was sounded as (ə) according to Jones.

Christmas, William, &c; centaury, restoration, &c; fasten, listen, &c; aspen, burden, chicken, cozen, &c; yeoman; bezel, civil, devil, &c; basin, cabin, coffin, &c; Westminster "sounded Westminster;" boil, coil &c=(boil, koil) &c; another, mother, pether &c; boil, bout, fout, lou, out, &c=(boul, bout, fout) &c; dove, love, moe—this is peculiar, showe &c; owle, howl, &c=(koul, koul) &c; voyage, &c=(vsei'dzh); vouch, &c; word, work, worth, &c; yonder, yonker, &c; colonel, colour, &c; comfort, &c; coney, conjure, &c; money, monkey, &c; mongcorn, monger, &c; cullly, &c; blemary, &c; (see under O, p. 102), come, some, &c; bucksum, fumose, &c; kingdom, &c; chibol, gambol, symbol; son, does, recogisance "sounded recunnisance;" foot, forsooth, good, hood, look, soot, stood, tool, "when it may be sounded oo rather than a;" wood, woof, woel "which some sound as with å viz. wid wull &c;"—adjour, attournment, attorney, blowd, Bourdeaux,¹ country, courage, courlass, courteous, courtesan, cemetery, cousin, double, doublet, flowd, flourish, housewife, journey, morn, nourish, scourge, sojourn, Southwark, touch, trouble, uncouth, young, your, youth "‘and all the Names of Seaport Towns as Falmouth Portsmouth Yarmouth" &c; athwart, thewart "sounded athurt, thurt;" anseer, teepence "sounded tuppence," myrrh, pyramid &c; camarade "sounded cumrade," hicough "sounded hicoup;" frumenty "sounded furmety," construe "sounded constur," Catharine "sounded Catturn;"

¹ There is a place near Edinburgh called (Bar'dé neus) from the old Bourdeaux House. Jones also writes (Buurdoo), supra p. 140.
In almost every instance (o) is seen to be a substitute for an older (u), or (u) as (uu) was of an older (uu).

**U — xviii th Century.**

1704. The Expert Orthographist gives us no information on the nature of the sounds of u long and u short.

1710. The Anonymous instructor of the Palatines says that u at the beginning is like the German jü, meaning that long u = (iu). He also gives the pronunciation of the English words *church, much*, in German letters as *tschurtsh, mutsch* = (tsurtsh, mutsh), so that he does not acknowledge (a) at all. This may have been designedly, because (a) would have been so difficult to the Palatines, and because (u) would be intelligible to the English.

1766. The following are a few words from Buchanan: (ful, push, shug′ir) sugar; (put; botsh′ir, pae) butcher, puss; (tu pat) to put; (ber′i, biz′i) bury, busy; (triu, fiu′riss, liut, miuz) true, furious, lute, muse.

1768. Franklin has (setsh, renz, metsh) such, runs, much; (fiu′riss, iusedzh, truu, ruulz, iuz′ed) furious, usage, true, rules, used.

1780. Sheridan gives as peculiar Irish faults, (bel, bezh, pesh, pel, pel′pit, ped′in, kesh′en, fat, pot) for (bul, bush, push, pul, pul′pit, pud′iç, kush′en, fut, put), all of which, as well as (drov, strov) for (droov, stroov) are, as is now manifest, remnants of the xviii th century. The other cases of Irish mispronunciations which he cites, and which have been already noticed, (pp. 76, 92, 103, 129, 160), shew very clearly that the so-called Irish mispronunciations are merely fossil relics of the xviii th century, preserved in a community separated by the sea from the mother country, see supra p. 20.

§ 4. The Consonants.

.Y, W, WH.

According to the present usages of English speech, Y and W are the consonants (y, w) when preceding a vowel, as in *ye woo* (ji wu), and those who can pronounce these words differently from (ii uu) can generally pronounce these consonants. But there has been a great dispute among orthoepists whether y, w should be considered as vowels or consonants,
and various terms have been invented to suit the case. As they do not occur in French, _Palsgrave_ of course does not notice them. _Salesbury_, with his Welsh habits always regards *y*, *w* as the vowels (*i*, *u*), and consequently writes (und'ër, uu) for (wun'der, wuu). _Smith_ has the same opinion, but writes (i-is, i-it, u-ul, u-ud) for (jis, jit, wul, wud), although these sounds cannot be distinguished from (iis, it, uul, uud) unless either a distinction in the vowels be made, which he does not allow, as (iis, it, uul, uad), or else the vowel be repeated as (i-is i-it u-ul u-ud). _Hart_ carries the same principle to the extent of writing (iild uul) for (iild, wuul) and even (ureit) for (wreit) meaning (rewit) making that word therefore dissyllabic. _Gill_ has distinct alphabetical characters for (*x*, *w*), and says:

"Si quis sonorum æquus estimator vsrum earum apud nos perpendat, inveniet esse consonas,"

but seems to consider that the principal test ("lapis Lydius") of the fact is that the indefinite article assumes the form *a* and not *an* before *y*, *w*. He adds:

"*w*, aspiratum, consona est, quam scribunt per *wh* et tamen aspiratio precedit. Ilti namqes voces qua per *wh* scribuntur; possunt atque etiam ad exempla maiorum scribi debent per (*hw*) aut (*hu*); ita enim, nihil aliud inde colligi queat, quam quod ex ipso *wh*, intelligimus; vt (*wiil*) sive (*uiil*) *weele* *nassa*, (*hiil*) sive (*hiuil*) *weele* *rota*. Tamen quia nostra experiensia docet, (*w*) et (*wh*) veras esse simplicesque consonas, in quorum elatione (u) sugrannit tantum, non clara vocalis auditur; ideo illud (*w*) ante vocales aut diphthongos ius assignatsum obtinebit; at (*wh*), mala tantum consuetudine* valebit in (what) quid, (whedher) uter & similibus."

We have here the first distinct recognition of a consonant peculiar to the English language, which is seldom acknowledged even by recent orthoepists, most of whom consider (wh) as = (*nw*) or (*hu*). The preceding writers had all used (*nu*). It is to be observed that Gill had no (sh); this must have been because, as he used (yy) in place of (juu) initial, he said (*hyym'ur*) and not (*juum'ur*), for which most recent orthoepists have (*nuu'mor*), a combination as objectionable as (*hiil*) for (whil).

_Gataker_ 1646, goes to the extreme of making *y*, *w* always consonants, considering *ei*, *ew* to be (*ei*, *ew*). This, however,

---

1 Misprinted *ilkr*.
2 Narrow necked basket for catching fish.
3 The fault in Gill was that he wrote two consonants (*wh*) when he only meant one (wh). This "bad custom" is evaded by the palaeotypic use of (*w*) for the aspirate and (*h*) for the diacritic.
depends upon a diphthongal theory, to which writers have been led by observing that (ai) is not merely (a, i), see p. 51. Wallis inclines to Gataker’s opinion, and says:

“Diphthongi ai, ei, oi, au, eu, ou, &c, recte pronunciatiæ ponuntur ex vocalibus prepositivis et consonantibus y et w quæ tamen pro vocalibus subjunctivis vulgo habentur.”

His contemporary Wilkins, alluding to the opinion of Gataker and others says on his p. 370, that they

“do earnestly contend that there are no such things as diphthongs. Their principal Arguments” he goes on to say, “depend upon this Supposition of (i) and (u), which are necessary Ingredients to the framing of all usual Diphthongs, are Consonants the same with (r) and (w). Others would have them to be of a middle nature, betwixt Vowels and Consonants; according to which opinion I have already described them: From whence the Reason is clear, why these Vowels concur to the making of Diphthongs because being the most contract of Vowels, as is also the vowel (a) of which more hereafter. They do therefore approach very near to the nature of Litteræ clausæ, or Consonants; there being no Transition amongst these, either from one another, or to the intermediate sounds, without such a kind of motion amongst the Instruments of speech, by reason of these different Apertions, as doth somewhat resemble that kind of Collision required to the framing of Consonants.”

Cooper recognizes (i, w) as consonants and also (jh, wh) under the form, (hj, hw), at the same time that he defines a diphthong as the “conglutinatio duarum vocalium in eadem syllabâ.”

This theory of “conglutination,” effected by the “glide,” is that which I have adopted (p. 51), and, consequently, believing that the sounds were in all cases the same, I shall, in transcribing the pronunciation of others, when they use (ia) or (aw) consistently write (ja, ai), having precisely the same intention, and representing the same sound, on different theoretical principles. I consider the sounds of (j, w) to consider the sounds of (j, w) to have been the same throughout the period now considered. Whether there may not be or have been a sound (bh), leading to the confusion between (v) and (w), well marked in the South East of England, I leave unsettled. In Chapter V, § 4, No. 1, I shall adduce reasons for believing that the Anglosaxon w was not (bh). Although (wreit) can be pronounced, yet (vreit) or (brreit) is much easier for the lips, and in Mr. Melville Bell’s Scotch specimen Chapter XI, § 4, the initial (vr) will be found in (vraq) wrong, which may however possibly have been (bhraq). As qu is now, and probably always was, (kw), the labial modification of (k), produced by rounding the lips at the same time that the (k) contact is made, and
releasing both contacts simultaneously, so (wr) probably always was (rw), the labial modification of (r), produced by keeping the lips rounded during the whole time that (r) is trilled. It is similar to the sound in French roi, which Féline writes (rua), and which English now call (rwaa), the true sound being (rwa), which produces a species of evanescent (u), but whether before (r) as Hart wrote (ureit), or after (r) as Féline writes, appears doubtful to the ear, simply because it is during (r), p. 131. Similarly (yy) is (iui) or (ii) with a labial modification, and all the “round” vowels might be written as ordinary vowels followed by the labial modification (w), p. 161. At the same time, in transcribing the notation of others, I shall generally use (wr), although this is probably as incorrect as (rw) would be, and is very difficult to pronounce. The notation (wr) is similar to the notations (hw, hw); in all three cases succession (w + r, h + w, h + j) is written where simultaneity (w* + r = rw, h* + w = wh, h* + j = jh) is intended. See cw, wv, wr in Anglosaxon, Chapter V, § 4, No. 1.

The interchange of the vowel (i) with the consonant (j), and the vowel (u) with one of the three consonants (w, bh, v) is an interesting phenomenon in all languages. In Europe (w) is thought to be peculiar to England; Wales also claims it, but the claim is doubtful, as its (w), if it exists, is confused by its writers with (u). In Arabic however (w) is quite at home, and also serves to mark the vowels (o, u). In Sanscrit, if the native grammarians are correct, the (i) between two other vowels fell into (j) and the (u) into (v), and not (w) or (bh). In Germany (u) generates (bh) not (w). Similarly in modern Greek (eu, au) generated (ebh, abh) becoming (eph, aph) before mutes as (aphtos’), although modern theory makes n a (v) or an (f) as (evris’koo, aftos’), seplarkeos, avtroς. It seems probable that in precisely the same way, the original transition of the Sanscrit (u) was into (bh), and that the pronunciation (v), distinctly pointed out by the native grammarians, is a comparatively modern alteration, comparable with the change of (k, kh, g, gh, g) into (tah, teh, dzh, dzh, nj) and of (kh) into (sh). The immediate change of (u) into (v) is difficult to conceive.

The letter (w), or (u) forming a diphthong with a following (a), formerly kept the sound of (a) pure. Thus Bullokars writes (waar, war’m, war’n, war’en, war, waarter) for waur, warm, warmen, war, water. As late as Wilkins we have (waaz) for was. Price says that a is never sounded (AA) except before l, and hence he excludes the action of w.
Cooper does not mention the effect of *w*, and Jones 1701 only instances the word "*water*, sounded *wauter*." But the Expert Orthographist, 1704, says that *a* has its broad sound (AA) "between *w* and *r* as *war*, *ward-en*, *warm*, *war-n-er*, *warren*, *watch*, *water*, *wath*." It would appear then that this effect of *w* on a following *a* became prevalent at the beginning of the xviii th century. It is by no means general in the provinces, where (*wat-er*, *war-m*, *war-m*, etc.) still exist. I have heard (*wa-er*, *waal-iti*, *kwen-iti,* etc.) from even educated speakers. Of course the effect of the (*w*) on the subsequent vowel arises from beginning to pronounce it before the lips are sufficiently opened, so that the vowel becomes round, as (*wa*w* = *wo*), for which however either (*wa*), or (*wo*) has obtained in practise. Although in London and the South of England (*wh*) is seldom pronounced, so that (*wat*) is the usual sound for both *Wat* and *what*, yet to write *wot* for *what* is thought to indicate a bad vulgar pronunciation. In the North of England (*wh*) is very well marked, and in Scotland it is often labialized to (*kwh*), owing probably to the intimate relation between (*u*) and (*k*).

M, N, NG.

These nasal sounds frequently disturb the pure sound of the preceding vowel, giving it more or less of a nasal twang, occasioned by allowing some of the breath to pass with more or less force through the nasal passages. We know that in modern French *in*, *an*, *on*, *un*, represent four distinct original nasal vowels, palaetotypically written (*ea*, *aa*, *oa*, *oa*) although their exact relation to the oral vowels is not pretended to be accurately determined.¹ It is very difficult to determine how soon this change occurred. Palsgrave, who, it must be remembered, finds the French *e* feminine to be "sounded almoste like an *o* and very moche in the noose,"² tells us that "if *m* or *n* folowe nexte after *a* in a frechene worde, all in one syllable, than *a* shall be sounded lyke this diphthong *au* and somethynge in the noose," so that the nasality was not "very moche" as in the other case where no other writer recognizes any nasality at all, but only "something." This would lead to *am*, *an* = (*a*um *a*un). Palsgrave notes the exception when "the syllable next folowyng of any suche worde begynne also with a lyke consonant," such as *flamme*, where the sound of *a* is not changed—and we are left to

¹ See above, p. 67, for a discussion ² See p. 181, note, col. 2. of these sounds.
suppose that the $m$ and $n$ have their normal sounds. As regards French $e$ before $m$ and $n$ Palsgrave says it “shall be sounded lyke an italian a and some thynge in the noose,” with a similar exception. See the passages cited for $a$ on p. 143, near the top, and for $o$, on p. 149, near the bottom. In the latter place, no distinction is made (except as regards the final $e$) between $bon$, $bonne$, which must be (bun, bun’e) putting $(e)$ for Palsgrave $e$ feminine, at a venture. He makes no mention of $un$, $uen$, but in his transcription he writes “imbevo, depainz, poant, insaïublo, inconsideré, uoazins, mayn, évmblo, evnshemyn” for $imbeu$, $depainctz$, $poymt$, $insaciable$, $inconsidere$, $voisins$, $maynt$, $humble$, $ung chemin$, in which there is no apparent trace of nasality.

On examining Meigret there is not so much evidence of nasality as in Palsgrave. From Meigret’s notation, as may be seen in the numerous citations already given, there is no appearance of any nasal vowel. Indeed the following remark would seem to exclude the idea of any such nasals as now exist. He says:

“Je ne veu’ pas aost oublier qe la prolacion Franço’ze n’uze pas fort souwent de deus mm, ne de deus nn, ensemble, combien qe l’ecriture ne le eparne pas: come, en homme, comme, sommet, comment, commandement, honneur, donner, somner, ancienne. Il et vrey qe les mm se rencontret aos Auëres qe se terminet em ment qant $a$, ou e ouuernt preçedet: come prudemment, suffizam- ment. Notez aosi qe $n$ finall’ ayant en suyte, vn vocable comen- çant par voyelle (si çe ne sont qelqes aspirzeit) double sa puissance: come en allant, en etant, qe nou’ prononçons come en nallant, en netant: tellement q’otant sone l’un qe l’aotre; e ny trouuons aucune difference.”

That is Meigret heard no difference between the final $n$ in “en” and the initial $n$ in “nallant,” he must therefore be understood to have said (en nallant) in lieu of the modern (an nallat). See also John Hart’s transcription of French, Chapter VIII, § 3, and suprą p. 150. There seems to be no intimation of the French nasal in Cotgrave, and Miege only says that English final $m$ and $n$ are sounded “d’une maniere plus forte en Anglais qu’en Francais,” which may mean almost anything. In his French part, he says nothing about $an$, $on$, but informs us that

“em in the same Syllable is pronounced am, the e taking the sound of a French a; as embleme, ensemble. Except where the word ends in em, or emme; as item, dilemme. And yet femme is pronounced femme. . . . So is en sounded am. Except 1. after $i$ or $y$, in which case the $e$ retains its proper Pronunciation, but that it takes somewhat of the sound of an $i$; as in these Words bien, chien
&c.” with other exceptions, thus *anteene* has “e open” or *ai*, but *tiene* has “e masculine.” “In, making the first syllable of a Word is pronounced in French as in English, except the *n*, which is but gently sounded; as incapable, indivisible. The same is to be understood of *in* at the end of a Word; as *fin, vin, venin,*” very unlike the modern (ca, xa, xa). “Before *m* and *n* in the same Syllable, it (u) takes the sound of the Diphthong *eu*; as humble, *lundi.*”

The investigation of the time of commencement, and the origin of the French and Portuguese nasality, would be extremely curious; at present, however, we are only concerned with the effect of the French sound upon English ears.

First then as regards *aim, ain; im, in; um, un*, the English seem to have heard in the xvi th century and previously (*aim, ain; im, in; um, un*), and to have pronounced accordingly. Thus Hart in his French Lord’s prayer writes (indui, point, peen) for *indui, point, pain*, where Hart’s (ee) represents the contemporary English (ai).

Next as to *am, an* the English generally heard an inserted (u), thus (aum, aun). This does not however appear in Hart, who writes (an, kotidian, ofansea, tantasion, pyysänse, aman) for *en, quotidien, offenses, tentation, puisance, Amen*. The omission of the (u) may perhaps be due to his usual mincing utterance. Palsgrave however distinctly notices it, and to this must be due the orthographies *aum, aun*, which are frequent at this and an earlier date in English words taken from the French. In Salesbury we have the example *galaunt, galawnt* (gal’aunt), and he particularly says that “A in the British ... is never sounded like the diphthong *au* as the Frenchmen sounde it in commynge before *m* or *n* in their tongue.” Levins, 1570, spells *daunce, glueunce, launce, praunce, vaunt*, but he is not fond of the orthography, which seldom occurs. The pronunciation of such words is still marked by many speakers, (p. 147,) and although some, especially ladies, say (daens, glæns, læns, præns, vaent), others lengthen the vowel at least to (daæns) etc., while many say (dans, glæns, læns, præns, vaunt), and others lengthening this vowel say (daæns) etc., and the intermediate sounds (daæns, daæns,) are not unfrequent; but although some say (vaænt), no one perhaps will now be heard to say (daæns, prææns).

In the combination *-nge*, although we have the *u* inserted in Chaucer’s time, a peculiar thinness seems to have been introduced by the -ge, for Salesbury gives *oranges, oreintaya* (or’aindzhiz), (p. 120,) and Butler says that before *-nge*, a is

1 See also the passage quoted supra p. 126, and the observations upon it.
pronounced as \textit{ai}, (ai) or occasionally (ee), as in \textit{change}, \textit{range}, \textit{danger}, \textit{stranger}, words which retain the evidence of this pronunciation in the modern form (\textit{tshe}\textit{indzh}, \textit{re}\textit{cindzh}, \textit{dee}\textit{indzh}, \textit{stree}\textit{indzh}). The last word is said to exist in America under the form (\textit{stra}i\textit{ndzh}.

As to \textit{om}, \textit{on}, the English as we have seen, p. 150, heard (um, un). In the older English, in which, as we see from Palsgrave and Bullokar, \textit{ou} was pronounced (\textit{uu}), we consequently find \textit{oum}, \textit{oun} = (uum, un) for these sounds, and these became (oom, oon) in accented and (um, un) in unaccented syllables in the \textit{xvi}th century. Hence the final (un) of Salesbury in \textit{condi}\textit{sy}\textit{un}, \textit{cond}i\textit{sy}\textit{un} (kondisjun); \textit{exhi}\textit{bi}\textit{si}\textit{un}, \textit{exhi}\textit{bi}\textit{si}\textit{un} (eksibisi,un); \textit{prohi}\textit{bi}\textit{si}\textit{un}, \textit{prohi}\textit{bi}\textit{si}\textit{un} (proo,ibisi,un). To the way in which Palsgrave heard \textit{o} pronounced in French even before \textit{ne}, we may attribute Salesbury's (\textit{tru}m) for \textit{throne}. We have also in the \textit{xvi}th century a distinct recognition of the vocal (\textit{'m}, \textit{'n}) constituting a syllable. Bullokar has even separate signs for them, an accented \textit{m}, \textit{n}.

The guttural nasal (q) seems to have been the regular pronunciation of \textit{ng} in English, but it was not recognized as a simple sound by the older writers. There is a difficulty in pronouncing the true dental (n) before (k, g) so that \textit{nk} was commonly written for (qk) or (qkh) as Mr. Melville Bell, among others, thinks the sound should be more correctly written, and \textit{ng} for either (q) or (qg), as in \textit{singer}, \textit{linger} (sq\textct{\textae}\textct{\textae}, Iq\textct{\textae}q\textct{\textae}). This was observed by the Latin Grammarians. Nigidius, quoted by Aulus Gellius, lib. xix. cap. 14, says:

“\textit{Inter literas N et G est alia vis;} ut in nomine \textit{anguis et angaria} et \textit{an}c\textit{ora et in}c\textit{ur}at \textit{et incurit et ingenuus}. In omnibus enim his non verum \textit{N}, sed adulterinum ponitur. \textit{Nam N non esse, lingua indicio est. Nam si ea litera esset; lingua palatum tangeret.”

Nigidius appears to have considered this \textit{n} to be \textit{g}, or perhaps only related to \textit{g}. The Greeks wrote \textit{γγ}, \textit{γχ}, \textit{γχ} for (qg, qk, qkh) and we find \textit{qq} in Gothic, but it is not easy to separate (q) from (ag) and we may perhaps assume that (ag) was the older form in all cases. This would at any rate account for no special symbol having been assigned to (q), in most languages. It exists in Sanscrit \textit{ṛ}, but few Sanscrit transliterators think it necessary to provide a separate symbol for it. In recent English (q) occurs frequently as a final, did it so occur in early English? This is a difficult question to answer, when we consider the practice of modern Germany, because the present pronunciation of German and Dutch being less altered than English, represents an earlier stage of English pronunciation. Now
according to Rapp ng is (qg) when final, and (q) when medial over the greater part, especially the North, of Germany. Hence Sänger Gesang would be (szeq'er gezaq'g'). Practically, however, as final (g) is very difficult for Germans to pronounce, they use (qk) so that Gesang Dank rhyme as (gezaq' daqk). This is not the case in central Germany, where (q) final is common, and where therefore (gezaq' daqk) do not rhyme. Even in England many speakers confuse thing, think under (thi'qk), but this seems to be an exceptional word.

Gill appears to be the first writer who recognises (q) as a separate element. He says, leaving his notation unaltered:

"N in illis [literis] est quas nihil mutare diximus: at si k, aut g, sequatur paulum minuenda est nostra sententia: neque enim (si accuratè expendas) planè ita profertur in thank et think quemadmodum pronunciatur in hand manus, et non nux nullus. Sed ne adeo nasutuli videamur ut nihil vetustate rucidum ferre possimus: quia k, ibi clarè auditur, nec congruum esse reor quicquam veritati propinquum immutare; monuisse tantum volui, sed te invito non monuisse tamen. At si g subsequatur vt in thing res et song canticum; quia sonus literae g ibi nullus est, at semivocalis planè alia que ab n non minus distat quàm m; literæ ng. una erit ex illis compositis, quibus fas esse volui sonum simplicem indicare, ut in sing canta, et among inter. hic etiam refer illa in quibus g, ab n, ratione sequentis liquidei quodammodo distrahitur, a oang' nitella, tu intang' implicare."

Hence he said (siq, amoq', a spaq'g'l, tu intaq'g'l) according to the present usage of ng. It would appear therefore that we are justified in adopting this usage from at least the xviith century, and, in the uncertainty which cannot be dispelled, it will be safest to adopt it also from the earliest times that English became distinct from Anglosaxon, although the North German custom may have been that of Anglosaxon itself, namely to call ng = (qg) when final, and (q) when medial.

Gill names (q) as a bad pronunciation of the Hebrew y, which is still heard, being replaced by (gn) when initial, as Europeans generally find a difficulty in initial (q), although it is not unfrequent in extra-European languages.  

---

1 Thus Voss in his Minnelied has "Der Holdseligen Sonder Wank Sing' ich frohlichen Minnesang: Denn die Reine, Die ich meine, Winkt mir lieblichen Habendsch." And again in his address to Luther

2 The vulgar Parisian, however, says (qj'a pa) for il n'y a pas, and the Viennese porters will call a gentleman (ei quad'n) or (ei qaahd'n) for our Gnaden.
bury speaks of the "Latine vocables agnus, magnus, ignis, at what time they were thus barbarously sounded angnus, mangnus, ingnis," meaning (aq'nu's, maq'nus, iq'nis). This nasalisation of (g) into (q) before the following nasal (n) seems to have been common in the middle ages, and has crept into the Latin orthography of the period. Gill in English gives both (benig'n) and (benig'n) for benign,¹ This (qn) is the regular pronunciation of gn in Modern Swedish, the poet Tegné'r being (Teqneer).²

The (qg, qk) are heard in Italian and Spanish, but they are unknown in French. The older orthography of French had ng in many cases where the nasal (n) is now heard. But Meigret does not recognise this, writing n simply in such cases. The French confuse our (q) with their gn = (nj) and some Englishmen seem to have fallen into the converse error. The Spanish ñ,³ Portuguese nh, Italian and French gn, are all (nj), or nearly (ns).

L

The great opening for the passage of the voice while L is pronounced and the very slight nature of the vibration of the sides of the tongue, tend to give it a strongly vocal character, and not unfrequently the L has been entirely lost in a vowel sound, produced simply by not bringing the tip of the tongue close enough to the palate to form a division of the passage and throw the voice out on both sides. Both French and English seem to have had a tendency to labialise (l) into (lw) after (a, o), that is they rounded the lips either during the vowel or just as it glided into the consonant. The Latin alter thus became (alwter) or (awlwtre) felt as (awlvre), till the (l) became absorbed, that is, neglected for convenience of utterance, thus (aotre), which is Meigret's

¹ Strange as the final combination (q'n) may seem, there is a well known London vulgarism in which it is very familiar (q'nz) for (qn'zna) onions.
² In Sjöborg's Swedische Sprachlehre, p. 10, this is the rule laid down, but mogna, tagne, stagne are said exceptionally to preserve the (g) and in logn the sound is (loan). The irregularity of Swedish orthography as compared with pronunciation is considerable, shewing a great alteration of pronunciation in the comparatively short period since the orthography was established.
³ In old Spanish nn, just as ñ is the modern Spanish for (lj). The tilda over the ñ was merely the usual abbreviation for the second n. "En los tiempos mas antiguos de nuestra lengua se explicó con dos nn juntas esta pronunciación, y algunos se han persuadido a que la tilde sobre la n, como hoy se usa, se introdujo para denotar la otra n que se omite, al modo que la tilde puesta sobre las vocales se usó frecuentemente en lugar de n." Ortografía de la Lengua Castellana, compuesta por la Real Academia Española. 7th ed. Madrid 16mo, 1792, p. 64.
form, and finally (oort'), the modern form. In England
(alse) became felt as (aul) or (awelw) and this degenerated
into (aa1), perhaps through (aul). Finally when a conso-
nant followed, it was more convenient to leave out the (l),
and the lazy or the nimble tongue, as usual, took the most
convenient or shortest road, and (l) disappeared. The Scotch
even lost it without a following consonant as (kää aa) for
(kaa1, aa1). The passage was perhaps (talk, talzek, tauquelk,
tauk, tawk, talk). Whether (taalk) was ever said, except by
Gill's "docti interdum" is more than doubtful.

Similarly after (oo) we had (ooold, oould, ooold) or
(ool). In this case the (l) was not generally absorbed, but
we have provincially (oool) for old.

Salesbury says that in the English calm, call, the a "is
thought to decline toward the sound of the diphthong au."
Again: "o in Welsh going before u, soundeth nothing
more boystous, that is to say, that it inclineth to the sound
of the diphthong ou (as it doth in English) no more than if
it had gone before any other letter."
"L hath no nother
difference in sound in Welsh than in Englysh. And note
that it neythar causeth a nor o when they come before it, to
sound anye more fuller in the mouth, than they do elsewhere
sounde, commynge before anye other letter." "Sometimes a has the sounde of the diphthong au especially when
it precedes l or u, as may be more clearly seen in these
words: balde baseuld (baultd) caluy, bale, bawel, (bawl) pila;
wall bawel (wawel) murus." "O also before id or u is pro-
nounced as though w were inserted between them, thus
cole, could (kould) frigidus, bolle bowel (boul), tolle towel
(toul) vectigal." "In some districts of England u is sounded
like w, thus bowel (booud) for sold, bow (buu) for bull, coau
(kau) for call. But this pronunciation is merely a provinci-
cialism, and not to be imitated unless you wish to mince like
these blunderers." But this did not arise from mincing, but
from broadening. The mincer, so far from dropping
the front of the tongue from the palate, raises the middle part
and produces (ij) which degenerates into (i), as in Modern
French. The effect of l which Salesbury names is generally
recognized and exists to this day in the modified form of
(aa1) for (au) and (ou) for (oou) or (ou). The sound (ou)
is however, heard in (oould) Ireland, either in its genuine
form (ou) or its modified form (ou) at the present day.
Buchanan in the xviii th century wrote (sould, kould, bould,
skeuld, teuld, nueld, soueld, soueldiir) for sold, cold, bold, scold, told,
hold, soldier. Sheridan did not imitate him, but scrupulously
used (ool) and notes (bauld, kauld) as Irishisms for (boold, koold), in which again the Irish were only following the fashion of the English in the xvii th century.

Salesbury recognized 'l) or prolonged (l) as forming a syllable by itself in able, sable, twyncle, wryncle, writing abl, sabl, twinkl, wrinkl = (aa'b'l, saa'b'l, twiq'k'1, wriq'k'1). In this he is fully borne out by all subsequent writers. Hart and Bullokar have special signs for ('l). Hart considers it to be the same as the Welsh ll, (llhh) which is the reason why he provides it with an especial character. He says

"Wée hane further the l, aspired lyke to the Spanische and Walsh1 often vse of the ll, which maketh the .xj. dumbe or dull sounde, but we vse it not that I know of, at the beginning of any words as they do: but often at thend of words, as in this sentence, the bede is hable to fable. Where we wrest the e, which is but closely or (as it were) halfe sounded: wherfore we may with as smal cost and labour, as of the rest, vse a fit figure for it: and neuer neede to vse the ll, or lh, and for the reasons abonesaid not to abuse the h."

Smith says:

"Qui nescit quid sit esse semivocalem ex nostra lingua facilè poterit discere, ipsa enim litera L quandam quasi vocalem in se videtur continere, ita ut juncta mutæ sine vocali sonum faciat, ut (sabl) habilis, (staabl) stabillis, (faabl) fable, &c; aliis abil stabil fabill, aliis abul stabul fabul scrunt, sed ne quicquam pronuntiant: nam consideratius auscultant nec e nec i nec u est, sed tinnitius quidam vocalis naturam habens, quæ naturaliter his liquides inest. In omnibus his quidam e addunt in fine, vt able, stable, fable: sed certò illud e non tam sonat hic quam fusum illud et femininum Francorum e,2 nam ne quicquam sonat."

1 Like Salesbury he confuses the Spanish (l) with the Welsh (llh).
2 This is a recognition of an obscurely sounded final French e, the present (e), in the xvi th century, agreeing with Palsgrave but disagreeing with Meigret. In the same way most Germans call their e final in eine gute Gabe a fine (e), and very many Englishmen would call it (e). Rapp, Physiologie der Sprache, vol. iv. p. 16, says (translating the passage for convenience): "Short (e) only occurs unaccented, as (be, ge, unde), bez.e, unde, doubtful, half-mute, or, when heard, with a faint nasal in en (gezeben) geben. On account of the uncertainty we generally prefer the orthography (gezeben)." Rapp uses e much as the palaeotype (e), and represents (x, e) by e, ę, but (ex, ee) by ę, ę. Generally I have used (e, ee) for his ę, ę, but in this passage it was necessary to draw the distinction. In the same way I have represented the final -e in Chaucer by (e), as doubtful. Rapp continues: "Yet where the syllable new with double n results, (nmem) nennem is distinctly pronounced." Rapp writes (nmem) owing to his custom of doubling the consonant after a stopped vowel. "To exhaust what I have to say about the unaccented e, observe that the first e is taken as the natural vowel in the termination enen, (gezellenen) gezeilenem, or else elided. The natural vowel is distinct before M, R, S and T, (satam, fator, gutos, brextat) atem, eoter, gutes, belet, foreign names as (mooeses) of course excepted; custom varies in (quipor, quuplar). The eculitics (ur, fur, tear; or, dar) ur, vor, zer; or, der must be mentioned among the (er). The e is always mute before L, as in all allied languages, as (mitl, xq'l)
In Bohemian the (l) is fully recognized, and forms the only vocal element in some accented syllables, as wilky (bh’l’ky) wolves, sluza (sl’za) a tear. It seems probable that it was the sound intended to be represented by Sanscrit \u092e\u093f = (l, ’l) commonly called (lri, lrii), unless these were originally cerebral, as (l, ’l). The modern French do not possess the sound, but pronounce (tabl’ or (tabl), sometimes merely (tabl), although their orthoepists write (tabl), and contend that (l) here forms a syllable by itself. As we have seen Hart indicates his own pronunciation of final -le to have been (-lh.)

R

In English at the present day r has at least two sounds, the first, when preceding a vowel, is a scarcely perceptible trill with the tip of the tongue (r) which in Scotland, and with some English speakers, as always in Italy, becomes a clear and strong trill (r), but as this is only an accident of speech, it will not be further noticed, (r) being used indifferently for both. The second English r is always final or precedes a consonant. It is a vocal murmur, differing very slightly from (a). I seem to hear it occasionally in two forms, differing nearly as (a, e) which I represent by (a, i). As however this distinction is, certainly, by no means always made, I do not usually mark it. This second (i) may diphthongise with any preceding vowel. After (a, a, o) the effect is rather to lengthen the preceding vowel, than to produce a distinct diphthong. Thus farther, lord, scarcely differ from father, laud; that is, the diphthongs (aai, aoi) are heard almost as the long vowels (aa, a). That a distinction is made by many, by more perhaps than are aware of it, is certain, but it is also certain that in the mouths of by far the greater number of speakers in the South of England the absorption of the (a) is as complete as the absorption of the (l) in talk,

mittel, engel, and this should be theoretically the case even when terminations are added on, although it is then certainly difficult to continue to make the vowelless L form a syllable by itself, as (smaih’l-au, sa’l-lander, mit’l-landish) schmeichel, engelländer, mittelländisch.” This theory is partly wrong, for the vocal (l) being only a lengthened (l) = (ll) is naturally shortened before a vowel, as (ster-b’l, ster-bliq; -fel’l, -fel-1a); so it should be in German (smaihhihl), but in fact (shmaihhihl) is said. Rapp continues: “The terminations (s’l-in, smaih’l-in, gaab’l-in) engeln, schmeichel, gabeln, are difficult to pronounce with purity for foreigners and even for Germans. Finally the natural vowel or mute e is generated in popular speech by neglecting ancient terminations as in (anzer, iizer, raud’lstat, iq’lstat, dokter, professar) and among the uneducated even in (jesusus, zeens, goota).” This passage is interesting as serving to show the state of a language in which the final e is in a transition state. See suprà p. 119, note, col. 2.
walk, psalm, where it has also left its mark on the preceding vowel. When Dickens wrote Count Smol't Tork he meant Small Talk, and no ordinary reader would distinguish between them. But in (ər, ər) proper, there is a slight change of lingual position generating a glide, and consequently Mr. M. Bell represents the effect by a glide character especially invented for the purpose, which he terms the "point glide," and describes "as a semivocalized sound of (ə)." The diphthongs (ər, ər) are very difficult to separate from each other and from (əʊ). But the slight raising of the point of the tongue will distinguish the diphthongs from the vowel in the mouth of a careful speaker, that is, one who trains his organs to do so. No doubt the great majority of speakers do not make any difference, and I think that the best representation of these sounds is the simple (ə) or (ᵊ), which is in this respect wholly comparable to the (l) already discussed. It seems to be an indistinct murmur, differing from (l) by not having any contact between the tongue and the palate, but similar to it, in absorbing a variety of other vowels.

The following is a comparison of my notation of this murmur (ə) and its various diphthongs, with Mr. M. Bell's. The (ə) character will express Mr. Bell's glide, and (əə) its labialised form, as in Introduction, p. 15. The examples have been taken from Visible Speech, pp. 113–116.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bell</th>
<th>Ellis</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>word, journey, furnish = (wəd, dzəmər) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ər</td>
<td>ər</td>
<td>paper, circuitous, answer, martyr = (pəpər) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əi</td>
<td>əi</td>
<td>fire, lyre, choir = (fər, liə, kweər)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əAIR</td>
<td>əAIR</td>
<td>wiry, fiery = (wərrəi, fəirəi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əou</td>
<td>əou</td>
<td>hour, power = (əuə, pouə)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au əu</td>
<td>au əu</td>
<td>ourselves = (əusəlvəz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əUR</td>
<td>əUR</td>
<td>dower, flower, showery = (dəurəi, fləurəi) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>hard, clerk, heart, guard = (maud, klaark) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əi</td>
<td>əi</td>
<td>barbarian = (bərəbəriən)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əI</td>
<td>əI</td>
<td>altar, grammar, particular = (ələr) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>starry, tarry (adjective) = (stərə, tərə)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>prefer, earnest, firm, myrrh, guerdon = (prəfrə) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ər</td>
<td>ər</td>
<td>near, bear, here, we're, pier = (niər, biər) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>aree, era, weary, peeress = (iəriə, iəriə) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>care, aer, pair, Ayr, prayer (petition), there, bear, ne'er, their, eyre, mare = (keər) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>mayor = (məə)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>canary, fairy, therein, bearing = (keənəriə) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>war, ward, swarm, dwarf = (wəər, wəərd, dəəرف) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>poor, moor, tour, sure = (puə, muə, tuər) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>poorer, surer, assuring, tourist = (puəə, suər, assuring, tuəəur) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əə</td>
<td>əə</td>
<td>cure, pure, endure, immure = (kəə, pəə, enəədərə, imməərə) &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be observed that Mr. Bell has not marked a long vowel in many places where I have marked one. His general habit is not to distinguish the length of the first element in diphthongs. Simple r is used in ordinary spelling, after long vowels, for the combination (ar), or ('r) as Mr. Bell prefers writing. This combination is very peculiar in English; compare dear, deary, mare, Mary, more, glory, poor, poorer, with the French dire, dirai, mere, maire, Maure, aurai, tour, Touraine.

The Scotch do not use (a) at all, but only (r) or rather (r'), saying (word, serf, surf, karv) word, serf, surf, carve.

In Italy (r) is constant, in France and a great part of Germany (r) is pronounced in lieu of (r). Could it be to this sound that Palsgrave alluded when he said:

"R in the frenche tonge shalbe sounded as he is in latyn without any exception, so that, where as they of Parys do sounde somtyme r lyke s, sayeng pawsye for parys, passioun for parisien, chaure for chayre, mary for mary, and suche lyke, in that thyng wold we have them folowed, albeit that in all this worke I moost folowe the Parisyens."

Certainly z would be the nearest character by which, without explanation, he could have given a conception of the true r grasseyé ou provençal, the French (r), which is not unlike the Arabian (grh), and the Northumberland burr. The last is often confused by southerners with (g), (Haghr'iet) Harriet sounding to them like (Hag'iet). The Spanish r suave is (r), with no more trill than in English, but the r fuerte is, according to Mr. M. Bell, the usual (r'), but according to M. Favarger, (r'), a sharp uvula rattle without any moisture.

1 The French razzia (razia) is a corruption of the Arabic رِجَة (grhazaat).
2 See Ortografía de la lengua Castellana compuesta por la real Academia Española, 7th ed. Madrid, 1792, p. 70, where the strong r (r') is said to occur, at the beginning of words as razón, romo, rico, romo, rueda; after t, n, s always, as malrotar, enriquecer, homnra, Israel, desgloade; in compounds, where the second part begins with r; and where rr is written as barra, carro. In other cases the soft r (r) is to be pronounced.
No allusion to more than one sound of \( r \) is found in any of the older writers except Ben Jonson, yet it can hardly be supposed that even if the northerners have retained \( (r) \), the complicated \( (r, \mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r}r) \) system could have grown up in a single century in the South. For the old \( or = (re) \), see p. 187.

1547. Salesbury has the following words which are now pronounced with \( (x) \), the old spelling being in small capitals and the phonetic Welsh in italics.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Papyr, papyr
  \item Quarter kwarter, syr syr
  \item Treasure treasuor, vertue vertue
  \item Churchke tsurts, ladder lad-dr, bladd' blad-dr, empeorour emporor
  \item Euermore efermuor, thondre thundr, wondre wnder, suffre sufferer, Gilber Gilbert, gynger tsintair, honoure onor
\end{itemize}

Here we find the unaccented syllable \( er \) or \( ir \) represented by the Welsh \( er, yr, ir, r \), and finally simple \( r \). This points out to an indistinct murmur, where the writer tries first one vowel sound and then another and finally gives them all up in despair, and trusts to the simple consonant \( (r) \) as best representing the sound. Now in Bohemian \( (r) \) is recognized as sufficient to form even an accented syllable, as \( erma a roe, erno kernel, trn thorn, dtrn turf, chrt greyhound \). I do not know whether the sound is here \( (x) \) or \( (r) \), but as Ziax (Böhmische Sprachlehre) compares it with the German termination -er, which Rapp (supra p. 194, note) declares to be \( (er) \), it will be safest to consider it as \( (r) \) or \( (r, r) \), though even the Germans are apt to fall into the convenient \( (x) \) final. The examples from Salesbury would therefore lead us to conclude that \( (r) \) was sufficiently common in English of the \( xvi \)th century, but would not allow us to assume either that the syllables he writes \( er, yr, ir, r \) were \( (x) \), or that every final \( r \) was \( (x) \) and middle \( r \) \( (r) \).

1569. Hart says of \( l m m r \) that they are “rightly used in sound when they be single.”

1580. Bullokar, who has especial signs for \( (l, \ 'm, \ 'n) \), has none for \( (r) \) or \( (x) \), writing (foormer, dheeer, aar, severawl, letterz, figyyr), for former, there, are, several, letters, figures.

1621. Gill says: “aeri fore trissyllabum est; earl mobilis; apud alios enim diphthongus valet, hlc earl auditur, illc orl.”

Here some tinge of \( (r) \) or \( (x) \) seems to come into play, (a'ri, e'rl, eerl). Gill also writes (foi'er) fire, and complains that they say (fir) in place of (fai'er) in the East of England. But the Germans also write feuer (fay'or, foyr, foir), and this does not imply \( (x) \).

1653, Wallis and 1668, Wilkins have no allusion to \( (x) \).
If it was then heard it was possibly considered to be an erroneous utterance not worth naming.

1685. Cooper says: "Verba Anglica & latina derivativa que in origine scribuntur cum or scribimus item er, pronunciavimus autem ur (or), non quia sic proferri debet, sed quia propter literae r vibrationem vix aliter efferere potest; ut adder coluber, prefer prefero, slender tenuis."

Here the mention of the vibration excludes (i) and insists on (er) or ('r). Cooper proceeds to give lists of such words with final (er) spelled -ar, -er, -ir, -or, and even -ure, shewing that he pronounced -ure as (-ur) in adventure, juncture, lecture, nature, pasture, picture, rapture, scripture, etc., which are vulgarisms at present under the form (-tu), although in figure, injure, measure the (i) is common (fig'z, in'dzhə, mez'zhə). Cooper also says: "r sonatur post o in apron gremiale, citron citreum, environ circundo, gridiron craticula, iron ferrum, saffron crocus; quasi scriberentur apurn, &c.," almost as at present.

1688. Mirex also says of r, "en certains mots la voyelle qui la suit se prononce devant, comme en here, sire, spire, hundred, apron, citron, saffron, iron;"

but this can only point to (er) or ('r) after what Cooper has said. Jones identifies the sounds of er, ur, referring from the latter to the former, and making both co-extensive with the modern (i), but he does not help us to determine the double power of r.

1640. Ben Jonson says: "R is the Dorse letter, and hurtheth in the sound; the tongue striking the inner palate, with a trembling about the teeth. It is sounded firme in the beginning of the words, and more liquid in the middle, and ends: as in rarur, viper, and so in the Latine."

This seems to imply that a difference was made so early as the end of the xvi.th and beginning of the xvii.th century. The precise meaning of the vague terms firm and more liquid cannot of course be assigned. But probably firm meant more consonantal and liquid more vocal, so that something like the difference between (r) and (i) is indicated. The reference to the Latin is of no value, as it was only to its English pronunciation.

Walker, 150 years later, refers to this passage and says:

"The rough r is formed by jarring the tip of the tongue against the roof of the mouth near the fore teeth: the smooth r is a vibration of the lower part of the tongue, near the root, against the inward region of the palate near the entrance of the throat. This latter r is that which marks the pronunciation of England, and the former that of Ireland."
But he does not proceed to point out where the rough and smooth $r$ were pronounced, and his description of the smooth $r$ better agrees with a gently pronounced ($r$) or (grh), the uvula trill, than with (z). The theory of a vibration of the back or lower part of the tongue is untenable; that part of the tongue is too firm to vibrate in the manner conceived. And in England we do not perceptibly vibrate the uvula.

SMART, who has entered into the consideration of (z) more than any preceding writer, calls (z) a "guttural vowel sound." He says of (r) that "it is formed by a strong trill of the tongue against the upper gum," to which it may be objected, first, that the trill is gentle in English, and, secondly, that the tongue vibrates freely, near, but not striking the upper gum. For (z) he says, "there is no trill, but the tongue being curled back during the progress of the vowel preceding it, the sound becomes guttural, while a slight vibration of the back part of the tongue is perceptible in the sound." Now I do not find the tongue to be "curled back," although it passes from the preceding vowel to the (z) position, and I find no vibration of the back of the tongue, though vibration of the velum may occasionally be felt, and some persons may more or less vibrate the uvula.

On account of the resemblance of (z) to (e), a sound to which all unaccented vowels approximate in the mouths of many southern speakers, and also because when (z) is followed by a vowel, it is usual to interpose (r) thus (meat, meat, hii'tic), hairy, hearing, illiterate speakers—those who either do not know how to spell, or ignore the rules of spelling in their speech—usually interpose an (r) between any back vowel, as (a, a, e) and a subsequent vowel, thus (draat, laar ð-dhe-lend, winder ð-dhe ,eus) for (draat, laa ð-dhe ðend, win'do ð-dhe ðeus) drawing, law of the land, window of the house. From this habit, a very singular conclusion has been commonly drawn by a great many people, namely, that such persons habitually say (draat, laat, win'dar) when not before a vowel,—a feat which they are mostly incapable of performing. They will indeed rhyme window, cinder, not because they say (win'dar sin'dar) as generally assumed, with the trilled (r), but because they say (wind sin'dar) or (win'dar sin'dar), omitting to trill the $r$ in both cases.

Another point on which Smart insists is the distinction between serf, surf, which Mr. M. Bell writes (sərf, səf), and I write either (səf, səf) by preference, or (səf, səf), or else, sinking the distinction, as is far the commonest practice, write (səf) for both words. A distinction of course can be made,
and without much difficulty, by those who think of it, and is made by those who have formed a habit of doing so; but the distinction is so rarely made as to amount almost to pedantry when carefully carried out, like so many other distinctions insisted on by orthoeptists, but ignored by speakers whose heart is in the thought they wish to convey, not in the vehicle they are using. Smart, notwithstanding the pains he has bestowed on this subject, finds that the words payer, player, slayer, which are dissyllables = (pee, plee, sleet, sleet), rhyme perfectly with care, fair, hair, share, which are monosyllables = (kee, fee, hee, shee) with a different vowel.

The action of the (') in altering the preceding (a) into (au) and thence into (AA) has already been noticed. It is always the tendency of two sounds combined in rapid succession, to generate some alterations in one or both, or to fuse themselves into some new sound (p. 52). This is very marked with (a). It is now not customary to pronounce (ee) or (oo) before (a). Such words as (meet, moo) have a very peculiar effect, either antiquated or illiterate, and are replaced by (meet, moo) mare, more. Mr. M. Bell considers that (au) is in like manner altered to (iu). This is certainly often the case, but (puaa) for (puua) has no singularity in it. We certainly do not change (ii) into (ii) and say (ii) ear. It is probably this action of the (a) which has preserved the sound of (a) so that art, part are not (art, part) but (aart, paart) or (aar, paar) or simply (aart, paart). Indeed, in ordinary spelling, many writers now habitually use ar to indicate the sound (aa), in the same way as they use or to represent (AA); (p. 197). At the same time (ear, aear) were certainly prevalent in the xvii th century, and are fossilized in America.

How far all these effects are modern, or how far they were heard even in Ben Jonson's time, I have been quite unable to determine. But as (r) may still be said, and is still used by Irishmen and Scotchmen (implying an older form of English) and, carefully inserting (') or (r), is even now used by many Englishmen without giving offence to the ear (ii'r, iior), it is certainly safer to assume that there was formerly only one sound of (r), but that a murmur ('r) was generally inserted before it when following a vowel. In my transcriptions, however, I have been obliged to omit this theoretical (r) for which I have no proper authority.

1 But observe the Norwich street cry, p. 138, note, col. 1.
The pronunciation of P,B does not seem to have varied in any respect.

T,D have now a tendency, ignored by most orthoepists, under particular circumstances to pass into (tah, dzh); thus nature, verdure are, perhaps most frequently, pronounced (neetshə, vərdʒə), the last word being in that case identified with verger. This alteration takes place generally through the action of a palatal sound, originally (yy), then (iu, ju) so that the transition was (-tyyr, -tiur, -tiyəz, -tiəz, -tahə). I have not found traces of the change however, but the pronunciation (neetə) or its equivalent given by Jones seems to show an effort to avoid it by omitting the palatal element (z). In the xviii century Sheridan carried this still further and allowed for such pronunciations as (tshuutə) for tutor. The palatals (i, z) have always had a great effect upon preceding consonants of the dental and guttural class, as they tend to materially alter the position of the tongue, in order to facilitate the transition to a following vowel. The languages derived from the Latin are full of instances. It is a fashion in modern English to resist, or to believe that we resist, this tendency in the especial case of -ture and -dure, but we have given into it completely in -tion, where the t, hesitating in classical times between c and t, underwent a change which gave (-sioə) in French, whence in English, first (-siun) and then (-shon),—never, except in orthoepical fancies, (-shon),—and in Italian produced (-tsiuh-ne). A similar change is recognized in -cious, -cial. And it is in vain to protest against -ture, -dure becoming (-tahə, -dzhə), at a time when even (-tjuə, -duə), though far less pedantic than (-tiuə, -diuə), have a singularly orthoepistic effect.

C,G also underwent a similar change, not from the action of an (i) sound, but paradoxically, as it might appear, through the action of a following (a) sound. The letter k is not much used as an initial in English and hence the observation refers in spelling to c but in sound to (k). It would be interesting to know when the English began to introduce an (i) sound between (k, g) and an (a) sound. There is no trace of it in orthoepists, but there are traces of it in a very early stage of our language, in the Anglosaxon orthography, and there are traces of final (k, g), especially after (l, n, r) having been also palatalized to (k, g). The word church, now (tahrtsəh), but previously (tahirtsh) if we may trust Salesbury's Welsh tran-
scription *tsiurts*, is an excellent example. The Anglosaxon forms are *circe*, *cricic*, *cricic*, *cirece*, *cyricea*, the Greek being *κυριακόν*, which in the present Greek pronunciation, prevalent certainly in all its main points when the word was transplanted into Anglosaxon, is called (*kiriakon*'), and the word (*kirik*) or (*kirk*) probably arose¹ from omitting one or two of the intermediate vowels. Ormin’s *kirke* = (*kirk*e) and the Scotch *kirk* (kerk, ke-rk), shew the unpalatalized form. That the initial consonant should have yielded to the following (i) was to be expected, and although in modern high German we have *kirche* (kirkh'e), the old high German often shewed an initial *ch* = (*kh*) or perhaps (*kh*), a palatal, although it possibly meant the upper German initial (*kh*). The final *k* in this word is palatalised in modern German, for it is (*kh*) and not (*kh*), and it is to be remarked that the Germans always use (*kh*) and not (*kh*) after (l n r) shewing the tendency of Germanic languages to this palatalisation. The transitional form between (*kirk*) and (tahirtsch) was (*kirk*). From (*k*) to (tah) seems a great stride. Yet there is no doubt that the passage was accomplished in Italian, where every (tah) results from a palatal (*k*), and every (sh) from a palatal (sk) precisely as in English. In modern Greek *καλ*, properly (*ke*), becomes (*ke*, *ki*, *tsi*) in various dialectic pronunciations. In Sanscrit also there can be no doubt that the palatal series *c h k g g* were originally (*k* *kh* *g* *gh* *g*) although they are said to be now (tah tshn dzh dzhn nj).² This is not the only change of the palatized (*k*). The older French seem to have generally palatalized the Latin *c* before *a*, as (*kamp*) from *campus*, whence afterwards (shamp, shaa), (p. 53). But the change was often first into (s), whence (sh) became evolved by a further action of an (i) sound, so *oceanus*, *oceán*, *ocean* (*oke'anus*, *oeceans*, *oo'shen*).

In pronouncing (*j*) the middle of the tongue is arched up against the palate; while for (*k*) the back, and for (*t*) the tip of the tongue only come in contact with the palate. When then (*kj*) or (*tr*) come together rapidly, the first change is to produce (*kj*) and (*tj*). By (*kj*) is meant precisely the same as (*k*). The latter is generally the more convenient notation, but the former seems more suitable for the present discussion. For (*kj*) there is an attempt to pro-

¹ There is a possibility that *cire* is not of Greek origin, see Graff. iv, 481, Dieffenbach’s Goth. Wörter. ii, 400. This however will not affect the derivatives of the Anglosaxon.

² It is very possible that (*g*) may remain; few Englishmen would detect the difference between (*nj*) and (*g*) that is (*qj*), and some mispronounce the French *gn* as (*g*). The sound (*nj*) belongs to a series (*tj* *jx* *dj* *djx* *nj*), not developed in Sanscrit.
nounce (k) and (s) simultaneously. Hence the back of the tongue still remaining in contact with the palate, the middle of the tongue is also raised, so that both back and middle lie against the palate. This is rather a constrained position, and consequently the back of the tongue readily drops. The result is the exact position for (tʃ) which, originating in an attempt to sound (t) and (ʃ) simultaneously, brought the tip and middle of the tongue to the palate, and this being almost an impossible position dropped the tip. The two consonants (kj, tʃ) are therefore ready to interchange. The passage from (tʃ) to (tʃb) is very short and swift, so much so that many writers, as Wallis, have considered (tʃb) to be really (ts). ¹ But the organs of different speakers have different tendencies, and in some (s) or (ʃb) are more readily evolved than (tʃb) from (tʃ). It must be remembered that when the sound is thus spoken of as changing, it is not meant that it changes in the mouth of a single man from perfect (k) to perfect (tʃb). Quite the contrary. It probably required many generations to complete the change, and the transitional forms were possibly in use by intermediate generations. From these must be excluded all intentional, that is, artificial inorganic changes, such as those induced by modern orthoepists. The (s, sh, tʃb) were all imperfect attempts at imitating (tʃ), a sound which is said to have remained stable in the Hungarian language where it is written ty, while its congener (dj) is written gy, Magyar being called (Madjar).

The reason why (k) should have been palatalized to (kj) after (l,n,r) is not so clear, but the example of the modern high German milch, manch, durch (milkh, mankh, durkh) shows that the tendency is a reality not an hypothesis, and enables us to understand milch as well as milk ags. milc, meolc; bench as well as bank, ags. banc; drench ags. drencan as well as drink ags. drincan, stark and starch ags. stearc, mark and march a border, ags. mearc. Chaucer interchanges werk, seurch, etc., to suit his rhyme. It would seem therefore that about this time there was a great tendency in the two sounds to fall into one another. The close connection also of the sounds of (k, tʃb) naturally suggested the related signs c, ch, a notation early adopted. And as (sk) became

¹ Wallis says: "Anglorum ch vel tsk sonat ty. . . Si voci Anglicanne yew taxus sigillatim preponantur d, t, s, fiant dyew, tyew, syew, eyew, hoc est, Anglorum Jes Judeus, chew mastico, chew ostendo, et Gallorum Jes lasus. Qui syllabis yan, yer preposuerit s, s formabit Gallorum changer, hoc est, syan-syer, at si preposuerit t, d formabit Anglorum changer, hoc est, tyadianer." There is no doubt of the readiness with which the first sounds generate the second, but the two are quite distinct, and a very little practice enables any one to distinguish them.
(skj, stj, sh), the earliest sign for the new sound was sch. This has been adopted in German where ch by itself has a different meaning. See also Chap. V, § 4, No. 1.

But the phenomenon which suggested these remarks, namely, the palatalisation of (k) before an (a) sound, is different. Generally the consonant follows the tendency of the vowel. A German is so imbued with the tendency of ch to become (kh, kjh, kch) according to the preceding vowel, so used to say (akh, ikjh, auweh), that his organs would find (akj, ikh) an impossibility. But different speakers seem to have been affected with the very opposite tendency; some striving to render the consonant thinner, or more palatal, by inserting an (i) effect, between it and a following (a) sound; others avoiding the palatalisation of a consonant before an (i) sound by the introduction of an (u) sound. The first would convert (ka) into (kia), whence (kia, kja), the common Italian schiacciato (skjattabasato) effect; the second change (ki, ke) into (kui, kwe) or (kwi, kwe). These tendencies are carried far beyond these limits in the Slavonic palatalisation and the French labialisation of consonants. They are not widely developed in our own language, and, being inorganic, may prevail only partially both in time and place. In modern Italian both chi and cui (ki, cuui) occur, the French qui though written with the mark of thickening or labialisation, is palatalised into (kji) and similarly in all words where qu precedes a (i, e) sound in French.

As respects the particular usage, (kaat, keind, skarlet, skai; gaaid, goid) for cart, kind, scarlet, sky; guard, guide, it is now antiquated in English. But in Walker's time it was so much the custom that he found it "impossible" to pronounce garrison and carriage with the pure (g, k), without any inserted (i) sound. I have however not been able to find any allusion to this practice in the older writers. The custom is now dying rapidly out. But we find the same tendency in other languages. Thus in Modern Greek, I have been told, that χ is always (kh) even before α, α, and it seems that the Sanscrit χ had the same sound.

What has been said of k applies directly to g, substituting sonants for mutes, and as (k) produced (tsh), so did (g) produce (dzh). The Anglo-Saxon g has however usually remained (g), and even in several cases, as edge, bridge in which the change to (dzh) has been made, the (g) is found as a dialectic form. The alteration of the Anglo-Saxon g has generally taken other directions, which will be considered under gh.
CH and J, G are also (tsh, dzh) when corresponding to the present French sounds (sh, zh). Palgrave admits that French ch is English (sh), but he makes the French and English j identical. It is not easy to determine whether in very old French ch, j were read (tsh, dzh) or (sh, zh). Hart makes eight pairs of consonants (b p, v f, g k, dzh tsh, d t, dh th, z s) and two breaths (sh h'). The letters here transcribed (dzh, tsh), he identifies with Italian (gi, ci) and the last with the “High Dutch” tseh, by which their sounds are determined. Then he says, translating his phonetic orthography,

“The French do use the j consonant in a sound which we use not in our speech, whereof this (sh) serveth for the sister thereof, with us, as ch doth with them, having no inward sound, and are both framed with keeping of the tongue from the palate and bringing the teeth together, or the one or other lip to his counter teeth, and thrusting the breath through them with the inward sound for the French j consonant; which if we had in use, should make us the eighth pair. For want whereof the (sh) doth remain to us, a breath without fellow, which the other seven pairs have. But for want of that sound, we have four others which the French never use, to wit of (dzh, tsh) and (dh, th) which are very hard for any natural French to pronounce: other than such as are brought up amongst us somewhat in youth.” And again in the theoretical part of his work, after an elaborate description of (sh) he adds: “For the fellow of which sh, the French do sounde their g, before e, and i, and the i. consonant before a, o, and u, and sometimes before e, and doe never sound perfity our sounds before said for (dzh) & (tsh), in all their speach.”

Hence the French j is fixed as the voiced form of (sh), that is (zh), as Hart heard it in 1569. Yet Palsgrave, whose ear was unfortunately by no means delicate, confused (zh) with (dzh). The Welsh have no (sh, zh, tsh, dzh), and are forced to transcribe the two first by si and the two last by tsi, while they sometimes use si for all four. Thus Salesbury transcribes Jesu, John, Joynt by tsiésu, tsión, tsioynt, and makes a Jack ape into a (siak ab) in his dictionary. He admits that the Welsh tsi is as like the English (tah) “as brass is to gold,” and says of the English “ch, g and r” (tah, dzh), that there is “the same likeness between these three English letters as exists between pewter and silver, that at first sight they appear very like each other, but on close examination they differ.”

The letters ch when transcribing the Greek χ are called (k), and in the word ache which the Promptorium also writes ake, ch has generally the sound of (k). But Hart says: “We abuse the name of h, calling it ache, which sounde
serueth very well to expresse an headache or some bone ache,” so that as the name of the letter could only have been (aatsah), the words imply that ache was also so pronounced. Bullokar also notes it as (aatsah), and thus, by the very same collocation bone ache, is confirmed a fancy of John Kemble’s, in pronouncing the line (Tempest, act i., sc. 2, v. 570):

Fill all thy bones with Aches, make thee roar.

It is true Kemble said (etshe’es), and therefore erred in the vowel, though right in the consonant; and the feeling of the O. P. rioters in placarding, “Silence! Mr. Kemble’s head aitshe’s,” was in so far correct, that it was absurd to retain a single antique pronunciation in the midst of his modern sounds.

The initial k according to all the authorities was still heard in the xvith century before n, as (knou, knot, knuk’l) and hence probably initial gn was (gn), as both are used in present German knochen, grade (knokh’en, gnaa’dé), but I have not met with an instance of gn. Jones makes initial gn always (n), but says that initial kn “may be sounded kn,” which was therefore unusual at that time. Wallis however fifty years before allowed (knou, knyy) know, knem, and Cooper, strangely enough says: “Kn sonatur ut kn; knare nebulo.... quasi knate &c.,” meaning (nh), but perhaps really simple (n), the aspiration being a theoretical difference to distinguish initial kn from simple n.

Labialised l or (lw) has already been shewn to have existed in our language, (p. 193,) but it has died out. Labialised k or (kw), the lips being opened simultaneously with the release of the k contact and not after it, is an ancient element of our own and probably of many other languages. In Anglo-Saxon it is written kw, in Latin qu, which is the form adopted in English. It is needless to say that no orthoepist has distinguished (kw, kw). Gu properly bears the same relation to g as gu to k, but as the form of the g remained unchanged, little attention was paid to it. It does not exist as part of the Saxon element of our language. Initially it is generally used superfluously for g. Occasionally it has the sound (gw) as in language, itself a modern form, anguish, distinguish, &c. Usage, however, varies, some saying (laa’guydzh, eq’gwish) and others (laa’wydzh, eq’wish). The Italian quale, guanto are apparently (kaauw’le, guwan’to). The final -gue for -g as in tongue, plague is quite a modernism. Ague, also spelled ague in the Promptorium, was probably (aa’gvy) or (aa’ggu) from aigüé, and hence does not belong to this category.

As we have (kj gj, kw gw), so also to our unacknowledged
(tj dj) correspond an equally unacknowledged (tæ dæ,) which, written tw as in between, twain, twang, twist, twelve, twirl; dwindle, dwell, dwarf, have been generally considered as (tw, dw), but many of those who have thought on phonetics have been more perplexed to decide whether w was here really a vowel (u) or a consonant (w), than in the corresponding words wean, wain, wist, well, war. The difficulty is resolved by observing that the opening of the lips is really simultaneous with the release of the (t, d) contact.

The termination -age is represented as having the sound (-aidzh) in Salesbury, in domage, heritage, language, all French words, and this agrees with Falsgrave, supra, p. 120, note. Smith, Bullokar, Gill, and Butler, however, do not recognize this tendency in English, although Butler notes the similar change of (a) to (ai) before -nge (-ndzh), and both are confirmed by the modern sounds (-ydzh, -endzh), of which the first is a degeneration of (-edzh, -eedzh).

GH

The Anglosaxon alphabet having no especial letter to represent the guttural (kh), the single letter ʰ was used, as in old High German the double letter ḥḥ was employed. As ɡ often interchanges with ʰ in Anglosaxon, as lagu, lah, law, it is possible that there was a tendency in those times to pronounce ɡ final or medial as (gh), just as the Upper Germans now do, and as the Dutch pronounce their ɡ in all positions. At a later period the Anglosaxon ɡ seems to have become (gh) and then (ʒ), sounds even now confused by German phoneticians. Hence ʒ, which was also written ʒ, and occasionally printed z, became the regular sign for (ʒ) till it was supplanted by y. When, therefore, it was desirable to shew that ɡ retained the sound of ʰ, that is, (kh), it was natural to write gh in its place. In the Ormulum we have all varieties; fulluhht pohhtest, mihhte are instances of ʰ, doubled merely to shew that the preceding vowel is short; maʒ, eyuher, ay, twijess illustrate the use of ʒ, doubtful whether (gh) or (ʒ), while reyhel-boc, folthenn shew the use of ʒh. As in Dutch the ɡ often sounds (kh) as well as (gh),¹ and as the Scotch adopted the orthography ch, it seems probable that (gh) early ac-

¹ Recent opportunities of hearing Dutch pronunciation have convinced me that the Dutch ch, ɡ are rather (krh, grh) than simple (kh, gh). But the sounds are so lightly and gently pronounced that they rather resemble (r, r) than (krh, grh), thus schip = (orhgp) rather than (okrhp, skhrp). The Dutch themselves consider the sound very soft. The Dutch final and medial sch is pronounced as simple s, thus visesch (vlees), a modern example of an omitted guttural.
quired the sound of (kh) only. But it is by no means certain. The two sounds (kh, gh) are so easily confused by those not familiar with them, and may so readily interchange owing to the nature of the adjoining consonant, and so few languages have provided for their discrimination, that we cannot be certain of their not having both existed even though only one is named. It is the same with (sh, zh), the latter of which is scarcely ever noticed, so that it is not easy to say when it first came into use. Even (s, z) are constantly confused. They both exist in Italian, and have only one sign s. But only one of them (s) exists in Spanish and Welsh, having the same sign s. Hence it is impossible to tell from the orthography gh whether it represented only (kh), only (gh), or occasionally (kh) and (gh), nor would it be certain if a Welsh writer, for example, who only knew (kh) and was not acquainted with (gh), asserted that the English gh was (kh). Now Salesbury says: "Gh has the same sound as our ch (kh), except that we sound ch deeper in the throat and more harshly." The two expressions "deeper" and "more harshly" might be applied in Salesbury's popular language in two ways. For example, (kh) is deeper than (kh) and harsher. And (kh) being called 'hard' in contrast to (gh) 'soft,' (kh) might be esteemed harsher than (gh); or the reverse, when (kh) is a familiar and (gh) a strange sound. But certainly (kh) would be felt to be much deeper and harsher than (gh). There is another supposition, namely, that gh was merely (h'), the simple jerk of the aspirated breath. In most cases (h, h') are confused, and the aspirate is considered to be (h'). In my own opinion (h') is much less frequent than (h), but (h') is occasionally said when only (h) is intended. Sir T. Smith writes h for either sound, and this is the general custom of orthoepists. He also represents gh by h only, saying:

"Scio tauht, nikht, fiht & cetera ejusmodi scribi etiam g adjuncta, vt taught, night, fight, sed sonum illius g querant, quibus ista libet scribere, aures profecto meae nunquam in illis vocibus sonitum rou g poterant haurire."

This ought to imply that the sound was (h') and that (taught, night, fight) was at that time the pronunciation of (laught, night, fight). Hart at the same time writes lauh, oht = (laun't, oh't) for (laught, ought). Bullokar has also (liht, bouht = (lin'tbouh't). But then Gill finds it necessary to introduce a new sign, namely, h with its stem crossed like a t, to represent the sound of gh in bought, and says:

"X. ch. Graecorum in initio nunquam vsum pulsamus, in medio, et
fine sæpe; et per gh, male exprimimus: posthac sic (kh) scribemus: vt in (waikht enukh) weight enough satis ponderis."

Now those who do not possess a symbol for (kh) often write h for it, as we have seen in Anglosaxon finals, and as Rapp considers to have been the case in the Anglosaxon initial hl, hr, hw, which I rather suppose to have been (lh, rh, wh). The sound of (khw) is very harsh, and in Scotland and North Wales it is modified into (kwh), corresponding to the English and South Welsh (wh). Those who wish to acquire the sound of (akh) may be led to it by endeavouring to say (ah), and at the same time slightly raising the back of the tongue. Hence it is possible that Salesbury’s ch, (which is not so “deep” and “harsh” as the Welsh ch,) Smith’s, Hart’s, Bullockar’s h, and Gill’s χ, may be all one and the same sound, either (h) or (kh). But it is certain that when Gill wrote, the sound (kh) was disappearing in the south of England, for Butler, who uses a g with a crossed stem, to represent gh, says that “the Northern Dialect doth yet rightly sound” it, implying of course that it had gone out in the South by 1633.

The safest conclusion seems to be that the sound in the xvi th century was really (kh), but was generally pronounced very lightly; ² it might, however, have been (kh) after (i,e). This is still the custom in Scotland.

By the middle of the xvii th century the rule had become to omit the sound, after changing the preceding vowel, or to change it into some other sibilant, generally (f), in one or two cases provincially (th). WALLIS, 1653, after noticing that initial gh is simply (g), adds:

“alias vero nunc dierum prorsus omittitur; syllabam tamen producendam innuit. A quibusdam tamen (præsertim Septentrioribus) per molliores saltem aspirationem h effertur, ut might potestas, light lux, night nox, right rectus, sigh visus, sigh singulatus, weight pondero, weight pondus, though quamvis, thought cogitatio, brought operatus est, brought attulit, taught docuit, sought quesivit, fraught refertas, nought nihil, naught malus, &c. In paucis vocabulis effertur plerumque per ff: nempe cough tussis, cough tussis, cough tussis,”

¹ Gill misprints g, which he uses for (dh) and in his errata endeavouring to correct this mistake and also (iuukh) for (enukh), he has accidentally repeated the error instead of making the correction, as has been done here in the text.

² The Pedant in Love’s Labour Lost, Act v. Sc. 1. 1623 comedies p. 136 complains of the pronunciation “neighbour vocatur nebour; neigh abreviased ne.” This seems to show that both (neekh) and (nee) were heard in the first syllable of this word, and would imply that (nee) was rather pedantic. Indeed if it were to be classed with the other pronunciations which the pedant recommends, as (doubt, debt, half, half) it might be considered as obsolete.
through alceolus, tough tenax, rough asper, laugh rideo proseruntur, 
coff, troff, tuff, ruff, laff. Inough (singulare) sat multum, sonatur 
imph; at inough (plurale) sat multa, sonatur enow.”

Wilkins, 1668, after saying that gh might have been 
(gh) adds: “this kind of sound is now by disuse lost among 
us.” Price, however, in the same year, says: “Gh sounds 
now like k in Almighty, although,” etc., adding in the margin 
“But the Ancients did, as the Welch & Scots do still pro-
nounce gh thorow the throat.” He notes that gh sounds as 
(f) in cough, laughter, enough, rough. Cooper, 1685, says: 
“hodiè apud nos desuetit pronunciatio gh, retinetur tamen 
in scripturà,” but he makes it (f) in cough, laugh, rough, 
tough, trough, and makes Wallis’s distinction between enough 
and enow. Mige, 1688, says also that gh is generally mute, 
but is (f) in laugh, draught, rough, enough, not distin-
guishing enow,) but adds “sigh, un Sopir, et le Verbe to 
Sigh soupier, ont un son particulier qui approche fort de 
du th en Anglois.” Jones, 1701, extends both the (f) 
and the (th) list. According to him (f) is heard regularly 
in draught, draughts, laugh, cough, enough, cough, tough, trough; 
and he adds “some also sound daughter, 
bought, nought, taught, etc., as with an f, saying dafter, boft, 
&c.” And he states, that gh, ght are th “in sigh, sounded 
sith; in drought, height sounded drouth, heith,” but in other 
parts of his book he also admits the sounds (soi, draat, neet). 
In the xviiith century we may notice that Fielding in his 
Tom Jones, book vii, chap. 13, makes his landlady say oft, 
thoft, for ought, thought, and Mrs. Honour write soft for 
sought, book xv, chap. 10. These are meant to be West of 
England vulgarisms, but they sufficiently shew the tendency.

It would be vain to consider the changes thus indicated, 
without proceeding at once to the fountain head. In Anglo-
saxon itself g became h before t very frequently, and was 
often omitted. Let us therefore consider the sound as some-
times (kh, gh) and sometimes (kh, gh). Let these sounds be 
kept as widely apart as possible. Then (gh) must be rounded, 
that is, there must be a rounding of the lips while the gut-
tural is uttered, producing (kwh, gwh), thus German aueh, 
aüge are, as already mentioned, in reality (aukeh, augeh’e), 
The Scotch sough is (suukwh), and generally the (uu) sound 
before (kh) has a tendency to produce (kwh). This would 
then have a natural tendency towards (wh, w). On the 
other hand (kjh, gjh) are in themselves the closest allies of 
(jh, j). Hence an effort to keep the two sounds of (gh, gjh) 
well apart would result in producing (w, j), which, after
vowels, would diphthongise as (u, i), and after consonants would form the syllables (u, i). Now this is precisely what has happened in the passage from Anglosaxon into English.

First the (u) change. From lagu, lah comes law (laau, laα); from dragan comes draw (draau, draα); from boga comes first bough (boukεh) and then bow (boou) or (boukεh, bou, bou). From halgian comes hallow (halεu, halεou, heλεo) from taεy comes (taεu, taεou, taεo). In Edinburgh, Musselburgh, etc., although gh is written, (o) is regularly sounded.

Next the (i) change. From wagn comes wain (wain, weein); from seiger comes fair (fair, feεt), from régyn comes rain (rein, reε). From bele come bulge (buldh, beldzh), bellows (belεez, belεouz), and belly (belεt), shewing three changes of g.

If instead of falling to (u), the (kwεh), remained at (wh), this would after a vowel rapidly become (f). In Aberdeen-shire (f) is the regular substitute for (wh) or rather the Scotch quh, which looks like an attempt to write (kwεh) under the form of (kwεh). Dwarf from dæwεrh is an instructive example. The old English forms dæwergεh, dæwεce and the dialectic dærgan are found; a dialectic Swedish dærf, and Dutch dærf, dørf are said to exist (E. Mueller, Etym. Wört. d. Eng. Spr., i. 327). The Dutch agter, kraft and English after, craft, Anglosaxon æfter, æcroft, are examples of the correspondence of (f) and (gh) in different forms of the same low German word. The chief English examples have been already cited, and it has been shewn that the change prevails dialectically much further than it has been admitted into the received forms of speech. Some words have even in English both forms, as hough (hεf, hεk), trough (trof, troou), slough of a snake (slεf), slough a quagmire (slou), tough (tof, toou), enough (enεf, enεuε), the grammatical distinction made by Wallis and Cooper that the first is singular, sat multεm and the second plural sat multεa, although conformable to Scotch usage, does not seem to be historically justified.

The change of gh into (p) in hiccough (hεlkεp) is mentioned by Jones 1701, and must be considered to be of the same nature as the change to (f), as (wh, w, p) are even more closely related than (wh, f). The curious but not admitted change to (th) seems to rest merely on the confusion of the (f, th) hisses.1 When these are pronounced without any vowel it is very difficult to distinguish them at a little distance, as is well known to those who teach to spell by means of the powers of the letters.

1 Sigh, which Jones and Miego give as (seith) is called (saεf) in Devonshire.
When $gh$ falls into (u) it naturally alters the preceding vowel, with which it diphthongises, hence (a) becomes (au, aau, AA). Similarly (o) should become (ou) and thence (ou), but in this case the tendency has been rather to (ou, oo, AA), as in ought, bought, etc. When $gh$ falls into (i) we have alterations in the other direction, as (ai, eei, eet).

After the vowel (i), the (i) change of $gh$, which is the only natural one that could be expected, would simply prolong the (i), and hence, from hih, niht we might have (iii, niiit), forms which really exist dialectically for high, night; and from the termination -ig we might expect (-i), the commonest form in present use.

We shall see in the next chapter that such were probably the original forms of transition. In Cumberland and Westmoreland igh is regularly replaced by (ii), and the change to (ai), which is constantly attributed to the omission of the guttural, seems to have no real connection with it, but forms part of the general change of long i from (ii) through (ei) to (ai), which will be minutely considered in Chap. IV, § 2, under I. If we are to trust Gill, the sound of (ai) and the guttural coexisted, as he always prints (niikht) and neither (nikht), the pronunciation of Salesbury, nor (noiit) as became prevalent during the xvii th century.

With this $gh$ proper must not be confounded $gh$ written for $g$, in comparatively recent times, at the beginning of words. Jones tells us that the sound of $g$ is written $gh$ in gherkin, ghees, gheus, ghittern, ghost, where ghees is found in Spenser for guess.

The use of $c$ for (s) follows the same rules as at present, throughout the period under consideration. The letter $s$ seems also to have been (s) or (z) under the same circumstances as at present, but as the sound of (z) does not exist in Welsh, Salesbury had no means of indicating it by Welsh letters, and he therefore writes $s$ in all cases, although he names the $s$ sound. Smith, Hart, and Gill all use $z$, but none of them are sufficiently careful. Still there can be no reasonable doubt that $s$ was pronounced (z) under the same circumstances as it is at present. The letter $s$ is now used for (sh), where the change has been generated by a subsequent (i) sound, and the same remark applies to $c$, $t$, as in mission, pressure, special, motion; and $s$ passes in certain cases into (zh) under similar circumstances, as vision, excision, measure. There is no trace of this in the xvi th century. Salesbury
has graciously, gracius (gra' si us), condicion, condiscion (kondis' i un), exhibition ecobisicion (eksibis' i un), prohibition proboisicion (pro obis' i un), tresure tresuer (tree' zy e r). Bullokar has (abrevias' ion, komposiz' ion, naa'sion, syy' or, syy' gar) for abbreviation, composition, nation, suer, sugar. And Gill writes (ekspektas' ion, habitaas' ion, naa' sion, okaa' zion, pas' ion) for expectation, habitation, nation, occasion, passion. In the xvi th century Wallis generates (sh) from (w), but Wilkins writes (resereksion) for resurrection. Price, 1668, only recognizes "hard s in passion; soft s in concision, and sh in cushion, fashion." Cooper, 1685, does not name the use of (sh) in such cases, but admits shure, shugar, which may have been, (shuur sheg' er), "facilitatis causâ," although he places such words immediately after his "vitanda barbaræ dialectus." Miege, 1688, writes chure, pennchoun in French letters for sure, pension, states that in the termination -ision, s sounds as French g or j (zh) and writes ujual, train- gient, lejeur, ôjer, höjer, crôjer for usual, transient, leisure, osier, hosier, crozier. Jones, 1701, says: "Tho' you have the Sound of sh very often in the Beginning of the last Syllable of VWORDS, as in action, nation, &c. sounded, acohon, nashon, &c. yet is sh never written there in Words of two or more Syllables; except in cushion, fashion, hogshead, lushious, Marshal." He admits that s is commonly sounded sh (sh) in assume, assure, assurance, censure, consume, desume, ensue, ensure, fissure, issue, leisure, measure, pleasure, pressure, pursue, pursuer, pursuit, sue, suet, sugar, suit, sure, sute, tissue, treasure, and says that ocean is "sounded oshan." He does not recognize (zh), but says that sh is written s "in azure, sounded ashure." The change was therefore fully established at the end of the xvii th century.

Though the orthoepists of the xvi th century were slow to recognize this change, and those of the xviii th and xix th even admit it rather grudgingly, while those of the xvi th do not seem to be even aware of such a "slovenly habit," yet we have at least two early traces of the degeneration of suit into shoot, in Shakspere and in Rowley, for a notice of which I am indebted to Mr. Aldis Wright. In Love's Labour Lost, Act iv. Sc. 1, written before 1598, the folio 1623, Comedies, p. 130, there is apparently a play on suitor and

shooter, deer and dear. The two latter words were pronounced alike by Smith. Were the two former really pronounced alike by Shakspere, as they were by Jones, 1701, and Buchanan, 1766, though Cooper, 1685, gives (siut) and Sheridan, 1780, (suet) for suit? Gill, 1631, only allows (syt), Bullokar, 1580, has (syy-gar). Hart has (syy’er). But some persons must have said (shuut), or such jokes would have been lost, and, whatever was the case in Shakspere, we have this pun in Rowley’s *Match in the Dark*, 1633, Act ii. Sc. 1:

**Moll.** Out upon him, what a suitor have I got. I am sorry you are so bad an Archer, sir.

**Eare.** Why Bird, why Bird?

**Moll.** Why to shoots at Buts, when you should use prick-shafts.

In the present day we have a joke of an Irish shopman telling his customer to shoot himself, meaning suit himself.

Here sweete, put vp this, twill be thine another day.

**Exeunt.**

**Boy.** Who is the shooter? Who is the shooter?

**Ros.** Shall I teach you to know.

**Boy.** I my continent of beautie.

**Ros.** Why she that bears the Bow.

**Finely put off.**

**Boy.** My Lady goes to kill horses.

**Ros.** Well then, I am the shooter.

**Boy.** And who is your Deare?

In Boyet’s first speech, Steevens, at the suggestion of Farmer, altered the shooter of all the quartos and folios, to suitor, which is the reading usually adopted. The preceding dialogue, which has been given for the purpose of comparison, seems at first sight to point to suitor as Boyet’s meaning, which Rosaline perversely takes as shooter. But the connection is not evident. There is no allusion to suitor, but much to shooter in what follows. Boyet knew both the suitor (whether we take him as Biron or Armado), and the shooter (the Princess, apparently, who is represented as going to shoot a deer at the opening of the scene) but Rosaline’s reply, and her remark that it is a “put off,” look as if she was purposely misunderstanding him. In the absence of a tenable hypothesis for the introduction of the new word, suitor, we may suppose that Boyet, looking off after the shooting party which has just left, sees an arrow sped, and inquiries of Rosaline who shot it, whereupon she puts him off with the truism that it was she (one of the Princess’s company) who bore the bow.

1 John Hart, in his first treatise, as cited in Chap. VIII, § 3, note 1, classed the three words “suer, shut, and shuuer,” as he spells them, together, and pronounces (syy’er, syyt, bry’y’er). The first may be suer or sewer, the last is, of course brekker; is the second suit, or shoot intended to be written shute (Scotch, shutes = shoot), as Hart in that treatise constantly omits the final e? It is the only indication of such a change in the xvth century, and the word suer renders it very doubtful. We can hardly suppose the word to have been shut. Stratman gives the old English forms for shut, schatten, schute, schettet, schette, for shoot, scoten, sceten, scheten, scoteet, saete, schete, scuten, soten, schoten. The original difference of the words is difficult to determine; Estmuller does not give any ago. word scytan, to shut, as different from scytan, to shoot; E. Müller refers shut to shoot from shooting the bolt of the door.

2 Steevens quotes an equivoque of suaters and shooters, miscalled archers by a servant, from “The Puritan, 1607,” and Malone a similar play upon archers and suitors in “Essays and Characters of a Prison and Prisoners, by G. M., 1618,” and also Antony and Cleopatra Act v. Sc. 2, where Pope reads “a grief that shoots My very heart at root,” and Capell reads smiles for the folio, 1623, suiter.
The Irish pronunciation however only shews an English pronunciation of the xviiith century. In England at the present day, shoot for suit would be vulgar, but the joke would be readily understood, though few persons use, or have even heard, the pronunciation. Might not this have been the case in Shakspere’s time? At any rate there is no authority for supposing that such a pronunciation could have been used seriously by Shakspere himself.1 But the sound*  

1 Mr. Aldis Wright seems to suppose that the composers might have had that pronunciation, and that it therefore might have crept into the text. In Lear, Act ii. Sc. 2, the word three-suited of the fo. 1623, is spelled three shoeted in all the quartos but one, where it is three suited, an evident misprint for three suited. Now shoeted would probably have been written for (shyted, and may indicate the transitional pronunciation; on the other hand it may be itself a mere misprint for seoted, which would be a legitimate orthography for suited. This hypothesis is questioned by Mr. Aldis Wright, who says: “in books printed in the time of Shakespeare and Bacon variations occur in different copies of the same edition. I have never seen two copies of the 1623 edition of Bacon’s Essays which were exactly alike. A list of the variations is given at the end of my edition. Now there are six copies of the quarto of King Lear printed in 1608, which we [Mr. W. G. Clark and myself, editors of the Cambridge Shakespeare] have in our notes erroneously (as we confess in the Preface) called Q2, whereas we are now convinced that this edition was earlier than the one in the same year which we have called Q1. These copies of Q2 (so called) differ from each other in having some of them been corrected while passing through the press. The earliest of these which we have met with is one of the two copies in the Bodleian, and we call it for distinction sake Q2 (Boll. 1). This has the reading three suited: but all the other copies of the same edition read three shoeted. I suppose therefore that while the edition was in course of printing the error was discovered, and the correction communicated verbally to the composer, who inserted it according to his own notions of spelling. It is not a question between the readings of two different editions, but between an uncorrected copy and a corrected copy of the same edition. The later quartos follow the corrected copy but their testimony is of no value, because their reading is merely a reprint.” Harried corrections, whether of print or manuscript, frequently introduce additional errors, and hence there is no guarantee in this curious history that the composer who substituted shoeted for suited, did not himself put shoeted when he meant to have inserted seoted. More instances are certainly required to decide the point. The Scotch wrote schuote for shoot. Palgrave writes sute for suit. In Henry V., Act iii. sc. 6, fol. 1623, p. 81, we find “what a heard of the Generalls Cut, and a horride Sute of the Campe, will doe among foming Bottles and Alewasht Wits, is wonderfull to be thought on.” In the Chronicle History of Henry the Fifth, printed in the fourth vol. of the Cambridge edition about stands for sute. If we take Bullokars old pronunciation, about would be (shuot. Mr. Aldis Wright observes that this was “an instance of a play apparently taken down at the time of acting, and whether about or suit be the true reading, one of them could not have been substituted for the other unless the pronunciation was something similar,” and he thinks that these instances lead to the conclusion that the pronunciation (shuot) “was in existence at the beginning” of the xvith century. The jokes upon shuoter and suitor certainly establish that a sufficiently similar pronunciation of the words was in existence to make the joke applicable. The various spellings, I fear, prove nothing, because, considering the frequency of the word—suit occurs 163 times, suitable once, suited 7, suiting 1, suitor 38 times in Mrs. Cowden Clarke’s Concordance,—the rare variations can only pass for
may well have existed unrecognized, precisely as the sound of \( (sh) \) is supposed to be unknown in Welsh, although \( ceisio \) is now generally called \( (koi\'sho) \), and not \( (ko\'sio) \). Similarly in Dutch \( (sh) \) has been developed from \( (si\-, (su\-) \) in several words, but it is not orthoeptically acknowledged. In the xviii th century there was a decided tendency towards \( (sh) \). Thus \( suc, suet, sugar, suicide, suit, suitable, suitor, sure, suture, all commence with \( (sh) \) in Buchanan, \( sue, suit, suitable, suitor \), have \( (s) \) in Sheridan, but the rest have \( (sh) \), which Sheridan also uses in \( sudorific, sudorous, super-, superable, superb, superior, supernal, supine, supinity, supran-, supremacy, supreme, sural \), where Buchanan has \( (s) \).

The sound of \( (sh) \) was well known in the xvi th century. Salesbury says:

“\( Sh \) when coming before a vowel is equivalent to this combination \( asi \), thus shappe \( s\!\!i\!\!iappp \) (shapp), shere \( s\!\!i\!\!i\!\!ip \) (ship). \( Sh \) coming after a vowel is pronounced \( is \), thus \( ashe \!\!a\!\!ise \) (ash, aish ?), \( washe \!\!a\!\!ise \) (wash, wash ?). And wherever it is met with, it hisses like a roused serpent, not unlike the Hebrew letter called \( schin \). And if you wish further information respecting this sound, you should listen to the hissing voice of shellfish when they begin to boil.”

We learn from Hart, supra p. 207, that \( (zh) \) was unknown in the xvi th century. Wilkins, 1668, says that \( (zh) \) is “facil and common .... amongst the French, who express it by \( J \), as in the word \( Jean, \&c. \), and is easily imitable by us,” implying that it was not in use in England. But Miege, 1688, being a Frenchman, heard it, as we have seen, p. 215, in the words where we now use it. He is the only writer in the xvii th century who notices it, and, as he is a foreigner, his testimony is suspicious. Franklin, 1768, seems only to know it in French, as he has no special sign for it, and even in French writes \( (zh\!\!e\!\!me) \) for \( ja\!\!m\!\!a\!\!is \). Just as Hart writes \( (oz\!\!du\!\!ru\!\!d\!\!wi\!\!r) \) for \( au\!\!jour\!\!d\!\!h\!\!ui \), for want of an appropriate sign, although he had recognized the sound. Sheridan, 1780, fully acknowledges it. It is always written \( (s) \) or \( (z) \), and arises in English from palatalisation as \( (zh\!\!i\!\!z) \). In French it seems to be a degeneration of \( (dzh) \) formed from a palatalised \( (g\!\!i\!\!z) \); or else to have arisen from \( (j) \).
cisely in the same way as (sh) derives in some parts of Germany, and still more frequently to English ears, from (kh) as (ish) for (ikh).

X was usually (ks). Salesbury gives flaxe fllaces (flaks), exhibition eksibision (eksibisi'un), oxe ocs (oks), but, apparently by a misprint, axe ags (agz).

F, V

F and v seem to have retained their sounds throughout, but in the earlier times v and u were interchangeable, and either could be used as a vowel or consonant. This was not the case in Welsh, where u was the vowel, and v the consonant. The consonant has been generally replaced by f in Welsh, ff being used for (f). Salesbury notices as a dialectic variety in "some countries of England" the use of (v) for (f), but he does not particularize the districts. Gill attributes it to East Anglia, "(v) pro (f), ut (vel'oou), pro (fel'oou)."

TH

The double sound of th as (th, dh) is fixed by Salesbury as the Welsh th, dd, and the two uses were distinguished almost exactly as at present; with seems however to have been always (with), though (widh) is now more common. Salesbury gives (th) to through, thistle, thynne, wyth, thanke, thorowe, thyck; and (dh) to this, thynk, the, that, thou. He also notices that th sounds (t) in Thomas, threasure and throne, which he writes trun (trun); and (d) in Thavies Inn. Smith, Hart, Bullokar, Gill, Butler, have all different signs for (th, dh) and use them according to our present custom of speech. Jones makes th = (t) in antheme, or anthnym, Anthony, apothecary, asthma, Author, authority, authorize, Catharine, Cantharides, Esther, Isthmus, Lithuania, posthumus, priesthood, Thames, Thannet, thea, Thomas, Thomson, Thomasin, Thuscany, thyme.

It is difficult to determine when these uses were settled. The two Anglosaxon letters ð Ƿ are usually taken to be (th, dh) but their employment is almost exactly opposite to modern use. In later Anglosaxon and Early English only one, either Ƿ or more usually, ð was employed, and even Orrin makes no distinction. This might have been a peculiarity in writing names. It seems safest to infer the old use from the modern, which is found to hold for the xvi th century.
The question concerning h is simply when was it mute? for its sound, or rather its action on the following vowel was always the same as (h) or (h'). Palgrave says h is mute in honest, honour, habundaunce, habitation. Gill does not agree in the last word, and the h has now disappeared, even in writing, from the last but one. Salesbury says h is mute in honest, habitation, humble, habile, honeste, honoure, exhibition, prohibition. Modern orthoepists will not admit the two last, though custom sanctions them, but habile and habitation have recovered their h, and humble is still doubtful. Gill adds the words hour, hyssop, which he writes (oi'zop). Abominable was a common orthography in the xvi th century, and the h seems to have been occasionally pronounced or not pronounced, for the Pedant in Love's Labour Lost (1623, Comedies, p. 136) says: "neighbour vocatur nebour; neig abreuiated ne; this is abominable, which he would call abhominable." It is usual to print the second abominable without the h and the first with it, but it seems more proper to reverse this, and write "this is abominable, which he would call abhominable," for the Pedant ought certainly to have known that there was no h in the Latin, although in the Latin of that time h was used, as we see from the Promptorium, 1450, "Abominable, abominabilis, abhominacyn abhominacio," and Levins 1570, "abhominate, abhominari," as if the words referred to abomine instead of ab-omine.

In the xvii th century, Price 1668, says that h is mute in ghost, rhetorick, catarrh, dunghill, host, hour, John, imposthume, myrrh, Rhene, rheum, rhode, Wadham. Miege, a bad authority, because Frenchmen cannot rightly appreciate the English aspirate, having no such element of their own, declares that hour, hourly are the only two words in which h is mute, and especially instances honour as having an aspirated h.

1701. Jones says h "may be sounded in hallelui, harbergeon, habiliment, haver-du-pois," &c., but seems to imply that it is generally mute in these words, and says that -ham in names of places in England is -am as in Broxham, Buckingham. He also makes h mute in cowherd, Nehemiah, shepherd, swine-herd, and in Heber, Hebraism, Hebrew, hecatomb, hectical, Hector, hedge, Hellen, hemorrhoids, herb, heriot, hermit, &c., "which h may be found by putting a Vowel before them."

1 The quarto 1631 also prints abominable in both places.
He allows unaccented *his* to lose the *h*, "as in *told* his man, sounded *told* is man, &c." He says *o* is written *ho* "when it may be sounded *ho*, as in *homage*, *holster*, *homo*, in the beginning of all words, *hosannah*, *host*, *hostage*, *hostess*, *hostler*, *hostile*, *houlent*, *hour*, *so-ho*, *inkhorn*, &c., often sounded as with *o* only." Also he says *oo* is written *hoo*, "when it may be sounded *hoo* after a vowel, as *hood*, *hoof*, *hook*, *hoop*, *hoord*, and in *hood* in the End of Words as in *likelihood*, *manhood*, *Priesthood*, &c." Finally he says *u* is written *hu* "when it may be sounded *hu*, especially after a *Vowel*, as in *humble*, *humility*, *humour*, *Humphrey*." This frequent reference to the vowel depends on the following remark: "That *h* is hardly sounded before or after consonants; but more easily before and after *Vowels*, therefore the best *Way* to discover on *h*, is to sound the Word that begins with it after a vowel; as a *hat*, &c." Unfortunately this rule would make a vast number of *h*’s to be heard in London, as (a *u*’*o*’i, a *h*’*ass*), an *eye*, an *ass*.

At the present day great strictness in pronouncing *h* is demanded as a test of education and position in society, and consequently most of the words mentioned in Jones are now aspirated. Smart, 1836, reduces the list of words with mute *h* to *heir*, *honest*, *honour*, *hostler*, (in which the *h* is now commonly not written) *hour*, *humble*, and *humour*. It is certainly at present very usual to say (h*om*-’*b*l, jhu’*mu*), so that the list is reduced to *five* words, which it would be considered social suicide to aspirate. But in practice, even of the most esteemed speakers, *-ham* in names of places has no aspirate, *exhaust*, *exhibit*, *exhibition*, lose *h*, and *his*, *him*, *her*, etc., after an accented consonant when perfectly unaccented, drop their *h*. It is extremely common in London to say (u too’*ern*) for *at home*. A vast majority of the less educated and refined in London, and a still greater majority in the Midland Counties, never use the *h*, pronouncing their words as if they never had had an *h* at all. The insertion of the *h*, generally in the form of a very strong (u’*t*), is also a remarkable phenomenon, not so common, and still more illiterate.

(H) is properly only a jerk of the voice, and as such forms part of the Sanscrit post aspirates (*kh* *gh*) etc., and is frequent as a post aspirate in the Irish brogue. It also occurs before every *o* in Tuscan pronunciation, in which dialect (*k*) is also changed into a strong (*h’*) thus (*h’onfrhon’tho*) for *confronto*. I have heard *Livorno* pronounced in the place itself, almost like (livh’or’nh’o) so that a foreigner might
easily persuade himself that he heard (lighor'no),¹ whence an Englishman’s Leghorn is but a step. As an initial letter however (H) is not common. Thus Sanscrit has no initial (H), the letter ṣ being (gh). Precisely the same thing occurs in Russian, where the (gh) has also to be used for a foreign (H). The Gothic h may have been occasionally (H), but seems to have been frequently (kh), in place of which (h') as a milder form, became gradually prevalent in the Germanic languages. No German at present leaves out or puts in an initial h contrary to the orthography; but final h after a vowel, which is dialectically pronounced (kh) or (kch) as (shuukch) Schuh shoe, has disappeared in the received pronunciation. No Scotsmen omit the aspirate. The old Greeks had an aspirate, the exact nature of which cannot be accurately known, as every trace of it has disappeared from the language, and its old relations were rather singular. It is a matter of dispute how far the Latins pronounced their h, but the Italians, Spaniards, and French have nothing resembling the true sound of (H), although the French have a trace of its former existence, asserted by Palsgrave but not recognized by Meigret, in that hiatus which they call an h aspiré. The French and Italian also have no (kh), which has been retained in the form (kh) by both the Sanscrit and Greek. The so-called (kh) x, j, of the Spaniards seems to be a Moorish importation, and is possibly an alteration of (h). In Spanish America it is said to be replaced by (H). The Spaniards used it to replace a foreign (sh), as in Mexico; the French transliterate it by ch = (sh), and the English have made Xerez (xeer'ee) into sherry. The (h') is abundant in Arabic.

In England the use of the (H) among the illiterate seems to depend upon emphatic utterance. Many persons when speaking quietly will never introduce the (H), but when rendered nervous or excited, or when desiring to speak particularly well, they abound in strong and unusual aspirations. It is also singular how difficult it is for those accustomed to omit the h, to recover it, and how provokingly they sacrifice themselves on the most undesired occasions by this social shibboleth. In endeavouring to pronounce the fatal letter they generally give themselves great trouble, and conse-

¹ Rear-Adm. W. H. Smyth. The Mediterranean, London, 1864, p. 331, mentions that a map belonging to a Greek Pilot in 1550, now in Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 10,184, contains Αργοσ as the name of Livorno. This would be pronounced (leghor'no), and is a singular testimony to the antiquity of this custom of speech.
quently produce a harshness, quite unknown to those who pronounce (h) naturally. An English author, S. Hirst, writing an English Grammar in German, in which 50 quarto pages are devoted to a minute account of the pronunciation of English, actually bestows 167 quarto lines of German, measuring about 90 feet, upon attempting to shew that formerly h was not pronounced in English, and that it was altogether an orthoepic fancy to pronounce it, saying that almost all non-linguists would admit that h was generally mute, or at most scarcely audible, and that linguists who denied this in theory gave into the practice. The division of the people is not exactly into linguists and non-linguists, but it must be owned that very large masses of the people, even of those tolerably educated and dressed in silk and broad cloth, agree with the French, Italians, Spaniards, and Greeks, in not pronouncing the letter H.

§ 5. Realisation of the Pronunciation of English in the XVIth, XVIIth, and XVIIIth centuries.

The results of the two preceding sections are sufficiently minute to give an indication of the pronunciation of English during the XVIth century, but it is not easy from this mass of details respecting individual words, to arrive at a conception of the actual sounds of sentences. Hart, Bullokar, Gill and Butler have however given specimens of connected speech, and in Chapter VIII, §§ 3-6, sufficiently extensive extracts will be given from their works, and translated into palaeotype, to enable a reader to form an accurate conception of the sound of our language in the XVIth century. After these, follows, § 7, a vocabulary of the principal words pronounced by the authorities of this period, which will be very useful in endeavouring to read any other work of that time, because, even if the unknown word is not there found, some analogue will almost certainly present itself, which will suffice to determine the sound within the requisite limits. Finally, applying all the results of previous investigations,


2 His principal argument is the retention of an, mine, thing, etc., before words beginning with h, in the authorized version 1611. The lists of words with mute h given by Palgrave, Salesbury, etc., were of course unknown to him. If, however, he had been aware of the loose manner in which h is inserted and omitted in Layamon, Genesis and Exodus, Prisoner’s Prayer, and other writings of the XIIIth century, he would doubtless have considered his point established. In practice I understood from a gentleman who conversed with him, he omitted the h altogether.

3 See also the Index of Words.
I have in § 8, endeavoured to realise the pronunciation of Shakspere, and have reduced my conception to palaeotypic spelling, which will enable a reader of moderate perseverance to reproduce it orally. The result is peculiar, and has been generally well received by those to whom I have had an opportunity of communicating it vivē vocē. There can be no reasonable doubt, after the preceding discussions, of its very closely representing the pronunciation actually in use by the actors who performed Shakspere’s plays in his lifetime.

In Chapters IX and X, I have endeavoured to give a similar realisation of the pronunciations which mark the xvith and xviiith centuries. The only connected phonetic writing of the xviiith century which I have found, is Bishop Wilkins’s transcription of the Lord’s Prayer and Creed, but this very inadequate specimen is eked out by a vocabulary collected from the principal authorities of the time. It is with considerable hesitation, that in the midst of such diversities of sound attached to the same symbols, and such numerous lists of rules and exceptions, relating to different parts of words and not furnishing the complete representation of entire words, that I have endeavoured to restore Dryden’s pronunciation, or rather the pronunciation of some contemporary reader. It is impossible to feel the same certainty respecting his sounds as respecting Shakspere’s, and the attempt should be viewed with indulgence.

For the xviiith century, the complete vocabulary of Buchanan has enabled me to give his pronunciation of a passage of Shakspere, and Dr. Franklin’s interesting letter furnishes a contemporary piece of phonetic writing, uncorrected certainly, but sufficiently suggestive. A vocabulary of the principal words in which Buchanan, Sheridan, and other authorities, differ from the received pronunciations of to-day, or anticipate them, will complete the account of this century.

It has not formed any part of the plan of this work to enter into detail upon the pronunciation now prevalent, although incidental allusions to it perpetually occur. This is a very difficult and very complex subject, which has been taken up by many other writers, but requires entirely new treatment, in reference not only to the results of the present investigation, but to those abnormal, cacoeptic, rare, vulgar, and dialectic forms, which the history of the past shows that we ought to collect for the benefit of the future, and for the thorough appreciation of the real state and possible development of our language, which is principally unwritten. Mr.
Melville Bell's Visible Speech, or my own Palaeotype, now give a means of writing all such forms with great accuracy, and the rougher Glossotype (p. 13 and Chapter VI, § 3), will enable those who do not wish to enter into minuter distinctions of sound, to write our dialects much more intelligibly than the generality of systems hitherto pursued. Those therefore who wish to assist in forming a written picture of our language for the first time, should neglect no opportunity of immediately noting diversities of pronunciation whenever heard, after some of these comprehensive systems, of which Palaeotype possesses the great advantage of requiring none but ordinary type. To shew the nature of the process required, I have in Chapter XI contrasted Mr. Melville Bell's and my own pronunciation of the parable of the Prodigal Son, and transliterated many specimens of Scotch dialectic pronunciation which he has furnished, both into palaeotype and glossotype, while the politeness of several correspondents in the provinces, has enabled me to give a first instalment of a greatly needed comparative phonology of the English dialects.

§ 6. The Direction of Change.

For determining older pronunciation than that of the xvi th century, it is important to consider the direction in which sounds have changed since that period, because we can then by continuing the line backwards, arrive at some conception of the sounds from which those in the xvi th century were derived. It is for this reason that so much space has been devoted to a consideration of the pronunciation of the xvii th and xviii th centuries.

TABLE OF CHANGES IN THE VALUE OF THE LETTERS.

1. Short Vowels.

A short, in xvi th century decidedly (a), became (æ) in the course of the xvii th and has so remained except in a small class of words, where the various sounds (aa, a, aah, ah, ææ, æ) are heard.

E short, has remained (æ) throughout, but is locally (a) and may have been (æ) at any period.

I short, has remained (å) throughout.

O short, seems to have been generally (o) and often (u) in the xvi th century. The (o) sounds became (å) or (å), it is impossible to determine which, in the xvii th century, and have so remained, the present sounds being generally (o) in closed and
(e) in open syllables. In a few words (e) remains, as cross, gone. The (a) sounds, as in the case of short a, became (o) in the xvith century and have so remained.

U short, was either (u) or (au), probably the latter, in the xvith century, but during the xvith become decidedly (o), which has remained to the present day, with the exception of a few words which retain the old (a) sound, but some of these are occasionally pronounced (o), and more of them probably were so pronounced in the xvith century.

2. The Long Vowels.

A long, was (aa) in the xvith century, but inclined already to a very fine and thin pronunciation, nearly (ah), quite different from (aa). In the xvith century this seems to have become decidedly (eae), advancing at the close of that century or the beginning of the xvith to (ee), which in the xith century, if not earlier, became (ee) and even (eef).

1 In an unknown treatise on the pronunciation of French, of which two quarto leaves with the signatures B i, B ii, bearing date 1628, (two years prior to Palgrave's book,) are preserved and described in Rev. S. R. Maitland's List of some of the Early Printed Books in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth, 1845, p. 291 (but which did not fall under my notice till the preceding pages were printed), we read of the French A and E, "A ought to be pronounced fro the bottom of the stomak and all openly. E a lytell hyer in the throte there properly where the englyshe man soundeth his a." This would imply that the French sound was (aa), unless it was rounded into (AA), as we know that it sounded to Englishmen in the xvith century. The English a was quite distinct from this and sounded more like (ee) to French ears, than (aa). The sound could certainly not have been (ee), or Palgrave would not have found it like the French a, and Salesbury like the Welch a. If we suppose the English a, e were (aa, ee) and the French were (aa, ee) we shall be probably very near the truth which underlay this and similar statements. Compare Gilles du Gues, supra p. 61. Since the above was written, Mr. Payne has obligingly brought under my notice: "The French Garden: for English Ladies and Gentlewomen to walk in. Or, A Sommer dayes labour. Being an instruction for the attaying unto the knowledge of the French tongue .... By Peter Erondell, Professor of the same Language, London, 1605, 8vo., the English in black letter, the French in Roman type, unpaged, signatures extending to P 2, with two more leaves. The author has taken considerable pains, but not always successfully, to indicate the French sounds, and occasionally refers to the English, in passages which will be quoted as footnotes to this table. It must be remembered that as in the two cases just cited, the author was French. "Our A is not sounded altogether, as this english word aues as some have written, but as the first voice of this word Augustine or After opening somewhat the mouth, as for example, Baptiste, tacitement, scouoir : and not after the rate of the english word ale, for if a Frenchman should write it according to the English sound, hee would write it in this wise ees and sound it as if there were no s." This passage seems to indicate clearly that French a was rather (aa) than (a). It also infers that this (aa) was heard in the English after, where we retain (aa, ah), but that in ale and other words of that class the Frenchman heard (ee). I may mention in illustration that Padre Socchi, the astronomer, when speaking English at the meeting of the British Association at Norwich, 1868, said (meeed) for made, which to English ears sounded very nearly as (meed), and very unlike (meeed). It must be borne in mind that Erondell's eet was quite
E long was (ee) during the xvi th and xvii th centuries, except in a very few words, as he, she, me, etc., because in the xvi th century the spelling ee was introduced for those words in which the sound has actually altered to (i), but no such alteration of spelling was afterwards admitted, and in the beginning of the xviii th century the sound of (ii) began to prevail, and became general by the close of that century, as it now remains.

I long was a diphthong in the xvi th century, probably (ai) but occasionally (ai). In the xvii th century, and perhaps during the latter part of the xvi th, the sound of (oi) was introduced, which has remained. Even at the present day, however, (ei, ai, io) and other varieties may still be heard.

O long was apparently (oo) in the xvi th century, a sound which is still generally heard before r, in more, glory, &c.; but in the xvii th century, (oo) was introduced, and still remains, though frequently called (oo w) or (ou), and dialectically (ou). Some words containing o long were pronounced (uu) but in the xvi th century these were mostly written with oo, and hence o long is sounded (uu) in only a very few words, as more, prove.

U long does not occur in any Saxon words, and in the xvth and down to the middle of the xviii th century had the sound of (y) or some closely allied sound as (ii, uu, oo) which may be still heard dialectically both in the East and West of England. 1

After the middle of the xvii th century the long u became (iu) after a consonant in the same syllable, and (iuu) at the beginning of a syllable, and this sound has remained; in the xviii th century, as at present, after (r) it is pronounced (uu).

distinct from ile our present ail (eel). As in 1603 there must have been a large class of speakers who called long a (ah) or (aa), which could have sounded nothing but (aa) to a Frenchman, we may suppose that this was the sound with which Erondell, with his limited experience as a foreigner, was familiar. In: The French Littleton. A most concise, perfect and absolute way to learn the French tongue, Set forth by Claudio Holyband, Gentil-homme Bourbonnois, London, 1609, 32mo., pp. 223, for a knowledge of which I am also indebted to Mr. Payne, the author says, p. 184: "Ai, and ay, have three dierers sounds: for the first person singular of the future tense of the Indicative mood, is sounded as it is written, as j'aimay I loued, je trouay I found, je parlay I spake, &c. (ai f). As for the rest, wheresoeuer you shall find ai, sound it as gay [gay in p. 185] gazing." He means of course (aa), and he seems to agree with Hart partly in gay, and with the xvii th century pronunciation generally in gazing. The only English writer who would make gay = (gas) is Cooper, suprà p. 125. Most probably the Frenchman heard an English (get) as his (gas), and found the first syllable of gazing = (gas) more like his gaz than his ga.

1 Erondell says of French u: "o Is sounded without any help of the tongue but by moving of the lips as if you would whistle, say u, which is, make a syllable by itself, as enir, enuir. But if it were written e-neer, pronounce then musique, punir, subvenir not after the English pronunciation, not as if it were written musique, punir, suvenir, but rather as the u in this word, murtherer,
3. Combinations with A final.

AA was not used in English words in the xviith or subsequent centuries, except in Hebrew names, as Isaac.

EA, which had been used occasionally without any strictness for long e, was established towards the close of the xviith century as (ee), and remained so throughout the xviiith century, with the exception of about 30 words. In the xviiiith century however it rapidly altered its sound to (ii), only a few words finally resisting the change, after having yielded to it for a time. Several words with (e) short, were from the middle of the xviith century, and still are spelled with ea.

IA had no particular value separate from (ia), and has followed the fortunes of its components, one or the other letter being frequently omitted.

OA was introduced at the close of the xviith century for the long (oo) in closed syllables, after oo had been appropriated to (uu).

In the xviiith century it became (oo), except in broad, great, where it was (AA). It has retained these sounds.

UA is not an English combination.


AE was so to speak, not used, in the xviith century; even in Latin words e was often employed. When e was introduced into English it was always pronounced as the long e of the period. This e is one of Bullokar's signs for (ee).

EE was introduced in the middle of the xviith century for the sound of (ii), which it has since retained. In the earlier part of the century no distinction was made between ee and long e.

IE was a combination having the same meaning as long e until the xviiith century, when it was considered the same as ee.

not making the u too long." It is very
difficult to understand the meaning of
this passage. It is possible that as
Erodell may have met with those
who said (eae), he might have heard (iu),
which of course must have been fre-
quently used at this date, though it was
not received, and as this sound did not
satisfy him he took refuge in (a) or (ae)
as confused by a following (e), and
perhaps was thinking of some indi-
vidual pronunciation, which he had not
satisfactorily appreciated, but conceived
to be general. Holyband also (French
Littellon, 1609, p. 162) seems to have
recognized (iu) in English and not (yy),
for he says: "Where you must take
paine to pronounce our, v, otherwise
then in English: for we do thinkes that
when Englishmen do profer, v, they say,
you: and for, q, we suppose they say,
kion: but we sound, v, without any
helpe of the tongue, ioyning the lips as
if you would whistle; and after the
manner that the Scots do sound Gud." Here we have the first distinct recog-
nition of the English long u as (iu)
distinct from the Scotch and French
(yy). Hart, who in his first treatise
(infrà, Chap. VIII, § 3, note,) also
identifies English long u and you,
makes both the same as the French and
Scotch, and in his second treatise, suprà,
p. 167, distinctly describes (yy) and hot
(iu) for this sound. Wilkins, 1668, is
the next author who distinctly recog-
nizes (iu), Wallis, 1668, being the last
who as distinctly insists on (yy).
OE was not an English combination; when it was introduced as æ, it followed the sound of the long e of the period.

UE was only used at the end of words in the xvith century and later, for the long u, which had in this situation been previously written ec.

5. Combinations with I or Y final.

AI was (ai, aai) in the xviith century and possibly (aei, ææi) in the xvith th; but towards the close of that century, and in the pronunciation of a minority even as early as the middle of the xvith century, ai was called (ee). Becoming thus identical with long a, it shared its fortunes and fell into (æe, æei).

EI was (ai) or (ei, eei) in the xvith century, and seems to have retained the sound of (eei) or (ee) till a late period in the xviiith century, when many, but by no means all the ei fell into (ii). In either, neither, the old (et) developed (et) as well as (ii), and both sounds are yet heard from the same speaker at different times.

II was never used.

OI was (oi) and nearly (ui) in the xvith century, in some words (oi, uui) were heard indifferently. In the xviiith century though (ai) or (oi) was the rule, (ai) was frequently heard. In the xviiith and xixth centuries only (ai) was recognized, although some speakers still say (ai), now considered a vulgarism.

UI was not a genuine English combination, and was only a substitute for long u, or long and short i, and followed their laws.

6. Combinations with O final.

AO is only accidentally an English combination in extraordinary, where it is usually pronounced (åe).

EO when used at an earlier period seems to have been considered identical with long e, and has been generally so treated. In pigeon, dungeon, the combination eo is only apparent, for the e belongs to the preceding g.

IO is not found.

OO was used in the beginning of the xviith century indifferently with long o, but was introduced towards the close of that century to indicate those long o which had come to be pronounced (uu), and it has retained this value.

UO is not used.

1 Erondell says in the French Garden, 1605, speaking of French at, which was then certainly (æ): "Also if e doe follow at, it maketh the word long, and the e vnsounded, as Maitre, paistre, where the ai or ay be pronounced as these English words day, say, may," which he therefore identifies with long a. No English writer of the period makes this confusion. But compare Holyband's pay, gaping, supra, p. 227, note, col. 2.
7. Combinations with U or W final.

AU was (au, aau) in the xvi-th century, and seems to have passed by the absorption of (u) into (w), or simple labial modification, into (αα) in the xvii-th century, which sound it generally retains although there is still a contest between (aa, αα) in a few words.

EU had in the xvii-th century two sounds (yy) and (eu) which were not distinguished by any orthographical expedient. In the xviii-th century the (yy) sounds became (iu, iu), and the (eu) sounds either remained (eu), or became (oo). In the xvi-th century those which had become (oo) remained so, the rest fell into (iu, iu) where they have since remained.

IU is not used.

OU in the earlier part of the xvi-th century, and in the pronunciation of some writers even down to the latter part of that century, had the sound of (uu, u); by the middle of the xvth century it was generally pronounced (ou), but occasionally (uu). A class of words in ou, however, derived from the Anglosaxon aw, ou, was by both set of speakers pronounced (ou). In the xvi-th century the (ou) sounds became (ou) as they have since remained, though theoretically considered as simple (oo). The (ou, u) sounds at the same time became (ou, o) and have since retained these forms.

UU is not used.

8. Consonants.

B invariably (b).

C invariably (k) before a, o, u and (s) before (e, i), except that in the xvii-th century, and perhaps earlier, s before a became (k); and si- before a vowel became (sh).

CH sometimes (k) in Greek works, generally (tah) throughout the period.

D invariably (d) except that, in the xviii-th century, 3 in the termination -dur, -dier became (dj) or (dzh).

F invariably (f).

G invariably (g) before a, o, u, and almost invariably (g) in Saxon words before e, s; otherwise invariably (dz) or (dzh) before e, 3. In the xvii-th century and perhaps earlier, g, before a, and gu before i long became (g).

GH in the beginning of the xvi-th century, full (kh) or (kh): towards the middle and close, very gently pronounced, almost (h); and in the xvii-th century and subsequently entirely lost. In a few words of the xvi-th century and more after wards, gh was sounded as (f). In one word, sigh, in the xvii-th and xviii-th centuries gh was called (th), and in one word, hicough, (p). When gh was omitted in speech after i, the sound of that letter was changed from (i) to (ai); the sound of ough with silent gh was either (aa) or (αα); of ough with silent gh, (ou) or (αα), sometimes (ou) and (uu).
H in many words in the xvii th century, where it is now never omitted, was not sounded.

J or "I consonant" had invariably the sound of (dzh).

K was (k) before all vowels, perhaps inclined to the palatalised (ğ) before the sound of (ii), and in the xviii th century frequently became (k) before a (as, aas), and long i (ai).

L invariably (l) or (‘l)'. In the xvii th century it was beginning to disappear after a, after becoming labialised to (læ) and thus changing the sound of a from (a) into (an, ąa), the latter prevailing in the xvii th century; (aa) is now commonly heard in the termination -alm.

M invariably (m) or (‘m).

N invariably (n) or (‘n).

NG invariably (q) or (ag), except in the combination -age when it became (-ndzh) and had a tendency to change preceding (a) into (ai) which became subsequently (ee).

P invariably (p).

PH invariably (f), except perhaps in such combinations as Olapham, in which the ą was omitted in the xvii th century.

QU invariably (kw), or labialised (k).

R preceding a vowel, invariably (r), following but not preceding a vowel, it was most probably (z) as early as the xviii th century, and possibly in the xvii th.

RH was the same as simple r.

S initially, invariably (s), medially and finally either (s) or (z) according to present usage. In the xviii th century s before long a, and s-i- before a vowel became (sh), and -si- became (-izh-); in the termination -tare, s became (sh) or (zh). None of these changes seem to have been acknowledged before the middle of the xvii th century.

T invariably (t), except that si- in the terminations -tion, -tions, was (s) in the xvi th and xvii th centuries, and became (sh) in the xvii th. In the termination -tare in the xvii th century, t fell into (t) or (th).

TH either (th) or (dh) according to the present laws, except that in the xvi th century it was (t) in Thomas as now, and also in throne, and (d) in Thavies Inn; and generally (th) in with instead of (dh) as now.

V or "U consonant" invariably (v).

W as a consonant, whether confused with an initial (u) or not, invariably (w).

WH, whether confused with (wu) or (w), was probably always (wh).

X invariably (ks), the present use as (gz) seems to have been unknown previously.

Y as a consonant, whether confused with an initial (i) or not, invariably (t).

Z invariably (z).
On examining this table of changes, it would appear that the consonants have been subject to little or no alteration, except under the action of an (i) or (u) sound. The action of an (i) sound changes (t, d, s, z) to (tj sh, dj dzh, sh, zh), but this action did not materially affect the English pronunciation of the xvth and earlier part of the xvinth centuries. The (u) sound was generated through the labialisation of (l) which gradually disappeared, labialising the preceding vowel.

The consonant gh, originally (kh), became gradually disagreeable and harsh to the Southern English and passing through (h) soon ceased to be appreciable, and was therefore neglected, although it was probably theoretically maintained long after it had practically disappeared. On examining the oldest forms of words, however, this sound appears to have passed through (i, u), and in its disappearance to have acted by palatisation and labialisation on the preceding vowel. The change of igh to long i is the only one that presents a difficulty, and this depends upon the same cause which changed long i generally from (ii) to (oi), p. 234.

For the vowels the following changes occur, taking the sounds only, independent of the spellings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Vowels.</th>
<th>Long Vowels.</th>
<th>Diphthongs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, æ</td>
<td>aa, ææ, ee, ee, eei</td>
<td>ai, ei, eei, ee, eei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ee, ii</td>
<td>ai, ææ, ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o, ə</td>
<td>oo, uu</td>
<td>ou, oo, ouu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u, ə</td>
<td>uu, ou, ou</td>
<td>ui, oi, ai, oi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The directions of change are here seen to be three,—towards (i), towards (u), towards (ə). But the two last are not essentially different, as (u) may be considered as a labialised (ə), p. 162.

The long vowels have altered more than the short vowels. The voice being sustained there was more time for the vowel sound to be considered, and hence the fancy of the speaker may have come more into play. This has generally given rise to a refining process, consisting in diminishing the lingual or the labial aperture. The lingual aperture is materi-
ally diminished in the passages (aa, øø, ee, øe) and (ee, ii). It seems curious that the first was not continued as far as the second. In the name James, however, which became (Dzheemz) in the xvii th century, and has passed to (Dzhimz) in flunkey English, and to (Dzhim) as a common abbreviation, the series of changes is complete. Fashion and refinement have nearly banished (aa), but have not yet confounded in one (ii) all the words formerly distinguished by (aa, ee).

The change of (oo) to (uu) was a similar refinement, consisting first in the elevation of the tongue, and corresponding narrowing of the labial passage, producing (uu), and secondly in the narrowing of the pharynx. The change from (oo) to (oo) consisted simply in narrowing the pharyngeal cavity.

One of the most remarkable changes is that from (uu) a simple vowel, into (ou) a diphthong. Both sounds held their own side by side for some years, Palsgrave in 1530 and Bullokar in 1580 both upholding (uu), while Salesbury, Smith, and Hart declared for (ou), which finally prevailed. Although the change is certain, there is no trace of any reason being given, and as the sound (uu) had been represented by the letters ou in those cases where it changed into (ou), whereas when (uu) was a change of (oo), it did not further change into (ou), and the orthography also did not give ou,—the mere accident of the spelling naturally presents itself as a cause. This hypothesis is strengthened by observing that in the north of England, where reading was perhaps less common than in the South, the sound of (uu) in these words still remains unaltered. But such a supposition can hardly be correct, because the change of (uu) into (ou) is precisely analogous to the change of (ii) into (ei), a change which must certainly have occurred in passing from the Anglosaxon period to the xvi th century, although it has not yet come distinctly before us, and had no connection with the orthography. In each case the change simply consists in commencing the vowel with a sound which is too open, (that is, with the tongue not sufficiently raised), and, as it were, correcting that error in the course of utterance. This variety of speech might easily be generated and become fashionable in one part of the country and not in another, and as it penetrated far beyond the classes whom orthography could affect at a time when books were rare, and readers rarer in proportion to the speakers, the physiological hypothesis seems more deserving of adoption than the orthographical. On further examination it will be found that this hypothesis has an analogue in a well known custom of the South of
England. In the North of England, in France, and Germany, no difficulty is felt in prolonging the pure sounds of (ee) and (oo), but in the South of England persons have in general such a habit of raising the tongue slightly after the sound of (ee), and both raising the tongue and partly closing the lips after the sound of (oo), that these sounds are converted into the diphthongs (eej, oow), or (ei, ouu) where the (ee, oo) parts are long and strongly marked, and the (i, u) terminals are very brief and lightly touched but still perceptible, so that a complete diphthong results, which however is disowned by many orthoepists and is not intended by the speaker. Now we have only to suppose a habit growing up of beginning the (ii, uu) sound with a tongue somewhat too depressed, and in the latter case with the lips also too open, but passing instantly and rapidly from these initial sounds to the true (ii, uu), and (ii, ouu) would result. From the habit of accenting the first element of a diphthong, the initial touch of (e, o) would come to have the accent, and being very short and indistinct might readily vary in different mouths into (a, a, a). We should thus obtain the diphthongs (ei, ou; ei, ou; ai, au; ei, eu) in which also the second element may be, and at present in the South of England seems to be (i, u) rather than (i, u). Thus on lengthening out the terminal sounds of nigh, now, I seem to hear in my own pronunciation (nəi, ənu).

The generation of (eej, ouu) from (ee, oo) consists then in subjoining brief (i, u) to long (ee, oo); while the generation of (ii, ouu) from (ii, uu) consists in prefixing brief (e, o) to long (ii, uu). The elements in both cases are the same (eej, eii; ouu, ouu) and the accessory sounds are in both cases brief, but when terminal they are unaccented, when initial accented, just like an appoggiatura in music.

We might therefore expect to hear (ei, ou) developed either from (ii, uu) or from (ee, oo). Further reasons for supposing the first to have actually occurred will be given in Chap. IV, § 2, under I. For the second, it is not uncommon at present to hear (ei) for (ee), and (ou) for (oo), although these changes have not been generally recognized.

This change of (ii) into (ei, ai, ei), and (uu) into (ou, au, ou) is etymologically interesting because it is by no means confined to our own country. The Gothic (ii) corresponded to (ii) in Icelandic, Anglo-Saxon, Frisian, Old Saxon, Low German, and Upper German, and is still (ii) in Danish and Swedish, but is now (ei) in English and Swabian, and (ai) in Dutch, High German, Frankish, East Frankish and Bavarian,
according to Rapp (Phys. d. Spr. iv., 144) and the same writer says that (uu) in Gothic was (uu) in Icelandic, Anglosaxon, Friesic, Old Saxon, Low German, Upper German, and is still (uu) in Danish, but it has become (au) in English and Swabian, (au) in High German, Frankish, East Frankish and Bavarian, (ey) in Dutch, and (uu) in Swedish. Except the two last changes, the phenomena must be all referable to local habits of the kind named. The Dutch sound (ey), written ui, would appear to be an alteration of (au), but whether there is any historical as well as phonetical ground for supposing such a form to have existed, I cannot say. It is impossible not to be reminded in this historical change of (ii, uu) into (ei, ou) of the (guna) changes in Sanscrit, because they are phonetically the same, although they arise in a different manner.

We have then briefly the following changes of the principal vowel sounds, of which the change (ii) to (ei) was anterior to the xvii th century, unless, as seems to be the only legitimate inference, Palgrave’s and Bullok’s statements (pp. 109, 114) are held to imply that long i was still pronounced as ii in some words by them:—

From (aa) through (ææ) to (ee, ee, eee)
From (ee) to (ii)
From (ii) through (ei) to (ei, ai, ei)
From (oo) to (uu), or to (oo, ou)
From (uu) through (ou) to (ou, u)

Proceeding backwards, then, we must, if there was any change, look for it in the same series. Thus (aa, aa) may have preceded (aa). Perhaps (ee) may have preceded (ee). The sounds (ee, oo) may have preceded (ii, uu), and it is possible that (aa) may have preceded (oo), as the latter is only the rounded form of the former.

The vowel (yy) can hardly have been an original vowel sound. Its relations to (i, u) and (iu) are so close, that it might have arisen from any one of the three, but it has principally the appearance of being an alteration of (u) caused by making the narrowest part of the lingual channel with the middle instead of the back of the tongue. This

1 In the actual Dutch pronunciation of huis, mus, it is very difficult to distinguish the sound from (uu), and the difference seems mainly produced by altering the form of the lip into that for (yy), which is slightly flatter than for (uu), rather than by bringing the tongue into the (i) position. Still (ey) was the best analysis I was able to make on hearing the sound, not (ey) as Dr. Rapp remarks. The Dutch consider it to be the sound of the German eu, which Dr. Rapp also says is sounded (ey) in the North-East of Germany, Berlin, Brandenburg, and on the Baltic coast from Mecklenburg to Russia; the general sounds being (ay, oy, oi) and even (ei) in Hamburg.
A priori physiological conception is confirmed by finding that dialectically, in Scotland and in Devonshire, (yy) or some form of it as (iu, uu), occurs as a substitute for (uu), as the Devonshire (myyr, myyn), or more properly (muuv, muun) for (muuv, muun). In German we find that (yy) has also been generated from (uu) by the retroactive effect of an (i) or (e) sound in an added syllable. In French, the substitution of (yy) for the Latin (uu) can only be traced to a national habit. The same seems to have occurred in Greek, where u was at a very early period changed from (uu) into (yy). There is no historical evidence that (yy) can be considered in any case as an alteration of (iu), although we have in English the proof that (iu) may be an alteration of (yy), and we know by the Welsh uw and Hart's iw, that the use of iw as a representative of (yy), was natural. In fact the second vowel u in both iw, au naturally suggests a labialisation of the preceding, which would give iw, au = (iuw, auw) = (i, a), whence (y, v) readily derive. This seems to have been the case with Ulphilas, who certainly uses au for (a) and probably iw for (yy). 1

In such languages as the English, French, and Greek, where the natural sound of u had been replaced by (yy), the only device left for marking the (uu) sound was to use the o from which it was derived, as in the Swedish, or to put an o before, after, or over the u to indicate more distinctly that the combination was to have the modified o sound. This seems to be the origin of the use of ou in older English, French, and Greek for the sound of (uu). Similarly in old High German wo, in Italian wo, in Bohemian in the case noticed on p. 133 note. The combination iw is the most difficult to appreciate in the Gothic and old high German orthographies.

1 Weingärtner (Die Aussprache des Gothischen zur Zeit des Ulphilas, Leipzig, 1853, 8vo. pp. 63) sums up all the arguments bearing on the pronunciation of Gothic iv in favour of (iu). The actual English change of (yy) into (iu), and the common German change of (yy) into (ii), seem sufficiently to account for the various forms, which the Gothic iv received, or rather to which it corresponded in various Germanic dialects. The alternation of iw into ie before vowels, as in kniv, knie, may be explained as perhaps (knyv, knyv) the full written form kniwes having been contracted into kniws, as the single letter e seemed most nearly to express first the labialisation of the i, and secondly the generation of a subsequent (w) by the lip action of (yy), which is nearly the same as that of (iu), on the following vowels, precisely as in the case noticed in Wal- lis's English sounds. The older Dutch writers seem to have used i as a simple sign of prolongation in wi, wi, wi, so that wi can only be regarded as o used for (uu) with a special mark of pro- longation. In modern Dutch the sound is frequently short, as there is no other means of representing (iu, iu). Siegen- beek (Nederlandische Spelling, Amster-
In English the change of (yy) has been into (iu), but in German it changes into (ii), that is, in English the lips were not rounded at the beginning of the sound but were rounded at the end of the sound, producing first (iy) and afterwards (iyu, iu), while in German the lips are frequently not rounded at all.

For the long vowels, then, anterior to the xvi th century we may possibly have (aa) for (aa); (ee) for (ee); (ee) for (ii); (oo) for (uu), and (uu) for (yy); (oo) is not likely to have been changed.

For the short vowels we find no change in (i, e), which we therefore must suppose to have existed anteriorly in this form. The change (a) to (a) could only give (a) for an anterior sound. The changes (o, o) and (u, u) could lead to no conclusions respecting any anterior sound. The first change (o, o) consists merely in depressing the tongue, the second change (u, u), as has been shewn, may consist only in neglecting to close the lips sufficiently. These changes do not give sufficient indication of direction. It would be safest to conclude that (a) or (a) and (e, i, o, u) were the sounds of the five vowels before the xvi th century, but the words busy, bury (biz' i, ber'i) and the pronunciation (trist) for trust, leads us to suppose that (u) in writing may often indicate a short (y) which would be taken as (i).

We find then that there was probably an older pronunciation of the English vowels than that of the xvi th century,

dam, 1804, p. 139), denies that  should be considered as long (i), although it is now pronounced (ii), because long (i) used to be written it, iy, and says that in the province of Zeeland  is still heard as a distinctly mixed sound "duidelijk een gemengd geluid," probably (ii). The same author (p. 82) accounts for the use of  as a mark of prolongation in as, oe, we, on the ground that when words anciently written mate, hope, murer, came to be pronounced mat', hop', mur', without the final 5, the  was transposed in writing, thus maet, hoop, muer, precisely as Lane proposed to write English, supra, p. 44, l. 3. The orthographies oe, ue for (oo, yy) had been replaced by oo, uu for more than two centuries before he wrote, and he proposed and prevailed on the Dutch to use as for aa, an orthography jealously retained with us, y for uu, y, as marks of distinct nationality, in Belgium. This left oe free for (uu, u) without any danger of confusion, and even the Belgians admit the distinction oo, oe.

1 Hart expressly says: "And to perswade you the better, that their auncient sounds are as I haue sayd," that is (a, e, i, o, u), "I report me to all Musitians of what nations soeuer they be, for a, e, i, and o; and for u, also, except the French, Scottish and Brutus as is sayd: for namely all English Musitians (as I can understande) doe sounde them, teaching vi, re, mi, fa, sol, la; And so do all speakers and readers often and much in our speech, as in this sentence: The prattling Hosteler hath dressed, curried, and rubbed our horses well. Where none of the five vowels is missounded, but kept in their proper and auncient sounds: and so we maye wee them, to our great ease and profite."
and that we may not unnaturally expect to find in it (aa, ee, ii, oo, uu) for (ai, ei, eu, ou) of the xvi th century.

As to the diphthongs they have followed two courses, according as the first or second element became the most conspicuous. In (ai) the (a) has been gradually made closer, changing in the diphthong (æi, ei), as in the simple sound (æ, e), and then the first element being lengthened (œi), the second gradually disappeared (ee), only to reappear as a faint aresound in the present century (œi). Hence, before the xvi th century we can only expect the (ai) to have been the same, or at most to have been preceded by (ai). On the other hand, (ei) may have had an antecedent (ai). It is a remarkable circumstance that (ai) in French also gave place to (ei) and then to (ee), p. 118. In Modern High German we also find a dialectic substitution of (ee) for (ai), as (een) for (ain) one, but it remains to be proved which is the older form, the old high German ei answering to the Gothic ai = (ee), and the modern high German ei often answering to an old high German i = (ii), of which (ee) may be a first degradation. In Latin (asii) as in pictai appears to have generated (ai, ee) as in pietas (pik'tees). In Greek αυ, which could hardly have been originally anything but (ai), is now (ee) and was so apparently at the time of Ulphilas. In Sanscrit the (guna) combination (ai) resulted in the present (ee) or (ee).

In (au) the (a) has been gradually made opener (a), and the (u) has acted more and more to produce a labialisation of this open (a), thus (ɔw) till it disappeared altogether; leaving (av) only. We cannot, therefore, well suppose (au) to have preceded (au). The sound may have had an antecedent (eu), but was most probably original. It is remarkable that (au) in Welsh generated (oo), that is (a) was labialised to (ɔ = aw), without being previously broadened to (a), in quite recent times, pob, paub = (poob, paub) being still co-existent. In French (au) produced (oo). In German (au) is often dialectically (oo). In Latin (au) became Italian (oo), as paucus pocc (poo'ko). In Sanscrit the (guna) combination (au) has become (oo) or (oo). In Greek the vowel (u) fell into the consonants (bh, ph) and hence the vowel was preserved. But Ulphilas used the combination (au) for the Greek ὥμπρον.

The change (ei, ei) hardly indicates a direction. But as (ou) had an antecedent (uu), so (ei) may have had an antecedent (ii).

The change of (eu) to (iu) on the one hand and (oo) on the other is recent. One or the other seems to have occurred
according as the first element (e) or second (u) prevailed. The number of words in which the sound of (eu) remained is so small that it is difficult to form any conclusions on the change.¹

The change (ou, eu) would have been insufficient, if we had not known that (uu) generally preceded (ou).

As far as the xvi th century is concerned (ou) is original, but as (aa) may have preceded (oo) so (aau) may have preceded (ou).

There seems every reason to suppose that (ui) was the original form of the diphthong which is now (oi), and that the form (uui) which we find in the xvi th century, and which, altered to (ei), appeared in the xvii th century, and crops up even now, is not an alteration of (oi), but is rather a remnant of the older form. It does not appear possible to suggest an antecedent for (ui).

Combining the above observations on the direction of change, with the orthographical representation of sound, we should be led to expect that previous to the xvi th century the sounds attributable to the various letters in alphabetical order might possibly be as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Spelling</th>
<th>Possible Sounds before xvi th Century</th>
<th>Modern Spelling</th>
<th>Possible Sounds before xvi th Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a short</td>
<td>a, a</td>
<td>i short</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a long</td>
<td>a, a</td>
<td>i long</td>
<td>ei, ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai, a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>o short</td>
<td>o, a; u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e short</td>
<td>e, e</td>
<td>o long</td>
<td>oo, aa; uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e long</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo, aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ea</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo; uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>ou, aou; uu; uu, u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>ei, ai</td>
<td>u short</td>
<td>u; i, y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eu</td>
<td>yy, eu</td>
<td>u long</td>
<td>yy, uu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But at what time any such combinations were prevalent, and how early the xvi th century pronunciation had prevailed, we must seek other evidence to shew. In the meanwhile, by

¹ The pronunciation cited on p. 141, (shmu) for show, must be some dialectic remnant of (sheu), and suggests an intermediate between (sheu) and (shoe). Hart in his phonetic writing uses both (shio) and (sheu) for show. Mr. M. Bell notices that there is a "Cockney" habit of "separating the labio-lingual vowels (u, o) into their lingual & labial components, & pronouncing the latter successively instead of simultaneously," one result of which is saying (au) for (oo). Visible Speech, p. 117.
comparing this purely theoretical table, founded on no evidence of any kind, put purely deduced from a consideration of the direction of change, and not limited to any particular period of time preceding the xvi\textsuperscript{th} century, with the table given by anticipation on p. 28, as an expression of the general general results of the following investigation respecting the xiv\textsuperscript{th} century, it will be seen that there is a remarkable agreement between the two, so that all the results there obtained may be pronounced theoretically probable, however strange they would have appeared if the direction of change had not been previously ascertained. At the same time the great difference between the sounds here considered as possible, and those which, based upon present habits, are usually assumed, will serve to shew the value and importance of the preceding investigation. The subject has hitherto been considered from far too modern a point of sight, and with far too limited a range of vision. The changes in the last three centuries, of which we have contemporary evidence, not having been generally known, and the changes in the cognate Germanic dialects, although recorded by Rapp and Grimm, not having been duly weighed, and the habit of reading Spenser and Shakspere in our modern pronunciation having become ingrained, we were prepared to regard the sounds of our language as something fixed and settled in point of time, at most admitting a dialectic difference which we perhaps attributed solely to geographical causes. This must now be given up, and we must proceed to investigate pronunciation with a knowledge that it has changed, and must change chronologically, that at any time there must be, even at the same place, diversities of coexistent forms; and at different places, even when the language has been derived, at no very great interval, from the same sources, there must also be differences arising from want of communication, which will therefore be the more striking, the earlier the period and therefore the more imperfect the means of transit, and especially that any cause which will occasion the intercommunication of districts usually isolated, must have a great effect on pronunciation. Our endeavour therefore will be to discover, not what earlier English pronunciation was generally, but as definitely as possibly what it was at different particular times and places. Of course this can only be done by means of determining the value attributed to the alphabetic symbols by writers of known time and place. This is the object of the investigations contained in the two next chapters.
CHAPTER IV.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF ENGLISH DURING THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY AS DEDUCED FROM AN EXAMINATION OF THE RHymes IN CHAUCER AND GOWER.


The War of the Roses raged from 1455 to 1486. The Long Parliament met in 1640, and Charles II. returned in 1660. Hence the xvth and xvith centuries were memorable in English history for two long continued civil wars, causing unprecedented communication between all parts of the country, and withdrawing the minds of men from literature to fix them upon the events of the day. This "commyxstion & mellynge," as Treuiss hath it, of men from the various counties of England necessarily produced an effect both on the structure and pronunciation of the language. The whole style of English at the close of the xvith century is dissimilar from that at the close of the xviith. A different mind reigned in the people and required a different instrument to express itself. And that this was not confined to an alteration of words, idiom, and composition of sentences, but extended itself also to pronunciation in a most distinctly characterised manner, we have already seen. The xvith century produced a number of writers who paid attention to pronunciation, who sought either to investigate the relations of spoken sounds, or to supplement the deficiencies of orthography by lists of words and rules, by which the pronunciation could be tolerably ascertained. These lists and rules became so full towards the close of the xviith century, that we have been able to trace the successive phases of alteration which words underwent, and to see how the sounds of the xviith century gave place to those with which we are more familiar.

If then the civil commotions of the xvith century produced such important changes in our language and pronunciation, what must we expect from the still longer and ruder
disturbances of the xvth century, when the language was in a more inchoate stage, when the French element was fusing with the Saxon into the familiar alloy of the xvth century, when no printing had as yet called forth an abundance of readers,\(^1\) so that the language altered organically from mouth to mouth untrammeled by literary setters, and men of the north, middle, and south, jostling with each, wore down the angles of their dialectic differences, and gradually produced an English of England? Practically we know that the xvth century was a period of great change in the whole character of our language; the last remnants of our inflexional system were abandoned, the sharp distinction between the "gentilmen" French and the "plondischemens" English, disappeared, and a "common dialect" was acknowledged by all writers.\(^2\) The distinction between the English of Chaucer, writing down to the close of the xivth century, and that of Spenser, the next great poet on our roll, who wrote after the country had well settled from its troubles, and printing had formed a reading public, is so sharp, that we seem to have fallen upon another language rather than upon a form of speech differing only by five generations.

As then the language altered so markedly, must we not look for similar changes in the pronunciation? The example of the xviiith century irresistibly forces this conclusion upon us, and we also feel that if there had only been a succession of writers to chronicle them, we should have had a continual list of changes, comparable to those furnished while the xviiith passed its meridian and drew to its termination, only more complex, more striking, more characteristic. Unfortunately we have no such writers, no such rules and lists to refer to; only a certainty of chaos and no guide. In shewing the development of the spellings ee, ea (p. 77) and oo, oa (p. 96) in the xviith century, to mark distinctions in the sounds of long e and long o, familiar to the speaker, but ignored by the writer, and, without such a guide, impossible to discriminate by an ignorant reader, as one of the xixth century must naturally be in this respect, we foreshadowed the confusion in the orthography of the latter end of the xvth and commencement of the xviith

---

\(^1\) Caxton set up his press in 1471; the effect on the masses did not make itself felt till the next century.

\(^2\) Gill, after distinguishing the Northern, Eastern, and Western dialects, says "quod hic de dialectis loquor, ad rusticos tantum pertinent; velim intelligas; nam militoribus ingeniijs & cultibus euntritis, unus est ubique sermo & sono, & significatu," and this he terms the "dialectus communis."
century, a confusion which it is as yet impossible to dissipate. We can, as in the estimate made at the end of the preceding chapter, be tolerably sure that a given written vowel or combination of vowels, was pronounced in one of two or three ways, but there does not appear to be, at present, any means of deciding which of those ways should be chosen in any particular case. After we have arrived at a more definite notion of the pronunciation of the xivth century, the range of diversity will be somewhat narrowed, and by comparing the xivth with the xvith century pronunciation of any word, noticing the direction of change, and, theoretically estimating the time necessary to effect it—an estimate which must be always hazardous—we may feel somewhat more confident. As however it is advisable in a preliminary investigation like the present, to reduce theory to the narrowest possible limits, and to base results upon evidence, or a wide induction, I have thought it necessary to exclude the xvth century altogether from my researches, and to proceed by one step from the settled period of the xvith to the settled period of the xivth century. In § 7 of this chapter, however, I shall indicate a rough practical method which may be adopted for reading works of the xvth century, founded upon the comparison already indicated.

The manuscripts of the xivth century poems, which the name of Chaucer points out as the principal subject of investigation, though all belonging to the xvth century were fortunately written in its early part, and the Harleian MS. of the Canterbury Tales, No. 7334, which will be here generally followed, was probably written before the Rose troubles had commenced, so that although it labours under the disadvantage of being a generation after time,¹ yet it was not subject to those more violent changes which render the earlier printed editions of Caxton and others useless for our present purpose. This manuscript has, in addition to its careful execution, early date, and accessibility in the British Museum, the advantage of having been twice recently printed, by Mr. Wright,² and by Mr. Morris.³

---

¹ Mr. Morris in his Chaucer Extracts, (see note 3, below), p. xliii, calls this a “MS., not later perhaps than the year of Chaucer’s death.”

² Mr. Wright’s edition has been reprinted in double columns large octavo, and is published by Richard Griffin and Co., London and Glasgow, for half-a-crown. It is the most convenient working edition.

³ Mr. Morris’s edition forms the second and third volumes of his complete edition of Chaucer’s poetical works in six volumes, published by Bell and Daldy, London, 1866, at five shillings a volume, the only edition of Chaucer’s works taken wholly from MS. authority where MSS. exist. In the Clarendon Press series Mr. Morris has reprinted the Prologue and two
both editions the punctuation and capitals and the uses of th, y, u, v, are modern, and the contractions are all extended. In Mr. Morris’s edition, the Lansdowne MS. 851 has been collated throughout, but every word not in the Harleian is printed in italics, and many final e’s have been also added in italics when considered to be grammatically necessary. The long and tediously written Confessio Amantis of Gower, has not been properly edited. Dr. Reinhold Pauli’s text, like Tyrwhitt’s Chaucer, exhibits the text and orthography of no particular manuscript or time. But three good MSS. in the British Museum, and one at the Society of Antiquaries, are readily accessible, and Pauli’s edition serves as a guide through the ponderous mass. The great regularity of Gower’s verse and rhymes, renders his works a convenient supplement to Chaucer’s, and I have found it necessary to make a complete examination of his rhymes. The mode of referring to Chaucer’s and Gower’s works will be explained at the end of this section.

The principles of the investigation on which I am about to enter, as to the sounds intended to be conveyed by the orthography used by the scribe of the Harleian MS. 7394 in particular, which may be assumed as the received Court pronunciation towards the close of the xivth century, and will be briefly termed the pronunciation of Chaucer, are the following.

tales in a cheap form from this MS. This will be referred to as his Chaucer Extracts.

1 In the numerous citations which I shall have to make I have generally followed Wright’s edition, but in all important or doubtful cases I have referred to Morris’s. One reason for using Wright’s edition, besides convenience, was that the lines are numbered consecutively throughout, except the Okte’s Tale of Gamely, which is numbered separately because it is omitted by Tyrwhitt as certainly not Chaucer’s. Mr. Morris’s edition has fresh sets of numbers for every prologue, tale, and part of tale throughout. This is theoretically the best, for it is certain that the poem is altogether fragmentary, and, as the manuscripts and editors do not all agree in the order of the pieces, it is probable that no order as yet adopted is that into which Chaucer would have cast the poems had he lived to give them the extension originally designed. For example, in the Secundae Nonnes Thia, supposed to be told by a woman, not written by a man, we have—

And though that I, unworthy some of Eve,
Be synful, yet accepte my blyevo. 11990.

Yet pray I you that redeem that I write. 12006.

Again, in the Schipmannes Tale, supposed to be told by a man, in speaking of wives we find—

The sely housbond alget moste pay,
He moost ws clith in ful good array,
Al for his oughthe worship richely;
In which array we daunce jollity;
And if that he may not, paraventure,
Or elles wil not such dispes endure,
But thynketh it is wasted and i-lost,
Than most another paye for oure cost,
Or lenus gold, that is perilous. 14422.

These expressions are in both cases irreconcilable with the supposed speaker, so that there must have been some jolting or oversight in the editing.
1.) When few people can read, rhymes to be intelligible must be perfect.

Owing probably to a change of sound which has not been accompanied by a change of spelling, English poets of the xviiith and xixth centuries take the liberty of considering such words as love move, pull cull, eternity I, pass was, none stone, etc., to be rhymes, and readers are accustomed to pass them over as “licenses,” although they always produce a disagreeable effect upon children and unlettered adults. On the other hand words of which the final parts are pronounced almost identically, at any rate with a much nearer coincidence of sound than those cited above, are absolutely tabooed as rhymes. A xixth century poet would be much sooner allowed to rhyme whelk, with talk, than harm with psalm, or fork with hawk, although an unlettered Southern makes no difference in the sound, and a lettered Southern rather imagines that he makes than really makes any distinction (p. 196). It is different with Northern, Irish, or Scotch. It would be, perhaps, incorrect to push the theory too far, and say that in the very earliest attempts at rhyme an untutored audience would be satisfied with nothing less than that perfection which they could not possibly appreciate. But even then the general tendency becomes a sufficient guide. In finished and careful writers like Chaucer and Gower, such imperfections are not à priori likely to occur, and, as we shall see, are in fact unknown.

The various kinds of rhyme which are actually found are as follows. Let BAC, DEF represent two syllables, A, E being any vowels, and B, C; D, F any consonants. Then if B = D but AEC is not = EF, as in Bac, Bef, we have initial rhyme or alliteration, which was used in the earliest form of English poetry, the Vision of William concerning Piers Plowman, 1362, being a comparatively modern instance. Next let A = E, but B-C not equal D-F, as bAC, dAF, the result is middle rhyme or assonance, which prevails in Spanish ballad poetry, where the same vowel occurs in the final syllable of alternate lines throughout the whole ballad, and the consonants must vary.1 Thirdly let C = F but BA not = DE, as baC deC we have final rhyme, the English “rhymes to the

---

1 This is the theory; in practice however the difficulty of keeping the consonants always distinct has occasioned rhymes to be occasionally mixed up with assonances. If a diphthong is introduced in place of a simple vowel, the assonance refers only to the accented vowel, e.g. in Spanish ai, au are assonant with a, ia, ua, and e, ie, ue. Thus in the Cid romance: En las cortes de Toledo, the assonant words are: Sesto, sentimiento, muerto, desdicha, dello, propuesto, puesto, suelo, asiento, denuestos, reino, teneos, condeno, consejo, pletos, reto, escuderos, derecho, fecho, medio, alojamiento, hecho, mensageros, storgamiento, maneuvers, acuerdo, arreo, Pedro, heredero, contento, casamientos. In ‘Después que retó a Zamora;’ among others occur: Lara, haya, contrarias, quesas. In ‘Considerando los condes,’ among others: vale, paces, banes. In ‘Morir vos queredes, padre;’ Tajada, preciada, caiga. See also the Cid ballads ‘Con el cuerpo que agoniza,’ ‘Fabiando estaba en el claustro,’ ‘Si atendeis que de los brazos,’ ‘De palacio sale el Cid,’ ‘Desterrado estaba el Cid,’ ‘Aquese famoso Cid,’ ‘Non quisiera, yernos..."
SECOND PRINCIPLE OF INVESTIGATION. CHAP. IV. § 1.

eye,” like few, move: (the words was, pass form no rhyme at all). I am not aware that BA = DE, but C not = F, as BAe, BAF that is double initial rhyme, or B-C = D-F but A not = E, as BAe, BAC, BAC, that is extreme rhyme, are recognized as rhymes under any system. But AC = EF, and B not = D, as bAC, dAC or double final rhyme, is the ideal of a perfect rhyme in modern English and most European languages, and is the normal rhyme of Chaucer. Nevertheless modern French writers, as well as Chaucer, admit the identical rhyme BAC = DEF, that is BAC, BAC, which under the name of rhyme riche is constantly used in French versification. Either perfect rhyme bAC, dAC, or identical rhyme BAC, BAC, and even the assonance bAC, dAC, would obviously serve to determine either one of A and E from a knowledge of the other. This leads to the second principle—

2). When a word containing a known vowel sound rhymes with a word containing an unknown vowel sound, the sound of the latter may generally be assumed to be the same as the former before xv th century.

The difficulty consists in finding words whose vowel sounds are known. These are supplied in Chaucer from three sources, Latin, French, and those known sounds of the xvith century which we have a right to suppose, according to the results of the last chapter, came down to that period in an unaltered form.

As regards the Latin words we may assume a Roman Catholic pronunciation, which will give s, e, i, o as certainly (u, e, i, o) long or short, and short u as (u). There may be a doubt whether long u had its general sound (uu), or its occasional Latin and general French sound (yy). I am rather disposed to think that Chaucer, to whom French was familiar, used the French sound (yy) for Latin long u. Even in 1580 we learn from Bullokar that Latin as pronounced in England did not possess the sounds of (ch, ii, uu, sh, dh, w, wh, r), so that long u was pronounced by him in Latin as in English and French, namely as (yy). We are

mios, 'Después que el Cid Campeador,' 'En Valencia estaba el Cid,' 'De Castilla van marchando,' &c. In 'Cuando el rey y claro Apolin,' we find idest'ma quain ides'ma, assonancing with: estaba pasan. In the oldest Romance poems, assonances occur mixed with rhymes; the following are instances of diphthongal assonances: Bulatia (Dies: Altrom. Sprachdenkmale 1846, p. 21) test coist v. 19, Ledegar (Dies: Zwei Altrom. Gedichte, 1852, pp. 39-46) fiet rei stena 9, mesfalt rait 16, advuat estra 16, mors toit 20, preiser duer 25 and 81, talier queu 27, deus cel 40. In English poems of the xiiiith century, assonances are well marked, see Chap. V. § 1, and especially No. 6, Havelok, and No. 6, King Horn. In more recent English they are avoided, or occur only from ignorance or carelessness, as in the Nursery Rhyme "Sit on a barn And keep himself warm," and in the old catch "Cinnamon and ginger, nutmegs and cloves, And that gave me this jolly red nose," or as Benedick (Much Ado, v. 2) "can finde out no rims to Ladie but babie, an innocent rime." In Goethe's song in Faust:

"Es war einmal ein König
Der hatt' einen grossen Floh,
Den liebt' er gar nicht wenig,

Ais wie sein eignen Sohn,
The apparent assonance; Floh Sohn, may have only been a reminiscence of his old Frankfurt pronunciation Sohn for Sohn.

1 See the example of Bullokar's phonetic writing Chap. VIII, § 4.
therefore hardly justified in assuming a different pronunciation for the Latin long \(u\) in Chaucer's time, as the English long \(u\) had most probably the same sound. The case is different with respect to long \(i\) which was (ci) or (ai) in the \textit{xvi}th century both in English and the English pronunciation of Latin, but was I believe (ai) in both during the \textit{xvith} century.

The French of the \textit{xvi}th century would, on this hypothesis, have the same set of vowels as the Latin. It would be useless attempting to distinguish in the French pronunciation of that time two sounds of \(e\) and two of \(o\); we cannot even be sure that they existed at that early period, as we know from Meigret that they did in the \textit{xvith} century. The combination \textit{ou} in French was in Chaucer's time (\textit{uu}, \textit{u}) and \textit{eu} was probably (\textit{eu}) or (\textit{ey}) and occasionally (\textit{yy}) as in the \textit{xvith} century; (\textit{ae}) the modern sound of French \textit{eu} appears not to have been developed in Chaucer's time, or Meigret would have been familiar with it. The French diphthongs \textit{ai}, \textit{au} could not have differed from (\textit{ai}, \textit{au}) or (\textit{ai}, \textit{ao}), since we find them in the latter form in Meigret. The syllables \textit{an}, \textit{in}, \textit{on}, \textit{un} now pronounced as the nasal vowels (\textit{a}, \textit{a}, \textit{o}, \textit{a}), seem to have been received in England as (\textit{an}, \textit{un}). We now have modern examples of the same kind. Old French letters will be found extremely useful, especially when it is remembered that Chaucer not only used French phrases, but introduced a large number of French words into his poetry, and as these were familiar to the gentry in the pronunciation of the time, he could not have ventured to give them a different form in poetry intended especially for the delight of that gentry. We have modern examples of the same kind. Old French words we ruthlessly anglicize; we talk of \textit{a see} (\textit{fiil}) of arms, as if it were \textit{see}, but we refuse the same sound to \textit{feet}. We speak of \textit{recoup} (\textit{rikoo}) and \textit{estate} (\textit{esteet}) but of \textit{coup d'état} (\textit{kudeta}) not (\textit{kuup destet}). We do not scruple to say \textit{anno} (\textit{senoi}) but we try to say \textit{ennui} (\textit{many}), and even if the trial results in (\textit{nnii}), it has not the true English ring with it like (\textit{senoi}). The old words \textit{aid} (\textit{sed}) and \textit{camp} (\textit{kemp}) will not allow us to call an \textit{aide de camp} an (\textit{sed di kemp}), although our (\textit{se-di-kaa}) is not the French (\textit{sed de kaa}). \textit{Environs}, \textit{envelope} are words in a transition state (\textit{envoi-renz}, \textit{envelop}) and (\textit{on-viroon}, \textit{on-vilop}) being both heard. \textit{Chignon} and \textit{crinoline}, constantly spokon of, remain French (\textit{shinjoa}, \textit{krinolin}) or as nearly so as the speaker can contrive.

For old English words we shall have to lay most stress on the pronunciations of those now written with \textit{ai}, \textit{ea}, and pronounced in the \textit{xvi}th century as (\textit{ai}, \textit{ee}). We might safely assume that these sounds must have been the same in the older periods, but we shall be generally able to establish the fact by the other two sources.

1 This subject will have to be specially noticed in the next section, under I, Y.

In case of any marked peculiarity, the imperfection of manuscripts will make it necessary not to draw conclusions from isolated examples, but to collect as many examples as possible, and to search as carefully for exceptions as for corroborative instances. The exceptions will then have to be separately examined, and carefully investigated to see whether they are mere mistakes of the scribe, which other known orthographies would explain, whether they are simply solecisms not borne out by other instances and therefore incorrigible errors, or whether they really indicate a double pronunciation.

Having thus obtained an insight into the system of orthography used by the writer, having learned to estimate his various contrivances to represent sound, at their true worth, we may venture to assume as a third principle,—

3.) Orthographies shown by rhymes to have certain values, may be assumed to have those values even where they are not confirmed by rhymes.

This assumes that the intention of the writer was to represent the sounds of the words, and that his variants arose, not from simple ignorance, but from the fact that he had to make his orthography, as he proceeded, after the usages which he had been taught in youth, and he naturally hesitated as to which usage was most appropriate at any time. Other variants of course occur from carelessness, for which the scribe who writes many hours a day is scarcely to be blamed,—he that is without such carelessness among us, let him throw the first stone, I cannot. 1 That the writers anterior to printing had any intention of representing the histories of words by means of the orthography, in place of the mere sounds, it is impossible to believe. Not only do the variants we meet with exclude this notion, but there was the all-sufficient reason that they could not indicate what they did not know. New French words would be written, of course, in the French way, but then this accorded so closely with the English way, that the scribe would hardly note the difference. 2

1 In reading over the first draft of this chapter, I found I had written consequence for confident, to such utter destruction of the meaning of the sentence, that I had some difficulty in recovering the original word. Similar examples will occur to every author, and his own difficulties in correcting his own errors will lead him to appreciate the difficulty and danger of a critical restoration of any corrupt text.

2 So far as I can recall, there are very few decided examples of a French spelling being retained which did not represent the English sound. The only example I have noted where the rhyme pointed it out, is But Nathelés, pas over, this is no fors, I pray to God to save this gentil corps. 13718.

Where the p is written although not pronounced, as in the French fashion. Yet we have now both core and corps, and it may have been mere accident that the copyist wrote corps for core, just as if, because corpse is the more usual word, we made it in writing rhyme with remorse. In the middle of a line we find tempes 12803. The use of gn in French words where we have reason to think only n was pronounced in English may be also considered as a case in point, as digne 619, atteigne 8323.
These are the principles on which I shall endeavour to determine Chaucer’s pronunciation. The question naturally arises, how far is the first and most important principle, to which the two others are only subsidiary, justified by the manuscripts? A careful examination of all the rhymes, in the 17368 lines which compose the Canterbury Tales as exhibited in Wright’s edition, has resulted in finding less than fifty rhymes in which the spelling indicates a difference of pronunciation. Of these a large number consist in one of the two words cited having a final e added or omitted, while there are constant examples in other places of an orthography which would render the rhyme perfect.

The principal instances are:—born biforn 1225, trace alias 1953, bere messager 5142, ecke leek 6153, potestate estant 7599, wolde brynge, for her lyvyng 8101, of hew, at newe 8253, withoute youre wityng, in this thing, in your wirching 8368, mighte, to sight 8556, solace alias 9149, atte laste, it cast 9827, est beste 10773, her witte, it 8303, rest, he keste 10663, hert smerte 10793, kepyng ryng 10965, hoste west 11007, ever dissovere 12802, Galiane Égipciene Arrabiene sleem 15822, matero gramer 14946, tresor Nabugodonosore 16629, gold olde 16645, may aye 17105, leye pray way 8758.

These cases are often mere slips of the pen and can easily be corrected. The considerations in §§ 4 & 5, will be sufficient to explain them all, and they must be all reckoned as errors of writing, not of rhyme. Poor Chaucer is very pathetic in reference to the damage done to his verse by scribes. In Troylus and Cryseye 5-74 he says, addressing his "litel boke,"

And for ther is so grete dyversite
In English, and in wrytyng of our tonge,
So preye I to God, that non myswrite the
Ne the mys-meter, for defaute of tonge!
And red wher so thou be, or elles songe,
That thou be understonde, God I beseeche!
But yet to purpos of my rather speche.

And what he suffered from the carelessness of scribes is well exhibited in his address to his own scrivener, which by the bye has itself been much injured in transcribing.1 He is made to say: 6-307

Adam Scrivener, if ever it the befall
Boece or Troilus for to write new,
Under thy long locks maist thou have the scall,
But after my making thou write more trew!
So of a day I mote thy werke renew,
It to correct and eke to rubbe and scrape;
And all is thorow thy negligence and rape.

Would that we had a text corrected by Chaucer’s hand!

1 Mr. Morris had added several e’s required by the language. But the lines are quoted from Thynne’s edition of 1532, and were evidently “improved” to suit the xviith century pronunciation. It is a wonder we do not find anew in the second line; for in the second, long in the third, and
The cases in which short or long \(i\) rhyme with short or long \(e\), may either belong to the class of accommodation rhymes, to be immediately noticed, or are explicable on the principles laid down in the next section under \(i\). The following are the chief instances noted:

geven lyven 917, list best 6819, 7567, list rest 9299, 16559, abrigge alleng 9531, awere hire = her 11101, 12076, pulpit iset 13806, shitte = shut lette 14660.

There remain only nine instances of other classes to be considered, and some of these are patent clerical errors. Thus since hye is constantly found for high, it follows that in: charged hem in hyghhe, some remeclye 4629, the gh is a more error of the writer. In: tyrant Bucerus, serpent orennes 15589, there is little doubt that -new is a clerical error for -wone, which would give a perfect rhyme and be a correct form, as Mr. Morris reads and as is found in 16063. The common yes for eyes, shows that the initial e, in: thin outer eyen, may well aspen 12426, is a mere slip of the pen. The rhymes: alle thastates, of debates, desolat 4548 are manifestly clerical errors, and we have probably to read: thastat (= the estate) debate, desolat. The lines:

There saw he helte with her horns hee
The gretest that were ever seen with eye,

given in Wright and Tyrwhitt (who has his eie) are not in Morris, and correspond to a gap in the Harleian MS. If genuine, the rhyming words should clearly be the common pair bye you or heigh hyghe. In: more and lase, marquisesse 8516, lase is evidently a clerical error for lease, which is the reading of the MS. Dd. 4. 24, University Library, Cambridge.

The rhyme: i-cased, y-pressed, 6511, is given as: y-cased y-pressed 2:234 by Morris, and: esed ypreised by Tyrwhitt, but the Harl. 7334 reads: I casd, y pleased, and the Landed. 851 esede yplesede.\(^1\) These are usual rhymes. Lastly: jolosye me 1809, more in the fourth line are evident insertions; a final was omitted in befaile, newe, sceale, trewe, renewe, and unne-

\((\text{Andam Skri\'neer, if eer it thee befaile\text{Boeev or True\'ilus to revi\'te nev\'e, Under di lok\'es maist dhu nan dhe skale\'e But aft\'er mii maak\'e\' doh revi\'te treu\'e\', So oft a da\'i i\'i most dh\'i werk renue\'e, It to korekt\' and eek to rub and skrae\'pe, And al is thrurk\'e\' dh\'i neglidzhens\' and ra\'a\'pe!})

\(^1\) Wright says in a footnote: "The Harl. MS. reads y-pleased: but the reading I have adopted seems to give the best sense." The context as well as the rhyme declares in favour of y-pleased, for flattery and pleasing, named at first, are repeated as flattery and attendance, business, afterwards. The whole passage, inserting the bracketed words, runs thus in the Harl. 7334:

Some sayden [pat] our herte is most I eued
Whan [pat] we ben y flaterid and y pleasant
He ge\'f ful neigh \(he\) soth I wil not lye
A man ichal wyne vs belt wip flaternye
And with attendance and [wiz] butynesse
Ben we y limed boye more and leffe.
is not even an approach to rhyme and is manifestly corrupt. I find on examination that all the other MSS. in the British Museum read jolite, which is Tyrwhitt's reading, and is no doubt correct. The rhyme: mercy sy 13308, will be specially examined in the next section, under I, when it will be shewn from other MSS. that the proper reading is: mercy sy.

This examination is calculated to make us feel confident in the correctness of our first principle as applied to the Canterbury Tales. On extending the examination over the whole of Chaucer's poems, the following faulty rhymes are all that I have noted, which do not admit of an immediate correction. Except in certain pieces, of which the originals are thereby proved to be of very doubtful authority, and of comparatively recent date, the faulty rhymes will be found exceedingly rare. The citations refer to the volume and page of Mr. Morris's edition, and the references to the original MSS. or editions, are all given.

Vols. II. & III.

1. The Canterbury Tales, from the Harl. MS. 7334, collated with Lansdowne MS. 851. After the previous examination this may be said to have no faulty rhymes.

VOL. IV.


3. The Parlement of Bruder, or the Assembly of Fowles, pp. 51-74, from Bodleian MS. Fairfax 16, collated with Harleian MS. 7333, and Bodleian MS. Seld. B. 24. None.

4. The Boke of Cumple, God of Love, or the Ockowe and the Nightingales, pp. 75-88, from Bodleian MS. Fairfax 16, collated with Harl. MS. 7333, and Bodleian MS. Seld. B. 24. None.

5. The Flower and the Leaf, pp. 87-107, from Speght's edition of Chaucer 1597 and 1602, no manuscript copy being known: his = high certainly 87, truly company 93, melody soothly 93, company lady richely 98, sautry craftely 98, womanly daisie 99, company friendly 103, properly company 103, chivalry worthy 104, victory mightily 104, company humbly his = haist 107.


7. Chauceres A. B. C. called La Priere de Notre Dame, pp. 78-85, from the Bodl. MS. Fairfax 16, collated with a MS. in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, medeyne resynge 81, this rhyme is probably correct.

8. Chaucer's Dream, pp. 86-154, from Speght's edition of Chaucer 1597 and 1602, no manuscript copy being known: cene = even kene 87, was glasse 88, paire here (this word seems to have been supplied by the editor) 88, his = high sie = see 88, be companie 89-90, come some 92, undertaketh scapeth 98, greene yene = even 96, place was 100, named attained 104, een = even queen 106, joyously harmony 107, gentilnesse peace (?) 107, be companie 108, destroide conclude 108, vertuous use 110,aigne encline (?) 113, resigne nine (?) 120, found bond 126, remember tender 129, fittene, an even 132, ligne companie 132, safety companie 133-4, greene een = even 138, cry company 138, softly harmony 141, nine greene (?) 142, vermidouse use 143, company by 147.


13. *The Romane of the Rose,* pp. 1–234, from the unique MS. in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow: be nycete 1, samet delit (?) 27, lorcyes oliveris 41, I maladis 57, hastily company 67, generally villanye 67, worthy curtesie 68, more are 68, abrode forweride 78, annoy away (?) 82, escape make 84, joye conveye (?) 89, curtesie gladly 91, foly utterly 97, laste barste 97, foly hastily 99, 100, were ye seye 99, rodly maisterie 101, flaterie utterly 103, affere debonaire 105, bothom salviaicon 106, angerly villanye 107, espie sikirlye 116, foliye jelousye 116–7, jelousie I 119, 126, I feechery 119, bothoms sessouns 122, high deliverly 125, certemlye jelounye 123, glotouns bothoms 131, storne core 132, sikirlye foly 136, bittirly foly 138, I curtesie 138, lorde rewarde 141, seignorie 142, ever fer (?) 146, engendrure pleyng 147, compayne discrywliye 149, servis preise =preis 160, worthy druise 164, visc wyse 164, to bye hastely 171, sy =part of the second syllable of fysh, foly 175, covertly ipocrisie 185, company outerly 192, whyte trestrerie =trickery 194, compayne I 209, mekely trechery 223, sobrelye, je vous die 225.


In examining Gower's rhymes through the medium of Pauli's edition, I have put aside his orthography as of no value, and have reckoned as faulty rhymes only such as I could not immediately correct by means of the results obtained from an examination of Chaucer, and exhibited in the following sections. The citations refer to the volume and page of Pauli's edition.

Vol. i. sely privete 225, er = formerly ware 231,
Vol. ii. named proclaimed 84, joy money 147, Troy monae 188,
nine peine 261, enemy michery 355,
Vol. iii. accomplisheth amounteth 54, straught sought 374.

Nine faulty rhymes out of more than 33000 verses would not be much. But in fact the editor Dr. Pauli, and not the author, is the person really answerable for them, as the following examination will shew.

The reading: sely privete i 225, is wrong on the face of it, for sely makes no sense; the word is celec or cele as in Harl. 3490, 3869, 7184, and Soc. Ant. MS. 134, meaning secret, a purely French word. The passage runs thus in Harl. 3869.

As who fai̇t. I am so celec
Ther mai no mannes priate
Ben heled half fo wel as myn.

The reading: er ware i 231, is: er war in Harl. 7184, but: ar war in Harl. 3490 and 3869, the passage in the last being

Of such ensamples as wer ar
Him oughte be þe more war.

The rhyme: named proclaimed ii 84, is given: named, proclaimed, by the three Harl. MSS, and: named proclaimed, by the Soc. Ant. MS. The first reading is evidently correct from the French proclamation, and even Pauli in another place writes: named proclaimed i 6.

For: joy money ii 147, Troy monae ii 188, the Harl. MS. 3869, reads: ioye monoe, Troie monoe. These rhymes will be further considered in the next section under OE.

The rhyme: nine peine ii 261, is written: nyne peyne in Harl. 3869, but this is an evident slip for: nyne pyne, the reading of Harl. 3490 and 7184.

For: enemy michery ii 355, both Harl. 3490 and Harl. 3869 read: enemie micherie.¹ The enemy is Venus, and the word receives the French feminine form, thus, according to Harl. 3869

For Venus which was enemie
Of þike loues micherie.

The words: accomplisheth amounteth iii 54, are so spelled in the three Harl. MS., but as it is certain that the two French words from which they have been taken, had the same sound, the rhyme was really perfect. This then is an example in Gower of the retention of a French spelling, which did not represent the English sound, suprâ, p. 248, note 2. The orthography accomplish is even yet

¹ Harl. 7184 is illegible; the word they mean it is hard to say; probably is like enne, that is, there are five strokes between the two e’s, and what enme.
retained in our written language, though generally superseded by account.

The words: straught sought iii 374, were wrongly transcribed by Pauli from the Harl. 3490, which he professed to follow in this passage, and which reads: straught caught.

This examination must be held to establish the correctness of the first principle for all the writings of Chaucer and Gower. The exceptions are clearly due to some error of the editor or the scribe, or to certain varieties of pronunciation which will meet with an explanation hereafter. In Chaucer's time many words certainly existed in two or more forms either entirely different, as tho for those, say for saw, they for though, mo for more, etc., or only differing in a vowel as kess for kiss, lest for list lust, stree for straw, etc. We find instances of this double use even in prose, and in places where the use was optional, but it was evidently a most convenient instrument in the rhymer's hand, and Chaucer, who, notwithstanding the far greater facilities for rhyme at his time than at the present, seems to have been frequently "hard up," to judge by those numerous little tags which appear in his poetry and are absent from his prose, has extensively availed himself of them. The following are a few examples of these Accommodation Rhymes, as I propose to term them:—

rood upon a mere (== a mare), and a mellere 543, gan it kess e 8428, holde champartye, may sche gye 1951, Then pray I the, to morwe with a speere That Arcita me thurgh the herte here == bore 2257, unto oon of tho, moche care and wo 2353, that on myn auter bren, that thou go hen == hence 2357, stree == straw three 2355, Paternoster soate == sister 3485, compa/ne

1 A cook thei hadde with hem for the nones, To boyle chiknes and the mery bones 381.
Hence merybones for marrow bones (possibly a reference to St. Mary le bon) is not a recent vulgarism, but can boast a high antiquity.
2 Compare Chaucer's own admission, 6:274:
And eke to me hit is a grete penance, Syth ryme in English hat's such skarrete, To folowe worde by worde the curiosite Of Graunson, flore of hem that maken in Fraunce.
3 This reading is doubtful. Lansdown 851, Harl. 1758, MS. Reg. 18. C. ii.; and Sloane MSS. 1686, 1686, all agree in reading: compa/ne blame. Harl. 7335 has come bare, Harl. 7334 and MS. Reg. 17 D. xv. have both com pame, which Wright prints compa/ne in one word, and Morris misprints compa/ne, and it should be observed that there is a blotch on the parchment in Harl. MS. 7334, fol. 49 4, which looks at first sight as if paine and not pame were intended, but such a mark is never used throughout the MS. for the dot over an a, which is always represented, when written, as it would be in such a case, by a flourish like 1. The writer of MS. Harl. 7333 was so puzzled that he left out the line with compa/ne, altered the next line to
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== compagne blame 3709, becste sheete == shooete 3927, day lay == law 4795, wirche == work chirche 9257, Eve prove == prove 9203, feste mestl == moste 10613, est aiust == almost 15168, als == als fals 4315, speche seeche == seeke 4939, beech, theech == the ich == prosper I 12856, mein == seen agayn 5177, time evenyner 6055, nobles, preye, seye 8704, therto, is do == idon 10313, glayre of an ey, cley 12734, seye abeye 13514, mystresst wist 13784, the mery orgon, in the chirche soon 16337.

These instances, which are only a few out of many, are abundantly sufficient to shew that the scribe was not content with continuing to write one form of a word, and allowing its different sounds to be elicited from the rhyme (as we should now write a tear, to tear) but that he altered the spelling when he wished to shew a difference of sound. Hence although we have detected him tripping at times, from mere carelessness, we can feel confident that when varieties of spelling as eyen yen, hye hihe, deyde dyde, etc. constantly occur, they really indicate different sounds, such as for example we shall learn to attribute to ey, y, ih, in other combinations, so that the words just cited should be read (ai'en, ii'en, xi'e nikh'e, daid'e duid'e), and we are thus led to a corroboration of our third principle as well as of our first.

Having thus established the trustworthiness of my instrument of investigation, not merely for the particular instance of this Harleian manuscript 7334, but for all good MSS. of the period, I shall proceed to apply it to discover a complete system of pronunciation, so as to allow us to declaim Chaucer's Canterbury Tales as they might have been read during his lifetime, although doubtless with a modern accent which would have failed to satisfy the poet's ear. Still this pronunciation would have probably been perfectly intelligible, while our modern English method of reading must have sounded as mere gibberish.¹

rhyme, omitted the following which was then without a rhyme, and read:
Go from þe wyn dow, Jacke folle
th'eye
I love bette opur and elles I were to blame
Welle more þan þe by Jhefu and his dame
So lette me slepe a twenty devilweye.

The words: and his dame, in the last line but one, are in another ink, and are apparently written over an obliteration. The last line was originally proceeded by:
Go forth thy weye or elles I wolde caste a stone,

which has been scored out, as it was thus left without a rhyme, but is perfectly legible.

¹ This opinion I entertain so strongly, that I retain its expression in the text, notwithstanding that I have been informed, since it was written, that many Early English scholars adopt systems of pronunciation agreeing in the main with our barbarous method of reading Latin and Greek. While this sheet was passing through the press I received the following: "As to O.E. and A.S. Pronunciation, my scheme is i = i of shine, ð = ee of feet, ð = a of father,
Mode of Reference to Chaucer and Gower.

The lines of the Canterbury Tales will be cited by their numbers in Wright’s single volume edition (p. 243 note), the number refers to the first line or word cited. The lines in any of Chaucer’s other poetical works will be cited by the volume and page (not number of line) in which they occur in Morris’s edition, a turned period being placed after the number of the volume; thus, 4:87 means vol. 4, p. 87. As final words are usually cited, hardly any difficulty will be thus experienced in finding the passage. The list of Chaucer’s poems on pp. 251–2, will show at once from the reference the particular poem in which the passage occurs. The lines in Gower will be cited by the volume and page in Pauli’s edition, the number of the volume being in small roman letters and the number of the pages following without an intervening comma, thus ii 84 is vol. 2, p. 84. By this means the form of the reference distinguishes the book cited, which will therefore not be named.

As Mr. Morris’s edition of the Canterbury Tales is not numbered throughout, and as Tyrwhitt’s order of the Tales is not entirely the same as Wright’s, the following comparison will be found useful. The numbers refer to the volume and page in Morris and the line in Wright and Tyrwhitt. Occasionally some lines are inserted in one of these editions and omitted in the others, hence it will not always be possible to refer from one to the other by the numbers with certainty, but the difference is always very small, and if allowed for, will create no confusion. In order to correspond as far as possible with Tyrwhitt’s system, Mr. Wright’s first line of a piece is not always numbered consecutively to the last line of the preceding piece, and his number 6440 is a misprint for 6439. The roman titles of the pieces in the following table follow Mr. Morris’s edition; the italic titles of the tales have been added by the author in accordance with the text of the poems, for convenience of reference.

Harmony of the References to Morris’s, Wright’s, and Tyrwhitt’s Editions of the Canterbury Tales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Poem</th>
<th>Morris</th>
<th>Wright</th>
<th>Tyrwhitt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Prologue</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Knightes Tale. Palamon and Arete</td>
<td>2:27</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Prologue of the Myller</td>
<td>2:96</td>
<td>3111</td>
<td>3111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Milleres Tale. Nicholas, Absolon, and the Carpenteres Wyf</td>
<td>2:98</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>3187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Prologue of the Reeve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Reeves Tale. The Miller of Tromp-syngtoun</td>
<td>2:122</td>
<td>3919</td>
<td>3919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Cokes Prologue</td>
<td>2:135</td>
<td>4323</td>
<td>4323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a = o of bone, Æ = a of fate, ʌ = on of house, &c.); a scheme utterly irreconcilable with the direct evidence of the last chapter. See also Benjamin Thorpe on the pronunciation of Órmín, (Analexta Anglo-Saxonica, 1846, 8vo, preface, p. xi) quoted below Chap. V, § 2, No. 1.

1 Confessoio Amantis of John Gower, edited and collated with the best manuscripts by Dr. Reinhold Pauli, London, Bell and Daldy, 1867, 8vo, 3 vols.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Piece</th>
<th>Morris</th>
<th>Wright</th>
<th>Tyrwhitt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The Prologue of the Wyt of Bathe</td>
<td>2:206</td>
<td>4619</td>
<td>4619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The Prologue of the Freke</td>
<td>2:245</td>
<td>6847</td>
<td>6847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The Sompnour's Prologue</td>
<td>2:258</td>
<td>7247</td>
<td>7247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The Clerk of Oxenforde's Prologue</td>
<td>2:278</td>
<td>7877</td>
<td>7877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pars Secunda</td>
<td>2:284</td>
<td>8073</td>
<td>8073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineipit tertia pars</td>
<td>2:292</td>
<td>8325</td>
<td>8325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineipit quarta pars</td>
<td>2:297</td>
<td>8486</td>
<td>8486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineipit pars quinta</td>
<td>2:302</td>
<td>8651</td>
<td>8651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pars sexta</td>
<td>2:307</td>
<td>8815</td>
<td>8815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Envoye de Chaucer</td>
<td>2:316</td>
<td>9063</td>
<td>9063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Prologue of the Marshamtes Tale</td>
<td>2:317</td>
<td>9089</td>
<td>9089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The Squyeres Prologue</td>
<td>2:334</td>
<td>10293</td>
<td>10293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineipit secunda pars</td>
<td>2:356</td>
<td>10661</td>
<td>10661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The Frankelynes Prologue</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>10985</td>
<td>10985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Prologue of the Chanoynes Yeman</td>
<td>3:46</td>
<td>12462</td>
<td>12462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The Chanoynes Yemanes Tale. <em>The Fales Chanoun and the Prest.</em></td>
<td>3:60</td>
<td>12940</td>
<td>12940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The Doutoures Prologue</td>
<td>3:75</td>
<td>13410</td>
<td>13410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The Prologue of the Pardoner</td>
<td>3:85</td>
<td>13702</td>
<td>13702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The Schipmannes Prologue</td>
<td>3:106</td>
<td>14384</td>
<td>14384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The Prioresse Prologue</td>
<td>3:121</td>
<td>14846</td>
<td>14846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The Prioriess Tale. <em>The Hitel Clergeoun and the Jesus.</em></td>
<td>3:122</td>
<td>14864</td>
<td>14864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Prologe to Sire Thepas</td>
<td>3:130</td>
<td>15102</td>
<td>15102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The Tale of Sir Thepas</td>
<td>3:131</td>
<td>15123</td>
<td>15123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Prologe to Melibes</td>
<td>3:138</td>
<td>15327</td>
<td>15327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The Tale of Melibes, prose</td>
<td>3:139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The Prologe of the Monkes Tale</td>
<td>3:198</td>
<td>15375</td>
<td>15375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The Monkes Tale. The harm of hem that stood in heigh degree</td>
<td>3:201</td>
<td>15477</td>
<td>15477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The Prologue of the Nonne Prestes Tale.</td>
<td>3:237</td>
<td>15653</td>
<td>15653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The Nonne Prest his Tale. <em>Chautelere.</em></td>
<td>3:239</td>
<td>15870</td>
<td>15870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The Prologue of the Manouicles Tale</td>
<td>3:249</td>
<td>16923</td>
<td>16923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The Prologue of the Persones Tale</td>
<td>3:261</td>
<td>17295</td>
<td>17295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. The Persones Tale, prose</td>
<td>3:263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 2.—The Vowels.

Long and Short Vowels.

The orthographic custom of the Germanic languages is to consider a final vowel in an accented syllable long, and a vowel in a syllable closed by a consonant short. The physiological cause for the duplication of a consonant between two vowels to indicate the shortening of the first vowel has been already explained, p. 55. But long vowels also occur in syllables closed by a consonant, and here the writers have generally been put to great straits. Orrmin by simply leaving the consonant single after a long vowel, and always doubling it after a short one, escaped the difficulty. In the oldest Germanic monument, Uphilas's Gospels, the Greek custom of using different signs for long and short (e, o) was usually followed, thus e ai, o au were generally, = (ee e, oo o). Long i was represented by ei, following the Greek custom of pronouncing ei at that and the present time. Long a, u, were not distinguished from short, even if the real long (aa, uu) existed in Gothic.1

In Anglosaxon an accent is occasionally placed over the long vowel, but it is frequently omitted. In modern high German and Dutch aa, ee, oo are often used for the long vowels, but this system of reduplication does not extend to long i and long u. When the i was not dotted, it would have been difficult to distinguish ii from u, and the combination uu might be read nu, un, im, mi, ini, which seems sufficiently to explain the non-use of reduplication to express these prolongations. Still I find reduplication sufficiently distinct even in these cases, provided that the i is properly dotted, and hence I have employed it consistently in palaeotype.

In Chaucer, as represented by our MS., reduplication is not unfrequently resorted to in the case of aa, ee, oo, but as the writer often neglects to mark the distinction (compare in such a caes 657, arwe in a caes 2081), and sometimes employs ee where we expect to find a short vowel (as weel for weel 2125), not much reliance can be placed upon this orthography. The fact, however, that both short and long a, e, i, o rhyme with each other, but that long u and short u never rhyme, leads at once to the conclusion that the sounds of the long and short a, e, i, o differed only in quantity, but the sounds of long and short u differed also in quality. This general conclusion, will be abundantly confirmed.

1 See an account of the values of the Gothic letters, Chapter V, § 4, No. 3.
A — XIVTH CENTURY.

That long and short a could not be very different from (aa, a) we have already seen. It is not possible to distinguish after such a lapse of time between (a, a) and it is safer probably to consider (aa, a) as the real sounds. The effect of a preceding u does not appear to have been felt; that is, a in was, warm would not have differed from a in has, harm.

Latin rhymes. . . as assollyng saveth, a significavit 663, where the old habit of reading the Latin termination -it as (-ith) may have been alluded to; 1 the Psalm of David, cor meum eructavit 7515;

Yet spak this child, when spreynde was the water,
And song, O alma redemptoris mater. 1506L
My teeme is alway oon, and ever was,
Radix malorum est cupiditas. 18748
On which was first i-writen a crowned A,
And after that, Amor vincit omnia. 161

These examples lead at once to the conclusion that a was called (aa), and that saveth, David, water, was were pronounced (saaveth, Daavid, waater, was). Hence also the words rhyming with was will have (–as) or (–aas), e.g. hire statue clothed was, arwes in a 2081, thereto chosen was, such a 2111, he walketh forth a pase, ther hir temple was 2219, this hors of bras, siege of Troye was 10619, of Macedon he was, alas, such a caas, thyn seis fortune is turned into an aas 16142, where seis, aas are seis, ace. These words give the key to many others, thus: in this caas, of solas 799, and all words of that kind now usually spelled –ace, as: paas Thomas 827. We should also conclude that in: caught in his lase, this troaspase 1819, we ought to read laas, troasps, as in: a dagger hanging on a laas 394 &c.

French rhymes. . . hadde thei ben to blame, to be clept madame 377, hadde hosen of the same, no wight eplee hir but madame 3953, fy for shame, sayde thus Madame 16377, it happed him par cas, ther the poysoun was. 14300

This last example confirms one of the Latin rhymes. In the other examples observe that Madame is a word which has preserved its French sound (or what is meant to be such) down to the present day, and hence the rhymes with it are conclusive.

Short and long A rhymes.

A long surcote of pers uppon he hadde
And by his side he bar a rusty bladdre. 619

Here, judging by the modern use, blade is spelled bladdre simply to secure the rhyme, that is the long vowel is, for the occasion, treated as a short one. This of course could not be done if the quality of the vowels changed with the length, as in the present had, blade. In the following example—

Each after other clad in clothes blake
But such a cry and such a wo they make. 901

1 See Salesbury, infr, Chap. VIII, § 1, under T.
we have exactly the converse, the vowel in blacke being lengthened
to rhyme with make. This is also the case in: I may no longer
tarry, lady scinte Mary 7185, where the correct reading would
probably be tarie, Marie. In ages both black and black had short
vowels.

The pronunciation of a in Chaucer, which scarcely admitted of
doubt before, is so clearly indicated by these three classes of ex-
amples, that it is unnecessary to accumulate passages of the last
kind, those cited in the first two cases are all that I have observed
of that description in the Canterbury Tales. We must, there-
fore, conclude that

A in the xiv th century was always either (aa, a) or (aa, a).

E, EE, EA, EO, OE, IE — xiv th Century.

Final e presents peculiar difficulties, and will therefore be treated
separately in the fourth section of this chapter after the other
vowels and the consonants have been fully considered. At present
it may be assumed to be pronounced as the inflexional German final
e (p. 195, note) in all cases where it ends a line or seems to be re-
quired by the metre, and to be otherwise omitted in pronunciation,
leaving the precise discrimination of these cases to future investi-
gation.

The combination oe is used so frequently in place of e long, that
it cannot be considered as a different letter. The combination ee
is rare, but occurs most frequently in case, please, which are also
found without a. Eo, oe are occasionally used instead of e, when
an e usurps the place of a, but there does not appear to have been
any variation of sound. Is and e alternate in some words, especially
matero matere, hiero here, but is does not appear to have had any
special signification distinct from e. The modern pronunciation of
the e, and the separation of its long sound into (ee, ii) which was
confirmed in the xvi th century, does not appear to have commenced.

Latin Rhymers.—The only Latin word ending in e which con-
cludes lines in Chaucer is benedicite, and this was almost always
pronounced in three syllables, but whether (ben’diste) or (ben’ute,
ben’ete),—compare Scint Beneyt 173, and the modern Bennet—I
am not able to say, I incline however to (ben’ete).1 The following
are all the passages in which I have observed the occurrence of this
word, and as most of them illustrate the sound of e, oe, it may be
best to cite them all at length.

The god of love, a! benedicite (5 syllables)
How mighty and how gret a lord is he. 1787
To lighte for a lady; benedicite!
It were a lustye sighte for to see. 2117
Why rys ye so rathe? benedicite. 3765

1 Prof. Child (infra, § 5, art. 96) suggests benedic as the contraction and
suspects a lacuna in v. 1787, where it

has five syllables. The word has always
five syllables in Gower.


These examples establish the pronunciation of, in modern spelling, he, see, tree, bee, flee, ye, thee, me, as (hee, see, tree, be, flee, see, dheee, mee), so far as the vowel is concerned. The other rhyming words, adversity, dignity, meny, will be considered under I, Y. The words thus established suffice to prove the pronunciation of many others and shew that the personal pronouns, he, she, we, ye, which were exceptionally pronounced with (ii) in the xviith century, (p. 77), and the combination ee which was confined to (ii) at the latter end of the same century (p. 79), had in Chaucer's time, exclusively the sound of (ee).

It might seem proper to reckon among these Latin rhymes

Yet schal I saven hir, and the, and me,
Hastow nat herd how saved was Noe.
But certeynly no words writeth he
Of thilke wikked eysample of Canace.

But the preceding examples will also shew that Noe Canace must have had a final (ee).

French rhymes ... a sop in fyn clarre, than sittith he, 9717 away fro me, as well as thin parde 5891, the lasse light parde! the thar not pleyne the 5917.

For cousyngae, and eek for bote cher
That he hath had ful ofte time heer.

Long and Short Rhymes ... trapped in steel, dyapred wel 2159, here the long pronunciation of wel is not noted as it is in

Som wel been armed on here legges wod,
And have an ax, and eek, a mace of steel.
Thanked be fortune, and hire false wheel,
That noon estat assured to ben woel.
His eyn en steep, and rollyng in his heed
That stemed as a forneys of a leod.
E, ER, EA, EO, OE, IE — XIV TH CENTURY. Chap. IV. § 2.

Here head, lead are now both short (zed, led). They may have been both long occasionally, as broad, dead spelled breed, deed 147. In: Jerusalem, a straunge stream 465, both words may have been pronounced with (cem). But in: I holde my pees, al the press 5096, we have either short and long rhyming, or else a short lengthened to rhyme with the long. In either case the sound of long e is shewn to be (ee).

In the following examples we have words written in the xvi th century with ee and then pronounced (i), rhyming with words then written ea and pronounced (ee). Those afterwards written with ee will be italicised for distinction: ful len, no calf y-see 593, this cost (coast) so clene, that ther nys no ston y-see 11307, his speche, gladly teche 309, it needeth nat the teche, I the bysche 3593, wolde han caught a sleep, Johan the clerk up leep 4225, in this drede, at thy gret rode neede 5077, at his feet, and of a man he este 2049, a child that is i-bet, went he over the strete 3757, in word and deede, repentance and drede 1777, bodyes deede, of hernyez and of neede 1007, glorious for to see, fletynge in the large see 1957, with leyghen slope, noon in chope 755.

In the next examples we find ee rhyming with words which the Latin rhymes have established to be sounded with (ee): so as it semed me, of what degre 39, so ofte of his degre, hadde he be 55.

The following are examples of words written with ee or simple e, which were afterwards written with ea. The ea words are italicised: humble cheer, ye schal hear 2221, piled bord, sore aford 629, hem to wroke, scholdel speke 963, breeth, heeth 5, as of the doth, upon an heath 608, agreved with here, to a bere 2059, pite to heere, Dyane gan apareo 2347, quod sche, in the saltel see 5527, in the Greete see, hadde he be 59, or forge or bete, to counterfete, 13432. These examples might be greatly multiplied. Ea occurs in: for ease, nought displease 5709, sche wolde vertu please, noon ydel ease 8092, his spirit was at ease, nothing may me displease 9507.

The use of oo and oe is shewn by the spellings: theof 13498, theves 13499; corthe 8557, beof 9295, poepel 9241, pepul 2536, reproef 10078, 10137, preef 5829, reproeva 17002, repreve 6759, these latter words having generally simple e.

The following shew the pronunciation of ie as (ee): with evel preef, a great meschief 5829, al your preef, an odious meschief 7771, a theef, meschoef 1327, me repreve, we beliefe 6759, ere that it was eve, made him bileue 4993, and eek a frere, disshie and matiere 6418, in this matere, quod the Frere 6421.

The following are some instances of words now spelled with ie but apparently only written with e in Chaucer. See the table, p. 104. I saw no man him greve, Osewald the Reeve 3857, be agreved, be releneved 4179, by youre leve, ye yow not greve 7395, a frend, as a fendo 5825, loth or leef, an ivy leef 1839, longen unto eelde, mowan be unweslede 3883, oon bar his schoed, in his hondes heeld 2895. We also find chierete 5978 for cherete, and whiel 15482 for wheel.
These rhymes lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the one general sound of e, ee, ea, eo, oe, ie in Chaucer was (ee) long or (e) short, and they leave no room to conclude that e was ever pronounced as (i) except in the prefix be which we find written indifferently be bi. The double forms less lasse, left left, seem however to indicate that e short was occasionally pronounced as broadly as (a). In the xiii th century this was certainly dialectic, and the various forms may have remained in use during the xiv th. Perhaps the e was generally broad, as (e) rather than (e). In the same way we shall find i short to have been occasionally pronounced as (e), and this might be rather held to indicate the broader sound of (i), for i, or the finer sound of (e) for e. Such delicate distinctions, difficult to appreciate in actual living speech, are quite beyond our grasp at such a remote period, and we must be content with one form (e) for the, possibly, three forms (e, e, e). It is indeed very probable that all three coexisted, and were not discriminated by the speakers themselves. Practically this is the case at present.

**EI EY, AI AY, AU AW — XIV TH CENTURY.**

It is needless to shew that ai, ay were generally (ai) and au, au generally (au). They could not have had any other sound, as we saw at the conclusion of the last chapter, p. 238. But whether any distinction was made between ei and ai may be doubtful. In the greater part of modern Germany, ei, ai are both (ai), and they seem to have both had the same sound in Chaucer. Thus we have them rhyming together in

That we with pitous hert unto yow playne
And let youre seris my vois nor diceynes. 7973

But playne is written pleyne in

He was out cast to wo and into peyne.
O glotony, wel oughte us on the pleyne. 13926

Again: I wot it well certeyn, I dar well seyn 8185, may be compared with: myn harmes not bewreye, I may not seye 2231. In 13335, 13511 they occurs for they. And generally the same words constantly vary from ey to ay, and conversely, so that the phonetic identity of ey, ay is the only legitimate inference. Thus: for sche was faire, to maken hir his heir 3975, what so men jape or playne, holden the righte seye 9263, companyes tweege, that cowthe seye = say 2591,

Kepeth this child, al be it fowle or faire, ....
Crist whan him lust may sende me an hair
More agreable than this. 5184
Well wiste he by the drought, and by the reyn,
The yeeldynge of his seed and of his greyn. 597
And Venus sayeth here Mercury is reyped.
Therfor no woman of clerkes is praise.
Ben they as seely men for to decepyn.
And from a soth ever wel they seyn = they seyns. 10297

The assumption that ai was pronounced as (ai) is confirmed by the French rhyme: how lasteth hir vitale, no wight but Crist saus faile, it was a gret mervaille 4919, and the Latin rhyme, as all rhymes with Scripture names must be considered: the mount of Synay, fasting many a day, 7469.

It would appear that (ai) was sometimes lengthened and divided into (sa,i) forming a dissyllable. Thus seyn is a monosyllable (saint) in

For by that lord that cleped is seynst Jame. 4262
But when prefixed to the same name it becomes a dissyllable (saa, int) in

Wel be we met, by God and seint Jame. 7025

Where, however, by may have been omitted after and. On the same principle I would explain

Hire grettest ooth nas but by seynst Loy. 120

That is (saa, int Luu’i), St. Louis, as Meigret writes his first name Loy in his Traité touchant le common usage, etc., but Louis in his phonetic French Grammar. Prof. Child would read othe, but this form is not well established.

I had the print of seynst Venus sel. 6186
That seynst Peter hadde, when that he wente. 699

So also fair in

To lede him forth into a fair mede. 7621

And maistrye in

Bachus had of hir mouth no maistrye. 13472

In the four last cases there is no simple means of altering the reading,1 and on repeating the lines it will be readily perceived that this pronunciation is not at all strained, and immediately solves their metrical difficulties. In the Prisoner’s Prayer, Chap. V, § 1, No. 2, it will be seen that the French diphthongs in: ucie 17, mayn 36, are given to two musical notes each, though they are frequently given to single notes, and other examples from Norman poems will be found near the end of Chap. V, § 1, No. 3.

As compared with Salesbury’s observation that a in asha is “thought to decline toward the sound of the diphthong ai,” it is interesting to note aisshon 3880, aisschen 12735. Four words now written ai were either always or occasionally written with e, ee and hence pronounced (ee). They are sustain, hair, slay, strain, and I have not observed more. Thus for sustain: to susteene, bright and

1 And sayede twyes, Seync Marye! Thou arte noyouse for to carye. 5-226
we should probably read: Seyncst Marye.
Compare Twelf pens? quod sche, now lady seyncst Marye. 7186

In: a gounne cloth, by God, by seint Johan. 7833
the word end has been probably omitted before the second by.
schene 1995, sche myhte nowht hir sustene, sit adoun upon the
grene 11173, o blisful queene, in my wyt sustene 14892,

Then nys ther noon comparison bitwene
Thy wo, and any woo may man sustene. 5266

For hair (ags. hær): a tuft of heros, a souwes eeres 557, heer 677, heros 1390, kempt his heere, a trewe love he beere 3691, myn
olde yeere, so moulidy as myn heros 3867, Sampson left his heros,
kut hem with hir scheris 6303, under his lange heros, tuo assas
eeris 6535. On the other hand as we have seen that heir is spelled
hair and hair. But we have heire 12061, for hair shirt.

For sly (ags. slan, alean, sleahan): or elles sle his make 2558,
the freisshe beaute sleoth me sodeynly 1120, for curs wol sles 663,
hir self to sle, as it thenketh me 11709.

The sner of himself yet saugh I there,
His herte-blood hath bathed al his heros. 2007

For strain, in the sense of race (which is derived from ags. streon,
stroonan, strynan, and has nothing to do with the other word
strain), we have

For God it woot, that childer ofte been
Unlik her worthy eldris hem before;
Bounte cometh al of God, nought of the streon
Of which they been engendrid and i-bore. 8031

Strain, hair, sly, are clearly not proper instances of ai pronounced
as (ee), but rather examples of a subsequently inserted i. But
sustene would have naturally appeared as susteigne, as we have
alteigne 8323.

Connected with this is the converse use of (ai) for (ee) or (e),
thus: fleish 147 for fleesh, have ye not seye 5065 for seon; and
woyke ben the oxen 889, this woyke woman 5352, to arrayse, at eyse
7683 for ease. That the word was then really pronounced (aiz′e)
and not (eez′e), appears not only from this rhyme, but from the
following lines in Gower, where Pauli incorrectly prints eso; the
orthography is that of the Soc. Ant. MS. 134:

Whyche hadde be femant to Thaife
So pat fehe was pe worfe at ayse. 3ii 320
Anwerceth and fey′h my name is Thayfe
That was fumtyme wel at ayse. 4ii 332

The use of fleish, woyk¹ is not so easy to explain, but eyse, freissh
367, 1120, burgesys 371, paleys 2201, 2697, 9565, 10374, herneys
2498, herneys 3760 are rather direct representatives of ai, oi in
French, the latter being changed into ei in Norman French, so we
have in the rhymes to the two last instances palfreys 2497, Gerneys
3759 and deys 9585 = dais. This is an argument in favour of the
Norman pronunciation (ai) for ei.

We find say for saw 8543, 9810, 13642, 16600 and elsewhere,
and in the same way we now have a saw for a saying.

The sound of au is of course generally (au), as is confirmed by

¹ It is remarkable that both words have ei in Modern German fleisch, weich. Compare eyse Rel. Ant. i, 22, fleiss, ib. 57, and einkr in Iceland.
the French rhyme: to make hir alliaunce, him happede par chaunce 14020, but the name of St. Paul, especially when applied to the cathedral church, was pronounced with (oou) as we have found for this particular case in the xvth century (p. 145). The orthography by seint Paules bello 16266 is very unusual and probably erroneous, we have: seynete Poules, chaunterie for soules 511, in Petres wordes and in Poules, cristen mennes soules 7401, with Powles wyndowes corven on his schoos 3318, after the text of Crist, and Powel and Jon 7229,

Of this matter, O Paul, wel canstow trete.
Mete unto wombe, and wombe unto mete,
Schal God destroyen bothe, as Powel saith. 13938

The most singular interchange, however, is that of (au) with (ee).
Gill complained of his Mopse saying (lecn) for (laun) (p. 91), but 200 years before that time we find: for losful is with force force to schowwe 3910, in mullok or in stree, so fare we 3871, of the stree, of the realite 6121 and elsewhere. The two forms straw, stree are due of course to age. straw, stree. But loe must be a form of lay, as ese of syes. The form lay for law occurs, for the rhyme, in:

Hence we conclude that EI, AI were always (ai), and AU was always (au) in the xiv th century.

O, OO, OA — xiv th Century.

O long and oo must be considered as the same letter in Chaucer.
The regular sound was (oo), as shewn by the Latin rhyme,

For though a widewe hadde but oo schoo
So pleasent was his In principio

Yet wolde he hase a fethering or he wente, 253

whether the sound was (oo) or (oo) is of course open to the same difficulty as in the xvth century, but the perfect agreement of long and short vowels, turns the balance strongly in favour of (oo), which seems to have been the original Latin’sound.

The sound of scho gives that of do by: may nought do, is not worth a scho 6289, which gives to, therto, a hoo, by: oon hole to sterte to, than is al i-do 6155, he addid yet therto, what schulde yren doo 501,

An herowd on a scaffold made a hoo
Til al the noyse of the pepul was i-doo. 2555

After this we may feel tolerably certain of the sound of long o and its identity with that of oo — (oo). The following examples are however worth attention: of symony also, did he grettest woo 6892, never the mo, tel me who 6273, for he saith us sotth, that so dooth 6529, ever in oon, thought anoon 1773, as stille as stoon, for ther ascapith noon, as we knowe everychon 7597, al ther schel goth, I have no thrifty cloth 5819, a fan right large and brood,
lay his jolly schoold 3315, his eyghen grey as goos, corven on
his schoos 3317, God amend it soune, ye wot what is to doone 7775,
when he awook, he the lettre took 5226,
Tel, quod the lord, and thou shalt have anoon
A gonne cloth, by God, by seint Johan. 7833
And every statute couthe he pleya by roote
He rood but hoomly in a medled coote. 329
Wel may men knoe, but it be a fool,
That every partye dyrryeth from his hool. 3007

As then oo seems to be always (oo) we must assume wood = mad,
often spelt wod, wode, to have had (oo) and hence conclude the
same of blood, stood, good from the rhymes: upon a carte stood,
grym as we were wood 2043, jalous and eke wood, wel ney al the
blood 1331, that is so good, of blood 2565. The change of long o
into (uu), developed in the xviiith century, had therefore not yet
occurred.

But did short o always represent (o)? Generally it did so, but
there must have been exceptions. It would be difficult to imagine
an interregnum of (o) between two reigns of (u). It will be shewn
soon that ov represented long (uu) and but rarely short (u) for
which certainly u was available, but nevertheless o seems to have
been often employed. Thus we have

Outber for ye han kept your honeste,
Other elles for ye hau fall in frelete. 13492

So that in two consecutive lines ou, o are used in the same word;
in the Knightes Tale Palamon seems to have had either (o) or (u)
to suit the rhyme, as: oon, Palamon 1015, doun, Palamon 1072,
prisoun, Palamon 1453, 1469, Palamon, opynyoun 1481, while we
have the orthography: doun, Palamoun 1517. Again: he might
not lenger sejourne, homward most he torne 6569, had I not done
a frendes torn to the 14230, for fore of beres or of boles blake =
bullen 16421, i-lyk to the stremes of burned hete = burned 13453,
bakeler 112, asonder, thonder 493.

The fact is that short (u) is comparatively rarely represented by
u, perhaps among other reasons because short u was as we shall see,
frequently called (i) or (e), as in our modern words busy, bury, so
that except in certain very well known words there might be more
error induced by writing u than by writing e. Under these cir-
cumstances I have been compelled to adopt a theory, indicated at
the commencement of the last paragraph, and I consider short o to be
(u) in all those words where it replaces a former u, and was in the
xvirth century pronounced (u); that is, as a practical rule where it
is now called (a). There will be exceptions to this practical rule,
thus word is now (wad) and Bullokar makes it (wurd) but in
Chaucer it was (woord) as we see from

But al for nought, he herde nat o word,
An hode he fonde right lowe upon the boord. 3439

There might seem to have been another sound of short o in a few

1 Johan, written Jon, 7229, is regularly a monosyllable.
words, compare the uses: hadde we on 

|honde, my fourth 

housbonde 6033, to 

|withatonde, thral and 

|bonde 7241, in londe, to telle it 

|vol I fonde 15295, as liked Cristes sonde, approached unto 

|londe 5322.  

In comparing this o in place of a in 

|land, withstand, husbaud, with 

|oa in 

|lounde in the Proclamation of Henry III., and with the 

|interchange of a and o in northern and southern dialects, the use of not 

|frequently by Chaucer, and later by Palsgrave, it was easy 

|to imagine the pronunciation (a) or (sh) as an intermediate sound, 

|which the scribe did not know whether to represent by o or a. 

|Thus Englishmen now confuse Scotch (mair) or (mahn), and Irish 

|(shhr) with their (mair, sor), and write them mon, sorr = man, sir. 

|But this conjecture will not explain such rhymes as the above. As 

|bonde, sonde must have had (o) and housbonde ought to have it, we 

|must read (o) in londe, stonde, and in stronde and elsewhere, compare: 

|strange stondes, sondry londes 13. 

|I have not noted any instance of the combination oa, but some 

|cases may have escaped me. The modern oa is replaced regularly 

|by oo or o as: goot 690, boot 9298, brode 2919, loode 2920, ook 

|10473 for goat, boat, broad, load, oak. 

|The conclusion seems to be that long o or oo in Chaucer 

|was (oo), that short o was generally (o), but occasionally (u), 

|the latter cases being those in which there was a previous 

|Anglo-Saxon (u), and a xvi th century (u), now become (o). 

OI, OY — xiv th Century.

This is a rare diphthong and its sound cannot be satisfactorily 

|established by the rhyme. If the identification of Loy 120 with 

|Loys, that is, Louis, be correct, then: ful symple and coy, by saint 

|Loy 119, should give (koui) as the sound of coy. In my article on 

|the Diphthong OY (Trans. of Phil. Soc., 1867, Supp. part I.), I 

|have given reasons for supposing (ui) or (uui) to have been the 

|original sound of this diphthong, which we have seen was 

|frequently so pronounced in the xvi th century. Thus Hart gives 

|the sound (buee) for boy (p. 133), and if we interpret this as (bui) or 

|(buni), the above pronunciation of Loy is confirmed by the rhyme. 

|That was wel twight, myn oghne lyard, boy, 

|I pray God save thy body and start Loy. 7143 

|The word boist 13722 is merely the French boiste now botte, box, 

|which historically would have the sound (buiste), and in our bushel, 

|Fr. buseau, which Chaucer writes buissel 4310, we have preserved 

|the (u) of the original. The two spellings boist, buissel seem to 

|shew two ways of writing the same sound, the writer, accustomed to 

|use either o or u for short (u) hesitating between them. This is still 

|more plainly shown by the double orthography of the word destroy. 

|It doth no good, to my wit, but amoweth 

|See ye now, lord, how mankind it destroyeth? 11187 

1 Sonde 9246 rhymes with grounde, indicating the pronunciation (sund-e).
Where anoyeth most probably had the old sound (anuu"eth), and destroyeth is used to make the spelling agree with its rhyming word. But where this motive did not act we find oy written, as

That hath destroyed weh ney al the blood. 1332
How he destroyed the ryuer of Gysen. 7662

And in the prose tale of Melibeeus (Wright’s ed., p. 159, col. 2, l. 32, Morrie’s ed. 3-172, l. 13): by vengenence takynge be wikked men destroyed.

The words: fruit destroy i 137 are written in Harl. 3869 and 3490 fruit destruie, in Harl. 7184 fruit destroie, and in Soc. Ant. MS. 134, frute destrie, the last being clearly a mistake for destruire. It cannot be supposed that the combination ui was pronounced in the same way in both words. The last is the more common spelling of fruit, viz. frute = (fryyt). The same MSS. in the same order read in i 140 despueiled, despoiled, despueiled, despueiled. From these readings, it would seem to follow that (ui) was the sound meant, but that the writing oy was preferred, short o having as we have seen (p. 267), very commonly the sound (u) or (ui), because (ui) rather suggested the sound (yy). Probably oui was not employed, because ou rather suggested the long sound (uu). Thus anoyeth anoyeth 4-68, encolied annoied ii 47, must refer to a French acloué, encloué, and hence ought to have been written oui and to have had the sound (ui), which they therefore lead us to infer in annoy. See also the sound of (ui) cropping up even in the xvith century (pp. 131 sqq.). But this was probably not the only sound of words generally written oy in the xivth century. The French oï was as we have seen (p. 130), pronounced (œz, æz) with the stress on the second element, which was generally converted into English as (œz, œz) with the stress on the first element, but Gower probably retained the French pronunciation when he invented the rhymes: joye monioie ii 147, Troie monioie ii 188, (p. 258). On the other hand, the Norman oï, pronounced originally perhaps (œi), but, on account of its interchange with oi in the xivth century, pronounced in the same way (ai) at that time, see Chap. V, § 1, No. 3, regularly replaced the French oï, so that many French oï appear as oy in Chaucer. In: Gregois vois iii 188, the oï was probably the usual (ui), just as in: chois vois ii 181, 206. But Harl. 3869 writes: gregois curteis ii 238, and considering that the latter was the usual form of this word, the reading is probably correct. If any dependence can be placed on the readings of the Hunterian MS. of the Romaunt of the Rose (p. 252), this must be the explanation of: joynt queynt 6-62-3, annoy away 6-82, joye conveye 6-89, but the passages are probably corrupt. In the Canterbury Tales there

---

1 It might have suggested a division of the diphthong into two syllables. Bea (Livet, p. 523) says of oui:
"Quand ces trois lettres sont placées devant il, l’ist seulement à prévenir le lecteur qu’il faut mouiller il; partout ailleurs oui forment deux syllabes, et ne sont pas, par conséquent, une triphongue."

2 It must not be assumed that this is the origin of (oi) in a well known vulgarism, as (baï, point, dzhaint) for bai, point, joint, because this was a mere regular xviith century trans-
seems to be no instance where (ui, ue) might not be used, with
the stress on the first element, and the modern English (ai, oi) is so
limited geographically, and appears to be so modern, that it would
be merely truckling to present habits to introduce it into Chaucer.

We must therefore conclude that the most general pro-
nunciation of Oi in the xivth Century, was (ui).

I, Y — xivth Century.

It will probably prove the most difficult conclusion for the
reader to admit, that long i in Chaucer’s time had not that diph-
thongal sound (ai) with which we are so familiar, and which we
have since the xviith century at least, recklessly introduced into our
pronunciation of Latin and Greek, and into our method of reading
Anglo-Saxon and Gothic. The belief that long i was anciently (ai)
or (ai) is not simply shared by those only acquainted with modern
English, it is adopted by men eminent for their knowledge of the
older languages. To assert, then, that so recently as the xivth
century this sound (oi), now so universal, in different modifications,
was never associated with the letter i, is a thesis which will require
ample justification. As regards the present writer it may be men-
tioned that before he began his researches he simply wondered
whether it was possible to establish any conclusion whatever, that
he inclined to the supposition of (ai) or (ai),¹ and that, even after
having established the general pronunciation (ii), misled as he now
believes by an isolated instance, he for a long time imagined that
he could point to a whole class of words in which long i had the
sound of (ai). A rhyme in Gower first induced him to reconsider
this conclusion, and he then undertook the examination of the
rhymes in the whole poetical works of Chaucer, in addition to the
Canterbury Tales, and in Gower’s Confessio Amantis, with the sole
view of discovering something which might help to decide the point,
and he examined or caused to be examined all the available manu-
scripts containing the passage in question,² seventeen in number, to
see whether there were not sufficient orthographic variants to render
it doubtful. He also made inquiries into various existing dialectic

¹ In a theoretical attempt to assign
the pronunciation of the account of the
Prioresse, 117-162 in my Essentials
of Phonetics, 1848, I find (ai) given in:
smiling, by, wiped, eyen, i, and (ii) in:
prioresse, hire, Egilence, service, de-
vine, sweetly etc., Paris, curtesie,
digne, tretis.

² Quoth the chanoun, and far wel,
graunt mercy.
He went. his way, and never the priest
him sey.
After this day. 13308.
pronunciations, of long \(i\) and the pronoun \(I\) in England and Scotland\(^1\) to see what corroboration there was for any theory on the subject. These various researches have led to one conclusion, already anticipated as the only possible explanation of Palgrave’s and Bullokar’s otherwise enigmatical treatment of the letter \(i\) (pp. 110, 114), namely that

The vowel \(i\) in the xivth century was probably called (\(ii\)) when long, and (\(i\)) when short.

The sounds of (\(ii, i\)) as distinguished from (\(ii, i\)), the true Italian vowels, have been already carefully considered (p. 106). The first point which strikes an Englishman in endeavouring to teach the common short sound (\(i\)) to a foreigner, is that the latter most generally confuse it with (\(e, e\)), p. 83. The words in French final -\(ie\), the representatives of the Latin -\(ias\), and similar words, Chaucer still distinctly pronounced (-\(te, -tees\)), etc., rhyming them with he, me, see, be, see, three, degree, as: be chastite 2237, charite me 1723, we felicite 1267, he faculte 243, vanite thre 3833, degree destyne 1843, destene be 1467, possibilite free 1293, subtilitez bees 10295, citez iniquite 941, adversite parde 1313, thentre see 1985. In all these cases we now use (-\(i\)), and it is curious to trace the change in the spelling. Prompitorium 1440, chastyte, charyte, faculte, vanite, desteyne desteyne,\(^2\) cyte, entre. Palgrave 1530, chastyte, charyte, vanyte, desteny, cytie, entre = entree, entraye = auant portail, entry = introite. Levins, 1570, chastitie, facultie, vanitie, destenie, citie, entrie, and he classes -\(ie, -ye, -y\) as identical endings. We have here then an example of the change of (-\(e\)) into (-\(i\)) while any living Frenchmen will prove that the best way to teach him to pronounce pity (pity) is to tell him to consider it as written, in French letters, pete (pète). Again in Scotland the short \(i\) in closed syllables is almost invariably pronounced (\(e\)), our words ill, pit, bid, hit becoming (el, pet, bed, bet), but are saved from any confusion with ell, pet, bed, bet because a Scotchman calls the latter (el, pet, bed, bet). In Scotland moreover (\(ii\)) is considered to occur. But when Mr. Murray pronounced some words to me in which he thought he said (\(ii\)), and which he writes was deo, beato, beate, I seemed to hear rather (\(ee\)) than (\(ii\)). In examining Cooper’s vowel system, 1685 (p. 83), we were led to consider his pair will, weal to mean (\(w\)il, \(w\)el) rather than (\(w\)ill \(w\)ill), that is, Cooper classed as (\(ii\)) a sound which in the general opinion of other writers was (\(ee\) or (\(ee\)).

These facts serve to show that (\(ii, i\)) are now often confused with

\(^1\) He is particularly indebted to the elaborate observations of Mr James A. H. Murray, F.E.I.S., of the Philological Society, on the Scotch dialects which were kindly placed at his disposal, and had their value enhanced by oral explanation and pronunciation of the difficulties. One lady and several gentlemen from different parts of England (p. 277, n. 1) have also most obligingly answered a general invitation in the Athenæum to give the author information on this point, by which traces of the older pronunciation, as he believes, have been unexpectedly brought to light.

\(^2\) This is the reading of one MS., and is probably erroneous, as indeed desteyne for destene would appear to be.
(as, e, ə), and hence we should be led to expect, if there be any truth in the theory advanced that we should not unfrequently find ï, ə confused by the scribe, and allowed to rhyme by the poet, both when long and short. Cases of the short vowel are not uncommon, for example: list best 6819, list rest 9299, abrigge alegge 9531, abregge tallegge 3001, pulpit i-set 13806, shitte lette 14660, blesse kesse 8428, schert, hert 9757, yett witt 4·117. Cases of the long vowel also occur, as: swere hire 11101, 12076, geven 1 lyven 917, enquire lere 5049, there requere 6633, enquire were 8646, afered requered 4·244, matere desire 4·333, desire manere 6·85, lere desire 6·143, and in Gower, her sir i 161, here spire i 198, yere fire, i 302. These rhymes are not only reconcilable with the theory that (ii, ï) were the usual and proper sounds of ï, but are exactly what we should expect from the mistakes which occur at the present day. If indeed long ï had been pronounced (ei) and the first element had been slightly lengthened, as (eet), we should get a sound almost identical with a pronunciation of long ã now much in use in London. In this case the rhyme might also appear to be explained. But this theory would not account for writing a simple ã for long ï; we should rather expect to find ãy, and this never occurs except in a few words, as ãye, ãhigh, ãdis, ãdry, ãsly, etc., to be especially considered presently, in which there is every reason to conclude that there was a double pronunciation. Hence the specimens of long ï rhyming to long ã, and being frequently replaced by long ã, throw great difficulty in assuming any diphthongal sound for long ï, and tend greatly to confirm the hypothesis that the sound was not pure (ii), but such a modification of it, as would easily fall into (ee), namely (ii). Add to which there is the negative evidence that long ï does not rhyme to ãy, ãay and that, except in the few cases of a double pronunciation, long ï is never written ãy by an error of the scribe in any decent manuscript.

There are a number of words of French origin which have now the accent on the penultimate or antepenultimate, but which were used as if with an accent on the last or penultimate respectively, in Chaucer's verses. In the French language when these syllables, which are now unaccented, had the vowel ï, it was pronounced (i) or (ii), and it would be difficult to suppose that Chaucer, who was familiar with French, and, in the spirit of the times as shown by the contemporary practice of Gower, was introducing it into English, could have changed the French sound and have pronounced the words with (ai). Still more difficult would it be to suppose, that at a time when the (ai) or (ei) or (ai) pronunciation of long ï was

---

1 This is from the ase. form geofen, and is therefore not an instance of ã written for ï, but of ã long rhyming with ï long.
2 The French forms sufficiently explain the termination -quer.
3 A correspondent informs me that when Mr. Matthew Arnold visited a school at Tenby, Pembrokeshire, where an ancient Flemish colony seems to have materially affected the language and pronunciation of the people, the children had great difficulty in distinguishing his fate (feit) from their fight (feit).
common, as at the close of the xvth and beginning of the xviith century, it should have been deliberately rejected from these words, and replaced by (i) when the accent was thrown back permanently. But we know that such words had (i) in the xviith century, and that this sound has continued to the present day. For my own part I cannot force myself to suppose that in the last syllable of the following words ever had any other sound but (ii, i, ii, i): Venise, lycorise, covetise, servyse, justise, merite, Euaungles, malise, sangwyn, famyn, Latyn, Jankyn, opposit, superlatif, motif, Phisik, ypocrite, practike, riche, cherice, office, Cupide, visite, avarice, cowardys, Ovide, authentik, sybil, retorike, magike, cubit, Virgile, famyne, ruyne, apprentys, relyke, doctrine, profit, posite, peril, musike, chronique, inquisitif, mechanique, elixir, olve, etc., etc.; or that the i was ever diphthongal in the penultim of: possible, digestible, fusible, etc., etc. Now if we admit that in these words was (i) or (ii), or if we even allow it to have had the purer French sounds (ii, i),—and there is absolutely no ground whatever for any other conjecture, and great reason for this,—we have gone a long way to prove that long i in Chaucer was (ii) or (ii), and was not (ei, ai, oi). For in the first place these words rhyme as having long vowels, and rhyme with words which are by no means always French, and which in modern pronunciation have (oi), and had generally received (ei) by the xviith century. That is, from undoubted cases of long (ii) or (ii), we are led to infer that the rhyming words had also long (ii) and not (oi, ei, ai). If at present we saw machine rhyming with seen, we certainly should rather conclude that the i in the first word was (ii), than that the ee in the second word was (oi), and we should never dream of rhyming mine, seen, even in these lax rhyming times. Perhaps even Butler has not such a rhyme in his Hudibras. Hence it is of great importance to study and weigh the rhymes to the words just cited. They are as follows: and to Venise, were to dyveys 7927, at point devys, cheweth greyn and lycoris 3689, which I shall devys, augur covetisye 3881, ther any profyt should arise, lowe of servysye 249, for that they ben sayse, sitting as as a justise 6609, so well to write, doe me endite, thurg hire merite 11588, i-write with evaungles, in the mene whites 5085, to pitous and to nyce, of his crownd malice 10838, he was sangwyn, a sop of usyn 335, sterve for famyn, licour of usyn 13866, wel dronken hadde the sayne, he speke no word but Latyn 639, oure apprentys Jankyn, schynynge as gold so sys 5885, a gate of marbel whet, another in opposit 1895,4 in gre superlatif, an humble soyf 9249, of me tak this motif, a court man al my lyf 9365, Doctour of Phisik, he was ther non him lyk 413, to yglie, ypocrite 10826, of youre practike, syns it may yow like 5769, solempne and so riche, was there noon it lich 10375, cherice vice 4-148, nyce nyce cherice 4-182, office vice 4-283, cupide tabide gyde 4-298-9, cryeys 4

1 On p. 16 of the Grammar of 1713, supra p. 47. we find incline rhyming for the nonce with magazine and join, but when memorial lines are attempted, all sense of rhythm, accent, quantity or rhyme seems to vanish, p. 275, note 3.

2 Compare the modern names Whybly and Whilsunday, both from white.
The last cited rhymes to Bible were the first which gave me any hope of being able to discover the pronunciation of Chaucer, approximately, by a study of his rhymes. The above list does not contain by any means all the rhymes of this sort which I have noted as important; but it is obviously sufficient to establish that in the words: devyse, devys, arise, wyse, write, endeite, whiles, nyce, wyn, fyn, whit, wyf, lyf, lyk, byte, vice, abide, gyde, crydele, glide, side, beside, delyte, myte, wide, yle, while, strife, vile, fire, &c., all of which have new (si), the i could not have been diphthongal in Chaucer’s time. And these words admitted, determine so many others, that the proposition might almost be considered proved; but it is one which many will find so difficult to believe that it is worth while accumulating proofs.

Besides the French words already dealt with, in which the accent has been thrown back and the sound (i) preserved, there are many others which have either not become part of our modern language, or have not been left without at least a secondary accent on the i. We may divide them into three categories, which however do not include all, such words as sacrifice, &c. being omitted. The first class comprehends those French words in which the i is followed by a simple consonant, the second those in which i ends the word, and the last those in which i is immediately followed by an e final. Now we have at present in our language a series of French, Italian, and other foreign words containing i, of comparatively recent introduction, which we may therefore properly compare with the words then recently introduced into English by Chaucer, Gower, and others. The following list is taken from Walker, into which a few words in [ ] have been introduced; the † marks words which have become obsolete since Walker’s time, and the italics words in which the French (ii) has become (i); in all other cases the sound (ii) has been retained in modern English, notwithstanding our predilection for (oi) and our association of (oi) with long i.

Ambergris, verdegris, antique, becaico, bombasin, brasil, capivi, capuchin, †colbertine, chioppine or chopin, caprice, chagrin, chevaux-de-frise, [chignon, crimoline,] critique, †festucine, frize, gabardine,
haberdine, sordine, trugine, trephine, quarantine, routine, fascine, fatigue, intrigue, glais, invalid, machine, magazine, marine, palanquin, pique, police, profile, recitative, mandarine, tabourine, tambourine, tontine, transmarine, ultramarine.

Now if it would sound hideous in our ears to talk of (Lusis shain-van and kroinolain,) notwithstanding our acknowledging (Taisa and Kerrolin), can we imagine Chaucer having called lys (lois), parvys (parvais), agrise (agreiz'), sophine (sopheim'), desir (dezuir'), avys devys (avois: devoys'), assise (assol'), devyne, (devain'), &c.? Such a supposition appears to be monstrous, unless we also adopt the theory that French in England in that day was pronounced with (ei, ai, ei) for (ii) as now used. Of this there seems to be no shadow of proof, nor even a germ of probability. Since the present habit of Englishmen is to make long i into (ai) in all words not of recent introduction, it would be necessary to establish that the Normans so pronounced and that that pronunciation of French was general in England during the xiii th and xiv th centuries, in order to use this hypothesis in opposition to the usually accepted theory that the French sound was (ii). We shall find however that any doubt of this kind affects the present argument very slightly, because most of the words rhyming with those just cited, are also found rhyming to words of the preceding class, in which there can be no reasonable doubt of the old sound having been preserved by the throwing back of the accent. The following are some of the rhymes which belong to this class:—

he bar utterly the pryse, the flour-de-lys 237, war and wys, atte parvys 311, might agrise, may devys 7231, som sophime, hath time 7881, to wilde fiyry, it hath desir 5955, to arys, if you devysse 38, make it wys, more avys 787, ne non novys, and wye 15425, so wise, in assise 315, madame Englytyne, service devyne 121, lord and sire, knight of the shire 357, Aryste quyte 1038,

1 For convenience the modern (oi) is written for whatever diphthongal form (ei, ai, ei) etc. the reader may choose to adopt.

2 M. Le Hériche's opinion to the contrary will be considered in Chap. V, § 1, No. 3, at the end, together with the value of the Old Norman French ai, ei, and some other matters relating to modern Norman French pronunciation.

The pronunciation (shoir) is very recent and by no means general. Walker gives (shuir), and says that this "irregularity," as it appeared to him, "is so fixed as to give the regular sound a pedantic stiffness." Even his recent editor Smart, 1836, gives (shuir). Webster has (chair). This is an excellent example of the change of sound, and the difficulty with which a new fashion of pronunciation forces its way into notice. Walker quotes the following lines from "the Grammar called Bickerstaff's, recommended by Steel," which this quotation identifies with the Anonymous Grammar of 1713, suppl p. 47, in which they occur, p. 16.—Bickerstaff's recommendation is quoted opposite the title page—

"To sound like double e, i does incline, As in Machine, and Shire, and Magazine." Walker adds: "It may likewise be observed, that this word, when unaccented at the end of words, as Notting-hamshire, Wiltshire, &c., is always pronounced with i like ee." Smart says: "Letter i or y under the accent, and final in a syllable, or followed by a conso- nant and e mute, is irregular in no word purely English except the verbs to live and to give, and the noun shire; but there are several semi-French and other foreign words in which the French

The word lyte, which seems shewn to have been (liit) or (liit) by some rhymes above, being the origin of our little, can hardly be conceived as (liit). The following among other rhymes to this word, however, not only establish the sound as (liit, liit), but settle many other words as well.


The word Inde must be considered French, and most probably had the sound (ind') which the English heard (ind'). The present nasal pronunciation of French in is certainly not at all indicated in any of the numerous words beginning with in, which we have taken from the French, and without any intimation of this nasality or any trace of it in English derivation we have no right to assume it. The vowel in Inde is short in the original language, and in the Greek and Latin derivatives. It is still so pronounced in English, and although I have heard some persons read (ind), for the sake of a modern rhyme, I doubt whether they would venture to talk of (india). It seems therefore just to conclude that the Saxon words which rhymed with it, most or all of which had acquired the sound (ind) in the xvith century had also the sound (ind). Thus we have kynde Inde 6405, and fynde kynde mynde Inde bynde lynde 9057, 9063, 9069, 9075, 9081, 9087, rhyming together in L'Envoie de Chaucer, at the end of the Clerkes Tale. The last wordes lynde = linden or lime tree, still has the sound (ind) and confirms the other conclusions. The use of mende

sound of i is retained; as marine, police, profile, &c.: ... The word obige, which formerly classed with marine, &c., is now pronounced regularly. Lune, gothic ibban, ags. ibban, Orrmin liban, had from the first a short vowel, with which, however a long vowel alternated in Orrmin in lifipp, lifenn, and a long vowel seems general in Chaucer, and hence we have simply the usual continuation of the short vowel. Give, gothic giiban, ags. giban, geofan, also had a short vowel, but in Orrmin, all parts except the imperative giit, and pretit gaff, have long vowels. From geofan, we have the frequent form gese in Chaucer. In this case we have then perhaps rather the preservation of quality by shortening of quantity, as in p. 273. Shire, ags. sciir is said to have a long vowel by Bosworth, and a short vowel by Etzmueller. But the vowel became decidedly long, and, as we have seen, it has preserved the (ii) sound. The cognate word sheere, ags. scir with long i, which has preserved its sound in all Germanic dialects, will be especially noted in Chap. V, § 1, No. 5, at the end, as a rhyme to fire.

1 "Set an example to," from ags. bisein, example.

2 Lite, however, the Danish lille for little, is called (lail) in the North of England.
for mide to rhyme with ende in the carefully spelled Harl. MS. 3869 of Gower, ii 23, ii 67, and kende for kinde also to rhyme with ende iii 120, is scarcely reconcilable with the present diphthongal sound of i in mind.

Through the kindness of several gentlemen I am enabled to say that in South Shields, Kendal, Westmoreland, and Cumberland generally, and parts of Lancashire, the short vowel (i) is still heard in the words bind, blind a., behind, hinder a., hindmost, find, grind, wind v. = (bind, blind, bïnd, hind, hind·most, find, grind, wind). See also the Scotch pronunciation infra p. 289. With these analogies it would be considerably more difficult to imagine the diphthongal sound than the short vowel in such words.

The French words of the next class are those which end in i or y, and which are referred to in that paragraph of Palsgrave which occasioned so much difficulty in the last chapter (p. 109), and they are also remarkable for the English words which rhyme with them in Chaucer. The French words are themselves not numerous. In the Canterbury Tales, there seem to be only mercy, fy, enemy, foolhardy, cry, gyrboily, to which perhaps gevory, vicory, although the final y is difficult to account for. These words rhyme, first with each other, next and very frequently with the termination -fy, and these words and this termination rhyme with the Dutch (?) courtepy, and with the AngloSaxon I, why, by, thereby, sty. The only words among these which could have a plural, enemy, sty, do not occur in the plural in rhymes in the Canterbury Tales. It was with special reference to this investigation that I enlarged the field of enquiry, extending it over the rest of Chaucer's poems and Gower. Some of these poems, as we have seen, are not in a trustworthy form, especially the Court of Love (p. 251), Flower and Leaf (p. 251), Chaucer's Dream (p. 251), and Romant of the Rose (p. 252), because they admit of rhymes which belong to a later period. The best manuscripts are altogether free from such rhymes. The spelling in Pauli's Gower must always be corrected by the manuscripts. Allowance must be made also for those words which had a twofold pronunciation, as (ai) and (i), not always marked with sufficient care in the

1 Rev. C. Y. Potts, of Ledbury, for South Shields; Mr. Brown, of St. Peter's College, Peterborough, for Kendal; Mr. J. N. Hetherington, Clifton Parsonage, Workington, for Cumberland; Messrs. Jackson, Fielding, and Axon, for Lancashire,—have supplied me with information from personal knowledge on this and other points; and Mr. Shelly, of Plymouth, for Devonshire; Messrs. Atkinson and Moore, for Yorkshire; Mr. Hallam, for Derbyshire; and a lady near Norwich, have also supplied much information on dialectic pronunciation. I beg to express my thanks to these and other correspondents who have at great trouble to themselves enabled me to supply these illustrations. Messrs. Potts, Brown, Hetherington, and Shelly have been particularly liberal with the time they have bestowed on me. I shall term these assistants generally my dialectic correspondents.

2 The substantive wind is generally (wînd), but in Cumberland it seems to be always (wahind, waind), so that wind s. wind v. have precisely the opposite pronunciation to what they generally receive in the south.

3 Dix says that aver, icori are Provençal forms, which is it singular to encounter in English. For vicory I know no authority.
spelling, to be carefully considered presently. With the exception of such words no case has yet come before my notice in which -e or -y final rhymes with -ey or -ay. In the following list of rhymes all cases of -ly rhyming to -ly, which are very frequent and convey no information, are omitted; and by no means all the rhymes, except in the Canterbury Tales, of J with -ly, -by, forthi, etc., are given.

Soburly courtepy 291, pitously mercy 951, enemy I 1645, ryally by 1689, fy mercy 1775, ryally enemy 1795, synfully fy 4499, mercy solemnly 5110, pitously, mercy I 5479, by specially 5544, therby I 6597, privelv therby 6925, yvory fetisly 7323, sty I 7411, comunly why 7839, stedefastly mercy tenderly 8970, why I 9315, uncertesly cry 10237, cry pitously 10727, therby I 12650, mercy sey 13308, therby ydelly 13860, subtly by 13980, redily forthby 14082, pitously, ther by 15011, quiribly yvor y 15283, I fool-hardy 15401, trewely by 15411, sodeinly enemy 16889, lustly vicory 17315.

I mercy 4·65-6, truly unlusty I 4·76, by privelv 4·77, by I cry1 4·78, cry ocly 4·79, ny cry I2 4·81, wrongfuly I 4·125, redy I 4·148, trewely I by 4·175, tym, bi me, pryme 4·193, by hertely 4·205, whi by bisly 4·272, I finaly 4·336, pitously by hastily 4·337, I certainly therby 4·341, y why 5·173, why comeely 5·180, trewely lady 5·190, hooly mercy 5·193, I why 5·239, I mercy 5·266, by, domus Dedaly = Dedali 5·267, y by 5·269, by and by, curteysly 5·285, y by 5·341.

I openly i 44, why I i 47, forthy pleinly i 51, forthy therby i 53, cry unhappily i 54, redily by i 93, sodeinly by i 102, I, graunt mercy i 103, forthy mercy i 106, I forthy i 107, worthy mercy i 107, sky sodeinly i 109, why forthy i 114, openly cry i 115, mercy why i 116, why privelv i 148, communly why i 172, why forthy i 173, comely awry i 174, redely forthy i 200, kindely why i 205, sely privete i 225, time, by me i 227, 309, 370, ii 41, 49, 114, iii 6, 369, I truely i 227, bodely why i 259, why forthy i 280, lady thereby i 292, cry buxomly i 297, by lady i 298, cry therby i 314, forthy enemy i 330, I forthy i 332, enemy why i 347, why forthy ii 20, I by ii 24, 41, sky by ii 29, bodely therby ii 34, forthy therby ii 50, openly forthy ii 51, truely sky ii 59, why I ii 69, besily enemy ii 75, I forthy ii 95, why cry ii 122, bodely forthy ii 133, redely by ii 137, why sky ii 158 forthy Eoly = Eoli ii 160, forthy by ii 161, forthy why ii 163, sky why ii 167, Satiry = Satyri properly ii 171, forthy properly ii 187, by I ii 219, why buxomly ii 228, by mercy ii 278, cesely mercy ii 295, why therby ii 301, mercy redy ii 314, mercy therby ii 373, I worthy ii 379, sodeinly askry ii 386, mercy rudely ii 396, why almighty iii 61, mercy thereby iii 82, forthy mightyli iii 92, high sky iii 93, by and by sky iii 116, Gemini redely iii 119, Gemini forthy iii 119, Gemini properly iii 127, I by iii 168, I forthy iii 185, mercy redely iii 198, sodeinly

1 Erroneously spelled bye, crise.  
2 Erroneously spelled nys, crise.
askry iii 217, why pitously iii 260, why Genesey iii 276, by and by, prively iii 305, pitously I iii 315, enemy envy iii 320, cry by iii 321, lady prively iii 325, forthy by iii 348, redely why iii 368, I mercy iii 372, sodelyne sky iii 375.

It is impossible to glance over the above list without feeling that whatever was the pronunciation of this final -y in any one word, it must have been the same in all the words, and hence if there is a certain clue to any one word, we have a clue to all the rest. Two rhymes are very noteworthy: mercy sey 13308, and sely privete i 225, but their very peculiarity and the absence of any corroborative instance whatever, render them suspicious. Yet, as the first of these was the only clue which I could obtain for some time, I was misled by it to suppose that this termination -y had like sely the sound (sai). This shews the danger of trusting to single instances. Even in the Harl. 7334, which is followed by Wright and Morris, we find: an hih, siih 11161, which should be: hih, siih, probably (nihk, sikh). But an examination of seventeen MS. which contain v. 13308, shews the following variants.

In the British Museum.¹

| Harl 7333 | mercy s | Rawl. MS. Poet 149 | mercy s | Halton 1 | mercy s |
| Harl 7334 | mercy s | Barlow 20 | mercy sye |
| Lansdowne 861 | mercie s | Arch. Seld. B 14 | mercy s |
| Sloane 1685 | mercye s | C. C. Coll. MS. 198 | mercy syl |
| Reg. 17 D xv | mercy s | F. 3. 2 | mercy s |
| Reg. 18 C ii | mercy s |

At Cambridge.²

| Gg. 4. 27 (No. 1) | sey |
| Laude 600 | mercy s | Ll. 3. 26 | s
| Laude 739 | mercy s | MM. 2. 5 | seye |
| Trin. Coll. R. 3. 3 | mercy sigh |

It is clear that the passage has much exercised the scribes who have occasionally ventured to add an e to mercy, which is quite illegitimate, and the majority have inclined to the more usual form in Chaucer, sey. The usual form, however, in Gower is sikh, written sigh by Pauli. The above 17 instances may be divided into an (at) class and an (it) class, thus—

(at) sey sey say sey sey say sey sey seye . . . . 10

(ii) siih sy sii sye sye siih . . . . . . . 7

The word clearly belongs to those doubly sounded and doubly spelled words to be presently examined, and we must conclude that those scribes who used the (at) class of forms were misled by habit, and should have used an (ii) class, and, since the guttural could not have been pronounced in French, the scribes ought to have omitted it in the English word. It will be seen that when eyes, high are pronounced with (ii) the guttural is frequently omitted. This leads us to prefer sy, given by two MS, of which sii, se are mere accidental varieties. The preterite (ii) as: I see him do it yesterday, is not yet obsolete among the uneducated, while (sai) is unknown.

¹ Examined by myself. ² Examined by Mr. G. Parker. ³ Examined by Messrs. H. Bradshaw and Aldis Wright.
The second instance: sely private i 225, although unparalleled among these rhymes, would not be unprecedented, for we saw at the beginning of this investigation that long ʼi and long ʼe occasionally interchange, but we already know that the proper reading is: cele private, (p. 253).

Rejecting these isolated instances, we are struck by the rhyme: tymc, bi me, pryme 4·193 in Chaucer, and the eight times repeated rhyme: time, by me, in Gower. The rhyme: sophime, time 7881, has already (p. 275) led us to consider (ti’s me) a probable pronunciation, and hence these repeated rhymes lead to calling by (bi’s). More than this, by is often spelled be, be thy trouthe 5·227, alle be hemselve 5·246, be God 5·256, and indeed be, by occur in the same line: be strengthe and by his might. 5·348, from the *Legende of Good Women*, following the Bodleian MS. Fairfax 16, a good manuscript. These variants strongly confirm the hypothesis that by == (bi’s).

It is certainly fair to conclude that the purely French words in these rhymes had the sound (ii) or (ii), the latter probably in England, and the former in France. We were driven to this supposition on comparing Falsgrave with Meigret in the xvth century (p. 110). We might therefore assume that: mercy, enemy, fy, cry, quirboily, fool-hardly, envy, had the sound (ii) or (ii), and these would be fully sufficient to determine all the rest. But as this assumption in fact involves the whole question, it will be better not to lay great stress upon it.

The cry *oci* attributed by the cuckow to the nightingale 4·79—

For thou hast mony a *feyned* quinct cry,
I have herd the seye, ʼoci, ʼoci;'
But who myghte wete what that shulde be?

leaves us in the same ignorance as the cuckow, and can be of no assistance if we go to the real cry of the bird; but if we take it as a French spelling of an imitation of that cry, ' then we have simply two French sounds *cry*, *oci* rhyming.

There are several instances of Latin final -i, one in Chaucer: Dedaly 5·267, and several in Gower: Eoly ii 160, Satiry ii 171, Gemini iii 119, twice, and iii 127, and it is difficult to suppose that Latin was at that time so mispronounced as to have i called (ai). The Roman Catholic tradition must have saved this heresy, which seems to have only crept in with the xvi th century, and was even then reproved by many, as by Salesbury. At least these rhymes must be considered to add to the probability of the (ii) or (ii) pronunciation.

With regard to the termination -ly which plays so great a part in all these rhymes, it is to this day generally pronounced (i) in conversation, although declaimers will sometimes permit themselves to

---

1 "*Fier, fier, oci, oci*: Sous onomatopées représentant le chant du rossignol (répétés plus bas dans une chanson)." Roquefort, sub. *fier*, where he cites: "il y avoit au-dessus de luy ung cheme sur lequel avoit ung ros-signal qui chantoit tres melodieusement et cryoit ainsi que tout endeve et *fier, fier, oci,oci*," from *Roman de Ferce-Forest*. 

---
say (lai), and we find Gill in his transcript of the Psalms constantly using this sound, apparently to add dignity. He also says (madzx'estai), and, at least in one place (mer'sai), but the latter is probably a misprint, for he generally writes (mer'së). Modern poets, working upon an old foundation, permit themselves to consider -y, under a secondary accent, as either (-oï) or (-ii). This belongs to the licentiousness of modern rhyming, superinduced by an unphonetic orthography. I cannot consider this early usage of Gill to indicate in any way the old pronunciation. It was undoubtedly wrong in words which had formerly -ië, -ëi, and was probably fanciful in other cases. Dr. Gill had a notion that the (oï) added to the beauty and strength of the English language,¹ and hence his employment of it is suspicious unless well corroborated. As to the practice of modern times, it is sufficient to cite Walker and Smart, who, not recognizing the difference between (i, ï) identify this termination with (-li), but that is properly an Irishism. As, then, there seems no reason to suppose that this termination -ly ever had, in natural speech, the sound of (-lai) but only (-lii, -lii, -li, -li'), the conclusion in favour of the (ii, ïi) pronunciation of the other words seems inevitable. But those who have made up their minds to the (aï) pronunciation of long i, and especially of the pronoun I, will object that we have in Gill an actual example of the (aï) sound, and that we hear occasionally, under peculiar circumstances perhaps, and by no means uniformly in the same speaker, but still we do hear (-lai) now and then, and that it is possible that (-li) may be a "corruption" of (-lai), rather than (-lai) a mistaken intensification of (-li'). It is therefore necessary to try some other words, which are free from Gill's imputed (aï). Enemy is not such a word, for he writes (en'êmoiz), suprâ p. 110, note. But lady 5'190, i 292, 298, iii 325; almighty iii 61, worthy i 107, seem unexceptional. The words do not occur in Gill, but lady does occur in Salesbury, who transcribes it in Welsh letters ladi = (læd'i'). In modern ballad poetry we have constantly to read (leedii'),¹ but the pronunciations leedai, leedai¹ are utterly unknown. As this word determines -ly -by, by its rhymes, and these are sufficient to determine all the rest, the difficulty may be considered as solved.

But there are still important considerations which lead the same way, and which must therefore still be adduced. It is difficult to suppose that a cry and the verb to crye, had their y differently pronounced. This y would probably retain its sound in the inflected form cryede, often a dissyllable as cry'de. Now we find: cryede glide Cupide 4'349 in Troilus and Cryseyde from a good manuscript, and Cupide is one of those words in which we have already recognized the persistence of the (ii) sound. Again: cryede Cupide Cupide 5'9 occur in the same poem. Gower has: crime hide i 149, crime wide iii 213. All this points to the pronunciation (cri'de) and hence (cri') for the substantive. But there is one

¹ "Retinebimus antiquum illum et masculum sonum." Logonomia, p. 7.
² As in Sir W. Scott's Jock of Hazeldean, in which the first stanza is said to be ancient: "Why weep ye by the tide, ladie?"
word which seems at first sight to run counter to this conclusion: reneye 4796, 12196, 12376, 16047 etc, always meaning to renounce, abjure, in modern French renier, so that ey seems to answer to French i. But Roquefort (Gloss. de la lang. rom. ii, 463) gives the old forms renier, renier, and Kolham (Dict. of the Norman or Old French language 1779) has reneyes renegado, reënigne refuse. So that the i is a modern French development, which does not affect the present investigation.

Perhaps the strongest evidence of all is furnished by the very word enemies, which was lately rejected on account of Gill’s (en-e-maiz). Of course there is no doubt whatever of the sound of i in the words is, his. These words never could have been (eis, nais) at any time. No champion of (ai) could ever entertain such a notion as this. Now in Gower we have: pris is ii 341, wis is iii 226, which may be taken to settle the pronunciation of pris, wis i.e. price, wise, in the xvi-th century, and strongly corroborate the method by which we have already arrived at this result. Bearing this in mind, the rhymes: enemies pris ii 67, iii 199, enemies is ii 342, enimis his iii 214, enimis wis iii 216, leave no doubt that Gower said (en-emiz) or (en-emis), and that he therefore must have said (en-emit) as the natural pronunciation of his time, or have occasionally lengthened the final vowel into (ii, ii). But if so, all the rest follows from the rhymes: enemy I 1645, ryally enemy 1795, sodeinly enemy 16889, forthy enemy 1830, enemy why I 347, bealle enemy ii 75, enemy envy iii 320.

It seems impossible to form a stronger chain of evidence in favour of an unknown pronunciation, but the strength is rendered more evident by the circumstance that there is no instance of -i rhyming with -sy, except such as are explicable by the fact that the word had several sounds and several modes of writing, often used in other places, and that the scribe accidentally employed a wrong orthography, as in the instance: mercy sey 13308, already considered. Everything is therefore so far reconcilable with the hypothesis i = (ii, i), and many circumstances are irreconcilable with the hypothesis i = (ai, i). Hence I feel compelled to admit that even the personal pronoun I was called (i) by Chaucer. This personal pronoun had three forms, I most commonly, ic, ich, rarely. That in these latter forms the i was (i) short, seems proved by such contractions as theek 3862, theech 12857, 14962, = theek ik, thee ich. The diphthong could hardly have been so lost. Again the change ic, ich, would be unusual, though possible, if i were (ai). But I seems formed from ic, ich, just as a is from an. The original pronunciation of the indefinite article was of course (a), and it is now frequently (a, ae), but the emphatic pronunciation (ae) is of modern growth, and seems precisely comparable to the emphatic use of (ai) for (i) in I.

Further corroboration of the above conclusion will be afforded by considering the termination -is, -ye. In two instances Chaucer uses the French words par compaignye, at the end of a line, not as Anglicised, but as a real French phrase. There may be some doubt
as to the sound of _yn_, whether (_nj, nj_) or simply (_n_), as will be hereafter considered, but as it is also written as a simple _n_, it will be sufficient to consider it here as (_n_). The two last letters must have had the French sound, which cannot well be conceived as anything but (_ii'ë_), or the English modification (_ii'e_), a change so slight that the Englishman would have thought he was exactly correct. Hence: par compaignye, fantasie 3837, par compayne, molodye 4165, must be considered as establishing the English pronunciation (_fantasie, melodiesi'e_) of these Anglo-French words. The following rhymes strongly confirm this conclusion:

hostellrie, companye 23, multiplie Marie 15100, Emelye melodye 873, Emelye, gan to crie 2343, signified, sche cried 2345, philosophie, wolde he crie 647, envoye 9909, tyrannye espye 1113, chyvalrye curtesie 45, I made him frie, jalousie 6069, ragerie, as a pye 6037, maladie manye = _mania_ 1375.

I schal not lyse, companye 765, curtesye lyse 7251, vilonye, nat a flye 14189, Emelye, gan sche _hysse_ = _hīs_, _hasten_ 2275, harlotries, tollen thres 563, boile and frie, bake a _pys_ 385, melodie, my body _gys_ 12062, curtesie, for to _gys_ 7950, maladie, moist or _dryse_ 421.

The first list consist entirely of Anglo-French words, the second gives rhymes of such with other words. Now throughout Harl. 7334 this termination _-ye_ never rhymes with any other termination, such as _-y_ or _-e_, which has now received the same sound (_-i_). But during the xvth century the final _e_ was thrown off, and then these words fell into (_melodië, fantasieë_) etc., and became rhymes to _-ly_. These rhymes therefore not only show a later date, but indicate an identity in the pronunciation of _e_ in the two sets of words. As then we have no conception of there having been an (_si_) sound in the _-ye_ endings, (except in such words as _signify_, where of course it is due to the accent), we have a corroborating of our former conclusion that long _e_ was (_ii_, _ii_). Whenever we see in any manuscript of Chaucer or Gower such rhymes as _-y_, _-ye_, or as _-s_, _-ye_, we may be sure either that there has been some accidental orthographical error of the scribe, or that words of a more recent period have been substituted. The error is often very obvious and easy to remedy, thus: _high_ testifie 4-1, _majestie_ dignyte knye 4-3, see _ryallie_ 4-5, _libertie_ degree 4-10, _crystallie_ pyte 4-12, should have: _hysse_, _majestie_, _rallye_, _liberte_, _crystlle_. But degree _ye_ = _eye_ 4-5, I dye high 4-8, he cyewhy 4-10, I espysse _ye_ = _eye_ 4-10, he besly _ye_ = _eye_ 4-11, fantasye merly 4-15, _ye_ = _eye_ prettily 4-15, se _ye_ = _eye_ 4-27 etc., are certainly erroneous, and could not have been written by a xivth century writer. They serve therefore to discredit the MS. (R. iii. 20, Trinity College, Cambridge,) of the _Court of Love_.

1 Probably _significale_, _cryede_ are the proper forms.
2 Both French forms _envi, envie_ occur, old and recent, and both _emy_, _envie_ are found in old English.
3 The mistakes _hysse_ remedy 4629, _eyen_ apien 12426, _hes_ _eye_ 11503, _jalousie_ me 1809, have already been noticed (p. 260); the proper readings are _hysse_, _yen_, _hysse_ ye, _jolite_.

---

1, Y — Xivth Century. 283
Three other corroborative circumstances may be mentioned. First, if long ı had been (ai) in the xivth century and earlier, English would have presented the extraordinary spectacle of a language without a long (ii, ıı), one of the primitive vowel forms. Sir Thomas Smith had indeed reduced Latin to such a condition, but this was a purely artificial formation, due to a mistaken theory, and we may safely say could never occur in practice. Secondly, if long ı had been (ıı), we should have to account for its common unaccented form (i). There is a dispute among orthoepists as to whether (ıı) or (ı) should be pronounced in certain unaccented syllables, such as (sivilizá-shun) or (sivilizá-shun), or (díádhest-, dóádhest-), (in: finít, in-fánait). These disputes at least serve to show that there is no difficulty whatever in using (ıı) in an unaccented syllable, and hence make the employment of (ıı) inexplicable, except on the theory that it was the original normal sound. The change of (ıı) into (ı) is of course possible, but it is generally through (ei, ee, ii). We have this very transition in deceive, which was (desiv-ı) in the xiv th and even xvth centuries, became (desiv-ı) and passed into (desив-ı) in the xvth, and fell into (disiv-ı) in the xvi th century. But the transition took a long time. This was probably the course by which the old Greek ei reached the modern Greek (ii). We have no trace of such a change in the words considered. The third circumstance is, that the scribes of the xiv th and early part of the xvth centuries seem to have had no hesitation in writing ı and ei or y and ey according as they wished to indicate a difference of pronunciation. This is especially the case with the words die, dry, eye, high, lie, sib, tie, pine, which must therefore be considered individually.

Die = (daı’e, dıı’e). This common old English word is not Anglosaxon. The old Norse is deyja, ek dey, dö (deı’ja, ek deı, doı), and deıı in Ormin, deııın in Lagamon, deııı in the Promptorium, point out (daı’e) or (deıı’e) as the older pronunciation. The same sound is indicated by: seye deye 4944, 7207, waye deye 5010, 5238, 11649, disobeye deye 8239, deth seith 7623, seyde deye 2847, preyde deye 8424, sayde abrayde deye 8935, and generally. In: brayde prayde dye 16022, we have therefore a clerical error for dye. But we have a different spelling and a different set of rhymes in: Marie dye 5261, Emelye dye 1569, 1589, 1595, dye, folye 1799, ye = eye1 dye 7913, Lombardy hye allie dye 15886, die Galaxye 4:53. Hence in: dye vilonye 11715, dye biganye 5667, dye soggardy 11943, dye is a clerical error for dye. Whether this double pronunciation was of a much older date or not, it is difficult to say. The point to note here is, that there was a double method of spelling, and that, except from mere carelessness of the scribe, each method answered to its own rhymes, which we had previously recognised as (ai, ıı). At present (daı) is the common form, but (dıı) is more usual in South Shields, Kendal, Westmoreland, and Lancashire.

1 MS. Univ. Lib. Cam. Dd. 4. 24, reads eye deye, which is also legitimate.
Buy = (bii’e, bai’e). The first seems the older form as an alteration of biggen, the second is not so frequent: to byen 14467, bye housbondrie 5869, preye bye 12564.

Dry = (dri’e, drai’e). Here (ii) seems to have been the original form corresponding to ages (yy), and (ai) the derived. Ages dryge drige drege dry, Ornm. drüz. Hence: maladye drye 422, drye remedy 4·56, drye dye drie crie guye 5·208, where the first drye means to suffer, still found in Scotch as dree (dri). On the other hand: weye drye 8778, drye seye preye 4·64, where drye is evidently an error for dreye, awie drye(c) 1220, but: drie deie iii 98 might be: drye dye, or: dreye deye, probably the former. The form dreye seems proved, but it is not so common, and what is most important for the present purpose, it was a derived, not an original form, which the scribe was not content to leave under the old spelling drye. The legitimate inference is, therefore, that if in other words (ai) had been pronounced, ey would have been written. At present (dri, drai) are the common sounds, but (dri) is known in South Shields.

Eye = (a’i’e, i’e). The older sound seems to have been (aih’e, eih’e). The more usual orthography is eyghë, eyghen, or eyhen when the word does not occur final. I have not noted it in a rhyme in Chaucer, but we have: eie see i 72, eye sayce(e) i 127, and Pauli constantly writes eie when the MSS. have yhe. The guttural (kh) seems to have been often entirely lost, passing probably through (zh), and then becoming absorbed in the preceding (i); or more properly the diphthong (ei) grew out of (eh). The value (ii’e) results from: melodic yhe 9, company daseye = dassë = day’s eye 333, (for daysye hie 4·77, read daysye hye,) eyre yhe 1097, ye = eye plye 9044, yen wryc 17193. For: specifie eye i 3, highe eye i 106, sigh eye i 116, as Pauli writes, read: specifie ye, hye ye, syhe yhe. Although (ai) is very general, yet (ii) is almost the only form known in Newcastle, Cumberland, and Lancashire, and is even used in Devon.

High = (nai, ni). The older form is here (nei, nai) tho (i) being generated from (zh), the representative of (kh). The usual forms when the rhyme does not require the others, are heih, heigh, frequently with an added e. Possibly, as in eye, the guttural was early lost in developing the diphthong, compare Ormin’s hoh, heghë. In rhymes this older form is not common, and is often doubtful, thus: hye eyghte 3243, heygë eyghte 10587, might have been: hye ye. More certain seems: heygë piggesneyghë 3268, on heigh seigh = saw 1067, which may have been: on hih sib, compare 11162. This form often occurs in Gower, where Pauli writes: high sigh i 2, i 24, i 137. On the other hand the form (ni) is very common: hye crye 10725, hye prye 7319, high eye, read yhe 11347, eyen read yen, prien 9985; prye hye compagnie 4·222, hye gye compagnye 4·296, hye navye 5·215, hye jurye 5·253, hye skye 5·258, high read hye, pocie ii 36. (Hii) is used in Cumberland and Scotland.
Sly = (slai, slii). The first is the old form, in Orrin aleh, and (slii) is more recent. The rhyme slye, lye mentiri, ye oculus 5:37-8 is ambiguous; but if: high testific slye 4:1 should be bye, testific, slye, this is a rhyme in point. Sleigh occurs 3201, 4:339 v. 944. (Slii) is still found in Cumberland and South Shielida.

Tie = (tai'e, tiie). The first is the old form, from ages. tegan, the second seems to have come from a second form ags. tygan; sayd teyd 10305, gives the first distinctly, the form: tyged, Allit. Poems by Morris A. 464, suggests the second sound, for which I have noted no rhymes. (Tii) is found in Kendal, Cumberland, and Lancashire.

Pine, pain = (pi'ne, pai'ne), are really two separate words, but they are used so much in the same sense that they might be easily supposed to be different forms of the same word. The first is Anglo-Saxon, the second French, but both apparently come from Latin poena. They have come down to the present day also with different pronunciations (pain, peen), and different meanings. The following passages will shew how the words are confused by Chaucer as the exigencies of the rhyme require.

And when a beste is deed, he ne hath no peyne,
But man after his deth moot wepe and pleyne,
Though in this world he have care and woo:
Withouten doute it may stonde so.
The answer of this I lete to divinis,
But wyl I woot, that in this world grete peyne is. 1321
In whiche ther be som merthe or doctrine.
Gladly, quod I, by Goddes swete peyne. 16343
That telleth us the peyne of Jesus Crist. 16352
And sythen that I knewe of loves peyne
And wot how sore it can a man destreyne.
Ful gultele, by Goddes swete peyne,
For as an hars, I couthe bothe bite and whyne. 5967
who wolde suppose
The wo that in my herte was and peyne?
And when I saugh he nolde never peyne
To reden on this cursed book. 6389
In Armorik, that clepis is Breataigne
Ther was a knyght, that loved and dide his peyne
To serven a lady 11041

We thus see that in the fourteenth century there was a tendency to two forms in certain words, and that in general the original form has (/i/) and the secondary form (/ii/). In one case, however, at least, dry, the (/ii/) form appears to be the older. In every case, however, except from mere carelessness of the scribe, the two sounds were carefully distinguished as /ei, i/ or /ey, y/. There can therefore be very little doubt that when only one form /i/ or /y/ was employed, there was only one pronunciation, (/i/), because the scribe, who was hampered by no historical associations, must have many a time and oft written /ey/ if he had ever heard the sound (/ai/). In all of these cases the (/ii/) sound has been dialectically preserved.

This completes the argument in favour of the proposition with which I started, viz., that the sound of /i/ in Chaucer's time was (/ii, i/) and not (/ai, i/). But the result admits of illustration by
dialectic peculiarities in addition to those just adduced. Isolated and small societies necessarily preserve idiomatic expressions, peculiar words and peculiar pronunciations. Of course the so-called Anglo-Saxon which established itself in England was not uniform. The languages with which our dialects began, so to speak, were remarkably different in many respects. It is not merely the pronunciation of a few words which now distinguishes the men of the North, North-west, North-east, West, East, Midland, South-west, and South-east, from each other and from those who speak literary English. The whole intonation, many of the words, the idioms, the grammatical constructions, are different. The effects of isolation are shown strongly among the scanty population that speaks what we call Scotch, and consider it as a single language. Mr. Murray has been able to distinguish eight Scotch dialects so sharply as to translate the book of Ruth into each of them. In some of these dialects the differences of pronunciation are as great as those which separate English utterances in distant centuries. Nevertheless we feel that all these dialects have one common origin with the literary English, and that an examination of their peculiarities, as respects this vowel /r/, will be of some assistance in conceiving the former existence of a pronunciation so extremely different from our own. It was with this view that I requested the cooperation of those personally acquainted with these modes of speech—which every one must regret to see at present so imperfectly written, that the spelling conveys but little knowledge to a reader who is ignorant of the dialect, and whom the writing ought principally to aim at instructing.

Mr. James A. H. Murray's native dialect was that of Teviotdale, and this possesses a very remarkable peculiarity. The following words which are pronounced with (ii) in all other Scotch dialects, are in this dialect, which extends over Roxburghshire, Selkirkshire, and part of Dumfries, pronounced with (ei): eye, be, bee, die, dree endure, fee mad, a fly, to fly, free, gi' ye give you, glee squat, gree agree, he, key, lie falsehood, me, knee, pea, plea, pree try, see, stee steep, spee, tea, ti' ye to you, tree, thigh, three, wi' ye with you, agee aislant. That is where other Scots say: (ii, bi, di, dri, fi) etc, the Borderers say (ei, bei, dei, dree, fei) etc. This one peculiarity is very striking. Some of these words as: eye, fly, lie, thigh, are pronounced with (ai) in the South, but what Englishman would say (boi) for bee, (froi) for free and so on? Conjoined with this curious correspondence of (ei) with the (ii) of other dialects is another of precisely the same character. The sentence: You and me weil go over the dyke and pull a pea, is a perfect shibboleth in this dialect. Alone, in all Scotland, it says: (Jau an mei el gq our dri deik an pau e pei). On the other hand, the Edinburgher

1 See Mr. Murray’s paper on the Lowland Scotch Dialect, read before the Philological Society on the 4th and 18th Dec., 1888.

2 Mr. M. Bell writes (myi pyi) for (mei pei). The latter were the sounds as I appreciated them when Mr. Murray pronounced them.
would say: (Juu an miül jgeq xur dhi'deik on puu s pii). Observe the (Stu pau) for (juu puu) corresponding with (mei pei) for (miü pii). We have here, then, two sets of words in a living dialect corresponding in precisely the same way as the xviith century (ei ou) with the xvith century (ii uu),¹ and similarly in the Netherlands, we shall find (oi, ii) coexisting in adjacent provinces, as pronunciations of the written ị. The phenomenon, then, of the change of (ii uu) to (ei ou) ought not to present any very serious difficulties. Nor ought we to feel any great surprise at Palsgrave and Bullokar having retained (ii uu), while their fellow countrymen generally said (ei ou).

The sound (ii) for long i is by no means extinct, and the double use of (ii) and one of the (ai) sounds is, as we have seen, familiar in the very words which have been noted above. Mr. Murray, notwithstanding his residence in England, and his critical knowledge of our language, confesses that he is "continually discovering words which he has all his life pronounced with (ii) which Englishmen pronounce (ai)." "In fact," says he, "long (ii) is the sound we instinctively associate with the letter i unless we have been taught to pronounce it as in English." The following is taken from some remarks which Mr. Murray obligingly communicated in writing.

Fly s. and v. general Scotch (fii), but Teviotdale (fei). Cleveland (fii) a fly, but (fiiq) to fly, compare lie.

Lie (mentiri), general Scotch, Westmoreland, and Cumberland (lii), Teviotdale and Dumfriesshire (lei).

Lie (procumbere), Westm. Cumb. Lanc. and Cleveland (lig, leg); this does not seem to cross the border where the word is (lia, la', lohi), although the older Scotch always wrote lig, lyg.

By preposition of the agent, (bi). Teviotdale (Hei waz sin bi s'vèrelz) = he was seen by several.

By of place is always (bai, bohi).

Thigh Scotch, Westm. Cumb. and Cleveland (thii), Tev. and Dumf. (thei).

Friar = (frir), thus a part of Jedburgh is called the Freir.²

Briar = (britr), Cleveland (britr) and (brii), inquire (enkwiir'), choirm (kwii') and (kweer) (?), squire (skwiir).

Site, old people pronounce (sit, zit).

Neighbour = (nib'er), with a short vowel, not (nii'ber) as Englishmen hear.

Licks = (lek, leik), the latter more common, but (lek'liz) is used for likely; in Cleveland also, like = (lah'k), but likely = (lek'li, lik'li).³

¹ The difference between (au ou) is very slight, the latter having simply labialised the first element of the former, which effect readily produced by the action of the subsequent (u). The difference between (au ou) is merely that the first element of the latter is widened, and it would be presumptuous to attempt to discriminate between (au ou) in an ancient form of speech, when it would be difficult to do so in living pronunciation.

² A well of very fine water at Workington, Cumberland, is always called the (frir-x).

³ An old Scotch jeweller, who had
Oblige, obliged = (oblidzh·, oblīsit·) 3 and similarly in numerous French words, as invie, polite, and words of classical origin as idol (īd·i·l) type (tip), baptise, chastise, civilised (sī·vī·līz·t), advertise·ment.

Eye, general Scotch (ii), Teviotdale (ei), plural in both (in) with short (i). Cumb., Westm., Lanc., and North Yorkshire (ii, iin) with long (ii). Barnsley, South Yorkshire (ii, iiz).

High Tev. (xeik, hei, hai), other Scotch (xeikh, xikh, xii), as (as mi·lahnz az dhe xii rood) = as highland as the high road. 4 The guttural form is common but is passing away, and (nii) is used instead in Centre, West, and North of Scotland, as also in Cumb., and Westm. (nai, rohi) are the common recent forms in Teviotdale.


Dree (drii) endure, and so in Cleveland; but dry (drai dri dra' drohi), and so with buy.

Sly follows the analogy of high, but the guttural form seems only to occur in sleight (sleikht) like height (xeikt). The usual Scotch, Cumb., Westm., and Lanc. is (alii), Tev. (sei), or more commonly (alai, alohi).

His is not known to Mr. Murray in living speech, in reading ballads it is called (nai rohi) in Tev. In Westm. dialects it is sometimes written hii. 3

-light, words of this class, as right, might, light, sight, which in Scotland are (lekht, lekht) are in Cumb., Westm., Lanc., and Yorkshire, (riit, niit, liit, siit) etc. 4 In cases where -ight does not represent ags. -ht, the pronunciation is different, so fight ags. feoht, Tev. (feikt), Lanc. (fcit) not (fit). 5

Sigh (sekh).

China, the ware or the country (tabin·a, tabin·i), as in (Waht est wts at jens uut w tahin·i un enw tahin·i? Tc) = What is-it that—is at once out of China and in—of China? Tev. Walker

lived from youth in London, always said (lek) for like, in all senses. He was constantly using the word, and never seemed to hear that other persons pronounced it differently.

1 Observe the form of the past tense. I quite lately heard (oblidzh·; oblīsit·) from a noble lord at a public meeting.

2 Perthshire smilie in describing one who is ultra Celtic. Observe here the different use of (as, az).

3 A gentleman in Derby informed me that in North Derbyshire the pasountry say (mak iin) for make haste. Compare: I se where come a messengere in he·m in hast·e 4·10. ags. higan e. hp·h e. Promptorium hyyn p. 229.

4 Prof. Sedgwick, a native of the dale of Dent, Yorkshire, writing at upwards of eighty years of age, says: "I remember the day when all the old men in the Dales sounded such words as sigh, night, light, &c., with a gentle guttural breathing," which, he adds in a footnote, "seemed partly to come from the palate," and was therefore (4th). See: A Memorial by the Trustees of Cowgill (Ke·g·g) Chapel, with a Preface and Appendix, on the Climate, History, and Dialects of Dent, by Adam Sedgwick, L.L.D., senior fellow of Trinity College, and professor of Geology in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge, 1866, 8vo. privately printed, p. 103—a book of affectionate and interesting reminiscences of manners and speech, extending over nearly 120 years, through Prof. Sedgwick's father, the honoured clergyman of Dent, who was 50 years older than his son.

5 Several correspondents have confirmed this rule, and the exception.
gives (taheurri) for china ware or orange, but (Tahai'me) for the
country, and has a long note on it.

\textit{Bind, find, hind, blind, grind} = (bend, fend, rent, blend, grand),
\textit{wind v. and s.} = (wrend), but \textit{kind, mind, wynd} = (kwind, maxind, 
waind), and \textit{little} is often (hait-l) especially as a proper name.

\textit{Why!} as an exclamation, not \textit{why}? the interrogative, is (wi!?) in
Scotch, and (wivi!) in Cumb., Westm., Lanc., and Cleveland.
(Wiis! sez ai) = \textit{Why! says I}, is a common formula in the
Northern counties.

Can this existence of the (ii) sound, and its general association
with i in Scotland, be considered a modern development? Has it
not rather the appearance of an ancient form? The latter view
seems confirmed by seeing that numerous words are pronounced
with one of the (ai) forms as (ei, ei, ei, ai, ai, shi, xai), and that
these various forms are differently distributed in different localities,
whereas the (ii) form when it occurs is almost general. Mr. Murray
gives the two following lists of words which have (ei, ei) in Teviot-
dale, but (xai) in Western Scotch, the first element of these diph-
thongs being more distinctly heard than in English (ai, ou).

Tev. (ei), west Scotch (xai): bike \textit{woasp's nest}, dyke, \textit{fiko to ık},
like, pike \textit{pick, sike weet hollow}, spike, strike, ti_k; bite, clyte \textit{clot},
dite \textit{dot}, dite \textit{scold}, gite \textit{crasy}, kite \textit{a holly}, mite, kite (kneit) \textit{rap
the knuckles}, quite, white (keheit), spite, snite \textit{blow the nose}, wite
\textit{blame}, write (w'riet), yite \textit{zeit} \textit{yellow hammer}, gype \textit{goip} im-
guident \textit{fellow}, (meipel) awkward \textit{clown}, pipe, ripe, sipe \textit{cone}, snipe,
tripe, wipe; - bice, Brice, Christ, dice, grice, lice, mice, nice, price,
rice, spice, sklice \textit{slice}, trice, wise (weis), twice, thrice, fife \textit{Fife},
\textit{fie}, life, knife (kneif), rife, strife; - pint (peint), ninth (neint).

Tev. (ai), west Scotch (xai): bide, bride, guide, hide, pride, ride,
side, slide, tidy, wide; - jibe, kibe, siba (seiba) \textit{onion} Lat. cepa;
- guize, prize, rise, stays (steiz); - kithe \textit{shew}, liteh, wrih; - dive,
drive, hive, alive, lives, knives, deprive, schive \textit{slice}, strives, thrives,
wives; - tings (teiız) 
\textit{longe}, whings (weiiqz) \textit{shoe-strings}; - brine,
cryn \textit{dry in}, fine, line, mine, nine, pine, sine \textit{since}, swine, shine,
tine \textit{lose}, twine, wine, vine; - crime, dime, glime \textit{glimpse}, lime,
prime, rime, stine \textit{indistinct form}, time; - bile, file \textit{befoul}, guile,
kile \textit{hay-cock}, mile, pile, slide \textit{strain milk}, tile, vile, vile, stile,
smile; - bire \textit{coushed}, chair (teair), fire, hire, mire, sire \textit{sewer}, swire
\textit{tire}, wire; - wild, mild; - mind, hind, kind, rind, sind \textit{rinn}.

In the second list the consonant is a liquid, nasal, or voiced
letter, which distinguishes it from the first. Generally in Scotland
when English long i or y is final in monosyllables, as \textit{cry}, \textit{dyce}, or a
long i occurs in underived words, as \textit{dial, trial}, the sound is (ai),
and in Teviotdale (ai, xai). Derivatives follow their root sounds.

The two sounds, that is the (ei, ei, xai, ai) series, and the (ei, ai,
ai, xai) series, attributed to the Scotch long i, are strongly insisted
on by Scotchmen, and in 1848 when I was printing much English
in a phonetic form, the Scotch always exclaimed against the use of

\footnote{1 In Aberdeen (vriiit) or (bhriiiit).}
one sign for the two forms. The late Professor W. Gregory, of
Edinburgh, divided the sounds into (ai) and (ai),¹ in which case they answer to the two sounds heard in Isaiiah in England. Mr.
Melville Bell in a private letter says that: "in different districts you hear (a', a', ahi), but the representative sound is (ai). This is
heard regularly when the sound is final, before a vowel, or before
final r, and generally when it occurs before (z) or (v). This (ai)
is the 'genteel' form of i. I hear it from all my educated Scotch
pupils; though they come from widely separated districts they give
(ai) for 'I' etc., with absolute uniformity." The other sound (ei)
is the regular one for i in other syllables, and in a few words for
a," as aye, pay, clay, Tay, May, way, plague, etc. In Teviotdale,
aye, may, are called (ei, mei) to distinguish them from (ei, mei) =
ees, me.

My dialectic correspondents (p. 277 note), and Mr. Murray have furnished me with the following words in which (ii) or (ii)² re-
 mains in the provinces. Abbreviations—C. Cumberland, D. Devon,
Db. Derbyshire, K. Kendal, L. Lancashire, N. Norfolk, S. Shields,
generally South Shields, sometimes North Shields, and occasionally
Newcastle, Sc. general Scotch, W. Westmoreland, Y. Yorkshire,
Yc. Cleveland, Yorkshire The list is of course very incomplete,
both in words and localities. The numerous French and classical
words pronounced in Scotland with (ii), p. 289, are omitted.

Words spelled with I, usually sounded (ai), but Provincialy
Pronounced (ii).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alike D</td>
<td>fly s. CKSScWY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>briar Cy</td>
<td>fly s. CKLSsYYc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright CKLSW</td>
<td>fiair GSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by preposition of agent Sc</td>
<td>bright S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child D</td>
<td>hiis Db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die CKLSScW</td>
<td>high C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry S</td>
<td>hind s. C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyke N</td>
<td>iide D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye CKLSScWY</td>
<td>ill O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyesight Y</td>
<td>kindly D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be difficult to suppose that in all these cases, widely
differing from ordinary use, and extending over several counties,
the (ii) should have been a recent transformation of (ai). The
probabilities are all the other way.

The personal pronoun I is one of the greatest difficulties. In the
Aryan languages its changes have been great. The original word
seems to have been (a) to which a strengthening termination (gham)

¹ See my Essentials of Phonetics, p. 172, note, where (ai) is used when not
followed by a consonant and before the
inflectional (d, z), and also before (v, x),
but otherwise (ai) is more common.
² Mr. Murray accounts for this ab-
normal uniformity, by saying that (ai)
is not a Scotch sound, but the Scotch
conception of the proper pronunciation
of the English long i. In England
(ai) is rather cockneyed.
³ It is impossible to trust the unac-
customed ear to distinguish these
sounds, though they have separate
letters i, i, in Icelandic.
was affixed, producing (aghim) as in Sanscrit.1 The vowel (a) was
retained, and the following guttural altered to a sibilant in Zend,
Lithuanian, and old Sclevonic. In Greek, Latin, and Gothic, the
guttural was retained, but the vowel palatalized, into (e) in Greek
eββον (eghoon), and Latin ego (ego’o, eg’o) which retained por-
tions of the following syllable, and into (i) in Gothic (ik), which
dropped the following letters. This low German form (ik) was the
normal Saxon form, probably (iok), and the orthography ioc in
Obrian, guarantees the shortness of the vowel. In Icelandic we
find ec, eik, eg, where the vowel seems to have become long, and (i)
was prefixed in speaking. The Modern Danish is jeg (jei, jai). In
Chaucer as we have seen (p. 282), the form is still occurs, and is
sometimes palatalized to iek (iteh), but the usual form in Chaucer
and Gower is I.2 By Shaksper the words I, eye, aye were identi-
fied in sound (p. 112). The frequent phrase quot-a, may some-
times mean, quoth I, but is often interpreted quoth he, and the well-
known passage in Henry V, act ii, sc. 3, describing the death of
Falstaff, is full of a for he. Now as he was certainly generally
pronounced (mi), as it was frequently written see, at that time, the
provincial, or vulgar, or dialectic correspondence of (a) with (mi),
would be precisely similar to a dialectic use of (a) for (ii), sup-
posing the last to have been Chaucer’s personal pronoun. At the
same time the acknowledged form (mi) for he, would lead us to
expect some acknowledged forms (ii) or (iii) for I, existing in
dialects.

Now both of the forms (a) and (ii) exist in the provinces for I,
though the traces of (ii) are very few and very slight, but few as
they are, it would be difficult to account for them except by the
action of an old tradition, and as in some cases the pronunciation
is only known among very old people and is fast going out, it may
have been much more common as lately as one or two hundred
years ago.

1 Bed = I had: If eed done soa, it wad sartainly hev been
better.”2 “I, eye, eigh. Yes. I is sometimes pronounced like E, par-
icularly when the pronoun follows the verb, as ‘do E,’ for I
do.”3 “I is often sounded like E, in in,”4 probably (i) as a con-
tracted form of (in).

1 F. C. August Richter, Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Grundsprache in
ihrem Bestande vor der Völker tren-
nung, 1888, p. 4. C. F. Koch, His-
torische Grammatik der Englischen
Sprache, vol. 3, p. 3.

2 The omission of the guttural is
quite similar to the (ai, i, mi, di, si,
aa, do, no) for euch, ich, mich, dich,
sich, auch, doch, noch, in the neigh-
bourhood of the Danube, Bavaria,
Schmeller, Grammatik art. 427. So in
old high German, and old English we
find ihe for ih ne, in ne, Graff, 1, 118,
Rel. Ant. 1, 235.

3 Rev. W. Corr, Craven Glossary,
vol. i. p. 127, 2nd ed.

4 Ibid., p. 241. The author cites as
an illustration, what looks like a coup-
plet, from Cant. Tales, 12530, by which
it seems as if me, I rhymed. Of course
this was not the case. The author has
taken together two lines belonging to
different couplets, and the whole rhymes
are żolte me, I thrifty.

5 Ibid. The author has unfortunately
not followed any strict orthography, and
has not attempted to explain that which
he has used.
In Lancashire (i) is used when unemphatic, as (man i tel dhe?) must I tell you.¹

In Blackburn "the old fashioned way" of pronouncing I is (i) very short.²

"I have frequently heard old people pronounce I like our own ee (ii), especially in the interrogative form, did ee do it? will ee go? must ee do it? etc. This is very common, in fact about twenty years ago it was the invariable pronunciation. In the phrase: (aiz gva’an ham, at is ii) = I am going home, that is I, ee (ii) is as decidedly emphatic as I ordinarily is. The contraction I’ll for I shall, is frequently given ee’ll. Ee is also used occasionally but very seldom in every tense and form. This pronunciation is only used by old people here, but in central Cumberland it is more general. The same people use the form (as) and sometimes (a), but never in questions or in the direct future."³

Scarceley less convincing as respects the vowel in English ich are the contractions cham, chas, chil (taham, tahas, tahil) for ich am, ich was, ich will, mentioned by Gill (Logonomia p. 17) as a Southern pronunciation, in Rev. W. Barnes's edition of the Glossary of the Dialect of Forth and Bargy, and in the Glossary to his Poems in the Dorset dialect, 1858, p. 150. See also J. Jennings, Dialects of the West of England.⁴

The dialectic pronunciations Ise, 'ch are preserved in Shakspere, King Lear, act iv, sc. 6, l. 240, Globe ed., Tragedies p. 304, col. 2, folio 1623, which reads:

   ¡Edg. Chill¹ not let go Zir,
   Without vurtuer ‘casian.
   Stew. Let go Slane, or thou dy’st.

   ¡Edg. Good Gentleman goe your gate, and let poore volke passe: and ‘chud⁶
   ha’bin swagged out of my life, ’twould not ha’bin so long as ‘tis, by a
   vortnight. Nay, comne not nere th’old man: keepe out che vor’y’s,⁷ or ice⁸
   try whither your Costand, or my Ballow be the harder; chill⁹ be plains with you.

   Stew. Ou! Dunghill.

   ¡Edg. Chill¹ pick your teeth Zir: come, no matter vor your foymes.

About thirty years ago utchy (stah’s?) was in use for I in the Eastern border of Devonshire and in Dorset, and examples of cham, chould = I am, I would, occur in the "Exmoor Scolding," which dates from the beginning of the last century.⁹

The prevailing dialectic forms of the pronoun are however (a, e, a, oh) occasionally (a, u), and (ai, a, ohi, ai, oi). In Derbyshire I generally heard (a), but in the northern parts it is said to be (ai).

Mr. Murray writes: "I in the Northern dialects of England is

¹ Letter from Mr. John J. L. Jackson, teacher of languages, Manchester.
² Letter from Mr. T. Fielding, Manchester.
³ Letter from Mr. J. N. Hetherington, Clifton Parsonage, Workington, Cumberland.
⁴ For these references to Glossaries I am indebted to Mr. W. Aldis Wright, Trin. Coll. Cambridge.
⁵ I will.
⁶ I would.
⁷ Printed chmare yu in the 4to, 1608.
⁸ "Austrole—(Tahi voor xi), pro (ai warrant you) certum do," Gill, Logonomia, p. 17.
⁹ "Ise = I; printed ë = I’ll, in the 4to. 1608.
¹⁰ Letter from Mr. John Shelly, Plymouth.
usually a simple vowel of the (a, æ, oh) series. In some dialects it is, when accented, a diphthong composed of the same first element and (i'); In Scotch (oh, aa), even when emphatic (oh woud'ne goh') = I would not go. In Ayryshire it would probably be (aai, aa'j) in such a case, so also in Cumb. and Westm. In Lancashire it is (aa) even when emphatic, in Barnsley, Yorkshire, (ss). When unemphatic it is in all the dialects an obscure (a, æ, u), it is hard to say what."

Unemphatic syllables have always a tendency to fall into this colourless (a, u) sound. Even in Germany, where there is no tendency to pronounce ich (ikh) with an (ai), rapid speaking will generate (a), as (hab'odii, las'umi, tsa'tode, deq'omaa) = habe ich dich, lasse ich mich, thäte ich dir, denke ich mir, in Bavaria.1

The confusion of (i) with (e) penetrated, as we have seen, into orthography, p. 272. But during the xvth century there also arose a tendency to thin (ee) into (ii), whereby so many (ee) of the xivth century became (ii) by the xvth. This tendency was precisely the same as that which converted so many of the remaining (ee) into (ii) at the beginning of the xviiith century, p. 88. Now if we suppose these two tendencies to act together, which is no extravagant hypothesis, since they certainly co-existed, the result would be that (ii) would be begun as (ee) and ended as (ii), that is that (ii) would become first (eii) and then (ei). During the same time we know also that (oo) was in many instances refined to (uu).

We might therefore suppose that there was the converse tendency to take (uu) as (uw), and then as (oo), which is by no means uncommon, and then that the joint action of these two tendencies produced first (ou), then (ou) or (ou) as it would have been certainly accepted. This supposition as to the mode of generating (ei, ou) from (ii, uu), has the advantage of being based upon known facts. But the considerations adduced on p. 283, are quite sufficient to account for the change. At the present moment the (ee, oo) of the South of England are actually changing into (ei, ou), and these sounds have been developed by the less educated, and therefore more advanced speakers, the more educated and therefore less advanced having only reached (eii, ou)² although many of them are not conscious of saying anything by (ee, oo).

1 Schmeller, Mund. Bay. art. 284.
² "The English alphabetic accented a, in the mouth of a well-educated Londoner ... is not quite simple, but finishes more slenderly than it begins, tapering so to speak, towards the sound (i) .... ō in a Londoner’s mouth is not always quite simple, but is apt to contract towards the end, finishing almost as oo in soo." B. H. Smart, Walker Remodelled, 1836. Principles, arts. 1 and 7. Mr. M. Bell, among “English Characteristic” reckons: “The tendency of long vowels to become diph-Ponges. This is illustrated .... in the regular pronunciation of the vowels in aid, aid, aim, ache, &c. (ai), oise, oak, globe, &c. (ou). The same tendency leads to the ‘Cockney’ peculiarity of separating the labio-lingual vowels (u, o) into their lingual and labial components, and pronouncing the latter successively instead of simultaneously. Thus we hear (oo, uu, yu) for (u), and (e’o, o’e, a’eh) for (o).” Visible Speech, p. 117. As Mr. Bell marks the second element by the glide sign he does not distinguish the length of
CHAP. IV. § 2. I, Y — XIVTH CENTURY.

As has been already remarked, p. 234, the change from (ii, uu) to sounds of the (ai, au) order has not been confined to England, but took place in the literary language of the other Germanic countries, nearly at the same time, that is, during the xvth and xviith centuries; and in these countries as well as in England traces of the original pronunciation remain in the provinces.

Siegenbeek, whose work on Dutch Spelling originated the orthography now in use, tells us that old Dutch manuscripts employed i, ı, for their long i, which, partly for distinctness and partly for ornament, became ıj, and hence that the inhabitants of Friesland, Zeeland, Guelders, Overyssel, and Groningen, who still pronounce (ii), evidently preserve the ancient sound; but that the inhabitants of the province of Holland had at an early period changed the sound into one very like (ei)¹ and that after the Spanish disturbances, that is, about the end of the xviith century, this province having become the seat of learning and civilisation, its pronunciation necessarily became prevalent, and is now the literary pronunciation of the country.² Hence we have an indubitably ancient (ii), preserved in those provinces of the Netherlands whose dialect most resembles ancient English, and passing into an (ai) in other provinces which by a political accident was able to set the fashion of pronunciation.

the first element, so that with him (œ, œ) have already in appearance become (ei, ei), but this does not represent his actual pronunciation, which is rather (œj, œ w).

¹ The Dutch ij, ei differ slightly, if at all. Sir Hendrik Gisela, D.D., minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in Austin Friars, London, who kindly pointed out to me the passage in Siegenbeek (Siighgenbeek) referred to in the text, and confirmed what is there said of the provincial (ii), said that he felt more of the e in pronouncing ei than ij, reminding me much of Gill's remark (supra p. 114), of being diffuse over the e. At first he seemed to call both (ei), but afterwards he recognized my (oi, ei) as the two sounds, and, assuming the English as (ai), he said he considered the Dutch a neatier sound. The distinction (ei, ei) is precisely that which I had to make in Gill, and, considering the close connection between Dutch and English, the coincidence is remarkable.

² "Doch deze enkele i kon geen plase hebben in lettergrops, op eenen medeklinker stuitende, als mijn, zijn, blijf, en sooortgelijke; maar moet hier noodzakelijk verduubeld worden.—Men schreven dus oudtijds, met eene dubbele i, blijf, wie, schrijf, von welke schrijf-wijze, in oude handschriften, nog vele sporen voorhanden zijn. Doch, om de gelijkheid der dubbele i met de u, waaruit ligtelijk verwarring kon ontstaan, en mischien ook sieraadshalve, begon men de tweede i reeds vroeg met een' langen staart te schrijven, 't welk man, bij hare plaatsing vóór eenen vokaal aan het begin der woorden, inangelijk in zwang bragt. Wij kunnen niet voorbij hier in doen opmerken, dat zij, die, in de woorden blijven, schrijven, mijn, zijn, bij de uitspraak den klank der enkele i en dubbele i doen hooren, als de Vriezen, Zeeuwten, Gelderschen, Overijsselschen en Groningers, blijkens het voorgestelde, de echte en oorspronkelijke uitspraak dezer woorden behouden hebben. Doch op de tong der Hollanders is deze echte klank reeds vroeg verloren geraakt, en voor eenen anderen, evenzins zwemende naar den klank ei, verwisseld geworden. Nadat nu Holland, waarlangs, na de Spaansche beroeringen, de voornoemde zetel der beschadigheid en wetenschappen werd overgebracht, door middel van dit uitteekend voorregt, zijne uitspraak meer en meer als de algemeene en heerschende heeft doen gelden, is ook die verbastering in de meest beschadigde uitspraak en daarop gebouwde schrijfwijsche ingevoerd, en
We have precisely the same phenomena in the less closely related
High German dialects. An old and middle high German ð (ii)
became a modern High German ë (ai). All these latter ë are how-
ever not derived from ð (ii), but some come from a middle and old
High German ë (ei), answering to the Gothic ai (ee). Moreover
we have the same phenomenon of a persistence of the sound of (ii)
in the provinces, notwithstanding the real change of orthography
from ñ to ë, whereas in Dutch the change is only apparent, from
ñ to ë, and hence resembles the English retention of ñ through a
change of sound. Schmeller says: "ë sounds, conformably with
its origin, like a long (ii) by the lake of Constance, i.e. on the Upper
Rhine, and by the tributaries to the Weser from the Rhön-chain of
hills;" (min, diin, siin,—bii, drii, Iis, Fliis, Liim, Liib, bhiiis, Tsiiit
—biis-e, blii-be, griis-e, ii-le, lii-de, shii-de, shrii-be, trii-be),
== mein, dein, sein,—bei, drei, Eis, Fleiss, Leim, Leib, weiss, Zeit,—
beissen, bleiben, greifen, ellen, leiden, schneiden, schreiben, treiben.
Also on the Lauter (sin) for soyn, on the Ii (ii) for sein, as in
(ii,span-e) == einspannen; on the east of the Leech, (drii)-fach,
(drii)-fueez, (shliih)fstein." 3

Dr. Rapp in the passage previously cited (supra p. 235) has
endeavoured to give the relations of all the long vowels throughout
the Germanic languages, and it seems while to reproduce his
table here, although it is only a sketch, and requires much filling
in to make it at all complete. The first line gives what Dr. Rapp
imagines to have been the seven primary vowels in this system of
languages. The lines 2 to 6, refer to the older, the lines 7 and 8
to the intermediate, and the following lines to modern forms. The
pronunciations assigned may be occasionally disputed, but they are
near enough for the present purposes, and without attempting to
make any change, I have translated the phonetic symbols as well as
I could understand them. The uniformity with which the Germanic,
as distinguished from the Scandinavian, branches have in
recent times adopted the (ai, au) forms in place of (ii, uu) is very
striking. Many persons may feel that it is an argument in favour of
the pronunciation of ñ long as (ii) in Anglosaxon, and therefore in
Early English, that the Scandinavians certainly called their long ñ
(ii), as their descendants in Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark
continue to do. But that conterminous districts may differ precisely
upon this point we have already seen in the case of Scotland (p. 287)
and Holland (p. 294), and another instance may be cited from the

Sprache, iii, 267. Grimm, Deutsche
ib. 95, 106, 176, 182, 225. Grimm
assumes Gothic ei, ai = (ei, ai) appa-
rently; in Chap. V, § 4, No. 3, the
sounds (ii, ee) are preferred.
2 In the same district, au sounds as
(uu) conformably with its origin.
3 Mundarten Bayern's Art. 244.
Norman peninsula containing Cherbourg. At Montebourgh, only fifteen miles SSE of Cherbourg, the pronunciation of \( i \) as (ai) is very common, whereas at Beaumont Hague, on the same peninsula and only twenty-five miles NW of Montebourgh, this pronunciation is unknown.\(^1\) Such examples show the necessity of examining existing phases of pronunciation before attempting to decide upon extinct usages.

### Relations of the Seven Long Vowels in the Germanic Languages according to Dr. M. Rapp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Vowels</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gothic</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Icelandic</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>iu</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anglosaxon</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>A0</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Friesian</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Old Saxon</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Middle Saxon</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Middle German</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>iE</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. English</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Danish</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>yy</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>oE</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Swedish</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dutch</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High German</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Suabian</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>oE</td>
<td>oE</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Frankish</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. East Frankish</td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>oE</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Bavarian</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>oE</td>
<td>oE</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>broad</th>
<th>thief</th>
<th>wide</th>
<th>leaf</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jahr</td>
<td>breit</td>
<td>Dieb</td>
<td>weit</td>
<td>Laub</td>
<td>gut</td>
<td>Haus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the subject is far from exhausted, as we are thus led into an examination of the cognate dialects, sufficient has been adduced to show the antecedent probability of the theory that in the xivth century long \( i \) was pronounced as (ai), and as all the facts which we have been able to discover, agree with and are explicable by this theory, whereas the usual hypothesis that long \( i \) was one of the (oi) diphthongs during all periods of our language, is not reconcilable with many of the facts adduced, and is opposed to the general tendency of the cognate dialects on the continent, it seems to be the only legitimate inference that in Chaucer's time long \( i \) was (ai) and short (i) was (i).

\(^1\) This curious fact is given on the authority of Dr. Le Taill, mayor of Beaumont Hague, but a native of Montebourgh. See the note on M. Le Hériche and Normand, \( i \), at the close of Chap. V, \( i \), No. 3.
U — XIVTH CENTURY.

After the lengthened proof which has been given that long ɔ in the xviith century had the French sound (yy), it follows almost as a matter of course, that those words in Chaucer which have long ɔ, and which are as a general rule all taken from the French or Latin, had also the sound of (yy),¹ and this will be further confirmed when we find that (nu) the only other sound it was likely to represent had a different symbolisation, ou. We may, however, notice the pure French rhyme—

Another day he will par adventure
Play the, and bring the to lure. 17003

compare by aventure 25, the English phrase. With this French sound there was also a tendency to dwell on the syllable ure with more accentual stress, so (naa tyyr) 11, and

Venus, if it be youre wil
Yow in this gardyn thus to transfigure
Biforn me soreful wicked creature. 1106

Short ɔ was properly (u) or (u) as in the xviith century, and as in the Anglosaxon times. This we see from the Latin rhymes—

Sayde Plato. Ye, sire, and is it thus? 13384
This is ignotum per ignotiæ.
In which I pleyne upon Virginius.
And if he wile seyn it is nought thus. 13582

At the same time we find ɔ short occasionally used as a substitute, apparently, for e and i short, where we cannot imagine that a difference of pronunciation was intended, as for example in the verbal termination -ed, bathud 3, ensipurad 6, esud 29, while in the same passage occur parced 2, engendred 4, semed 39. In connection with the common forms list, lest should lyst 102 be taken as different, or as another way of writing the same sound? Suister 1835, 8465, seems to have some claim to be called (susster) on account of the form soster 3486 rhyming with Pater-nooster, and the Anglosaxon form suuter as well as susooster, swyster, but it may have been likewise generally called (suster).

In fithul 298 = fiddle, fasur 100 = father, guilt 10142 = guilt,

¹ Mr. Murray informs me that ɔ still retains its French sound in Scotch in words taken from the French, as: tune, lute, cure, sure, Bruce, reduce, conduc, consume, assume, bruise, judge, endure, rude, mute, secure, use, abuse, suit, noble, false, just, is the Cockney (dzist) a corruption of (dzyst)? It looks very like it.] justice, humour (ymar), ulzie (y-li, y-lij) oid, and similarly ɛ, ɛ are representatives of (i, aj), changed in some districts into (i, aj) in: asulzie augist, tuilkze a quarrat, tuilkze contents of the parish dust oart, the toom's fuisie, gaberiuinzie scalt, cuinzie coin. But when ɛ is final, and where ɛɛ is pronounced (ui) in English, whether derived from French or Anglosaxon sources, it is sounded (ai) or rather (yu) with the accent on the first element, as in: blue, due, duty, sue, ensue, hue, fou, dew, rue, crew, blew, fiew, grow, threw, brew, drew, view, new, cew, Jew, rule (rul, ryl), sew, skew, beauty, feu, feu'd, feudal, queue (kyu), lewd, ruin (ruv'n), Euau (Ywau) not (Juawn). But the meow of the cat, and some of the kitten are in Teviotdale called (meu, wasu).
first 1920 = first, compare forest 530, huld 16699 = held, hulden 15802 = helden, hules 7921 = hills, put 14982 = pit, and many other cases there seems to be no doubt that u must be read as i or e. Compare Canterbury 16, with: from Canterbury, the more mery 803, and this again with the three rhymes—

And thus I let him sit in the pirie
And January and May romyng mirye.

thow tho Marcius,

That writest us that like wedyng mery
Of hir Philologie and he Mercurie.

Him thought that how the wended god Mercurie
Byform him stood, and bad him to be muryse.

Here we have all three spellings mirye, merye, murye of the same word, the first rhyming distinctly with i short or long, (i) or (ii), and the two last rhyming with u long which we must consider as (yy). Now in the Schipmannes Tale there is occasion to mention the town of Bruges, and we find it spelled Bruges 14466, but Briggs 14472, 14669, 14712, which must have been intended for the same sound. Recollecting that the sound of (y) short is in Sweden, Denmark, and most of Germany scarcely distinguished from (i) short, into which it very often entirely falls, it occurred to me that the explanation of this use of u short as i might be a similar vagueness or indistinctness of pronunciation, and that the scribe, writing from dictation, either actual or internal, (for it will be found that the copyist usually pronounces the words to himself as he writes, with a mental effort which reproduces the sound to his consciousness although it is externally inaudible, and although the organs of speech are not even put into the corresponding positions), feeling doubtful, occasionally wrote u, but generally i or e. This theory supposes that the (y) was a known English sound, and that the u represented the Anglosaxon y. In the words busy, bury where the old u spelling has clung to the words notwithstanding the (i, e) sounds, we have y in Anglosaxon bysig, byrigean. Trust is marked by Salesbury as having the sound (i), and so it has in Scotch, where (pit) or (pet) is also said occasionally for put. This again calls to mind the East Anglian (kiv-er)1 for (kuv-er), now (kuv-er) = cover, mentioned in Gill, and also his denunciation of the Mopey transformation of (butsch-erz) meet into (bisth-erz) mitt. There would seem therefore to be some physiological connection between u short, and i short, which must be sought for in the elevation of the tongue, both being high wide vowels, although (u) is back and (i) front, (u) round and (i) primary.

This theory that, when short u stood for short i or e, it was in fact meant for the short sound of the French u (y), of which the long sound was at that time represented also by u, will receive additional corroboration in the next chapter.

The East Anglian Promptorium writes everynge, and, in connection with the words we have been previously considering, it is interesting to note the spellings fydyl fiddle, fauder father, gyple guilty, forest first, hyllys hills, put pit, pult put, lysty lusty, cytysr sister, Mercurys Mercury, myry merry.
In Trevisa's Higden, taking the chapter 59, De Incolarum Linguis and comparing the text in Mr. Morris's Specimens of Early English, p. 338, taken from the Brit. Mus. MS. Tiberius, D. vii., with the Harleian MS. 1900, and Caxton's edition (Brit. Mus. C. 21. d) I find the following spellings:

**Tiberius D. vii.**  **Harleian, 1900.**  **Caxton.**

buþ  beþ  ben
furste  first  first
burketonge  birketonge  langage
sylthe  syþþe  syn, syth
lurnede  lerned  lerned
wondur  wonder  wonder
undurstondeþ  vnderstondeþ  vnderstande

This comparison at any rate shews that different scribes had a different feeling as to the vowel that should be employed, and proves the practical identity of this short u with short i or e. If any one will resolutely say,¹ (byth, fyrst, byrythetuq, syth'e, lyr'nede, wun'dyrd, un'dyrdstendeth), and then compare his pronunciation with provincial utterances of the same words, which are the best living representatives of the ancient, he will be better able to appreciate the trouble of the scribe in selecting the proper letter, on the theory here advanced. It must be borne in mind that the scribe was quite familiar with long (yy) and had a letter for it, u, and that he had no other letter for short (y) but the same u, although he had three signs for short (u), viz. u, o, ou. In such a case he most probably felt it to be a greater liberty to use i, or e, than u in many words, although, to avoid the ambiguity of sound (y, u) in the letter u, he often employed i, e.

Although it is of course possible that there was a dialectic West of England pronunciation (u) which replaced (y) or (i),² it is at least extremely doubtful, and certainly cannot apply to the indifferent use by the same writer of u and e in similar situations in the same sentence as already pointed out (p. 298).

¹ Without considerable practice an Englishman may find the distinct enunciation of these words very troublesome, especially when he feels bound to keep himself clear of (u, i, e). The true short (y) in a closed syllable is an especial stumbling block to Englishmen. Prof. Max Müller, gets so often called (Müller) and (Müller), that it is a pity English people do not know that these sounds would be unintelligible in Germany, where their own (Müller) would be readily understood. Even Wilkins, who lived at a time when we know from Wallis that (yy) was a common sound in England, and who must have constantly heard the sound from Wallis himself, says that this vowel is of "laborious and difficult pronunciation ...... especially in the distinction of long and short." See suprà p. 176.

² Mr. Barnes, in his Poems of Rural Life in the Dorset Dialect, 1846, p. 31, says: "U in wall, will, is rather unsettled, being mostly sounded in the Vale of Blackmore as u in bull (u); but in some parts will is wull, wull in will (o), and sometimes wull with the u of German müller (y). ...... In the Vale of Blackmore will is at different times woll, wull and wull (wel, wel, wyl) even in the same mouth." In the introductory letter to Nathan Hogg's Letters in the Devonshire Dialect, by Mr. Henry Baird, of Exeter, 1847, 12mo, pp. 51, I find the following orthographies kindly interpreted for me
The conclusion is that U in the xivth century was generally (yy, u), but short U was occasionally employed for (i, e), which were generally sounds into which a more ancient, originally Anglosaxon (y), had fallen, although through errors of the scribe U was employed in many words for I, E simply.

EU, EW — xivth Century.

In the xvth century there were two pronunciations of this combination, as there were also in the French language, (yy, eu). The following lists may be collected from Chap. III., under the headings eu (p. 137) and u (p. 163), where the italicised words in eu are now spelled with eu.

EU = (yy); blow, brew, glacier, know, mew (of hawks), new, reuse (a plant), slow, sneeze, truce
EU = (eu); dewe (moisture), ewe, fewe, to hew, mew (of cats), sewer (a waiter), shew, shrew, stew

Rhymes in eu are necessarily few in number. I have noted rather more than thirty in the Canterbury Tales. For the purposes of comparison an alphabetical list of all the words in these rhymes, including one Latin word, and a few words whose spellings seemed of importance, though they do not occur in rhyming syllables, has been annexed. Against each word its pronunciation in the xivth century has been written, when it could be ascertained, on the authority of Bull. (Bullokar), But. (Butler), G. (Gill), P. (Palgrave), S. (Salesbury), S. (Smith). The immediate ags. (Anglosaxon) or fr. (French, often old French), origin follows, together with the orthography, when it could be found, in the Pr. (Promptorium), the first being the reading in Mr. Albert Way’s text, and the subsequent ones those which he adds from other MS. Next follow the rhymes in which the word occurs, with its orthography in the place and the reference number. By this means a complete comparative view of all the words is furnished, which will enable us to draw a satisfactory conclusion.

by Mr. J. Shelly, of Plymouth, in which u is apparently used for (a, o, u, y, yy, a, o); eur (vay) for, eury (varri) very, gude (good) good, du (dyd, dy) do, parmuting (parmuti) promoting, dude (dud) did, yu’ve (rxy) you’ve, so (ov) of, kuse (kose) course, tail (tal) tell, spull (spal) spell, beatiful (beautiul) beautiful, use (uls) else, abul (ebul) able, uny (uny) only, thur (tha) then, wulling (wailin) willing, bukes (books) books, addu (addy) adieu. Here we have dude (dud) precisely as in the xiii th century, in Robert of Gloucester etc, but tail, spull (tal, spal) seem to indicate an ancient (tal, spul); yet this may not be the case, for (tal, spal) may be representatives of (tal, spal). The Devonshire (y) is here seen to be uncertain and to admit (e) as well. The same is the case in Norfolk. Mr. M. Bell hears French u as (e). In Nathan Hogg’s New Series of poems, including ‘Mackey Lane’ a ghost story in the Devonshire Dialect, dedicated by permission to H.I.R. Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, London, 1864, 12mo, pp. 32, Mr. Baird uses an italic u for the (yy, ey) sound, reserving roman u for the others, and similarly uses a for (a), and the whole orthography is much improved.
A careful examination of this list would show that if attention is confined only to the words for which we have xivth century authority, the old classes would remain undisturbed, because no (y) word rhymes with an (eu) word or conversely. But if we remark that has rhymes with true, know, and also rue, and that rue, which rhymes with hue, also rhymes with true and with shew, we are led to conclude that true and shew would have rhymed in the xivth, as they do in the xixth century. But this breaks up the old classification altogether. On examining the etymological relations, it will be seen that the old classification is at variance with them, but taking them as a basis we can divide the words into two classes, French and Anglosaxon,—including in the latter, words certainly Germanic, though not accurately traced,—as follows:

French—blue, due, eschew, glues, mew, renew, stow, sue.
Anglosaxon—drunkelew,few, how to hack, how servant, hue, know, new, row row, rue, shew, shrow, threw, true.

The following table then shews that words of the first class rhyme together, but no word of the first class rhymes with any word of the second class. The first class corresponds to a French u, the second to an Anglosaxon ic, ow. Taking into consideration the Latin rhyme: de coitu, eschien 9685, as well as the derivation of these words, there can be little doubt that in Chaucer's time the first class had (y) and the second (eu). This distinction, then so carefully kept, was not understood in the xixth century in which several of the (eu) words, as know, new, true, had fallen into the (y) class. At present all the (y) class, and most of the (eu) class have formed an (iu) class, except when, through the influence of a preceding (r), the modern English organs naturally change (iu) into (uu), but some of the (eu) class have become (oo) as shew, now more frequently written show. In such a word as Theseus 862, there is no diphthong, and we have to read (Thее's,us).

In the xivth century then it will be safest to call EU, EW, (yy), in words of French origin, and (eu) in all other words.

**Alphabetical List of EW Rhymes, etc.**

beauty (benti) G., fr. beauté, Pr. bewte, beawtye deavw, bewte 2867
blue (blby) Sm. ays. bleb, blew, bleo, blo, Pr. bloo liedius; blewe mewo (for hawks) 10957
coitu, Lt. de coitu, eschien 9685. As the practical identity of the spelling ic with r has already been established, no weight can be laid on the variant iru as distinct from eu.

**drukelew, Pr. drunkeler (see Mr. Albert Way's note there) ebraius, drunkelew schrew 7627, 9407, 13910**

due (dry) Sm. G., fr. dô, Pr. duly deavw, due eschew 9225, eschew dewe 3045
eschew, fr. eschiver, eschiver, eschuir, esquiver, Pr. achywn icuo; eschien coitu 9685, eschew due 9225, eschew dewe 3045, eschewed sewed—followed 16823
few (fen) P. Sm. G., ays. feawa; Pr. fewe pawus; fewe schewe 7431, 12546, 13758, fewe schrew 14234

**glue (glyw) P., fr. giu birdime, giwyer stick together, Pr. giwyn visio, i-glewed renewed 10486**

---

1 For the Scotch sounds, see p. 298, note 1, at the end.
hew (hew) Bull, ags. heawan, heawan, Pr. hewyn seo, hakke and hewe, lay hem on a rewe = rowe 2867
hew = hind, domestic servant, ags. hiwa; hewe uintrew 9659.

hew, ags. hiw, hiw, heow; hiewe trewe 13836, 10901, 17207, hewe newe 1039, 10953, 11327, hewerewew = have compassion 12656

knew (knwy) But, ags. cnew perf. from cnewan; knewe newe 14995, knewe rewe = repent, 3081

new, for hawks, (myy) P. Sm. fr. mue place for putting poultry to fatten; P. mue for hauks meov; Pr. my of hawkys, falconarium, newe or cowle, mv, saginarium; meow (for poultry) stiwe 351, meow (for hawks) blew 10057

new (nyy) Sm. G. ags. neowe, niwe, nywe; Pr. ne, nev, nev, newe; newe hewe, 1039, 10953, 11327, newe trewe 14044, 16556, newe uintrew 727, 12970, 16514, newe knewe 14995, newe threw (error for threw) 14983

remew, fr. remuuer; Pr. remoun or remuyn, amoceo; remewed i-glewod 10465.

rwe, ags. raw, Pr. rowe sorte; lay hem on a rewe = rore, hakke and hewe 2867

ruw, pain, repentance, repent; ags. hrewwe, hrewwan; Pr. rawwy poxite = compassion trewe 1865, rewe = have compassion trewe 1865, rewe = repent trewe 3529, rewe = have compassion hewe = hew 12656, rewe = repent knewe 3081

rule, fr. riule monastic rule, Pr. rawlie of teochyne, regulat, norma; reule 173, reuled 1674

ruth, see rwe, quasi hrowpe Pr. ruthe compassion; reuth = compassion 5074, reuth = compassion trewe 14608, ruth = compassion, trowthe slouthe = sloth 4949

shew (sheu) Sm. G. Bull, ags. scawian scawian; Pr. scwhe or schwere monstrata; scwhe schwere 5865, 12444, scwhe feowe 7431, 12546, 13768

shrow (shreu) P., etymology unknown, see Wedgewood 3, 176. Pr. schrowe praeus, schrowyd praesius, schrowyd heryd praeuros, schrowdensese praetis, schrowe rewe = pain 6087; scrowe scwhe 5865, 12444, scrowe dronkelewe 7627, 9407, 13910, scrowe fewe 14234

stro, fr. estree, Pr. stuwyn mens, stuyyn, stopho; stuwyn mens or bathyn, stuyyn in a stw, balance; stw fysche pond, stewe, vivarium; stw bathus, stopho; stewe = fish pond mens (for poultry) 561, styres = brodetha lyves 6914

stew, fr. suir, sivire, sivre, sewir; Pr. sivyn or puresyn persever, suwyne sequela, svinge successus; sewed escheved 16823

surety (syr) Sm. Bull., fr. seur; seurte 1608, seurte 6485

threw, ags. treow; threw (error for 12970, throve) newe 14983

true (tryy) P. Sm. Bull. G. ags. treowe, trywe; Pr. trwe eurw, trwe manu, eurwe; Pr. trewe = hew 10901, 17207, trewe hiwe = hew 13836, trewe rewe 1865, 3529, trewe newe 14344, 16535

truth, ags. trewote, Pr. trrowthe veritas, treuth reuth 14608, trowthe routh slouthe = sloth 4949
untrew, see true, untrewere hewe = servant 9699, untrewere newe 737, 15154
value, fr. value; valieu 14582

OU, OW — XIVTH CENTURY.

As we have already had occasion to remark (p. 236), when the letter u, which is the natural representative of the (uu) sound in all languages that have adopted the Roman alphabet, has come to lose its proper sound, as in French, Dutch, Swedish, English, but that sound remains in the language, it becomes necessary to adopt some other notation for (uu). The (uu) sound in these cases has been generally a transformed (oo). Hence it lay ready at hand to use o simply for this sound, as we have seen was occasionally done in Chaucer (p. 267), and is still done in move, etc., and as the Swedes have been content to do. The Dutch employ oo for (uu), as they
use oo and o for (oo), but, as appears from the history of this orthography (p. 236, note 3), oo was in fact long o used as (uu), precisely as in the last case. The French used ou, in the earliest existing documents, though the Normans used u for both (yy) and (uu) apparently, as may be seen in the French original of Henry III.‘s English proclamation, Chap. V, § 3, No. 1. On an examination of the documents of the xivth century it will be found that the use of u for i, e, representing the y, that is (y), of the Anglosaxon, greatly increased towards the end of the period, so that confusions between the values of u as (uu, yy) became annoying. Writers then appear to have introduced the spelling ou towards the close of that period, in conjunction with u, to represent (uu), but, the convenience being manifest, ou became general by the early part of the xivth century. These facts will be established in the next chapter, and are here only stated by way of anticipation. There was one disadvantage in the use of ou, namely that it had also to be employed for (ouu), but this occasions very slight inconvenience. In the present place we have only to establish that ou really represented (uu) generally, and consequently (u) occasionally, in Chaucer.

As the use of u for short (u, u) was already well fixed, and its use for i, e was rapidly going out, ou was of course not so frequently employed for short (u) as for long (uu). Examples however occur, thus: ours 5729 stands for us, outerly 6245 for utterly, and the orthographies Arrious 6344 for Arrius, Causacous 6722 for Caucausus, leave no doubt of the use of ou as short (u). Curiously enough the sound of (uu) fell into (ou) about the xivth century (p. 150), and ou served then to represent that sound without change of spelling. But after this it became important to distinguish the (uu) and (oo) sounds of long o, and the orthography oo, adopted for the former (p. 96), has remained in use to the present day. In the unaccented syllables -our, representing -(u)ur, the orthography was left unchanged as well as the pronunciation. In the xivth century these syllables fell into (-or), and either the o or u in -our was felt to be superfluous. In quite recent times factions have been formed, one requiring -or to be used universally, others maintaining that -our should be preserved to distinguish the words that come from the French, which now exhibits -our, corresponding to a later development of that language. In Chaucer’s time however -our was used, simply because the pronunciation was (-ur), as -oun was used for the present common termination -on, compare corruptiou 13950, confessioni 1735, regioun 2083, visioun 7259, leoun 6377, etc., which were pronounced (un) or (uon) even in the xivth century (p. 99). We have retained -ou unaltered, and this was also (-us) in the xivth century (p. 150).

1 Dies, Gram. d. Rom. Spr. 1, 429, 2nd ed., where he quotes Benary Röm. Lautlehre, 82, to show that the Old Romans occasionally used ou as a mere orthographical sign for u, and remarks that it was even employed for a short vowel, as navicous = navibus, observing that Mommsen (Unters. Dialec., 217) and Ritteh (De milliario Popilliano, p. 84) are of a different opinion, and consider that in really old inscriptions ou = oe, and not u.
As Palsgrave (p. 149), and Bullokar (p. 152), in the xviith century recognized this (uu) sound of ou, it will only be necessary to introduce a few examples.

**Rhymes with Latin Names:**—Theseus, desirous 1675, curious, Darius 6079, Venus, contrarious 6279, Apius, lecherous 13680, Claudius, courageous 15821, viscous, Swethoneus = Suetonius 15949, Antiochius, venemous 16061.

**Rhymes with French Words:**

- What will ye dine?  
  I will go thare aboute.
- Now, dame, quod he, jeo vous dy sauna douts. 7419
- Full many maybe bright in bour
- They mourne for him, par amour. 15153

**Compare—**

- And but thou do my noice honoure
- And to my chamberer withinne my bourse. 5882

**Natural Sound.**—The cry of the cuckoo was certainly intended to be (kuk·kuu·), and this determines ou in

- This crowe song, Cuckow, cuckow, cuckow!
- What brid, quod Phebus, what song syngistow now? 17175

Perfectly Saxon words as bourn, noue, aboute, having thus the sound of (uu) established, we may feel sure of it in other cases, as: houz Cawksous 6721, thus vicious 7629, dowe aboute 489, tour honour 2029, Arthour honour 6440, dortour hour 7437, powre labore 185, flour odour 2939, hour schour 3519, emperour honour flour 5507, in an hour (error for houres), to honoure 14954, houres schoures 3195, 10431, and hence schowres 1 = (shuure·s);

- yow how 7982, youthe nouthe 463, to give the child to souke, all in the crowke 4155, colours (error for colours) flouries 10824, licour flour 3, adoun broun 394, licorous mous 3345, pitous mous 143, boundes stoundes 5867, stounde founde 5441, vertious hous 251, for to touche, in his couche 5669, untrouthe routhe 5107. Whence also we conclude that: cowde 110, flowtyngue 91, drowpud 107, embrowid 88, so woweth hire 3372, they blew and pouped, thay schryked and thay houped 16885, facound 13465, and numerous other words in ou, have also (uu) or (u).

As examples of those cases in which ou, ow, had the sound (ouu) maintained in the xixth century as (ou) practically, but (oe) theoretically, we may take: anoon the soules, with fleischhok or with soules = ace, ags. svwl, awul 7311, Bowe, unkonowe 125, lowe knowe 2301, I trowe, undurgrowe 155.

In the provinces two sounds of ou, ow are also common. One of these is (uu) in almost all districts, but the others varies as (aa, LL, au, iau, ou, iou), and even (uu, ow), and there is great difficulty in obtaining a satisfactory account of what the sounds really are, and consequently in classifying them. The following lists referring to the dialect of South Shields,1 will serve as a specimen. For the

---

1 Obligingly communicated by the Rev. C. Y. Potts, of Ledbury.
present purpose the most important point to dwell on is the persistence of the (uu) sound.

ou = (uu) in: down, town, crown, tower, now, trowsers, how, flower, power, drowned, cow, sow, bowl, & v. flectores, bow arcus = (bau).

ou = (uu) in: plough, round, sound, mound, hound, doubt, thou, about, count, out, house, sour, flour;—found, bound, ground, these three words are also pronounced with (o), but this is for the dialect even, very vulgar;—our, which is vulgarly (wur).

ou = (au) in: brought, sought, fought, bought, thought, ought, & v., nought, soul, four, loup, sun, = leap, coup = exchange.

ow = (as) in: blow, snow, low adj., row, crow, slow, below, know, callow, arrow, barrow;—owe, own, another and less vulgar pronunciation of these words would be (au) or (s), and in these words generally (au) not (oo) would be the alternative pronunciation.

o = (au) in: old, cold, also (aad, kaad);—old, told, also (seld, teld);—old, bold, fold;—stroll, toll, roll;—over (au-er).

(au) is heard in: daughter, neither, either, loose, sew, chew, mew, row, v. & s., low = frame, bow arcus.

Mr. Murray has been kind enough to furnish the following interesting account of the Scotch usages:

"In all the Scottish dialects the Anglosaxon long u, and French ou, retain their old sound (uu, u) before a consonant as: bour (buur) bower, clou (vraai) swelling caused by a blow, dour, stubborn, flower (fluur), hour (uur), power (pur), tour (tsuru tuur to plee) its your turn to play, tower, sour, stour. Loose dust, shower, scour, devour (di-vuur), our (uur), your, pour (purur), cower (kuur), spout (spuat), shout, lout (luur) A.S. latian, to stoo, rouse, house (ruuz, buux).

"In the following the vowel is shortened in quantity but unchanged in quality: brown (brun), crown, douen (dun), drown (drun), gown, loun, town (tuun), bowl Fr. boule (bul), foul, fowl (ful), swim (sum), sum (sum), howl, yowl, scowl, owl, howlet Fr. houlette (rulat), mouldy, course, court (kurs, kurt), source, douce, croose (krus) sprightly, house, mouse, house, mouth (muth), drouth drouth, south, Soutra, souther, snout, out, about, (ut, abut'), doubt, clout, bout (a dreck-in but) a drinking bout, stout, scout, pouc, vouch, crouch, often (kruutah), couch, bulk (buk), duck verb—

---

1 The first stanza of Burns's address "to a Mountain Daisy, on turning one down with the plough, in April, 1786," well illustrates these (uu) sounds. The pronunciation is that heard by Mr. Murray from a townsman of the poet.

Wee, modest, crimson-tipped flower, (Wii, mod-seht, krem-a-tep-rit fluur, Dhuni se mat ma en un ivil uur;)
Thou's met me in an evil hour;
For I maun crush amang the stoure
Thy slender stem;
To spare thee now is past my pow'r,
Thou bonnie gem,

2 The hilly ridge which separates the Lothians from the south country.
the noun is (dyk, deck),—drouk to drench, jouk to elude, louk, pouk to pick, piifer, ploch to pluck, suck, toue o'drum, stouk a shock of corn.

"The combination -ound is, like -indo, in a transition state; the past participles: bound, found, ground, wound, are usually (ban, fand, gran, wun), and ground s. (grand), but I consider this to be recent, for I have heard (u) in some of these from old people, and we always hear it in: Where are ye (bun) or (bund) for, to beat the (bunds), boodit, boondarie, boun'tree: and the sound is always used in round (rund), sound, to found, founded, foundation, sound a fit or "spell" as (v stund s dho teoth ek) = a fit of the toothache. Hound is occasionally (rund), usually (rund).

"Anglo-Saxon u final is also (ru) in most of the Scottish dialects. but in that of the Southern counties, the same law which has developed long e into (ei), here develops (un) into (su). The following words therefore pronounced in the other dialects with (uu) are pronounced in Teviotdale and Dumfriesshire with (su): cow, saw, how, you, now, bow to bend, through, doo dove,¹ loe to love, brow, fu' full, tispy, got, an after taste (gum), Tev. (gmu), as (it has a kwir gum abut: it) = it has a queer flavour about it, pu' pull, (supra p. 287,) mou' mouth.

"The Borderers thus pronouncing (ru) where the other Scots say (uu),—where the others say (ru) they advance a step and say (ou), so that the following words are in the Lothians pronounced (ru), in Teviotdale (ou), in English (oo) or (ou): bow aruse, grow, dow to acast, howe a hollow, knowe a knoll, bowe a boll,² a flame, powe a poll, rowe roll, row, stow, tow, trow, thowe to thace, drow a Scotch mist, a drizzle, bowl, soul, four, grower to stare, ower over.

"The two pronunciations may be shewn thus:

Central Scotch: (four baulz fuu θ nruu molk fe dho kuu)
Teviotdale: (four boulz fru u nu melk thre dho ku)
English: four bowls full of new milk from the cow."

The conclusion seems therefore to be that OU, OW in the xivth century should be read as (uu, u) except in those cases where aw, or simple o was used in Anglo-Saxon.

¹ A school inspector wishing to get the sound of (uu) out of a Hawick girl, and unaware of this peculiarity of pronunciation, asked her what she called a pigeon, (A duu) replied she, and posed him as much as the child posed the teacher, who, wanting to obtain from him the word take, asked him: "What would you do, if I gave you a piece of cake?" and received the very natural reply: "Eat it."
² Compare Sir T. Smith's Bo, Beul, supra p. 161.

³ Compare—
(Debra let' wet en dho peu
Dhat lebhts dho kan't at dho luo)
—There's little wit in the poll or head.
That lights the candle at the low or flame;
and the pun on the names of Messrs. Lowe and Bright at the Edinburgh Reform Demonstration: "The Lowe that'll never burn Bright" (Dhe luo dhat'l never burn breet).

⁴ So likewise in the Barnsley dialect throo is used for from.
§ 3. The Consonants.

Very little is to be learned from the rhymes respecting the consonants. With our knowledge of the xvi th century consonants, however, there can be but little doubt as to the values of any one of them.

B, C, CH, D, F.

B when silent as in doubt, debt, was not written thus: doute 489, dette 282. It was otherwise (b) of course.

C was (s) or (k), according to the same rules as at present, but ci- remained (ci-) and had not become (sh). In the termination -tion, we find c, s, t interchanging, shewing the identity of sound, but it always formed two syllables. Compare

Lo, heer bath kynd his dominacioun, 17114
And appetit siiemeth discretioun.
O wantrust, ful of fals suspicioun
Where was thy wit and thy discreetioun. 17214
And eke he was of such discreetioun. 16795

CH was generally (teh), see J, K.

D was (d) of course.

F seems to have been always (f), so that of must be called (of) not (ov). Judging from other writing, as Robert of Gloucester and Trevisa, u or v would have been used had (v) been pronounced. Mr. Murray says that of is still pronounced (of) in the North, when the consonant is retained before a vowel, as (dhe rid of 'v bist) the head of a beast.

G, GN.

G followed the same rule as at present, and was (g) in all Saxon words, but in French words (g) before a, o, u, and (dzh) before (e, i). See J.

GN occasionally represented simple n, as in the couplet

Sche may unto a knave child atteigne
By likilhed, sith sehe nys not bareigne. 8333

where gn represents an old French gn, in bareigne, which was probably (nj) as now, so that (atayn' barain') would be the natural English representatives. Accordingly the MS. Univ. Cam. Dd. 4. 24, here writes atteyne, bareyne; a spelling found also in Harl. 7384, in

Thou maist to thy desir somtyyme atteyne
But I that am exiled, and bareyne
Of alle grace. 1245

while gn and n rhyme in

And of his cughne vertu unconstreyne
Sche hath ful ofte tymne hire seek y-seymned. 13476

where we should have expected gn in the second line as much as in the first. Companye 24, was also commonly written for: compaignye 3837.
How were *digne*, *benigne* 519, pronounced? As Anglo-French (dīn-*e*, benīn-*e*)? Or after the custom of Latin pronunciation (maq-*nus*, iq-*nis*) in the middle ages—testified by the medieval Latin orthography, and still existing in Salisbury’s time,—as (dīq-*ne*, benīq-*ne*)? The question affects also such words as *dignité*, *signifie*, *sign*. Here the modern use *consign dignity, benign benignity, sign signify* (kuðain dig-ni-ți, binain- binig-ni-ți, sain sig-ni- fi) would seem to lead to an anterior (diin dig-ni-ți, beniin- benig-ni-ți, sīn signifi- e). But the old example of *i-seined* for *signed* in Henry III.’sd English proclamation, throws a doubt over this. As however the special word *sign*, had assumed a thoroughly Saxon form, *segmen* to sign or bless, *segmen* a signing with the cross or blessing, the (ai) sound would be developed naturally by the passage of the guttural *g* into (*i*).

Can we consider the forms: deynous 3939, 6’114, deyn 3961, 5’204, deyneth 5’288 as conclusive. The French *digne*, daignier, shew a double form in these words, and hence leave us still in doubt. The word: dyne 4’200, 4’201, = *dine*, was in French disgnier, despair, and is considered by Roquefort to be derived from the commencement of the grace *dignare, domine*, but the etymology is so doubtful1 that no weight can be attached to this. The termination *-igne* is not found rhyming either with *-eyne* or *-yme*, and this would a priori lead us to conclude that the sound was different from either, that is, neither (*-ain-e*) nor (*-in-*e*). But we find: *digne* benign specie 4’125, 4’225, *sygne* benigne 5’183, *digne* signe 5’330, so that the old and proved (sain) and the occasional (dain) would seem to imply also (benain’, resain’). On the other hand Gill writes (benig’n) or (beni’n) for *benign*, and this ought to imply that he did not know the pronunciation (benin’), which may nevertheless have existed, and been ignored. Jones, however, 1701, gives only (binig’on), though he admits (sain, rezain’), and Salisbury and Smith give (seyn), Gill (sain), Buchanan and Sheridan in the xviii century give (binoin’ biain’). Similar difficulties have existed in the pronunciations of *impugn*, *impregn*.

If the sound (ain) had prevailed in Chaucer’s time, we should have expected (AIN), not (eIN) in the xvii century. Bullokar seems to write (sain), and the (sain) of the xviith and (sain) of the xixth century are in harmony with this, which would imply (sain) in Chaucer also. In this doubt the safest plan seems to be to adopt (sain) for Chaucer’s pronunciation, admitting the secondary form (ain) when *eYN* is written. This will be consistent with the present and intermediate pronunciation, with the general use of *I* in Chaucer,

---

1 Diez (Gr. de R.S. i, 439 note, 2nd ed) says that *digne* occurs in old French with silent *a*, as *brigarna dignum* rhymed with *brigandinae* citing Ducange sub voce *brigga*. And the MS. 188 of Mag. Coll. Oxford, cited by M. Gémin (Introduction to the French reprint of Palgrave, p. 29) says, rule 92: *item, quando- cunque a sequitur i in media diocione, in diversis silabis g debet interponi, ut certamination, benignament; sed g non debet sonare.*

2 Among the etymons given are *decernare*, *decenmare*, *decima* (hors), *adignonare*, *dijeaner* = *dijenmare*. See Donkin’s *Diez*, sub *desinare*. 
and with his use of -yns in other words, and as regards the word sign would imply that he took it from the French with the other words, or designedly adopted a French in preference to the antiquated pronunciation (sain). The question is one of extreme difficulty and the conclusion is doubtful.

GH, Y, Z

The modern editors usually represent χ or rather ʒ 1 by gh when medial and final, and by g or y when initial. In Mr. Morris’s Chaucer Extracts he purposed to shew where the manuscript exhibited ʒ for his printed gh, y, by italicising these letters. He has not carried out his plan with sufficient accuracy to make an examination of the MS. unnecessary. 2 Assuming, however, that where he has used the italics, ʒ was employed in the MS., we obtain the following results for the Prologue, Knightes Tale, and Nonne Prestes Tale, in which I have here used a common z in place of χ or ʒ. The numbers annexed to the words indicate the observed number of occurrences of this orthography.

| azens | 1 | sauz | 1 | zelwe | 1 | zolden | 1 |
| brouzt | 1 | thouzte | 1 | zemen | 3 | zollyng | 1 |
| deyzen | 1 | unzolden | 1 | zerd | 6 | zolo | 1 |
| dountzer | 3 | upzaf | 1 | zerde | 1 | zolow | 1 |
| draunt | 1 | weyzede | 1 | zereas | 1 | zolw | 1 |
| eyzen | 9 | wizt | 1 | zet | 8 | zolwe | 3 |
| fisntyng | 1 | ynowz | 1 | zette | 1 | zomanly | 1 |
| forzete | 1 | yze | 1 | zewe | 5 | zonder | 1 |
| forzeve | 2 | zaf | 5 | zeven | 3 | zong | 3 |
| heyz | 1 | zalwe | 1 | zevest | 1 | zonge | 6 |
| heizer | 1 | zate | 1 | zeveth | 1 | zore | 2 |
| kniizt | 2 | zeddynges | 1 | zif | 3 | zou | 2 |
| nozt | 8 | zeeldyne | 1 | ziftes | 2 | zoung | 1 |
| nouzt | 9 | zeez | 1 | zit | 18 | zouthe | 5 |
| perizzt | 4 | zeldehalle | 1 | zive | 3 | zou | 1 |
| rizt | 1 | zelleden | 1 | ziven | 1 |

But the orthography is not consistent, for gh is often employed in the MS. Thus, accepting Mr. Morris’s edition as correct, except in the words you, etc., we find in the Prologue only

brought 1 captured 1 foughte 1 herbergh 2
bythought 1 draught 1 foughten 1 hey 1
cauthe 1 drought 2 heih 1 heygh 1

1 This character in the MSS. is generally indistinguishable from s, so that when an editor prints some words with ʒ and others with s he is making an arbitrary distinction like that of separating s, v. In Mr. Morris’s edition of Sir Gawain for the Early English Text Society, ʒ is printed for both χ and s. It would have been more consistent with the employment of Roman types to use s instead of ʒ in both cases.

This is the plan I have pursued in the following lists, and it is one followed by older printers and embalmed in the Scotch Menzies, Dalzel, Mackenzie, which are often called (Meq’tz, Drz, Dezm, Makenzr) in Scotland, see p. 238, n.

2 Thus in v. 34 and 38 he prints ‘yow’ in place of ‘gaw’ that is ‘gow.’
high 1 neigh 2 oughte 1 taughte 1
hight 1 neighe 1 naught 1 though 2
inough 1 night 1 right 4 thought 2
knight 2 nightertale 1 seigh 1 wight 1
might 4 nightyngale 1 sleight 1 wright 1
mighhte 1 nought 1 streight 1 wroghte 1
mighten 1

It may be doubtful whether y is ever used initially, in the modern sense. I have not observed any instance in the MS., but I have not examined it thoroughly with this view. The use of y was quite established however before the time of printing.

The reader is requested to refer to the remarks on gh in Chap. III. (pp. 209–214). As gh still retained its guttural sounds in the xviith century, we cannot but believe that it had these sounds in the xivth, whatever may have been the Anglosaxon original sounds. The diversifications of (kh) into (kjh, kuh) pointed out in the remarks referred to, so that it sank to (j, i) on the one hand, and (wh, u) on the other, are well shewn. Thus, to the first class belong theigh = (dhaikh) for though,

\[\text{For theigh thou night and day take of hem heed.} \quad 10926\]

which becomes simply they (dhai) in

\[\text{That Chaucer, they he can but lewdely} \quad 4467\]

On metres and on rhyming craftely.

and similarly seigh 9005, sey 13307 for saw.

1 The sound is hardly lost yet in the provinces, thus Prof. Sedgwick in the work cited above, p. 289, note 4, says:

"The suppression of the guttural sounds is, I think, the greatest of all the modern changes in the spoken language of the northern counties. Every syllable which has a vowel or diphthong followed by gh was once the symbol of a guttural sound: and I remember the day when all the old men in the Dales sounded such words as sigh, night, sight, (sih, nigh, siht), &c., with a gentle guttural breathing, and many other words, such as trough, rough, tough (trouch, runkuch, tunkuch), had their utterance, each in a grand sonorous guttural. The former of these guttural sounds seemed partly to come from the palate; the latter from the chest. Both were aspirated and articulated; and differed entirely from the natural and simple vocal sounds of the guttural vowels a, ð (as, að). All the old people who remember the contested elections of Westmoreland, must have [p. 104] heard in the Dales of that county the deep guttural thunder in which the name—Harry Brougham (Broukuch um)—was reverberated among the mountains. But we no longer hear the first syllable of Brougham sounded from the caverns of the chest,—thereby at once reminding us of our grand northern ancestry, and of an ancient fortress of which Brough (Broukuch) was the written symbol. The sound first fell down to Bruffham (Bruftum, Brousam), but was too vigorous for the nerves of modern ears; and then fell lower still into the monosyllabic broom (Bruun, p. 158)—an implement of servile use. We may polish and soften our language by this smoothing process; yet in so doing we are forgetting the tongue of our fathers; and, like degenerate children, we are cutting ourselves off from true sympathy with our great northern progenitors, and depriving our spoken language of a goodly part of its variety of form and grandeur of expression."—p. 103–4, palæotype introduced. Mr. Murray notes that the Southern (a) is always (u) in Cumberland and Westmoreland, and that (ruf, tuft, Bruft) are the present pronunciations of rough, tough, Brough, in those counties, and (Brouam) for Brougham in Cumberland.
To the second class belong long 476, losch 3117 = laugh, sough 5268, 9726, souch 5265 = saw.\(^1\) Compare also herbergh 767, herberghw 4117, herberw 4143. Sometimes the transition is complete as in

For, as I trowe, I have yow told gnows
To rayse a sound, al loke he never so rose.

where y-nowes, ros (innu, rnu) stand for enough, rough, in which the modern sound of (f), as already suggested in p. 213, has arisen from (wh). So frequent was this change in the word enough, that it is sometimes neglected in writing as

For had we him, than were we syker y-nough,
But unto God of heven I make avow.

only a couplet beyond the last example quoted, where we must read (innu, avuu). Similarly enough, now 12946, where ynow should be read as in on, y-now 11019. Plough which rhymes with enough 889, 3158, had generally the pronunciation (pluukh), and this reduced to (plu), (shewn in the spelling plo, which I have noticed elsewhere, but not in Harl. 7334, an orthography found also in the authorized version of the Bible in the xvth century),\(^3\) generated the modern (plo).\(^3\) The following rhymes may also be noted:

When that he saugh that al the peple tough.
No more of this, for it is right y-nough.
He also hath to do more than y-nough
To kepe him & his capil out of the slough.

Compare
Now is my cart out of the soo parde.
In which ther ran a s人民银行 in a enough
As it were a storne schuld berst every bough.
He sikeeth with ful many a sory enough
And goth, and geteth him a kneeldynig trough.

The regular pronunciation of all these ough words seems to have been (nuukh), whence (uuwh, uu), which afterwards changed to (uf, ou), and finally to (af, ou). That gh was occasionally written without being pronounced, we see by the rhymes: at his noten, Sir Hugh 5907, melodie yhe 9, etc. We shall see that this is the case also in Shaksper, whenever it was convenient for the rhyme.

The form augh may have had similar varieties of sound, as the spellings already cited indicate. In both cases we cannot do better than follow the spelling of the moment, except the rhyme requires

---

\(^1\) There is a similar resolution of medial \(y\) in Icelandic. Thus 
hiða to tell a falsehood, is theoretically (Iruu-
gscha), and practically (Iruuwa). See Chap. V. § 4, No. 2.

\(^2\) The passages are: plough Ps. 37, 12; plo Deut. 22, 10, i Sam. 14, 14, Job 4, 8, Prov. 20, 4, Isa. 28, 24, Hos. 10, 11, Amos 6, 12, i Cor. 9, 10; ploosed Judg. 14, 18, Ps. 129, 3, Jer. 26, 18, Hos. 10, 13, Micah 3, 12; plovers Ps. 129, 3; ploeweth i Cor. 9, 10; ploewing i Kings 19, 19, Job 1, 14, Prov. 21, 4, Luke 17, 7; plowman Isa. 28, 24, Amos 9, 13; plowmen Isa. 61, 6, Jer. 14, 4; plowshare Isa. 2, 4, Joel 3, 10. Supra p. 159, note 4.

\(^3\) Mr. Murray observes: “ough and onow (unikhe) and (onau) or rather (anyke: anyu) are both used in Scotch with a difference of application. Plough and plo are synonymous for the noun (plyk, plo), the former the more common: for the verb the latter alone is used as (u plyd fid, u plu in matsh).”
one of two forms to be altered, and then the first should generally be accommodated to the second, as there is a probability of its having been written down without consideration of what was to follow, and of its having been then left uncorrected, as being of slight importance. Thus augh, auwh, auh, aw = (aukwh, auwh, auh, au), where (aukh) may be used for (aukwh).

When the letter t follows fresh difficulty arises. How should drought, foughiten, daughter, nought, be pronounced? There seems nothing but theory to guide us. At present we say (drout, draat, froun't, daat, naat), but these are all quite recent developments. We find fough = (faun't) in Smith, daughter = (dauk-ter) in Gill, nought = (nour't, naun't) in Smith, and (noukht) in Gill. There is no sixteenth century authority for drought. Taking into consideration the double use of ou (uu, ouu), it seems probable that when the original vowel was u in ages, as druge, the sound should be (uu) as (drunkht, drunkacht) of which the modern (drout) would be a legitimate descendant; and that when the original vowel was o as ages. dochter, the sound was (ouu) or perhaps simply (ou), the (u) having been developed by a (kwh) sound of gh. This would give (duukht, foukht-t'n, doukht-ter, noukht) or (duukh, foukht, doukht-ter, noukht). It will probably be as near the truth as we are able to get to write (duukht, foukht-ten, doukht-ter, noukht). The spelling nouht, however, indicates a very light sound of the guttural, as (nourt), which rapidly disappeared in (not, nat).1

What the initial sound of s or j might have been, it is more difficult to say. Probably the sound of the ags. letter became (kh) or (gh) at an early period. Now in modern Germany (kh) is often considered to be the hiss of (z), that is (zh), and the difference is certainly very slight. The ease with which initial (kh) will pass into (z) may be well studied in modern German pronunciation. During the sixteenth century when initial s was replaced by y, the transition was certainly complete. In the next chapter (§ 2) reasons will be given for thinking that this transition may have been prevalent in the time of Lazamorn and Orrmim, the preceding (kh, gh) stage being relegated to the Old Anglosaxon period. It will therefore be safest to pronounce the initial s as (z) where it corresponds to the modern y.

We shall have an opportunity of seeing g in every stage of transition, from (g) through (gh, z) to (i) on the one hand, and through (gh) to (w) on the other, and even absolutely disappearing through a scarcely pronounced (gh, gwh) in the living Icelandic tongue, the very interesting phonetic phenomena of which will be considered in Chap. V. § 4, No. 2.

1 Mr. Murray says that in Teveriotdale drought is (druth) daughter, foughiten, nought, bough, brought, thought, nought, worought are (doukhtor, foukhw't'n, boukht, wroukht), &c., or perhaps (doukhter, foukht), he prefers the former, though the o is absolutely long.
H

H, by its substitution for gh, is shewn to have been pronounced when final distinctly as (h’). In what cases, when initial, it became (h) or vanished, it is now impossible to say. It appears by many old MSS. that there was often great confusion as to the use of initial h in many words, indicating local and partial peculiarities of pronunciation, similar to those now found. But the MS. under consideration seems to be quite consistent in the use of initial h, and there is therefore nothing to shew that it was not pronounced in honour, honest, hour, as well as other words. However, in this doubt, I have thought it safest in my transcriptions, in the modern use. In the words he, his, him, hire, hem, before which, especially when enclitic, the final e is, as we shall see, generally elided as freely as before a vowel, it is extremely probable that the h was silent under the same circumstances. It is known to be constantly so in modern English, and some orthoepists even admit that it should be silent. The apostrophe in catch’em indicates the absent h, not an omitted th. When hath, have, hadde, were similarly placed they also probably lost the h, as they also admitted the elision of the vowel. The modern contractions I’ve, we’ve, they’d, and the old hadde = ne hadde 3751, point to the same conclusion. Hence when those words beginning with h stand in such a position that a final e might be elided before them, I omit the h in my transcriptions, but indicate the omission by a hyphen in the usual way, thus: (wel kuud -e sit on hors) 94.

J

J when representing the French consonant j, is now called (dzh) and was so in the xvi th century. Was the old French sound (dzh) or (zh)? Diez (Gr. d. R. S. i. 400, 402) shews good reason to suppose that the Provençal pronunciation of ch, j, was (tsh, dzh), as for example Petrarch’s chant for Provençal chant, and Dante’s giausen for Fr. jausen. Again (ib. p. 448, 451) Diez shews reason for supposing (tsh) to be an old French sound of ch, although in Palsgrave’s time it had sunk to (sh), and observes that in middle Greek, the French Jean, Geoffroi, are rendered Tc’áv, Tc’édpé, which are the present combinations for (tshan, tshyro). Considering that the Greek had no means of representing (dzh), this would stand for an original (dzh) rather than for (zh), which would have been best rendered by

---

1 Host and ost, hosterie and osterie, both occur.
2 Thus in: Phonotypy by Modification, a means by which unusual types can be dispensed with on a plan proposed by T. W. Hill (the father of Sir Rowland Hill, and a well known orthoepist and educationalist) printed in 1846 for private circulation only, the last sentence runs thus (it is a quotation from Goldsmith’s Citizen of the World, the italics are mine): ‘As is feis undurwen’t un involuntary ablution’jun und ‘fwaund imself ridy’st tw is primitif complek’yun and indi-djens; that is: Thus his face underwent an involuntary ablation and he found himself reduced to his primitive complexion and indigence.
3 In the most recent Greek πρέα is used initially for (dzh), as πρέαυ (dzhamiː) a mosque.
The middle Greeks according to Diez also wrote τζ for oh, as Περτζάφος = (ritshard’os) for Richard. These transcriptions are precisely similar to Salesbury’s tsiwrt, tsiuff, taisuu, tsiun, for churche, chape, Jeeu, John, and should evidently be interpreted in the same way. Even in Palsgrave’s time he makes French j = English j, which we know (p. 207) was then (dzh), but this certainly only implies a rooted mispronunciation, because we know that although (zh) had not then been developed in English, it existed in French (p. 207). But it implies the traditional pronunciation in English, because Palsgrave was decidedly archaic in his tendencies, as we have seen in his retention of (ii) for long i (p. 110), and (uu) for ou, ow (p. 149), out of the xvth into the xvi th century. This mispronunciation therefore is in itself a strong proof of the old pronunciation of j as (dzh). If to this we add that in the present pronunciation of the Norman peasantry (tah, dzh) are occasionally used for (sh, zh), it will be difficult to suppose that oh, j, in Chaucer had any other meaning than (tah, dzh).

K

K in Anglo-Saxon constantly generated tah in English, as already explained (p. 205). The orthography of our MS. and the alterations of words to suit the rhyme, shew that although in many cases the custom was firmly established, in others there was a fluctuation of use similar to that in the present day between brooks, brooches, Scotch brigg, kirk, English bridge, church. The termination -lig or -lic has become generally -ly = (-lii) in Chaucer, but traces of the original form remain as -lik, lich; thus we have: sikurly 137, 154, against: sikirluk 3889, and: snoterlich, dich 3961 = (smoo-ter-lith, ditsh), = dirty, ditch. Against: the holy blissful martir for to seeke 17, we have: without more speche, not longe for to seeke 785, I schuld yow seeche, in softe speche 6993, and we may compare our modern words seek, beseech. Against the common form work, as in: that was a clerk, at this werk, 11417, we have the altered forms: wirche, 2761, 7559, 9555, werche 4986, and so on. Such changes, which have been shewn to be common to other languages, confirm the value of oh as (tsh) even in Saxon words. The pronunciation of icsch as (itch), in the phrase: so theec 12857, for example, = so the ich (see thee-tsh) is singularly corroborated by Gill’s observation that in the East of England “pro (s) substituunt (z), ut (zil) pro (silst) cano; et (tsh) pro (ei) ego: (tshaim) pro (ei am) sum: (tahl) pro (ei wil) volo: (tahi voor si) pro (ei war-ant jou) certum do,” see supra, p. 293.

L, M, N, NG

L, M, N must have been (l, m, n) as in all languages. The termination -le from the French is occasionally written -ul, -il, -yl. It

1 “Comme en angliaques, D se fait TCH ; Tchim, chien, Tchidboury, sentir devant G et J, comme dans Gerce, Cherbourg,” Le Héricer, Glossaire brebis [Dgerce]. . . . . CH se prononce souvent comme en anglais Normand, vol. i. pp. 30 and 32.
will be best to call it ('l) as in modern English. Before a following
vowel it probably became (l) as: simple and coy 119 — (simpl-and
cui) just as in modern English we have double, doubling not double-
ing, i.e. (dab'ldob·l'iq) not (dob·liq). As there is a difficulty in
establishing a nasal value of n in Old French, there can be no
thought of its occurrence in Chaucer.
NG was either (q) or (qg) or occasionally one and occasionally
the other as in modern English. Modern use can be our only guide.

P, PH, QU

There is no reason for supposing p, ph, qu to have been anything
but (p, f, kw), but of course it is impossible to determine whether
qu was not (kw, ku) instead of (kw). In Chap. V, § 4, No. 1 & 3,
the fact of the Runic and Gothic alphabets having a single sign for
this sound, has led me to suppose that it was really simple (kw),
and not double (kw, ku), even at that early epoch. The use of two
letters ce in Anglo-Saxon would not decide anything, as (kw, ku)
would be a sufficient approximation for all purposes of writing.

R

R presents the same difficulties as in the xvi th century, yet we
cannot allow it to have 'any value but (r). It must however have
affected the preceding vowel, so we could otherwise scarcely account
for the use of or, er, or in the same words, as worche 9231, werk
481, weiriching 8371. In one case at least we find ar where
the modern form is er, as: thurghe the cote large, with cloth of gold
and not with serge 2569, but both serge, sargge are old French forms.
It is also observable that many words in which the sound was (ar)
in the xvi th century appear as (er), thus, yerde, amerte, herte 149,
worge, ferre 47; serve, store 1145, prive and pert 6696, pryyv and
apert 10845, deere, store 4867, 5252, store, bere 2151. Against
wors 9183, we have: wers, ers 3781; I moot rether, al be they
better or wors 3173, it needeth nat to rether, who can do wors

1 The chief reasons assigned by
Diederich (Gram. der rom. Sprach., 2 ed.
vol. 1, p. 437), for considering the use
of the French nasals to be old are the
identity of the assonances on and en;
and the constant confusion of the forms
andriot endroit. But the modern

demne rhymes with dame, and yet there
is no trace of nasality here. Diederich
also names the ancient rhymes of Solinon
ferregium, salutum consuevim; but these
may have been due rather to a peculiar
(-om) pronunciation of the Latin, the
m and n being allowed to rhyme, as in
many English popular songs. At any
rate these forms are not incompatible
with non-nasality, which was the rule
in Provençal, and Walloon, and there
are absolutely no grounds for supposing
that, i, u, were pronounced as nasals
even in the xvi th century. Rapp reads
2 Mr. Murray says: "R affects pro-
ceeding vowel in Scotch even while re-
maining (r). A simple vowel, short
before other consonants is long before
final r: heat hear, bat bar, not nor,
stout stour, (nit nitir, but bear, not
noor, but stour). And a before a con-
sonant followed by e mute is in the
South of Scotland ea (ie) but before r
it remains (ee) so main and mean are
distinguished (men, miem) but fair, fare
are both (feer, fer) not (feer, fier) the r
preventing the closing of the sound." 
Compare Cooper's observations, supra
p. 76, where his (waw) is the coun-
terpart of (ie).
10913. Since the xvii th century there has been a great tendency to pronounce er as (ar) or (aə), as in clerk, Derby, sergeant, and formerly servant, but the contrary tendency to use (er) for (ar) does not seem to have been at all developed except at this earlier time. The confusion of (ur, er) as in were, were, is very like the modern confusion of (ar, eə) with (aə). By a change of re into er the rhyme: ers, kers 3753 is obtained. The terminations -re, -er alternate, as: mordre 16538, morder 16539, at the commencement of two consecutive lines. It would seem then that we should always sound (-er), as (mörder). The metathesis of r is frequent. § 5, art. 98, d.

S, SCH

S = (s) also represented (z) in plural terminations, but never had the sound of (sh), which was always represented by

SCH a combination derived from the Saxon se, in the same way as ch from Saxon c, to shew the effect of palatisation. In later times the c was omitted.

T, TH, ð

T seems to have been generally (t), but it became (s) in the termination -tion, see examples under C.

TH, which is used promiscuously with ð in the MS., had probably the same sounds as at present, and distributed in the same manner. Occasionally we meet with ð in places where we should have expected th = (dh), as in fadur 100 = father, hider 674, thider, slider 1265, where the rhyme shews that the sound was really (d) and not (dh), but the (d) seems to guarantee the pronunciation of th as (dh) when written in these words.

V, W, WH, X

These letters as consonants seem to have had precisely the same sounds as at present, but w was also used occasionally as a vowel, as herberw 4143. In arves 104, halves 14, which had arwe, halwe in the singular, there seems no reason for not giving w its usual sound.

WR was probably pronounced (rw) as in ags. and down to the xvi th century (p. 186).

Y, Z, ŋ

The Y consonant is always represented by ʒ which is the same form as the letter used for s. The meanings of this letter must be disentangled by a consideration of modern usage, see supra under GH (p. 310).

The consonants seem to call for no further remark, and the rules laid down in this and the preceding section are sufficiently general to permit the reader to read any line in this edition of Chaucer with tolerable certainty, except as regards the use of the E final, which has now to be considered.

1 For the xvii th century see p. 86.

The Rev. C. Y. Potts remarks that in South Shields or is usually pronounced (ar) or (aə) in: clergy, person, mercy, eternal, universal, learning, the last word being also called (leer-mé).

That *e* final was at least occasionally pronounced, and that its sound did not differ, except in accent, from that of *me, the* = (mee, dhee) is conclusively proved by the following rhymes. It must be remembered that *to me, to the*, when the accent is thrown on to the preposition, become (too-me, too’dhe), with brief and indistinct (*e*), that is nearly (too’me, too’dhe), or as in modern High German (p. 321, n. 1). Hence the following rhymes show that *Rome, cyna-mome, sothe* must have been (Roo’me, sinamoo’me, soo’dhe), although there may have been, as frequently at present, a little liberty taken with double rhymes, and (soo’dhe) may have been used for (soo’the), and similarly (zuu’dhe) for (zuu’the), (swii’dhe) for (swith’e) in the following couplets:

| That streyt was comen from the court of Rome. |
| Ful lowde he sang, Come hider, love, to me. |
| My fayre bryd, my svete cynamome, |
| Awake, lemma myn, and speketh to me. |
| So faren we, if I schal say the sothe. |
| Now, quod cure est, yit let me talke to the. |
| Quod the Frankieyn, considering thin youthe |
| So felingly thou spekest, sire, I alowe the. |
| Elles go bye som, and that as switthe. |
| Now good sire, go forth thy way and hy the. |
| Al only now, for the love of Marte, |
| Quod Pandarus, for every thynge hath tymye; |
| So long abid til that the nyght departe, |
| For als siker as thow list here bi me, |
| And God tofore I wol be thare at pryme. |

| Bot fader, if it fo betide |
| That I aproche at ony side |
| The place wher my ladi is |
| And pane jast hire like ywryf |
| To speke a goodly word entome, |
| For al ye gold jat is in Rome |
| Ne cowbe I, affer that bewrop |
| Bot all myn Anger ouergro. |

Here *hy the* stands for *hys the*, but the final *e* of *hys* is not pronounced, as also it is not pronounced in *alowe the*, so that we read (aluu’dhe, mii’dhe). This omission will be considered afterwards.

The middle *e* in Dertemouthe holds the position of a final *e* in:

For ought I woot he was of Dertemouthe 391, where it is necessary, for the metre, and it is observable that the *e* is here pronounced to this day by the peasantry in the neighbourhood of Dartemouth and Dartemoor.

---

1 This section was written before I had had an opportunity of seeing the admirable Observations on the Language of Chaucer and Gower. I have thought it best to leave my investigation almost in its original state, and to give a complete account of these observations in the following section.

2 The rhyme time, by me, occurs eight times in Gower, i 227, 309, 370, ii 41, 49, 114, iii 6, 369.

3 Just as *f* rhyme in thevys, graf is 7755.

4 Printed from the Harl. MS. 3869.

5 Private letter from Mr. Shelly, of Plymouth.
In the Man of Lawes Tale, there is a king called Alla, whose name on one occasion is reduced to Alle, which must have been pronounced (Al’e), so that calle and bifalle which rhyme with it must have also been (kal’e, bifal’e) in—

Mauricius atte fustetone men him calle.
This constabul doth come forth a messenger,
And wrot to his kyng that cleped was Alle,
How that this blisful tyding is bifalle. 5143

Scarcely less convincing than the above instances is the case of the plurals in -es, where they do not at present form a distinct syllable. Not only are these frequently spelled -is, as is the case still in Scotch, but they also often rhyme with the verb is. Thus, taking first those spelled with es:

For sondry scolis maken subtil clerkes;
Womman of many a scole half a clerk is. 9301
How schuld I thanne, that live in such pleasance
As alle wedded men doen with their wyves,
Come to blisse ther Crist eterne on lyves is? 9625
Him wolde he snyblye scharpylye for the nones,
A bettre preest I trowe ther newher non is. 525
Crist, which that is to every harm triacle,
By certeyn menes ofte, as knowen clerkes,
Doth thing for certeyn ende, that feel derk is. 4900
Thy wyf eek and thy wench sinfully
Dronke of the same vessel sondry wyves;
And heriest false goddes coveredly;
Therefore to the schapen ful gret pyne es. 15713
Withinne the cloyster of thi blisful sydes
Took mannes schap the eternal love and pees,
That of the trine compas lord and gynde is. 11971
And nyl himselve doo no gentil dedes
Ne folw his gentil aunceter, that ded is. 6737

In the following the plural is written -is, but it rhymes with is in precisely the same way.

Of catapus, or of gaytre beris
Of erbe yve that groweth in our yerd, ther mercy is. 16451
Ther schuln ye se expresse, that no derk is,
That he is gentil that doth gentil dedes. 6751
Ye leke as though the woode were ful of thewes,
Sit down anon, and tel me what your gref is. 7755
After the opynyoun of certeyn clerkes.
Witness on him, that eny parfit clerk is. 18721
And for that faith is deth withouten worcis,
So for to werken give me witt and space,
That I be quit fro themes that most derk is. 11992
Which gift of God had he for all his wyves?
No man hath such, that in the word on lyve is. 6621

1 In the difficult combinations write, priests, we hear generally in the provinces, (rist’is, priast’is).
2 Sometimes is is used, with the same pronunciation as -is or -es, (p. 298).
3 This Scotch final -is, generally formed a distinct syllable in serious poetry, but was practically reduced to -es in familiar versification, and in prose, even in the xivth and xvth century, as shewn in Mr. Murray’s paper, supra p. 287, note 1.
4 These lines are evidently corrupt as they stand. Morris reads 3-233, Of erbe yve growing in our yerd, ther mery is.
So made he eek a temple of fals godis,
How mighte he do a thing that more for bod is?
But me was taught, nought longe tyme soon is,
That synnes Crist wen never but onys
To weddying.
Alas! and can ye ben aginst of soneymes? 5591
Nought, God wot, but vanite in soneymes is. 18407

Since in place, place is 7349, the final -is must of necessity be pronounced, it is not reckoned among these examples, which are all that I have noted in the Canterbury Tales. To these, however, should be added, as equally convincing,—

Take youre disport: I nyl lieve no talis;
I know yow for a trewe wif, dame Alis.
From hous to hous, to here sondry talis,
That Jankyn clerk, and my gosib dame Alis. 6129

It would be impossible to read many lines in Chaucer without finding that the number of syllables in a line would be constantly in default, if the final e's were not reckoned. At the same time the number of syllables in a line would often be in excess, if every e final were reckoned. Again, the slightest examination shows us words which are at present identical, differing in different places by having and not having a final e. That this insertion or omission of the e final is not due simply to carelessness or option of the scribe, is apparent from the presence or absence of the e being generally essential to the metre, or the rhyme, and a notion seems to have possessed some persons, that lines could be made to scan by omitting or inserting these e's at pleasure. The examination of the prose tales, where these final e's are also found, ought to disabuse us of this absurd notion. We must admit that these final e's formed a part of the language of the time, and that there must have been some reasons for their insertion and omission. These we have, if possible, to discover, and the first step is to examine two modern languages, German and French, in which final e's also occur, and which are the living representatives of the Saxon and Norman elements of which Chaucer's poems were composed.

Final e in German, which is always pronounced where written, arises in several ways:

1) it is a natural final of many words as Ruhe, Weise, Reise, Mütze, Rabe, Käse, Knabe, Horde, Herberge, weise, leise, sachte,

sundre (for sondry), 19 sesone daie, 20 laie, 22 devoute, 23 nighte, 24 twente (for twenty), 25 sondre folke be (for by), 26 pilgrimes, 27 towards, 29 esold, 31 everychone, 32 anone, 34 þære powe, 37 resnone, 38 condiconne, 40 whiche whate 41 eke whatte arai, 42 knighte, where the Harleian shews no e, and: 8 half, 9 smal, 11 her, 30 sonn, 31 had, 32 felaweche, where the Har- 

leian has the final e. It is obvious that no conclusions respecting e final could be deduced from such an ortho-

graphy.
lange = (ruu'e, bhai'ze, rai'ze, myts'ae, ras'be, kee'ze, knaa'be, neer'be, neer'ze, her'ber'ghi, bhai'ze, lai'ze, sahkt'e, laq'e), and so forth, mostly representing some other vowel in old high German.

2) it is inflexional, frequently expressing—
   a) plurals as der Wind die Winde, der Zug die Züge, der Herzog die Herzoge, &c. = (der bhind dui bhind'e, der tsuuguh dui taygh'e, der herts'og dui herts'oghe).
   b) dative cases singular, as dem Winde, dem Zuge, dem Herzoge = (deem bhind'e, deem tsuuguh'e, deem herts'oghe).
   c) the plural of the indefinite adjective, as gute Götter, alle Menschen, lange Reisen = (gaut'e got'er, al'e mensch'en, laq'e rai'zen'en).
   d) the feminine singular of the indefinite adjective, as gute Mutter, arme Frau, keine Frucht = (gaut'e mut'er, arm'e frau, kain'e frukht').
   e) the nominative singular of the definite adjective in all genders, and accusative feminine and neuter, as der gute Mann die gute Frau, das gute Weib, ich ohre die gute Frau und das gute Weib = (der gaut'e man, dui gaut'u frau, das gaut'e bhai, ikh ee'ra), &c.
   f) the imperative singular of verbs, as liebe Gott, ohre den König = (lii'b'e got, ee're deem kœ'nigh).
   g) the first singular of the indicative mood present tense of verbs, as ich liebe ihn, ich fange an = (ikh lii'b'e in, ikh fa'ge an).
   h) the first and third person singular of the present and past tenses of the subjunctive mood of verbs, as er sagi, sie kome; sie sagten er käme = (er zaaght, szii kom'e, szii zaaght'en, er keem'e).
   i) the first and third person singular of the past tense of weak verbs, as ich liebte und er liebte dieselbe Freundin = (ikh liib't'e und eer liib't'e dui'zeib'froynd'ien).
   j) it is frequently added on to numbers in familiar counting, as eine, zwei, dreie, viere, fünf, &c. = (ain'e, tsbhai'e, drai'e, fii'ri, fyn'f).

With all these reasons for adding on e, and the very similar syllable en, (which on the Rhine is constantly called e), the language is necessarily full to overflowing with this termination, which is consequently very often dropped or slurred over with great rapidity in conversation. But that poets with perfect sensations of rhythm, and immense power of expression, accept this final e and even multiply it in a single line, may be collected from this one example in Goethe's most finished drama, Tasso, Act I., Sc. 1.

Ich bring' ihm seinen Sohn . . . .
Und thulle seine vaterliche Freude
(ich briq' im zain'en zoen . . . .)
unt tail'e zain'e foorterli'hfroynd'ien). 3

1 The final German e, en, in these transmissions have been generally represented by (e, en) as they are theoretically held to represent these sounds, but the reader should consult p. 119, note 1, col. 2, and p. 196, note 2, where these cases are fully discussed.
2 In these transmissions the German ey has been represented by (ey), the sound preferred by Dr. Rapp, but (oi), (ai) are frequent in the North, and (ae) in the South of Germany. Some theoreticians prefer (ey), and others (ay).
3 There are as many final e's in Chaucer's—
Him thoughte that his herte wolde broke (Him thoukweht dhat hris neert'e wol'de brekke), where the repeated e gives a melancholy softness to the line.
At the same time the first line gives an example of the elision of an e—ich bringe ihm—before a following vowel. This is not a rule, or a necessity, it is merely a matter of feeling. In such a verse as

Wie brennt meine alte Wunde.—(Heine's Die Grenadiere)

(Bhi brent main'e al'e bhund'e)

the elision mein' would have been impossible, on account of the concord, although it would have avoided a trisyllable measure and improved the metre. But throughout the first act of Tasso I have only noticed one instance in which Goethe has not avoided the necessity of an open vowel which he could not elide, namely

Für holde Früchte einer wahren Liebe

(Fyr hold'e fryht'e einer bhaar'en lieb'e).

where the natural pause at the caesura assist the reader. Thus when ich, er, ihm, es follows a verbal -e, the e is always elided, as: gar oft beneid' ich, irr' ich mich nicht, besser wär's = wäre es, ich geb' ihm oft = (gar oft beneid' ich, i.r ich mäch nicht, bes'er bheaxe, i'ch gebe ihm oft), and so on. The feeling is strongly shewn in

Erwach'! Erwache! Lass uns nicht empfinden,
Dass du das Gegenwärt'ge ganz verkennt.
(Erbhakh', erbhakh'e! Las uns niht empfind'en
Das du das geeh'genbhert'ge gants ferkenst'),

Where there are two other elisions one marked in : Gegenwärt'ge, the other unmarked in : verkennt, both similar to what might occur in Old English as semde for semde = seemed, singet for singest.

But Goethe does not hesitate to add on his e to an open vowel, as: ich thue was ich kann = (i'ch tuu'e bhez i'ch kan).

The e of the dative case is frequently omitted, as after the italicized words in—

Und lass mich der Gelegenheit, dem Glück—

Mir ist an diesem Augenblick genug—

Ach! sie versagt mir eben jetzt! Im Glück—

Doch war an Wissenschaft, an rechtem Sinn—

(Und las miñh der geleegh'naht, dem glyk—

Muir ist an diiz'em augeh'blick genug'nih'—

Akh! sai fézaaght miñh seben seetz! Im glyk—

Dokh bhaar an bheurelsaht, an reht'en zin—)

The imperative e is frequently omitted even when no vowel follows, as:

Und liebt er nicht—ersetzi' dass ich es sage!

(Und liibt er niñh'—srtzi's das i'ch es szaagh'.)

The final e is omitted in many other cases where the feeling of the poet requires it, even before a consonant, or at the end of a line where the elision is not absolutely necessary to the metre, as

Fest bleibt dein Sinn, und richtig dein Geschmack,

Dein Urtheil g'rad, stets ist dein Antheil gross

Am Grossen.—

Uns für den Schatz erkannte, den er lang'

Vergebens in der weiten Welt gesucht—

heilt er

Den Pfad, den leis' ihr schöner Fuss betrat—

Ich sah ihn heut' von fern; er hielt ein Buch—

Und bist du zu geinse', so will ich treiben—
Die Menge macht den Künstler irst und schen—
Von fremden Heerden Woe' und Buech erfüllt—
(Fest bläupt dain zin, und richt'gh dain geshmak,
Dan ur tail graed, shtects ist dain an tail groe
Am groe'en—
Uns fyr deen shats erken'te, deen er lasq
Fergesheen in der bhait'en bhelt zuuckेht—
na'licht eer
Deen phead, deen laiz iir shoseur er flus betraet—
Ist zaat sin xoet fon fer: er zillt sin burkhe
Und bist du tu gelind', soo bhil iad traib'en—
Dil meq'e makht den kynst'ler i.r unt sho—
Fon fremd'en neerd'en bhiz und bush eryft—)

All these examples are taken from the first act of Tasso. In lyrical poems we find similar omissions, not merely for the sake of rhythm or force, but also for the sake of rhyme. Thus in the

Maysied.

Zwischen Waizen und Korn, (Tebhish'en bhait'en unt korn,
Zwischen Hecken und Dorn, Tebhill'en reek'en und dorn,
Zwischen Bäumen und Gras, Tebhill'en boym' en und gras,
Wo geeth's Liebchen? Bhoe geeet's lib'khen?
Sag mir das! Szaaggh mir das!
An dem Felsen beim Flusses, An demm felsen baim fino,
Wo sie reichte den Kuss, Bhoe zii raiht'e deen kus,
Jenen ersten im Gras, Jeen en ersten im gras,
Seh'ich etwas! Szeez ied et'bhoe'!
Ist sie das? Ist zii das?)

Here Gras (grees) for Grasso (graas'e), and Flusses (flus'e) for Fluss (flus'e) are necessary for the rhyme. The most common omission is that of the dative e, but even the essential final e is occasionally left out, thus in the lines An Luna, we have Buohe (ruu'e) abbreviated to Ruh (ruu) for the rhyme.

Und in wollastvoller Ruh' (Unt in bhollastvoll'er ruh
Sah' derr Weltverschlag'me Ritter (Szech der bhelt'ferhlags'me river
Durch das glat'serne Gegitter (Durch das glaz'merne gegiter
Seines Madchens Nichten zu. (Szainz mad'chens naht'khen tsan.)

Less common and, no doubt intentionally, very harsh, is Schiller's

Donner sprach' (don'er,shpraakh') to rhyme with nach (nashk), in his

Kindes-mörderin, st. 9.

On the other hand in Goethe's Gluck der Entfemung (Glyk der Entfern'uq) we have an e apparently added in Glucks for Gluck,—really an archaism from the middle high German Gelucke,—also for the rhyme and metre.

Trink', o Jüngling! heilege Glucks (Triqk', oo rye'leeg! naile'ghes glyk'e,
Taglang aus der Liebsten Blieke. Teagh'tleeg aus der liib'sten blik'k.)

All poets do not avoid the open final e with the same scrupulousness as Goethe, thus Wilhelm Müller in his

Alexander Ispa'nt me has

An des Mittag Horizonte hing sein Auge unverwandt.
(An des mit'taetskhus noor'risont's niq saiz aughe'v un'erban'k?)

Such examples are however rare. On the other hand the omission of final e for rhyme or metre is very frequent. Thus for rhyme in Rückert's Der Betrogene Teufel (der betroogh'en toy'f), Eit'
(ail) is used for Eil (ail'c) to rhyme with Theil (tail). In Heine's Die Grenadiere, already quoted for non-elision, we have Grenadier' twice to rhyme with Quartier, mir (k'bhartiər, miər), and bitte (bit) to rhyme with mit (mit), and for metre

Und gürt mir um den Degen.

(Und gyrt mir um den degh'en.)

These examples, which could easily be greatly multiplied, will serve to shew how a living language deals with its final c's, and Germans know that this treatment of s final is not a mere license taken by the poet to help him out of difficulties, but is on the contrary a source of great power of expression, giving force and character to many passages by omission, and softness and delicacy to the others by the frequent use of the final s. Hence we are led to look upon the use and disuse of this letter, (the feeling for which has been entirely lost by Englishmen,) as a great resource for the poet, and a great beauty in the language. To those whom long custom has made familiar with the German language and the music of its poetry, the idea of constantly clipping off these final s's in the English fashion would be distasteful and barbarous to the last degree, and their frequency conveys no feeling of trailiness or weakness, as it does to the mere English reader.

Proceeding to French we meet with a new phenomenon, an existing system of versification founded upon an obsolete system of pronunciation (p. 119, note). In looking at French songs when set to music, we see that all final s's are pronounced, except before a following vowel or a mute h, and that the -ent of the plural of verbs is also pronounced as s, (except in the combination -lient where it is absolutely mute,) although it is not elided before a following vowel. But in common French discourse this final s and many medial s's may be said to be entirely elided. The consequence is that there is a great schism between the language of poetry and that of common life. When singing, the French not merely pronounce these s's, but dwell upon them, and give them long and accented notes in the music. This recognition is absolutely necessary to the measure of the verse, which, depending solely upon the number of the syllables in a line, and having no relation to the position of accent, is entirely broken up and destroyed when these syllables are omitted. And yet when they declaim, the French omit these final s's without mercy, producing, to English ears, a hideous rough shapeless unmusical result, which nothing but a consciousness of the existence of the omitted syllables can mass into rhythm.

1 In M. Jobert's Colloquial French (London, Whittaker, 1864), M. and Mme. Thériot's Phonographe and Tourrier's Model Book (4th ed. 1861, London, Nutt), will be found excellent rules for shewing when this s is or is not to be pronounced.

2 The late M. Turver, of Eton, in his Choix en Prose et en Vers (London, 1838), says: "The reading of French poetry (in tragedies especially, and principally in those which are considered as standards of classic purity,) is seldom pleasant to English ears; but in the complaint which is generally made of the want of harmony of the French verse, there is not sufficient allowance made. One is too apt to forget that the Ear, accustomed to the rhyme and peculiar intonations of one's
M. Féline, who endeavoured to introduce a phonetic system of printing French as an assistance in teaching ignorant adults to read, has, at the end of his *Exercices de lecture Phonétique, Aventures de Robinson Crusoe* (Paris, Didot, 1854), given an *Exemple de Déclamation*, consisting of a fragment of La Fontaine’s Fable (xi, 7), *Le paysan du Danube*, which he has printed phonetically. We are thus presented with a Frenchman’s views of how French poetry should be read, and as this is important in relation to the use of the final *e*, I think it worth while to give the greater portion of it in ordinary spelling and in a palaeotypic transcription of M. Féline’s characters.

The lines are supposed to be spoken by a German peasant to the Roman Senate. They are introduced by the following remarks:

“Cet exemple nous montre que, même dans la déclamation, il est des *e* muets qui ne se prononcent pas, quoique leur présence soit nécessaire à la mesure syllabique des vers. Cette suppression a lieu, soit parce que les deux consonnes séparées par l’*e* muet s’unissent facilement en raison de leur douceur, soit parce que le sens est interrompu. Il importe aussi de faire observer que, presque toutes les fois que l’*e* muet est supprimé, la syllabe qui le précède en acquiert plus d’intensité ou de longueur. A la fin des rimes féminines, quand il est précédé d’une voyelle, cette voyelle devient plus longue. On remarquera, en outre, que, lorsqu’on lève une finale dans un vers au commencement du suivant, la liaison doit avoir lieu.”

Language, is not easily pleased by foreign sounds;—that want of habit of hearing French read renders it a bad judge in point of harmony; that the full and rapid comprehension of the meaning of the author greatly influences our finding the words harmonious or harsh; and how few there are who can boast of so familiar an acquaintance with a foreign language!”

The following brief résumé of the laws of French versification given by M. Turver (ib.) may be useful. “Measure and Rhyme constitute French verse. Measure is determined by the number of syllables contained in the verse. The longest French verses have twelve syllables, commonly called feet. When, in the body of a verse, a word ends with an *e* *muet*, that is, an *e* not accented, and is followed by a word beginning with a vowel, the *e* *muet* is blended with that vowel, so as to form one sound, and consequently one foot only, instead of two. When the *e* *muet* is followed by an *e*, there is no elision. The termination *ent*, of the third person of verbs, which, in prose, is generally blended with the following syllable, if it begin with a vowel, must in verse, be sounded as a distinct syllable or foot, but, in the third person plural of the imperfect and conditional of verbs, such as *parlai*, *parlerai*, the *ent* of *aimer* does not form one distinct syllable, because there is but one sound uttered, *par-lai*, *par-le-rai*. Some diphthongs form two syllables, and some one, at the option of the author. The *oin* is a rest which comes after the sixth foot or syllable in heroic verse, and after the fourth syllable in verses of ten syllables.—There are no blank verses in French; they always rhyme. There are two sorts of rhymes, the masculine which ends with a consonant or combination of letters forming one full sound, such as, *lan-guis*, *tuxit*, &c., the feminine with an *e* *muet*. In heroic verses, the rhymes must be regularly and alternately, two masculine and two feminine. If a stanza end with a masculine rhyme, the following must begin with a feminine, and vice versé.” “Enjambement, the running on of the sense from the end of one verse to the beginning of the following. It is a fault and to be avoided,” but is often designately committed by Victor Hugo and recent poets.

1 This Mr. Féline has not marked particularly, I shall therefore place two dots (.) in place of the suppressed “e” *muet,* in order to guide the reader.

2 This he has marked, and hence I
LE PAYSAN DU DANUBE.—FRAGMENT.

Craignez, Romains, craignez que le ciel quelque jour
Ne transporte chez vous les pleurs et la misère;
Et mettant en nos mains, par un juste retour,
Les armes dont se sert sa vengeance sèvere,
Il ne vous fasse en sa colère
Nos esclaves a votre tour.
Et pourquoi sommes nous les vôtres ? Qu'on me die
En quoi vous valez mieux que cent peuples divers.
Quel droit vous a rendus maîtres de l'univers ?
Pourquoi venir troubler une innocente vie ?
Nous cultivions en paix d'heureux champs; et nos mains
Étaient proprès aux arts, ainsi qu'au labourage.
Qu'avez vous appris aux Germains ?
Ils ont l'adresse et le courage ;
S'ils avaient eu l'avidité
Comme vous, et la violence,
Peut-être en votre place ils auraient la puissance,
Et sauraient en user sans inhumanité.
Celle que vos prêtres ont sur nous exercée
N'entre qu'à peine en la pensée.
La majesté de vos autels
Elle même en est offensée ;
Car sachez que les immortels
Ont les regards sur nous. Grâces à vos exemples
Ils n'ont devant les yeux que des objets d'horreur,
De mépris d'eux et de leurs temples,
D'avarice qui va jusques à la fureur.
Rien ne suffit aux gens qui nous viennent de Rome,
La terre et le travail de l'homme
Font pour les assouvir des efforts superflus.
Retirez-les : on ne veut plus
Cultiver pour eux les compagnes.
Nous quittons les cités, nous fuyons aux montagnes,
Nous laissons nos chères compagnes ;
Nous ne conversons plus qu'avec des ours affreux,
Découragés de mettre au jour des malheureux,
Et de peupler pour Rome un pays qu'elle opprime.

Le peizaa dy Danyb.—Fragmee.

Crenje, Romea, crenje ka le siel kelke zhur
Ne transpoar she vu le plerz e la mizer.;
E metat aal no mea, par ox zhyste retur
Lez arme doa so ser sa vaazhaee sever.;
Il ne vu fas aal sa koler.;
Noz esklav...z a votre tur.;
E purkua som.. nu le votr..? K-oa ma dii..
Aa kua vu vala mios ka sall peplle diver.
Kel drua vuz a raady metre do l-yniver?
Purkua venir trubler yn inosaate vii..?
Nu kyltiviaaz aal pe d-sroe shaa.; e no meaz
Ete proprez oz ar, easi k-o laburazh..

K- ave vuz apriz o Zhermea?
Ilz oal l-adre s le kurazh.;
S- ilz avet y l-avidite
Kom.. vu, e la violasas.,
Pote cte- aal vorez plas ilz ore la pyisaas.,
E soeret aal- yze saaz inymanite.
Sel.. ka vo pteer oal syl ruuz egzernee..
N- aatze k- a pen- aal la passe..
La mazhste de voz otel
El.. mem- aal- et ofasse.

Kar saah koo lez immortelaz
Oa le regar syr nu. Graez a voz egzasp.,
In no- oal devaa lez xo ka dez obzhe d-ozer,
Do mepry d- oez e de ler taapl;
D- avaris. ki va zhyskaz a la fuyn.
Riea no syfit o zhaa ki nu vien.. do Rom:..
La ter e le travaj de l- om..
Foa pur lez assuvir dez efor syerfly.
Retire le: oal no voe ply
Kytilve pur o le kaapanj...
Nu kiioa le site, nu fyivoaz o maotanj.;
Nu lesoa no shier.. kaapanj.;
Nu no kalversoa ply k-avek dez urz afro,
Dekuranze de metre- o zhur de maluor;
E de peplle pur Rom oal pe,i k- el oprim...

which he places before a pronounced final "a muet," or a consonant that which runs on to the following vowel, and which I employ in the usual palaeotypic manner.
Notwithstanding that this passage does not offer numerous examples of the disarrangement produced by modern speech in French verse, yet it is evident that had French verse arisen in the present day, or had it followed the usages of pronunciation, it could not have taken such a form. Thus the distinction between the masculine and feminine rhymes, which is so important in the construction of French verse, has entirely disappeared, *severe*, *colere*, becoming (sever, kolere), do not differ from *divers*, *univers* (diver, univer), though a French poet who attempted to make the first rhyme with the second would be laughed from Parnassus. The rhyme *mains*, *Germaine*, has disappeared in (meaz, zhermez), owing to a "liaison" preserving the e in one case, while it was lost in another. The open vowels, which are so strictly forbidden, crop up, as in

\[ \text{Comme vous, et la violence.} \]

(kom vu e la violae.)

This line also wants two syllables, which the singer would have added as—

\[ \text{(koms vuaz e la violae).} \]

Observe also how the lines

\[ \text{Elle même en est offensée—} \]
\[ \text{D'avarice qui va jusquès à la fureur—} \]

suffer from the want of the italicized syllables.

The composition of French verse is as purely regulated by rule in France as that of ancient Latin and Greek verse is at modern English schools; it is thoroughly artificial. The French have got to feel a sort of rhythm in it as Étôians feel a rhythm in their own hexameters; but that the former at all resembled the rhythm known to the old French poets, can as little be imagined, as that the latter resembled the rhythm that guided Virgil. Even the popular rhymes of Béranger cannot always imitate the speech of the people, witness the italicized e's in the following first stanza of *Paillasse*—

\[ \text{J'enis né Paillasse, et mon papa,} \]
\[ \text{Pour m'laner sur la place,} \]
\[ \text{D'un coup d' pied quequ' part m'attrapa,} \]
\[ \text{Et m' dit : Sante, Paillasse !} \]
\[ \text{Tas l' jarret dispo,} \]
\[ \text{Quoiqu' t' ay' l' ventre gros} \]
\[ \text{Et la fac' rubicond.} \]
\[ \text{N' sau' point-x à demi} \]
\[ \text{Paillasse' mon ami ;} \]
\[ \text{Sante pour tout le monde !} \]

From the French we learn then this lesson, that it is possible to have a versification which requires the pronunciation of e final, although it has disappeared from the language. Hence Chaucer may have used an e final in poetry, which was unknown in common speech. But the French e final, which has now disappeared, was pronounced in general conversation as late as the xvi th century, as

---

we know both from Palsgrave, and from Meigret, and hence it must have been so pronounced in Chaucer's time, and must have formed part of the rhythm of the French verses with which he was well acquainted.

This examination of German and French versification has led us to two very different results. In German the final e is a living part of the language and metre, affecting the music of speech, a real element in prose and verse, in the loftiest and the homeliest discourse. In French the final e, although the representative of other original vowels, the note of feminine and of many parts of verbs, and of constant occurrence in writing, has died out as utterly in French as it has in English speech, but forms an element of the commonest as well as loftiest versification of the present day, any attempt to build verses upon the theory of its disappearance, as in English, being scouted as low and vulgar. What was the case with Chaucer?

The foundation of our language is Saxon. The construction of our sentences, the expressions of the relations of ideas by the order of words, has undergone little or no change from a period when French words were still unused. The only effect of the introduction of French words was to enlarge our vocabulary, not to alter our grammar. Hence it would seem more likely that while the Germanic e final was still in use in our language, it was employed by English poets much in the same way that it is now used by German poets. That is, we have every reason to suppose that it was generally, as we have proved that it was occasionally pronounced, whether it was a substitute for some other original vowel or was merely inflexional, but that in both cases it was omitted, when not destructive to the sense, before another vowel, or whenever its omission gave dignity, force or precision.1

In French versification the rule for the elision of final e before a subsequent vowel or a mute was absolute. We should therefore expect to find this rule absolute in Chaucer at least for French words. But it may have been only partially adopted. In this case however we have no occasion to go to a French model. In Chap. V, §§ 1 and 2, we shall see that this was the rule of English versification, even in the xivth century.

It is quite possible that, as the inflexional condition of our lan-

1 In German and French poetry the omission of the vowel is complete and absolute. It is not in any way slurred over or rapidly pronounced in connection with the following vowel, as is the case in Italian and Spanish poetry, and even in Italian singing. The Germans, like the Greeks, do not even write the elided vowel. The Latins wrote the elided vowel as the Italians do, and may therefore have touched it briefly, as in the English custom of reading Latin verse, whereas it is the German custom to omit such vowels altogether even in reading Latin verse. Except in a few instances, as e', e', &c., the French do not mark the elision of a final e before a following vowel, and in old English the vowel was written even when elided.

2 Occasionally, but less frequently, the final e may have been also omitted for the sake of the rhyme or the metre, but in such cases the poet must have felt that the sacrifice would have been greater to turn his verse so as to render the elision unnecessary.
Guage underwent a rapid degradation in the xvi th century, and was certainly much inferior in the xvi th to what it was in the xiii th, (several of the inflexional e's having perhaps disappeared even in Chaucer's time), and as most of the manuscripts belong to a period of at least a generation after Chaucer's death, this disuse of the final e may have considerably advanced before the best copies of his writings, which we possess, had come into existence. It may therefore well be that the scribe has frequently introduced or omitted final e's with rather an indistinct and uncertain feeling as to where they ought or ought not to be pronounced.  

We know indeed that even in the xvi th century, when the final e's had altogether disappeared from speech, they were considered an indispensable ornament in writing, and were added on without any knowledge on the writer's part whether their addition was or was not historically justifiable.

Before judging from the inner part of a line in Chaucer, whether the final e's that are written should be pronounced or mute, it is necessary to obtain some feeling as to the style and character of his verse. We have no occasion to consider the shorter lines of Sir Thopaz, nor the grouping of the lines into stanzas. The question is only, of how many syllables did one of Chaucer's longer lines consist, and where did the stress fall?

The last question requires the position of the accent in Chaucer's words to be considered. Or rather the two questions must be considered together, for there is no means of determining the position of the accent but by the metre. We may assume that the rhyming syllables had sufficient stress to make the rhyme fully audible, but we must be aware of concluding that therefore they had the chief stress. This rule would be generally true in German verse,—where however it is sometimes transgressed,—but it is not at all true of French verse. Many writers assert that French words have a fixed accent. In the xvi th century Palsgrave marks the position of the French accent and lays down rules for it. So does the very high phonetic authority, Rapp, in the xix th century. Nevertheless one of the great peculiarities of French, as distinguished from Italian on the one hand, (representing its Latin element,) and German on the other, (representing its Frankish element,) is the absence of determinate stress upon any syllable in a word. French speakers do frequently put a stress, but that stress varies with the feeling of the moment, and without affecting the intelligibility of a word. I have

1 See supra, p. 320, note.
2 See the latter part of Salesbury's observations on e in his Welsh pronunciation, infra, Chap. VIII. § 1.
3 The following remarks on the very difficult subject of accent and metre, make no pretension to completeness. The two volumes of Mr. Guest's History of English Rhythms, 1838, shew the extent of the subject, which, however, the present investigations make it requisite to reconsider. In these pages I have strictly confined myself to the smallest amount of discussion which my object allowed.
4 Compare etcas in the Maylied, supra p. 323, a word which generally has the stress on the et, as in other compounds of et, but there has nearly an even stress on both syllables.
heard the last word in *les champs Elysées* pronounced with a distinct stress on the first syllable on one occasion, on the second on another, and on the third on another. A German speaker is apt to accent the final syllable in French words, an English speaker the first. It is the *evenness* with which a Frenchmen pronounces the syllables that gives so much peculiarity to his pronunciation of English, and reflects his national habit of speech, a habit also shared, as I am informed, by the Turks. A simple example of the effect of this *evenness* is that most Englishmen feel the French Alexandrine to consist of four measures, of three syllables each, accented more or less distinctly on the last syllable, whereas the English and German Alexandrine founded upon it consists of six measures of two syllables each, more or less distinctly accented on the last. That the French allowed very evanescent syllables, as for example the final *e*, to fall on the even places, may be seen from the italicised syllables in Corneille's lines (L'imitation de Jeseu-Christ):

Les tenebres jamais n'approchent qui me suit;  
Et partout sur mes pas il trouve un jour sans nuit,  
Qui porte iniquue au coeur la lumiere de vie.—  
Ne lui sauroit offrir d'agreables victimes—  
Et la vertu sans eux est de telle valeur,  
Qu'il vaut mieux bien sentir la douleur de tes fautes,  
Que sauroit définir ce qui est cette douleur.1

1, 1, 3

We also find the same word differently placed in a verse with respect to the odd and even places, which should, therefore be differently accented according to any accentual theory. For example (Corneille, Imitation):

Et tu verras qu'enfin tout n'est que vanité.  
Vanité d'entreau richesses sur richesses.  
Le désir de savoir est naturel aux hommes.  
Borne tous les desirs et ce qu'il te faut faire.  
Les Squauans d'ordinaire ayment qu'on les garde.  
Qui puissent d'un Squauan faire un homme de bien.

1, 1, 3  1, 2, 2

And so on, shewing that in the year 1651, when this was published, there was no proper determinate stress on any French words. From this to the xivth century is a great leap, but the very fact that Chaucer employs his French words in the same way, leads us to infer that he was accustomed to the same practice in his French originals, thus:

| Trouthe and honour, freedom and curtesie. | 46 |
| And evere honoured for his worthiness. | 50 |
| Sche was so charitoble and so pitous. | 143 |
| They fillen gruf and criden pitously. | 961 |
| Tathemes, for to dwellen in prisoun. | 1025 |
| Oure prisoun for it may non othir be. | 1067 |
| Fairest of faire, o lidy min Venus. | 2223 |
| And ye be Venus, the goddess of love. | 2251 |

1 If the text be correct we find precisely similar cases in Chaucer—

Ful wel scha saught the service destyn. 122
That often hadde beene atte parys. 312
As seyde himself more than a curat. 219
It is needless to heap up examples as the fact is well known. It is dwelled upon by Mr. Skeat, but although he names the equable French pronunciation, he seems to think the final stress in English words to be due to the French and the change of accent to be entirely English. It is more probable that the words were always pronounced with an equable stress, which allowed of their appearing in either position, and this was altogether French.

There is at least one English termination which could be placed either in an odd or even place, namely -ynges, thus in

Syncynges he was or sawcynges al the day. 91

-ynges occurs both in an even and odd place. This termination, as a true participial form, is difficult to derive from Anglosaxon, where the termination was -end, -inde. In the Romant of the Rose we have -ande in an even place—

Poyytes and sleeves be welle sittande
Right and streight on the hande. 669
They shal hit tele how they thee fande
Curtes and wys, and welle deognde 683

And in the Canterbury Tales,

Touchand the cherl, they sayd that subtul the

But it occurs in an odd place apparently in—

The God of Loun deliverly
Come lepand to me hastily. 659

and in the Canterbury Tales,

Thr is ful many an eygh and many an eere
Awayland on a lord, and he not where. 7635
His meyne, which that herd of this affray,
Com lepand in, and chased out the frere. 7738

and by the analogy of all Germanic inflexional syllables it ought to be unaccented.

As a verbal noun the -ynges came directly from Anglosaxon, and it occurs in an even place so early as Genesis and Exodus.

pride and gissinges of louerd-hed. v. 832

Chaucer therefore apparently took the liberty of placing French words, foreign names, and English words with heavy terminations, as -ynges, -nisse, and some others, in any part of his line which

1 In the additions to Tyrwhitt’s preliminary Essay, Mr. Morris’s edition of Chaucer, vol. 1, 172-196. Bell and Dalby, London, 1866. See the list of words given by Prof. Child in his Essay, reproduced in the next section, art. 99. Prof. Child cites as “Examples of the French accent,” which he evidently regards as lying on the last syllable—
ther was discord, ranour, ne hevy-
nesse. 8308

glori and honour, regne, tresor and
rent(e) 15697

2 Mr. Skeat accentuates it (ib. p. 189). The change of form of the present participle is carefully noted in Koch, Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache, vol. 1, p. 342, to which I am indebted for the references to the Romant of the Rose, the text of which however, is unfortunately very doubtful (p. 252). The form -ende is very common in Gower, and is generally accepted. See Prof. Child’s observations in the next section, art. 64.

3 Prof. Child loc. cit. art. 99, also notices felawe 2650, &c., felawe 668, melie’re myleiere 644, 3167; melier 2929, &c.; yeusum 6962, yeusman 101.
suited his convenience, most probably pronouncing them with an even stress on each syllable, which in process of time became transformed into a double method of accentuating. For English words generally the usual Germanic rule of the stress on the radical syllable apparently prevailed.

Chaucer's verse seems to consist generally of five measures, with or without a final unaccented syllable, forming a "feminine rhyme," added at the pleasure of the poet. There is no trace of the strict alternation of couplets with masculine and feminine rhymes which distinguishes French verse of the classical period. Each measure properly consisted of two syllables, with more or less stress on the last, but each syllable might also have nearly the same stress. In the first measure the chief stress was often on the first syllable, as

\[
\text{Bright was the day and blew the firmament} \quad 10093
\]

Mr. Skeat has pointed out (ib. 174) that the first measure might consist of a single syllable, which then ought to have a certain stress, or at least be followed by a decidedly unaccented syllable, as

\[
\begin{align*}
&\textit{May} \quad \text{with all thyn flouris and thy greene.} \quad 1612 \\
&\textit{Ther} \quad \text{by aventure this Palamoun.} \quad 1618 \\
&\textit{Now} \quad \text{it schyneth, now it reyneth faste.} \quad 1637
\end{align*}
\]

His example

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{I make pleyly my confession,} \\
&\text{That I am the woful Palamoun.} \quad 1737
\end{align*}
\]

can scarcely be correct, as such a reading would be quite destructive of the sense, for \textit{that, am}, must be without stress, and \textit{I} must have the stress. The line is therefore corrupt. Tyrwhitt reads \textit{thilke for the}, another mode of correction would be

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{That I am he, the woful Palamoun,} \\
&\text{That hath thy prisoun broke wickedly.}
\end{align*}
\]

Probably Mr. Skeat is right in admitting a monosyllabic first measure, but it should not be accepted in any particular case, unless the single syllable it contains has a decided stress.\(^1\)

In the modern verse of five measures, there must be a principal stress on the last syllable

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{of the second and fourth measures} \\
&\text{or of the first and fourth measures} \\
&\text{or of the third and some other measure.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\) The first line of the Canterbury Tales seems to belong to this category. The Harleian 7383 reads \[\text{\textit{[swoote}} \]
The Harleian 7333 has \[\text{Whanne \textit{b} Aperyll \textit{w} his schoures}
where \textit{whanne} is an Anglosaxon form.
The Hengwrit MS. reads—\[\text{\textit{[sote}} \]
The Lansdowne 851 has \[\text{Whan that Averyll with his schoures}
The Harleian 1758 reads—\[\text{\textit{[sote}} \]
Whan that Aprill \textit{w} his schoures swote

Similarly

\[\textit{At} \text{bysmoterud with his habergeon.} \quad 77\]
There is also generally a stress upon the last syllable of the fifth measure, but if any one of the three conditions above stated are satisfied, the verse, so far as stress is concerned, is complete, no matter what other syllables have a greater or less stress or length.\footnote{1} It is a mistake to suppose that there are commonly or regularly, five stresses, one to each measure.\footnote{2}

This rule of stress is necessarily not so strictly carried out in Chaucer, who was provided with a number of words having even syllabic stress. But on examination it will be found to hold tolerably well. There are however many lines in which so many syllables come together, with little or no stress, that unless they are read somewhat syllabically rather than by measures, or stress, we fail to feel their rhythm. Thus

That every of you schal go wher him lest. 1850

may be accented on the italicised syllables, (first and fourth measures), in which case of you schal go would be passed over lightly, or else the whole line may be read with an even stress like a French verse, and this seems the more probably correct method.

Any measure may occasionally consist of three syllables, but in this case the two first are always very light. In

Wyd was his parish, and houses for asondur. 493
Biforn me sorowfa sorech creature. 1108

the third italicised measure has three syllables. In such cases it will be generally found that the first syllable is merely an inflexional or derivative e, en, er.

It is not usual in modern verse to have two trisyllabic measures in the same line, or if they do so occur they must be widely separated. It is also not customary in modern verse, but it is not unfrequent in Chaucer, to give three syllables to the fifth measure, as

Than with an angry woman doun in a hous. 6361
As wel over hir houesbond as over hir love. 6621

\footnote{1} The length of syllables has much to do with the force and character of a verse, but does not form part of its rhythmical laws.

\footnote{2} Take for example the first six lines of Lord Byron's \textit{Corinna}, marking the even measures by italics and the relative amount of stress by 0, 1, 2, we have—

\begin{verbatim}
O'er the glad waters of the dark blue sea
Our thoughts as boundless, and our souls as free,
Far as the breezes can bear, the billows foam,
Survey our empire, and behold our home!
These are our realms, no limits to their sway—
Our flag the sceptre all who must obey.
\end{verbatim}

The distribution of stress is seen to be very varied, but the action of the rules given in the text is well marked. Different readers would probably differ as to the ratios 1 and 2, in some lines, and others might think that it would be sufficient to mark stress and no stress. The last line most nearly approaches to having five principal stresses.
If gentiles were planted naturally. 6716
For vileynsyf full dodes maketh a cherk. 6740
That will nought be governed after her wyves. 6844

Besides the stress, the cesura plays an important part in modern verse. This consists in terminating a word, at the end of the second measure or in the middle of the third, or else more rarely at the end of the third or middle of the fourth measure. Words forming a logical whole must in this case be considered as parts of the same word. Thus Chaucer's

That slepen al the night—with open yhe. 10
(where the even measures are italicised) has the cesura (marked by a dash) after night, the end of the third measure, not at al, or the, because al the night has the effect of a single word.

If we now read Chaucer's lines with the pronunciation obtained in our previous investigations, we shall find it very difficult to say in general where the final e, when written, may not be sounded. 3 But the principle of economy would lead us to avoid the use of trisyllabic measures where they are not agreeable, or where they would be too frequent.

Final e arises in Chaucer 4 from nearly the same sources as in German:

1) as a substitute from some original final vowel—essential E
2) as a mark of plural, oblique case, or definite adjective—inflectional, oblique, definite E
3) as a mark of adverbs—adverbial E
4) as a mark of the infinitive mood and gerund, past tense of weak verbs, and imperative mood—verbal E
5) as a representative of the French final e—French E.

1 The trisyllabic measures in 6621
are avoided by reading o'er for over,
as in modern times, and in 6740 by reading mak'th.

2 "It is difficult to point out instances where the -e final is not sounded but it appears to be silent in dore 2424,
  feast 885, regne 879, and beste 1282." Skeat, ibid. p. 183. The reference numbers have been adapted. Now on examining these lines—
The rynges on the tempel dore that
hange 2424
only gives a trisyllabic fifth measure, comparable to the above instances where it is formed without a final e.
And of the feste that was at hire wed-
dynge. 885
Ther as a beste may at his last fullille. 1320
have trisyllabic third measures, which have never a bad effect, indeed we have

precisely the same rhythm in a line in
Goethe's Tasso, act 1:

       ein neu Hesperien
        Uns du die nicht alle
Für holde Früchte einer wahren Liebe?
       (ain noy Hesper-rien
Uns dund'nd bilden, ernstest du xii
nicht al's
Fyr hold-e fryht'v ain ve bhe'en
hir'-be?)

In fact when the cesura occurs in this place a trisyllabic third measure has a pleasant effect. In

[879]
How wommen was the regne of Femenye.
There is simply an elision of e final before a following vowel. Hence these four instances selected by Mr. Skeat
from the whole of the Knightes Tale, come to nothing.

3 Prof. Child's minute examination of the final E's in Chaucer, is given in the next section.
The use of the final e seems to have been more regular in poetry than prose, to judge by the prose tales in this manuscript, but this may be erroneous; the reason may only be that the scribe, to whom many of the uses of e final had become obsolete, had no guide, when writing prose, to correct his more modern spelling, or, as is more likely still, at once used the orthography corresponding to his more recent pronunciation.

The question now arises, was final e ever added on by the poet for the sake of metre or rhyme, as Goethe apparently added on e in Glucks as shewn above (p. 323)? It is possible, but not probable, as it would have been instantly detected as a weakness, unless it could be justified as an archaism, like Goethe's, or a colloquialism, as when sweet, dree, is said in German. But the scribe certainly not unfrequently added on an e when it was not required, shewing that the value and meaning of the final e was disappearing in his time. Mr. Skeat calls this "orthoeptic" and considers that it has "solely to do with the length of the preceding vowel" (Ibid. p. 189). I am more inclined to consider it "ignorant," and as pointing out a later date for the writing of the MS. See the observations on the Lansdowne MS. 851, supra p. 320, note. It would be impossible to suppose that the writer of that MS. added on an e in: wyfe, hafe, suche, whiche,—examples which occur in the first four lines,—to shew the lengthening of a vowel which was not lengthened.

The following examination of words with final E in the first 100 lines of the Canterbury Tales will give a clearer notion of their origin and use. To each word is added the number of the line, with an accent after it when the word is final. From the metre alone it is of course generally impossible to determine whether the final E at the end of a line is to be pronounced. Therefore we may, for the moment, reject all such from consideration. When an apostrophe is substituted for a final E, it shews that the e is written, but not pronounced, and is followed by a vowel or enclitic beginning with h. A double apostrophe shews that the e was written, but should apparently be omitted for the sake of the metre. When the word is in italics, it is essential to the metre in the middle of a verse. Prof. Child's remarks in the next section should be consulted by means of the list of Forms of Words in Chaucer and Gower referred to in Prof. Child's memoirs there appended.

1. Superficial final E, that is, a final E not required by grammar or by Anglo-Saxon usage. Aprille 1, vertu' 4, nyn' 24, wyc' 34, all' 38, fifteene 61', hethen' 66, mek' 69. Here Aprille 1, is really not essential to the metre, if we allow of a monosyllabic first measure. Nyne 24, and fifteene 61', may have assumed the e as numerals, § 5, art. 39. Weye 34, is written weghe in Ormin, so that the e was no more an addition of Chaucer's than the e of Glucks was an addition of Goethe's. The word occurs frequently without the e,

See Prof. Child on the cases where final e is found in Chaucer in words where it does not exist in Anglo-Saxon, infrà § 5, art. 13, 14, 16, 17, 30; and my footnote on art. 13.
and should be so written here. **Mone** 69, frequently requires to have a final *e* pronounced, but Orrin writes **meoc, meoc** without a final *e*.


3. **Essential final E**, that is, already existing in Anglesaxon or used as a substitute for some other vowel or syllable in Anglesaxon; the Anglesaxon form is given immediately after the word: swoote swete 1', swete swete 5, sonne sonna 7', ende ende 15', her' hira 32, tym' tima 35, tale talu 36, inne innan 41', trouth' trewe 46, werre werre 47', forre forra 48', mayde meden 69', son' sunu 79, hop' hops 88, mede, mede 89', goun' old friesian gone 93, nightingale nightegale 98'. In here = their 32, the *e* seems to have been scarcely ever pronounced. Though hop 88 may have been merely (scoop), the *e* may have been sounded (scoop-e) producing a trisyllabic second measure

In hope to stonden in his lady grace. 88

In **goune** there is no Anglesaxon authority, the *e* was not required and perhaps not pronounced.

4. **Verbal final E**, that is a final E which arises from the inflections of the verb: they wende 16, to secke 17', wer' thei 26, wolden ryde 27, had' I 31', made 38, to aryse 33', I yowe devyse 34', I pace 35, to told 38, wol I begynne 42, he lovede 45, it was wonne 51', he hadde' the bord bygonne 52, had' he be 56, he sayde 70', he wente 78, I gesse 82', syngyn', flowtyng 91, wel cowd' he sitt', ride 94', cowde mak', endite 95', justin', daunc', write 96', he lovede 97. Were 26, hadde 56, were frequently, or generally monosyllabic; portray 96 should be portrayed, but the *e* would be elided; lovede 45, 97 had the first *e* elided lovd 67, and similarly frequently.

5. **Oblique final E**, that is, *e* added to form a case or plural of substantives: to the roote 2, in every holt' 6, in felaschip 26, 32, atte beste 29, to reste 30', of ech' 39, in hethenesse 49, for his worthinesse 50', in presse 81', of lengthe 83', of strength 84', by nightertale 97'.

6. **Adjectival final E**, that is, an *e* added to form the plural or feminine of adjectives, or to make adjectives definite: the sones sonne 7', his halfe couse 8, smale secondes 9, ferre halwes kouthe' 14, whan that they wer' seeke 18, thei alte 26', weren wyde 28', our' 34, ful ofte tymey 52, alle naciouns 53, the grete see 59; this skye 64, lokkes cruyl 81, sones lengthe 83, freshe 84', filthes white and reede 90', sleeves wyde 93'. Ofte 52 seems here used as an adjective, for manye. In ours 34 the *e* does not seem to have been ever pronounced.

7. **Adverbial final E**, used to form the adverb: oft 55, everemor 67, last 77.

8. **Contracted article, atte beste** = at the beste, 29', 56.
It is thus seen that if we omit the consideration of final e at the end of a line, and allow final e to be elided before a subsequent vowel, we have only 23 cases in the first 100 lines in which the final e was essential to the metre. These are distributed as follows:

1. Superfluous final E (doubtful) - - - - 1
2. French final E - - - - - 2
3. Essential final E - - - - - 3
4. Verbal final E - - - - - 6
5. Oblique final E - - - - - 0
6. Adjectival final E - - - - - 10
7. Adverbial final E - - - - - 1

——23

Shewing that the verbal and adjectival final E’s were the most important. When the final E was so seldom required to satisfy the ear of a scribe who had ceased to use it in speech, we must not be surprised if he often treated it as an ornament to be added or omitted at pleasure. This seems to have been the case with all the later manuscripts.

Now turning from verse, let us examine the use of the final e in prose, as in the Tale of Melibeus. Here we do not find by any means so many e’s, or such regularity in their use. I refer to the words by the number of the paragraph containing them, and give two or three words together to facilitate reference, italicising the word under consideration.

mighty and riche 1 has the French e.
upon a day 1 for daye.
him to play 1, for to playe.
doreas were fast i-shite 1, pl. part.
olde foos 1, plural adj.
here feet, here, &c. 1, as usual.
nose 1, ags. nasu.
rendyng 2 for rendynge, the final e is here constantly omitted, and it is not always inserted in verse.
gan scoope and ore 2, infinitive e, this is generally correctly inserted, but the gerund e is often omitted.
as she dorste 2, verbal e.
of his scoypynge to stynte 2, the gerund e is correct, the oblique e is omitted, so again, of here scoypynge to stinte 3: but, what man schulde of his scoypynge stynte 4. The oblique e of the dative we found most frequently omitted in German, and it is clear that after a preposition which shewed the connection sufficiently, the inflection could be readily dispensed with.

Remedy of Love 3 for remedy. We have already noticed in the poetry many cases in which y final had been written for ys in French words. It is very possible that in these words the use of the final e rapidly dropped from speech, and that then the words had final long (ii). See p. 283. Love, ags. lufu, has always retained its e, although the e may have been short (u) in the xivth century; it is long in Ormin.
of hir child 3, oblique e, but child is constantly found with e even when not oblique.  
hir fille 3, this seems a superfluous e, ags. yll plenitudo.  
diligence amysable 3, have the French termination.  
hir housbonde 3, ags. husbonda, is regular.  
in this wise 3, ags. wise.  
youre self 3, usual form, but e not pronounced.  
forethe 3, adv. e, or else for sothe, oblique e.  
to a wyes man 3, ags. wis, distinct from the former wise. The  
oblique e is here omitted.  
such sorwe 3. Ormin has sorghe, but there is no e in ags. sorg,  
sorh, which should only form sorw, from sorwh = (sorkwh),  
compare sorwful 4.  
ye ne oughte nought 3, past tense.  
youre sif destroye 3, infinitive e.  
The wise man 3, definite adjective, compare the indefinite a wys  
man above.  
his owne persone 3, owne feminine e, and persone French e.  
anuervede noon and sayde 4, past tenses.  
And whan thou hast for-gon thy frend, do diligence to gete another  
frende, and this is more wisdom than to wepe for thy frend,  
which thou hast lorn, for therein is no boote 4. The spelling of  
frend is very careless, the first time it is right, the two following  
times it is reversed, frende frend for frend frende. To gete, to  
wepe are gerunds. Wisdom is an error for wisdom. Boote, old  
norse byfi.  
out of youre hert . . . glad in herte 4, ags. heerte, hence the first  
spelling is incorrect. Ormin has heorhte, herhte; hert would be  
a stag. It is singular that heart, hart are now distinguished by  
an e, but the e is put in the wrong part of the word. In German  
here is a contracted form, and herze is occasionally used in poetry,  
o.h.g. herza, goth. hairto (her-tou).  

It is not necessary to continue this examination. Sufficient has  
been adduced to show that the system of final e is the same in prose  
as in verse, so that it has not been invented by the poet or his scribe  
to patch up a line where necessary. If an editor of Chaucer would  
carefully examine all the final e's, restoring all those grammatically  
necessary, and ruthlessly omitting, or at least typographically  
dicating, all those which neither grammar nor derivation allow,  
when they were not necessary for the metre or rhyme, and then  
submit the others to a careful consideration, he would do the study  
of English great service. The elaborate researches of Prof. Child,  
described in the next section, have smoothed the way for such an  
edition, and in Chapter VII I have endeavoured to carry out this  
suggestion for the Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, in a method  
there explained, and in an orthography which the present examination  
has suggested. The careful examination of every verse thus  
rendered necessary has resulted in convincing me that Chaucer and  
Goethe used the final e in precisely the same way, with the solitary  
exception of the consistent elision of e before a vowel and silent A.
This conclusion is in harmony with the historical position of Chaucer. He was not the first or the only writer of smooth verses in English.Ormian’s are as regular as any written at the present day, and he treated his final s in precisely the same manner as Chaucer, making the same elisions. We shall find the same principle marked in the other versifiers of the xiii th century. Gower, Chaucer’s contemporary, carries out the use of the final s even to a greater extent than Chaucer. As Gower wrote also in French, this greater regularity may be attributed to French influence, but we must remember that the French final s at that time must have been regularly and distinctly pronounced in common conversation as well as in verse, or it would not have formed a part of Meigret’s phonetic prose in the middle of the xvi th century.

Although Chaucer, by the mere force of his genius, became the apparent founder of our English poetry,—few ever thinking of the equally smooth but insufferably tedious Gower,—he was in fact the last, not the first of a period. The wave of civil war passed over the country after his death, and when poetry again rose under Spenser, the language was altered in idiom and in sound, and Chaucer could only be “translated,” not imitated. A new versification suited to the new form of language rose to majesty in Spenser, Shakspere, Milton. Hence we must not look upon Chaucer as an innovator, and the justification of his final s must not be sought for in an imitation of the French, but in the custom of all the versifiers which preceded and accompanied him.

Acting upon this feeling I have examined what would be the result of this theory upon the pronunciation of Chaucer’s lines, and the mode in which I have printed the Prologue to the Canterbury Tales in Chap. VII, having given great facilities for performing the calculation, I have drawn up the following table. It must be remembered that the text in Chap. VII does not precisely accord with any manuscript, a few simple alterations having been made where the metre seemed to require it, but the general results will not be at all affected by these changes. The enumeration is by no means easy to make, as different opinions may be entertained of the categories under which elisions or retentions should be classed, and it is not possible to check it without taking far more trouble than the results deserve. In the present case the enumeration has been made twice, at considerable intervals, and the text was corrected between the two enumerations. The results differed, but not in any way to affect the conclusions to be drawn from them. The second series of numbers are here given because they refer to the text as it stands, but I would by no means guarantee their absolute correctness, although they were obtained with care.

1 Dryden’s and Pope’s ‘translations’ of Chaucer, remind one irresistibly of Quince’s exclamation: “Blesse thee Bottom, blesse thee; thou are translated.”—Mid. N. Dream, act 3, sc. 1, speech 41.
Final E was pronounced—

Before a vowel, doubtful: th‘olde Esculapius 429
Before a consonant

At the end of a line, that is, it is consonant with strictly
preserving the grammatical inflection, and the essen-
tial final E, with the rhyme, and with the cases last
numbered, to suppose that it was pronounced in this
position

Final ES was pronounced—

In the middle of a line
At the end of a line

Final E was elided—

Before a following vowel, always, with only one doubt-
ful exception, v. 429

Before he 92, his 22, him 13, hisr 6, her‘ 4, hem 1, hadde
7, have 1, how 1, with one doubtful exception before
he: that on his schyene a normal hadde he 388, and
none for the other words, except hadde, how, have,
which have not been noted, total

Final ES was treated as simple S—

In the middle of a line
Final E was regularly elided—

In hadde (with 12 exceptions: v. 253, 286, 310, 373,
379, 386, 447, 464, 554, 677, 700, 760, as num-
ered in Chap. VII, where the numbers sometimes
differ by 2 from Wright’s)

In her‘ = her, without exception
her‘ = their, without exception
wer‘ = were, one exception noted: woe was his cook,
but if his sauce were 351
our‘ = our, without exception
your‘ = your, without exception

Final E was arbitrarily elided—
as in modern German poetry, for the sake adding force to
the expression, for the metre or for the rhyme, either
at the end of a line or before a consonant—

when the mark of the oblique case
when the mark of verbal inflexion
when essential, or representing a final vowel in an
anterior stage of the language

Final E was arbitrarily added—

for the sake of rhyme or metre, in no case noted.

These enumerations enable us to lay down the following rules for
the pronunciation of final E, which would have to be verified by a
wider field of research, and as they agree essentially with the
results of Prof. Child’s more elaborate examination,—see the next
section, arts. 74 to 92,—they probably represent the practice of
the court dialect in the xiv th century as nearly as we can hope to
attain. There is reason to suppose that the s final had been long
much neglected in the Northern dialect.
Final unaccented e, when essential or inflectional was regularly pronounced, except in the following cases:

1. It was regularly elided before a following vowel.
2. It was regularly elided before a following he, his, him, hir', her', hem, and occasionally before hadde, have, how, to which Prof. Child adds hath and her = here.
3. In the following words, e though generally written was never sounded, hir' = her, hir' = their, our' = our, your' = your.
4. Final e was frequently not sounded in hadd, wer', tim', mor'.
5. Occasionally, but rarely in comparison to the other cases of elision, essential or inflectional final e was elided to render the expression terser, or to assist the metre or rhyme, precisely as in modern German poetry, but not so frequently as in German. The oblique e and essential e were most frequently dropped, as is also the case in German; the e of verbal inflection was seldom omitted.

By the elision of final e is meant its absolute suppression as in German, Greek, and French, not its rapid or slurred utterance as in Italian and Spanish. But there may be many cases of the fifth exception in which the elision may be saved by introducing a trisyllabic measure, without material harshness, and it must remain an undecided question whether Chaucer would or would not have elided the vowel in such cases. Judging from the practice in German, the elision seems most probable. For the effect of the action of these rules in declaiming Chaucer and Gower, reference must be made to the examples in Chap. VII.


In the Memoirs of the American Academy, New Series, Vol. viii, pp. 445–502, 3 June 1862, and Vol. ix. pp. 265–314, 9 January 1866 (subsequently revised so that it may be considered as dating from Nov. 1867), Professor Francis James Child, of Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S., has given the results of an elaborate and searching examination into the language of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales as exhibited in Wright's edition of the Harl. MS. 7334, and Gower's Confessio Amantis as edited, from no one manuscript in particular, and with an arbitrary system of
spelling justified by no single manuscript, by Dr. Reinhold Pauli.\(^1\) As a large portion of these investigations tend towards the discovery of the number of syllables in words, by determining when the final e was or was not pronounced, or should or should not be written, the present work would be incomplete without a full account of them, more especially as the memoirs themselves are not readily accessible.\(^2\)

**Nouns.**

Art. 1. Nouns which in Anglo-Saxon end in a vowel terminate in Chaucer and Gower uniformly in e.\(^3\)

2.\(^*\) First declension of Anglo-Saxon nouns. Neuters. (I. 1. Rask.)\(^4\)


\(^1\) Supra p. 256, note 1.

\(^2\) In the Memoir on Gower, for §§ 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, as printed, read 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30 respectively, as pointed out in the corrections to that paper. The corrected numbers only are used here. The memoirs have been slightly abridged, chiefly by omission, and amalgamated. The long lists of words appended without reference to certain articles, are given at length in a common index at the end, for convenience of casual consultation. When they do not appear in this index references are generally appended, but the whole of the references are not always given, and those to Pauli’s Gower are fre-quently omitted altogether. The words of the author have generally been retained. This re-arrangement is made with the kind permission of Prof. Child.

\(^3\) In Prof. Child’s papers e means an e pronounced, e an e elided, e and e written and not elided, but not forming a syllable in the editions used, [e] an e added by himself, (e) an e which occurs in Wright’s edition, but which he considers should be omitted. The grave accent (‘) marks the accented syllable.

\(^4\) The asterisk appended to the number of an article shows that the full references and explanations of the exemplificative words are in given in the final table of Forms of Words in Chaucer and Gower.

The following extract from B. Thorpe’s Translation of H. Rack’s Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue, Copenhagen, 1830, p. 28, will explain these references. 49. The following tables will serve as a synopsis of all the regular declensions:

**The Simple Order, or 1st Declension.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. &amp; Dat.</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural Nom. and Acc. -an

G. -ena

**The Complex Order.**

2nd. Declension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. &amp; Dat.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural N. & A. -as

Abl. & D. -um

Gen. -a

3rd. Declension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. &amp; Dat.</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural N. & A. -as

Abl. & D. -um

Gen. -a -a -a

"a (ena) -a (ena) -ena."
3. * Masculines. (I. 2.)

Ex. *Chaucer*—ape, asse, balke, bane, bere, bi-leeve, bowe, clifte, crede, crowe, cuppe, drope, dwale, fane, feere, foode, galle, grame, hare, harre, hawe, hiwe, housebond, housebons, hope, hunte, hyne, knave, knotte, kyte, lappe, leere, lippe, make, mawe, moons, mouthe, name, nekke, oxe, poke, pope, pride, prikke, reeve, schrew, spearwe, speke, steke, steede, stiere, sterre, stikke, tene, tym, wele, welle, wete, wile, wrecche.—bloeme, gere, schoppe, stete, webbe, wone, wright'. *Gower*—ape, asse, bere, be-lev, bonde-man, bowe, crede, cuppe, drope, dwale, fere, flete, fode, foile, galle, gere, grame, hare, herre, hewe, hope wan-hop, husw- (houe-)bonde, knape knave, lappe, like, lippe, make, mone, name, necke, onde, oxe, pese, pope, pricke, pride, see, shrew, snake, sparte, spore, stake, steede, stiere, stikke, swere, tene, thombe, time, wane, wele, welle, wile, wone, wroche.—cope, hunte, like, wan(e), wranne.

4. * Feminines. (I. 3.)

Ex. *Chaucer*—almesse, arwe, belle, berye, cappe, cheeke, chirche, cloote, cote, crowe, despe, dowse, erthe, sky, glose, harpe, heepe, heire, herte, hose, howe, lark, lille, mare, masse, myte, nightyngele, oule, panne, pipe, pirre, pisse-mye, pose, rafe, rose, schete, schere, schire, schyne, side, snare, sonne, swalwe, targe, throte, tonge, tonne, trappe, wak, wenche, wiche-craft, wise—birch', tapetera. *Gower*—almesse, arwe, belle, blase, cheke, chirche, crowe, crumme, despe, erthe, harpe, herte, hitte, kerse, lille, lunge, masse, mite, molde, netle, nightingale, nonne, oule, panne, pipe, reshe rishe reishe, se see, shete, side, sail, sonne, swalwe, throte, tonne, tunge, wache, wak, wiche-craft, wenche, wise—lapp-finke, more, sale.

5. * In the following the final e has been absorbed by y or e. In the following the final e seems to have been transposed from after l (as is often the case after r). *Gower*—The following may or may not be correctly written. The combination of a liquid with e is unstable, the vowel easily slipping from one side to the other of the consonant.

Ex. *Chaucer*—play, lady, sex: herberw herberwh herbergh, widow widw:


Ex. *Chaucer*—pith, beech, kers, stot.


Ex. *Chaucer*—awe, bale, cheese, ende, hate, begge, herde, hyve, ire, leche, lye, mede, myre, pilwe - beer, reye, skathe, tete, whete—some, mere-

8. * Exceptions to art. 7. Termination -schipe. The length of the words compounded with this termination may perhaps account for the final e being soon dropped. Termination -ere in Saxon nouns signifying for the most part an agent. It is quite as likely as not that in 544, 3167, the final e of mellere was pronounced. *Gower*—Such representatives as occur of the Saxon noun in -eré, denoting an agent, seem to want the final vowel. Nouns of this kind were by no means as common in the old language as in the modern. I have noticed but three fair cases in Gower. There are other in-

1 Paragraphs introduced by the word Gower followed by (——), are taken from the memoir on Gower, the other being from the memoir on Chaucer, but occasionally paragraphs are headed Chaucer—for greater distinctnesses.

3 The simple numbers refer to the lines in Wright's edition, as throughout this chapter, supra p. 256.
stances without the final e, but in these cases the succeeding word begins with a vowel, and it is supposable that the e may have been elided. It is doubtful whether these words should be called exceptions to art. 7; for, in the first place, the metre does not settle the question of their form, inasmuch as cläppë, for instance, would suit the verse (which hath no clapper for to chime, li 13′), as well as clapper; and secondly, if for any of them, can we show a form in -ere in the Saxon dictionary.

Ex. Chaucer—felawshipë, friendshipë, lordshipë, worship: carter, hopper, loverë, mellere miller, outtryders, siper, wonger. Gower—clapper,

9.* Third declension of Anglosaxon nouns. Neuters. (III. 1.)


10.* Masculines. (III. 2.)


11.* Feminines. (III. 3.)

Ex. Chaucer—breede, care, elde, fare, gappe, hele, hete, lawë, nave, nose, sakë, sawë, schame, schonde, schadwe schawe, scôle, sawe, spade, tale, talë yit, trouthe trouthe, ware—scale, spade, tale, trouthe.

12.* Exceptions. It will be noted that the nouns some and love have the final e regularly in Gower, contrary to the apparent rule in Chaucer. The same is true of the important word time, art. 8.

Ex. Chaucer—some sonë, woodë woodë; answar, lovë lovë.

13. Many nouns which in Anglosaxon end in a consonant have in Chaucer and Gower the termination ë, derived from an oblique case the old inflection. A few familiar parallel formations in other modern languages may be mentioned. Lat. radix, Ital. radice; animal, animale; cupido, cupidine; imago, imaginie; nix, neve; latro, ladrone; honor, onore; libertas, libertate; voluptas, voluptate.

So in colloquial Romanic, as compared with Greek:—Greek, λάμπνα, Romaic, lamphā; χήν, χήνα; νεξ, νύξτα.

Two forms not unfrequently occur; one with, and the other without the vowel. By the dropping of this vowel in later English, the primitive form is restored. Though this secondary, transitional form in ë is found in Layamon and the Ormulum (quite frequently with Feminines of the second Anglosaxon declension), yet it is by no means so common as in Chaucer.

As it is possible that some may think the forms in ë of the Masculine and Neuter nouns to be oblique cases of a nominative, which (if it occurred) would be found to end in a consonant, the grammatical relations of these words are always indicated, but this (probably superfluous) trouble has not been taken with the Feminines.¹

¹ This mode of citation refers to Paul's edition of Gower, vol. ii, p. 13. ² On examining Prof. Child's lists in §§ 14, 16, 17, 30, I have obtained the
14.* Masculines and neuters of the second and third declensions (II. 1, 2, III. 1, 2). Gower—Most, if not all, of the following, and many other nouns of the same declensions, are found in the primitive form without the vowel. In many instances the terminal e might be explained as the Saxon dative inflection, but it will be found on inspection that about half of the nouns in the list occur in the nominative or accusative case.

Ex. Chaucer—bedde, berne, bisearme, bladde, borwe, botme, brede, brembre, bronde, carte, childe, corne, croppre, cultre, dale, donge, drynke, feere, ferne, folde, foote, fyre fyre, gate, golde, grave, grounde, grove, hede brotherhede, chapmanshe, childhede falshe, manhede, maydenhede womanhede, heede, herne, hevene, hewe, hole, -holme, house, -kynne, -leke, liche, londe, loode, loone, lyste, lyve, mormorwe, myndwe, -oth, schippere, sithe, sleepe, -smoke, sore, sothe, spele, stalle, -style, -swyne, -tempel, tothe, towns, wave, wedde, werke, weye, whelpe, whippe, -wif, -wif, wronge, yere, arme, bote, carle, -derke, domê, fishe, keere, mele, schepe, sighwe, sowme, teere, walde, wyne wyn. Gower—bedde, bote, berde, berne, -bore, -borwe, bote, botme, -browe, -carte, -childe, -clerke, -cole, -cope, -dale, dawe, deale, dehte, dome, drinke, fee, fre, fire, fleashe, -fete, folde, folke, -fote, -gate, golde, grave, grounde, -hede falshe, godhede, hasthede, -kinghede knighthode, knighthilhede, ladyhede, -likyhede, maidenhede, manhede, susterhede -wif(e)hede, womanhede, hewe, home— the adverb should be spelt hom, age, ham, and not home; at hom is also the correct form, ags. at home—horse, house, kinge, kinne, leefe, liche, limme, life, -lude, londe, -lope, middle, minde, monthe, morwe, mote, mouthe, mule, rede, rore, scorne, sete, shape, shippe, shotte, shrife, sithe, -slepe, smoke, sore, sothe, stronde, templ, -thowe, -thing, -towne, -wave, -wedde, wele, weighte, -whippe, -wise, -wryde, -wryde, -werk, -worde, -worth, -wronge, -yere—so, so—hie, kepe, lette, leve, -swone, were.

15.* The following merely drop a final e (compare Lat. and Ital. acumen, acume; certamen, certame; vimen, vime).

Ex. Chaucer & Gower—eve, game, mayde.

16.* Feminines of the second declension. (II. 3.) These nouns have in Anglosaxon all the oblique cases of the singular in é.

Ex. Chaucer—beere, beme, boone, boote, brigge, bryde, burthe, bynne, dede, done, drede, ille, gifta, -glose, hallé, heede, helle hellé, helpe, helpe, heste heest, hyre huyre, keye, kynde man-kynde, lengthe, leve, lise, lystes as in 1861), morwe 14710, sothe 12690 (probably an adverb) swyne 1597, wave 4838, wife 6648. In the feminines we should also omit the accusative which had an e in Anglosaxon. They reduce to: bryde 9764, gifta 9167, lengthe, 17302, morwe 7768 (plural ?), schipere 2002 (probably an error for schiporen), spanne 166 (the accusative of dimension?), tyle 7687 (probably accusative), -youte 2381 and frequently. The adjectives reduce in the same way to: bare 8750 (feminine?), -bews 566, -eche 1184 (es4 would only give a monosyllabic first measure), home 1575, -lowe 10682 (feminine ?), merye 208 (Bosworth gives an ags. form mirige), -shorte 6206 (not in Harl. 7334), tame 2188, -wete 2340.
loode, starre, lora, lynde, lyvera, mesede, melle myllit, merke, merthe, myle, needes, nese bysnes boldenesse brightenesse clennesse cursednesse drunkennesse fairnesse falsenesse goodnesse handynesse he thinnesse hevynesse holi nesse homlynesse lewdenesse newefan giennesse schamfastnesse secknesse siker nesse stedefastnesse warrenesse wikked nesse witnesse worthinesse wrecchen nesse ydlenesse, bysnes clennesse goodnes lewednes hastynes worthines woodnes, ore, pyle, pyne, querna, rewe, roode, schipen, siwre, slouthe, sonde, sorwe, soule soul, spanne, speche, speché, stounde, streete, strenghte, synne, throwe, tyde, tyle, apriete, wade, werte, white, wolfe, womb, wounde, yerde, youthes — aip, booke, droughthe, lynde, rewthe, scherte, sleighte, steve ne, wiw, wrenche. **Gower**—banke, bene, berth the birth, blisse, bongs, bone, bowe, brige, chest, dede, drede, egge, fille fille fulle, filthe, forgithe, glede, growe, halle, halfe halve, hed, hele, helle, helpe help, heste, hinde, hire, heke, kinde, kieste, kite, lengthe, leve, linde, lorde, marche, mede, merthe mirthe, mile, nede, —nese be sinesse buxomnesses halinesse idlenesses rightwinesse sik(e) nesse sikernesse we rinesse wildernesse witnesse, ore, quene quené, reste, rewe rowe, rinde, rode, roode, salve, score, shele, slythe, slythe, slke, sloutha, sende, sorwe, soule, spanne, speche, stempe, stounde, strete, strength, thefe, throwe, tilthe, tide, warde, wede, wene, while, wombe, wounde, wrathe, wrenche, wulle wolfe, yerde, yfhe yebe, youthes—arist, fiste, flight, light, ladder, lefte, liver, nedel, rathe, sherte, slaught, sleighte, stafleshe, welthe, wierd, wente.

17.* Exceptions to art. 16. **Gower**—Hand, might, night, wight, are exceptional in Anglosaxon, having the accusative singular like the nominative: so *world*, more commonly: *bok* (constantly misspelt boke) i 2, 5: ii 58: iii 65, 138, etc.; *burgh*, ii 232: iii 292; *furgh*, ii 245, all feminines, are also irregular in Saxon, and have the accusative singular like the nominative. **Chaucer**—Nouns derived from Saxon feminine nouns in -ung, -ing, or formed in imitation of such, terminate in Layamon mostly in -ingë, rarely in -ing. In the Ormulum the termination is almost invariably -ing, but one or two have the nominative, and three or four an accusative in -ingë. The more usual ending in Chaucer is certainly -ynge. The termination -ynge occurs frequently at the end of a verse, and in most cases rhymed with an infinitive. **Gower**—Nouns derived from Saxon feminines in -ung, -ing, or formed in imitation of such, generally have in Gower the termination -inge, less frequently -ing: in the latter case the accent is sometimes thrown back.

Ex. **Chaucer**—aldir, ax, bench, blisse blissë, box, chest, curs, fann, fist fest, fit, flight, floor, hand bond, heeth, hen, mark, might, milk, night, ok ook, queen, sight, rest, soken, tow, wight, world, nouns in -yg Åxyn begynnynge clothing comynge çonnynge dwellynge flichtynge hângynge harpyng hântynge lôking longynge makynge offrynge rënnynge smyllynge têching wândrynge wêpyng wôrynge wrightynge wyanyng, lernynge turnynge, vanyshynge walkynge, ca rolînge comynge dawnenînge envenyynge fêlînge lûînge morwenînge offrynge rejoiynge seymynge tarynge werkynge all rhymed with infinitives synge byrrynge styngynge sprynge [and with the exception of felynge 16779 all oblique]. **Gower**—axel bench bridé flight flor(ë) hen bond les might milk might spelt spedd(ë) tow wight world, nouns in -inge axinge bakkintinge caroline childinge cominge compleigninge grucchinge knoulicheinge leisinge likinge lôkinge mishandleinge spekinge spélinge welwillinge wêpinge writinge, beginning knoulicheinge teching, hanting likinge wêning writing(ë); excusing of, hunting as, shedding of are apparently cases of elision—steven.

18.* The following nouns, of etymons more or less uncertain, but mostly of undoubted Gothic origin, are found in Chaucer and Gower terminating in ë.
PROF. CHILD ON CHAUCER AND GOWER.  Chap. IV. § 5.

Ex. Chaucer—brinkle, cake, charfare, cloke, coldwe, cope, dagger, deynté, dogge, drake, selawé selawé selawé selawé, gable, jade, knarre, know-leche, kyn-rede, marie, rote roote, sculle, alynge, snowte, stalke, tare, wyndoué wynke, wicky, window.

19. The unaccented final e of nouns of French origin is sounded in Chaucer as it is in French verse. Exceptions, however, are frequent. Gower—Exceptions are by no means so common as in (Wright's text of) the Canterbury Tales; a few exceptions, after the sounds r and s, are cited under arts. 84, 91f. So in adjectives. Chaucer—It is scarcely necessary to mention that an internal e in French words is also pronounced, as, comandaëment 2871, jugemént 780, etc.

Ex. Chaucer—Arcté Arcté, aunte, best, bille, cause, centre, chambré, couche, cynamome, dame, damadé, doute, Dryne Dryne Dryne, eese, egle, entente entent, experience, experience, face fas, feste fest, force forcé fora, fortune, grace gras 16242!, haunch, herbe, heritage, homicide, hoste ote host oit, joie, juge jugé, male, manere maner, medicine, nexe, personne personne, peyr, phisik, place place, plante, pompe, regne regné, remembreance, request request, Rome Romé, sauce, seige, servise, signe, spouse, tente, trumpem. Adj. chastite, excellente, nice, pore, riche, solempne. Gower—abbesse, adventure, avarice, baptism, beste, borde, bonde bonde, bowele, chere, Constance, defaute, deserte, egle, entente, 'envie, feste, fortune, grace, haste, homicide, hous, jote, justice, madame, magique, manere, mappemounde, mariage, matere, medicine, merveille, message, mewe, mule, multitude, nature, navie, offrende, oile, patience, passage, personne, pestilence, phisique, place, pompe, Rome, spume, vice, virgine, ymage. Adj. chaste, double, huge, invisible, nice = foolish, riche, solempne.

20. The accented final e of French nouns (in modern English, y) is of course preserved in Chaucer.

Ex. Chaucer—adversité, bounté, cherté, clarité, contré, liberté, perré, plenté, pruytité, renomé. [This accent is due to the editors, and is not in the MS.]


Ex. Chaucer—achiers 15, cherles 7788, lordes 47, Cristes 480, pigges 702, reëves 601, modres metes kynes 5435-5. Gower—loës iii 86, mannës iii 86, godës iii 88, worldiës iii 90, nightës iii 96, daës iii 111, bullës iii 119, kingës iii 146, livës iii 73.

The following have, at least sometimes, no termination:

Ex. Dec. I. Chaucer—holy chirche good 3981, holy chirche blood 3982, holy chirche feith 11445; his lady grace 88, oure lady vey 697, his ladies grace 9382; the sonne uprste 1053, the sonne stremes 16240, myn herte blood 10221, a widow sone 14913. Gower—the chirche kei i 10, mone light iii 109 (perhaps compounds), the mones circel i 109; my lady side i 160, this lady name ii 107, my lady chere i 213, my lady kith[e] iii 6, my lady good iii 30, ladies lovers i 228, "hest i 84, "selve i 228, "doughter ii 227, "mercy ii 118. So, Chaucer—fader 9239, 9012, 15670, 8772, 4036, 9389, 12757, 15423, but fadres 5883, 8738, 8685, 8747, 13626, 7837, 10175, 14833 ß brothir 3966, 13360?, brothers 11478, modres 15004, philosophre 12790, heven 6763, 10281, 12470, 16282, 13017. Gower—horse i 40, 119, heven ii 187, helie ii 97, soule i 39; fader i 209, faders i 167, brother i 199, brothers i 214, mother i 289, modres ii 354, doughter i 208, doughters i 150.
So, many proper nouns in s, as in Anglo-Saxon and Modern English
Chaucer—Epicurus 335, Peneus 2066, phemus i 166, Bachus ii 358, Phebus 17170, Melibes 15382, Phebus iii 260, etc.
Gower.—Poly-

22. Plural of nouns. Nominative. The Nominative Plural is formed for the most part in -ês; occasionally in -us or -is, a dialectic variety. Gower—-s only is frequently added, especially to nouns terminating in a liquid or in -t; sometimes when -es is added (rightly or wrongly), only -s is pronounced.

Ex. Chaucer — ladiês 900, bodyês 1007, knës 1105, 1877, degréês 17298; fowlîês 9, domes 325, chiknes 382, bones 702, fyngres 125; droppês 7; robes 319, knobbes 255, wyfes 284, knyfes 66, kyttyvves 1719, leves 1498; lokkës 76, songes 96, braunches 1069; bootês 203, argumentes 4632, ornamen tes 8134, houndes 146, swerdes 2058; stremmes grevês droupes leevês 1457-8, brawnës schaldres armes 2137-8. Gower — weïês, tirannïês, thwës, soûles, hilles, formes, philosphrês, fire, lore, sterres, droppes, herbes, levës, lives, wivës, turves, bokes, clerkes, beïnges, thinges, notes, frotest, bestes, flodes, cloudes, hevedes = heads, months, mouths. Chaucer — pilmgrystes 2860, nacionys 65, bargays 284, sessouns 349, sessions 357, pens 7158, lazars 245, sellers 248, achators 510, pilours 1069, lovers 1635—schoos 389, dys 1240; bisschopes 4675, kerveches 456, cațiês 926; reliks 13764, lorynges lordynges 7260, 16726, vyddynges 237, prechinges 6139; servanteês 101, contractês 6890, vestiments 2950, marchafts 4568, 4691, argumens 4648, maundementes 6668, instruments 9087; greyhoundês 196, stwardês 581, husbondes 2824. Gower — anglys, cardinals, nations; courte, points i 149, pointês i 151, elements, jugements, arguments, tiraunts, Sarcs, zins, complections, maconys; saints, estat(e)s, craftês, clime, herts hertês i 326, lovers, flizers, fathers; words i 176, wordês i 161, Grekês ii 171, Grekês i 165, knes knës, tre treês.

23. The following have -en, -n, derived from the Saxon plural in -an of the 1st Declension: asschen 1304, assen 5867, aissches 12735, been 10518, beec 7275, eyen yên 152, fleen 16949, hosen 458, oxon 5867, schoon 15143, schoos 459, ton 16348, toos 16817.

24. The following have -n, -en, by imitation, being of various declensions in Saxon. Gower—The following, which have the termination -n in Saxon, have superadded the -en of the 1st Declension to a weakened form of the Saxon plural.


25. The following have no termination in the plural, according to the rule of the Saxon neuters of the 2nd Declension: deer, folk, hors, neet, scheep, swin, thing, yer. (The word good added in Chaucer is corrected in Gower). So night 7467, wynter 10357, and probably freend 3052, 3053.

26. The plurals formed by change of vowel are the same in Chaucer and Gower as in English: feet, gees, men, teeth.

27. The following plurals of French words are remarkable: caas 325, pas 1892, degre 1892, secre 6923 (?), organ 16387, vessel 15634, but vesseaux vesseaux 16680, 16687, richesesses and riches.
28. The Genitive Plural in Chaucer and Gower is much the same as in English, saving, of course, the use of ès instead of s.

Ex. Chaucer — lordés heastès 8408, lorde doughtrès 13488, foze talle 15518, bestes dennes 18749, seinte lyvres 6272, mennes witten 4622, wymens counseiles 16742, his eyghten sight 10134. Gower— the Grekes lawe, alle mennes speche, mennes goodes ii 382, out of all other briddes sight i 100, princes hevedes, of the goddes pur- veinance.

ADJECTIVES.

29. Adjectives which end in e in Saxon end in è in Chaucer and Gower. Several other adjectives might probably be inserted in this list, but as they are found in the Canterbury Tales only in the "definite form" (see art. 32), they have not been noticed.

Ex. Chaucer — blithe blithè, clene clêne, dere, derne, drye, elenge, frende, grene, heende, kene, kynde, lene, newe, proude proud, rape, schoene, softe, stile, sterne, swete sweote, thanne, thikke, trewe, un-weelede, white—(all-) one, narwe, worthi worthi. Gower— blithe, a-cule, clene, dere, derne, dreio, fre, grene, kinde unkinde, mete unmete, milde unmilde, neisehe, newe, softe, sterne, stille, swete, thick, thime, trewe untrewre, un-wylde, yare—(al-) onè, onè.

30. The following adjectives and adjective pronouns, though ending in a consonant in Saxon, have sometimes, or always, the termination è in Chaucer and Gower, resembling the nouns in art. 13 (compare Lat. atrox, Ital. atrose; fallax, fallace, etc.). Gower— But most or all of the following are found also in the older form, without the -e. It will be observed that the adjectives in list (a), are all from monosyllabic Saxon stems, or from contracted dissyllables. A few polysyllabic adjectives are also found in Gower with the termination è. Chaucer—So, as if by dropping the final consonant (compare Lat. mortalis, Ital. mortale, etc.); haire 14151, lyte 2629, moche 1810.

Ex. Chaucer—alle, bare, blewe, eche, evens, faire, fawe, foule, freshe, grete, hige, longe, lowe, longe, olde, rowe, shorte, suche, swifle, tame, wete, whiche, wise, wyldre wilde wyld, yle, y-nowe—formes fader, apparently from agra. tromfürde—ware 1694 should be war, and charre (charriot) 16998 char, not to be confounded with charre = chair 16099. Gower—(e) alle, bare, bleche, blinde, brode, faire, false, gladde, grete, leve, leweed, like liche, longe, lowe, olde, one (the common forms are on, oun; the misspelling one continually occurs in Faul's text), righte, sharpe, stronge, suche, tame un-tame, thilke, whiche, wilde, wise; so, moste in 92.—(d) wommanishé, bodeliche, diversé, komen, devoute, secondé; so, as if by dropping the final consonant, golde, lote, moche.

31. The following adjectives of uncertain derivation are found terminating in è: badde, deynte, dronkelewe, meke, racle, wikke.

32. The Definite Form of monosyllabic Adjectives, including Participles and Adjective Pronouns (i.e. the Adjective when preceded by the Definite Article, by any other Demonstrative, or by a Possessive Pronoun) ends in Chaucer and Gower in è.

Ex. Chaucer— the yonge somme 7, his halfe cours 8, this like monk 176, atte (at the) full 653, thou felle Mars 1661, here hoote love 2321, that selve moment 2586, thy borne man 9664, thin false querle 16932. Gower—the wise man i 5, this foule greate coise i 100, my faire maidie i 154, her dreinte lord(e) ii 104, thy fulle mind ii 126, min bolde herte ii 277, that stronge place ii 376, his owne lif(e) i 9; so, in the derke i 190, in the depe i 194.
33. So, for the most part, the Definite Form of monosyllabic superlatives.

34. Among Definite Forms of the Adjective are to be reckoned adjectives occurring in forms of address (as in Anglo-Saxon, leofa fader, etc.).

Ex. Chaucer—ye false harlot 4266, however, that some of these forms be-
indef. fals 1132, goode leman 4246, long under art. 30. Gower—false
indef. good 514, but, O good Constance 5237, leve brother 1186, O strong
god 2375, indef. strong 752, O yonge
Hugh 16096, indef. 79. It is possible,

35. The Definite Form of Adjectives of more than one syllable has not (generally) the final ĕ. There are however more exceptions to this rule in Gower than in Chaucer. (a) Comparatives and Superlatives. (b) Post Participles in -ed, -t, -en. (c) Adjectives in -ed, -en, -ful, -isch, -ly, -y, etc. (d) Various adjectives of Latin derivation and terminations.

36. The following exceptions to arts. 32, 33, 35, occur, but many
of the readings are suspicious.

Ex. (a) To art. 32. Chaucer—the
greet 2387, 2525, 14402, his high 2539?,
9534 ?, 14328 ?, the dreyn 4489 ?, the
right 8149, his fals 13001, this good
14603 ?, this proud 3167 ? (the proude
4311, 13245), this fers 4720. Gower
his fals, her wrong, her glad, the bright,
the ninth, the seventh, his high lignage,
the high prowess, his high suffrance,
his sigh compas; but the highe god,
his highe worthinesse, his alié caste.—
(b) To art. 33. Chaucer—the first
14239, at the, atte, last 11059, 10759,
14259, for the best 1849, 9392, 11198,
the worst 1616. Gower—the best.—
(c) To art. 35. Chaucer—(c) the wo-
fulleré cheer 1342, the sorrowfulsté man
9972, the semliesté man, 17051. Gower
—(c) this tirannise knight iii 256, her
wommenische drede ii 66, thy bodeliche
kinde i 271, the hevenliche might i
138. (d) the covetouse flaterly, this
lecherous[é] pride iii 259, the parite
medicine, the secounde.

37. The distinction of the French masculine and feminine adjective
is preserved in one case,—seint, in Chaucer, seint Jon 5439,
seinté Mary 7186, and may perhaps be noticed in Gower in one or
two cases,—soveraine i 277, iii 356, gentile iii 352.

38. (a) The Comparative Degree of the Adjective is generally
formed in Chaucer and Gower, as in modern English, in -er (S.-re).
—(b) A few Comparatives of "irregular" Adjectives retain the
Saxon ĕ: worse were, lasse lesse, more bettre. These forms in
-re are all suspicious. Those of three syllables (if correctly spelt)
are contracted in reading, so that the metre does not determine
their validity, and er and re are easily interchanged.—(c) The vowel
change of the "ancient" comparison is found in the following:
lenger 332, elder 15746, eldest 15898, strenger 14240, strongest
15661.—(d) Some analytic forms of comparison are found: mo
slakke 14824, the moeste stedefast 9425, the moeste deintevous 9588,
the moeste free 11926, the moeste lusty 17039, the moeste grettast.

39. The Plural of Monosyllabic Adjectives ends in ĕ. The same
is the case with some of the Pronouns. So, also, bothe, fele, fewe,
and many of the Cardinal numbers. Those from 4 to 12, inclusive,
took an -e in Saxon when used absolutely except perhaps cahta,
ignon, endlufon.
Ex. (a) Chaucer—blak 569, blynge 4973, colde 1304, dede 7090, deva 12214, duklyng 4822, goode 3158, hore 7784, hote 9682, reede 90, sadde 17190, sharpe 475, sclandre 9476, seekte sike 18, slakke 14824, smale 9, stronge 2137, wayke 889, wrothe 1181, wyde 28, yonge 213; so, sworne brethren 8957, gilte cheynes 16866. Most of the irregulars occur without -e, as, blak 913, blyled 9124, cold 1577, deed 1201, deaf 445, good 183, hoor 3875, hoot 7018, reed 1912, sad 17207, sharp 2005, sclander 16318, sik 16323, smal 158, strong 637, weyk 14892, wroth 7743, wyd 498, yong 79. Gower—sharp notes softe highe lowe iii 90, blinde, colde, glidade, grete, harde, i-nowe, loude, olde, save, shorte, smale, softe, sothe, swifte. (b) Chaucer—bothe 1841, fele 8708, fewe 841, othere 3232, but other 7369, meth 8216, whiche 1016, the two last being occasionally used for the singular also. Gower—bothe, fele, fewe, some, som men i 21, suche, whiche. (c) Chaucer—twayne 8626, foure 2141, fyfe 492, sice 14586, sevyn 7857, seyven 13582, twelve 4139, but twelfe 7839, thretene 7841, fifeteene 3223. Gower—twene, two iii 196, thre, four, five, eighte, nine, twelve, twelwe (twelfe?) ii 68, thritene, fourtene, fiftene, sixtene, eightetene; seven, ten, eleven, are undeclined; twenty, thirty.

40. The Plural of Adjectives and Participles of more than one syllable has no -e.

Ex. (a) Chaucer—contrefete letters 5229, weddid men 8498, cered poketis 12730, sleves pur-filed 193, broken sleepes 1922, colours longyng 10253, they thankye galypung 10668. Gower—furred hodes i 63, lered men i 283, no other cases observed. (b) Chaucer—skulled browes 629, lewed wordes 10023, wikked werkys 5414, wretched wommen 952, wrecchede 923, sacred teorses 1923, golden clothys 6927, cristyn men 4800, open werres 2004, thinges spedul 5147, woful wreches 1719, synful deddes 6740, careful sikes 11176, blisful sydes 11971, seily clerkes 4998, mighty werkys 4990, tiel children 4993, biter teeres 2227, wiser men 9443, other men 12672, other 8312 absolutely. Gower—no dedly werres iii 222, thes(e) drefull iii 66, thes(e) woffull iii 323, woffull teris iii 260, doffuff clothes iii 291, other i 106, etc., these other i 20, al other i 64, we find another care = another's care i 167; other is sometimes undefined in age. (c) Chaucer—certeyn yeres 2998, mortal batailles 61, cruel briddes 15836, gentil men 6692, stubil clerkes 9301, payrtbly kesises 9512, jelous strokes 2636, elders vertuous 6736, pitous teeres 13239, sightes mervelous 11518. Gower—hastif rodeis ii 56, certein sterres ii 128, gentil hondes ii 291.

41. Even monosyllabic participles standing in the predicate are unvaried in the plural. It is sometimes the case with monosyllabic adjectives. Gower—Adjectives and Participles standing in the predicate sometimes take e in the plural, sometimes are unvaried.

Ex. Chaucer—(a) were hurt 2710, been born 4706, ben went 9075, were kept 10005, been blad 2901, ben knyt 11543, ben stert 11689, be brennt 13335, sworn were 13392, were slayn 15626. (b) quyk (they were) 1017, were glad 5804 were fayn 2709, which they were 40, were wroth 8313, (were) lik 1654, but: blaké were 559, were seeké 18, wayké ben 899, weren wyde 28, ben devé 12214, dedé were 11493. Gower—(a) that be greater i 5, ben to smale i 6, ben un-ware i 17, wittes be so blindè i 49, to him were alleé thinges couthi i 138, whiche are derken i 63, they were gladié i 79, weren dedé i 76, the gates were shetté i 348, we be

saufe bothé two i 198, hem that were him levé i 273, briddes been made ii 80, that him thoughte alleé women Íothé i 118, havé be full ofté sithes wrothé i 52, they shul of resen ben awsweréd i 51; we have even: whan that thesé herbés ben holomé i 161, in thinges that been naturéli i 135, of hem that were so discréti ii 167. (b) hem that ben so derk i 78, we ben set i 317, be shet ii 10, so ben my wittes overlaid ii 21, all men be left ii 119, hem that thanne were good i 11, which only were sauf by ship ii 38, the thre were eth to reule ii 60, they were clyped ii 165, they ben laid ii 246, the ben corrupt ii 163.
42. Exceptions to arts. 39, 40, 41.

Ex. Chaucer—art. 39a brenn bones 12687,—39e enleven 17300,—40a ler-
nede men 577? lerned men 14389, eynen fast yschette 4980? Qu. fostë
schette?—40e dyversë freres 7537, dy-
versë folk dyversëly seyde 3856, divers freres 7532, thay ben so dyvër
7588.—art. 41 been mette 1638? were
faldë 2926, they be i-mette 5535, been
sette 5538, were made 5702? been
maad 2091. Gower—40e of godes and
precious stones ii 47, his bedes most
devoute i 64, divrêsë occurs i 56, 252,
256, ii 164, 325, iii 26, but is found
also in the singular, see art. 30 Ex. 6.

43. The following adjectives (of French origin) exhibit the
French plural in s: places delitables 1121, necessaries as ben
pleysynges 5131, wayes espirituels, goodes espirituelles, but things
espirituel, travailes covenables. Even Palsgrave says (1530) pro-
nownes prynmytves, verbes actyves personalles. Gower—til they
become so vilains i 28.

44. Of the Genitive Plural of Adjectives there remains a trace in
the word all: here aller cape 588, your alther cost 801, oure
althur cok 825, alther best 712, alther first 10863; alther werst
i 53: ii 224: iii 9: allthermest i 147, 224, altherbest i 106: ii 20:
alhtertrewest i 176.

 Pronouns.
(See also arts. 30, 32a, 35c, 39b, 44.)

45. Personal Pronouns and their Possessives. Chaucer—Yk,
3865, ich 10037, 3862, 12857, 14362; my, myn; sing. and pl.: abs.
form myn, mynë. Thy, thyn sing. and pl., abs. form thyn,
thynë. Hir, hirë = her, abs. form heres. Our, oure, abs. oures.
Your, youre, abs. yourë, yourës. Her, hir, herë = their, abs.
heris 7508; hem = them. The Saxon genitives mın, ūn, ūr, cūwer, are declined (like adjectives) for possessive pronouns, but
not the genitives of the third person. Of the above forms, some
of those in e must be regarded as adjectives declined. Gower—I;
min, my, abs. min, minë; me dat. & acc. Thou; thin, thy, the dat.
& acc. He, his gen. masc. & neut., her gen. fem., abs. hers, ii 287,
her[ē]ë i 358; him dat. mas., herë her dat. fem., him acc. masc.
i 6 etc., hirë, herë, her acc. fem. commonly her. We, oure, our, us
dat. acc. Ye, youre, your, abs. yourës, you dat. acc. Her = their,
abs. her[ē]ë, hem dat. acc. = them. Their, their but seldom occurs
and wherever it is found we should doubtless read her; i 111, i 245,
i 48, iii 219, i 65, 59, 76, 115; them is not found.

46. In Saxon sylf, self, same, was declined like an adjective both
definitely and indefinitely, and agreed with the pronoun to which it
was attached; as, ic sylf, or ic sylfa, I myself; be me sylfum, by
myself. The forms ic me-sylf, pū þe-self, I myself, etc., also occur.
The following are the combinations of the personal pronouns with
self in Chaucer—myself, myselfe, myselven; thyselven, himself, himselfe,
himselfe, himselfen; hirselfe, hirselven; youselfe, youreselven; himself = themselves, hemselven. Gower—my-
self, myselfë; myselfe, myselven, myselven; thyselven, thyselven;
himself, himselfe, himselfe, himselfelven; herself, herselven,
herselfen; usself = ourselfes; hemself, themselves; my ladies selve i 228, should doubtless be my ladie, the s being caught from selve: selfe, preceded by the article, means the same, as in Saxon; the selfe prest i 48.

47. Demonstratives and others.—Chaucer—that = the, as in: that oon, that other 1551, 1553, 7603, 9350, 9351, 12151, 12152, 14222, &c., tho = those; oon of tho that 2353; they (their and them do not occur), thi 1755 should probably be they, thes = these, this = these, these (?), 9150, etc, these (?), 9110; whos genitive 5062, 5438, 7350, everich, on oon, non noon, pl. noon, abs. noon. Gower—that = the, the, that dem. sing., tho = those, this, these should be thes, these = these, thilk = that, so = such. Relative that, which, whiche, whos, whom; that = that which, what = that which, the which, which that, etc. = simple which, etc; who that, what that, etc. = quisquis, quicumque; what = whatsoever. Interrogative, who, which, what, as in English; whether = which of two. Indefinite, somwho = aliquus (once only) i 15.

VERBS.

48. Present Indicative. The First Person Singular of the Present Indicative terminates in -e.

Exceptions. Chaucer— I bequeste 2777(?), trow 3666, 10527, trowe 17312, answere 4982, schrew 7024, sel that I wered ded(e); (probably incorrect) 2234; sel 9332, 9338, hop 9448 red, i 299.

49. The Second Person of the Present Indicative ends in -st as in modern English. But sometimes in -s, in Chaucer not in Gower. The Second and Third Persons occasionally, but very rarely, end in Anglosaxon in is.

50. The Third Person ends generally in -eth, -th, occasionally (in Chaucer not in Gower) in -es (is).

51. But Saxon verbs which have t or d for the last consonant of the root, and one or two which have s, form the Third Person Singular in t as in Saxon. Exceptions sometimes occur, a dissyllabic form being used, as also in Anglosaxon, as sitteth, but this hardly occurs in Gower.

Ex. Chaucer—sitt sit syt 3641, 3817, etc., set 7564, wris 6291, amyt 7998, light 6526, pat 13768, hight 1974, byt (bide) 187, 9291, 10865, byt (abides) 13103, rit ryt 10483, 12536, 17011, slyt 12610, chyt 12849, let 8465, stant stont 3077, 7616, etc., fyn fyns 4069, 4128, etc., gryn gryst 5971, sent 9027, blent 15319, ehent, but 10925, holt holt 9224, ris ryst aryst 3688, 4686, 9284, kyt(?) 4805. Exceptions: sitteth 1601, byddeth 3641, rideth 14734, stondeth 14060, kissth 9822, ryseth 1666, 13662, bihetth, heeteth, putteeth. Gower—writ, smut let, bott, shet = shoots, spret = spreads, behols, pat, set, holt, ge, byt, first, sit, hit, abit, fin, bint, blent; in a few cases we find d instead of t, stood i 84, send i 221, held i 328; arist, lost lest = loses, wox; le let it never out of his honds, but get him more and hait it fast(e) i 128, he taketh, he kepeth, he hait, he bint i 284. Exceptions: lasteth overcasteth i 317, but we should probably read arist in: the mod arysth of the service i 342.

52. The Plural of the Present Indicative ends in Chaucer in eth
(ith, th); more commonly in -en, n (yn); sometimes in *e; in Gower, rarely in -eth, generally in -en, sometimes in -e.

53. Imperfect Indicative. Simple (or "Regular") Verbs. a. The Imperfect of Simple Verbs is often formed by adding -ede, -de, or -te to the root, with occasional change of vowel,—as in Saxon.
b. The Imperfect Indicative, in Chaucer often (perhaps more generally), in Gower sometimes, drops the $e$ of the above-mentioned terminations.
c. The Second Person Singular of the Imperfect Indicative of simple verbs is formed in -est, like the Saxon and English. But thou axed occurs 7064.

Ex. to (c). The rhyme in several cases will show conclusively that the final $e$ was actually dropped, and not simply left off by the copyists: brought nought 11585, went yheht (participle) 12462, 16586.

54. Imperfect of Strong, Complex or "Irregular" Verbs. (a) Chaucer.—A few verbs have, besides the Strong Imperfect, a later form of the other conjugations, e.g.: sleep 98, 5165, 9731, slepte 4192, slept 11033; weep 2823, 2880, 8421, weptè 148; creep 4224, 4258, crepte 4191. The following cases are suspicious, and some, if not all of them, bad readings: bifelle belfille fille 9771, 10390, 10007, 10883, dronke 7643, cete 15703, come (to) 1729 should be: com unto, badde (four) 4911 (should be: bad the four).

See has various forms, saw 11503, saugh 193, saige 855, say 8543; sihe 11162 (if correct) is an instance of an $e$ arising from the softening away of a guttural. Ryngede (the tromp and clarioun) occurs 2602; rong 14077. The conjugation of the Anglosaxon hrigan is uncertain, but it would be strange if a verb weak in Saxon had become strong in English. Gower—Several Strong or Complex Verbs have in Gower the Imperfect Tense in $e$, contrary both to ancient and present rule; but how as ever it fell so it 67, but: befell i 214, etc., he toké manifold(e) i 231, he bondé both her armes ii 318, I camé fró i 98, this ilké talé comé iii 350.

(b) Chaucer—The 2nd Person Singular of the Imperfect Indicative of Strong Verbs (which in Anglosaxon terminates in $e$) has commonly in Chaucer no termination or is the same as the 1st and 3rd, thus: thou bighelt 2474, saugh 5268, swoer 8372, bar 8944, 11976, spak 12422, 14168, dork 15712, flough 16717, thou were 16146, 16718, were nere 4786, 13635, 15886, 15888, 15892, 17177, gave 15937, songe 17226, the $e$ is doubtful in were, gave, songe, and especially in the two last; but, knewest 4787, hightest 8372?, bygonnest 12370. Gower—The Second Person Singular of the Imperfect Indicative of Strong Verbs (which in Saxon ends in $e$) in the few cases which occur, either has $e$, or is the same as the 1st Person, as: thou sìghté, weré, were, knewe, come.

55. The Plural of the Imperfect Indicative (both of Simple and Complex Verbs) ends (a) in -en, or (b) in -e, or (c) has no termination.

Ex. to (c). Chaucer—schuld 2543, sayd 7872, remued 11817, herd 1426, 4898, 14253, cried 2564, besought, used 14910, sawgh saugh seigh 4638, rhymes with sought, 4116, had 5786, 7121, 9956, 9278, 13004, began, rhymes
with man, 5767, bygon 7142, schon stood i 80, stood i 233, shuld iii 144, 9000, wan 11718, sat 14079, com ran iii 300, wold iii 356, had i 101, 16473, fond 18476, ran, rhymes with wist ii 163, fall ii 380.
man, 16897. Gower—let i 80, under-

56. Subjunctive. The Singular of the Subjunctive, both Present and Imperfect, uniformly ends in e through all the Persons as in Saxon. The Plural of the Subjunctive is in -en, -e.

57. Imperative. In Anglosaxon the 2nd person singular of the Imperative consists of the root of the verb, and terminates therefore, in what is called the characteristic consonant: except that verbs whose infinitive is in -ian (1st Conj., 1st class) have the Imperative sing. in a (as lafam, lafa), while those which have a double characteristic drop one of the consonants and replace it with e (as vittan, vite). The plural of the Imperative is the same as that of the Indicative, and ends in ath (iath), when the pronoun or subject goes before or is omitted, or in e, when the pronoun which is the subject follows. In Chaucer the Imperative exhibits considerable irregularity. The a of the Saxon Imperative singular of the 1st conj. becomes e, which e is sometimes shortened or suppressed. The full plural form (in -eth) is of very frequent occurrence; but sometimes the -th appears to be dropped, and very frequently the whole termination. In this case the plural is not to be distinguished from the singular form, and both are found together. Gower—In those forms of the singular of the Imperative which end in a vowel, the vowel is not well preserved in Gower. In Pauli's text an e is generally appended to the forms which in Saxon end in a consonant; erroneously, as the slightest inspection will shew.

58. Second Person Singular of Imperative.

Ex. Chaucer—(a) Simple conjugation: sake axe 3557, herke harke 9168 herke 7500, grope 7272, knokke 3432, thanke 16172, bave 2421? havē 2227, loke 7169 loke 3549, schewē 7675, mak 3720, telle 7026 telle 3433 tel 7346, bygryne 13049, fettē 3492, lēf 1616 lef 7671 ?, fynd thou 2246, speed 3623, stynat 3146, keep 6488, red resed 17276, send 2227, plight 6591, thend 10039, thou bek 17278, recche 12626 ?, yeldē 13604, wreke 15931 ?
(b) Complex conjugation: spek 3803, ber 7662, brek 15413, com 6016, et 15938, gif 2222, hold 2670, bhold 16501, awak 4260, awakē 4288 ?, tak 2228 takē 9172 ? thou take 16937, far well 14675, let lat 923 letē 3713 ?, do 2407, go 3431, wopē 2480 ? fynd 2246, drynk 7685, holp 2089, smyt 17217, rys 13183, wyt 10051, abyd 6751, ches 1616 cheē 1597 ?, be 6488, rydē 16413 ?. The superfluous e in all the words marked (?) is altogether suspicious, and probably should be dropped. (c) In the following cases the final e is difficult to be accounted for, unless an abridged plural form is confounded with the singular: holde thy pees 9606, (Tyrwhit has hold thou), werkē by counsil and thou shalt nat rewē 3530, ... I praye the ... as sendē love 2319, ne with no wood man walkē by the way 7669. Gower—(a) Forms which in Saxon end in a vowel: mediē, lokē, tellē, but lokē i 85, tel i 49, etc., tellē i 47, herken i 53, etc., should very likely be herke, herke, shewē. (b) Forms which in Saxon end in a consonant: list, let, yif yef, shrift shrīvē, drynk, kepē, redē, levé, spekē, takē, farē, comē, abidē, beholdē. (c) behold(e) and demē (demeth?) my queere i 196, for setē (seteth?) well that never man ii 242.

59. Plural (a) generally in -eth, (b) occasionally loses its final consonant; awake 3700, hithe 7191, tritte 10642, holde 7779
(rhymes with: he tolde), loke 11304, make 14837 (c) often the termination is entirely dropped, (d) sometimes the abridged plural (if we should not rather say the singular) seems to be used indifferently for the full and regular plural: in other words, the singular and plural forms are entirely confounded: tel sparit 5768, tellith let 6871, goth ley 2560, awaké spekeoth 3700, stoupeh helpeth put loké 13255-7, youre gentilnesse ... lat thou falle 922-3, rydé brek 15413, cast armith 12312-3, voydyth let schet 13064-5.

60. Infinitive. The Infinitive in Chaucer and Gower ends in -en (Anglosaxon -an) often shortened to -e. In a few cases in Chaucer the termination -e is dropped. A few contracted infinitives in Chaucer are sometimes protracted(?): to seene 1037, to sayne 10628, to doone 10648. The prefix y- (S. ge-) is found in at least one case before the infinitive: y-knowe 11199. We find in Gower the infinitive without to after several verbs which now require that sign, thus: thanke assaie, wende have said, assay desireth, they crie begunne, gonnen say, is free defende, oughte put, were lever have had. We also find the Infinitive with to or for to in the same connections, and to and for to in indifferently used.

61. Participles. The Perfect Participle of Complex ("Irregular") Verbs terminates in -en. The -n is often dropped, especially in Gower as printed by Pauli. The contracted Participle seems in a few instances to be protracted(?), as: sene seene (S. segen) 134, 594; 926; slayne (S. slegen) 14116; sene i 42, 82: be-seine i 54.

62. Participles. The Perfect Participle of the simple Conjugation requires no notice. Send, which has Imperfect sende 1134, has Participle send 10438. Some Verbs which are of the Complex Conjugation in Saxon have become simple in Chaucer, according to the well known law. Hence we have wiset for wielen 10574, 12210. Dawet 5935, amendit 7757, &c., are trivial dialectic varieties. The abbreviated forms annonciate, consecrate (like the above, common in Scotch) occur 15501, 3, kidde 9817, should probably be kid.

63. Participles. The prefix y-, i- (S. ge-) frequently occurs in Chaucer, but not frequently in Gower, before the past participle.

64. Participles. The Present Participle terminates for the most part in -ying (Anglosaxon -ende). In some cases, however, it is rhymed with the Infinitive Mood, and we must either suppose the participle to end in yngé, or else the Infinitive to have lost its termination. The older forms awaytand 7634, lepand 7739, tooch- and 7872 occur, all in the Somnpoures Tales. Gower—The Present Participle terminates, with few exceptions, in -ende (S. -ende). Many words of French origin adopt this termination. In innumerable cases the elided e is not printed in Pauli's Gower. Much less frequently the accent is thrown back: comend after i 1, touche of i 52, etc. Only two suspicious cases have been observed where the participle ends in -end, where no elision could take place. A very few cases occur of the later form of the participle in -inge, -ing, salinge i 59, wisshinge and wépinge i 45, meving i 213, brenninge ii 29, sitting iii 253.
65. Anomalous verbs.¹

Can = know, be able; ps. can canst; ppl. connen connen konne connē can; imps. couthe cowthe cowde couthe; impl. couthen; inf. conn; pp. couth coud.

Dar = dare; ps. dar dar(e) darst; ppl. darē dar dor; imps. dorste dursest (?); impl. dorse durste

May = may; ps. may, 2 might may mow mayst maist; ppl. mowe mow may mowen; prs. (?) mowe mow; imps. mightē might mihte; impl. mighten might; inf. mow.

Mot = must (debec), may; ps. mot moot, 2 must most; ppl. moten mote mot; prs. mote; imps. muste moste most (= English must as at present); impl. musten meisten moste. In the sense of may: prs. mote mot; imps. most (= might); inf. mote.

Owe = debeco; ps. oweth = debet; imps. oughte = debet, ought, oughte ought; impl. oughten oughte.

Schal = shall; ps. schal shalt; ppl. schullen schuln schul schal sul (dialectic); imps. scholde schulde.

Thar = need; ps. he thar, 2 tharst; ppl. thar ye.

Wot = wot, scio; ps. wot woot, 2 wost; ppl. witen weten witē wote wot woot woten; imps. wiste; prs. wite; imperative wite (witeth ?); inf. witen wite; pp. wist; pres. part. witynge.

66. The Verbs wil, astert:

Wil; ps. 1 wil wol wol? wille, 2 wilt wolt wil wol, 3 wolē wolle wolle wolle; ppl. woln wol wil wolle woll wol will; imps. wolde wolde wolde, 1, 2, 3, wold; prs. wile wolle; pp. wolde!

Swert; ps. stert start, (these might be Imperfect Tense but less probably); imps. sterte; impl. starte; pp. stert; pres. part. stertyng; inf. asterte;—pp. ystert (astert?) 1594; imps. asterte asterted.

67. Some impersonal verbs: him' deyned 15620, him falles (= opus est) 4025, him gained 536, him lakced 10330, hem liketh, me lyst list lest lust, me liste; me mette (= me dreamed) 16380, but he mette 16569, us moste (nobil opus est) 12874, us needeth; him oughte (oportet), me rewith (pomitet), him semeth, him smerte, the thar (opus est tibi) 5911, 5918, it thinkith me 16264, him thenketh 3615, thursted him 15525. Gower—him hungreth, me longeth, him nedeth, me quemeth (placet), him receth, me thinketh.

68. Negative Verbs: Am, nam nys nas nere; Have, nath naddē nad; Will, nylle nyld nolde; Wor, nat not noot nyste nyste.

¹ Contractions: ps. present indicative singular, ppl. the same plural; imps. and impl. imperfect indicative singular and plural; inf. infinitive; prs. present subjunctive; imps. imperfect subjunctive; pp. past participle. These are not Prof. Child's abbreviations. Chaucer and Gower are not distinguished, and references are omitted.
ADVERBS.

69.* Anglo-Saxon Adverbs have commonly in the positive degree the termination -e, and this termination is preserved in Chaucer and Gower.

Ex. Chaucer—brighte, clene, depe, evele, eyeve, faire, faste, foule, harde, bye, inne, late, lighte, longe, loude, nede, oute, rathe, softe, sore, stille, swithe, unn-eth, uppe, wide, yerne, ylike, yoore. So: slyve, lowe, pore. So in Layamon: clene, ufolle, ehe, feire, faste, fule, harde, hlyge (hagh), lune (lo), late, longe, lude, nede, raje, softe, sore, stille, swiue, unepe, uppe (up), wide, georne, iliche, geare. And in the Ormulum, see, depe, faste, faggre, fule, harrede, heghe, ille, inne, lanne, late, nede, raje, sare, swiue, uppe (upp), georne. Gower—clene, depe, dimne, unn-ethe, faire, faste, harde, highe, note, inne, ther-ine, with-ine, late, -liche a-liche besi-liche communl-liche duè-liche even-liche open-liche parfit-liche prive-liche un-proper-liche sodein-liche solempne-liche verri-liche, longe, loude, oute, same partier, smale, softe, sone, sore, stille, swithe, uppe, wide, highe. So, alofte, blive, lowe, smarte, straite, wele. Halfing halving occuru ii 65, iii 206, 353, 356.

70. Comparatives and Superlatives of the Ancient ("Irregular") Form. Compar. Bet better; superl. best, the bet, the better. Fer ferre. Lenger, the lenger. More. Ner, neer, neere. Nest, iii 121. Lassé, the lassé; super. last. Compar. Were, worsé, the worsé, the werre. Note—bette, ferre, lenger, more, neere, were originally adj. forms. The following superlative forms are also noticeable on account of the ë in moste, etc.: O firste mevving 4715, the moste stedefast 9425, deintevous 9588, free 11926, grettest, lusty 17039, the gentileste born 7948, but: the fairest hiweud 16355.

71. The following Adverbs have an internal e (i) which is not found in Anglo-Saxon: boldely, forthëward, needëly, onëly, softely, treweully, worthily; redëly ii 198. So semely, rudeuly, quyteuly.

72.* The following Particles, of various terminations in Saxon, have -ë more or less frequently in Chaucer and Gower. Those in Italics have also a form in -s, see art. 73.

Ex. From Saxon forms in -an. Chaucer—aboven above abovë, abowten aboute abouté, asondere asonder asondur, atwynne, besede, biforn beforne before, behynde bylyndë, bynethe, bytwene, by weste, hem, seithhe seiththe sith seth, withouten withoute, by-yeñð. Layamon, abuten, abute, biforen, bifere, bihinde, bihinde, &c. Ormulum, abuten, biforn, bifornenn, bihimden, &c. Gower — a-boven a-bove abovë, a-boute, a-twine, be-hinde, be-twene between between, -form -fore a-from tofore tofore before, -nethe be-nethe under-nethe, -side a-side be-side be-side, sithen sithe, withouten withoute, without i 8 (?—6). Chaucer—betwix betwix, bothe, eek ek eke eke, evere nevere, evere never (generally contracted to a monosylla-"ble), her heer heere, ther there, wher where, nouth, ofte ofte-tyme oft-sithe ofte sithes, selde, some oft-soone, thanne thenne than thanne, whanne whan, thonne,therefore therfor wherefore, tille, ynowe; welle 1663 should probably be deowle as in Tyrrwhitt, but welle, wele, occur in Layamon, and wel is rhymed with I fel (which possibly should be I fel) 2233. Gower—al-gate, a-longe, a-middle, a-monge among among (8), bothe, eete, ekë eke, ferre fore, her here, ther ther thare, wher where, nede, ofte ofte-time often-time, selde seldom, some, thanne thanne then the, whanne whan, thenne = inde whanne = unde whennë, therefore, to-wards toward toward, wele, while whilst whil.

73.* The following Particles, of various terminations in Anglo-Saxon, have in Chaucer and Gower the termination -es, -s.
Ex. Chaucer — agen, agen, agen, agen, agen agen, agen agen, algate algat algat algat, amonges among, amyndes, in the middle of 16534, bysides elies, hennes hennes hennes hennes, needes, ones, synes syns sin sin sin, thrives, tosiders towards twyces, unythees, whiles whiles whiles whiles, now-on-days, 13824, other genitives used adverbs are, his thonkes, here thonkes, 1628, 2109, 2116, his wills 5854. Gower—aboutes, algates, amidades, amonges, be-sides, elies, nedes, ones, thries, swies, un-ethes, up-rightes, worldes to-worldes after-wards afterward, whiles whilsts, for-the-none, now-on-daies, now-a-daies, his thankes.

Elision of Final Vowels.

74. Even if Chaucer followed invariable rules with regard to the pronouncing or suppressing of the final a, it cannot be ex-pected that they should be entirely made out by examining one single text of the Canterbury Tales, which, though relatively a good one, is manifestly full of errors. A comparison of several of the better manuscripts would enable us to speak with much more accuracy and confidence. Tyrwhitt’s arbitrary text may very frequently be used to clear up, both in this and in other par-ticulars, the much superior manuscript published by Wright. Still the question whether an a was pronounced would often be one of much delicacy (as the previous question whether it actually existed is sometimes one of great difficulty), and not to be deter-mined by counting syllables on the fingers. No supposition is indeed more absurd than that Chaucer, a master poet for any time, could write awkward, halting, or even unharmonious verses. It is to be held, therefore, that when a verse is bad, and cannot be made good anyway as it stands, then we have not the verse that Chaucer wrote. But with regard to the particular point upon which we are now engaged, it would often be indifferent, or nearly so, whether a final a is absolutely dropped, or lightly glided over. Then again, as not a few grammatical forms were most certainly written both with and without this termination, the fuller form would often slip in where the other would be preferable or necessary, much depend-ing on the care, the intelligence, or the good ear of the scribe. Very often the concurrence of an initial vowel, justifying elision, with a doubtful final a, renders it possible to read a verse in two ways or more; and lastly, hundreds of verses are so mutilated or corrupted that no safe opinion can be based upon them. Such verses as these ought plainly not to be used either to support or impugn a conclusion; neither ought the general rules which seem to be authorized by the majority of instances be too rigorously applied to the emendation of verses that cannot be made, as they stand, to come under these rules.

Gower—Unaccented a final may be elided (slurred) [but see above p. 342].

I. before a vowel following:
II. before a few words beginning with h:
1. before the pronoun he (his, him, her, hem):
2. before hath (has) and hast; before have, except perhaps the Infinitive Mood; sometimes before hadde (had).
3. before the adverbs now and here (her).

4. before two or three words of French origin, in which a is silent.

When one of these words beginning with a ends the verse, no elision takes place, before it.

The e final of a monosyllable generally does not suffer elision.

Elision seems frequently to be prevented by the casural pause.

75. Unaccented e final is commonly elided before a vowel 69, 81, 421, 498, 900, 7294, 7321, 9162, 9700, 12036, 13432, 13701, 14875, 15000 [and innumerable other instances].

76. Unaccented e final is elided before a few words beginning with a:

Before the pronoun he (his, him, hire, hire, her).

Gower—But not when these pronouns stand at the end of a verse: wenendë that it werë he i 243, and in this wise speddë he ii 74, hadde he ii 150, saide his ii 388, tolde he iii 139.

b. Before hath (has), and sometimes apparently before have, hadde (had), though with regard to these last two words the number of cases is not enough for certainty. Gower—Before hath (has?) and hast: before have, except perhaps the Infinitive Mood; sometimes before hadde (had).

Not often before have in the Infinitive. More frequently not before hadde. Hadde often stands at the end of the verse and then there is no elision.

c. Before how and her (heer). [Exceptions, both in Chaucer and Gower are queried, and the readings are doubtful.]

Ex. to (a). Chaucer—106, 184, 696, 949, 1364, 1370, 1483, 3954, 7462, 10418 and innumerable other cases.

Ex. to (b). For hath, has the Ex. are innumerable, as: fortune hath 1088, 1492, 15833, ful sone hath 2448, eilde hath 2449, neede has 4024, nature hath 2760, 3095, 13424, pepel hath 8869, youte has 9613, etc., but: and now so longe hath the tape i-ronne 3891?

Gower—exceptions: som(e) cause hath whereof it growth i 264, a sonë hath which as his li(e) li 324, men sain that nedë hath no lawe ili 277, of love hath within her warde il 384, (but in the next verse: Phœbus to love hath so constreigned), which kindë hath and reson can i 366.

For have. Chaucer—so longe have 11144, herte havë 11339, sorwe havë 12987, gunde have i 13804, pynë havë 15527, couthe have 9308. Exceptions: scholdë have 691, Arcië have 2260, drinkë have 4918, frendë have 7718, poeple havë 8118, mightë have 8566, I scholdë havë 15062, your telë have 16285, schreddë han 8264 doubtful.

Gower—though I sikness have, and longë havë had i 8, but I his grace have i 73, if for love havë i 224, etc. Thou might the morë havë i 178, he thoughtë havë ili 162, his lorë havë ili 302. No elision at the end of the verse: woldë have ili 358, hertë have ili 50, shuldë have ili 139, i 127, medë have ili 88, yfë have i 170, i 333, mightë have ili 24, woldë have ili 211, ymagë have ili 124.

For had, hadde. Chaucer—pope had 6002, chirch[e] had 7318, sonne had 11328, routhe had 11573, w[h]tmesse hadde 12017, sorwe had 1361 ô, frend had 7316 ô hert[e] had 11819 ô, science had 12660 bad reading, wordë had 16151 had reading. But: at many a noble arici hadde he be 60, as Noë hadde 3580, namly on bedde hadde 6989, though he no morë hadde 9859.

In Littowe hadde 64 ô atte siegë hadde 56 ô. Hadde he is sometimes contracted, and spelled as pronounced, had he, hadde, as: a garland had he set 668, 319, 381, in termes hadde cas 325, 84, 578; he hadde is generally pronounced he haddë (= he had?) as: ful ofte tyne he hadde the bord bygonne 52, for he hadde power 218, 86, 642. Gower—

for he his love had i 77, thus he which
lore had i 121, and of the soules had i 128, wherof the soule had i 285, the god an eye had i 149, this Adriagne had ii 308. Exceptions: was hoté, haddé i 55, the sceptre haddé i 179, wher(e) they the quenes hadde do i 201, that Rome hadde ii 196, a werre had ii 200, so as the quene had ii 271, a soule had ii 302, victoire had iii 165, which lové haddé iii 364. Had final: a werre had i 125, joic had i 167, timc hadde i 219, a soé haddé i 313, to soé haddé ii 4, no lové haddé ii 48, her herti haddé ii 65, his wille haddé ii 196. Ex. to (c). For how. Chauver—by his clennesse how 508, than wol I clepe how 5377, but of my tale how 4510, jugge how may this be 5234, thou wilt algrate wits how 7996, nought wold i tell how 11628, unto this philosophre how 11865, me mette how 16384, mette a thing 16598; wise how 1491 indecisive. Exceptions: I spake to him and sayed how that he 6149, Tyrrwhit, said him how; in myn office how that I may wyne 7003, Tyrrwhitt, how I may moste winne. In the following the infinitive should have an n: to tellé how 2823, dar I not tellé how 14531, and ye schal understandé how 15760. Gower—the elision is very frequent, in the exceptions: if no man writé how it stood i 4, and thoughté how(e) it was not good i 268, and all the cause how it went ii 122, we should probably read how that, a phrase of frequent occurrence in similar positions.

For her era hère. Chauver—that serve here 1296, plicht me thy thouketh(e) her 6591, both heer 8043, anoon for myn allys heer take i 12226. Exceptions: in erté, heere 9521, lordings enamplié herby 15725, here example may be pronounced enampl as in 5594. Gower—her not final: we shall befallé here i 3, and for to bare herof i 70, lo, some her(e) might thou ii 50, I not what falle herafter shall ii 278, of dedly, peins here iii 37, my som, herafter ii 146, it is teles observed that falle[a], bare[a], may be read as monosyllables; the other three cases cannot be explained away, if the readings are correct. Her = here final: penuancé here ii 43, saidé here ii 46, alive here ii 171, tellé here ii 176, erté ii 259, i 37, iii 94, 38, iii 106, etc.

For a few French words. Gower—(a) the vein(e) honour i 11, for thilke honour i 281, cause honest ii 9, of armes thilke honour ii 64, that love honest ii 78, of treble honour iii 165, of pees richesse honour ii 273, may never be to love lawe honeste iii 362, but: which teechth thilke honeste iii 141, but upon allé honesté iii 272, where the elision is prevented by the ictus. (b) to feign humblei i 66, and with low(e) herte humblessé me i 118. (c) thilke horrible sinne i 77, 76, that thilke horrible sinfull dede i 365. (d) dame Heleine ii 230, quene Heleine ii 384, had wonne Heleine i 387, compare; after his moder quene Heleine i 276.

We find also in Gower: an saide Ha i 320, and when he wok(e) he said, Ha, wi(e) iii 310. But saide should perhaps be printed said, as: and said Ha, now thou art atake ii 338, or Ha should perhaps be Ah. We find: receivé til he saidé ho ii 201, I wole the telle and thanne ho iii 274.

77. Except in the cases mentioned above, there appears to be no rule that final e should be elided before h, as: 14, 146, 150, 535, 884, 1015, 1051, 1677, 1820, 2088, 2465, 2711, 3953, 4266, 4407, 5934, 6035, 6548, etc.

78. It is very probable that some liberty was allowed with regard to elision of e before h. A few cases are added where the practice (so far as it can be determined by a very few examples) seems to have varied, and a few other instances, which, if the reading is correct, are exceptions to art. 77: 6034, 6062, 6035, 6085, 6169, 5599, 2273, 14512, 2369, 2791, 999, 4523, 8139, 11151, 12039, 17200.

79. An accented final e (including e coming from French é), even when the accent has been cast back) is of course not elided.

80. The e of monosyllables is commonly not elided, except in the
case of the article the and, in Chaucer, not in Gower, the negative particle ne.

81. The e of the is much more frequently elided than not, and before e almost invariably. The th is frequently united to the following word, as also with the verb the = thrive in the forms: theek, theeche, 3862, 12857, 14362. The e of ne is perhaps less frequently united.

Ex. for the Chaucer— but to the effect 1191, this is the effect 1489, thenceautements 1946, 1538, 2279, 4670, etc., that is bitwine thist 6829, thestat, peyne 1231, alias I ne havé 2299, ne ð array 718, ths absence 1241, than was thassenbe 4823, 3078, etc., in which thoffice 2865, thymage 14916, the hernyes 2896, of children to thonour 9323. Exceptions: thé olde clerkes 1165, when al thé orient 1496, up to thé ancle 1663, on thé auter bright 2427, only thé intellect 2805, of which thé eldest 10344 ? thé elf-queen 6442, thé ende is this, that he 6652. Gower— no exceptions to the elision of thé noted.

Ex. for ne Chaucer—he ne hath no 9322, peyne 1231, alias I ne havé 2299, ne abydë 3125, ne at Rome 4710, privé ne aprët 6718, I ne held me 8694, I ne have as now 11289. Exceptions: né oynement 635, né of the knobbes 635, no herd né hadde hé 691, fry né eyr 1248, young né old 3112, né in noon other 9963, in al the world né hadde he 16540, if that the wynd né hadde he 16555.

82. The cesural pause frequently prevents the elision of final e.

Ex. Chaucer—

a. that on his schynë—a mormâl hadde he. 388
   this was thyn othë—and myn eek certayn. 1141
   withouten doutë—it may stondë so. 1324
   and letë him stille—ën his prisoun dwellë. 1337
   but how sche didë—I ne dar not telle. 2286
   for thilke peyne—and that hootë fyr(e). 2385
   Some haddë salvé—and some haddë charmes. 2714
   and tył he haddë—all that night i-syn. 4377
   than that it roët—all the remenaut. 4405
   ire is a sinnë—oon the grëte of sevenë. 7587
   to stonde in grace—of his lady deere. 13276
   if that a prince—usë hadernes. 14014
   no longer thanne—after Deth thay sought[e]. 14187

b. the trespass of hem bothë—and herë cause. 1768
   I prey to God hir savë—and sustene. 4580
   for though that I be fouël—old and pore. 6645
   com forth my sweetë spouse—out of doute. 10018
   in thende of which an unçë—and no more. 13194
   this Persoun him answerëd—all at oones. 17324

Gower—

he weptë—and with woful terës. i 143
with strength—of his owne might i 236
supplant of lovë—in our waies i 241
in the croniquë—as I finde. ii 82
kisse her erstonë—if I sholdë. ii 96
with all min hertë—I wolle serve. ii 110
though he ne woldë—it allowë ii 146
and in worshippë—of her name. ii 171
and with spellëngë—and her charmes ii 263
Jason bar(e) crowë—on his hed(e) ii 267
her love is sonë—after (af'r) ago ii 300
with shanë—and the nimphes fledë ii 337
which kindë—in her laws hath set(te) i 268 etc.

83. Other vowels are occasionally elided as in modern verse.

[The examples cited 225, 294, 423, 929, 1111, 1890, 7285, 9212,
9284, 9394, 11669, 13734, 14874, 15112 are almost all simple cases of trisyllabic measures, and similarly in Gower, see art. 92.]

**Silent Final **E.

84. E final seems especially liable to become silent when it follows r. The sound r is peculiarly unstable, and most languages, in their successive stages or in their dialects, afford instances of its being transposed, now standing before, now following a vowel, as SaxoN gars, gres; Ital. capre, Roman dial. crape; Engl. iron, apron, spectre, etc. In Wright's text of the Canterbury Tales we often find the terminations re and er indifferently used, as asondre 5577, asonder (ur) 7256, 493. Of course we have no means of determining to what degree, if at all, the pronunciation er had begun to prevail even while the spelling re was retained. The Comparative Degree of Adjectives is commonly spelled with er in Chaucer (see art. 38), instead of the Saxon re, though both forms occur; as bettre 526, 650, better 10416, lenger 332, lengere 823. Nouns which anciently ended in -ere, generally or always end in -er, as hopper 4034, miller 3923, sleper 16377, etc. (see art. 8). We find many French words spelled both with re and er, as lettre 5228, 5229, 5241, letter 10415, cloystre oystre 181, 182, cloyster oyster 7681, 7682; chambr e 1073, chambrur 13145, tendre 150, 9631, tender 9617, etc. We also find the final e of some French words absolutely dropped; thus maner occurs most commonly without the final e, except at the end of a verse, 71, 2746; 10501, 11737; ruyver (F. rivière) is rhymed 6466 with bacheler (F. bachelor), and 15148 with deer; cheer (F. chère) once 1342 with prisoner (F. prisonnier), though commonly pronounced cheerè. In these cases ruyver must have been pronounced like our revere (ryve-er) and cheer che-er, instead of ruyver-è, cheer-è, the r being in fact transposed. \*Gower—The only cases which are supported by instances enough to make silent final e of consequence are the words have, here (their), were, more, and the termination -ore (to-fore, be-fore). We have also the double forms còmùn, comûné; divûr, divûrè; here the longer form seems to be a license for the sake of rhyme. The Comparative of Adjectives is always written in Pauli's text with -er instead of the Saxon -re. French words are written indifferently with both terminations. Slight reliance, however, is to be placed upon the editor's spelling.

85. The only rule with regard to e being silent after r which can safely be made general, is perhaps that

- e final is silent in the pronouns hire, here (\= her), very often spelled hir, herë (\= their), ourë, yourë. \*Gower—The e final of here (\= their) is silent, that is, not forming a full syllable; whether the letter was absolutely mute, or slurred, or, in the words ending in -re, pronounced before the r, I do not pretend to say. The dative and accusative of the feminine personal pronoun often preserve the Saxon e, see the forms hire, herë, art. 45.
86. *E* final is in Chaucer frequently, in Gower sometimes, silent in *were*.

Ex. *Chaucer*—were, indic. 2nd pers. sing. 15865, 15868, 17177; plural of indic. 18, 26, 59, 81, 2109, 2186, etc., etc.; subjunctive, 894, 877, 1215, 1216, 14299, 14570, etc., written *wer* 10782, 12650 (ner = ne wer). Exceptions: *wer* é, indic. 2nd. pers. sing. 4877, 16718, pl. of indic. 326, 1705, 1666, 6893, 1238, etc., subjunctive 9483, 10529, may be read: it were good that such thing were y-knowe, or: *'t were* good that such thing were knowe. *Gower*—[17 instances of *wer*], and 60 of *were* are cited, and the last are only a few out of many.]

87. There can be no doubt, however, that *e* final was *generally* pronounced after *r*. It is commonly in the body of a verse, and for metre's sake, that the occasion is presented for dispensing with this sound; rarely is it dropped for the sake of rhyme, though very often *e* is added on that account to words which ordinarily terminate in a consonant,—or more properly speaking, of two existing forms, a rarer one in *-e* is often employed when the rhyme demands the final vowel, as yer by *yer* 4552, rhyming with *heere*. The final *e* of *deere* (ags. *deore*) and of *cheere* (Fr. *chère*) was most distinctly pronounced. We should therefore be justified in inferring that the final *e* was pronounced in the following words rhymed with *deere* and *cheere*, even if this fact could not be independently proved, and can be done in the case of most of the instances cited.

Ex. *Chaucer*— *deere* 1236, 2455, 3861, etc., the only exception noticed being 7334; with this rhyme: *heere* (adv.) 1821, 3852, 3774, *prayere* 2261, 12184, *yer* 9273, in *feere* 4815, 12308, *cierer* 4868, 6263, *frerer* 6861, 13283, maneré 7207, 8456, to *leer* 7098, 13277, *cher* 8017, 12232, 12310, *maier* 8198, 8467, *wer* (subj.) 8758, to *heer* 8963, *pler* 12182, 15666, *beere* 15091, (to) appear 13060. *cheere* 749, 6422, 8411, 8554 (cheer 9889 in a suspicious line); with this rhyme: *heere* 7884, 8246, in *feere* 4815, 8899, *frere* 6847, 7739, maneré 140, 10821, *leer* (verb) 10418, *deere* 14739, 14836, *mater* 15928, *heere* 915, 2900, cierer 8656, 9719, berê 6169, to requierer 14737, all of which also occur in the former list. Similarly, *feere* 2346, 2685, 2932, 7256, 16877, with which rhyme: *ser* 6003, terê 11206, 15664, gerê 8220, therê 8222. Again, *beere* 15036, and above, with which rhyme: *wer* pl. 2901, 15664, therê 15037. Again, *ser* 6215 and above (ags. *ser*), with which rhyme: *wer* pl. 8904, 12823, *wer* subj. 17131, therê 7656, where 7634, 10629. *Gower*—the examples cited in arts. 84, 85, 86, are the only cases of *e* silent after *er*, except a few isolated ones, as: their haly(e) him another sper(e) ne sheld i 126, for if thou her(e) my tal(e) wel(e) ii 340, he yav(e) hem answer(e) (answer?) by and by iii 305. It has been observed already that such representatives of accusative* occur of the Saxon noun in -ere, denoting an agent, want the final vowel, but none of the few cases that occur are worth much, see art. 8.

88. Less to be relied on are the following:

*sper* 15299, ags. sper*é*, and therefore: berê *ser* 1642, werê pl. 2950, to berê 4877, therê 10554.

*teere* (art. 87) and therefore: were pl. 4954, 11498, 15662, therê 4956, were 2nd pers. 16148, schér 15642, yerê 15544, enquérer 9417. schér ags. scer*é*; and therefore (?): were pl. 15654, yerê 15654, teere 15654.

*gerê* ags. gars, 367; and there-
89.* On the other hand, we find many cases in which s final must have been silent, or where it is actually dropped after er. Chauentecler is most misspelt with -e, in the Nonne Prestes Tale. That it ought to have no final e appears from the French derivation (Chantecler), and from the rhymes ber (tulit) and powër (new fr. pouër) 16822, 16830, also misspelt bere, powere.

Ex. beré ferrs 1424, bere arcus 2060, berë ferr 8760, werë vautëri 8762, swerë jurare 11101, 12076, all rhymed with the pronoun herë hirë. So: answerë, baner, beerë, berë, chambrë, deerre, ferë, freës (often freës), maner, swerë, swerë. See art. 72 for the double forms: here her, there ther, where wheer, everere.

90.* With regard to final e after ir, ar, or, ur, it does not appear to be more frequently silent in such cases than after other letters, except in sire and more. Gower—E final is sometimes silent in -fore and more. We find two forms sire and siré = sir, corresponding to French sire, sieur, Italian ser, sere.

Ex. Chaucer—sire sire, irë irë, barë, faire, sparë, charë Fr. chair, declarë? declarë, hairë, peryë, morë morë, porë porë, bifiörë byforë, sorë sorë, dorë dorë, thereforë thereforë therforë, fourë, purë, vautëri. Gower—fore to-forë and -forë to-forë be-forë a-forë, morë oftener morë.

91.* A considerable number of cases will now be given of e silent after other letters than r without any attempt to explain the fact. Many words of French origin are spelt in Chaucer sometimes with a final ce, sometimes with s. Gower—The only important instances of silent e final are the word have and some forms in -ce (se). Note-worthy instances of e final silent after other consonants than those already mentioned are very few. By noteworthy instances is meant cases in which a final e, that by general laws should be sounded, is required by the metre to be silent. Some of the apparent exceptions can be explained away. A few cannot.

Ex. Chaucer—e silent after l, m, n: alë, halle, talë, tellë, hellë, fellë, wellë, felë, melë, welë, soulë, myllë, myllë, pylë—damë, madamë, namë, clamyë, demë, comë, welcome, somë, tymë—panu, regnu, crenë, begrynë, nonë, sonë, gounë. e silent after u, y: dawë, schrewë, trewe, bowë, crowë, ynowë, trowë, widowë, morë, joyë, weyë.
e silent after p, b, v: helpë, felawe, schipë, worship, hopë, popë, havë, savë, avë, recevë, levë, givë, geveë, lyveë, stryveë, lovë, groveë. e silent after k, g, ch: sakë, seekë, bigë, spekke—mariëgë, visagë, aqë, tongë, bringë, segë—speckë, wrecë, chirëchë.
e silent after t, d, th, besides the final e of the imperfect indicative of simple verbs, which is as often silent as pronounced [unless the -ed, for -edë be read -đë, and the point is doubtful]: hatë, betë, getë, metë, svette, hertë, schertë, mightë, sightë—forbedë, dedë, headë, ledë, redë, stedë, endë, fyndë, kyndë, lyndë, holdë, house-bondë, fondë, woodë, lowëd, brudë—byquëthë, mirëthë, rewëthë, truthë, youthë. e silent after s (c): nosë, prosë [the reference 466 is erroneous] cienennesë byenses goodness lewdes worthines, godissingë, blissë, blyssë, wise, cheesse, supposed, these, thisë, prayë, pres' Fr. presse, nobles'—grace, forçë but forcë in the same line 3910, prinë, malicë, placë, Constamë, Constançë.

Experience experiens, pleasance pleisans, norice nora, pacience paciens, sentence sentence, force fors, solas solas solacë solace, alias laas lace tresspace, trace trays harnays, face fass, preference. [In a large number of cases the ë here cited may have been an ë introducing a trisyllabic measure of no injury to the metre, see art. 92.] Gower—ë is generally silent in havë except at the end of a line, but: ne havë when I spak (e) i 296, ye havë thilëke vice ii 55, havë non(e) i 256, be so they havë i 316, havë ronhe i 47, and (infinitive) i 94, 170, iii 222, 702. The infiniti-
tives and the plural forms of the indicative and subjunctive may have originally been written heaven; so written, the word might perhaps have been contracted at pleasure into a monosyllable.

& is in a few words of Latin origin silent, or absent where it might be expected after e, s: gracè, rhymes with encres, old Fr. a-crois ii 392, gracè i 9, etc., Boniface, Morice, Moris = Maurice, forçè, rhymes with hors ii 392, fallas Fr. fullace rhymes with was, iii 158; avaricè ii 290 avaricè ii 127, pureç purs, this word derived from Middle Latin bursa, probably does not come to us through the Fr. bourse; it has dropped the e, like Swed. and Dan. börse, and Germ. bors, which is found as well as börse. helpè help 8 cases to helpè 9 cases; 2 quenè and 27 quenè, 2 sight & 6 sightè, 3 food & 5 or 6 fodè, 1 timè i 167 but elsewhere always timè, 1 nedè i 168 but elsewhere always nedè: 3 spedè and about 3 spedè, 2 I redè and elsewhere redè, etc. [These cases all require examination by manuscripts, and the remaining doubtful cases are therefore not cited here.]

92. For convenience sake the final e in the above citations has been treated as silent. It is, however, a question which may be called at least a difficult one to solve, whether the e in many cases was absolutely dropped, or only slightly pronounced. In very many lines the verse would be equally agreeable, whichever of the two should be done; in some, the verse might be fuller to a good ear, if the e were slightly sounded; in some this sound would disturb the metre.

A considerable number of these exceptions might disappear on a comparison of manuscripts, but very many would doubtless remain. The vowel appears to be most frequently silent after the liquids, after w and v, t, d, and s. Some of the most noticeable words are the pronouns hire, here, ours, yours; the verb were; then sire, mere, alle, tymo, zone (filius), touse, have, give, love, sight', woods, kiss'.

Possibly, all that is to be said of this matter is, that the final e might be dropped freely, as in modern German verse, as:

das Erst' wär' so, das Zweite so.
der begeht jede liebe Blum' für sich,
und dünktlt ihm es wär' kein' Ehr',
und Gunst die nicht zu pflücken wär'.
hat er so aller Treu', so aller Lieb' vergessen.
&c., &c.

—(Goethe's Faust.)

Of course we are not authorized, in the present state of our knowledge, to drop the superfluous e and indicate the omission by an apostrophe.

CONTRACTIONS.

93. The e in final or is very frequently elided, especially under the circumstances in which e final would suffer elision. [Most of the instances cited seem more properly to belong to the class of trisyllabic measures. The words and a reference to the line in Chaucer are here added, when the words begin with a capital the words appear in the lists given in both papers, when they are in small capitals they occur in the Gower papers only, and no references are given.] ADDER, After 162, 343, 527, anger 12847, answer 1325, begger 252, BETTER, CHAMBRE, coper 13236, delyver 84, Ever Never 50, 345, 1824, 9963, 1262, 8020, 8027, 9605,
9618, 10077, 10078, Fader 5613, fether 2146, fynger 7472, hinder v., lenger, letter, lever, marer 9755, monster, nedder 9660, neyther 9413, 9962, after 16914, other, over 11967, perserver 5730, silver 82, 631?, sober 7484, somer 396, sowter 3902, suster, tender, thudder, togider 826, water 402, 3815, 13244, Whether 1103, 15415, 9407, 15341, wonder 12531.


95. The third person singular of the Present Indicative ends commonly in -eth, not seldom in -th. When the form -eth is used, the e is often elided. Chaucer: answereth 1622, thenceth cometh 1645, cometh 8033, 14196, maketh 5318, 7415, speketh 5646, clappith 7166, lyveth 7944, takith 8178, loveth 8246, 8247, spedith 9801, bereth 10949, to-brekeith 12835, abideth 14396. Gower: speketh i 64, maketh i 68, 156, wipeth crieth i 120, kepeth i 126, leseth i 305, eteth drinketh iii 39, taketh cometh iii 280, ariseth iii 342.

96. Miscellaneous contractions. [Most of these are cases of trisyllabic measures.] Chaucer: purchasyng 322, schirrevi 361 (F), parishes 451, 496, parish[e] 493, benedicite (benciti) 2117, 5823, 5862, 7038, 7166, 7752, 9211, 12556, we may therefore infer a lacuna in 1787, certeynly 2761, candel 5916, so candlestick (canstic) in Shakespeare, I Henry IV. 3, 1, speech 36 (Guest I, 54: canstic in the quartos), litle 7256, vanyssh 10642, widow 14920, (similar forms though not contracted are sorwe 1456, wilw 2924, morw 9622,) woldist 15431, wicked 16909, this is an unusual contraction, but by no means unparalleled, compare naked, Crashaw, ed. Turnbull, p. 123. Gower—bible i 136, quarrel ii 223, devil iii 203, distempred i 281, heved iii 117, 376, augst iii 121, 370, Sortes (So- crates) iii 366. Benedicite is not contracted i 48.

97. Cases like the following, in which contiguous words are blended, are not common in Chaucer, but there is no reason to suspect the correctness of the lines: at his (at’s) 295, and a (‘n a) 56, I ne (I n’) 766, endure it (endur’t) 1093, whether it (wher’t) 9841. Contractions of the various kinds noticed in arts. 93-97 are on the whole not so frequent in Chaucer as in Shakespeare and Milton: see very numerous examples in Guest’s English Rhythms B. I. C. III.—Gower. Contiguous words are not often blended, but some cases occur: fall it (fall’t) ii 380, it is (it’s) iii 348, I have (I’ve) ii 61, that is (that’s) iii 247.

1 The real division of the measures, indicated by italicising the even measures, in this line, seems to be: i-fet-er’d in his prisoun for ever’ more.
2 Pauli reads: yet in the bible this name is bore, but Harl. MS. 3490, 3669, 7184, and Soc. Antiq. MS. 134, all read his for this, giving a regular elision.
97a. Accent. Many words of French origin have two accents; sometimes on the final syllable, or the penult; sometimes thrown further back as in English. So also with nouns of Saxon origin in -ynge, -ynge (see art. 17) and felâwe felaw (see art. 18). Gower—

Many words of French origin have a variable accent: the same is occasionally true of native words. The sliding of final e often causes the accent to be thrown back, [or rather conversely?]. Proper names of Latin origin have generally the French, or foreign, accent: César iii 366, Môdèe ii 212, Gower iii 373, Encêas Anchiâs ii 4, Aprille ii 327. [The list of words is here given in alphabetical order with single references, a capital initial (when the word is not a proper name, and in that case an italic capital initial) points out that the word is in both lists, small letters in Chaucer and small capitals in Gower only.]

Achilles ii 62
Achilles ii 58
Answere i 96
Answere iii 305
Apollo ii 366
Apollo ii 367
Aprille, Averell i 1, April i 4426
Arcite (f) [6128] Arcite 2258
Arcite 1114 'Arcite 1154
Aytin i 81 Aytin iii 61
bataille 990 bataill 2099
benigne 520 bëigne 8287
Coloure i 205 Coloure 1 133
Comme i 20 Comun 1 7
Cresus 16256 Cresus 1948
Daungier i 331 Daungier i 331
Discord 8308
Discrét 8296
Echâtres ii 260 Echâtres ii 262
Enviadus i 171 Enviadus i 172
Felâw i 170 Felaw i 171
Foest ii 68 Förster i 119
Fortune 917 Fortune 927
Grâîles 8108 Grâîles 8096
honest 14972 hônest 248
honour 15697
Jason ii 251 Jason ii 260
Labour 14574 Labour 3093
Ladie i 322 Ladie i 322
Loe ii 121 Léo ii 120
Lover i 64 Lovers i 175

Gower—At this point it is proper to say that in all likelihood some troublesome forms in Gower are to be explained as simple licences. Such, very probably, are the causes of the singular of the Imperfect of Complex Verbs which have an e (art. 54). So when the vertu ii 38, 187, is stretched to vertue i 7, 18: when the preposition for is made to rhyme with boré i 59, the pronoun min with mine ii 130, the noun men(e) (Fr. moyen) with lené ii 351, (if thou well) behought with sought ii 357, (1) sigh with eye i 370, oxes (elsewhere oxen) with foxes ii 63, perhaps all that it is necessary to

1 This is numbered 99 in Chaucer, and 97a in Gower, where the art. numbered 99 in Chaucer is said to have been put wrongly among the miscellaneous notes, and it is therefore restored here to its proper place.
say is that a clumsy poet has taken an extraordinary liberty. Such shortening of words as pusilamité for pusilanimité ii 12, 25, iii 210, Climestre for Clytemnestre, Methamor for Metamorphoses, is rather to be attributed to ignorance; so Agamemnon, Nauplius for Nauplius, &c. The vowels are not infrequently freely treated in the rhymes: e.g., minde ende ii 23, 67; ende kende (i.e. kinde) iii 120, nine peine ii 261, seen eyen iii 18; say see iii 31, wit yet; fell hill, men kin ii 158, iii 211, 280, kenne senne (i.e. sinne) ii 309, spedde hadde ii 191, deth geth (i.e. goth i 345, Sax. geð), ii 303; i 220, 247; piche sucho iii 312, &c.

Miscellaneous Notes. 4

98. Letters. (a) Ch for the Saxon ĉ before or after e, i, occurs in several cases where the modern English has retained the primitive sound. (b) Saxon g is changed to w both in Chaucer and Gower instead of y, i, as in modern English, and to y where we have retained g. (c) Th is dropped after t or changed to t in con-

1 [Sometimes, not always, we may say that an editor has been careless. The following is the reading of these passages after Harl. MS. 3869.

Tho was þe vertu sett a boue. i 7
In whom þat alle vertu duelleþ. i 18
That þing which I traunillle fore
O in good time were he bore. ii 69
For certes if sche were myn
I hadde hit lesere þan a myn
Of gold. ii 130
For to wel can þer noman slyke
Be hym no be non oþer mene
To whom Daunger wol zive or lene
Of þat Tredor he haþ to kepe. iii 351
Mi fone if you be wel beþoght
This toncheþ þeþ forþet it noght. iii 357
And taken hiede of þat I fye
Whereinne anon myn hertes yhe
I caste. iii 370
Whereinne anon in fede of Oxes
He let go zoken grete foxes. ii 63]

2 [Yet Gower had certainly read Ovid in the original, and shews by his headings and his Vox Clamantis, that he could write Latin. Some of the errors are certainly due to the scribe; others may have been Anglicism comparible to our Ovid, Horace, Virgil, Tully, Pliny.]

3 [The interchange of i, e, short is common in Chaucer, and must be accepted as (i, e), supra pp. 290, 272. The following are these passages according to Harl. MS. 3869.

Ne mihte I lete out of my mende
Bot if I pochte vpon þat hende. ii 23
The whos knaythode is þit in mende
And þahal be to þe worldes ende, ii 67

Ne to non oþer þing þei fryhen
Bot hire which to fore here yhen
Was wedded þilke same day. iii 18
Sche ȝi no sherp sche ȝi no barge
As þerþþ as sche mihte kenne
Ha lord sche feidhe which a senne
As al þe world chal after hire
Vpon þis woful womman hirene [ii 309
This worþi knayht haþ don and wroght.
Bot as we rede þat he þeþe
The which hir lordes befant hedde
And þerþpon gate non encreff. ii 191
That it be ferm wiþ led and pich
Anon was made a cofre such. iii 312
Nine peine, shoulde be myne geyme, see p. 253.
For my say there is a deletion in Harl. 3869, but Harl. 7184 reads—
Lo þus mi fader as J seie
Of last þe which miny he hath feie. iii 31
The rhyne deþ geþ occurs in all the passages in Harl. 3869.]

4 Of these Prof. Child says: Chaucer —The purpose of this paper being to do something towards ascertaining the forms of words used by Chaucer (including inflections), the notes upon that subject are intended to be complete, to the extent of the information to be derived from the one text employed. Not so with the Miscellaneous Notes, subjoined to the others. Gower—It may be observed that the subject of the article [memor] is really concluded at art. 97a. The miscellaneous notes which follow contain a few things noticed in passing which may on some occasion be useful; but they are purely incidental, and do not profess to be complete. [In this re-arrangement of
tracted forms, and in Gower ags. ʌ changed, where we have changed to the aspirate ʰd, spelt th. (d) The letters r and s were unstable in the older English, and subject to frequent metathesis. In the transition to modern English these letters have changed their position more than once in some words. Gower—(e) M is reinforced by ʌ or ʊ, n changed to m before ʌ, n not yet reinforced by ʌ as in English and s reinforced by t.

Ex. (a) Chaucer and Gower—scshe = seek 786, 7537, 7539, i 290, ii 190, 198; recche = reck 1400, 5011, receth 168, ii 284, wirche = work 2761, wor- chen i 166, ii 142, thenche = think 3253, scheneche = skink i 263, yliche, liche = like 7797, 10376, lich, liche i 118, 136, 208, 206, besi-liche ii 3, even-liche ii 179, etc., now-ly; iech = iek, i, 10037, and in: theeche 12867, 14362. So rubrique = rubrique, Fr. rubrique 5928. Chaucer—On the other hand, ʌ is often preserved where we have ʊ, as, biseke = besseke 1251, etc. Gower—Saxon e (ʌ) not changed to æ in modern English: make = mate i 45, 112, 367. æe changed to æ when changed to ʌ in modern English, fette, ags. feccan = fetch ii 333, 297. We find: chever = shiver iii 9. (b) Chaucer and Gower—dawe = day, 11492, i 136, fawe, ags. fais = fegan, fain, 5802, i-slawe = slain 14271, 16500, morwe, ags. morgen, E. morn i 186, 205, wowe, ags. wag, E. wall, wawes, ags. wagna, E. waves, 4888, i 141, 223, 312; gerarchie = hierarchie i 146 is old Fr. gersanie, Ital. gerarchia. willow = wilt thou, woltow 1546, 6422, hastow = hast thou 3594, 3338, 11893, woslow 3644, slepis- tow 4167, herdistow 4168, artow 4728, hydestow 5890, schalow 6998, atte beste = at the beste 29, atte siege 56, atte fulle 653, atte laste 2528, atte last 1:16, ii 345, 377, atte boord 10933, atte bord iii 299, atte halle 10984, etc., etc. Gower—fader i 43, 60, 61, iii 260, 332, father ii 174 is undoubtedly wrong; moder i 104 etc., woder i 112 etc., wether iii 295 is wrong, hider i 70, thider i 186, whider ii 21, gader ii 293, togider i 324. On the other hand we have: rother, ags. roser = rudder.

(d) Chaucer—bersties, ags. bristol, E. bristle, 658; brid, ags. brid, E. bird, 17104; brast breste, ags. bersten, E. burst, 2612, 2613; brenn brene, ags. byrnan brinnan, E. burn, 948, 17161; carte, ags. crat, E. cart, 2043; cripe (crips, House of Fame iii 296, Morris b-261), ags. cyrra crips, E. crisp, 2167; crulle, E. curl, 81; kers, ags. cesse cresse, E. cress, 3784; thrild, ags. tylord thyrel, E. thrilled, 2712, (nose-) thurles, E. (nos-)trils, 559; thridle, ags. thridda, E. third, 14251, threttene 7841, thirrti 14437; throp, ags. torph, E. -torph, -throp, 9075, 8884; thurgh, ags. thurh, E. through, 1988; axe, ags. ascian asian, 1349, 12354, axyn 1829, axke 3557; cripe, ags. cyrra (see above); lipsede, E. lipsed, 266; claspud, E. claspud, 275. Gower—brid bird i 112, 113 etc., bird i 206; hundred hundred ii 92, 249, 381; third third i 55, thirti thirty iii 214, brene burn i 334, brent i 109; kere cress i 229, 334; Adriane Arisadne ii 307, etc.; aaxe ask, i 334, ii 222 etc. (e) thombe, ags. yuma, i 175, stempne, ags. stern i 312—wimpel, ags. wimpel, i 326, 327—kinled = kindled iii 98, compare kin-d-red and kind, genus, which is apparently from Saxon syn, not cyn. [The following is from E. Mätzner, Englische Grammatik, Berlin, 1860-1865, i 173: an unmeaning d is added on to a final s; hind = servant, ags. hina, old E. hyn; fond, old norse fauna, fatue se gerere, old E. fon, still in Spenser, and fond; tend, ags. lenan, old E. and Scotch leen; round with obsolete roun in Skelton, Spenser, and Shakspere, ags. runian, G. zuraunen; sound, ags. s. son, old Fr. son, sun, v. soen, suner, old E. s. soun, v. soven; astound and astonish, old Fr. astoner mixed with ags. stanan, E. stun, etc.] lost, for los, ags. los, i 147, 238, ii 186, 277, but: los i 270.

Prof. Child's memoirs, some of the completeness of the first part has been necessarily sacrificed. Although the Miscellaneous Notes do not in general bear upon the subject of the present treatise, they present so much that is interesting to the Societies for which it has been written, that it has been thought advisable to give them nearly in full.]
99. See 97a.

100. Syntax for Measures, Kinds, etc. (a) Nouns denoting a substance measured, weighed, or numbered, are not followed by a noun with of, as in modern English; but are in apposition with the noun denoting the measure, as in ags. sometimes, and in German regularly. (b) Nouns denoting sort or kind are in like manner not followed by a noun with of, but by a noun in apposition, as also in German.

(c) Things numbered are put in the singular after numerals as in German and ags. (d) Sometimes numerals preceded by the article a are treated like nouns, the thing numbered being put in the plural number, but still without a preceding of, compare, a few pears, a great many men, a dozen books.

Ex. (e) a peyro dys (G. ein paar Würfel) 4384, 14038, a peyro plates 2123; a barrel ale, G. eine Tonne Bier, 16379, a botel hay, G. ein Bund Heu, 16946; a bushel whet 7328, 4310, half a quarter ots 7546; the beste galoun wyn 16566, a morsel bred 15920.

(f) a maner deye, G. eine Art Milchfrau, 16332, a maner sergeant 8396, so 3681, 11742, 11745, no maner wight 71, 1546, a maner kinde i 58, 123, what maner name i 206, such a manner wise i 342, what manner thing i 142, what nestir men 1712, no kyn monay 14749.

(e) syn thilke day that she was seven night old 16359, this fowrteneight 931, thirti winter he was old 14437, 15645, 7233, a child of twelf month old 14896, four yeer 8487, 8612, 15445, twenty winter age ii 226, of eigh(t)en ofe winter age i 102, withinne seven winter age i 267, ii 266, of nine hundred winter old(e) ii 265, of thre yer(e) age ii 22, of twelf(e) yer(e) age ii 88. So after numerals preceded by a: of an hundred winter age ii 343, of a ten yer(e) age ii 17, a thousand winter (tofore, after) i 267, ii 268, a thousand yer(e) ii 9, a ten mile i 209, a thousand sithe i 160, a thousand score i 176, a thousand del(e) i 295. The age. use of winter for year is to be noticed, and also the of, supplying the place of the ags. gen. in old of nine hundred winter. Night and winter (age. nift, winter) have commonly the plural like the singular in ags. (instead of nihis, wintra), but this is not a peculiarity of inflection; it is a consequence of a principle of syntax.

Year (ags. gear) might have the plural like the singular, at any rate; still the cases cited are fair instances of the rule. Fortnight (fourtheneight 931) has become a compound noun, and so has twelve-month (a twelve moneth 653), but these forms properly come under (e) and (f).

(d) a seven bushels 14186, a twenty books 296 (Tyr. the right reading), a twenty thousand freres 7277, Tyr., hir maistres elephent wommen a grete route, and up they risen, a ten other a twelve 10697, a thousand times i 330, a fewe yeres iii 246, seven yeres ii 9; according to the same principle: a certein frankes 14745, a certein yeres 15663, a certeyn ofe conclusions 3193, a certeyn gold 14815.

101. Genitive Case. (a) Some genitives are employed as adverbs. (b) The genitive sign is not annexed to a compound phrase as in English. (c) The genitive of names of persons and titles of books is sometimes used as a nominative in Chaucer, and in Gower the genitive case of classical proper names is frequently so used; Gower also declines classical proper names, a custom still in use with some old-fashioned Germans.

Ex. (a) his thonkes 1628, 2109, here thonkes 2116, his willes 5804, needes 1171, 7887, etc. (b) the wyves love of Bath = wife of Bath’s love 9046, my modres Ceres soul = my mother Cerés’s soul 10139, Goddess sone of hevene = God of heaven’s son; in Vestes temple the goddesse ii 157, the kinges
daughter of Cecile i 104, 235. (c) Cerces 1949, Judicium 15532, Encydos 16845, Sibelles ii 266, Sibele ii 166, Cerces and Ceres ii 168, Circes iii 49 etc., Echates ii 260, Spercheidos ii 261, the temple Apollinis ii 366, that he wolde upon knighthode Achilles seu iii 212 Achilles nom. same page, Del-
borum hath Abel take iii 277, Debor-
Judeam ii 191, Ephesim iii 335, Thel-
am nom, same page; till they Pentapolum
maschum ii 64, Thelmarcus iii 60;
have take, and: for Pentapolum iii. 341,
have for Metamorphoses i 65.

102. DATIVE CASE. (a) After to be, with: wel 2111; wo 1015,
14421, 10892, 353, bygoon 11628, 5338, schapon 1394, loth 1839,
lef 14175, loth 488, 11903, lever 295, 16965. NB. him hadde
lever 3541, 8320, have I lever 11672, 15379. (b) After verbs of
motion as in Saxon: goth him 3434, 4060, 13622, 14748; went hir
4213, 9653, 13038; rydeth him 1693, stalked him 8401, by the
13223, styrt hir 3822. (c) After other verbs: dreden hem 12252,
falleth him 5524, stele hem = from them 4008, us thought 786.

103. PERSONAL PRONOUNS. Me for I, once, 1810; his, gen. of it,
6726, 7838, it am I, as in ags. and German, 1462, 1738, 3764,
5529, 14625; he in the sense of one, indefinite, in the Persones
Tale; he, she, redundant with proper names 6225, 5994, 16880,
5360, 9908, 9912, 10564, 6080, 9242, 9247, 16827; etc. Both
(as in German) follows and does not precede, the genitive of the
personal pronoun, as: here bothe lawes 4641, etc.

104. RELATIVE AND INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS. (a) That is
frequently used in conjunction with the pronoun he so that both
express only the relative pronoun: that-he 44, that-his 2712, 14915,
that-him 3430, without the personal pronoun 12164, onn-his 4691.
Compare Mrs. Gamp’s “a lady which her name is Harris,” “she
being in liquor, which I thought I smell her.” (b) Which
frequently has the signification of what, what sort of, like welch in
German: which a miracle 2677, which they were 40, 2950, 3611,
5621, 6875, 10896, 11754, 16065. (c) Which that, the whiche that
is used for which in the prose tales. (d) What is used for why,
like Latin quid, German was: 184, 1382. (e) What is used in an
indefinite sense (like German etwas, was) wite ye what? = wissen
Sie was? 10805, 17014; so apparently, at first, in the colloquial
“I’ll tell you what (Ich will Ihnen was sagen)”; but the emphasis
put on the what shews that it is not now regarded as indefinite,
[compare German, Das sag’ ich Ihnen]. (f) Whose is frequently
used in the sense of of any one, 743, 4615, 9890, 13903. (g)
Gover—As who saith = one might say, so to speak, i 268, ii 131.

105. INDEFINITE PRONOUNS. (a) Peculiar uses of one 7587, 11046,
8088, 11499; iii 189, i 201, ii 70, iii 159, 259, iii 327; we also
find: in all this world ne might be a gladd woman then was sche
iii 51. one = only iii 231, all min one i 45, all him one
i 148, iii 285, 178. (b) Peculiar use of ought, like the German
ehuw = perhaps: can he ought telle a mery tale or twoye? 12525.

106. PREFIXES. The prefixes for- (German vor-, Lat. per-, con-)
and to- (Germ. sor-, Lat. dis-) have not lost their force in Chaucer
and Gower.

Ex. Chaucer—forpynd 1455, fordo
1662, 14538, fordrunken 3122, 4148,
forthiketh 9780, fordruye 10723, for-
fered 10840, forbrose 16100, for-
kuiteth 17272, forkeresh 17272, for-
trode, forlowith, forsluggith, forlesith,
forletin, all in the Persones Tale.
Gower—forstormed i 160, forbloows i
160, fordith i 266, formayve i 326,
forwept ii 15, forwaked ii 16, forshape
ii 100, foreast ii 167, fortrode ii 330, forthkeneth ii 276, forsluothen ii 190, forsmite ii 308, fordrive ii 330, forjuged ii 192, forlain ii 234, forworth ii 10, forwery ii 224. Chaucer—tohewen ii 2611, toschrede 2611, tobreken 2693, toskastrid 7551, totoke 12563, tobreketh 12835, totiere 13889. Gower—

107. NEGATIVE SENTENCES. Chaucer and Gower follow the Anglo-Saxon practice with regard to negatives, which was (like the Greek) not, as in modern English, to negative the copula only, but to give a negative character to as many words as were susceptible of being thus affected. Two negatives are perhaps more common than one, and verses can often be restored to good metre by restoring a ne which had been dropped: ne—nought 74, nys no 7124, nas no—nolde 522, never—no—no—no 574, no—ne nil no 6822, neyther—no noon—ne noon—never—nolde 9694, etc. But is only, takes a negative as in Saxon and vulgar modern English: I nam but deed 1124, nys but Persones Tale.

108. VARIOUS PARTICLES.

all although ii 160. alonge on along of because of ii 22 96, 121, 310. as with the fundamental meaning of considering, with respect to, so far as concerns, is employed by Chaucer and Gower in various shades of distinctness and strength, decreasing to insignificance. A similar loose use of as is now reviving:

as in so litel space 87, as now (Ger. als dann?) 857, 7899, 12872; so, 6623, 7557, 8370, 8928, 244, 7947, 9671, 6055, 3397, 8865, 8927, 7107, 6979. as in supplicating phrases is often absolutely redundant, 2304, 2319, 3173, 3775, 5773, 6642, 7253, 7883, 8761, 11201, 11371, 13581; and also in 7196. In like manner so is redundant in one instance 10772.
as is used as a relative in this one case; there may be more, but others have not been noted: his hundred as I spak of now 1860. as intensive = Latin quam; as blive = immediately, not very different from our as quick, ii 266, 313; als swithe iii 306, als faste i 55, also faste ii 132, 158; also blive iii 49. als = as; for als moche i 51, als fer as i 89, 132, als well as ii 203, 379, i 19. as—that insomuch as, seeing that, quippe; as he that ii 245, ii 325, as ye that ii 322, as she which ii 336. as-after after: mete iii 41, 63. Still used in the north of England. I do not find the combination in Saxon, but as set-foran occurs, set-after probably existed.

by about; tel I by this men, by wommen 17120. by of time as Germ. bei; by oldé daies i 67, by oldé tide ii 132, by the brodë sunne i 255, by the morwe 244, by thirty mile ii 186, by times seven i 138, by that = because that ii 228. [Compare (modern) betimes, by daylight, by the morrow.]

erst than before, 1688, 14077, erst without than 8212; er than 12827. ever among still, continually, i 149, 195, ii 16, iii 303, 328; ever in on(e) iii 28, 29. first then before 1157. firth with with, i 194, 209, 216, ii 67, 164. how that however that, although; that ignorance be mode of alle harm, certis negligence is the notice Persones Tale. in auster if if haply i 19; = last, i 344, ii 147. into until, my deth i 117, now ii 278, iii 188. in with within 9818, 10216, 9268. long on, ags. gelang, along of, because of, 12850, 12858. See alonge on. noon no = not: or non 11090, 14492, 12644, i 230, 342, ii 322, etc. nought fowrth nevertheless, iii 365. of representing the ags. gen., foryte of i 167, nedeth of i 272, he thonketh God (dat.) of his miracle i 210, ii 273, lette of ii 207, they drad him (dat.) of vengeance iii 321, pray of iii 390, of
whom I mene iii 301, 302, touchen[ed] of i 19. In the following the reason of the of is not quite so clear: call[ed] or by the name of? ii 331, of love to speke ii 31, i 331, love speke i 334, 336, of that shall speke iii 241, of which to done iii 176, iii 356. I that lawe obie of which that kings ben put under i 117.

of by, Fr. par.; of that i, of knight-hode ii 107, of drinke iii 4, etc., etc.
of that because, why (parce gue), i 66, 167, 161, etc.
other or, 9157, 10697, 13730, 13731.
other while—otherwhile ἠλογο—ἠλογο ii 104.
other—either either—or 1595, 1596; other—other—or, 13077, 13078.
that with imperative = Fr. gue, entreaty; that ye not discover 9816, ne that thy tale make us for to slepe 7990(?); that foule him falle ii 318, that it were do iii 183.

ther, the relatively, where, when: 172, 224, 249, 7043, 8696, 10812, ther(e) my lady is ii 372, tho this man iii 324, 336, etc.; thersa ii 107, there-
upon ii 136. [Compare Icelandic þar.]
till to, unto 12234, 1480, 7348, iii 98, 209, 370.
to unto, representing ags. and Lat. dat.; to nature obey i 291, i 288, thinke man obie i 247, serve to love ii 50, thanke unto i 210, I thanke God ii 94, renounced to heaven iii 46, to the houndes-like i 261.
to unto until 1146, 6211.
toward toward: iii 127.
upon, 6727, up a couche ii 132, up amendement ii 373.
upon on; upon he hadde 619; = after the manner of; and she upon childehood him tolde i 219.
yes—nay, yes—if. The distinction between the two forms of the affirmative and negative particles insisted on by Sir T. More, is not observed by Gower: that is to say, it is his custom to use yes and nay exclusively in answer to affirmative questions, and yes and no in answer to negative questions: hast thou ben? ye ii 20, hast thou nought? ye i 60, i 201, 206, 308, ii 275, 349, iii 24, 274, 281.


at min (thin, her) above. This singular phrase seems to signify, greater than I am (she is) at present, in: as though I were at min above iii 9, as though she were at her above ii 212: in: and how they were at her above ii 375, perhaps, they bore themselves as if superior to what they really were; in: thou might not come at thin above of that thou woldst notache ii 32, the meaning is, thou canst not make thyself master of what thou wouldest achieve.
can thank scire gratias, savoir gre: 1810, 3006, ii 393, i 17.
do so we make, do 2358, 2623, 16427, ii 29, i 94, = cause to be, Germ. lassen, 15638, 10075. Let do, 10360, 13688, ii 63, 208, i 191.
gan as an auxiliary to form an imperfect tense: she gan falle ii 381, 386, etc.
gesse think, as in New England; in Persones Tale, ii 11, 59, 368, iii 180.
go walk, Germ. gehem; ride or go 2244, 9964, 7175, go walk (fy-walkid) 7360; go ne speke ii 3, 6, etc.
habde lever had rather, i amerçois miens, ich hättte lieben, i 295, ii 211.
levest wolde be i 96, ii 46, i 96; I wolde rather ii 94. I had rather seems to be an imitation of I had lever; when the phrase came into use is not known to me.
life being, person, iii 264, 253; live creature = living creature, 2397, 8779, ii 14.
many on(e) many a one ii 56, ii 313.
moon masculine as in age.: the moon of silver has his part ii 84, iii 109; but: ne yet the moné that she carie ii 112; go tak(e) the moné ther it sit i 86.
much great, moche 496, more 2826, moste 897; moré feith iii 326, moré del. iii 335, mosté joy iii 8, care iii 24, make; 2398, 2623.
naile alehouse 6931.
past participles used adverbially, Germ. er kommt geritten; ride amaid i 110, goth astrayd ii 132, iii 176, goth astray, same page; stonden mis-believed ii 102. He cam ride ii 53, ii 45, 170, where ride looks more like the infinitive than like the participle; cam ridend, pres. part. ii 180, 47; and left hem both(e) liege so ii 160, is another extraordinary case of the use of an infinitive.
schol owes, is bound to, 12500, 11062? More distinctly in the sense of owe, if the reading is correct, and there is no ellipse, in Court of Love.
131 (Morris 4:6): for by the faith I shall to God.

sight in a peculiar American (?) use: a wonder sight of flowers i 121.
slyde go by: let slyde 7958, iii 61.
sworn sworn the contrary: although we hadde it sworn 1089–1090, 6222, 8279–81, 12609 (?) though at the world had the contrary swore 10639, 1668.
the def. art. with abstract noun: the experien 5706, 10112 (?), expri-
enias, without the article, 5653. A fre-
quent Gallicism in Gower: the man
l’homme ii 186, the men les hommes
i 9, the mankinde le genre human
iii 1, the experien, the speeche, the
blisse, the trouthe, the word, the derth,
the famine, the gold ii 135, the heven,
the helle, the God iii 177, 187, etc.
these curiously used somewhat like
the Latin sit, but in a fainter sense:
6142–3, 12567, 10961, 10962, 12993;
art. 104, used somewhat like Latin
duc, these oldi wise i 300, 62, 63; iii
161, iii 246.
time, these expressions are somewhat
remarkable; within a monthe day ii
27, within two monthes day ii 100,
sometime a (age, en) yere iii 349.
scare en, upon, wear 6141, 660.
who was who, 4299.
world, worldly lot, worldly happiness,
6055, i 116, 126, 323, ii 249, 304, 313,
iii 162, 170.

110. Peculiar Order of Words.
repeenting folk of here folies, Tale of
Melibeus; dine grate of patiences, but:
besees worthy of confessioun, both in
Persons Tale, lerned men in
lore 1438, wrap in me 14161, that I
of woot 6441, that I of havé sayd 7827,
upon he hadde 619, with kempe[d]
heres on his browne stowte 2136, on to
see 3247, ground(e) liurage on 12703,
al that a man bilongeth unto 9333, to
quyte with the knightes tale 3121, helé
with your eyen 10246, 10955, 13079,
and many cases in Gower. Of his visage
and seeth the make == and seeth the
make of his visage i 367, so iii 52, ii
298, etc., as thou might of to-forde rede
rede of toforé ii 342, of gold that
I the mantel lak(e) =I toke the mantel
of gold li 388, but al this wo is cause of
man = man is cause of all this wo
i 34, to reule with thy conscience = to
reule thy conscience with i 50, to rocké
with her child a siege = to rock her
child asleep with i 196, a damned man
to helé = O man! damned to hell
i 189, on daies now = now-a-days ii 69,
in perles whité than forsake = than,
in white pearls, forsake ii 335, the king’s
doughter Lamedon = the daughter
of the king Lamedon iii 375.

111. Ellipsis (a) of the relative pronoun, (b) of the personal
pronoun when subject, (c) of be, and other verbs, after shall, (d)
of have, (e) of it, (f) of to before the infinitive, (g) of with, but
note that the instrument, etc., are expressed in ags. with the abl.
either with or without the preposition mid = with, and that Gower
may have used the old construction, (h) of other prepositions.

Ex. (a) there was non auditor [that] cowde on him wyne 598, and in a
purs of silk [that] heng on his schert
9757, a pyr [that] stant in his ere
10630, he sent after a clerk [that] was
in the town 13355; unto the park
[that] was faste by ii 45, etc., so: men
besche [what] his will is ii 25. (b)
as thought ... and [we] grantéd man
786, this thing was grantid, and [we] oure
others swore ... and prayed 813, ye,
false harlot, hast [thou] ? 4266, ye,
schal [be] ? 10138; it thought her
faire and [she] saidé here ii 45, slain I
have this madde Thaise and [she] is
begrave iii 326, he was rebuked of hem
and [they] saiden ii 160, etc. (c)
that is, or shal [be] whil that the world
wol dure 1382; it is said and ever shal
[be] i 16, 222, ii 39, iii 88, 190, 351;
I wot never whider I shall [go] ii 21,
that they with him to Thaé sholdè
[go] iii 327, which wepte as she to
water sholdè [turn] iii 260, and what
she sholdè [become, come to] she was
arad iii 321, [compare German, du
süßt dahin; within must ich f] (d)
he wold hir [have] bient anon 3347.
(e) ner [were it not for] gingeal of
the bellis 16280, nere myn exorti
cions, I might not lyven 7021. (f) now
is tyne [to] wake al night 3672, he was
worthy [to] have his lif 6627. (g)
thing which he said [with] his owne
month ii 310, iii 155, fightend. [with]
his owne hondes slain i 90, madé cloth
[with] her owne hand ii 83, 190, 204,
i 346, 351, iii 305, where he [with] his
ownè body lay ii 198, iii 208. (b) owne had ii 236, for in the plit(e) [in]
I not what thing it may amounte [to ?] which I the finde iii 554, perhaps mere
ii 191, 194, etc., he no childe [of?] his carelessness.

In an appendix Prof. Child refers to the following among other lines as illustrating his observations, the numbers under 112 refer to the articles, the others to the lines:—129, 85 19 69. 230, 60 69 56a. 456, 89. 610, 53a 60. 673-4, 19 12. 822, 55 17. 956, 53a 4 60. 1221-3, 16 19 4 60 50. 1299, 91a 91c 95. 1612, 89 91c 60. 1616, 58b 36b. 1805, 85 19. 2306, 19. 2521, 53b. 2807, 60 4 53a. 2960, 14 4 61. 3699-3700, 30 29 32 19 58d. 4049-50, 38b 52c. 4052, 32a. 4300, 2. 4649, 59. 5590, 91a 86 85. 5859, 56 3 61, 5947, 91c 90 3 91c. 7017, 48 60. 7026, 34 58 3. 7593-4, 7 30 16 11 56b 60 14. 9475, 30 32 20 19. 11843, 35a 33. 12221, 53a 35c 15 29. 12621 58b 22. 12991, 85 90 71. 14861, 10 86 56b. 15037, 69 19 72b. 16421-2. 22 40 73 22 60. Nearly every line will be found to furnish examples.

The wonderful industry, the acuteness and accuracy, of Prof. Child could not have had justice done to them, without inserting the above full account of his memoirs. It is to be hoped that he will eventually himself put these papers, enriched with the results of an examination of those MS, which the Chaucer Society is now publishing, into a more accessible form, as they ought to be studied by all students of Chaucer and of the English language of the xivth century.

It now remains to add the references to the words in arts. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 64, 69, 72, 73, 89, 90, 91. These are arranged below alphabetically, according to the modern orthography of the word cited, if it is still in use in the xixth century. This is placed first, with a capital if found in both the Chaucer and Gower Memoirs, in small letters if in Chaucer only, in small capitals if in Gower only. The word is preceded by * if it occurs in the list of exceptions, by ** if it is also only found in an oblique case in the Chaucer, and then few or no references are given; by † if it is an adjective or participle, by ‡ if an indeclinable, by § if of uncertain origin. If the word is not now in use the roman word is omitted, and the article begins with the number usually following the first word. This number refers to the art. in both the Chaucer and Gower Memoirs in which (or in the notes to which) the word is to be found, and on referring to that number in the above account, the category under which Prof. Child places the word is readily seen. Next comes the spelling as found in Wright's Chaucer, or, if the word is not there found, in Pauli's Gower, printed in Italics, with this exception, that when a final e is there written but for any reason not pronounced, it is replaced by an apostrophe. This deviation from Prof. Child's system of notation, which has been followed in the preceding account of his system, has been adopted here, because by this means all written e's will have to be pronounced, and the index will be made conformable to the illustration in Chap. VII. After the spelling
of the MSS., the word in roman letters give the Saxon original, and an acute accent (') after any shews that it is a form in Lāçonmon, but a (°) that it occurs in Órmin. Then follow the references to the lines in Wright's Chaucer, or to the volume and page of Pauli's Gower, a final accent (') showing that the word cited is final in the line quoted. Several of the references in the memoirs are omitted, especially to the imperfect Gower text, and for oblique cases. Many of the Chaucer references have been verified, and all been compared with the original memoirs. Additions in brackets are generally by the present writer, and the other observations are either in the precise words used by Prof. Child, or their equivalents. Many words in other articles, besides those enumerated above, have been inserted, for the purpose of assisting the reader to turn to the proper article, and for these the above information is not given, and no references are added.

Thus the articles "ABBESS, About, against, algates," are to be read as follows:—

"ABBESS," modern form, found in the Gower memoir only (indicated by the small capitals), "19" mentioned in art. 19, "ABBESS" form in Pauli's Gower at "iii 337," vol. iii, p. 337, "French" derived from the French.

† Indeclinable; "About," modern spelling, the word being found in both memoirs (indicated by the capital), "72" in the 72nd art., "abouten," the spelling in Wright's Chaucer, "abutan" Anglo-saxon form, "3645" line in Wright's Chaucer in which the spelling abouten occurs; "aboute" another spelling with e pronounced occurring in Wright's Chaucer, "892" line 892 last word indicated by the accent ('), "2191 3554 4146," and also in these lines but not as the last word, "about" the same spelling as before but with the e not pronounced "2187" occurring in line 2187, "art. 73" the word is also referred to in art. 73, under the form "aboutes," in which it occurs in Pauli's Gower, "iii 162" vol. iii, page 162 last word (') in a line.

† Indeclinable, "against," modern form, the word occurs in the Chaucer memoir only (indicated by the absence of capital), "73" at art 73, "ageyn" the form in Wright's Chaucer; "onegan, ageyn togean" Anglo-saxon forms, "ægen, ægéne, ægénest" forms in Lāçonmon (indicated by the acute accent), "onguna ængænæss" forms in Órmin (indicated by the °), &c.

† Indeclinable. "72, 73" referred to in art. 72 and art. 73, not existing in the xixth century, indicated by having no word in Roman letters preceding these figures; "Algates," occurring in both memoirs, indicated by the initial capital, the spelling in Wright's Chaucer, "7096, 7393, 13024" at these lines, "alget" assumes the form alget with s elided, "573, 7619" in these lines, "algat (')" the form alget which is doubtful, "14422" in this line, and "algates" occurs, "i 25" in Pauli's Gower vol i, p. 25, "[always]" this is the meaning of the word, which is always added when the word is obsolete.
FORMS OF WORDS IN CHAUCER AND GOWER REFERRED TO IN PROFESSOR CHILD’S MEMOIRS.

See the Explanation of the Arrangements, pp. 377-8.

ADDEES 19 abbesse iii 337 French
Â About 72 abouten abutan 3645, abouts 892 2191 3554 4146 about 2187, art. 73 aboutes iii 162
Â Above 72 aboveen on-, a-, bufan 53 2771 7297, above 1802 1965 5789 above 2029 3213
Â 29 a-cæle a-cæle iii 296 [a cold]
[Accent] art. 97a
*ADDER 5 nedder adder nedre iii 118
ii 72 260
[Adjectives] art. 29 to 44.
ADVENTURE 19 adventure ii 236, art. 108 in aunter ff [if haply] French
[Adverbs] art. 69 to 73.
Â against 73 ageyn ongean aegan to-
gean sus aged on ageynes' agedest on-
gen' ouragesen's 66 4812, ages
ageyns 1611 8046 7878 10371, ageynnes
10199, ageyn against 8196 13597
*age 91 og' 13445
Â alas 91 allaas new French las 2391
alder 17 aldir alor aft 2923
Â ale 9 ale eau calo 343 669 13736 3130'
13720' i 294'
Â 73 Alges 7098 7393 13024 i 102,
algein 573 7612, algein (?) 14422, art.
72 algate i 25 [always]
Â alike 69 ylike yliche gelico 7797 7812
7833
*Â All 30 alle call all al' all' alle' 1247
1566 2704 4586 9623 13589 14015
14472 & al 7087 12013 12599 14091
14246 14376, art. 91 all' 210, 348 779
987 946 979 4541 & alther ather
[all] art. 44
*Â ALL 106 [although]
Â Alms 4 almesse almesse almesse' 4588
Â aloft 69 72 alofte ii 103' 234'
Â Alone 29 allone 9200 9435 14256
14707' is from the age. definite form
ans - ansus, ii 293
*Â ALONG 72 alonge ii 22', art. 108
am 103 it am i
Â Amidst 73 amiddes -middan -middles
amidde' amidden' 2011 10723 16215
in the middes (of) 16534, art. 72
amidde 58' 119'
*Â Among 73 amonges gemang imong'
amang' among' amonge 9902 14639, among
6534, art. 72 amonge ii 22' 310'
164 -and old form of the present par-
participle awaytand 7534, legand
7759, touchand 7872
*ankle 9 ancle ancle 1662
[Anomalous Verbs] art. 65
Â Answer 12 answer andswaru aanswer' annswaru' 6492, art. 89 answer'
9744, art. 11 answere i 96' 97 146'
Â Ape 3 ape apa 3933 7046 13241 13596'
appear 87 oppere
19 Arcti 1579 1582 &c. Arcti' 1147
1357 2317
Â ARIADNE 98 Adriane
*Â ariste ariist 320' where the e final
is omitted in Pauli [raising]
arm 14 arme arm 158 probably an
error, 2016 should be armes
Â Arrow 4 arrow arrow' 11244
Â ase 23 ase ase ase ase ase ase
ase ask 98 ase
as 188 [considering]
**asp 16 asp eap 2923 ?
Â Ass 3 ass ass ass 16798'
Â assunder 72 assundre on-,' a-, sundran
5577, anonder 7256' anondor 493'
Â at-above 109
at—after 108 [after]
Â atween 72 atweyne ontweean 3589'
13098'
*auget 105 ought
Â AUGUST 96 August
Â aunt 19 aunte 5401 French
Â AVARICE 19 avarice ii 127 French
*ave 91 ave' 14919 [extremely doubtful]
Â awating 64 awaytand 7534
Â awe 7 awe epe etc' aye' etc' 656' 16046'
Â axe 17 ax ex eax ex eax axe' 2546
*Â AXLE 17 azel eazl i 320 (?)
Â BABB 18 babe old swedish babe, Ger-
män bube' i 344
*Â Badd 31 badda 9467 3157' 9482'
15998' ii 47
Â Bale 7 bale bale bale' bale' 13409'
balk 3 balka bala balea 3918'
Â BAND 16 bonda bend also s. i 102'
bane 3 bane bana bone' bane' 1099
1683' 16446'
*Â BANK 16 bane bane i 164
*Â baner 80 baner French banère 980
Â BAPTISM 19 baptisme i 276 French
*Â Bare 30 90 bare bare' bare' 8755'
8771' 11884' 12660' ii 286
**Barn 14 berno bern berné bernene'
13812' i 162'
Be v. 111 [elided]
Be—, 106

* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique. + Adjective. † Indelizable. †† Uncertain Origin.
*Bean 16 borne bean 9296 3770' 4514' 9139' ii 275*
Bear 3 bear ber 2144, 1642' ii 339, art. 89 ber? 2060' [rh. here = her, probably the e was pronounced in here] art. 88
*bear 99 ber' (verb) 1424 9918 12264 all inf.; 2765 imperative, 8760 pres., to bear art. 88
*beard 14 boree beard iii 319
Beast 19 beast 7434 9413 10578 6616' beast i 280 French
*beat 91 ber 383 [wrong reference?]
**Bed 14 bed beth bed' bethelde i 24 101' [all ex. in Chaucer oblique]
*bede 14 bede bed i 208' [prayer]
*bene 6 beke boce becloe 12656' 2925? bece 23 becan been been
†Before 72 bife befor forman 1108 1150' 1164' 1388 byfore 379' 3238', before i 14405 bifer 3602 14965 i 69 117
*begin 91 begynn 17347
†Behind 72 behynde behindan 3239 7723' behynde 1052
Belief 3 blewle gleafa ilefe ilefe' sii 3456
11465 11991' 12355' belowe i 356
Bell 4 belle belle belle' 171' 14077' 14407' 16260' ii 13'
Bench 17 benc benc bencche bennche' 6829 ii 374, see banc
†beneath 72 bynethe benijan 4039
benedicite 96, see p. 260
*bequeath 91 bynyth' 2770
berry 4 berye beryge berie 207'
*besech 91 bisek' 7231, art. 98
*beseide 72 beseide be sidan 10688'
†Besides 73 bysidse be sidan 13344, besides ii 359
better 38 bettre betere bettre' 526 650, bet adv. form in ages. 4534 4731 30914
†between 72 bytwene betwyman 2861' 3107' between' i 6, 9, 20 between i 12
†betwixt 72 bettwix betwixt 1707 3096, betwixte 1212 2172 9348 14247
†beyond 72 bygond? i geondan geonda geond 15150
*birde 96
**bier 16 87 boere buer beroe' 15091
beer' 6179 [the cases in 16 are oblique], art. 87
bill 19 bile 13585 13591' French
*binn 16 byme binn 596'
birch 4 birch[e] birche birc 2923' birch' asp.
bird 98 bred
*Birth 16 burthe beor? 4612, berthe birthi ii 76 165
†14 bissemawe bismer bismare bismeare [abuse, filthiness] 3963'
†blade 14 blade blad 629'
BLAKE 4 blisse blisse ii 244
†30 blache blai ii 21 som on for she is pale and blische
†BLIND 30 blinds blind i 8
bliss 17 91 bles 1865 rh. this, blise' 4453 rh. is 4842 &e blisse 1451 & oblique only
†Blithe 29 bliche blisse blisse' 1890' 14210' blith' 848 blithe 10652
blossom 3 blosme blosma blosme blosstme' 3324 (blossm) upon
†Blue 30 blewle blech 666
†69 Blyse bilifte blive' blisse 2999' 6973 7102', i 314' ii. 238' [quickly]
†Boar 14 bosk bar 2072 iii 258
†Boat 14 bote bat i 2
†Boatily 30 bodelichе i 14
Bondman 3 bondeman bonda iii 320
Bonefac 91 Bonefes 205 281, but rh. grace i 258
†book 16 books boce' 6373 oblique, book 6261
Boon 16 boone ben bene' 2521' 2671' 9492' 12162' & [in all the cases cited rh. soone] i 185' iii 223
†Boote 16 boat bot bote' 426' 6054' [both rh. roote] i 225' 235'
†booth 18 bothe Ger. bude, Dut. boede, iii 281'
borde 19 oft bourde, i 304' French
†14 Borwe borg borth [loan] 10910'
†Beth 72 bote betwawe baSe' boSe' bape' 5695 6823 ii 229, art. 39 and 103
†Bottom 14 botme botme 13249
BOUND 19 bounde bonde mid. Lat. bunda, old fr. bonde, iii 102' French
Bow 3 bow boga 17044 108' 9885' 17061', art. 91 bow' 2897 [the elision is not certain]
BOWEL 19 bowele ovr. boele iii 265' French
box 17 box boxe 5165
†bramble 14 brene bremer bremer 15157
†brend 4 brande brande brand' 15313'
*bread 14 brede bread brede' 7422
BRECK 7 breche brice i 351'
†Bread 11 brede 2918 1972' 13156' 16646' iii 66' [breadth]
†Bride 16 bryde bryde brede' bryde' 9764, art. 17 bride' i 102 art. 91 bryde' 9694 bride' i 102
†Bridge 16 brigge brygge brugge' 3920' ii 201
†brightly 69 brighte beorhte 3352

* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique. + Adjective. † Indecinable. ‡ Uncertain Origin.
BRIM 7 brímmne brymme ii 293
*bring 91 bring 10049
*Drink 18 brink Icelandic bringr =
cobliculus) 11472 9270 11707
bristle 98 heralde
ROAD 30 brode brad ii 107
Brother 21 brother, brethrens ags.
brother brothers brethrens brethrens brethrens brethrens, art. 23
*brotherhood 14 brethren 513
*brow 14 brose brow i 96
*bull 18 bull bull ecle boli bauli Ger.
bull, ags. bulluci iii 118 ii 72 (?)
burned 98 brent brene
burst 98 brent breats
*busyness 91 besynes 13140
By 108 [about, of time]
†2 bywaste bewestan 390° [westwards]
*Cake 18 cake, Danish kage, Swedish
kaka 4309° 13737
Can, and its parts, art. 65, art. 109,
can thank [scire gratias]
Candle 96 candel
Capt 4 cappe cappe 688° 687° 3145°
Care 11 care eare care° 1491° 4934°
14011° 15170° i 339
*Cart 1 carte cart cartes cartes cartes carte kartre°
7123, cart 16522 7121 7136 16533,
art. 98
*carte 8 cart 7122 7124 7141
cases 27 cases
cause 19 cause 4142 5705 7666 French
centre 10 10836 French
certainly 96 certeynly
†18 Chaffor 14699° 14751°
chamber 19 chambre 1073, art. 89,
chambre° 9696 French
chanticleer echansticler French chan-
ticler 16336, mostly misspelt as above
in the Nonnes Prests Tale; that it
ought to have no final e appears from
the French derivation, and from the
rhymes ber (twil) and powèr (Nor-
man French pouër) 18622 18630,
also misspelt ber powër.
*champanhood 14 champanhede
30 char 16096° should be char =
chariot, not to be confounded with
art. 90 char 16099° = char
*Chaste 19 chaste 2306 French
Cheek 4 cheecke cese cese 6974° 16524°
cheek° 16529 bad verse
Cheer 19 chere i 55 French, art. 87
Cheese 7 cheese ceye cese 7329, art.
91, ches° 3628 suspicious verse
*Chest 18 kiste cist iii 316°, art. 17,
chest cist cest 6084 14149 rh. rest,
6982 rh. lest
*16 chaste ceaste ? i 294 [strife, con-
tumely]
*Child 14 child child child child°
child 5339 14890 15217° 8469,
child 15221 15228 16241 8488
15768 i 190 ii 16, childrens childrens
childrens childrens childrens, art. 23
*childhood 14 childcheste 14912
CHILL 7 chills cyle ii 369°
chim 9 chimne chimne i 275°
Church 4 chiroke cyrique chireche°
kirke° 7391 7776 13744 13793 &c, art. 91
chiroch° 3984, art. 21
*claim 91 claim 9176
*clapper 8 clapper ii 13
clasped 98 claspud
†Clean 29 clean clame clame clame°
506 12087 14288, art. 91 cleni°
12228
†Cleanly 69 clame clame clame 12553
*cleanness 91 ciemens° 508
clearly 87 cleere
cleft 3 clifes clifa 7727
*clerk 14 clerke clerke clerke i 288
*clerke, Middle Latin cleaca,
Flemish kloekke, 2001°
†Cloud 18 cloude 16268°
*Coal 14 cole col' col' 13088° 13124°
come 7 cyme cume° come° (noun)
12271? [comine, ctume]
*come 91 com° (verb) 689 14184
commandment 19 comunandement 2871
2981 12991 French
†COMMON 30 common iii 152 159 common
i 216 284 French
[Comparison of Adjectives] art. 83
*Constance 91 Constance° 4698 4858
4866 4898 Constance° 4684 4851
5320 5527, art. 19 Constance 1 i 185
186
[Contractions] art. 93 to 97
*Cope 14 cope cop i 102°, art. 4
cappa ii 101? § art. 18 1435°
*corn 14 corn corn° 14404°
cot cote 4 cote cote cote 2459°
couch 19 couche 7351 French
*Coutler cotler 14 coutler couler 3761
3723 3610
Creed 3 crede creda 12975°
*creas 6 ceras ceras ceras 3754°, art. 4 ceras
i 299 344°, art. 98
*cripple 18 cripol Icle kryppill, Dut.
krepel, Ger. krüppel, iii 147
*crisp 98 cripse
crock 3 crookes crookes 4156°

* Exceptional.  ** Exceptional oblique.  + Adjective.  ‡ Indeclinable.  1 Uncertain Origin.
**crop 14 Croppe croppe 1534**
Crow 4 crowe crown 17175 17062' 17294' 2694'; art. 91 crowe 17172
Crowne 4 crannme crume 135 16
Cup 3 cuppe cuppa cuppe's 134 10930' curl 98 crulles
curse 17 curs currs 663 658 4347
$ dagger 18 daggere (a thing to dag or
pierce with age, ending -ere ) 14070
[bad line] 112', daggere 14345
†Dainty 18 31 deynye, (Welsh dant = tooth; dantaidd = toothsome,
Wedgewood) 4559 5790 9917 16112, deynye 16321 ii 255
† Dale 14 dale dale dal'dale' 16248'
dame madam 19 dame madame 15382
16444 16656 madam' 11635 18130
16456, art. 91 dam' 4651 4604 6152
madam' 7786 7792 French
Dure, and its parts, art. 65
**dark 14 derke deare adj 4336'**
[Dative Case] art. 102
Daughter 21 doughtier, pl. ags. dothtru
doethere' dothren' dothre' dotheren' doutheren' doutheres', art. 23
*daw 91 dav 10069
*Day 14 daws dag i 113', art. 98
*DEAR 14 dele dele i 110
†Dear 29 dere deore deore' dere' deore'
dere' 13593' 14921', art. 87, art. 89
deer' 7334 15538? [see peer]
*DEATH 14 deeths death i 202
*declare 30 50 declare' 74245 14939'
declar' 14893 extremely doubtful
*Deed 16 dele dead dede' deded 4585' 5311 etc., i 272
*deem 91 dehn 3194
Deep 4 deep depe depe 4875' 5875'
†Deeply 69 depe depe depe 129' 198
deer 25 deer deor pl.
DEFAULT 10 defaults ii 206 French
[Definite Adjectives] art. 32 to 36
degrees 26 degrees 88 dere derian [injure]
†Der Deere derne' derne' derne' 3200
3278 i 107' [secret]
DEER 19 deere' deere' deere' 391 French
DEVIL 96
*Devout 30 devoute i 64 French
Diane 19 Dyane 2078 2348 etc. Dyane'
2293 French
*did 91 dedd 14926
**DIMLY 69 dimme dimme ii 293'
**DIVERS 30 diverse ii 55 77 125 iii 12
295, divers i 356' iii 3' 384' French
do 109 [cause]
§dog 18 dogge, Icelandic doggur, Dutch
dogge 6951 9888

**Doom 14 dom' dom doms' 11240,
dom' iii 211'
Door 11 80 dore dura dry dune' 1989
3439 3449 3506 13145 14624 etc.
dor' 555 5242 3741 3482 3634 [all
these are doubtful, they might be
dore introducing tri-syllabic measures]
†DOUB 19 double i 181 iii 187 French
doubt 19 doue 9859 French
do4 dowe dufe 10013 13812
*down 16 dowe dun dun' 15207'
§drake 18 drape 576'
*Dread 16 dreads dread dreed' drede'
16448 9031' etc. i 139
†Drink' 14 drynke drincnacrinac drin'
drince' drincnacdrinac' 1617 3411
4918 7481 etc., art. 7 love drunken
iii 12 16
†‡ 31 Drumkenoe' 7625 9407' [drunk-
ken] so costlewe [costly], Persones
Tale, De Superbia, 3rd par. near the
end. iii 5'
Drop 3 dropa dropa dropa' 12450 (131
bad line) ii 266, 286'
†Dry 29 drye drye drye drye' 16334
422 15705' i 234
†drought 16 droughts drags' 10432
**dung 14 dongs dang dang 16004, dang
532
Duval 3 dwala 4159' [nightshade]
[E Final Silent] art. 84 to 92
†feech 30 ehe ehe ec ehe' ehe' eile'
1184 [Doubtful, there may be only
a defective first measure, p. 333.]
†Eagle 19 eyle 2180 10437 French
Ear 2 ere eare ere' 6218 6603' 8603',
art. 87
Earth 4 ethe eethe eethe' ethe' 1248
8079 8557 10707 erth i 25
ii 197 [doubtful]
Ease 19 ease 971 French
**EDGE 16 egge eggr i 251
‡22 esfe eft i 171 [after, again]
†Eke 72 ek ek ek ec eke' ek 5081 5612
5688 8918 eke eke eke 4480 5136 6291
7075 7765 11692 15786 (all rh. with
seekes); 6373 7446 15522 (all rh. with
seekes), 16875 (rh. with breke)
Eld 11 elde yld yld yde' yde' elde'
6789 6797 3885 iii 365
‡29 elengy ellende = peregrins, and
therefore miser, as in other lan-
guages, see Dieff. Goth. W. 1, 37,
being changed into g, as in the
modern English form of the pre-
sent participle ‡14653 6781' [rh.
challenge and hence pronounced
(elen-d'zhe), and consequently not
analogous to the change of the participle from -ende to -enge, as suggested by Prof. Child.

[Ellision of Final Vowels] art. 74 to 83

[Ellipsis] art. 111

†Else 73 elles elles elles' elles' 1230

9410 11209 i 1 to 203

End 7 ende ende ende' 1867 4901 7037

15 etc. ii 81 186, art. 91 end' 197

64 -ende, usual termination of the present participle, even of French verbs, in Gower, accordende i 213', comende i 88 133' 220', toucheende i 243, wepende i 74, wriende i 137, kne-

lende i 155, prrende i 345, swende i 278 213', spekende ii 6', thenkende ii 369, thankende ii 297, ridende i 191 ii 46, amblende ii 45, wimende i 189, soudenende i 188, waiende i 190, bladende iii 60, wenuende iii 145, contiende ii 127 etc., all with the accent on -ende.

The accent is occasionally thrown back, comend i 1, toucheend i 52, belongend i 12, waiend i 144, waiend i 186, wepend i 266, kneelend' ii 96, stiembrend ii 103 etc.

†enough 30 72 ynoce genob inch' inow' 1278'8, art. 91 ynow' 4675

ENNY 19 enwe i 223 French

*er 8 -er -ere -ere, [see earl hopper lores moblere outlyders soper wonger; generally -er]

erst than 108 [before]

Eve 16 eve afen, afer' heve' efenn' 832 4993' i 70' ii 332'; at 691'4

*even 30 even efen efene' efenn' 833 8316

*evonly 66 evene efene 1062

*ever never 72 evere evere' afere' afere' afere' 50 676 1231 1347

1408, ever 70 everi 1135 1354 2397

2414, generally contracted to a monosyllable, art. 108 ever among [still]

*evilly 66 evele yele 1129, yll' 3715

†excellent 19 excellente 10459 French

*experience 19 91 experience 7099', exper- iences 5583 10112 (6650 rh. defens which in Old French is spelt both with and without a final e) French

Eye 2 yte ye caye exe' ii 10' 3018'

4700' 8109' etc. eyen ym, eyen ymg, art. 23

*face 19 91 face Norman French face, 9710 rh. trespacie 1580 16262, faus rh. haas=has 13117?

fain 98 fause

†Fair 30 90 faire fager feair' faire' fagger' 2388 2865 4021 13043 [all these are fem.] 304 2596 [these two are plural], 864 1687 [these two are definite], 12060 [probably an adv.],

ii 253 [a faire knight, probably in- federalion], fair 165 575 3233 7835'

9147' 9431' 1443' 

Fairly 69 faire fager fage 94 12060' 

91 fallas Fr. fallace, iii 158 rh. wos, fallas inne ii 86 [deceit, cunning]

†FALSE 30 false fals ii 329

**Falsehood 14 falshehehe 13101 i 216

fan 17 fann fann' 3315 16974 (?)

†far 72 farre far i 19

Fare 11 fare faru fare' fore' 1811'

4989' ii 173' 271'

†Fast 69 faste faste 4192 6552 11159

18033 13351 i 55

Father 21 fader, art. 98

*†30 fause, trah (=thag as in ealhick)

5802' [fain]

*Fear 14 89 fer' far' farr 11172 [oblique], ferre 2436 2688 2932 7286 [oblique, all for ferre'] ii 179' 96', art. 87

Feast 19 faste faste 8145 8886 1812, fast 6658 French

*FEE 14 fee feoh i 293 [cattle] monosyllable contracted

*fell 91 fell' 9332 pres., 9338 pres.

*feere see ferre

39 fele i 9739 [many]

*fell 91 fell' 9112 subj.

‡Fellow 18 Icelandic felagi felaxe

2550 16512 397' 655' 1527' 4248'

4366' 6967' 16499' felax 650 1194

2626 2657 4257 7606 7624 7668

16489 16514 16516 16527 16591,

felas' 652', felax' 892

*fellowship 8 91 felawschip' 476 430

3 Ferre feere ferre gerfa iere' 4748'

4816' 6506' 8989' [in all these cases the word means companionship rather than captain; it is the German gefährte, properly der mit-

fahrende, compare English seafarer]

[Feminine of Adjectives] art. 37

*fern 14 ferne learn 10569'

*FETCH 98 fetes

few 39 feue fawes feaw 641 7432'

*fiddle 5 fthaf fithele 298

†Fill 16 filla fill 1630' 7232' i 254

*fithe 16 fithe yh 174

*find 91 fynd' 16408

Finisterre 84 Fymaster

*Fire 14 for tyr fur' fr' 2921 2935

2948 [fere fyure seem to be oblique forms only]

* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique. † Indecinable. † Uncertain Origin.
**fish 14 flaska? flask flasc? flasc' 180**  
[oblique, with omitted s: is likened to a friend's what's wattle]

**Fist 17 flat fest syst 6574 4273 rh. breast, 6216 rh. list, 14217 rh. best, 17329 rh. jest, art. 16 fate i 175 obl. fit 17 fit fitt 4162 5024 rh. wit flesh 28 flesh fen**  
Pleat 19 feel eat i 314, art. 14 fate fleot i 197  
**Flesh 14 flaska flesh ii 342**

**Flight 17 fight flyth flight fliths flight' 990 rh. knight, ii 327 rh. night, art. 16 flighti 378' printed flight**  
Floor 17 floor flor for flor for fori for (i) 326 rh. scour(e) ii 337, art. 91 fori 337, probably belongs to art. 17 and should have no final e.

fly 4 flye fleote flyge 4550 14582 10178  
Foal 3 foal fola i 314  
*Foe 14 fo fab fa ii 116, pl. foom foos aegs fa, Bow., art. 23  
*Fold 14 folda fulad fald 514 i 16'  
*Folk 14 folke fol ii 165, art. 25  
*Ford 14 foada foada foada (i) 7463, rh. good ii 362 ii 26 30 foal five or six times in Gower**  
*Foot 14 foote fot fot** 11489 iii 149', pl. feet aegs fet, art. 26  
*For 72 foar for for ii 58 to rhyme with bore  
*Forbide 91 forbide 9635  
*Forc 19 force 3910, art. 91 forc 3810 [for] for fail is with force forc to shew as, art. 91 fora 7771 9171  
9709 10214 10304 13548 13718  
17000 (rh. corn) French, i 392 rh. hors**  
For-, 106  
*Fore 72 * form for for afern oncran  
*For 32, afore i 364, before toforan  
204 tofer i 59, befor i 138, art. 90  
*for i 59 117 138 etc. -fore i 32 204  
*Eorth with 108 [with]**  
Fortune 19 fortunate 15487 15727 15943 16209 i 32 (4 cases) French  
*Touly 69 foule fule? fullic 16694  
*Foul 30 foule ful ful' fule' 6645  
6664'**  
*Founder 9 founder ii 161  
*Four 90 four 2141 3863 1388  
*Frenche 29 fremede 10743  
*Frenche 30 freshe fresche freche' freshe' 2388 9556 2733 10698  
*Friar 89 freer 208 7315, freer 7252  
7254 7258 7264 etc., art. 87  
*Freend 8 friend 8 friend' friends' frends' friendscope 430  
*Funke 18 Ger. funke ii 18 [spark]  
*Gabie 18 gabie Gothic giba, German giebel, Danish gavl 3571'  
*Gabal 3 gabal gaul i 6522' 11986'  
12725 16813 i 303 ii 177  
*Game 15 game gamen gamen' gome'  
game' 3405 14701', acc. 555, in  
14244 ii 94', gam' 2288 3741  
gan 109 [auxiliary]  
*Gap 11 gappe geapa (Bow.) 1641 1647  
*Gate 14 gate gate get' gate' 1414'  
*Gather 98 gader  
*Gear 3 gara geara gara 367? 354?  
*Ger 2182? art. 86  
*Genitive Case* art. 101, [Genitive of Nouns] art. 21 and 25  
get 91 get' 9819  
*Gift 16 gifti gifti gifti 9187 5685 12203, gifti 276, for-gifti iii 372  
*Give 91 giv' giv 223 7455 7467  
9491 9403 14474  
*Glade 30 gladde gleded i 211  
*Glade 30 gleded gleded' 1999' 16870' i 280  
*Glade 30 gleded' gleded' [red hot coal]**  
glose 4 glose glose 7374' 7502'  
**Gl overs 16 glosa glosa i 351'**  
gos 109 [walk], art. 111 [black]  
*Goddess 91 goddess' 930  
*Godhead 14 godhead i 364  
**Gold 14 golda golda gold' 12138,  
nom. ii 366'  
*Golden 30 golda golden ii 356'  
*Goodness 91 goodness 7395  
*Goose pl. geese 26 gees gees  
*gown 91 gown' 93  
*Grace 19 grace 16219 3071' 14132'  
i 9, art. 91 graes 1175, 6842, graes  
16282' rh. Thomas French  
*Grome 3 grama grama 13331' [grief]**  
**Grave 14 grave greef 2780' ii 114'  
*Great 30 graat great great' 4764  
9100 9848 10783 10885 i 125 ii 346,  
grat 341 439 749 1189 1247 1401  
2485 4914 5100 etc. great i 70  
*Green 29 greene greene 2937 3876  
*Ground 14 grunde grund grund'  
*Grunde 5673' ii 111  
*Grove 14 91 groo' groat 1690, grove  
[oblique only]  
*Guess 100 geese [think]**  
*Guess 15 geese guess Dutch gissen,  
Swed. gissa, iii 211' i 105'  
had liever 109 hadde lever  

* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique.  † Adjective.  ‡ Indecinably.  † Uncertain Origin.
Hairy 30 90 hare hareen 14151
*Half 16 have helve half a iv 17" on other half i 77
*Half 16 halle helve halfs l2 206 [halfwise]
*Half 16 halle heall halle* 10394 iv 205" art. 91 half* 9062 10400
*Hand 17 hondo hands hand hond hand"* hond 13788 (this is acc. and all the other instances cited are oblique, so that this is not properly an exceptional word, hand hond are the common forms) hand fond 4113
hond fond 5026 hond bond 10065
*Hard 69 harde heardo 1220
Hare 3 hare hast 191" 686" 1812'
14167' ii 95'
Harp 4 harpe hearpe harpe* 6039
3 Herpe hearne 552' [hinge] heare i 36'
Haste 19 haste 1825 French
*14 haathede ii 245
Hate 7 hate hete hateo hate 6231'
13826' 16074', art. 91 hate* 13640
haunch 19 haunch 327 French
*have 91 haw 888 909 921 1257 2774
9210 9277 9308 10371 10594 10853
11535 11466 11530 14140 14142
and almost always; generally haw in Gower, except, of course, at the end of a line
have 3 have have 6240' 14270'
h e 103 [one indefinite and mark of gender], art. 111 elided
*head 14 head heald heald headle* healse* healse* healse* 10404; haved 12294 [head
seems to be only oblique]
hear 87 hear
Heart 4 herte herte hertes hecres hecres'
herte* 956 966 1149 2651 6354
etc. (40 cases), art. 91 hert 10526
8062 16301 9113 (7 cases), art. 21
Heat 11 hate hate hate hateo hate 12448'
12506' 13336' 13453'
heath 17 heath heatho 6'
*heaven 14 heame hefon heovens heaffed heaffed of 7988', in 9615', art. 21
hegge 7 hegge hege 14704
*Heed 16 heed hyd 306' 8511' 10296'
12363' 13178', art. 91 heed 7483
12987, i 82'
*Heel 16 heel helv a iv 17" ii 210'
*29 heede gehende? hende' 3199
3401 3487 [courteous]
Height 11 highte heatho 2921', rh.
*bright (bright?) 4432, rh. right
17298 [this is an error, it rhymes with to my heritage, which may have been an error for sight]

§ 5. Hopper 8 hopper hoppers 4034 4037
§ 6. Horse 14 horse hors iii 259, art. 21, pl. ags. hors hors' horses', art. 25
§ 7. Horst 60 60e ii 28' 301'
§ 8. Horse 4 horse hors' horse' 3931', horsem 3931', horsem ags. horsem, art. 23
§ 9. Host 19 hoste 753 6668 16936. Host 60 753 1166 12625, 11007 12380 rh. host, 16988 rh. gost, French
§ 10. Hour 19 hours ii 0' French
§ 11. House 14 house hus' haus' 5934 i 294 how that 108 [however that]
§ 12. Horse hoste 3902' [last cap]
§ 13. House 19 house bwe hoeve' bwe' 1366
§ 14. Hub 19 Hughes French ahuge i 236 hunter 3 hunters hunt hunters' hunters' 2020 [a line not in the Harleian 7334]
§ 15. Hunt 2014 bad line, 2630 hunt hunt', hunt
§ 16. Husband 3 husbandes husbandes hus- benda husbande' husbandes' husbande' 6034' 6608' 14578' 5612' 5698' husband' husbandes' husbandes' 6068 8977 (s1077) husband' husbandes' husbandes' 16850, art. 21 husband' 5974
§ 17. I 45 yk ich etc., art. 98
§ 18. 16 ighte eht ii 376' printed ight, [possession]
§ 19. till 30 yfel yfel uflel' uvel' ille' 4182
§ 20. Imag 19 ymage i 34 ii 178 French
§ 21. Imperfect Indicative] arts. 53-55
§ 22. Imperpersonal Verb] art. 67
§ 23. In 69 inn inn ine 41 10891 12809
§ 24. ther' inn i 224, with-inne i 30
§ 25. [Infinitive] art. 60
§ 26. ing 17 -yng -ynge ung -ynge, ing rarely -ynge generally, -ing' almost invariably. The more usual ending in Caucher is certainly -ynge. The termination -ynge occurs frequently at the end of a verse and in most cases rhymed with an infinitive vanyshystyne [acc.] 2362 rh. plur. pres. ind. vanyshystyne [acc. after thurgh] 9934, folyngy 16779, refoystyne 17178, [the other cases cited are oblique]. In Gower the termination is generally -ing, less frequently -ynge; in the latter case the accent is sometimes thrown back, ayinges i 171, babkitinges i 213', bloyinge i 53', childinges ii 211, cominges ii 28', compleigneings i 327', gwe- chinges i 234, knoulechinges i 122' ii 25' iii 34', loininge i 65' 213', lokinge i 65' 173', lokinge i 65', mis-handlinges i 189, seykinge i 262, tidings i 327, tidings i 327, ii 242' 385, vanyshyllings i 355', vcppynge ii 132, wrightings i 4 iii 104'; be- ginning th. spring iii 104, knouleching i 32', teching i 95, all accented on the last syllable; hunting i 53, liking i 319, seeing i 107 108, writing i 5 accented on the first; excusing or i 107, hunting as i 55, sheding of i 316 364 accented on the last, are apparently cases of elision.

+yng, 64 -ynge -ynge, -ende, for the most part -ynge; in some cases how- ever it is rhymed with the infinitive mood, and we must either suppose the participle to end in -ynge, or else the infinitive to have lost its termination. [Probably -ynge is the old and -ynge the abridged form] wonyng 290, lygynng 1013, rounyng 1073, dwellyng 1421, rhyving [several MS. read Malayng] 2605, wynyng 3263, sensan 3341, abydyng 3595, walkyng 3959, knowynng 4225, ymalyng (rh. thing) 8474; rounyng 10992, fastenyng 13778, sitryng' 802', lyfynng' 803', lottyng 12114', thun- deryng (rh. to sprynyng) 2176', gliter- yng(e) rh. brynyng(e) inf. 2892, stry- yng(e) rh. to sprynyng(e) 3673, wepy- ng(yng(e) rh. bronyng inf. 8760, swallynyng (rh. bynyng inf.) 12207, lorrynyng rh. synge inf.) 14927. See -and.

Inn 9 inne inne inn iii 314' inquire 88 inunque
Intent 19 entendre 1489 7138 14986 7212' 8610' 8737 11934' etc. extent 3173 4507 13294 5503' 16125' i 101 French
into 108 [until]

Y Invisible 19 invisible ii 247 French

In with 108 [within]

Yre 7 90 1r yre (inc. gen.) irre' 1661 1764 7093 14072 17210 17220 ir' 7575' rh. squire? 7671

Yade 18 jade 1629'

Joy 19 joye 1873 1875 12507, art. 91 joy' 9929 French

Judge 19 juge jugge 12317 12391 13540 13573 French

Judgment 19 jugement 780 820 etc.

French

Justice 19 justice iii 201 French

Ken 29 29 kene cene cene' 2878' 9638' 15745'

Keep 14 kepe 8934 keep 400' 10272' kep' 8207; at 505' should certainly be keep

Key 16 keye cewe 9918' 13147' ii 188
CHAP. IV. § 5. PROB. CHILD ON CHAUCER AND GOWER.

**kin 14 kynme cyna cun' kinn' 4038' ii 267'**
*Kind mankind 16 kynde mankynde cynde cunde' kinde' 1309 3521 6298 etc. (16 cases), art. 91 kyn' 6263 11080, i 265
†Kind 29 kynde cynde 649' 8728' 15008' unkinde ii 149'**
KINDEL 98 kinled
†kinled 18 kynrede 1288' 11047'
KINE 23 kyn cf.
*KING 14 kinge cynig i 117
9 kingserliche cyningrie i 268' [kingdom of the king]*
†14 kinghede iii 144'
KITE 3 kyte cits ctya 1181 10938 10939
*KITHE 16 kithe cyf iii 71 [country, patria]*
†18 knarrs 551'
Knave 3 knave cnafa cnapa cnave' cnape' 3434 3469 5135 5142 8320 8323 etc. iii 321' ii 16
KNER 9 kn eat eone cnew i 24 may be regarded as contracted
*KNIGHTHOOD 14 knighthode i 246
*14 knightheke iii 212
*KNOTE 3 knotes cnota 10715 10721
†knowledge 13 knowledge 14441. Can the termination -lehe be the same as -leghe in the Ormulum = there, to -ness?*
*LACE 91 las old French las 2291, rh. lalaas, rightly written; lace 1819 rh.
trespas' both wrongly (?) written [see solace]*
†LADDER 16 ladder hleder iii 330
†ladle 5 ladel hleded 2022 16003
*ladys 5 lady hestedil lestdl' laffdig' 1145 1351 14895, art. 21
*LADYHOOD 14 ladyhede ii 40'
lake 10 lake lacu lagu lake' lacs 5581' 16698'
**Land 14 lande land lond lond' land' 4942' i 220
LAP 8 lappes 888' 8461' 10949' 11940'
LAWING 4 lappgewiske hleapgewine, laping, ii 329
LARK 4 lark lawerco lawerce lawere lawre 1493 2212, *art. 6 lawerick ii 264'
†Lately 69 late late 77 i 211
Law 11 lawe lag laxe' lawe' laghe 811 4177 4178 7471
*lead 91 led' 9308
**LEAP 14 leape leaf i 17
†lean 29 lene lemes 9727' 16299'
*LEAP 14 lepe hleap i 310'
†leaping 64 lepand 7739

LEAS 11 leese leasu ; 17 [pasture]
*Leave 16 leve leaf lefe 4069 6490 13653 etc., art. 91 leve' 5594 9715 9230 14263
Lecch 7 lece lese lece leche' 3902'
7474' 7538' 11984' 14331'
†leek 14 leche leac 12723', leek 3877
3 leere lima 12688' [skin]
87 leere [teach]
†16 lefte lyth i 276' [sur]
*Length 16 lenythe leng' 17302
less 38 lese less lessesse lasse' 14280
17268 14895' 15357'
†14 late age'; ii 86' 249' [hindrance]
[Letters] art. 98
†LEWD 30 leode lawed ii 3
*lowness 91 levedenes 10537 12415
*Liche 14 lic lie' lieh' 2960 [dead body] ii 311'
lie 7 lyce lyce 3017' 3391' 5609' 12527' 13055'
†LIEF 14 30 leoves leof i 343 ii 324, art. 109 kados lever
*Life 14 lyfe lif lif' 9111' i 199 309'
 lif 1174', art. 109 [being, creature]
†lightly 69 lighte likhe 6724
3 like lica [corpora forma, cf. swim-
lica, Etmüller, not in Bosworth]
lic' ii 143' iii 70' [shape]
†Like 30 like liche -lie i 26' 261' 268'
i 124' 379, art. 98
*LIKEHOOD 14 liklheid ii 147
Lily 4 lile lile 2180 12019 12015' 11956' iii 249
*LIMUM 14 limme lim i 10
**Linden 16 lynde lind, on 9087', art. 91
lynda' 2924, linde ii 48
Lip 3 lippe lippa 183
lisped 98 lispade
*16 Lisie liss 11500' [forgiveness], art.
17 lees iii 379' (?) [comfort]
*list 14 lytte list 1884
†Little 30 lyte lye lytel 2629' 3861'
7182' list 1237 3860 14635, art. 96
*live 91 ly' 9157 14258
*Lever 16 lyvere lifer livere' 7421'°
†Load 14 leode hled 2920'
†load- (stone) 16 loode-stere ladu lade' 2061
*loam 14 loom lem lem'
11 lode, lie' lode' = life's journey, ladu
ii 293'°
†Long 30 longe lang long lang' lang'
1675 5399 5591 6206 11393 14414
long 619 1187 2061

Ex exceptional. **Exceptional oblique. + Adjective. †Indeclinable. †Uncertain Origin.
†Long 69 longes lange 1645 14847
18596', art. 108 long on [along of, because of]
•lordship • lordschip' hifordescipe
1627, rh. falorship
**•Lore 16 lore lar lare' 4762' ii 81
loes 98 lost
•Lord 30 loude huil 10582 [infrec
•ional]
†Iouldy 69 loude huilde 716, louteh
(from another Saxon form, hlc0's)
17225', art. 91 loud' 19034
Lowe 12 love lufo lufu 'love' lufe'
260 674 6096 6336 14569 (6 cases)
•art. 91 'lo' 1137 1756 1807 2226
2292 2308 2316, etc., etc. (17 cases).
In Gower e is regularly pronounced
•lover 5 lover' 1351'
•Low 30 lowe la hoh' lai' lage'
3696 6795' 184' ii 294'
•Lowly 69 lowe lage? lok' 1407' 17297
LUNG 4 lungus lungi iii 100
†-LY 69 -iiche, iiche i 268, beseliche
ii 2, comuliche i 226, dwuliche iii 246, eveliche i 179', eveliche
ii 328, parfuliche ii 186, priveliche ii 336, priveliche ii 252, unpropheri
i 129, sdeiniche ii 336, solensne
liche ii 328, sereiche ii 72
•16 lynde laden lyden (speech) 10749
Mae 91 mada'm 7786 7792 [see
dame], art. 10 Madame iii 300
MAIO 19 magique ii 128 French
Maid 16 mayde magnen meden
maiden' maide magnedenn', nom.
8259 12059 14078, acc. 5488 i 114, maigend 3209 2207 6469 i 154
•Maidenhood 14 moydenhede mayz-
denhad' 4460' 5651' 8713' 8742
12054' ii 55 230'
3 Make maca machclo' mako' 5667,
2658' 5120' 12152' 16209' [mate, spouse] ii 204' [form]
•male 19 male 1249 French
•malice 91 matic' 8960 9098
•Manhood manhede 1287 i 82 144'
Manner 19 manner 10951' 11737' manner
10462 11743 11745, art. 89 manner
71 2546 3861 8395 16332, etc.
French
many 11 mayne meyne menigeo mene-
geo meune' 1260 7627 10310' 14459'
many one 109
MAPPA MUNDI 19 mappemounde iii 102'
French
Marc 4 mero mere myre 17010' 4053'
693' mero 543'
••Mark 16 merke merke merke' merrke' 1195' marche i 245, art. 17
mark marc' [money] 12964
•marl 18 marle, German merrgel, Latin
marga, French marme, 3460
•Marriage 91 maring' 9550 8860 9663,
art. 19, i 101 French
MARVEL 19 merveille i 327 ii 236
French
Mass 4 mose mose mase mase' mese'
7331 9768 14662 16047
mote 98 make which see
MATTER 19 matters i 45' 146' 343 365
•il 207 353 iii 157 French
MAURICE 91 Moris' Moris i 206 211
213 191
Maw 3 marz magn 4906' 15224' 14411'
may 65 [all its part]
me 103 me for I
Mend 7 mede mede mede 89' 6443' 10106'
11456' [the last three instances are
oblique]
meal 9 melle melo mele [flour] 4040
3937' 4243', art. 90 mel' 4051'
4068'
•meal 14 meal meal' meal' [repast]
4886, mel meal 7356' 16319'
•mean 18 mene Old Fris. mene, ohg.
meina i 97 ii 285' 333'
[Measures, Kinds, etc., Syntax for]
art. 100
Meat 7 mene metti mete' 127
15910 10932', art. 91 met' 136 345
9795 10384
Medicine 19 medecine 10254 French
•Meed 16 mede mede' mede' 772 3380'
•Meek 31 mack 2520' 6016' 14653'
Gothic mucks, North Frisian meek
TBEET 99 mite mite iii 166', unmete
i 163
7 mite mite iii 21' [cup]
men 26 men pl.
mormaid ' meremayd mere mero' 16756'
•merry 30 mery mirig muri' muri'
208 8491'
MESSAGE 19 message i 889 French
MES 19 mewe Fr. mue, i 326 French
•Middle 14 midde middel i 120
•Might 17 91 might, might meaht
micht' mibht' mibhte' 1789 2237
and almost always, might' 10447'
•MILK 29 mille milde milde, i 196, un-
milde i 84'
•Mile 16 myle mil mile' 12816 14687
14127', art. 91 mil' 14102
Milk 17 milk melo melo milo mile' milo'
360 rh. silk

* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique, † Adjective. † Adjective. † Uncertain Origin.
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*mill 16 mello mylen 3921', millen 4309, art. 91 myll 4019
*miller 8 mellor 547 7 4044 5 544 rh. more, 3167 rh. forbers; miller 3923 3903 3998 4008 4904
*Mind 14 mynde mynd mind 13437 4947 1 61 55
*mire 7 myre myre 510' 6554' 16937' Mirth 16 merthe merte murthe 768 [pl.?] 6981' [rh. of birth which should probably be of birth], art. 91 mirth 9613
[Miscellaneous Notes] arts. 98 to 111 Mite 4 myte mite 1560' 7543' 12439' 12661' 1
*MONTH 14 monthe monn mon iii 27
*moon 3 moone mona mont 3515 4296, art. 109 mas. 9759 11699, mona 65, art. 21
**MORNING 14 morne morgen morn morgen 10999 morn 832 14710
*morn, 186 205
*morn 91 morow 824 [see morning] 98
*MORE 3 more more i 98 [mulberry]
*Morning 14 morne morgen morn morgen 10999 morow 360 3236, morow 10099 morow 832 14710
*MOUND 4 moulde molde i 217
*MOUTH 14 mutho mouth 149' 295'
*MOUTH 3 mutha mouth Dartemouth 391 [mouth of a river]
*Mucel 30 mowche nicel muceel 1810 914 917 9298 16256 mouche(-et)
*17269 17270, art. 109 [great]
*MULLE 14, mule mule, 19 mule Fr. mule i 210
*MULTITUDE 19 multitude ii 201 French
*MURDER 14 mordre morser i 270
*Myself 46 myself 11736, myselfe 9234 11674, myself 800 14600
*Name 3 name nama name' nome' name' 1439 1688 12090 12384 etc. name was 15128 perhaps we should read nam' is, art. 91 nam' 14864 16128
*MIST 19 narrow nearn 627 7386
*NATURAL 19 nature ii 17 French
*Nave 11 nave nau nau 7487 [of a wheel] NAY 19 nave i 197 French
*Neat 29 neet pl.
*NEAT 72 -netho, benetho beniyan i 36, underneath understand in 268 Neck 3 nekte bhenca 238 1220 3916
*NEED 16 need need' needs' need' 306 [rh. needs which should be head, all the other instances are oblique]
*NEEDLE 16 needle need ii 20 perhaps should be needle
*Needs 72, 73 needs needles needles needs' needs' 1171 7887 10179 13137 16720, i 108, art. 69 node 9208 9259 13205, nod' 14520, art. 72 node i 147
*NEIGHBOURHOOD 33 neighborhood i 234
*NEIGHBOURHOOD 33 neighborhood i 234 [Negative Sentences] art. 107. [Negative Verbs] art. 68
*Nephew 5 nevew 16890, 'is from the French neveu not from age. nefa, whence comes the old English and modern colloquial form nev, neve.'
*ness (termination) 16 -ness, -ness -nes -nis -nesse' (uniformly bessesse 14636 ii 11, bessesse 13140, boldenessobl., brightness 13089, buxomness i 87, clemess 608 f curriness obl., drinkiness 6196, fairness obl., fayynesse 13924', gooiness 7395, gooiness obl., haininess i 374', hardyness 1827, hethennesse obl., heynesse 5565 8308, holiness obl., homyness obl., idleness i 41, loveness 12416, lustiness 1941? newsfayynesse 10922', rightwise i 7, schamsfayynesse 842, seyness obl., sikeness i 105, sikeness obl. i 105, stadfayynesse obl., wooriness obl., wooriness i 196, wikkiddenesse 6043, wildernes i 193, witnesse obl., witnesse i 223, worsiness 2594, worthiness obl., worschedness obl., woodness 2013 1991 should be woodness, ydelness ydelness 1942 11908'
*Nettle 4 nettle nettle i 173
*New 29 new niwe niwe 430 888
*Nice 19 niec 12421 12770 12870' ii 22 [foolish] French

* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique. + Adjective. ‡ Indecinable. † Uncertain Origin.
niece 19 same 14511 14536 14744 French
Night 17 night night hnight tnight tnight 16704 [121746 is oblique, and probably the rhymes should be night night; night is the common form], art. 26 night pl.
Nightingale 4 nightingale nightegal 98' 3377' 15245' 17068' 154' *91 noble French noblesse 15504
*none 108 [not]
*now 73 for the none ii 72'
Now 11 now now noon noon 152 559 8746, art. 91 now 123 [omit ful] 705 2169 nought forthby 108 [nevertheless] [Nouns] arts. 1 to 28
*Now a days 73 now on days 13234 *now then 72 now the nunja nunja 464' Munn 4 nonee ii 281'
*Nurse 91 nurse 6581, noris 8494
*nut 11 mutta-tru nutta nutt ii 30, muttahalo ii 20
Oak 17 oh ock no 2299
*Oak 16 ore ar i 322'
*oath 14 othe a's a's 1141, oth 3291? ooch 120 should probably be oths [i, supra p. 264]
*of 105 sign of gen., of by; of that = because
19 offrendo i 73' French
*Oft 72 oft oft (Gothic utfa, Danish offe) offe' offtes' 1269 9541; ofestyms 52 358, ofestyms 1314; oft-steth 1879; ofste sthes 487 age. offes offo-stovy often-time i 287?
orn 19 ola iii 168 French
*Old 30 ola oald ald ald' oald' ola ald' 4470 9830 11465, old 12129 14128 14155 14160, art. 38 older oldest
*Once 73 ones one one ones' ones' 7259 15767 1106
3 one onda i 75', ii 260' [hated]
tons 29 one i 231 from ags. definite form ama = sola; iii 213? art. 30 ii 255 every-ch one ii 45, art. 105 [Order of Words, Peculiar] art. 110
*16 ore ar are ore' are' 8724 [honour, favour]
organs 27 orgon pl.
*other 108 [or], otherwise [at one time and at another]
*Out 63 oute u te ut 11407*
*outside 8 outrider 8 outrider riders' 165'
*owe 60 [all its parts]
*owl 4 owle ule 6663'

*Ox 3 oxe oxe oxe' 8083 13769 16490
16513, art. 23 oxen
*pack 18 packe Dan. pakke, Swed. packa, Ger. pack, ii 312' 393'
pak 19 90 packe 6384 2123 French
Pan 4 panne panne 13243 13138' 7196', art. 91 pan rh. man 1167 15438 [in the two last cases = brain-pan, head]
[Participles] arts. 61 to 64, [Participles, past, used adverbially] art. 109 [Particles, Various] art. 108
PASSAGE 19 passage i 223 French
Patience 19 91 patience 1085', i 302 paciens 16312
Peare 3 pear pise ii 275'
peer 99 peers 4023 10989 rh. her which should probably be her, 16336 rh. chaunteceare which should have no -e, 15340 rh. deer, but probably in all cases it should be written peer as in 12907
Person 19 personas 15425, person 10339 French
PERSISTENCE 19 persistence ii 346 French philosophe's 21 philosophie
[Phrases, Peculiar] art. 109
Physe 19 physe 413 2762 phynique i 265 French pillowbeer 7 pilubeer pyle 696
Pipe 4 pipe pipe 567
Piria 19 piria 10091' 10099' [paustrae]
pissure 4 pisse/ayushman mire 7407
*pith 6 pith pitha 6067'
Place 19 place 7262 9963, art. 91 place 16024 French
Plant 19 planta 11344 French
*play 5 play plega pieghe 1127 8906'
*9404' 14528' pleaseans 91 pleaseans French plaisance 8840, pleiachsen 8794
*plight 16 plight plight plattlih plittla 12880', art. 17 plitt this word is always a monosyllabic in Gower, but is continually spelt with a final e, as are also (wrongly) the words rhymed with it, e.g. appelle, spirite, partite; i 259' 259'
[Plural of Adjectives] arts. 39 to 44,
[Plural of Nouns] arts. 22 to 28
poke 3 poke poes 3778 4276'
Pomp 19 pompes 8804 French
*poor 19 90 porr 4566 4540 16308
pore 232 480 490 539 704 13594
14128 16307 French
[poorly 69 pore 8919?]
Pope 3 pape pape 8678 263' 645', art. 91 popi' 8002

4 pose gePose (Bowsw. after Somner)  
410' 1699' [cold in the head]  
*praise 91 praes 9420  
*preface 91 preface 12199  
[Prefixes] art. 106  
[Present Indicative] arts. 48 to 52  
*proes 91 proes French proce 10303  
Prick 3 prick pruck prucke prude prude'  
897' 9867' 14314' 15674' etc.  
* prince 91 prince 4642  
[Pronominals] arts. 45 to 47, [Indefinite]  
art. 165, [Personal] art. 103, [Relative  
and interrogative] art. 104  
proes 91 proes 466 [wrong reference  
proes 15342 15345']  
†Soon 30 proute riht iii 129  
†End 16 endi end i 152  
†ripe 29 ripe 17015  
†road 16 rode rad i 110 (?)  
†road 14 rode 10 74  
†rose 6 rose ra ra iii 95  
Rome 19 Rome 473' 4576' 5388' 10545'  
etc., i 202' ii 195, 196, Rom' 5386  
French  
*rood rosse rod rode' 6078' i 198  
‡Rooft 18 rote roof Iceland rot, Gothis  
varte, ags. wrot 13339, 3', 329' 425'  
rose 4 rose rose 1040 13448  
‡super 30 arose hrow hreh rash'  
†ræghe rægh 12785'  
‡*Rose 16 rose raw 2868' i 50  
†rubric 98 rubrica  
‡rudder 98 rother  
‡*Rush 4 roseh risheh risheh roseh rose  
†rice 160' ii 97 24'  
†Ruth 16 rutheh rutheh (as if from  
‡hrow rothe Iceland hrygh 916  
‡8438 etc., art. 91 ruthe' 10762  
‡rye 7 rye 7 ryge (Bowsw.) 7328'  
‡saint 37 saints fem. [supra p. 264, note]  
‡Sake 11 sake sacu sake" 10039 6945'  
7299' 7314' 8131', art. 91 sake' 539'  
1319' i 1802  
‡sale 4 sale sellef 29 German selle, ii  
‡SALVE 16 salve scalf 1'  
‡SAMM 69 samme same = partiter, 2240'(')  
sauce 19 sauce 9135 553 French  
‡sawe 91 saw 7285 7439 7857 13717'  
14133  
‡Saw 11 sawe scaw sage 1165' 1528'  
6241' 12619'  
‡seate 7 scate seate' (inc. gen. Bowsw.)  
448' 9840'  
‡skepsc scene scene' shene' 115'  
1611' [Bright]  
‡shipne shipen 2022 [shed, stable]  
‡*seckne seckn sceand sceand shande'  
16316' [harm]  
‡School 11 scowl scoul scoul 7768 9443 14909  
14916  
‡score 16 score scoor i 176  
‡score 14 score score Icelandic  
‡skarn, old German scern, iii 222  
‡Sea 4, 7 see se 3(inc. gen.) sse always  
‡monosyllable 278 700 4914 4954'  
etc., art. 3 i 35  
‡scend 30 seconds i 199 but the  
‡form second is found in old French  

* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique. + Adjective. † Indecinable. ‡ Uncertain Origin.
secre 21 secre pl.

* seek 91 seek' 14109, art. 98 seek
† seldom 72 sede sede seld' 10125
* 830', waldschinne ii 93, walden ii 96
self 46 self selve selven
* sentence 91 sentenras 308' 14974',
  sentenras 17352
service 19 service 122 French
* ent 14 set set set ii 156'
Shadow 11 schaduw shaww sceadu 4430
  4365' 6995' schadow' he 4430 ii 45
shall 60 [all its parts], owes art. 108
Shame 11 schame shamu shame' 12433
  13535 1567 3025'
* Sharp 14 shape speap iii 28
† Sharp 30 sharpes spearp ii 82
she 111 omitted
sharrow[s] 4 schere scrape 15452'
* sheep 14 schope speep sheep 506'
should certainly be scrape, cf. 6014
13768 where the same rhyme occurs
508 16137, art. 25 sheep pl.
Sheet 4 scheete sycyte secte 1280'
* Shire 16 shelle shale soul ii 20'
ship 4 schips sceips 388'
* ship 8 schips -schipe -shippe [generally
  -schip], the length of the words
compounded with this termination
may perhaps account for the final
s being soon dropped. fellowship' 476,
friends 420, frendesclipe 420, lord-
schipe hlaforclipe 1627, scorsehip
wurthesclipe 12560.
* 7-shipe dron-keshipe iii 17 worships ii 65 kinde-
schip fellowship occur in a couplet i 170
but doubtless should have a final s
* Ship 14 schips scip scip' schip' 5032
  iii 295
shire 4 shires scire 358' 556'
* Shirt 16 schorte schurte (as if from
scoort scyr 15608; 1668 and 9569
[rh. harte]; sheert 6708 [rh. povert]
16606 [rh. harte doubtful], art. 91
shertz' 749 2548 6768
Shiver 98 chever

* hoor 14 sho sho soe soo i 15 iii 236 is
  a contraction, art. 23 schoon schoon
shop 3 schoppe sceoppa 4 4376 4374' [it
is very uncertain whether this is the
same as the ags. scooppa, treasury]
* † stort 3 shorht scort scortt' shorht'
  6206, shorht' 749 2548, shorht 93
* Shot 14 shatte scot i 234
Shrew 3 shrews screwa wa 17083, art. 91
shrew 7024
* Shrift 14 shrifta scrift i 66
† 16 sirbreds sirbren [relationship] iii
  284' merely drops final s, like art.
  15, so apparently met-red' iii 68

Side 4 side side side' 1277 2736 9808
9821, etc.
† side 72 -side, side side onside? ii 86',
besiden besidan ii 379, beside ii 82
siege 19 sege 939, art. 91 sey' 16865
French
sirve 4 sirve s i 294 (?)
* sigh 14 sighha sie 10811'
† Sigh 17, 97 sighs sht' shtie shtie' 2116
  2355 3949 10280, art. 91
sight [a common form] 3305 7653
etc., art. 16 ii 243', art. 108 [mul-
titude]
sign 19 signs 10024 10087 French
[Silent Final E] arts. 84 to 92
* Sin 16 synee syne sunnes' (acc) sinne'
  5010 5773 etc.
† Since 73 synee syne syne sins sinit sinit'ha
  6651 5047 9341 9380 14284 14922,
syn sin 10181 12226, art. 72 sithen
  6826 15597, sithie 4478, sith 8225
  8721, sith 5234
* Sir 90 sir' French sire, 9642 12527
  13030 13035 16274 16428 16516
  etc., sirt 7056, sirve 16253, 357 (rh.
  shire) both forms occur in Gower
* Sisterhood 14 susterhode iii 278'
sisters 24 sistren sustren
        * 14 Siths sht' shtie shtie' 9183 5153'
          5875' i 160 [time turn]
** Skill 9 skillic scile i 16 skill found only
  when rh. well probably should have
  the e, art. 91 skill i 42 49, 8 cases
  rhyming to will, elsewhere skills (11
  cases) will, i 277 etc., so that we
  should probably read skille wilde in
  the other instances
skink 89 schenche
‡ Skull 18 skulls Old German sciulla
  ags. scell' 3933' 4305'
† Plain 98 istale
** -slaughter 16 -slaught man-eaht
  264' should be -slaughte
** Sleep 14 sleep sleep sleep' 1046
  16498 i 81'
* sleeper 8 sleeper sleptere 16377'
** Sleeve 16 selve 15325 ii 215'
** Sleight 16 sleight slie slie Irishlande slie'
  1050 [the cases cited for sleights are
  all oblique] i 238 acc. ii 198 nom.
štaling silwys, as if from ags. sleying,
15240'
** slit 7 slitta slite 15'
** Sloth 16 slowlke slowlke' 4960' i 372
  269 smale smale ii 279'
** Smatelyn 69 smarte iii 113'
** Smoke 14 smoke smoe smoe' 6800' i
  211'
* Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique. + Adjective. † Indecisive. ‡ Uncertain Origin.
SNAKE 3 snake snakes iii 118'
snare 4 snare snare (Bow.) [the word is not in Bosworth's large dictionary, but is given in his small one on the authority of Leo's Sprachproben 1838] 1492 4991' 17009'
§Snout 18 snout Danish snude, Swed. snyte, 14811'; snout 16921
†Soft 29 softe softe softe' softe'
6994
†Softly 69 softe softe 2783
17 soke soke soek 3995 [right of search, privilege]
Ølace 91 solas solas solas' Norman French solas, is rh. with caas 800, 16689 allons 9149 (French cas, alas, lis fromlassus was in the older French variable according to the sex of the person uttering the exclamation, as lias! fait etc: halas! fait-il. Palgrave has both forms also. The distinction is not preserved in Chaucer, but the diversity in the spelling of the word may possibly be owing to the existence of these two forms).
11114 rh. 3654 rh. Nicholas; solace rh. place, Norman French place, 4144 15193
†Solemn 19 solemnpe 209 French
*Some 91 som 9345
Son 2, 91 son sun sun sun' sun'
sune 1955 11000 15669 son 6733
7655 8524 8552 12345 15016 15889
16597 17250 etc, etc [none of these are convincing, the most so are 8524 & 16597.] In Gower s is regularly pronounced, son' i 317?
*16 Sonde sande sonde' 4800' 4943' 5246' 6469' etc. etc. i 212; etc. [message]
‡Soon 72 some some some 15769, eft-
soones 15682 eftsoones 8390, art. 91 som 6733 7655 and almost always, art. 69 ii 250
*Sooth 14 soth soth soth' soth' soth'
12590 rh. to the, but perhaps adverb, 6183' sothe i 31
*SOOTHHEATH 8 soth(e)sowr iii 164
*sore 14 90 sorr sar sar' sor' 2745', i 310
††tore 14 69 sorr +1297 33462, tɔrәs 230 1396 6810 12657 12799
*Sorrow 16 sorow sorh sorghs' sorghs'
553 1221 etc.
*Soul 16 souls sawel saule' sawle' 2788
8435, etc (13 cases) of the 5 specified, 3 are oblique) i 203 256, art. 91 soul 688 14355
sovereign 37 soveraine fem.
sow 11 sour sugru 2051 bed line
Spade 11 spade spadu spad 555'
*Span 16 spanne spann 155 [acc. of dimension?] i 79'
spare 90 spare' 739
SPARK 3 sparka sparea i 258
sparrow 3 spareas sparea 628' 7386'
*Speak 91 speak' 9742 9747
Spear 9 spere spere' spere' 15289
1641' 4879' spere' 2712
*Speech 16 speche speac speche' 1573
2600 etc. [two instances cited are oblique], art. 91 spech' 16978
*SPEED 17 sped sped i 88, spedle i 90', art. 91 sped' sped' about equally often ags. sped
*spell 14 spelle spell' spell' 15391'
spouse 19 spouse 12072 12125 French
SPUM 19 spume ii 265 French
SPUR 3 spore spura i 321 [Chaucer spors 475]
Stake 3 stake stacs 8560' 669'
†stake 18 stakke Icelandic stiklir, Swedish stjelk, 3917'
*stall 14 stalle stell stail' 8483'
Star 3 sterre sterro sterre' sterre' sterre' 2061'
start 61 [all its parts]
STEAD 7 steeds stedle stedle i 60 f.
*STREATH 16 stelthe [as if from an ags.] stelth i 349
Steed 3 steeds stedle steeds' 2159 2729
10484 15162, etc., art. 91 steed' 10438'
3 Sterre sterre ster' 4868' 6253' [helm rudder]
3 steele stela stel stel 3783' 6531'
[handle, stale is given in the dictionaries]
*16 stempne stenm stenf i 312 [voice]
sto stevene, art. 98
†Stern 29 starre sterre sterre' stern' 8341
*16 Stevenne stevenf steffhe' 4381
[fpl.] 1526' [oblique?] steven 10464
16777 (all doubtful rh. heven) [voice]
sto stempne
Stick 3 stikka stitca 13193 13199'
†Still 29 stillle stillle' stillle' 10810'
11782' 18929
‡Still 69 stillle stillle 7782
*stot 5 stot stotit 7125 7212 617
*16 Stund e stund e stund' stund' 1214'
[short space of time] i 90'
††STRAITLY 60 strait' Lat. stricte ii 354' iii 47'

* Exceptional.  ** Exceptional oblique.  † Adjective.  †† Indecinable.  †Uncertain Origin.
*STRAND 14 stronde strand i 185
Straw 9 stere strea 2920 2935, so pronounced as, straw straw 11007
*Street 16 streets street streete strate" 14904 15025 [both after thurgh, which may be acc., the other cases cited are after in]
*Strength 16 strengthe strengde strengdu strength" 1950 2403 15550
*strive 9 strive 7568
†Strong 30 stronge stronge strong iii 4 [inflexional], art. 38 stronger strongest
*stye 5 sty stige 7411
**style 14 style stigel 10420 [Subjunctive] art. 56
†Such 30 suche swhile sulche' swille" 8613 13800 15628, i 319, swich 3 2824
Sun 4 sonne sunne sonne' sunne" 30 1511 2524 10494 etc., art. 21 gen.
*suppose 91 suppose 8223
Swallow 4 swalowe swawle 3258
*swear 89 swor' sower 456 8045 8238
sower" 11101 12076 inf.
†Sweet 29 swete swote sweote sweot" 2429
666 1041 13544, art. 91 sweet' 2762
3 swere' swearon ii 30' [neck]
†swifte 30 swiftes swifte swift" 2870
swine 14 swynge swin swin" 16972,
swyn 13971', art. 25, swin pl.
†69 swithe swithe 13222 [quickly]
**swoon 14 srowned swun' 13668 i 204
†swoon 109
†tackler 18 tackle Ger. takel, Dan. takel, Swed. tackel, i 312
Tale 11 tale talu talu" 36 3128 4466
5645 7253 (29 cases), art. 91 tal' yiet 13875 e elided before y?
†Tame 30 tame' tam 2188 untame i 287?
tapeter 4 tapeter tapextro 241', tapeter 3336
†tare 18 tare 1572'
targe 4 targe targe targa 473' 977'
tear 14 teere tear 15647' 16148'?
Teat 7 teile tite tit 3704'
Teen 3 tenea teena' teene" 3108'
*tell 91 tell' 38 inf. 10043 inf. [both before sour]
**Temple 14 temple templp il 157
tent 19 lente 16050 French
†Thanks 73 his thankes, here thankes his chancs, hire chancs 1628 2109
2116 ii 211
60 thar' = need [all its parts]
†that 47 that' = the: art. 104, 111 omitted, †that art. 108 with imperatival = French que
†the 98 -te, att' = at the; art. 109 with abstract noun
98 thee' = to prosper
†there 16 thefel poe's ii 159'
†Then 72 thanne thanne thanne' than(n)" 1655 13987
16404 16762 19988 i 11 49 62 69 etc., thanne 1312' iii 36 rh. bronne, than 640 3052 i 8 7 224, than' 126 638 2936 2937 2938 7722 them? i 17
†thence 73 thanne thenne thanne' thanne" 4930 5463 10640, 10641
art. 72 thanne 6725' ii 185
†There 72 ther' ther' ther' ther' ther' ther'" 313 323 328 4215 9863 9872
10341 ther' 4595' 5222' 7650' 15037' (less common) i 56' 60' 112' etc. ;
art. 108 [where]
†Therefore 72 therfore therfore therfore' therfore' 3506' 8056' 8188' 9023'; therfor 7374 10571 10647;
art. 90 therfor' therfor' 7377 7374
10571 10647
*these 91 these' this' 9110 9127 9150
9297 10041 etc., art. 47, art. 109
*singular use
†throw 14 these peaw iii 6'
†they 111 omitted
†Thick 29 thick' piece' pieces' 551
†thick' ycle 2' [the like]
†Thin 29 thinne thinne' 4664' 9556'
thinne i 102'
†Thing 14 things' ping ii 207 251, no-
thing' ii 337, art. 25 thing pl.
think 98 themene
†thirde 98 thirde
†thrum 98 thirder
108 tho [when]
*thrump 98 thrump
†those 47 tho
thou 111 omitted
*thou 98 -low -low, willow, wastow wastow etc.
†Thrice 73 thris thrice priza prisa' prien' prien' prices' prizess' 63 564 14563
†thrilled 98 thrilled
Throat 4 throtes' throte' 2460' 3218'
†thrown 106 threw' throw' throw' 5637' 7397' etc.
†thrown 16 throw' throw' throw' prasse'" 5373' 7397' etc.
†thrown 7 throw' throw' throw' 246'
*tille 16 tyle' tyle' 7687
†till 72 tille til till' til till' 10811', till
10838, art. 108

* Exceptional.  ** Exceptional oblique.  † Adjective.  ‡ Indecinable.  § Uncertain Origin.
PROP. CHILD ON CHAUCER AND GOWER.  
CHAP. IV. § 5.

*WHRED 16 wierd wyrd i 340 should be wierde
*welcome 91 welcom' 764 856 7382 7393
Weli 3 welde wella wylle well weles' 5597 7924 1535' 1168', art. 91 well' 8091
*WEL 69, 72 wele wella wel iii 149' [art. 72 wele 1163' is dunsle in the Landisdowne, Cambridge, Petworth Corpus and Ellesmere MSS.]
Wench 4 wenche wencle wennechell' 3971 4165 4192 6944 etc.
*16 wenn wen wena i 88' [doubt conjecture expectation weaning]
*16 wenni ams. 161' [way manner]
*14 were as if from ams. wer iii 253' [defence]
*were 18, i 107' 318' [worry]
*Wet 3 weine wene wete wete' 13115'
*Wett 3 weine wene wete wet i 2240
*When 104 why
*Whet 7 whete hwete 5725 4312' 13863' 14278'
*whelip 14 whelipe hwelp whelp' 259'
*When 72 whanne whanne hwnne hwnne whannen' whone etc. whanne' whann' 17118 14695 i 212 [seldom in Gower, whan 1 762 732 803 824 915 3054 3055 [frequent in defence]
*Whence 7 whence hwanan hwana whanan' whone 12176 18750, whana 8464, art. 72 whanne i 198 when i 46 iii 308
*Where 72 wher hwar hwar hwar' wher' where' 323 344 9873 10341 etc. where 4536 7634' 9462 [less common both in Chaucer and Gower]
*Wherefore 72 wherfore 13631'
*WHETHER 98 wheder
*Which 30 whiche hwyc while' woch' whille' 15896, which i 2677 etc. i 135 ii 177 396, art. 194
*While 16 white hiwle while' whil' 4226 8899 10904 etc. [all the cases cited are oblique, but as etc. is put after them there may be others direct] i 282 ii 64 79
*While Whilst 72, 73 whilste ha hwile while' 6352 13067 13854 15047 i 26 while 13065, whilst's ii 345, while 1362 6350 i 12
*Whip 14 whippe hweep 5875' 9545' i 258'
*whistle 5 whistel hwistle 4153
*while 29 white hiwle hwite white' whit' 4775, the common form is whit' 17065 238 3238 2180'

*WHITHER 98 whider
*who 109
*who 104
*Wicked 31 wikke 1582' 5448', apparently allied with ams. wico = wicke, i 289 306
*wikke 18 pride is the worse of alle wicke i 154, 176
*Widely 69 wide wide 4568 8589 iii 208
*widow 5 91 widow widow widuwe widowe' widow' widowe 6609 8626 7166 7921 14913 14920 16507, wido' widoew 14997 255, art. 21 gen.
*Wife 14 wife wif wif' wive' 6648 wive' ii 217
*WIFEPHOOD 14 wifhede i 51
*Wight 17 wight wight wult wult' wult' 1427 2106 2467 etc. ii 149
*Wild 30 wolf wilde wild wile' 4740 5858 6595 7142 16166 16402, wild 10126 (?) i 236 290
*Wile 9 wile wile ii 227
*Will 3 wile willa wille wille' 2871 7986 8202 10315 etc. another form, will will will will 3875 3878 3885 8052' will' 11016' will 61 [all its parts]
*Willow 16 willo willi willie 2924 doublet
*Wills 73 his willes 5854
*Wynedow 18 wynedow, Icelandic vinaug, Danish vindue, Swedish vingda, 3386' 3876' 3905', wynedow(e?) 5708 3725 3570 5738, window ii 347
*wine 14 wine win win' 10016' [as it here means wine or bunch of grapes, perhaps it is an error for vine French vignes] wyne 637 14212 639' [and generally winter 20 sextn pl.
*WISDOM 14 wisdome wisdom iii 217
*Wise 4 wise wise wise' 9927 17309 5312 6622 etc. art. 91 wis' 2180
*Wise 30 wise wise wise' wise' 11183, i 156 [ fem. f?], wyes 67 787 863
*Witchcraft 4 wicke craft wicce wicche' 6885 iii 44
*Without 72 without wifunan 463 640 810 231 1851 1856, without 786 788 950 2089, without i 87
*Whoomanhood 14 womanhede 8951' i 333'
*WHOUMANISH 30 womanishe i 58 72
*Womb [stomach, belly] 16 wambe wamb womb wambe' wambe' 7470 19023 15970

*Exceptional. ** Exceptional oblique. + Adjective. i Indecinable. i Uncertain Origin.
§ 6. Chaucer's Pronunciation and Orthography.

Although much doubt must necessarily attach to the system of investigation here followed, and although in some few cases it has been necessary to help out research by theory, it has enabled us to arrive at a very definite and detailed result, which may be put to the test of practice. I have made the experiment of reading several hundred lines of Chaucer's prologue to large audiences, according to the system of pronunciation to which I have been here led, and it has been to me a considerable confirmation of my results, that these audiences generally, and those among them in particular whose previous studies had made them best qualified to judge, have expressed themselves satisfied with the oral effect, as giving a new power of appreciating the language and versification of the old master. It will be difficult to convey the proper impression by mere symbols, which the

* Exceptional.  ** Exceptional oblique.  † Adjective.  † Indelible.  † Uncertain Origin.
reader will have to study, and which he will perhaps mis-
render, or at least occasionally stumble over, so that he will
not so readily appreciate the system of pronunciation here
advocated, as would be desirable for proper judgment. But
to enable the reader who dares to face such an essay as the
present, and breast the difficulty of a new notation, to un-
derstand in connection the isolated results here obtained, I
shall in Chap. VII. give the whole of the familiar prologue
to the Canterbury Tales in palaeotype as an example, inter-
leaving it with a text in which I shall follow the Harleian
MS. 7334 as closely as possible, in a systematised ortho-
graphy. Before explaining this method, which might possi-
ably be adopted with advantage in popular editions of
Chaucer, and other authors of the xivth century, I shall
give a short account of the results obtained in the preceding
sections.

Probable Sounds of the Letters in Harleian MS. 7334,
and hence generally in the xivth Century.

A long, (aa) or Italian a in padre, English a in father, psalm, far;
possibly (aa) as in French âge, and German mahn, aal, when
broadly pronounced.
A short, (a) Italian a in anno, or as some pronounce a in cask, post,
quite distinct from a in cat, man.
AA the same as A long, (aa).
AI, (ai) as in Isaiah, aye, Etonian pronunciation of the Greek άλ, 
the German ai, Italian ahi! French patien.
AU, (au), the sound of (aa) followed by the sound of (uu), German 
aus in haus, distinct from English oui in house.
AW, (au) the same as AU.
AY, (ai) the same as AI.
B, (b), as now, never mute.
C, (k) before a, o, u; (s) before s, i; ci is (si), never (sh) as in mo-
dern English.
CH, (tsh), as in such, match, Italian ci, Spanish ch, German deutsch.
D, (d) as now, never (dz).
E long, (ee) English chair, dare, there; very nearly the same as
French é in même, and Italian e aperto (es), not the same as
English in ael, fate (ee, eei); but this last sound may be used
by those who have a difficulty with the others. Never (ii), as
in modern English supreme.
E short, (e) as now in met, pen.
E final, when pronounced, (e), same as E short, but generally
elided before vowels and he, his, him, hire, here, etc., and not
sounded in oure, youre, hire, here, seldom sounded in hadde and
sometimes mute in other words.
EA, (ee) same as E long, very rarely used.
EE, (ee) same as E long.
EI, (ai) same as AI.
EO, (ee) same as E long, rarely used.
EU, has two sounds, (yy) or French u long, in words derived from
French where the modern French orthography is u; and (eu)
or Italian Europa, the sound of (ee) followed by the sound of
(uu), in all other words. Eu is never to be sounded as (iu) as
in modern new.
EW, (eu) the same as EU.
EY, (ai) the same as AI.
F, (f) as at present; never (v) as now in of.
G, (g) before s, c, u and in Anglosaxon words before s, i; in French
words before s, i it is (dzh) as the present gem, gentle.
GH, (kh), as the Scotch loch, Irish lough, German loch; after an
(u) sound (kwh); when the sound was (x'), (wh), or omitted,
it was otherwise written. It was never sounded as (f).
H, (h), as in home; it may have been mute in some accented
words, as host, honour, and in the unaccented he, his, him, hire,
here, hem, have, etc. When a vowel is elided before these words,
the h should be disregarded, otherwise it is most convenient to
follow the present usage. When following a vowel in the same
syllable, as in mouth, it was a gentle (kh), or (x').
I long, (ii) the drawled sound of i in still, heard in singing, and
quite distinct from (ii) or as in steal, but the latter sound (ii)
may be substituted for it, by those who find the former (ii) too
difficult. It may have been occasionally almost (ee) and then
rhymed to (ee). It was never pronounced (ai), or as the modern
pronoun I, or as ei ay, ai ay (ai), with which it is never found to
rhyme.
I short, (i), that is, as i in the English finny (fin'y), and not as (i),
that is, i in the French fini (fini).
I consonant, (dzh) usually printed J.
IE, (ee) same as E long. Rare.
J, (dzh), frequently printed for I; MSS. seldom distinguish i, j.
K, (k) as now.
L, (l) as now.
LE, (l') as now in temple. It is frequently run on as (l) to the
following vowel.
M, (m) as now.
N, (n) as now.
NG, (q) or (qg) according to the same rules as now, or (ndzh) as
in strange.
O long, (oo) that is English ore, cross when lengthened, not (oe) as
in English home as usually pronounced, but as it may be heard
in the provinces; Welsh and Spanish o long; Italian o aperto;
French chose when lengthened, no trace of tapering into a final
u. Those who cannot readily say (oo) may use (oo), the usual
o in home.
O short, had two sounds (o, u); generally (o) the short sound of the last letter, not heard in usual English, the French homme, German höltz, Italian o aperto. Different from (ə) in English hot, which however may be used for it when the speaker cannot reach the other sound, just as (oo) in home may be used for (oo), but (poop pop) do not form a pair, as is the case with (poop pop). Occasionally o short was sounded as short u, apparently in those cases in which it was thus sounded in the xviit century provided it corresponded to Anglosaxon u; generally it was (u) in words which now have (ə) as wonder.

OA, (oo) if used, but no instance is known.

OE, (ee) same as long E, very rare.

OI, (ui) as some persons call buoy, almost like ooi in woeing; not (oi) as in English joy, but at most (oi) as in a provincial pronunciation of boy.

OO, (oo) the same as long O.

OU, has three sounds, (uu, u, ou); generally (un) as in boar, but occasionally (u) as in pull; in words derived from Anglosaxon aw, ou it is (ou) nearly as in the modern know, which may be used for it. See OUGH.

OUGH, (uukh, uukwh) when derived from Anglosaxon words having u before a guttural, as in yonough, plough, drought, otherwise (ouukh, oukwh) or (okwh) as in though, foughthen, oughte.

OW, (uu, u, ou) same as OU, but used more frequently than OU for (ou), especially when final.

OY, (oi) the same as OI.

P, (p) as now.

PH, (f) as now.

QU, (kw) as now.

R, (r) only trilled, as in present red herring; never as in modern ear, hearing, serf, surf.

RE, (er) same as ER, sometimes run on as (r) to the following vowel.

RH, (r) as now.

S, (s, z). Probably the (s) and (z) sounds were used much as at present, but was appears to have had (s). SI was (si) and never (sh) as at present.

SCH, (sh), present sh.

T, (t) as at present, -tion was (si, nun).

TH, in two syllables (th, dh) distributed as at present.

U long, (yy) the true French long u, which it represented.

U short, had three sounds (u, i, e); the general sound was (u) as in pull, but (i) or (e) was heard occasionally, and possibly had been original (y) or short French u.

U consonant, (v), usually printed v.

UI, UY, a very rare combination, sometimes written for oi, oy, and then pronounced (ui) most probably; sometimes, perhaps, written for French ui, when it may either have been (ui) or (yy), most probable the latter.
V, (v) as now, seldom distinguished from U in MSS, both forms
u, v being used, but v being generally chosen for the initial,
whether vowel or consonant.
W, (w), as now, and also occasionally the simple vowel (u), as
in soreful.
WH, (wh) as now.
WR, (wr) as in French roi, or else (wr, w'r).
X, (ks) as now.
Y, long, replaced I long, and had the same sound.
Y, short, (i) the same as I short.
Y, consonant (y) as now.
Z, (z) as now.

This gives a complete system of pronunciation, with only
a few doubtful points, chiefly as to the pronunciation of O
short as (u).

On this view of the signification of the orthography of the
Harleian MS. 7334, we may proceed to systematize the same
thus,—

SYSTEMATIZATION OF THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF HARL. MS., 7334.

A when followed by a single consonant, which is in turn followed
by a vowel or an apostrophe, will be long, otherwise short.
AA will represent long A in other cases.
AI will be disused.
AW will be used as the diphthong (au) to the exclusion of AU.
AY will be used to the exclusion of ai, ei, ey, for those diphthongs
(ai) which had an a in the Anglosaxon or French original.
E when followed by a single consonant, which is in turn followed
by a vowel or an apostrophe, will be long, otherwise short.
EA will be disused.
EE will represent long E in other cases.
EI will be disused.
EO will be disused.
EU will represent the diphthong eu when of French origin == (yy).
EW will represent the diphthong ev when not of French origin,
and == (eu).
EY will be used to the exclusion of ai, ay, ei for those diphthongs
(ai) which had not an a in the Anglosaxon or French original.
I will represent short (i) when not final, and will be used for the
pronoun I. See Y vowel.
IE will be disused.
O when followed by a single consonant, which is in turn followed
by a vowel or an apostrophe, will be long, otherwise short, and
the two sounds of short o will not be distinguished.
OA will be disused.
OE will be disused.
OI will be disused.
OO will represent long O in other cases.
OU will represent the long sound (uu), never the short sound (u) or the diphthong (ou).
OW will represent the diphthong (ou) exclusively.
OY will represent the diphthong now written oi, oy.
U long and U short, though having different sounds will not be distinguished, the first occurring only in French, and the latter only in Anglosaxon words, but the use of U as I and E will be discontinued.
W vowel will only be used in diphthongs, in other cases it will be replaced by OU long as harborou for harboru, or U short.
Y vowel will be used in diphthongs, and for long i or (ii),—except the pronoun I, which will continue to be written I,—for either long or short final i or y, and for the prefix y- or i- of the past participle.

The consonants, including W, WH, Y, will be used as at present, the two values of C and G not being distinguished, and J, V being exclusively used for I and U consonant. When C, G have to be (s, dzh) before e, o, u in French words, an e is inserted which is not pronounced, as habergeoun 76. GH medial or final, Y initial will replace y uniformly instead of partially, and TH will replace b.
The two sounds of TH will not be distinguished. H will be written uniformly in those words where it generally appears initially.
The doubling of consonants to indicate short vowels will follow the usual orthography.
E final or medial will be treated in such a way as to shew its nature. When it should be sounded according to the laws of grammar or from historical derivation, but is elided for the sake of the metre, whether before a vowel or consonant, it will be replaced by an apostrophe, precisely as in modern German, and all elisions will be treated in the same way. Hence c', g' final must be read as (s, dzh). When it is superfluous, having no claim to be written, but required for the metre, it will be replaced by k. In other cases it will be simply written as s, so that every written e will have to be pronounced, except when it is used after s, z and before another vowel, merely to indicate that these letters are to be pronounced as (s, dzh). When the authority of Orrmin can be given for a final e, it will not be considered superfluous.
When the first measure of a verse is deficient in a syllable, it will be preceded by three dots, thus (...) to mark the deficiency.

With the exception of the (...), e and ("), which are introduced for the convenience of the modern reader, the orthography would be perfectly well understood by the person who wrote this Harleian MS. and appears to be the ideal which he aimed at. This orthographical system will be used in the subsequent transcript of the prologue. It requires occasionally some etymological knowledge in which I may be deficient, but such trips I hope will be readily forgiven and corrected.
When a language has to be studied from its sources by scholars, its monuments should be presented in the form in which they exist. Hence the value of the exact reprints of several MSS. of Chaucer which have now been undertaken by the Chaucer Society, and which will inaugurate an entirely new system of studying ancient forms of language. We shall no longer echo opinions, perhaps hastily formed, by scholars in past days, who, deserving of all praise for what they did in their time, had not the advantages which their own labours have given to the present generation. Each scholar will be enabled to study the sources themselves, to compare the different forms they assume, and to conjecture the probable reality which they partly conceal. But how shall that result be expressed? Speaking for the English language only, it is evidently impossible to print the writings prior to Caxton, in modern orthography, without presenting a translation—to which, except linguistically, there is of course no objection—instead of the apparently best form of the original. Not to mention the organic difference of an inflectional system which would be thus concealed, and the destruction of poetical rhythm by the excision of final E, we have the simple fact that many words found in those authors have no similar modern form,¹ and hence that if we adopted a modern orthography, we must either replace them, or leave them as an old patch on a new garment.

For general purposes of teaching, the great diversity of orthography which medieval scribes indulged in, is undesirable, as tending to confuse the mind, and in no respect repaying the young student for the trouble it costs. Hence some uniform systematic orthography is desirable, and that which has just been explained, seems to combine every necessary requisite for the xivth and xvth century. For writings which date from after the disappearance of our inflectional system, and the silencing of final E, or say, from after the close of the xvth century, the modern orthography, which is now systematically employed in reprints of Shakspeare and the Authorized Version, is the only one which

¹ The vocabulary on pp. 379–397 furnishes the following examples:—

a-cake, a-gates, -and (in participles) ariete, borde, borwe, s., broede, byweste, chare, chest, come s., dere, derne, dwale, elenge, -ende (in participles), fallas, fawe, fele, fere, fremde, funke, grame, halting, harre, heire, herne, heste, hevenirche, hewe, hie s., hiwe, howwe, yk ich, ighte, kingseriche, knarre, leer, s. and v., lefte s., lotte, liche s., like s., lode, lydne, make s., mele, mot, nalo, neishe, nobles s. s., offrende, onde, pirce, pose, pyle, pyne, rase, rathe, rede, scheene s., schipne, schonde, sibrede, situhe, samle, steere, stelle, stempne, stevene, stounde, swore s., swithe, thar v., these s., thike, tho, uprste, wanhope, webbe, wedde, wene s., wente s., were s., wicke, wyte s., wonger, worideriche, yerne.
has a claim to be used except in designedly diplomatic editions. Before the use of *ou* was introduced for (uu) at the end of the xiii th or beginning of the xiv th century, the complete Anglosaxon system alone has any right to be employed. Hence for school and general editions of English works, the following systems of orthography are suggested:

1) **Anglosaxon period to the close of the xiii th century,—the received Anglosaxon spelling.**

2) **From the beginning of the xiv th to the close of the xv th century,—the system explained on p. 401, which may be briefly termed Chaucer's orthography.**

3) **From the commencement of the xvi th century—the orthography now in use.** But in the last period, and even in the most recent times, circumstances may arise where a diplomatic representation of MSS. may be desirable. Such cases are however not contemplated in any of the above suggestions, although in the citations made in this work, diplomatic correctness has almost always been attempted.

---

1 As for example, when the peculiar orthography of the writer is of more importance than his matter. Thus the following reproductions of letters actually written on business within the last three years, one by a private soldier in a very clear and legible hand, and the other by the keeper of a servant's registry office in a rapid scrawl, are valuable as shewing how difficult our present orthography and punctuation are to acquire. Several names have been reduced to initials, but otherwise the originals have been carefully imitated.

---

1. To Capt. S. Esq.

Dear Sir I wish to Informe you of a place No 17 Rosemary Lane ware a Drunckin woman name of Buttler Lives her husband d to Leive her for Idal ways Sergent Atkinson was Letter Righter for her to her Husband to return back again and other Smal Favours as promised to send her 6 or 8 mitilla men he will send to Lodge with her there is her own famly and her Daughters famley all Crowned in 2 smal rooms with a Varity of Other Company and filth a Servay is very much needed

Yours Respectfully
and yurs mens Frend

May 22/1866

2. Warkington.

If i had nown Last tuesday i Could have Sent Mrs S. a good Waiterf She as been 5 years 6 Months at Mrs D.s of Cockemth but Mr S. of C. Hall as been here About her and i think he Will have Engaged her if they Could Agree for Wages I have nown her for 12 years and She as been Reckomend by Me for that Lenth of time I Shall See her in Person at Cokemouth to Morrer Monday and if not Engaged I Shall Get her to Meet Mrs. S. She is a Good needle Woman She only Gave [looks like Gone, this writer does not always distinguish o a, and writtes u, v, m, r, and sometimes s in the same way] her place up Last tuesday I have My Boock on 2 Good Coocks and 2 very nice Girls for House Maids i Will Dow My best to Get one but i Must have A Little time if M. A. C. is Engaged She as no Parents here they Are Gone away [?, written upon another word which is illegible] She Lived 2 years With Mrs. J. S. in our own town her Age is 27 She is tall and a fine Loocky Girl as a Good Head and fine Eye Whath i Call a noble Looking Woman She is very Steady and Con have a Good Caracter [looks like leneaten at first, capital C is always like c] from Mrs D Ob B Peason i hope i Shall Get her to Morrar [looks like domane] 5 years 6 Months at Mrs d.
§ 7. Change of Pronunciation during the Fifteenth Century.

Comparing the results just obtained for the close of the XIVth century, with those found in Chap. III, § 6, p. 225, for the XVIth century, we are able to estimate the action of the XVth century upon English pronunciation, and to give some rough and practical indications for reading works of that transition period.

The pronunciation of the combinations employed may be considered as having been practically the same at the close of the XIVth and during the first third or first half of the XVth century, except in the points here enumerated.

Final E in the XVIth century was retained in writing, but had absolutely ceased to have any sound, and had come to be regarded mainly as an orthoepical symbol for indicating the length of the next preceding vowel, unless it was itself preceded by a double consonant. How soon this final e was lost it is impossible to say, but great irregularities already occur in the Thornton MS. of Lincoln, about the middle of the XVth century. Hence it will be safest to omit it altogether in reading works of that and later periods.

Gross and frequent irregularities in the use of e final in any manuscript seem to point to the copyist's having lived about or after the middle of the XVth century.

Short U, from being frequently used for (y) and pronounced (i) or (e), became established for the latter sounds in a very few words, as Busy, bury. In other cases therefore it had best be read as (u).

Long E split into two sounds, retaining its sound of (ee) in many words, but becoming (ii) in others, in which the single e was generally replaced by ee in the latter part of the XVIth century. There is no means at present of discovering which of the words now spelled with ee, were at any given epoch during the XVth century pronounced with (ee) and which with (ii). The probability is that the two sounds coexisted in the mouths of different speakers for many years, just as we have seen that both sounds were for several years given to the combination es at the beginning of the XVIIIth century. Hence if in reading works printed by Caxton we uniformly pronounced long e and ee as (ee) we should have probably a very antiquated pronunciation, similar in effect to the use of (grit, briik) for great, break at the present day, and if we uniformly pronounced (ii) where the spelling ee was employed in the XVIth century, (avoiding the iotaism of the present day), we should have been thought to have a strange affected effeminate way of speaking. It will be most convenient however to use the XVIIth century style up

1 See Rev. George G. Perry's edition of the Morte Arthure (Early English Text Society's publications, 1866), preface p. viii. As however this is an alliterative poem, it is impossible to apply the same rhythmical principles as in Chaucer. But see the irregularities of the Landaun M. S. 851 in respect to final e as pointed out in § 4, p. 320, note.
to the issue of Caxton's first work, and the xvi th century style afterwards. This is of course an arbitrary, but still a convenient distinction, and some such rule is necessary or we should not be able to read xvi th century books at all.

Long I, which interchanged with ey in a few words in the xiv th century, as dry, die, high, eye, became uniformly (ei) or (ai) in the xvi th. It will be convenient after the death of Chaucer's contemporary Gower and his follower Lydgate, that is after the middle of the xvi th century, to adopt the (ai) uniformly. This is no doubt an anticipation, but there seems to be no means of controlling it. We have indeed seen the probability of long i having been occasionally (ii) or (ii) to the middle of the xvi th century. (Supra pp. 110, 114.)

Long O like long e split into two sounds, (oo, uu), the latter of which had the spelling oo assigned to it. It will be best to follow the same law with respect to it as with respect to e, and use (oo) only up till Caxton's time, and then (oo, uu) as in the xvi th century.

EE, OO must follow the same laws as long e and long o, for which they were only substitutes.

OI probably gradually changed from (ui) to (oi), but, as we have seen, the old (ui) asserted itself in many words even in the xvi th century. It will be most convenient to use (oi) after Lydgate or the middle of the xvi th century.

EO followed the fate of long e.

EU, EW still formed two series in the xvi th century, but, as we have seen, with different divisions from those used in the xiv th century. The safest way is to adopt the xiv th century pronunciation till the close of the xv th century. Most probably we should only run the risk of being slightly archaic in a few words.

OU, OW, where sounded (ou, on) retained its sound; but as even Palsgrave 1530, and Bullokar 1580, acknowledge the (uu) sound in other words, it will be quite legitimate to do so till the beginning of the xvi th century.

GH may have changed slightly; the (kw) and (wh) sounds of GH were probably entirely lost in (f), but (kh) was retained.

We are thus enabled to read xv th century writings, not with great confidence certainly as to catching the prevailing pronunciation of any period, but with a tolerable certainty of pronouncing intelligibly, although occasionally in an antiquated and occasionally in an affectedly modern manner.

§ 8. Pronunciation during the Earlier Part of the xiv th Century.

The difficulty that besets us in attempting to determine pronunciation from orthography is the difficulty of determining the age of the MS. The tendency of writers at all times, and even in the present day, with some important exceptions, to disregard the orthography of the original
which they are copying, and adopt that to which they are themselves accustomed, is so strong and so difficult to check, that even if we supposed the older copyists to have set to work with an intention of giving a faithful transcript of their originals, we could not hope to obtain one. The older copyists indeed never seem to have entertained the least notion that they had to give a faithful transcript, or at least confined their notion of fidelity to a rendering of words and not of orthographies. We may, however, lay down this principle, for MSS. before the invention of printing:—

The Scribe always intended to make his Orthography indicate his own pronunciation.

There was no notion of any historical or etymological spelling, but certain definite senses were attributed to certain combinations of letters and by means of them the scribe endeavoured, with more or less success, to express himself.

Now throughout the xivth century it appears to me, on examining the best reprints, and especially those furnished by Mr. Morris in his specimens of all the scribes was essentially that which has been described and systematised in § 6 of this Chapter. It will be seen at once that this was not a definite and complete system, but admitted of many ambiguities, and many varieties of spelling several important sounds. Thus, confining ourselves to the vowels, we may expect to find—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the sound</th>
<th>written as</th>
<th>the sound</th>
<th>written as</th>
<th>the sound</th>
<th>written as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>(aa)</td>
<td>a a a a a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>(ee)</td>
<td>e e e e e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>i y u</td>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>i y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>(ou)</td>
<td>o o o o o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(u)</td>
<td>u o</td>
<td>(uu)</td>
<td>o u o o o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>(yy)</td>
<td>u e u e o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The special mark of this system of spelling, that which distinguishes it from the orthography of the xvth century on the one hand, and the orthography of the xiii th on the

1 Having lately had occasion to have a portion of the Canterbury Tales printed by a printer who was unaccustomed to facsimile work, I have had painful experience of the obstinacy of compositors and the blindness of printers’ readers in serving up and passing over modern réchauffés of ancient spellings. We cannot suppose that the old copyists behaved better. We know that the older printed books are full of the grossest disfigurements of their originals, and yet there is a better chance of correctness in a printed book, which must be diligently revised and can be easily altered, than in a M.S. which is read and corrected with difficulty.

2 Specimens of Early English selected from the chief English authors, A.D. 1250—A.D. 1400, with Grammatical Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by R. Morris, Esq., Oxford, Clarendon Press Series, 1867.
other, is the expression of the sound of (uu) by ou, owe with scarcely any exception. We have not lost that method of spelling in a few instances even at the present day.¹ And occasional instances of ou for (uu) probably occurred, before the general use was established. Throughout this period also, and down to the present time simple o is occasionally used for (uu) as well as by (u).² But it is the general and regular use of ou or owe for (uu) that characterises this system of spelling. The words pou, now, how, oure may be taken as convenient marks of this orthography as distinguished from the more ancient spelling to be presently considered, so that where we find these words thus written we may expect to find the rest of the system of orthography just explained, a system which may be, and probably often is, much more recent than the date of the work to which it is adapted. In Mr. Morris's specimens, this test will include under this system, the whole of his book, from the Romance of King Alexander downwards, although this Romance itself, Robert of Gloucester, and the Metrical Psalter belong to the xiii th century, in which a different system prevailed, and the Proverbs of Hendying, Robert of Brunne, William de Shoreham, the Cursor Mundi, Sunday Sermons in Verse, Dan Michel and Richard Rolle de Hampole, belong quite to the beginning of the xiv th century. The MS. of Havelock the Dane, as we shall find hereafter (Chap. V, § 1, No. 5,) belongs to the transition period, containing both pou and pou.

It is not to be supposed that these ancient authors pronounced in the same way as Chaucer, or that writers like Richard Rolle de Hampole near Doncaster, and Dan Michel of Northgate in Kent, had the same method of speech or pronunciation. Far from it. All that is meant is that they used a similar system of orthography, and that by interpreting their letters according to this system we can recover, very closely if not exactly, the pronunciation their transcribers meant to be adopted.

Dan Michel's orthography³ is very peculiar, marking a strong provincial pronunciation. The consonant combination as evidently

---

¹ The following list of words in which ou = (uu) is taken from Walker: Bourne, croup, group, aggroup, amour, paramour, house, house, boufe, capouch, cartouch, fourbe, gout (taste), ragout, rendezvous, rouge, soup, sou, sortout, through, throughly, toupee or toupet, you, your, youth, tour, contour, tourney, tournement, pour, and route (a road), accoutre, billet-doux, agouti, uncouth, wound (a hurt), and routine (a beaten road). These words in italics are Anglosaxon. The use of ou for (u) is a recent formation in: would, could, should; concde had a long vowel.

² Walker gives the following list for (uu): prove, move, behore, and their compounds, lose, do, ado, Rome, poltron, ponton, sponton, who, whom, womb, tomb. And the following for (s): woman, bosom, worsted, wolf, Wolsey, Worcester, Wolverhampton.

³ At the beginning of this MS. (Arundel 87) we read: pis boe is dan
represents sh, and has been constructed on the same principles as the Welsh dd, ff, ll for (dh, f, lhh) as distinct from d, f, l — (d, v, l). In precisely the same way the Spaniards wrote ll, ns (the latter being contracted in the usual way to ñ, but the uncontracted form occurring also1) for (lj, nj), and so many writers have proposed ñt, dd, ss, zz, for the Arabic (h, t, d, s, z). Probably Dan Michael finding no sound of ch in sch, objected to use it. But ss is really ambiguous; thus in yblissed = blessed, ss can only mean double s.

We find the same orthography ss at an earlier period (see Chap. V, § 1, No. 3) so that Dan Michael did not invent it. Other writers have employed the same notation.2 His use of u, e, i, ai are clear. The rhyme: bread dyad, seems to point to (eaan) or (e-an) with the stress on the last syllable as the value of ea. Since u is clearly used as (u) in 'pus, and as the substitute for e after h, in hue, and ou is employed in ours = us, ou, u must have had their usual sounds (un, u), so that short e probably always represented (o) and not (u), although it is constantly employed for an age. u. When u was long, which only happens in a few French words, it of course had the sound (yy), but this was apparently unknown to the dialect, an important remark when we recollect that Wallis was a native of Kent, and at the same time the last writer who insisted on the pronunciation of long u as (yy) in received English, (pp. 171-8). The constant use of u as a consonant (v) often renders words difficult to recognize. The use of by for be, and final y in the infinitive of verbs would be quite inconsistent with an (ai) pronunciation of i, and hence is corroborative of the conclusion before arrived at (p. 297).

The examples on p. 412, render this clear. They are taken from the preface and the end of the book, just before the final sermon, Ayenbite of Inwyt, p. 262.3 The Lord's Prayer and Creed may be compared with other earlier versions in Chap. V, § 1, No. 3, and Wilkins's version in Chap. IX, § 1.

Michel of Northgate, write an englis of his oeye hand. We have therefore the author's actual orthography, a most important fact.

1 Thus in Thomas de Ersceloune's prophecy of king Edward II, in the same MS. fo. 88, we find sail sail for shall.


The following orthographical points of difference between the Southern and Northern dialects, are noticed by Mr. Morris in the "grammatical introduction" to this work. A. Consonants.

1) CH for K, the Southern forms being named first, as chele for kele = cold. 2) V for F, now disused in the South East. 3) Z for S, found alone in the Ayenbite of all writings of the xivth century. 4) Vowel before R in place of vowel after R, as berne for brenne burn. 5) PS for SP as haps for hap. 6) G for Y, as sogge for bye, sogge for saye. 7) B for V as like, habe, habe for live, have, have = heave. B. Vowels. 1) O for A, as bon for ban. 2) E for A, as ayen for agen = against. 3) AW for Al = ags, ag, as faunc for fain. 4) U for I, as iest, hal, sum for fat, hill, sin. 5) EO for E, as breoste for brest. 6) An inserted y before e and a, as byreem byram for beam, and dyad for dead. 7) An inserted u before o, the only words of this kind in the Ayenbite being buon, guode, guo, guoe, sawle for bones, good, go, groote, and Dorset sud, a plough.
Richard Rolle de Hampole, an Augustine monk near Doncaster, who died 1349, left many writings in the Northern dialect, presenting a strong contrast to the Kentish, just considered. The manuscript is however not so carefully spelled, and there are many final E’s written, which were clearly not pronounced, so that we must either assume a much later date for the actual writing, or suppose that on account of the general omission of the inflectional -s in Northern speech, the habit of writing had become lax there at an earlier period, precisely as it became lax in the South during the xvth century as the final -s became discontinued. In the present case, probably, both causes were in action. The *Pricks of Conscience*¹ is in verse, with very perfect rhymes,² and there can be no difficulty in reading it. The verse, however, is so “hummocky” that no conclusions could be drawn from it respecting the number of syllables in a word.

A short extract will suffice to shew the action of our rules for pronunciation. Many liberties have been taken with the pronunciation of the final E’s, to reduce them to order, but the orthography of the text is Mr. Morris’s. The e before s in the plural of nouns and the third person singular of nouns, has been considered mute whenever the rhythm would allow, in deference to the opinion of Mr. Murray, who has made the Northern dialects his peculiar study.³

¹ The Pricks of Conscience Stimulus Conscientiae, a Northumbrian Poem, by Richard Rolle de Hampole, copied and edited from MSS. in the library of the British Museum with an introduction, notes, and glossarial index, by Richard Morris, published for the Philological Society, 1863. This edition chiefly follows Cotton. MS. Galba, E. ix. Six out of the other MSS. are adaptations of the poem to a more southern dialect. This MS. is supposed not to be later than the beginning of the xvth century, and is therefore much more recent than Rolle de Hampole himself, and hence no reliance whatever can be placed on the final e.

² In v. 1273 we find fortuna for fortune (which occurs in v. 1286), so that probably bace v. 2300, which may have represented the northern pronunciation (byyk) should be altered to bace to rhyme with take in the following line. I have not noted other faulty rhymes.

³ The -es has been preserved in v. 480. The final -e in forerather v. 463 has also been retained for the rhythm, although Mr. Murray prefers form, referring to formbind, formbirth, forndays. Mr. Murray thinks that ai, ay had in Scotland the sound of (ee) at the beginning of the xvi th century, at least a century before it was recognized in the South, although we learn from Hart that it was well known in 1569 (supra p. 122) or rather in 1551, the date of his first draft (infra Chap. VIII, § 3, first note). Mr. Murray’s opinion is based upon the sudden appearance of the orthography ay about 1500 in Gawan Douglas, who uses it where an intermediate (ai) between the old (as) and modern (ee) is hardly conceivable, and his often interchanging a and ay in the same word, as Bray, bra. Again there, their, thyay are regularly confounded, and bath, bathe, bayth, baint all occur. We have the rhymes: Ida lay, say Orlitga, Cassendray away, gafe half-gave have, rais face, say ishay =esche. Possibly this was a period of transitional sound from (as) or (an) to (ah) or (eem), and Douglas, *if the spelling is really his*, which of course is doubtful, strove to mark it by the same device which was known to him possibly by the pronunciation of Greek (the Erasmian system not having been yet introduced), namely the addition of si, or else from the growing habit of calling French ai (ee). There seems to be no doubt that in the instances named, and in: twa tway, ma may mo =plurse, wraith =wroth, maid =made,
It cannot be supposed that this mode of reading the writing of Dan Michel, and Richard Rolle, precisely renders the pronunciation of the dialect which they followed. We know how slightly dialects are at present represented, and how very insufficient our pronunciation would be if derived from the usual orthographical and orthoepical rules. It is not likely that writers five hundred years ago should have been more accurate. They had however the advantage of an alphabet in which the value of each combination was settled with remarkable exactness, and hence they were able by their orthography to make a near approach to the sound of speech around them. But their alphabet only having an accurate representation of the simple and compound sounds: (a, aa, ai, au, b, d, [dh], dzh, e, ee, ei, eu, f, g, h, i, ii, j, k, kh, l, m, n, o, oi, oo, ou, p, q, r, re, s, sh, t, th, tsh, u, uu, v, w, wh, yy), although far superior to that now in use, which only professes to represent in a very lame, confused, and uncertain manner, the simple and compound sounds: (aa, AA, e, e, e, o, ou, f, g, h, i, ii, iu, j, k, l, m, n, o, oi, oo, p, q, r, s, sh, t, th, tsh, u, uu, v, w, wh, z, [zh]),—the same in number but differing in value,—must have been as inadequate to represent our provincial sounds of that time, as our present orthography is to write our present provincial dialects, as may be concluded from an inspection of the key to Glossotype, p. 16. The writer probably refined the dialect and selected his sounds, giving an approximation which would have been understood by a native. It is also possible that he may have pressed some combinations and letters to do a double duty. Writers were already familiar with double uses. Thus i, u were vowels or consonants; o = (o, u), u = (yy, u), ou = ow (uu, oou), ou = (yy, eu), and long and short vowels were written with the same sign. But if in their dialectic writing they took such liberties, we have no satisfactory means, if indeed we have any means of detecting them. Such an approximation however as results from the preceding examination of Chaucer and Gower must certainly be far nearer the truth than any hap-hazard reading, founded upon modern analogies without historical investigation, and as such is worth the study and acceptance of the scholar. We may indeed feel some confidence that Hampole and Dan Michel would have at least understood the above conjectured pronunciation. But the usual modern English sounds would have probably sounded as strange to their ears, as an ordinary Frenchman’s declamation of Shakespeare to ours, or our own Southern pronunciation of Burns to an Ayrshire peasant.

sith = oath, as could not have been (ai).

We cannot but feel rejoiced to know that the long neglected Scotch dialects, which are in fact those of Northern England, are undergoing a thorough examination by one so well qualified in every respect as Mr. Murray, who to his local knowledge of the Border dialects, both Scotch and English, and an antiquarian research into their form and history, joins an extensive acquaintance with those languages, both European and Oriental, which have chiefly engaged the attention of philologists, and a long theoretical and practical familiarity with phonetics.
ILLUSTRATIONS FROM THE EARLIER  Chap. IV. § 8.

EXTRACTS FROM DAN MICHEL.

Ayenbites of Inwyte.

Ajen-bi-te of In-wit

PREFACE, p. 1.

Holy archanle Michael.
Saynt gabriel. and Raphael.
Ye brenge me to þo castel.
þer alle zaulen vareþ wel.
Lhord ihau almïti kyang.
þet madest, and lokest alle byng.
Me þet am þi makying:
to þine blisse me þou bryng.
Blind. and dyaf. and alsuo domb.
Of zeuenty yer al uol rond.
Ne ssole by drage þe grond:
Vor peny, uor mark, ne uor pond.

L’Envoy, p. 262.

Nou ich wille þet ye ywye hou hit is y-went:
þet þis boc is y-write mid engliss of kent.
þis boc is y-mad uor lewede men,
Vor uader, and uor moder, and uor oþer ken,
ham uor to berge uram alle man-yere zen,
þet ine hare inwyttte ne bleue no uool wen.
Huo ase god is his name yzed,
þet þis boc made god him yeue þet bread,
of angles of heuene and þerto his red,
and ondernonge his zaule huanne þet he is dyad.
Amen.

Ymende. þet þis boc is uol-ulded ine þe eue of þe holy apostles Symon an Iudas, of ane broþer of þe cloystre of sanynt austin of Canterberi, Ine þe yeare of oure lhordes beringe. 1340.

Hoo’li arka’aq’gle Miï’kaa’cel;
Saint Gaa’bri’keel; and Raas’faa’-

cel;
Jee broq’e mee to dhoo kastel;
Dheer al’e zaul’en faa’reth wel.
Lord Dzhee’syy’ almïht’ kiq,
Dhet maadst, and loo’kest al’e thiq.
Mee dhet am dhi’ maa’kiq,
To dhi’ne blis’e mee dhulu briq’
Blind, and dyaf, and al’seo domb,
Of ze’ent’ee jeer al vol rond,
Ne shol’e bi draagh’e to dhe grond,
Vor peni’, vor mark, nee vor pond.

Nuu itsh wil’e dhet je swite, nuu net is i-went,
dhet dhis book is i-swite mid Eql’ish of Kent.
Dhis book is i-maad vor levede men,
Vor vaa’der, and vor mod’er, and vor oth’er ken,
ham vor to bergh’e vram al’e manjecere zen,
Dhet in’e naar in-wite ne blevee noo fuul wen.
‘Whoo aase God? ’ is his naam i-zed’;
dhet dhis book maad’e. God him je’eve dhet bread
of aq’gelz of jeev’en, and dher-
too’ his reed,
and on’dervoq’ his zaul’e whan
dhet nie is draad.
Aa’men.

Amend’e. dhet dhis book is
volveld’ in’e dhe eev of dhe
hoool’s apost’tlz Si’moon’ and
Dzhyj-das, of aan’ bro’deher of
dhe klui’ster of saint Au’stin of
Kant’erbe’r, in’e dhe jee’a’re of
uur Lhord’es beer’i’qe. 1340.
Pater noster

Vader oure ðet art ine heuenes, y-halged by ði name, cominde ði riche. y-worse ði wil, ase ine heuene: and ine erfe. bread oure echadayes : yef ous to day. and ourelous oure yeldinges : ase and we oureleþ oure yelderes. and ne ouss led naȝt: in-to uondeinge. ac vri ous uram queade. zwo by hit.

Ave Maria

Hayl Marie, of þone kel uol. lhord by mid þe. y-blissed þou ine wymmen. and y-blissed þe ouet of þine wombe. zwo by hit.

Credo

Ich leue ine god, uader al-miȝti. makere of heuene, and of erfe. And ine iesu crist, his zone on-lepi oure lhord. þet y-kend is, of þe holy gost. y-bore of Marie Mayde. y-pyned onder poune pilate. y-nayled a rode. dyad. and bebered. yede down to helle. þane bridday a-ros uram þe dyade. Steag to heuenes. zit aþe rigt half of god þe uader al-miȝti. þannes to com-ene he is, to deme þe quike, and þe dyade. Ich y-leue ine þe holy gost. holy cherche generalliche. Meennesse of hal-þen. Leennesse of zennes. of ulesse arizinge. and lyf eurelestinde. zwo by hyt.

Pater noster

Vaa̱der uur-e, dhæt art in e heed-ven-e, ih-halged bhii dhi-nam-e. Ko̱-mind-e dhi-rui-te. I-word-h-e dhi wil, a as-in ee-veen-e, and ine er-e. Breaed uur-e ee-þe-hade-ies jet us to dai. And vorlec-t uur-e jeld-iq-e, as-e and weel vorlec-t eth uur-e jeld-i-eres. And nee us leed nakht in-too vonv-iq-e. Ak vri us uram kwœaad-e. Zwoo bih nit.

Ave Maria

Hail Marie, of thought e vol. Lhord bi mid dhe. Ih-bi̊d dhuu in e wi̊m-en, and ibisi̊d dhe oovet of dhiún-e wombe. Zwoo bih nit.

Kree̊doo

Ithsh lee-ve in God, vaa-der almi̊kht-i, maakere in heeu-ven-e and of erth-e. And in-e Dhee-sy Krist, his zo̊o-e oon-ki̊p-i uur-e Lhord, dhet ikend i̊s of dhe nui̊-bi̊ Goost, boo-ro̊ of Mari̊a Maid-e, i̊pin̊ed on̊d̊er Puuns Pilaåte nai̊led aa roo̊-de, draad, and bebered, see-de duun to nel-e, dhane thri̊d-kei dai aroos̊ vram dhe draad-e, steagh to heed-ven-e, zit adhe rikht half of God dhe vaa-der almi̊kht-i. Dhane-s to koon̊-e kne i, to deem-e dhe kwik-e, and dhe draad-e. Ithsh lee-ve in e dhe nool-i Goost, nool-i tebserteh-e dzehe-erall-i-te, meenesse of hal-ghen, leenesse of zen-es, of vleshe aru-iq-e, and li̊f ever-leste-in-de. Zwoo bih nit.

1 For the translation of pages 412 and 414, see p. 416.
And [when man] was born til his worldly light,
He ne had nought strenthe ne myght,
Nother to ga ne yhit to stand,
Ne to crepe with fote ne with hand.
Pan has a man les myght pan a beste
When he es born, and es sene leste;
For a best, when it is born, may ga
Aliste aftir, and ryn to and fra;
Bot a man has na myght þar-to,
When he es born, swa to do;
For þan may he noght stande ne crepe,
But ligge and sprawle, and cry and wepe.
For unnethes es a child born fully,
Þat it ne bygynnys to goule and cry;
And by þat cry men know þan
Whether it be man or woman.
For when it es born it cryes swa:
If it be man it says “a. a.,”
Þat þe first letter es of þe nam,
Of our forme-fader Adam.
And if þe child a woman be,
When it es born it says “e. e.,”
E es þe first letter and þe hede
Of þe name of Eve þat bygan our dede.
Þarfor a clerk made on þis manere
Þis vers of metre þat is writen here:
Deicit E. col. A. quot-quot nascentur ab Eva.
“All þas,” he says, “þat comes of Eve,
Þat es al men þat here byhoves leve,
Whan þai er born, what-swa þai be,
Þai say outher a. a. or e. e.”
Þus es here þe bygynnyng
Of our lyfe sorow and gretyng,
Til whilk our wrecchednes stirres us,
And þarfor Innocent says þus:
Omnis nascimur evolantes,
Ut nature nostre miseriae
Exprimamus.
He says, “al er we born gretand,
And makand a sorrowful sembland,
For to shew þe gret wrecchednes
Of our kynd þat in us es.”
Þus when þe tyme come of oure birthe,
Al made sorow and na mirth;
Naked we come hider, and bare,
And pure, swa sal we hethen fare.
Conjectured Pronunciation of Richard Rolle de Hampole.

Dhe Prîk of Kon'siens' v. 464–509

And [when man] was born tîl dhîs weîld-is lîcht,
Hee nee mad nudh'-er streths ne mîkht,
Nudh'-er to gaa, ne jîht to stand,
Nee to kreep with foot ne with hand.
Dhan nac a man leis mîkht dhan a beest
When nee es born, and es seen leest;
For a beest, when tî es born, mai gaa
Alstîit afht'ir, and rîn too and frea;
Bot a man nac naa mîkht dharto;
When nee es born, swaa to doo;
For dhan mai ne nokht stand ne kreep,
Bot lig and spraul, and krîi and weep.
For unedhaz' es a tahild born ful-'lîi;
Dhat it nee bigînz' to guul and krîi;
And bîl dhat krîi men knaau dhan
Whehdh'er it be man or woo'man;
For when tî es born it krîi'es swaa;
If it bee man it saiz "aa! aa!"
Dhat dhe first let'er is of dhe naam
Of uur form'c-fas'dor As'daam:
And if dhe tahild a woo'man' bee,
When tî es born it saiz "ee! ee!"
Ec es dhe first let'er and dhe need
Of dhe naam of Eev dhat bigan uur deed.
Dharfoor a klork maad on dhîs maneer
Dhis vers of mee'ter dhat is swee'ten noer:
Diisen'tees E. vel Aa. kwot-kwot naskun'tur ab
"Al dhaas," nee saiz, "dhat koomz of Eev," [Ec'va]
Dhat es al men, dhat hér bîsoovz' leev,
When dhai er born, what-swaa' dhai bee,
Dhai sai uhdh'er aa! aa! or ee! ee!"
Dhus es hér dhe bîgîn'eq'
Of uur liff sor'u and gree'teq',
Tîl whîl uur reetsh-ednes stirz us,
And dhar-foor Ín'osent saiz dhus:
Om'nees nas'imur eedzhyylan'tees
ut naa'tyy'ree nos'tree mîser'iam
ekspr'maam'us.

Hee saiz: "al er wee born greet'and;
And maak'and' a sor'ulful sem'bland',
For to shuu dhe greet reetsh-ednes
Of uur kind dhat ïn us es."
Dhus when dhe tüim koom of uur birth,
Al maad sor'u and naa mirth;
Naak-ed wee koom uhdh'er and baar,
And pyyr, swaa sal wee nedh'en faar.